

# THE WRITINGS OF NICOLE ORESME: A SYSTEMATIC INVENTORY

BY DANIEL A. DI LISCIA AND AURORA PANZICA

*This paper provides an up-to-date inventory of the works of Nicole Oresme (ca. 1320–1382). For each text, we present the incipit and the explicit, its (approximate) date, the list of manuscripts, and, whenever possible, editions and translations. We also*

---

Daniel A. Di Liscia is grateful to the DGF for funding his project (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft Projektnummer 282682744). Aurora Panzica wishes to thank the Swiss National Foundation for Scientific Research (Project number P500PH\_206632/1) for its financial support. In the course of our research we have contacted a series of libraries and colleagues who have kindly helped us to access bibliographic details or to verify our own information. In particular, we would like to express our gratitude to the staff of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (Alexandre Tur), Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève (Marie-Hélène de La Mure), Bibliothèque Mazarine (Patrick Latour), Médiathèque François-Mitterrand Poitiers (Florent Palluault), Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique (Roos Depla), Bodleian Library (Andrew Dunning), John's College Library Oxford (Petra Hofmann), Universiteitsbibliotheek Utrecht (Bart Jaski), Harvard University Library (Jessica Murphy), Universitätsbibliothek Erfurt (Andrea Langner, Thomas Bouillon), Universiteitsbibliotheek Utrecht (Bart Jaski), Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (Friedrich Simader), Universitätsbibliothek Kiel (Klára Erdei), Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel (Claudia Minners-Knaup), Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Florence (David Speranzi), Universitätsbibliothek Augsburg (Andreas Kosuch), Syracuse University Library (Barbara Ann Opar), Yale University Library (Bill Landis, Natalia Sciarini), Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana (Susy Marcon, Orsola Braides, Alessandro Moro), Istituto centrale per il catalogo unico delle biblioteche italiane (E. Caldelli), Biblioteca Reale di Torino (G. Mussari), Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden (Kerstin Schellbach), Burgerbibliothek Bern (Florian Mittenhuber), Magdalene College (Cambridge), Pepys Library & Special Collections (Catherine Sutherland), Rouen, nouvelles Bibliothèques, Bibliothèque patrimoniale (Lucie Garcia), Universitätsbibliothek München (Irene Friedl, Jutta Weishäupl), Biblioteca Colombina (José Antonio Zambrano), and Carolina Rediviva, Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek (Anna Fredriksson, Christel Kraft, and Taeda Tomic). We are also grateful to Georgina Rabassó, Sylvie Lefevre, Alain Boreau, Pedro Mantas España, Alejandro García, Sabine Rommevaux-Tani, Giovanni Catapano, Sten Ebbesen, Pieter Beullens and Harald Berger for their helpful comments. Finally, we would like to express our gratitude to the anonymous referees of *Traditio* for their attentive reading and valuable suggestions.

We use the following abbreviations in this article: AHDLMA = *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*; AL = Aristoteles Latinus; DSB = *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, ed. Charles Gillispie, 16 vols. (New York, 1970–80); Menuet 1966 = A. D. Menuet, "A Provisional Bibliography of Oresme's Writings," *Mediaeval Studies* 28 (1966): 279–99; and Menuet 1969 = A. D. Menuet, "A Provisional Bibliography of Oresme's Writings: A Supplementary Note," *Mediaeval Studies* 31 (1969): 346–47.

*Traditio* 77 (2022), 235–375

© The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of Fordham University. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.  
doi:10.1017/tdo.2022.6

*inventory self-references contained in Oresme's writings and discuss specific problems concerning their titles, attributions, and textual transmission. Oresme's works are classified into nine groups, for each of which we offer preliminary remarks to situate the group in the context of Oresme's career. The two appendices provide detailed information about two texts of possible Oresmian attribution.*

Recent years have seen an increased interest in the writings of Nicole Oresme (ca. 1320–1382), a mathematician, philosopher, and theologian active in France, especially in Paris, during the second half of the fourteenth century.<sup>1</sup> While for several decades significant results have been obtained by focusing on specific groups of texts written by him (in mathematics, economics or practical philosophy, for instance), the current state of research allows us to take a global approach to the complex world of Oresme's works. Although a complete and reliable chronology remains a *desideratum* for future investigations, Oresme's early Latin commentaries are currently gaining more attention as a starting point for a better understanding of his thought. In consequence, research done in the past few years has shed light on new texts and new manuscripts transmitting Oresme's works, making necessary a new, up-to-date bibliography that considers the recent developments of Oresmian studies.

Oresme's vast and diversified scientific activity received scholarly attention quite early. The first systematic attempt to present a bibliography of Oresme's works dates back to the middle of the nineteenth century with Francis Meunier's essay on Oresme's life and writings.<sup>2</sup> About fifty years later, Émile Bridrey provided a comprehensive list of Oresme's works in his essay on Oresme's *De mutatione monetarum*.<sup>3</sup> The 1960s and 1970s saw Oresmian studies flourishing in the United States with a considerable number of editions of Oresme's Latin commentaries, mathematical writings, and vernacular treatises. This movement led to the bibliographical contributions of Albert D. Menut and Marshall Clagett.<sup>4</sup> Other bibliographies of Oresme's writings were published by Charles Lohr in his

<sup>1</sup> For biographical information on Nicole Oresme, see Nicole Oresme, *De proportionibus proportionum* and *Ad pauca respicientes*, ed. E. Grant (Madison, 1966), 3–10; S. M. Babbitt, *Oresme's Livre de Politiques and the France of Charles V* (Philadelphia, 1985), 1–12; F. Neveux, "Nicole Oresme et le clergé normand du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle," in *Autour de Nicole Oresme: Actes du Colloque Oresme organisé à l'Université de Paris XII*, ed. J. Quillet (Paris, 1990), 9–36; M. Lejbowicz, "Nicole Oresme dans la lumière de l'urbanité," in *Chemins de la pensée médiévale: Études offertes à Zénon Kaluza*, ed. P. J. J. M. Bakker, E. Faye and C. Grellard (Turnhout, 2002), 675–708; and idem, "Nicole Oresme, spectateur engagé," in *Nicole Oresme philosophe: Philosophie de la nature et philosophie de la connaissance à Paris au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, ed. J. Celeyrette and C. Grellard (Turnhout, 2014), 21–61.

<sup>2</sup> F. Meunier, *Essai sur la vie et les ouvrages de Nicole Oresme* (Paris, 1857).

<sup>3</sup> E. Bridrey, *Nicole Oresme: Études d'histoire des doctrines et des faits économiques: La théorie de la monnaie au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1906).

<sup>4</sup> Menut 1966 and 1969; *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 645–48; and M. Clagett, "Oresme, Nicole", *DSB* 10:223–30.

inventory of Medieval Latin commentaries on Aristotle, and, more recently, by Olga Weijers in her comprehensive study on the intellectual activity at the Faculty of Arts of the University of Paris.<sup>5</sup> Further efforts include the bibliographies offered in the introductions to Oresme's editions, such as those provided by Benoît Patar and Menut.<sup>6</sup> Our inventory considers these contributions and integrates more recent discoveries resulting from our research.

Oresme's scientific production deals with different fields (mathematics, astrology, astronomy, optics, physics, ethics, politics, economics, law, theology) and literary genres (commentaries, treatises, sermons, pamphlets, translations, *questiones*).<sup>7</sup> For ease of reference, this inventory divides Oresme's writings into nine groups: I) Latin commentaries; II) writings on pure and applied mathematics; III) writings against astrology, magic, and divination; IV) writings in the vernacular; V) theological and metaphysical writings; VI) legal and economical writings; VII) writings whose Oresmian authorship has not been established; VIII) writings that Oresme quotes in other works of certain attribution, but that have not yet been identified; and IX) spurious writings. We order items in groups II, III, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX alphabetically; items in group I, according to the usual order of the books in the *corpus aristotelicum*; and items in group IV chronologically.

Group IX requires some clarifications. Given Oresme's popularity among his contemporaries, it was quite common to find other authors' works attributed to him in manuscripts and in early printings. This practice happened particularly — though not exclusively — for works that originated in Oresme's intellectual milieu and/or discussed subjects close to Oresme's interests. Items 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9 of group IX are examples of this kind. In other cases, the confusion resulted from the inaccuracy of late medieval and early modern catalogues (item 14, for instance) or from the errors of modern scholars (examples include items 15 and 16). Some French versions of Latin works have been attributed to Oresme because of the popularity of his vernacular production (such as items 10, 11, 19, and 20). The list of writings wrongly attributed to Oresme that we offer in this paper is not meant to be exhaustive. Such a list — if it were possible — would not belong to an inventory of Oresme's works, but to a general history of the transmission and interpretation of medieval sources. If we have included some texts whose Oresmian authorship should categorically be ruled out and whose attribution to Oresme can only be explained by scribal error (as in item 13), this is only because these

<sup>5</sup> O. Weijers, *Le travail intellectuel à la Faculté des Arts à Paris: Textes et maîtres, Répertoire des noms commençant par L-M-N-O* (Turnhout, 2005), 168–91.

<sup>6</sup> *QdA*, ed. Patar, 15\*–29\*; and *LdE*, ed. Menut, 28–33.

<sup>7</sup> For an intelligent overview of Oresme's works, see Lejbowicz, "Nicole Oresme, spectateur engagé" (n. 1 above); and idem, "Nicole Oresme dans la lumière de l'urbanité" (n. 1 above).

writings have previously been included in other Oresmian inventories and/or have been mentioned in scholarly literature about Oresme.

Our classification of Oresme's writings is purely pragmatic and is not intended to provide any systematization or interpretation of Oresme's scientific production. For instance, it is well known that Oresme developed the theoretical basis for his attack against astrology in mathematical treatises like *De commensurabilitate vel incommensurabilitate motuum celi*, *Ad pauca respicientes*, and *De proportionibus proportionum*. At the same time, the *Questions* on Euclid's *Elements*, which we include among Oresme's Latin commentaries, is a mathematical text. In this sense, we could have reasonably adopted other methods of classification (by discipline or by genre, for instance). We introduce each group with some preliminary remarks that aim to situate it in the context of Oresme's career.

For each work, we provide the *incipit* and the *explicit*, the list of manuscripts and printed editions, the (approximate) date, as well as information on the title and the attribution, particularly when it is not evident. We also transcribe the *initia* and the *colophona* of the manuscripts transmitting Oresme's works when they are useful to determine their title, date or attribution. For the works presenting significant variations from one manuscript to another, we quote the *incipit* and the *explicit* of each book, particularly in the case of Oresme's Latin commentaries. By contrast, for the works with an established and homogeneous manuscript tradition, we only transcribe the *incipit* and the *explicit* of the text. For manuscripts containing more than one of Oresme's works, we indicate after the signature, in parentheses, the Oresmian writings transmitted along with them. It was common practice for Oresme to quote his own work. Some of these self-quotations are particularly important to establish attribution and relative chronology. For this reason, we have reviewed some of these quotations in our inventory, although we do not mean to be exhaustive on this point.<sup>8</sup>

It is important to stress that this is an inventory of the sources, not of secondary bibliography. The latter has become extremely extensive. Thus, we have concentrated our efforts on the works related to the transmission of the texts rather than their doctrinal content. In addition, reference to different editions is intended to be informative rather than evaluative. The reader will notice that some texts have received much more attention in the scholarship than others and that this attention is not always consistent with the quality of the edited text (the best

---

<sup>8</sup> Some partial attempts to reconstruct the web of internal citations in Oresme's work can be found in L. Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science* (New York, 1923–1958), 3:399–400; M. Clagett, *Nicole Oresme and the Medieval Geometry of Qualities and Motions: A Treatise on the Uniformity and Difformity of Intensities Known as Tractatus de configurationibus qualitatum et motuum* (Madison, 1968), 122–33; J. Celeyrette, “Les *Questions sur la Physique* dans l'œuvre de Nicole Oresme,” in *Nicole Oresme philosophe* (n. 1 above), 65–68; and A. Panzica, “Nicole Oresme à la Faculté des Arts de Paris: Les *Questions sur les Météorologiques*,” *AHDLMA* 84 (2017): 7–89, at 27–33.

example of this is perhaps *De mutationibus monetarum*, translated into several languages on a rather weak textual basis). Furthermore, the editions of most of the texts that we use for our research have been produced based on only a selection of manuscripts (for example *Algorismus proportionum*, *De proportionibus proportionum* or *De communicatione idiomatum*), sometimes with a minimal critical apparatus and unsatisfactory determination of the sources (for instance *Livre de Éthiques*, *Livre de Politiques* and *Livre du ciel et du monde*). In addition, as the reader will note, we have included manuscripts that were unknown until now, which represents a significant addition even for editions considered exemplary, like that of *De configurationibus qualitatum et motuum*. The signatures of these manuscripts are followed by an asterisk and relevant bibliography is provided in footnotes. Whenever possible or relevant, we have also included a reference to the catalogue description of the manuscript in question. In the manuscript signatures, we mention the name of the city in English and the name of the library in the original language. In order to avoid redundancy, we use the following abbreviations for the libraries and collections:

- Ashb. = codex Ashburnianum (Florence)
- BAV = Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
- BJ = Biblioteka Jagiellońska (Krakow)
- BML = Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (Florence)
- BN = Biblioteca Nazionale
- BNM = Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana
- BnF = Bibliothèque nationale de France
- BR = Bibliothèque Royale (Brussels)
- BSB = Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (Munich)
- Erfurt, UB, Dep. Erf., CA = Erfurt, Universitäts- und Forschungsbibliothek, Dep. Erf., CA
- OB = Openbare Bibliotheek (Bruges)
- ÖNB = Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (Vienna)
- SB = Staatsbibliothek
- UB = Universitätsbibliothek, Biblioteca Universitaria, University Library, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka

Likewise, we use the following shortened forms for Oresme's writings:

- *AP* = *Algorismus proportionum*
- *CAJ* = *Tractatus contra astronomos judicarios*
- *CQM* = *De configurationibus qualitatum et motuum*
- *CVI* = *De commensurabilitate vel incommensurabilitate motuum celi*
- *DCI* = *De communicatione idiomatum*
- *EcL* = *Expositio cuiusdam legis*

- *LdC = Livre du ciel et du monde*
- *LdD = Livre de divinations*
- *LdE = Livre de Éthiques*
- *LdP = Livre des de Politiques*
- *LdY = Livre de Yconomique*
- *LF = De latitudinibus formarum*
- *Mm = De mutationibus monetarum*
- *QCQP = Questio contra divinatores horoscopios, De causis mirabilium, Tabula problematum and Problemata.*
- *QdA = Questiones super De anima*
- *QdC = Questiones super De celo*
- *QdG = Questiones super De generatione et corruptione*
- *QdS = Questiones super De spera*
- *QsE = Questiones super Euclidis Elementa*
- *QsM de prima lectura = Questiones super Meteorologica de prima lectura*
- *QsM de ultima lectura = Questiones super Meteorologica de ultima lectura*
- *QsP = Questiones super Physicam*
- *Pp = De proportionibus proportionum*
- *Pr = Ad pauca respicientes*
- *Pvm = De proportionibus velocitatum in motibus*
- *SdA = Expositio super De anima*
- *SsM = Sententia super libros Meteororum*
- *TdE = Traictié de l'Espere*
- *VS = De visione stellarum*

Finally, we have done everything in our power to cover the entire period of Oresmian research from its beginning in the nineteenth century (or perhaps even earlier) to the present.<sup>9</sup>

#### I. LATIN COMMENTARIES

*Preliminary remarks:* Oresme studied at the Faculty of Arts in Paris and obtained the degree of Master of Arts before 1342.<sup>10</sup> Most of Oresme's Latin commentaries are the result of his teaching activity at the same Faculty. As such, they count among Oresme's early works, dating from the mid-1340s. To this group

---

<sup>9</sup> Naturally, this is a difficult task, since research is advancing rapidly in various fields. For example, a very important project directed by Alain Boureau is currently in production, covering the fundamental texts by Oresme on astrology, politics, and theology. Organized in nine volumes divided into three sections, this work bears the general title: "Nicole Oresme: Écrits métaphysiques, politiques et théologiques." Volumes I–II, which include the *Questions on the Sentences*, have already been published (Paris, 2021).

<sup>10</sup> W. J. Courtenay, "The Early Career of Nicole Oresme," *Isis* 91 (2000): 542–48.

belong Oresme's commentaries on Aristotle's *Physica*, *De generatione et corruptione*, *De celo*, *Meteorologica*, and *De anima*. We know from the university statutes that Aristotelian texts were the object of two kinds of lectures. While the *lectio cursoria*, which bachelors could offer, presented a general overview of the text, the *lectio ordinaria* offered by regent masters discussed specific problems (*questiones*). The written counterpart of the *lectio cursoria* is the literal commentary (*Expositio* or *Sententia*); the *lectio ordinaria* resulted for its part in question commentaries (*Questiones*).<sup>11</sup> In the case of Aristotle's *Meteorologica* and *De anima*, we possess questions and literal commentaries attributed to Oresme. A literal commentary on *De generatione et corruptione*, which is transmitted in a manuscript containing Oresme's *Questions* on the same text, should probably be ascribed to Oresme as well (see item 8 in group VII). Oresme's literal commentary on the *Physica* has not yet been identified, but Oresme refers to it several times in his question commentary on the same text (see item 1 in this group). There is no trace of a literal commentary on Aristotle's *De celo*. Likewise, only question commentaries are transmitted for Sacrobosco's *De spera* and Euclid's *Elements*, two texts that medieval masters commented on less than the Aristotelian treatises. In contrast to the Aristotelian commentaries, we have no evidence at all that Oresme taught his commentaries on Sacrobosco's *De spera* and Euclid's *Elements* at the Faculty of Arts.

### 1. *Questiones super Physicam (QsP)*

*Incipit and explicit of the books* (according to the modern edition, with reference to the folios of the Seville manuscript): [book I, fols. 1ra–16vb] “Circa <primum> librum *Physicorum* queritur primo utrum cognitio unius rei faciat ad cognitionem alterius. Et arguitur primo quod non, quia unumquodque est natum facere <ad> cognitionem sui, ergo eius cognitio dependet ex se et non ex alio . . . X . . . Ultima ratio faciliter solvitur, et dicendum est: verum est quando est sub forma Sor, sed postea, quando non erit materia Sor, habebit aliam extensionem. Et si<c> finiuntur questiones primi libri *Physicorum* amen. Deo gratia amen. Compileate per reverendiss<im>um doctorem Nicolaum Oresme et Parisius disputate.” [II, fols. 17ra–28va] “Circa secundum *Physicorum* primo queritur utrum omne ens naturale habeat in se principium motus et quietis. Et arguitur primo quod non, quia motus, accidentia, materia et forma sunt entia naturalia, et tamen non habent in se principium motus et quietis, quia sunt simplicia, etiam motus non est motus, aut quies . . . X . . . Nec attribuitur forme, quia ipsa forma est efficiens et est finis, sicut dictum est in positione etc. Expliciuunt questiones secundi

<sup>11</sup> O. Weijers, *Terminologie des universités au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Rome, 1987), 306–308 and 324–35; and eadem, *Le maniement du savoir: Pratiques intellectuelles à l'époque des premières universités (XIII<sup>e</sup>–XIV<sup>e</sup> siècles)* (Paris, 1996), 45–47.

*Physicorum* Deo gratias amen amen.” [III, fols. 29ra–42vb] “Circa tertium librum *Physicorum* queritur utrum ignorato motu necesse sit ignorare naturam. Et arguitur quod non, quia semper est contingens quod natura ignoretur a Sorte vel ab alio homine vel sciatur, ergo nullo posito fiet necessarium . . . X . . . Ad ultimam, solutum est quomodo est e converso in divisione magnitudinis et augmentatione numeri etc. Deo gratias amen amen. Expliciunt questiones super tertium *Physicorum* per me.” [IV, fols. 43ra–56vb] “Consequenter queritur utrum locus sit superficies. Et arguitur quod non per Aristotelem in *Predicamentis*, qui ponit locum et superficiem species quantitatis distinctas, et ita unum non predicatur de alio . . . X . . . Nec sequitur quod tempus componatur ex eis tamquam ex partibus, quia <in> infinitum excedit instans etc. Expliciunt questiones quarti *Physicorum* Aristotelis. Amen.” [V, fols. 57ra–64vb] “Circa quintum *Physicorum* queritur primo utrum ad substantiam sit motus. Et videtur primo quod sic, quia aliqua substantia acquiritur successive, ergo ad eam est motus. Consequentia patet, quia motus non est aliud nisi acquisitio successiva partis post partem . . . X . . . Ad quintam et sextam, dicitur quod <nec> generatio et corruptio, nec motus et quies opponuntur contrarie et proprie, sed large. Expliciunt questiones quinti libri. Deo gratias, amen.” [VI, fols. 65ra–70vb] “Circa sextum *Physicorum* queritur utrum continuum componatur ex indivisibilibus. Et arguitur primo quod sic, quia numerus componitur ex unitatibus, ergo continuum componitur ex indivisibilibus . . . X . . . Vel potest dici negando consequentiam, eo quod indivisibile non moveretur per se, sed per accidens. Expliciunt questiones super sextum librum *Physicorum*.” [VII, fols. 71ra–78vb] “Circa septimum librum *Physicorum* queritur primo utrum omne quod movetur moveatur ab alio. Et arguitur primo quod non, quia animal movetur a se ipso, ut patet secundo huius . . . X . . . Et potest dici quod sic intelligebat Aristoteles, vel forte quod est vitium in translatione. Deo gratias laus in excelsis. Expliciunt questiones septimi *Physicorum*.”

*Manuscript:* Seville, Bibl. Capitular y Colombina, 7–6–30, fols. 2ra–78vb.<sup>12</sup>

*Modern edition:* S. Caroti (ed.), *Nicole Oresme, Questiones super Physicam (Books I–VII)* (Leiden, 2013).

*Partial editions:*

1. Edition of questions III.1–17, IV.1–21, and V.6–9: S. Kirschner, *Nicolaus Oresmes Kommentar zur Physik des Aristoteles: Kommentar mit Edition der Quaestionen zu Buch 3 und 4 der Aristotelischen Physik sowie von vier Quaestionen zu Buch 5* (Stuttgart, 1997), 197–417.

<sup>12</sup> This manuscript was discovered by G. Beaujouan in 1964: G. Beaujouan, “Manuscripts scientifiques médiévaux de la Bibliothèque de Séville,” *Actes du dixième Congrès International d’Histoire des Sciences / Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of the History of Science, Ithaca 26 VIII 1962–2 IX 1962*, ed. H. Guerlac (Paris, 1964), 631–34, esp. 633.



2. Edition of questions III.1–8: S. Caroti, “La position de Nicole Oresme sur la nature du mouvement (*Quaestiones super Physicam* III.1–8): Problèmes gnoséologiques, ontologiques et sémantiques,” *AHDLMA* 51 (1994): 303–85, at 335–85.

*French translation* (selected passages from question III.12): *De la théologie aux mathématiques: L’infini au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, ed. J. Biard and J. Celeyrette (Paris, 2005), 230–43.

*Attribution*: See the colophon of the first book (fol. 16vb): “Compile per reverendissimum doctorem Nicolaum Orem et Parisius disputate.”<sup>13</sup>

*Dating*: The *terminus post quem* for the dating of Oresme’s *QsP* is his *inceptio* as master of Arts, around 1342. According to modern editors, the *terminus ante quem* is John of Mirecourt’s condemnation of 1347.<sup>14</sup>

*Self-references*:

A. Self-references to *QsP*: Oresme refers to his *QsP* several times in his *QdG*:

1. I.5: “Impossibile est idem esse sursum et deorsum in duobus locis nisi respective sursum respectu unius et deorsum respectu alterius. Et de hoc visum est in quinto *Physicorum*.”<sup>15</sup>
2. I.5: “Responditur quod ille accipit elementum pro materia et forma, que verius sunt prima elementa, ut dictum est secundo *Physicorum*.”<sup>16</sup>
3. I.12: “Ultima conclusio: quod augmentatio est verus motus ad quantitatem, et potest probari ex diffinitione motus, ut visum fuit supra quinto *Physicorum*.”<sup>17</sup>
4. I.16: “Ad sextam, cum dicitur quod omnis motus continuus est de contrario in contrarium, visum fuit in quinto *Physicorum*.”<sup>18</sup>
5. I.21: “Tertio, sciendum quod ‘contingens,’ ‘casuale,’ ‘monstrum’ et ‘violentum’ habent quandam convenientiam et etiam differentiam, unde

<sup>13</sup> For other arguments supporting the attribution of this commentary to Oresme, see S. Kirschner, *Nicolaus Oresmes Kommentar zur Physik des Aristotele: Kommentar mit Edition der Quaestionen zu Buch 3 und 4 der Aristotelischen Physik sowie von vier Quaestionen zu Buch 5* (Stuttgart, 1997), 22.

<sup>14</sup> *QsP*, ed. Caroti et al., xxiv–xxv. See also S. Caroti, “*Modi rerum* and Materialism: A Note on a Quotation of a Condemned Articulus in Some Fourteenth-Century Parisian *De anima* Commentaries,” *Traditio* 55 (2000): 211–34.

<sup>15</sup> *QdG*, ed. Caroti, 40, lines 213–15. The source for this passage is *QsP*, V.9, ed. Caroti et al., 625, lines 9–97.

<sup>16</sup> *QdG*, ed. Caroti, 42, lines 26–65. The source for this passage is *QsP*, I.12, ed. Caroti et al., 109, lines 171–72.

<sup>17</sup> *QdG*, ed. Caroti, 109, lines 17–72. The source for this passage is *QsP*, I.16, ed. Caroti et al., 141, lines 171–72.

<sup>18</sup> *QdG*, ed. Caroti 141, lines 17–72. The source for this passage is *QsP*, V.1, ed. Caroti et al., 573, lines 149–51.

‘contingens’ dicitur respectu liberi arbitrii, et ideo, sicut patet supra secundum *Physicorum*, <si> nullum esset liberum arbitrium, omnia evenirent de necessitate.”<sup>19</sup>

6. I.21: “sicut dictum est supra secundum *Physicorum*, nihil alterat seipsum primo contra suam inclinationem, sive sit simplex sive mixtum.”<sup>20</sup>

Oresme also refers to his *QsP* in the second redaction of his *QsM*: “dico quod motus calefacit accipiendo ‘motum’ pro mobili taliter se habere; sed utrum mobile sic se habere sit ipsum mobile, vel aliud, vel que res sit, dictum est in libro *Physicorum*” (question I.8, ed. Panzica, 162, lines 15–17, see below). This topic is dealt with in *QsP* III.2–III.7.

Oresme refers to the discussion of *impetus* developed in the seventh book of the *QsP* in his *LdC*: “Mais l’en doit entendre par ceste pesanteur qui crest en descendant une qualité accidentelle laquelle est causée par l’enforcement de l’acressement de l’isneleté, si comme j’ay aytrefois declarié ou VII de *Physique* [. . .] Et telle qualité est en tout mouvement et naturel et violent toute foyz que l’isneleté va en cressant, fors ou mouvement du ciel. Et telle qualité est cause du mouvement des choses jetees quant elles sont hors de la main ou de l’instrument, si comme je <ay> monstré autrefois sus le .vii. de *Phisique*.”<sup>21</sup> According to Jean Celeyrette, the corresponding passage in *QsP* is the following: “Ad tertiam, cum dicitur quod grave non velocitaret motum suum, dicendum quod immo, quia non continue est equalis potentia. Immo quando velocitatur in fine, tunc, licet gravitas essentialis non augeatur, tamen ibi est additio virtutis motive aut propter impetum acquisitum aut propter aerem insequentem coadiuvantem motum,” VIII.9, lines 785–86. Anneliese Maier believes, however, that in this passage Oresme is referring to a different commentary from that transmitted in the Seville manuscript.<sup>22</sup> Another explicit reference to *QsP* can be found in *LdC*, III.7, 610, line 71–612, line 81. According to Celeyrette, in *QsE* Oresme refers with the expression “alias probabatur” to *QsP*: “Ultima conclusio est probabilis, quod angulus est alternus contactus duarum linearum [. . .]. Et ideo dico quod est quoddam accidens; non tamen est aliquod accidens quod est essentia sicut albedo, sed est accidens quod est sic esse, puta superficiem sic esse acutam capiendo acutum pro quoque concursu linearum [. . .]. Quod tale sic esse non sit suum subiectum sicut superficies, *alias probabatur*.”<sup>23</sup>

<sup>19</sup> *QdG*, ed. Caroti, 177, lines 5–56. The source for this passage is *QsP*, II.13, ed. Caroti et al., 264–266, lines 112–194.

<sup>20</sup> *QdG*, ed. Caroti, 177, lines 83–84. The source for this passage is *QsP*, II.2, ed. Caroti et al., 176, lines 71–79.

<sup>21</sup> *LdC*, I.18, ed. Menut and Denomy, 144, lines 69–73 and 80–84.

<sup>22</sup> A. Maier, *Die Vorläufer Galileis im 14. Jahrhundert* (Roma, 1966), 307–14. See also Kirschner, *Nicolaus Oresmes Kommentar zur Physik* (n. 13 above), 22.

<sup>23</sup> *QsE*, question 20, ed. Busard, 188, lines 54–63 (our italics). The passage to which Oresme is referring can be found in *QsP*, II.6, ed. Caroti et al.

Jean Celeyrette also believes that Oresme refers to *QsP* in *QdC* with the expression “sicut tangebatur”: “moveri est aliter se habere in semet ipso et non ad aliud, sicut tangebatur.”<sup>24</sup> According to Celeyrette, in this passage Oresme is referring to *QsP* III.7, 337, lines 44–46: “Quinta est descriptio melior et vera <est> quod moveri est aliter se habere continue quam ipsum mobile prius se habebat, respectu sui et non respectu cuiuscumque extrinseci.”

B. Self-references in *QsP*: In *QsP*, Oresme refers to the first redaction of *QsM* while speaking of the Sun, which heats the earth, but does not have the same effect on the heavens: “Secundum dubium est si medium non sit natum suscipere talem actionem, sicut celum non est natum calefieri, tunc non videtur quod oporteat quod actio fiat primo in ipsum. Respondetur, sicut ponit Commentator secundo *Celi*, quod non oportet quod eadem actione agat aliquid in medium et in distans, tamen requiritur quod aliqua; omnino sufficit quod celum sit illuminatum. Et de hoc dictum fuit in primo *Methaurorum*”<sup>25</sup>. The editors of *QsP* refer to question I.8 (*Utrum motus celi sit causa calefactionis ignis in spera sua*) of the second redaction of Oresme’s *QsM* as the source of this quotation. Yet in this question we find no reference to the problem of the transmission of solar heat and the inalterability of celestial orbs. Interestingly, in his partial edition of Oresme’s *QsP* of 1997, Stephan Kirshner correctly refers to the set of questions on the *Meteorologica* transmitted in MS Munich, BSB, Clm 4375, fols. 19ra–46rb as the source of this quotation.<sup>26</sup>

Oresme’s *QsP* contains some references to a commentary on the eighth book, which has not yet been identified (see below, group VIII, item 2):

1. IV.10: “celum non resis<ti>t intelligentie, ut videbitur octavo huius.”<sup>27</sup>
2. V.21: “Tertio, mobile quod movetur super aliquod spatium aliquando est in medio, et hoc non est nisi indivisibiliter. Similiter multa alia sunt indivisibiliter sicut creatio anime, et Commentator etiam dicit quod sunt quedam mutationes indivisibiles. Modo tale esse non mensuratur tempore, ergo, cum talia sint aliquando, et non in tempore, igitur indivisibiliter. Et hoc est esse instantanee, et de hoc videbitur octavo huius.”<sup>28</sup>
3. VII.1: “Ad secundum, conceditur quod lapis post amotionem impediementi movetur ex se, sed non potest incipere motum nisi precedente alio motore sicut generante vel removente impedimentum vel movente violente. Et ita declarat Aristoteles etiam de motu animalium octavo

<sup>24</sup> *QdC*, II.5, ed. Kren, 501, lines 82–83 (our italics).

<sup>25</sup> *QsP*, VII.3, ed. Caroti et al., 733, lines 124–29.

<sup>26</sup> Kirshner, *Nicolaus Oresmes Kommentar zur Physik* (n. 13 above), 30–31, n. 91. See also Panzica, “Nicole Oresme à la Faculté des Arts” (n. 8 above), 2–28.

<sup>27</sup> *QsP*, IV.10, ed. Caroti et al., 485, lines 1–16 (our italics).

<sup>28</sup> *QsP*, V.21, ed. Caroti et al., 563, line 81–564, line 88 (our italics).

huius; Lincolnensis declarat aliter quod forma est movens et materia est motum, licet tamen Aristoteles intelligit de partibus integralibus, et quod omne motum est divisibile in partes integrales. Conclusio potest aliter probari, *et de hoc videbitur in octavo huius.*<sup>29</sup>

Some passages in *QsP* might refer to a literal commentary on the same Aristotelian text:

1. II.8: “sed ut specialius videatur de istis agentibus, pretermisissis modis seu divisionibus causarum communibus omni generi cause, de quibus *dictum est in textu*, sicut de per se et per accidens, actu et potentia etc.”<sup>30</sup>
2. II.8: “Et hoc patuit in textu, et est commune omnibus causis.”<sup>31</sup>
3. II.15: “patet in textu totum illud.”<sup>32</sup>
4. III.8: “sicut dicebatur in fine tertii capituli.”<sup>33</sup>
5. IV.7: “Alii dicebant quod vacuum est idem quod rarum et leve, et hoc *dictum est in textu.*”<sup>34</sup>
6. V.5: “et hoc probat Aristoteles per multas rationes, de quibus dictum fuit in textu.”<sup>35</sup>
7. VI.1: “quia hoc dictum est in textu.”<sup>36</sup>

It is possible that in these passages Oresme is simply referring to the Aristotelian text. Yet it cannot be ruled out that he devoted a question and a literal commentary to the *Physica* (see below, group VIII, item 1), as we shall see for other Aristotelian treatises such as *De generatione et corruptione*, *De anima*, and *Meteorologica*.

## 2. *Questiones super De celo (QdC)*

*Incipit and explicit of the books* (according to Kren’s edition): [book I] “Primo queritur circa librum *De celo et mundo*: utrum ens mobile [Kren: mobili] localiter sit subiectum in hoc libro celi et mundi. Et videtur quod non, quia de tali ente et isto motu locali determinatum est in octavo *Physicorum* . . . X . . . Iterum potest dici quod privatio non est distincta [Kren: distinctum] a materia nisi esset unum significabile complexe et de tali non est inconveniens quia proprie non est aliquid

<sup>29</sup> *QsP*, VII.1, ed. Caroti et al., 723, lines 153–57 (our italics).

<sup>30</sup> *QsP*, II.8, ed. Caroti et al., 219, 3–39 (our italics).

<sup>31</sup> *QsP*, II.8, ed. Caroti et al., 224, line 199.

<sup>32</sup> *QsP*, II.15, ed. Caroti et al., 277, line 9.

<sup>33</sup> *QsP*, III.8, ed. Caroti et al., 343, line 27.

<sup>34</sup> *QsP*, IV.7, ed. Caroti et al., 466, 39–40 (our italics).

<sup>35</sup> *QsP*, V.5, ed. Caroti et al., 599, lines 117–18.

<sup>36</sup> *QsP*, VI.1, ed. Caroti et al., 659, line 36.

[Kren: aliquis], et per hoc solvitur quinta ratio et ultima conceditur.” [II] “Queritur utrum violentia vel contrarietas sit causa fatigationis. Et arguitur quod non, primo per Commentatorem [Kren: Commentator] octavo *Physicorum*, ubi vult quod habere materiam est causa fatigationis . . . X . . . Adhuc circa secundum librum habent locum questiones de figura celi et stellarum et etiam de figura terre sed facte fuerunt super *De spera*, et etiam de situ et loco terre sed solent [Kren: solet] fieri circa quartum [Kren: quartam] *Physicorum* et ideo non plus de secundo, et patet questio.” [III] “Consequentur queritur circa tertium librum de celo : utrum ex eo quod elementa sunt gravia et levia possit probari corpora non componi ex atthomis. Et probatio Aristotelis circa hoc fundatur supra duo. Primum est quod indivisibile non est grave nec leve nec esset . . . X . . . Ad auctoritatem in oppositum, negatur Commentator quia ipsemet negat alibi et si ipse sibimet [Kren: sibimen(!)] est contrarius, et cetera.” [IV] “Consequenter queritur utrum aliquod elementum sit grave in proprio loco et arguitur quod sic auctoritate Aristotelis et Commentatoris in isto quarto capitulo, ubi pro hoc quod aer est gravis in proprio loco, reddunt causam quare magnum lignum est gravius parvo plumbo in aere et e contrario est in aqua . . . X . . . igitur aurum huius mixti ponderat 6 libras et 6/7 unius libre et isto pondere posito cum pondere cupri veniunt 8 libre. Ratio ad oppositum soluta est.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4° 299, fols. 1r–50r.
2. Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4° 325, fols. 57r–90v (the last question is missing).
3. Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4° 342, fol. 66r (only the last question).

*Modern edition and translation:* C. Kren (ed.), “The Quaestiones super de Celo of Nicole Oresme” (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1965) (with English translation).

*Attribution:* The text of manuscript CA 4° 299 is listed as “Questiones Orem super *De celo*” in a catalogue compiled around 1412 by Amplonius Rating de Berka, a German physician who owned an important collection of scientific manuscripts.<sup>37</sup> In spite of this, the same catalogue attributes to Buridan the *Questions on De celo* of manuscript CA 4° 325, the text of which is identical to the one of

<sup>37</sup> *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, ed. P. Lehmann (Munich, 1928), 2:36. The ancient signature of this manuscript in Amplonius’s catalogue is “30 philosophie naturalis.” On Amplonius and his library, see Thomas Bouillon and Brigitte Pfeil, “Amplonius Rating de Berka und seine Büchersammlung: Bedeutung, Geschichte und zukünftige Perspektiven der Bibliotheca Amploniana,” *Mitteilungen des Vereins für die Geschichte und Altertumskunde von Erfurt* 70 (2009): 31–53.

manuscript 4° 299.<sup>38</sup> It is possible that Amplonius took this attribution from a third Erfurt manuscript transmitting this commentary: CA 4° 342. The text of manuscript CA 4° 325 breaks off at fol. 90v in the middle of a sentence. A later hand added a note at the bottom of the page informing the reader that the missing text could be found in manuscript 29 of the collection of natural philosophy according to the 1412 catalogue by Amplonius Ratinck after Buridan's commentary on the *Meteorologica* ("defectus trium foliorum vel duorum et unius folii pertinentis adhuc ad istud habetur in libraria, in 29 philosophie naturalis citra finem quarti *Metheororum* Biridani"). MS 29 bears today the signature 4° 342. In the top margin of fol. 66r of this manuscript, after Buridan's literal commentary on the *Meteorologica*, we find in fact the final part of Oresme's *QdC* missing in manuscript 4° 325. Nevertheless, the same hand that directed us to manuscript 4° 342 wrote at the top of fol. 66r that the subsequent three folios (fols. 66r–68r) contained the end of Buridan's — and not Oresme's — *QdC* ("ista tria folia sequentia stabant in volumine 31 naturalis librerie collegii porte celi Erfordie, citra finem questionum Biridani *De celo*"). These three folios do, in fact, contain the last question of Oresme's commentary as well as two anonymous questions on *De celo*: "utrum celum sit spericum et elementa sperica; utrum terra sit sicut punctus in medio firmamenti." At the end of these questions, the same hand that guided us from MS 325 to MS 342 wrote that Buridan's questions, which began in MS 31 of the collection of natural philosophy, ended at this point ("et sic finiuntur hic questions ascripte magistro Biridano super librum *De celo*, quorum principium quere in 31 naturalis philosophie librerie porte celi").<sup>39</sup>

*Dating:* Kren considered Oresme's *QdC* as a very early work to be dated at the beginning of his teaching at the Arts Faculty, that is to say, according to Kren, in the second half of the 1340s.<sup>40</sup>

*Self-references:*

A. Self-references to *QdC*: Oresme refers to *QdC* in *QdG*: "Octavo, quia gravitas et levitas immediate consequuntur prima corpora, scilicet elementa, et sunt minus separabiles, quia citius potest terra calefieri quam levefieri; et similiter de istis qualitatibus determinatum est in priori, scilicet in libro *De celo et mundo*."<sup>41</sup> Oresme deals with the four qualities in questions IV.1–5 of *QdC*. Another reference to *QdC* can be found in Oresme's *Problemata* (see below, group III, item 2): "Et ita diceretur de speciebus, quia possibile est, sicut alibi scilicet super *De celo* est probatum, quod si sint in celo aliqui motus incommensurabiles quod infinite fuerunt

<sup>38</sup> Bouillon and Pfeil, "Amplonius Rating de Berka und seine Büchersammlung," 36: "questiones Johannis Buryden super libris *De celo et mundo*." The ancient signature of this manuscript in Amplonius' catalogue is "31 philosophie naturalis."

<sup>39</sup> See *QdC*, ed. Kren, xxi–xxii.

<sup>40</sup> See *QdC*, ed. Kren, x–xii.

<sup>41</sup> *QdG*, II.1, ed. Caroti, 182, lines 32–35.

coniunctiones et erunt, quarum una non erit similis alteri, et sic etiam nove species” (MS Florence, BML, fol. 48rb). The passage to which Oresme refers can be found in question I.24.<sup>42</sup>

B. Self-references in *QdC*: As we have seen above, Oresme refers in his *QsC* to his *QsP*. In question II.13, Oresme refers twice to his *QsM*:

1. II.13: “Respondetur quod non oportet quia sicut dictum est super librum *Meteororum*, motus calefacit propter confricationem corporum que non est in proposito quia aer usque prope speram ignis movetur hoc modo.”<sup>43</sup> The corresponding passage can be found both in the first and in the second redaction of Oresme’s *QsM*.<sup>44</sup>
2. II.13: “Ad rationes in oppositum ad primam, sicut est de igne, et cetera, dico quod non est simile quia ignis est propinquior celo quam terra et propter hoc movetur ut patuit primo *Meteororum*.”<sup>45</sup> Oresme is probably referring to the first redaction of his *QsM*, question I.4: “Quinto movet celum inferiora mediante solo motu locali; sic dicitur quod movet speram ignis, vel ignem in spera, quia propter nimiam velocitatem trahit secum ignem tali motu.”<sup>46</sup> In the same question, Oresme refers in a general way to *QdS* (see above, the explicit of the second book).

<sup>42</sup> *QdC*, ed. Kren, 421–23: “Secundo si motus solis et lune sunt incommensurabiles, sicut est verisimile, tunc semper piramis umbre terre in orbe lune per aliquam viam per quam numquam transibit, nec potuit transire naturaliter, nec poterit in futurum, ergo continue aliquod totum lumen categorice corrumpitur quod fuerat ab eterno secundum aliquod sui et etiam per idem aliquod generatur quod numquam corrumpetur. [. . .] Verisimile est quod sit quandoque aliqua coniunctio stellarum que non potuit esse simile in preteritum nec poterit in futurum que forte est causa inceptionis alicuius speciei que numquam desinit esse vel finis alicuius que numquam incipit esse naturaliter loquendo.”

<sup>43</sup> *QdC*, II.13, ed. Kren, 681, lines 144–47.

<sup>44</sup> *QsM de prima lectura*, I.7, ed. Panzica, forthcoming: “Secunda conclusio est quod motus turbidus calefacit. Patet, quia ex tali motu partes distrahuntur et rarefiunt, per primam suppositionem, et ad rarefactionem sequitur calefactio, per secundam. [. . .] Et confirmatur per Albertum, qui in animatis assignat causam huius distractionem partium, et in animalibus motum spirituum et sanguinis. Ultima conclusio: quod motus tranquillus calefacit, non tamen solus, sed quia ex confricatione cum exteriori continente fit motus turbidus, ex quo sequitur distractio, deinde rarefactio, et calefactio consequentes. Patet ex exemplo de sagitta proiecta, et etiam de ferro confricato lapidi;” and *QsM de ultima lectura*, I.8, ed. Panzica, 159, lines 20–23: “Sic ergo motus qui fit cum confricatione est causa caloris. Unde ymaginandum est quod ex tali confricatione fit quedam rarefactio et quedam partium distractio, quam consequitur caliditas.”

<sup>45</sup> *QdC*, II.13, ed. Kren, 695, lines 266–69.

<sup>46</sup> The problem of the motion of the sphere of fire is addressed also in q. I.8 of the second redaction of Oresme’s *QsM de ultima lectura*, but in a slightly different way: “Secunda conclusio: ignis sic movetur, videlicet circulariter una cum celo, per virtutem sibi impressam a celo, eo modo quo ferrum movetur insequendo magnetem. Patet, quia ex quo non movetur motu raptus, sicut dicebat prima conclusio, non videtur esse alius modus dicendi nisi

Other references to *QdS* can be found in the second book:

1. II.6: “sciendum primo quod aliquid moveri pluribus motibus localibus potest intelligi multipliciter, ut visum est primo huius et supra tractatum *De spera*.”<sup>47</sup> Oresme deals with the different kinds of local motions in *QdS*, questions 10–11.
2. II.12: “posito quod luna esset tale speculum quod tamen est improbatum, attamen terra cum suis motibus non est taliter figurata sed magis accedit ad rotunditatem, ut patet per eclipses [ed.: celipses] et probatum fuit supra librum *De spera*.”<sup>48</sup> The reference is to *QdS*, question 5.

In *QdC*, Oresme also refers to his commentary on the eighth book of Aristotle’s *Physica*:

1. I.19: “Cum arguitur quod motus est eternus, negatur, sicut visum est super octavum *Physicorum*.”<sup>49</sup>
2. I.10: “Sciendum tamen quod licet celum non sit genitum vera generatione que fit ex materia presupposita tamen factum est creatione que est ex nihilo et tunc cum arguitur quod motus est eternus, negatur sicut visum est super octavum *Physicorum*.”<sup>50</sup>
3. II.10: “ad septimam dico quod posita diversitate specifica adhuc non sufficeret ad varietatem istorum effectuum nisi esset diversitas motuum, ut probatum fuit octavo *Physicorum*.”<sup>51</sup> Further on this text, which has not yet been identified, see also group I, item 1, and group VIII, item 2.

*Additional remarks:* Another set of questions on Aristotle’s *De celo* should probably be attributed to Oresme (see below, group VII, item 5, and Appendix I).

### 3. *Questiones super De generatione et corruptione (QdG)*

*Incipit and explicit of the books* (according to Caroti’s edition): [book I] “Utrum possit evidenter convinci aliquam generationem esse. Et arguitur quod non. Nam non videtur quod possit convinci aliquid esse de novo, quia si tu dicis quod a est de novo, quero unde potest concludi quod aliquando a non fuit et non videtur quare . . . X . . . licet respectu cause universalis sit naturalis et intenta; et etiam

---

dicatur quod sic movetur per virtutem sibi impressam a celo,” ed. Panzica, 160, line 27–161, line 1.

<sup>47</sup> *QdC*, II.6, ed. Kren, 509, lines 21–24.

<sup>48</sup> *QdC*, II.12, ed. Kren, 663, lines 110–14.

<sup>49</sup> *QdC*, I.19, ed. Kren, 149, lines 53–55.

<sup>50</sup> *QdC*, I.10, ed. Kren, 252, lines 50–55.

<sup>51</sup> *QdC*, II.10, ed. Kren, 617, lines 144–47.



non est contra inclinationem materie, quia materia potest violentari. Et sic patet de toto primo libro etc.” [II] “Circa librum secundum *De generatione* queritur primo utrum tantum sint quatuor qualitates prime, scilicet caliditas, frigiditas, siccitas et humiditas. Et arguitur quod non. Primo, quia quod per superhabundantiam dicitur uni soli convenit, modo primum est huiusmodi, et pari ratione qua ista una esset prima, eadem ratione alia . . . X . . . ad sextam, cum dicitur quod celum haberet infinitam virtutem etc., negatur consequentia, ut patet ex positione, quia nullius virtutis est permanere nisi ubi illud permanens resistit contrario, quia non habet contrarium etc.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Darmstadt, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek (formerly Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek), Hs. 2197, fols. 28v–51v.
2. Florence, BNC, Conv. Sopp. H IX 1628, fols. 1r–77v. Colophon: “Explicit liber *De generatione et corruptione* Nicolai Oresme.”
3. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 2177, fols. 126v–37v.

*Modern edition:* S. Caroti (ed.), *Nicole Oresme, Questiones super De generatione et corruptione* (Munich, 1996).

*Partial edition* (question II.15): S. Caroti, “*Peryodus e limiti di durata nelle Questiones super De generatione et corruptione* di Nicole Oresme,” in P. S. Souffrin and A. Ph. Segonds (ed.), *Nicolas Oresme: Tradition et innovation chez un intellectuel du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1988), 209–36.

*Attribution:* The colophon of the Florentine manuscript attributes the text to Oresme (see above). Philip of Othey, a fifteenth-century owner of the Darmstadt manuscript, refers to Oresme as the possible author of these questions. In the table of contents on the verso of the second guard-leaf, Philip wrote: “Item questiones *De generatione et corruptione*. Nota: puto quod sint a Nicolao de Oresme Normanno, sed deest prima questio et non sunt complete.” In the upper margin of fol. 28v, we find a very similar note by Philip: “Questiones libri *De generatione et corruptione*. Puto quod sint a Nicholao de Oresme Normanno.”<sup>52</sup>

*Dating:* The *QdG* belongs to the earliest known Oresmian works. The Darmstadt manuscript is dated around 1346. Caroti, the editor of the text, establishes 1349 as *terminus ante quem*, because in this year the students who copied Oresme’s text completed their studies at the Parisian Faculty of Arts.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>52</sup> On the attribution of this commentary to Oresme, see also A. Maier, *Metaphysische Hintergründe der spätscholastischen Naturphilosophie* (Rome, 1955), 218–20; and eadem, *An der Grenze von Scholastik und Naturwissenschaft* (Rome, 1952), 129–32.

<sup>53</sup> *QdG*, ed. Caroti, 66\*–67\*. For the relative chronology of Oresme’s *QdG*, see Panzica, “Nicole Oresme à la Faculté des Arts” (n. 8 above), 27–33.

*Self-references:*

A. Self-references to *QdG*: Oresme refers to *QdG* in his *QdA*: “Et ideo conceditur quod ibi fit resolutio usque ad materiam primam. De hoc est tractatum alibi scilicet in II° *De generatione*.”<sup>54</sup> This passage can be found in *QdG* II.3.<sup>55</sup> Another self-quotation can be found in the *LdC*, III.7: “Item, de ce que Aristote dist que encore est doute se les elemens sont en la chose mixte en leur propre forme ou autrement, je ay autrefois tractié ceste matiere ou livre *De generacione*.”<sup>56</sup> The reference is to question I.5.<sup>57</sup> Also, as we have shown above (group I, items 1 and 2), Oresme refers in his *QdG* several times to his *QsP* and once to his *QdC*.

*Additional remarks:* The literal commentary (*Sententia*) on *De generatione et corruptione* transmitted in MS Darmstadt 2197 should also probably be attributed to Oresme (see group VII, item 7).

4. *Sententia super libros Meteororum (SsM)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the Darmstadt manuscript): [book I, fols. 100ra–106ra] “<D>e primis quidem igitur causis nature et de omni motu naturaliter.’ Iste dicitur liber *Metheorum*, et quare sic vocatur patuit in prima questione. Ordo istius libri ad alios precedentes et sequentes patet in prohemio . . . X . . . et ibi: ‘quod quidem,’ etc., hic recapitulat. Et patet in littera.” [II, fols. 106rb–111ra] ‘<D>e mari autem et que natura ipsius.’ Hic assignatur secundus liber, unde in primo determinavit de impressionibus que sunt ex exalatione calida et sicca . . . X . . . media regio aeris est valde frigida existente caliditate inferius supra terram.” [III, fols. 111ra–15vb] “Hic incipit tertius liber secundum expositores. Et patet continuatio ad precedentia. Aristoteles volebat determinare de hiis que fiunt ex exalatione calida et sicca . . . X . . . ipsa est ita debilis et ita obscura quod non potest videri” [incomplete]. [IV, fols. 116ra–23ra] “<Q>uoniam quidem cause determinate quatuor sunt.’ etc. Iste est quartus liber *Metheorum* qui continuatur, sicut prius Aristoteles determinavit de passionibus metheorologicis . . . X . . . ad secundam patet ex dictis, quia solum aqua calida a frigido. Minor patet, quia talia. . .” [incomplete].

*Manuscript:* Darmstadt, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Hs. 2197, fols. 100ra–23ra.

*Attribution:* The text is attributed to Oresme in the colophon of the first book: “Explicit *Sententia* primi *Metheorum* reportata ante magistrum Nicholaum Oresme nationis normannorum. Incipit *Sententia* secundi eiusdem reportata ab eodem” (fol. 106ra). This attribution is repeated by the fifteenth-century

<sup>54</sup> *QdA*, I.2, ed. Patar, 127, lines 85–87.

<sup>55</sup> *QdG*, II.3, ed. Caroti, 199–200, lines 51–72.

<sup>56</sup> *LdC*, III.7, ed. Menut and Denomy, 616, lines 80–82.

<sup>57</sup> *QdG*, I.5, ed. Caroti, 32–45.

possessor of the manuscript, Philip of Othey, at the beginning of the text in the upper margin of fol. 100r: “Sententia primi *Metheororum* reportata ante magistrum Nicholaum Oresme nationis normannorum.”<sup>58</sup>

*Dating:* As the Darmstadt manuscript, which transmits a *reportatio* of Oresme’s literal commentary on Aristotle’s *Meteorologica*, dates back to 1346, we can assume that Oresme taught this commentary at that time.<sup>59</sup>

*Self-references:* In his *SsM*, Oresme refers several times to the first redaction of his *QsM*, as for example in the following instances:

1. fol. 100ra: “Iste dicitur liber *Metheorum*, et quare sic vocatur patuit in prima questione.” See question I.1.
2. fol. 100rb: “Ponit causam efficientem, dicens quod de necessitate iste mundus inferior est continuus et contiguus lationibus superioribus, id est celo, ut omnis virtus gubernetur inde tamquam a principali agente, ut dictum est in questione.” See question I.3.
3. fol. 100rb: “Etiam quod celum sit causa motum inferiorum ponit Albertus per duas rationes factas in questione.” See question I.3.
4. fol. 101ra–rb: “Tertio sciendum quod causa quare ibi fiunt nubes et similia est quia est continue frigida, et de causa frigiditatis eiusdem videtur in questione.” See question I.18.
5. fol. 100va: “Removet cavillationem dicens quod, si numquam fierent ex se invicem, adhuc non obstat quin deberent esse equalia in virtute et proportionalia in magnitudine, et illa que sunt dicenda hic videbuntur in questione.” See question I.10.

##### 5. *Questiones in Meteorologica de prima lectura (QsM de prima lectura)*

*Incipit and explicit of the books* (according to the modern edition): [book I] “Primo queritur circa primum librum *Metheororum* utrum impressiones metheorologicæ fiant secundum naturam inordinatiorem ea que est primi elementi corporum, id est secundum naturam minus ordinatam quam natura celi. Arguitur primo quod non secundum naturam . . . X . . . quia hoc contingit raro, ideo non est visibile nec debemus continue formidare hoc.” [II] “Primo circa secundum

<sup>58</sup> On this recently discovered text and its attribution to Oresme, see also C. Flüeler, “From Oral Lectures to Written Commentaries: John Buridan’s Commentaries on Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*,” *Medieval Analyses in Language and Cognition: Acts of the Symposium “The Copenhagen School of Medieval Philosophy*,” ed. S. Ebbesen and R. L. Friedman (Copenhagen, 1999), 497–521, at 511–12; and Panzica, “Nicole Oresme à la Faculté des Arts” (n. 8 above), 13 n. 28, 18 n. 45, and 32 n. 83.

<sup>59</sup> This date appears in the colophon at fol. 192vb: “Explicunt questiones super librum *De anima* reportate ante magistrum Johannem de Wesalia in vico straminum Parisius per manus Johannis Margan de Yvia, anno domini m<sup>o</sup>ccc<sup>o</sup>46.”

*Meteororum* queritur utrum locus naturalis elementi aque sit ubi nunc est mare. Et videtur quod non. Primo, quia aqua deberet circuire totam terram . . . X . . . dico etiam quod per accidens aliquando aqua generatur in loco calido, sicut fuit dictum in tractatu de grandine.” [III] “Queritur consequenter utrum visus refrangatur a corporibus densis et politis. Videtur quod non, quia visio non fit extramittendo, ergo non est ibi quod exeat ab oculo . . . X . . . cuius gloria pleni erunt celi et terra.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Darmstadt, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Hs. 2197, fols. 58ra–93ra.
2. Krakow, BJ, cod. 635, fols. 194a–209a (I.18–I.31).\*
3. Krakow, BJ, cod. 686, fols. 81r–97v (I.3, I.12–32).\*
4. Krakow, BJ, cod. 686, fols. 110vb–20ra (I.18–I.31).\*
5. Krakow, BJ, cod. 753, fols. 51ra–83vb.\*
6. Munich, BSB, Clm 4375, fols. 19ra–46vb.\*

*Edition:* A. Panzica (ed.), *Nicole Oresme, Questiones in Meteorologica de prima lectura: Study of the Manuscript Tradition and Critical Edition* (Leiden/Boston), forthcoming. Based on MSS 1 (primary witness), 5, and 6.

*Attribution:* The attribution of this commentary to Nicole Oresme can be found in the colophon of the oldest copy of this text, the Darmstadt manuscript, which represents an original *reportatio*. A doctrinal study of the text, as well as numerous parallels with other Oresmian writings, confirm the information contained in the colophon.<sup>60</sup>

*Dating:* The Darmstadt manuscript, the oldest copy of this text, contains some *reportationes* of commentaries used for teaching at the Faculty of Arts in Paris. As one of these texts is dated 1346, we can assume that Oresme taught his commentary at that time.<sup>61</sup>

*Self-references:*

A. Self-references in *QsM*: As we have shown above, Oresme refers to the first redaction of his *QsM* in his *QsP* (see item 1 in this group). We have also shown that Oresme refers several times to his *QsM* in the *SsM* (see the previous item). Some of these references are in the past, some in the future. We can thus infer

<sup>60</sup> See the introduction to *QsM de prima lectura*, ed. Panzica, forthcoming; and A. Panzica, *De la Lune à la Terre: Les débats sur le premier livre des Météorologiques d’Aristote au Moyen Âge latin (XII<sup>e</sup>–XV<sup>e</sup> siècles)* (Turnhout), forthcoming.

<sup>61</sup> Darmstadt, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Hs. 2197, fol. 192vb: “Explicientur questiones supra librum *De anima* reportate ante magistrum Johannem de Vezalia in vico straminum Parisius per manus Johannis Margan de Yvia anno domini m<sup>o</sup>ccc<sup>o</sup>46.” On the dating of this text, see also the introduction to *QsM de prima lectura*, ed. Panzica, forthcoming. On the relative chronology of this commentary within Oresme’s writings that date back to his teaching at the Faculty of Arts, see Panzica, “Nicole Oresme à la Faculté des Arts” (n. 8 above), 27–33.

that Oresme taught the two commentaries at the same time. Oresme refers to the first redaction of his *QsM* in *LdC* on the subject of the rainbow.<sup>62</sup>

B. The only self-reference in the first redaction of Oresme's *QsM* seems to be the following: "Comparando ista ad invicem, dicendum est quod ut in pluribus grando basse generatur propter signa prius dicta. Etiam aliquando homines de montibus altis videbant sub se nubem ex qua veniebat grando. Et veritas potest experiri alio modo, inveniando per artem altitudinem illius nubis. Et hoc fieret accipiendo aliquod corpus quadrangulare rectangulum et tunc motum nubis inspicere et signare illos angulos, et postea videre motum umbre illius nubis; et tunc ex istis cum quarta sexti libri Euclidis, posset sciri distantia oculi ad nubes. Et istud fuit demonstratum alibi, et patet etiam per omnes loquentes de geometria." So far, we have not been able to identify the source of this reference. Nothing in this passage assures us, however, that the text Oresme is referring to had been written by him and not by another master. It is also important to point out that this reading is transmitted only in the Darmstadt manuscript. The other two manuscripts read "et postea per eandem altitudinem nubis super terram" instead of "et istud fuit demonstratum alibi."

*Additional remarks:* This early redaction of Oresme's *QsM* has only recently been discovered. In the introduction of his edition of Oresme's *QdG*, Caroti called on scholars to pay attention to a new copy of Oresme's *QsM*, which was completely different from the previously known version.<sup>63</sup> During the preparation of the critical edition, Aurora Panzica identified five other copies of this commentary.<sup>64</sup>

#### 6. *Questiones in Meteorologica de ultima lectura (QsM de ultima lectura)*

*Incipit and explicit of the books* (according to the Klagenfurt manuscript): [book I, fols. 1va–33rb] "<C>irca initium libri *Metheorum* Aristotelis queritur questio talis: utrum possibile sit de impressionibus metheroicis simul habere scientiam et opinionem. Et arguitur primo quod non, quia de impressionibus metholoycis non contigit habere scientiam nec opinionem; ergo questio falsa . . . X . . . Ad quartam: 'si galaxia esset de natura celi, tunc de ea non esset determinandum in isto libro,' concedo tamen quod Aristoteles determinat de ea propter quod

<sup>62</sup> *LdC*, IV.12, ed. Menut and Denomy, 726–28, lines 11–30.

<sup>63</sup> See the description of the Darmstadt MS in Caroti's introduction to *QdG*, 35\*–46\*. See also Panzica, "Nicole Oresme à la Faculté des Arts" (n. 8 above), 13–27.

<sup>64</sup> A. Panzica, "Une nouvelle rédaction des *Questions sur les Météorologiques* de Nicole Oresme," *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 57 (2015): 257–64, esp. 261–64 for the list of questions with a comparison between the Darmstadt and the Munich manuscripts; and eadem, "Nicole Oresme à la Faculté des Arts" (n. 8 above), 7–89, esp. 41–46 for the incipit and the explicit of each question. The manuscripts adopt a different division of the books. See the introduction to *QsM de prima lectura*, ed. Panzica, forthcoming

quia plures antiquorum crediderunt galaxiam esse de natura elementari.” [II, fols. 33rb–40v] “<C>irca librum secundum *Meteororum* Aristotelis queritur questio prima, circa secundum huius, secundum distinctionem in principio positam ab Alberto, et est questio ista: utrum locus generationis pluvie sit media regio aeris. Et arguitur primo quod non . . . X . . . Ad rationes in oppositum patet in secundo articulo.” [III, fols. 40va–109va] “<C> circa tertium, secundum distinctionem illius libri totius in principio positam ab Alberto, sit questio prima: utrum ventus sit exalatio calida et sicca. Et arguitur primo quod non sit exalatio calida . . . X . . . dico quod non in vanum laborant, ex quo aliam artem ignorant.” [IV, fols. 109va–24rb] “<C>irca principium istius quarti, queritur primo utrum tantum sint quatuor qualitates prime, scilicet caliditas, humiditas, frigiditas, siccitas. Et arguitur quod non, quia quod per superhabundantiam dicitur, uni soli convenit . . . X . . . Ad quartam dico quod in salamandra non dominatur ignis in quantitate, sed tale animal non est ustibile ab igne net etiam nutritur ab igne. Ratio huiusmodi quia non uritur ab igne, dicimus quod tale animal habitat in igne. Hoc de questione et per consequens de omnibus. Ecce finis.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Basel, UB, F I 11, fols. 4r–85v. Colophon: “Expliciunt questiones libri *Meteororum* vel *Metheorum* seu *Methaurorum* reverendi magistri Nycolai Orem, viri multum experti, ut in istis dictis suis poterit apparere.”
2. Basel, UB, F V 2, fols. 2r–63v. Colophon: “Et sic est finis questionum Oren super *Meteororum*. Et tantum de questionibus *Metheorum* magistri N. Orem. Deo gratias.”
3. Berlin, SB - Preußischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 631, fols. 39r–114r. Colophon: “Rescripte sunt hee questiones venerabilis magistri Nicolai Orem super libros *Metheorum* Aristotelis. Anno Domini 1470.”
4. Berlin, SB - Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Fragm. Var. 573A, fols. 1ra–2rb (fragment from the fourth book, *inc.*: “a calido extrinseco igneo, igitur frifixio non est maturatio;” *expl.*: “habitat in igne.” Colophon: “Et sic est finis questionum 4ti libri *Metheorum* reverendi magistri Nicolai Orem, change etc.” to etc.”\*
5. Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 2° 334, fols. 158v–67r (only the fourth book).
6. Kassel, Landesbibl., Phys 2° 12, fols. 1r–107r. Colophon: “Expliciunt questiones Orem Reverendi Magistri Wilhelmi super *Metheorum* anno domini millesimo quadragintesimo vicesimo quarto.”
7. Klagenfurt, Bischöfliche Bibl., XXXI b 5, fols. 1r–124r.
8. Krakow, BJ, 749, fols. 59v–110v. Colophon: “Expliciunt questiones *Metheorum* magistri Nicholai dicti cognomine Orem, finite per manus Iohannis et reportate ante festum Sancti Galli.”

9. Krakow, BJ, 751, fols. 3r–53r. Colophon: “Et sic est finis *Metheororum* Horem.”
10. Krakow, BJ 2095, fols. 245r–307r. Initium: “Incipiunt questiones *Metheororum* reverendi magistri Orem, Parisius date ac ab ipso collecte.” Colophon: “Hec de questione et per consequens de omnibus questionibus librorum *Metheororum*, compilate per reverendum magistrum Orem Parisiensem et comparate per Johannem Stolle in Studio alme Universitatis Pragensis a. D. 1406.”
11. Krakow, BJ 2117, fols. 195r–322r. Colophon: “Et sic est finis *Metheororum* reverendi magistri Wilhelmi de Orem.”
12. Leipzig, UB, Ms. 1387, fols. 181r–275r. Colophon: “Expliciunt questiones magistri Orem super libros *Metheororum*, scripte in Studio Lipsiensi et finite anno domini millesimo quadragentesimo vicesimo nono.”
13. Munich, BSB, Clm 4376, fols. 1r–64r. Colophon: “Expliciunt questiones quatuor librorum *Metheororum* Byridani.”
14. Munich, BSB, Clm 17226, fols. 1r–140r (only questions I.2, 4–6, 10, 12–13, 17, II.1–7, III.7–10, and IV.1–11).
15. Paris, BnF, lat. 15156, fols. 226r–88v (only up to question II.10).
16. Poznan, Archivum Archidiecezjalne, Cms 53, fols. 1r–95v.<sup>65</sup>
17. St. Gallen, Stiftsbibl., Cod. Sang. 839, fols. 1r–175v. Colophon: “Rescripte sunt hee questiones venerabilis magistri Orem, supra libris *Metheororum* Aristotelis”.
18. Uppsala, UB, C 596, fols. 2r–97v. Colophon: “Et sic est finis quarti libri *Metheorologicorum* reverendi magistri Wilhelmi de Orem.”
19. Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 5453, fols. 49r–109v.
20. Wrocław, UB, IV Q 27, fols. 1r–163r. Colophon: “Expliciunt questiones *Metheororum* seu *Metherorum* anno Domini magistri Orem.”

An incomplete list of questions of this commentary can be found in MS Vatican City, BAV, Pal. lat. 1045, fol. 118v.<sup>66</sup>

*Modern editions:*

1. Partial edition (book III.12–27): S. C. McCluskey, “Nicole Oresme on Light, Color, and the Rainbow: An Edition and Translation, with

<sup>65</sup> On the recent identification of this manuscript, see A. Panzica, “Commenter les Météorologiques à l’Université de Cracovie: De l’assimilation des modèles parisiens à la naissance d’une tradition polonaise,” *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales* 87 (2020): 77–166, at 84, 103, and 160; and eadem, “Henricus Totting de Oyta’s and Nicole Oresme’s Commentaries on *Meteorology*: Some New Identifications in Central and Eastern Europe,” *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 62 (2020): 195–211, at 200 n. 7.

<sup>66</sup> D. Walz, *Die historischen und philosophischen Handschriften der Codices Palatini Latini in der Vatikanischen Bibliothek (Cod. Pal. Lat. 921–1078)* (Wiesbaden, 1999), 200–202.

Introduction and Critical Notes, of Part of Book III of His *Questiones super quatuor libros Meteororum*" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1974). This edition should be used carefully, as some of the questions edited by McCluskey should probably be attributed to Themo Iudaeus (see below, attribution).

2. Partial edition (books I–II.10): A. Panzica (ed.), *Nicole Oresme, Questiones in Meteorologica secundum ultimam lecturam, recensio parisiensis: Study of the Manuscript Tradition and Critical Edition of Books I–II.10* (Leiden, 2021). Based on manuscripts 14 (primary witness), 1, 6, 12, and 18.

*Translation:* In his edition, McCluskey provides an English translation of questions III.12–27.

*Attribution:* The text is attributed to Nicole Oresme in thirteen of the twenty extant manuscripts. The attribution of the third book is particularly problematic. In a pioneering study on the second redaction of Oresme's *QsM*, the Polish scholar Alexander Birkenmajer came to the conclusion that the third book of this commentary (at least in the form in which it is transmitted) cannot be ascribed to Oresme in its entirety. This book, which is to a large extent identical with the corresponding book of Themo Iudaeus's *Questions on the Meteorologica*, contains several philosophical and textual inconsistencies, as it defends theses that are incompatible with Oresme's views expressed in the same commentary and refers to questions absent in Oresme's text, but present in Themo's.<sup>67</sup> Given that every *QsM* manuscript with which Birkenmajer worked came from Central and Eastern Europe and that the oldest ones were copied at the University of Prague, he assumed that the transmitted form of this text was a compilation from Oresme's and Themo's *Questions* used for teaching there. The discovery of a Parisian manuscript of Oresme's commentary did not make it possible to verify Birkenmajer's hypothesis, as this witness transmits only the first and part of the second book (II.1–10) of Oresme's *QsM*.<sup>68</sup> Birkenmajer's explanation was contested by Stephen McCluskey, who suggested that Oresme himself drew from Themo's *Questions* in order to prepare his lectures without striving for consistency.<sup>69</sup> McCluskey's interpretation

<sup>67</sup> A. Birkenmajer, *Études d'histoire des sciences en Pologne*, ed. J. B. Korolec et al. (Wrocław, 1972), 1:178–239. Birkenmajer's thorough analysis of the third book of the second redaction of Oresme's *QsM* allowed him to determine that questions 1–17 and 20 can be ascribed to Oresme, while questions 18–19 and 21–35 are spurious.

<sup>68</sup> L. Thorndike, "Oresme and Fourteenth-Century Commentaries on the *Meteorologica*," *Isis* 45 (1954): 145–52.

<sup>69</sup> S. C. McCluskey, "Nicole Oresme on Light, Color, and the Rainbow: An Edition and Translation, with Introduction and Critical Notes, of Part of Book III of His *Questiones super quatuor libros Meteororum*" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1974), 30–63.



has not convinced other scholars.<sup>70</sup> Hopeful that the critical edition of the two redactions of Oresme's *QsM* will shed new light on this problem, a final observation remains. A comparison of the lists of questions of the two redactions of Oresme's *QsM* shows that all the questions of the second redaction that, according to Birkenmajer, should not be attributed to Oresme are in fact missing in the first redaction. This could be another argument in favor of Birkenmajer's hypothesis.

*Dating:* Internal elements do not enable us to establish a precise dating for this commentary, which was probably taught in the late 1340s or early 1350s.<sup>71</sup>

*Self-references in QsM:* As we have shown above, Oresme refers in the first book of this commentary to his *QsP* and to his *QdC* (see group I, items 1 and 2).

### 7. *Expositio super De anima (EdA)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Patar's edition): [book I] "Bonorum honorabilium notitiam opinantes, magis autem alteram altera, aut secundum certitudinem, aut ex eo quod meliorum." Iste liber dicitur liber *De anima*. Et continet tres libros. In primo ponitur prooemium, et recitantur opiniones antiquorum . . . X . . . Et postea dicit quod considerandum est de anima circa opiniones antiquorum, accipiendo bene dicta et male dicta reprobando." [II] "Quae quidem a prioribus tradita de anima dicta sunt. Iterum autem tamquam ex principio redeamus temptantes determinare quid est anima et quae utique," etc. Iste est IIus liber *De anima*; et, ut dicebatur, in I° posuit Aristoteles prooemium et recitavit opinionem antiquorum. . . . X . . . unde non possent discurrere nec ratiocinari nec recolere de praeteritis nec providere de futuris, nisi haberent sensus interiores. Tunc ibi: 'De phantasia,' recapitulat. Et est finis." [III] "De parte autem animae, qua," etc. Iste est IIIus liber *De anima*. Unde, postquam in II° determinavit de potentiis animae . . . X . . . Habet visum et videat, et gustum propter delectabile et triste, et auditum ut aliquid significatur et concipiat aliquid per vocem. Et homo habet linguam ut aliquid exprimat alteri. Et sic est finis IIIi libri *De anima*."

*Manuscript:* Darmstadt, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Hs. 516, fols. 168ra–81va.

*Modern edition:* B. Patar (ed.), *Expositio et quaestiones in Aristotelis De anima* (Louvain, 1995), 6–92.

*Attribution:* The *EdA* contains some references to a question commentary on the same Aristotelian text.<sup>72</sup> Benoît Patar showed that these references correspond to passages in Oresme's *QdA*.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>70</sup> Kirschner, *Nicolaus Oresmes Kommentar zur Physik* (n. 13 above), 33; and Panzica, "Nicole Oresme à la Faculté des Arts" (n. 8 above), 11–13.

<sup>71</sup> For the relative chronology of this text with respect to other Oresmian commentaries, see Panzica, "Nicole Oresme à la Faculté des Arts" (n. 8 above), 27–33.

<sup>72</sup> *QdA*, ed. Patar, 102\*–103\*.

<sup>73</sup> *QdA*, ed. Patar, 103\*–104\*.

*Dating:* See the next item.

8. *Questiones super De anima (QdA)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Patar's edition): [book I] "Quaestio prima supra Ium librum *De anima* est ista: utrum anima sit subiectum in isto libro *De anima*. Et arguitur quod non. Primo, quia de subiecto praesupponitur quid est, ut patet I<sup>o</sup> Posteriorum; et istud investigatur de anima in hoc libro, ut patet in II<sup>o</sup>, ubi investigatur eius definitio . . . X . . . Ad septimam concedo quod accidens facit ad cognitionem sensitivam substantiae, et similiter ad intellectivam. Et cum dicitur quod substantia prius intelligitur, verum est confuse, sed non determinate. Expliciunt quaestiones Ii libri *De anima*." [II] "Queritur primo, circa Ium librum *De anima*, utrum anima sit substantia. Et arguitur quod non. Primo, quia sibi competit definitio accidentis; igitur est accidens. Patet antecedens, quia adest et abest praeter subiecti corruptionem quod subiectum est materia . . . X . . . Vel potest dici quod reminiscencia est actio et discursus omnium virtutum interiorum simul pro reducendo aliquid ad memoriam. Ergo etc. Et sic dictum est ad istam quaestionem. Expliciunt quaestiones supra Ium librum *De anima* datae a magistro Nicolao Oresme." [III] "Quaestio prima circa IIIum librum *De anima* est ista: utrum de intellectu sit scientia naturalis. Et arguitur quod non. Primo quia intellectus est forma abstracta; igitur de eo non est scientia naturalis, sed metaphysica . . . X . . . Et quomodo intellectus rememorabitur post mortem et intelliget, et quod non erit per speciem, sed aliquialiter sicut intelligentiae, intellectione simplici et delectabili et felici. Et sic pateat ultima quaestio libri IIIi *De anima*, etc. Expliciunt quaestiones super III<sup>o</sup> libro *De anima* Parisius disputatae per venerabilem doctorem dominum Nicolaum de Oresme, etc."

*Manuscripts:*

1. Bruges, OB, lat. 514, fols. 71ra–111rb. Colophon: "Expliciunt quaestiones super secundum librum *De anima* date a magistro Nicolao Oresme" (fol. 97ra).
2. Darmstadt, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Hs. 516, fols. 182ra–203va.
3. Munich, BSB, Clm 761, fols. 9ra–40va. Colophon: "Expliciunt quaestiones super libro *De anima* Parisius disputate per venerabilem doctorem dominum Nicholaum de Oresme."

*Modern editions:*

1. L. Marshall, "Nicholas Oresme's *Quaestiones super libros Aristotelis De anima*: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Commentary" (Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1980).
2. B. Patar (ed.), *Nicolai Oresme Expositio et Quaestiones in Aristotelis De anima* (Louvain, 1995), 95–554.

*Attribution:* The text is attributed to Oresme in the Bruges and in the Munich manuscripts.

*Dating:* Both the *EdA* and the *QdA* probably date back to 1346, as this is the date of the Darmstadt manuscript, which contains a *reportatio* of these commentaries.<sup>74</sup>

*Self-references:*

A. Self-references to *QdA*: In the same way that the *EdA* refers to the *QdA*, the *QdA* refers to the *EdA*.<sup>75</sup> Similarly to what we have seen with the literal and the question commentary on the *Meteorologica*, the citations in the *Expositio* are sometimes in the future, sometimes in the past.<sup>76</sup> We can, thus, infer that these two texts result from lectures that were held at the same time.

B. Self-references in *QdA*: As we have shown above, in his *QdA* Oresme refers to his *QdG*.

### 9. *Questiones super De spera (QdS)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Droppers's edition): "Circa librum *De spera* queritur utrum diffinitio puncti sit bona, qua dicitur, punctus est cuius pars non est. Videtur primo quod non, quia ipsa competet aliis a diffinitio . . .X. . . Et etiam ad quintum, cum dicitur 'quod sol,' etc., concedo quod sol per radios suos facit stare planetas, sed hoc est per motum eorum in eccentrico vel in epicyclo et ideo negatur opinio illius poete."

*Manuscripts:*

1. Florence, Bibl. Riccardiana, Ms. 117, fols. 125r–35r. Initium: "Incipiunt questiones super tractatum *De spera* secundum magistrum Nicolaum Orem doctorem." Colophon: "Explete sunt questiones *De spera* que sunt XIII determinate per magistrum Nicholaum Orem."
2. Seville, Bibl. Capitular y Colombina, 7–7–13, fols. 93r–101v (with *QsE*, *Pp*, *Utrum aliqua res videatur tanta quanta est* and *Conclusio mirabilis*).
3. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 2185, fols. 71r–77v. Initium: "Incipiunt questiones *De spera* Parisius disputate per excellentem doctorem Nicolaum Horem." Colophon: "Expliciunt questiones *De spera* Parisius disputate per excellentem doctorem Nicolaum Horem."
4. Venice, Bibl. Marciana, Lat. VIII, 74, fols. 1r–8r (fragment).

*Modern edition* (with English translation): G. Droppers (ed.), *The Quaestiones De spera of Nicholas Oresme, Latin Text with English Translation, Commentary and Variants* (Madison, 1966).

<sup>74</sup> On the date of these texts, see also *QdA*, ed. Patar, 107\*–108\*.

<sup>75</sup> *QdA*, ed. Patar, 104\*–106\*.

<sup>76</sup> *QdA*, ed. Patar, 105\*.

*Attribution:* The text is attributed to Oresme in the colophons and the *initia* of the Florentine and the Vatican manuscripts.

*Dating:* We have no internal elements to establish a precise dating of the commentary.<sup>77</sup>

*Self-references:*

A. Self-references to *QdS*: As we have shown above (group I, item 2), Oresme refers to *QdS* in *QdC*.

B. Self-references in *QdS*: As Droppers has pointed out, Oresme might have been referring in a general way to *Pp* in his *QdS*: “quibuscumque duobus temporibus vel quantitatibus duabus demonstratis, verisimile est <quod> illa sunt [Droppers: est] incommensurabilia et quod eorum proportio sit irrationalis, sicut patet in libro de proportionibus.”<sup>78</sup> There is a further reference to *De spera* in Oresme’s *QdC* (II.11) where he mentions the fact that the increases and decreases of illumination in the phases of the moon show that the moon has no light of its own, but that it is illuminated by the sun: “De ista questione non est dubium quantum ad lunam quin habeat lumen a Sole, quod manifeste patet ex eius augmento et eius decremento, cuius causa et modus patuerunt in libro *De spera*.”<sup>79</sup> This passage could refer to Sacrobosco’s text, rather than to Oresme’s commentary. We were not able to find such a passage in the *QdS* edited by Droppers. It is worth noting, however, that a question about the lunar eclipse in the Seville manuscript (Bibl. Capitular y Colombina, 7–7–13) clearly mentions the matter many times: “Ad solutionem primi argumenti primo videndum quomodo luna illuminatur a Sole et qualis est causa quia crescit et decrescit; [. . .] et ipsa luna <est> de se tenebrosa, non habens lumen, sed fit luminosa a Solle [*sic*] radiante supra eam [fol. 102ra] . . . Ex hoc patet solutio per argumenta et conceditur quod luna illuminatur Solle [*sic*] modo predicto. [fol. 102ra] . . . Est notandum quod eo quod luna est sperica et opposita [*sic*] Soli, una pars eius est illuminata a Solle [*sic*] et alia, que est retro, non illuminatur a Solle [*sic*], sicut patet experientia de quolibet sperico opposito alicui luminoso [*sic*] . . . Quinto notandum quod non semper eadem est Soli opposita, sed secundum quod ipsa movetur sub Solle [*sic*] continue appropinquando et recedendo [*sic*], est alia et alia pars [fol. 102rb] illuminata, ut posset faciliter ymaginari [. . .]. Secunda propositio est quod de luna est verum quod quanto plus adproximatur Solli [*sic*], tanto maior pars de ipsa est illuminata, et quanto recedit, [*sic*] tanto minus, et potest sicut prius faciliter speculari ex protractione linearum.”<sup>80</sup>

<sup>77</sup> For the relative chronology of Oresme’s *QdS*, see Panzica, “Nicole Oresme à la Faculté des Arts” (n. 8 above), 27–33.

<sup>78</sup> *QdS*, question 13, ed. Droppers, 6 and 292, lines 20–22.

<sup>79</sup> *QdC*, ed. Kren, 637, lines 11–14.

<sup>80</sup> The question *Utrum luna possit eclipsari* (fol. 102ra–vb) was not copied along with the other questions on Sacrobosco’s *De sphaera*, but it follows Oresme’s questions on Euclid

10. *Questiones super Euclidis Elementa (QsE)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Busard's edition of 2010): "Circa librum Euclidis queritur primo circa quoddam dictum Campani dicen<t>is quod magnitudo decrescit in infinitum. Queritur primo: Utrum magnitudo decrescit in infinitum secundum partes proportionales. . . X. . . Notandum quod omnes illi anguli sunt acuti usque ad octogonum, in quo reperiuntur recti et semper ulterius sunt obtusi et hec omnia possunt demonstrari ex correlariis ex commento 32e."

*Manuscripts:*

1. Greifswald, UB, Ms. 742, fols. 16v–18v, 19r–25r, and 27r–31v.
2. Seville, Bibl. Capitular y Colombina, 7–7–13, fols. 102va–12ra (with *QdS*, *Pp*, *Utrum aliqua res videatur tanta quanta est* and *Conclusio mirabilis*). Colophon: "Expliciunt questiones super libro geometrie edite a magistro Nicollao Orem, famosso doctore."
3. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 2225, fols. 90ra–98vb. Initium: "Incipiunt questiones super Geometriam Euclidis per magistrum Nicholaum Oresme, probum philosophum et solempnem, disputate Parisius."
4. Vatican City, BAV, Chigi, F IV 66, fols. 22vb–23ra, 33va–35rb, 23ra–33va, and 35rb–40rb. Colophon: "Expliciunt questiones super Euclidis [alia manu: magister Nicholai Oreb Ormai]."<sup>81</sup>

*Remarks:* In his doctoral dissertation, Hubert L. I. Busard provided an edition of this text considering only the two Vatican manuscripts. John E. Murdoch suggested several improvements to this edition in his paper for *Scripta Mathematica* (see below, *Editions*). Following the Seville manuscript, which Busard had not considered, Murdoch corrected the text, sometimes substantially, and provided the transcription of the full question *utrum angulus superficialis sit idem quod superficies vel aliquod aliud* (fols. 102vb–103va).<sup>82</sup> The new edition that Busard published in 2010 added the Greifswald manuscript, but did not include nor discuss the question of the Seville manuscript that Murdoch edited. Busard's edition does not discuss the issue concerning this question, even though Murdoch's paper is

---

(see group I, item 10). The issue deserves further attention, especially considering that Droppers discovered the Seville manuscript too late to use in his edition. See *QdS*, ed. Droppers, 8.

<sup>81</sup> For information about this manuscript, see H. L. L. Busard, "A Fourth, Hitherto Unknown Manuscript containing the Tract *Questiones super geometriam Euclidis* by Nicole Oresme," in *Mathematics Celestial and Terrestrial: Festschrift für Menso Folkerts zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. J. W. Dauben et al. (Halle, 2009), 91–103.

<sup>82</sup> See J. E. Murdoch, "Nicole Oresme's *Quaestiones super geometriam Euclidis*," *Scripta Mathematica* 27 (1964): 67–91, at 79–86. As indicated in n. 80 above, this question is immediately preceded in the same manuscript by another astronomical question hitherto not discussed in the Oresmian bibliography (fols. 102ra–vb: *Utrum luna possit eclipsari*).

mentioned. The editor holds that “there is little doubt that **C** [ms. Vat. Chigi, F IV 66] remains the best of the four. But even **C** must be abandoned in favor of **S** and/or **V** in some places” (94). Thus, manuscript **G** (Greifswald 742) seems to play a subordinate role, except for the order of the text (93).

*Editions:*

1. H. L. L. Busard, “Nicole Oresme, *Quaestiones super geometriam Euclidis*” (Ph.D. diss., Leiden, 1961). Based on the two Vatican manuscripts.
2. H. L. L. Busard (ed.), *Nicole Oresme, Quaestiones super geometriam Euclidis* (Stuttgart, 2010). New edition by Busard, published posthumously. This edition, based on the four manuscripts, does not include the question that Murdoch edited.

*Partial editions* (Questions 10–14 and the beginning of question 15): M. Clagett, *Nicole Oresme and the Medieval Geometry of Qualities and Motions: A Treatise on the Uniformity and Difformity of Intensities Known as Tractatus de configurationibus qualitatum et motuum*. Edited with an Introduction, English Translation, and Commentary (Madison, 1968), 527–75 (Appendix I).

*Partial editions:*

1. J. E. Murdoch, “Nicole Oresme’s *Quaestiones super geometriam Euclidis*”, *Scripta Mathematica* 27 (1964): 67–91. Edition of the question *utrum angulus superficialis sit idem quod superficies vel aliquod aliud* (fols.102vb–103va).
2. M. Clagett, *Nicole Oresme and the Medieval Geometry of Qualities and Motions: A Treatise on the Uniformity and Difformity of Intensities Known as Tractatus de configurationibus qualitatum et motuum*. Edited with an Introduction, English Translation, and Commentary (Madison, 1968), 527–75. Editions of questions 10–14 and the beginning of question 15.

*Translations:*

- a) English translation of questions 1–10 with commentary: H. L. L. Busard (ed.), *Nicole Oresme, Quaestiones super geometriam Euclidis* (Stuttgart, 2010), 32–92.
- b) French translation of questions 1–2: *De la théologie aux mathématiques: L’infini au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, ed. J. Biard and J. Celeyrette (Paris, 2005), 243–52.

*Attribution:* The attribution to Oresme can be found in the Vatican and in the Seville manuscripts.

*Dating:* The *QsE* were written before *CQM*. According to Clagett, they can be dated to the late 1340s, and “almost certainly from before 1351.”<sup>83</sup> Assuming that “Oresme was acquainted with the *Quadripartitum numerorum* of Johannes de Muris,” Busard points out that the *QsE* cannot have been written before 1343.<sup>84</sup> According to Mazet, the *QsE* cannot be “beaucoup postérieures à 1350” because they are quoted in Pierre Ceffons’s *Commentary on the Sentences* “professé en 1348–1349 et publié en 1353.”<sup>85</sup>

*Self-references:*

Self-references to *QsE*: Oresme refers to *QsE* in *CQM*, II.17: “Et adhuc inter huiusmodi proportiones irrationales est magna differentia quoad istud secundum hoc quod aliquae sunt magis irrationales quam aliae, ut patet decimi Euclidis; et aliquae etiam inscibiles et innominabiles ut patet in commento quinti Euclidis.”<sup>86</sup> The corresponding passage can be found in *QsE*, question 14.<sup>87</sup> Oresme refers to the same passage in *Pp*: “Sicut iam ex commento quinti Euclidis allegavi infinite sunt proportiones irrationales quarum denominationes sunt ignote.”<sup>88</sup>

Self-references in *QsE*: As we have shown above, according to Celeyrette, Oresme refers in his *QsE* to his *QsP* (see group I, item 1).

## II. WRITINGS ON PURE AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS

*Preliminary remarks:* Oresme’s name passed to later generations not only as a philosopher and theologian, but also as a highly competent mathematician.<sup>89</sup> Oresme’s mathematical investigations are mostly embedded in topics related to other disciplines, often concerning questions about natural philosophy. As a result, his mathematical reflections are present in texts of very different literary genres. In his early questions on Euclid’s *Elements* (group I, item 10), for instance, he chose to discuss in depth some special problems that are less related to the text of the *Elements* itself. Here he laid the foundations of his doctrine of configurations and explored the mathematics of the infinite as well as the notions of commensurability and incommensurability. In *Ap* (also one of his first mathematical writings and the only one purely mathematical in content), he investigated the notions of

<sup>83</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 522.

<sup>84</sup> *QsE*, ed. Busard, 2.

<sup>85</sup> E. Mazet, “La théorie des séries de Nicole Oresme dans sa perspective aristotélicienne: ‘Questions 1 et 2 sur la Géométrie d’Euclide’,” *Revue d’histoire des mathématiques* 9 (2003): 33–80, at 35.

<sup>86</sup> *CQM*, II.17, ed. Clagett, 314, lines 51–54.

<sup>87</sup> *QsE*, question 14, ed. Busard, 154, lines 55–60.

<sup>88</sup> *Pp*, 1, ed. Grant, 166, lines 347–49.

<sup>89</sup> Searching for support for his anti-astrological attitude, Pico della Mirandola mentions Oresme as a “philosophus acutissimus et peritissimus mathematicus.” See *Disputationes adversus astrologiam divinatricem*, ed. E. Garin (Florence, 1946), 1:58.

“proportional part” and “irrationality” in connection with Euclid and Campanus, providing an insightful analysis of the theory of proportion that includes the treatment of fractional exponents. In *Pp*, he explored the “ratios of ratios” (*proportio proportionum*) according to his distinction into rational and irrational ratios. Focusing on the idea of commensurability of exponential parts, he developed further the standard theory of proportions and analysed thus the mathematical foundations of the so-called “Bradwardine rule” of motion regulating velocities, resistances, and powers (but considering also the covered space and time). Finally, his critique of astrology includes a good deal of mathematics. Particularly in *CVI*, but also in *Pp* and *Pr*, Oresme mathematically elaborated his anti-astrological attitude, arguing that the incommensurability of the motions of the different heavenly bodies made the theoretical basis of astrology impossible or, at least, highly unreliable.

One of Oresme’s most original projects, anticipated in the questions on Euclid, is presented in his treatise *CQM*. In this work, he proposed the development of a new discipline, the object of which would be the geometrical representation of the intensities of the qualities and motions. Here he gave the geometrical foundations of his “doctrine of configurations,” applying it *secundum ymaginationem* to a broad field of phenomena ranging from music, psychology, and divination to a mathematical formulation and proof of infinite series. Part III, chapter seven, includes an elegant geometrical proof of the so-called “Merton Rule” or “theorem of the mean degree.” Further mathematical discussions are found in the Aristotelian commentaries (especially in the *Physica*, *De celo*, and *Meteorologica*), in *De perfectione specierum* (connected to the configuration doctrine), and in the cosmological works related to Sacrobosco. Some of the single questions included in these texts are mainly or even exclusively mathematical in content, like the first two questions in *QdS* that deal with definitions of “point” and “line.”<sup>90</sup> Additionally, it is worth noting that mathematics plays a significant role in some single questions or shorter texts attributable to Oresme, such as the “*conclusio mirabilis*” (proving the convergence of a series by an arithmetical method), *De visione stellarum* (on optics and problems of atmospheric refraction), and the question *utrum aliqua res videatur tanta quanta est*, the Oresmian attribution of which can be provisionally accepted. Finally, we should mention that — as Claggett points out — Oresme was familiar with several texts of the Archimedean tradition.<sup>91</sup> Moreover, according to Claggett, it is possible that Oresme was “the

<sup>90</sup> *QdS*, ed. Droppers, 12–61.

<sup>91</sup> For instance, he used *De curvis superficiebus* in *CQM*. See M. Claggett, *Archimedes in the Middle Ages, Volume 1: The Arabo-Latin Tradition* (Madison, 1964), 445 n. 22. Likewise, he used *De incidentibus in humido* in *QdC*. For an in-depth discussion, see M. Claggett, *Archimedes in the Middle Ages, Volume 3: The Fate of the Medieval Archimedes, 1300–1565* (Philadelphia, 1978), 125–44.



continuator who completed Johannes de Muris *Ars mensurandi* after the latter's death."<sup>92</sup> To this tradition belongs in part the question on the commensurability of the diagonal of the square to its side, attributed to Albert of Saxony by Heinrich Suter and to Oresme by Vassili P. Zoubov (see below, group VII, item 10).

1. *Ad paucas respicientes (Pr)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Grant's edition): "Ad paucas respicientes de facili enunciant ut dicit Aristoteles. Sunt enim aliqui astrologi opinantes . . . X. . . sed potius compescere linguam a talibus que in manu Dei sunt. Et ipse solus novit cuius oculis nuda sunt omnia et aperta."

*Manuscripts:*

1. Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4°, 385, fols. 155r–58v (with *Pr*).
2. London, British Museum, Sloane 2542, fols. 55v–59r.
3. Paris, BnF, lat. 7378A, fols. 14v–17v. Colophon: "Explicit tractatus brevis et utilis de proportionalitate motuum celestium datus et compilatus per magistrum Nicholaum Orem normannum."
4. Paris, BnF, lat. 16621, fols. 110v–14r (with *Pp*).
5. Vatican City, BAV, Pal. Lat. 1354, fols. 233v–37v.
6. Venice, BNMs, Lat. VI, 133 (=1237), fols. 62v–65r (with *AP* and *Pp*).
7. Venice, BNMs, Lat. VI, 155 (=3377) (with *Pp* and *De instantibus*).\*
8. Uppsala, UB, C 658, fols. 130r–43r. *Incipit*: "Ad pauca respicientes de facili enunciant ut probatur Aristoteles . . ." *Expl.* and colophon: ". . . compescere linguam a talibus que in manu Dei sunt, et ipse solus est cuius oculis nuda sunt omnia et aperta. Finis tractatus Magistri Nicolai de Orem."\*\*

\*MSS 7 and 8 have not yet been reported. MS 7 was assumed to belong to *Pp* (see the *Remarks* in the corresponding section).<sup>93</sup>

<sup>92</sup> Clagett, *Archimedes in the Middle Ages, Volume 1*, 12. For a chronology of Oresme's mathematical writings, see *CMQ*, ed. Clagett, 122–25 and 645–48; and *Nicole Oresme and the Kinematics of Circular Motion: Tractatus de commensurabilitate vel incommensurabilitate motuum celi*, ed. and trans. E. Grant (Madison, 1971), 1–5.

<sup>93</sup> M. Andersson-Schmitt, H. Hallberg, and M. Hedlung, *Mittelalterliche Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Uppsala, Band 6: Handschriften C 551–935* (Stockholm, 1993), 229–30, at 230. The description correctly includes the reference to Grant's edition of *Ad pauca respicientes* (n. 1 above), 382–428, so it is not apparent why the catalogue introduces the title *De motibus sphaerarum* for this text. Manuscript 8 was included in the catalogue description. As mentioned in the catalogue, Oresme's text is followed by a question about the same topic discussed in Erfurt by Christian (Roder) de Hamburg: *Utrum velocitates corporum celestium ad invicem commensurabiles sunt . . .* (fols. 143v–48r).

*Early modern editions:*

1. Octavianus Scotus, Venice, 1505, fols. 25r–26v.
2. D. de Marnef, Paris, s.d., pp. 39–42.

*Modern edition and English translation:* E. Grant (ed.), *Nicole Oresme. De proportionibus proportionum and Ad pauca respicientes* (Madison, 1966), 378–441.

*Attribution:* The text is unequivocally attributed to Oresme only in the Paris manuscript 3 (see colophon) and in the two early modern editions. Nevertheless, as Grant points out, “there is no reason to doubt its attribution to Oresme.”<sup>94</sup>

*Title:* The title that the editor used is derived by Oresme’s remark at the beginning of *Pp*, where he said that he will deal with the topic of the incommensurability of celestial motions by correcting “quedam que alias *ad pauca aspicientes* breviter pertransivi.”<sup>95</sup> Some manuscripts read “respiciens” and the newly discovered Venice, BNM Lat. VI, 155, “respicientes.”<sup>96</sup> Note that in manuscript 3, the work is referred to as “tractatus brevis et utilis de proportionalitate celestium,” a title that the editor has refrained from using.<sup>97</sup>

*Dating:* According to Grant, *Pr* was written before *Pp*, which can be dated between 1351 and 1360.<sup>98</sup>

*Self-references:* See *Title*.

2. *Algorismus proportionum (Ap)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Rommevaux’s edition): [Proemium] “Algorismus proportionum Reverende Presul Meldensis Philippe quem Pithagoram dicerem si fas esset credere sententias.” [Text] “Una media debet sic scribi  $\frac{1}{2}$ , una tertia sic  $\frac{1}{3}$ , et due tertie sic  $\frac{2}{3}$ , et sic de aliis. Et numerus qui est supra . . . X. . . Aspectus celi distant moderamine tali: sextilis, quartus, trinus et oppositus.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Basel, UB, F II 33, fols. 95v–98v (the fols. 96–97 are inverted).
2. Bern, Burgerbib., Cod. A 50, 190r–98v (with *Utrum dyiameter alicuius quadrati sit commensurabilis costa eiusdem*).\*
3. Bruges, OB, lat. 530, fols. 25r–30v (with *VS*).
4. Brussels, BR, MS 1043, fols. 217r–22v.
5. Cambridge, Magdalene College, LP 2329, fols. 128rb–13rb (incomplete; with *Pp* and *CVI*).

<sup>94</sup> *Pp*, ed. Grant, 73, n. 98.

<sup>95</sup> *Pp*, ed. Grant, 138.

<sup>96</sup> *Pp*, ed. Grant, 78.

<sup>97</sup> *Pp*, ed. Grant, 380.

<sup>98</sup> *Pp*, ed. Grant, 76–77.

6. Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und UB Dresden, C 80, fols. 201r–21v (with *Pp*).\*
7. Erfurt, Dep Erf., CA 4° 348, fols. 39r–45v.
8. Erfurt, Dep Erf., CA 4° 349, fols. 22v–28v.
9. Erfurt, Dep Erf., CA 4° 365, fols. 91r–98v.
10. Florence, BML, Ashb. 210, fols. 172r–77v (with *Pp*, *CAJ*, *CVI*, *QCQP*, *Mm*).<sup>99</sup>
11. Florence, BNC, convent. soppr., J IX 26, fols. 37r–45r (with *CQM*).
12. Munich, BSB, Clm 14908, fols. 208(227)r–20(239)v.
13. Munich, BSB, Clm 6006, fols. 161r–v (fragment).
14. Munich, UB, 4° cod. ms. 738, fols. 108r–16v.\*
15. Oxford, Bodleian Library, St. John’s College, 188, fols. 109r–10v.<sup>100</sup>
16. Paris, BnF, Bibl. de l’Arsenal, lat. 522, 121r–25r (+ a further fol. inserted between fols. 125 and 126; with *CVI*, *CQM*, *DCI*, *De instantibus*, *Pvm*).
17. Paris, BnF, lat. 7197, fols. 74r–79r.
18. Paris, BnF, lat. 7368, fols. 1r–13v.
19. Thorn, Gymnasialbibl., ms. R 4° 2, pp. 82–93 (the prologue is missing in this copy).
20. Seville, Bibl. Capitular y Colombina, 56–2–25, fols. 92r–99r.\*<sup>101</sup>
21. Utrecht, UB, 725, fols. 165r–71r (with *CVI*).
22. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 4082, fols. 109r–13v (with *CVI*).
23. Venice, BNM, Lat. VI, 133 (=2429), fols. 66r–71v.

<sup>99</sup> Stefano Caroti’s description proposes two texts for this part of the manuscript: Oresme’s *Ap* on fols. 172r–73v alone, and the rest (fols. 173v–77v) comprising a text perhaps attributable to Oresme. See S. Caroti, “Nicole Oresme, *Questio contra divinatores horoscopios*,” *AHDLMA* 43 (1976): 209–12, at 212. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the quoted explicit corresponds exactly to Oresme’s text. See L. Thorndike and P. Kibre, *A Catalogue of Incipits of Mediaeval Scientific Writings in Latin* (Cambridge, MA, 1937), 506.

<sup>100</sup> Edward Grant, “The Mathematical Theory of Proportionality of Nicole Oresme” (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1957), 308 refers to fols. 104r–105v of this manuscript, but, according to the modern catalogue, the text is at fols. 109r–10v. See R. Hanna, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Medieval Manuscripts of St John’s College Oxford* (Oxford 2002), 270. This copy seems to be incomplete.

<sup>101</sup> The presence of Oresme’s *AP* in MS Seville, Bibl. Capitular y Colombina, 56–2–25 is mentioned in the online description of the manuscript found on the Colombina Library website at <http://opac.icolombina.es/opac/abnetcl.exe> (accessed 27 July 2022) by searching with the keywords “Algorismus proportionum.” A correction is required, however. The manuscript conveys not only the “tractatus secundus” (as the online description affirms), but also the first treatise. It should be noted, however, that this copy lacks the proemium. The text follows the last line of Peckham’s *Perspectiva communis* without any break or indication that the scribe has begun copying a new text. A later reader recognized this and added the following in the right margin: “Et hic est finis perspectiva communis edita a magistro Johanne de Pisis.” The same hand wrote “incipit” on the left margin, indicating the beginning of the new text, our *AP*.

\*Manuscripts 2, 6, 14, and 20 have not yet been reported.<sup>102</sup>

*Modern editions and translations:*

1. S. Rommevaux, *Les nouvelles théories des rapports mathématiques au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Turnhout, 2014), 171–257. Complete edition with French translation.
2. Partial editions:
  - (a) M. Curtze, *Der Algorismus proportionum des Nicolaus Oresme: Zum ersten Mal nach der Lesart der Handschrift R. 4<sup>o</sup>. 2. der Königlichen Gymnasialbibliothek zu Thorn*, ed. E. L. W. M. Curtze (Berlin, 1868). This edition does not contain the prologue.
  - (b) E. Grant, “The Mathematical Theory of Proportionality of Nicole Oresme” (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1957), 331–39 (edition of Part I).<sup>103</sup>

*Attribution:* Oresme’s authorship of this text is secured by self-references, remarks in the manuscript copies of the text, and internal doctrinal consistency.

*Title:* As attested in the *proemium* that appears in the vast majority of the manuscripts. The title follows the older text tradition on “*Algorismus*,” namely, brief tracts on arithmetic from the thirteenth century.<sup>104</sup> Oresme’s treatise, of course, goes far beyond this tradition in its theoretical content by its mathematical insight and its philosophical implications. A self-reference in his later *LdP* contains a French translation of this title: “si comme je demonstray en un Traictié appellé *Algorisme de proportions*.”<sup>105</sup>

*Dating:* According to Edward Grant and Sabine Rommevaux, *Ap* must have been composed between 3 January 1351 and 9 June 1361, the period during which Philippe de Vitry, who is mentioned in the prologue as “Reverende Presul Meldensis Philippe,” was Bishop of Meaux.<sup>106</sup>

*Self-references:* According to Marshall Clagett, Oresme refers to *AP* in his *CQM* as a “special treatise,” in which he deals with “harmonic difformity.”<sup>107</sup> In book VIII of his *LdP*, Oresme refers to *AP* by name when discussing proportions in

<sup>102</sup> For further details about some of these manuscripts, see Grant, “The Mathematical Theory,” 308–26.

<sup>103</sup> See also E. Grant, “Part I of Nicole Oresmes *Algorismus proportionum*,” *Isis* 56 (1965): 327–41, with an edition of the first part and the prologue, which was absent in the manuscript used by Curtze and, correspondingly, in the reprint of Curtze in E. Grant, *Studies in Medieval Science and Natural Philosophy* (London, 1981), no. 1.

<sup>104</sup> *Ap*, ed. Rommevaux, 144.

<sup>105</sup> *LdP*, VIII, ed. Menut, 347.

<sup>106</sup> *Pp*, ed. Grant, 12–13; and *Ap*, ed. Rommevaux, 143.

<sup>107</sup> *CQM*, II.19, ed. Clagett, 320, lines 43–44.

music: “si comme je demonstray en un Traictié appellé *Algorisme de proportions*.”<sup>108</sup>

### 3. *De commensurabilitate vel incommensurabilitate motuum celi (CVI)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Grant’s edition): [Proemium] “Zenonem et Crisippum maiora egisse,” affirmat Seneca, ‘quam si duxissent exercitus, gessissent honores, leges tulissent.’” [Text] “Numerus primus est qui a nullo preterquam ab unitate numeratur ut 5 sive 7 . . . X . . . et ecce sompnus abiit, dubia conclusio restat et ipse nescio quid super hoc iudex decrevit Apollo.”

#### *Manuscripts:*

1. Cambridge, Magdalene College, PL 2329, fols. 111v–28r (with *Ap* and *Pp*). Colophon: “Explicit nobilis tractatus magistri Jordani de Nemore de motibus celestibus et cetera.”
2. Florence, BML, Ashb. 210, fols. 159r–72r (with *AP*, *CAJ*, *APJ*, *Mm*, and *QCQP*).
3. Paris, BnF, Bibl. de l’Arsenal, lat. 522, fols. 110r–21r (with *AP*, *CQM*, *DCI*, *De instantibus*, and *Pvm*).
4. Paris, BnF, lat. 7281, fols. 259r–73r.
5. Utrecht, UB, 725, fols. 172r–93v (with *AP*). Colophon: “Explicit tractatus de commensurabilitate et incommensurabilitate motuum celestium magistri Nicolai ab horeym.”
6. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 4082, fols. 97v–108v (with *AP*). Colophon: “Explicit tractatus de incommensurabilitate motuum celestium editus per magistrum Nicholaum Orem.”
7. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 4275, fols. 96r–101r (only part III; with *Pp*, *VS* and *CAJ*).

*Modern edition:* E. Grant (ed.), *Oresme and the Kinematics of Circular Motion* (Madison, 1971).

#### *Translations:*

- (a) English: E. Grant, see *Modern edition*.
- (b) Russian: V. P. Zoubov: Орем Н. О соизмеримости или несоизмеримости движений неба [Nikolaj Orem o soizmerimosti ili nesoizmerimosti dvizhenij neba] (Москва, 1960), 301–400.

*Attribution:* The attribution of *CVI* to Oresme seems unquestionable. It is well-attested by a series of self-references, internal consistency with many ideas of

<sup>108</sup> *LdP*, VIII, ed. Menut, 347.

Oresme's natural philosophy, and many indications in the colophons of the manuscript copies (although manuscript 1 wrongly attributes the text to Jordanus de Nemore).

*Title:* None of the manuscripts used in the edition bears the title *De commensurabilitate vel incommensurabilitate motuum celi*, adopted by Edward Grant. This is, however, the title to which Oresme refers in this later *LdC*. The closest variants in the manuscripts are *Tractatus de commensurabilitate motuum celi* (MS 2) and *Tractatus de commensurabilitate vel incommensurabilitate motuum celestium* (MS 3).<sup>109</sup>

*Dating:* According to Edward Grant “the date of composition [. . .] can only be estimated as lying within rather widely separated terminal years.” The ultimate *terminus ante quem* is the *LdC*, but the text could have been produced much earlier. Possible earlier datings are 1362, 1351 (as *terminus post quem*), and even “in the 1340s.”<sup>110</sup>

*Self-references:*

Self-references to *CVI*: As Edward Grant pointed out, Oresme refers to *CVI* in his *LdC* and in his *LdD*.<sup>111</sup> In addition, the *LdP* contains a reference to *CVI*, in book VIII, while dealing with the notion of consonance in music: “Et de ce je dis autre foiz en un traictié que je fis de la Commensurabeté des mouvemens du ciel.”<sup>112</sup>

Self-references in *CVI*: In *CVI*, Oresme mentioned *Pp* by its title.<sup>113</sup>

#### 4. *De proportionibus proportionum (Pp)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Grant's edition): [Proemium] “Omnis rationalis opinio de velocitate motuum ponit eam sequi aliquam proportionem: hec quidem proportionem . . .” [Text] “Omnes proportiones equalitatis sunt equales nec earum plures species assignantur sed tantum est una . . . X . . . ut golias proprio gladio feriatur manifestetur quoque veritas et falsitas destruat. Hoc igitur quartum capitulum fineatur.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Cambridge, Magdalene College, PL 2329, fols. 93v–110v (with *AP* and *CVI*).
2. Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibl. – Staats- und UB Dresden, C 80, fols. 234r–44 (with *AP*).

<sup>109</sup> For further details, see *CVI*, ed. Grant, 4, n. 3, and the variant readings on 172 and 322.

<sup>110</sup> *CVI*, ed. Grant, 4–5.

<sup>111</sup> *Pp*, ed. Grant, 61–63, n. 81. The passages referred to by Grant are to be found in *LdC*, I.29, ed. Menut and Denomy, 196, 200, and 202; and *LdD*, ed. Coopland, 54.

<sup>112</sup> *LdP*, VIII, ed. Menut, 347.

<sup>113</sup> *CVI*, ed. Grant, 264, lines 200–201.

3. Erfurt, Dep. Erf. CA 4° 352, fols. 134v–48v.
4. Erfurt, Dep. Erf. CA 4° 385, fols. 67r–82v (with *Pr*).
5. Leipzig, UB, MS 1480, fols. 135v–53r.
6. Paris, BnF, lat. 7371, fols. 269r–78v (with *CQM* and *Ars predicandi*).
7. Paris, BnF, lat. 16621, fols. 94r–110r (with *Pr*).
8. Pommersfelden, Gräflische und Schönbornsche Stiftsbibl., 236 (2858), fols. 115ra–28ra (with *Conclusio mirabilis* and *De terminis confundentibus*). Initium: “Incipiunt proportiones proportionum edite a magistro Nicholao Orem doctore subtilissimo.” Colophon: “Expliciu[n]t quatuor capitula de proporcion[e] proporcionum tradita per magistrum Nycho[la]m dictum Orem que multas subtilitates includunt.”
9. Seville, Bibl. Capitular y Colombina, 7–7–13, fols. 114r–22v (with *QsE*, *QdS*, *Conclusio mirabilis* and *Utrum aliqua res videatur tanta quanta est*).
10. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 4275, fols. 102r–27r (with *CVI*, *VS* and *CAJ*).
11. Venice, BNM, Lat. VI, 133 (=1237), fols. 50r–62v (with *Pr*).
12. Venice, BNM, Lat. VI, 155 (=3377), fols. 112v–48v (with *Pr* and *De instantibus*).<sup>114</sup>

MSS 1 and 7 are mentioned in Grant’s edition only as “additional manuscripts.” MS 7 is most likely a copy made from MS 8, which in turn is without doubt the manuscript included in Amplonius’s catalogue and mentioned by Grant as “unlocated and presumed lost.”<sup>115</sup> MS 12 was unknown to Grant, who nevertheless mentioned the possibility of yet another manuscript similar to the only Venice manuscript known at that time and included in his list as N° 5 (N° 11 on our list). This is an important piece (see *Remarks* below).

*Early modern editions:*

1. Octavianus Scotus, Venice, 1505, fols. 17r– 25r.<sup>116</sup>
2. D. de Marnef, Paris, s.d..

<sup>114</sup> G. Valentinielli, *Bibliotheca manuscripta ad S. Marci Venetiarum* (Venice, 1871), 4:229–31.

<sup>115</sup> *Pp*, ed. Grant, 127. See *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands*, ed. Lehmann (n. 37 above), 2:16. For a complete description of this manuscript, see D. A. Di Liscia, “Der von Amplonius Rattinck dem Oresme zugeschriebene *Tractatus de terminis confundentibus* und dessen verschollene Handschrift (Hs. Pommersfelden, *Graf von Schönborn Schloßbibliothek*, 236 [2858]),” *Traditio* (2001): 89–112, at 89 and 90–95 (for the description of the manuscript).

<sup>116</sup> For further details on this edition, especially in connection with *Pr*, see *Pp*, ed. Grant, 130–31. According to Grant, the Paris edition is “almost identical with the Venice edition of 1505” (131).

*Modern edition:* E. Grant (ed.), *Nicole Oresme. De proportionibus proportionum and Ad pauca respicientes* (Madison, 1966). Grant also prepared a previous edition in his Ph.D. dissertation on Oresme's proportion theory: E. Grant, "The Mathematical Theory of Proportionality of Nicole Oresme" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1957), 141–283.

*Translations:*

- (a) English: see *Modern edition*.
- (b) French: S. Rommevaux (ed.), *Thomas Bradwardine, Traité des rapports entre les rapidités dans les mouvements suivi de Nicole Oresme, Sur les rapports de rapports: Introduction, traduction, et commentaire* (Paris, 2010), 75–173.

*Attribution:* Oresme's authorship of this text is secured by self-references, remarks in the manuscript copies of the text, and internal doctrinal consistency.

*Title:* The title follows the tradition of treatises on proportions and velocities initiated by Bradwardine and it is attested in many manuscripts and both editions.

*Dating:* Between 1351 and 1360.<sup>117</sup>

*Self-references:* In his *QdS*, Oresme refers to his *Pp*: "quibuscumque duobus temporibus vel quantitibus duabus demonstratis, verisimile est <quod> illa sunt [Droppers: est] incommensurabilia et quod eorum proportion sit irrationalis, sicut patet in libro de proportionibus."<sup>118</sup>

*Remarks:* The transmission, the structure, and even the possible connection with another mathematical text by Oresme, the brief treatise *Pr*, are all factors related to *Pp* that make it a specially complex case. How many chapters did *Pp* really have? Did Oresme change his ongoing project? What is the link to *Pr*? As Grant pointed out, despite the fact that none of the hitherto known manuscripts has more than four chapters, all manuscripts divide the text of *Pp* into six chapters.<sup>119</sup> In addition, it is worth noting that both of the earliest printed editions (which are very similar to each other) include the first and second parts of *Pr* as being the fifth and sixth chapters of *Pp*. By analysing these questions, Grant mentions in his edition of *Pp* the possibility of another manuscript similar to the only Venice manuscript he knew (manuscript 11 on this list). As

<sup>117</sup> *Pp*, ed. Grant, 11.

<sup>118</sup> *QdS*, question 13, ed. Droppers, 292, lines 20–22. See J. Celeyrette, "Les Questions sur la Physique dans l'œuvre de Nicole Oresme," *Nicole Oresme philosophe* (n. 1 above), 63–81, at 65.

<sup>119</sup> *Pp*, ed. Grant, 72. In the prologue, Oresme describes not only the content of the four extant chapters, but also two more otherwise unknown chapters: "In quinto ad velocitates motuum condescendam. In sexto dicam de incommensurabilitate motuum celestium" (*Pp*, ed. Grant, 134–38).



a matter of fact, we have identified such a manuscript, also preserved in the Biblioteca Marciana: Lat. VI, 155 (3377). This is an important piece containing both *Pp* and *Pr*. As Giuseppe Valentini did not identify these texts, Grant and other scholars overlooked it. The case merits a more detailed analysis, which we cannot carry out here. In preparation for future research, however, we offer some useful details.

Nicole Oresme's treatise *Pp* (chapters I–IV) is found at fols. 112va–29vb: [Proemium] “Omnis rationalis opinio de velocitate motuum ponit eam sequi aliquam proportionem, hec quidem proportionem excessus potentie motoris ad resistentiam sive potentiam rei mote. . .” For the expression “ad pauca aspicientes” at the end of the proemium, this manuscript contains “ad pauca *respicientes*” (our italics).<sup>120</sup> The series of the chapters is as follows:

- Ch.1 “Omnes proportiones equalitatis sunt equales nec earum plures species assignantur. . .” (fols. 112vb–15vb).
- Ch. 2 “Nulla proportio rationalis est divisibilis septimo modo. . .” (fols. 115vb–21ra). “In secunda parte huius capituli ponam tres practicas regulas utiles ad predicta. Prima regula seu conclusio est: Data proportione eius primos numeros. . .” (120ra). In this part of the manuscript there are some problems with the foliation but, as the librarians of the Marciana kindly confirmed, no leaf is missing.
- Ch. 3 “In hoc tertio capitulo aliqua magis specialia de proportionum proportionibus adiungam. . .” (fols. 121ra–25ra). There is a table of numbers to find the proportions of proportions on fol. 122va.
- Ch. 4 : “Quasdam propositiones de motibus in hoc quarto capitulo demonstrabo pro quibus sunt etiam alique suppositiones premitte. Prima: velocitas sequitur proportionem. . .” (fols. 125ra–29vb). The text of this chapter ends at fol. 129vb with these words: “et ex mathematica mathematicos impugnare ut golyas proprio gladio feriat manifestetur quoque veritas et falsitas destruat. Hoc ergo quartum capitulum finiatur.”

The text continues without any remark that could indicate the beginning of a new work. The next text, however, is the one edited by Grant as “Ad pauca *respicientes*” (*Pr*). There is one more significant detail worth mentioning. The following line in the manuscript corresponds to the beginning of the discussion of the notion of “possible” and, thus, jumping the introductory remarks about the astrologers and the Platonic years.<sup>121</sup> This copy starts with: “hoc termino possibile

<sup>120</sup> *Pp*, ed. Grant, 138, line 33.

<sup>121</sup> *Pp*, ed. Grant, 383, lines 1–13.

multipliciter utimur.” The end, which in this copy is clearly meant to be the end of the complete text of *Pp*, runs parallel to the end of *Pr*: “nullus debet loqui sed potius compescere linguam a talibus que in manu Dei sunt. Et ipse solus novit cuius oculis nuda sunt omnia et aperta.”<sup>122</sup> The colophon immediately following runs: “Explicit tractatus finitus et completus anno domini mcccc xvi tertia die mensis februarii deo gratias.” Hence, this is a later copy completed at the beginning of 1416, which, incidentally, belonged to the Marcanova collection and was acquired in Padua in 1438.<sup>123</sup>

*Summary*: MS Venice, BNM, Lat. VI, 155 (= 3377) is a complete copy of both *Pp* (fols. 112va–129vb) and *Pr* (fols. 129vb–133ra) as well, which, nevertheless, the copyist did not understand to have been two different texts. As a result, the proemial part of *Pr* is missing.

### 5. *De visione stellarum (VS)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Burton’s edition): “Plato in Timeo volens reddere causam propter quam visus inest nostris oculis . . . X . . . quanto splendidiore quam cetera sydera fulget lucifer, et quanto quam lucifer aurea phebe.”

#### *Manuscripts:*

1. Bloomington (IN), Lilly Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Medieval and Renaissance mss., fifteenth century, “Cum volueris scire gradum solis.”<sup>124</sup>
2. Bruges, OB, lat. 530, fols. 31r–40v (with *AP*).
3. Florence, BNC, Conv. Soppr. J X 19, fols. 31r–43r (with *Questiones de Perspectiva*). Colophon: “Explicit N. Orem, etc. De visione stellarum tractatus brevis.”
4. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 4275, fols. 40v–50v (with *Pp*, *CVI* and *CAJ*).

*Modern edition with English translation*: D. Burton (ed.), *Nicole Oresme’s De visione stellarum (On Seeing the Stars): A Critical Edition of Oresme’s Treatise*

<sup>122</sup> Fol. 133ra = *Pp*, ed. Grant, 428, lines 268–70.

<sup>123</sup> Giovanni Marcanova (1410/1418–1467), a student and later teacher of arts and medicine active in Padua and Bologna, and briefly also in Cesena, between approximately 1440 and 1460, was familiar with both new trends in scholastic philosophy and innovative humanistic ideas. On him and his famous book collection, see L. Sighinolfi, “La biblioteca di Giovanni Marcanova,” in *Collectanea variae doctrinae Leoni S. Olschki bibliopolae Florentino sexagenario* (Monachii, 1921), 187–222; M. C. Vitali, “L’umanista padovano Giovanni Marcanova (1410/18–1467) e la sua biblioteca,” *Ateneo veneto* 21 (1983): 127–61; and E. Barile, *Per la biografia dell’umanista Giovanni Marcanova* (Padova, 2011).

<sup>124</sup> Burton (*VS*, 4, n. 6) explains that “no manuscript number is given by the Lilly; rather, the entire manuscript is referred to by its century and the incipit of its first text, Messahala’s *Practica circa astrolabium*, part 2.”

on *Optics and Atmospheric Refraction, with an Introduction, Commentary, and English Translation* (Leiden, 2007).

*Title:* The title *De visione stellarum* can be found in the table of contents of the Florentine manuscript, which repeats a phrase of the introduction of the work (“Propter quod de visione stellarum aliqua recollegi dicta in disputatione apud sanctum Bernardum, ubi fuit dubitatum: Utrum stelle videantur ubi sunt”).<sup>125</sup> A header at the beginning of the work in the Vatican manuscript reads: “Incipit pulcher tractatus: Utrum stelle videantur ubi sunt” (fol. 40v). The table of contents at the beginning of the text in the same manuscript, in a different hand, refers to Oresme’s work with a variant of the same title: “Questio utrum stelle videantur ubi sunt.” A header in the Bloomington manuscript refers to this work in a more general way as a “Tractatus solempnis perspective.”

*Attribution:* The second colophon of the Florentine manuscript, which is separated from the first one and from the end of the *De visione* by some missing leaves, attributes the text to Nicole Oresme (fol. 43r).<sup>126</sup> The other manuscripts are anonymous. The content of the treatise shows a striking parallel with the discussion of atmospheric refraction and its effects in seeing the celestial bodies in the first redaction of Oresme’s *QsM*.<sup>127</sup>

*Dating:* The *De visione* is one of Oresme’s very early works. First and foremost, one cannot find any reference in it to any other of Oresme’s works, which is very rare in his production. According to David Burton, another argument supporting an early dating of this work is that Oresme submits it to the correction of the masters of the University of Paris, particularly those of the Faculty of Arts. According to Burton, if Oresme had been already enrolled in the Theology Faculty, he would not have submitted this treatise to younger and less experienced colleagues.<sup>128</sup>

## 6. *De configurationibus qualitatum et motuum (CQM)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Clagett’s edition): [Prohemium] “Cum ymaginationem meam de uniformitate et difformitate intensionum ordinare cepissem,

<sup>125</sup> *VS*, ed. Burton, 80, lines 1–3.

<sup>126</sup> The fact that the first colophon does not attribute the text to Oresme obscured his authorship, as the second colophon was thought to belong to a different, lost text. See *VS*, ed. Burton, 18–19.

<sup>127</sup> See Panzica, *De la Lune à la Terre* (n. 60 above), part II, chap. 10.

<sup>128</sup> *VS*, II.2, ed. Burton, 216, lines 2–5: “Hec pauca dicta sunt ad excitandum mentes iuvenum in speculatione rerum nobilium. Et cum humili subiectione correctione reverendorum magistrorum huius excellentissime Universitatis Parisius, et precipue quo ad istud venerabilium doctorum facultatis artium collegium, in quibus istis malis temporibus, tanquam in pretiosis vasculis, custoditur phylosophie margarita, quorum doctrina plus cunctis lucida tanto quanto splendidior quam cetera sydera fulget lucifer, et quanto quam lucifer aurea phebe.” For Burton’s arguments, see the introduction to this edition, 26–27.

occurrerunt michi quedam alia que . . .” [Text. Cap. 1] “Omnis res mensurabilis exceptis numeris ymaginatur ad modum quantitatis continue. Ideo oportet . . . X . . . Multa quidem alia possent ex predictis inferri, sed hec tanquam quedam elementa sufficiant gratia exercitii et exempli. Et de uniformitate et difformitate intensionum dictum sit in tantum.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Basel, UB, F III 31, fols. 1r–28r.
2. Bruges, OB, lat. 486, fols. 159r–73r.
3. Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4°, 298, fols. 63r–64r.
4. Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4°, 150, fols. 11r–14v (with *DCI*).
5. Florence, BML, Ashb. 210, fols. 101v–29v (with *AP*, *CAJ*, *CVI* and *Mm*).
6. Florence, BNC, Conv. Sopp., J IX 26, fols. 13r–35r (with *AP*).
7. Groningen, UB, MS 103, fols. 68r–95v, 119r–23v.
8. London, British Museum, Sloane 2156, fols. 159r–93v.
9. Metz, Bibliothèques-Médiathèques, MS 378, fols. 1r–58r.\*
10. Paris, BnF, Bibl. de l’Arsenal, lat. 522, fols. 1r–29r (with *AP*, *CVI*, *DCI*, *De instantibus* and *Pvm*).
11. Paris, BnF, lat. 7371, fols. 214r–66r (with *Pp* and *Ars predicandi*).
12. Paris, BnF, lat. 14580, fols. 37r–60v (with *DCI*, *LdD*, *EcL* and *DMM*).
13. Paris, BnF, lat. 14579, fols. 15r–37v (new foliation); fols. 18r–40v (old foliation) (with *DCI*, *Mm* and *Iuxta est salus mea*).
14. Vatican City, BAV, Chigi E IV 109, fols. 97r–159r (new foliation); fols. 87r–149r (old foliation).
15. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 3097, fols. 1r–22v (with *Questiones in libros I–II De generatione et corruptione* of Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 2185 and 3097).<sup>129</sup>

*Modern edition:* M. Clagett (ed.), *Nicole Oresme and the Medieval Geometry of Qualities and Motions: A Treatise on the Uniformity and Difformity of Intensities known as Tractatus de configurationibus qualitatum et motuum* (Madison, 1968).

*Translations:*

- (a) English: see *Modern edition*.
- (b) French: P. Debrouse, “Mathématiques de l’intensité et merveilles de la nature. Étude sur le Tractatus de configurationibus qualitatum et motuum de Nicole Oresme” (Ph.D. diss., Université de Paris VII,

<sup>129</sup> For additional remarks on MSS 1–8 and 10–14, see *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 142–55. On manuscript 9, which is not included in Clagett’s edition, see D. A. Di Liscia, “La ‘latitud de las formas’ y la geometrización de la ciencia del movimiento,” *Mediaevalia: Textos e estudos* 36 (2017): 75–114, at 92–94.

- 2019), 1145–1290 (a French translation of Oresme’s *CQM* in its entirety according to Clagett’s edition).
- (c) French (partial translation): P. Souffrin and J. P. Weiss, “Le Traité des configurations des qualités et des mouvements: Remarques sur quelques problèmes d’interprétation et de traduction,” in *Nicolas Oresme, Tradition et innovation chez un intellectuel du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, ed. P. Souffrin and A. Ph. Segonds (Paris, 1988), 125–34 (a French translation of some selected passages of *CQM*, especially on mathematics).
- (d) Russian: V. P. Zoubov, трактат Николая Орема “о конфигураций качеств” [Traktat Nikolaia Orema “O konfiguratsii kachestv”] (Москва, 1958), 600–731.
- (e) Spanish (partial translation): D. A. Di Liscia, “La ‘latitud de las formas’ y la geometrización de la ciencia del movimiento,” *Mediaevalia: Textos e estudios* 36 (2017): 75–114, esp. 113–14 for a Spanish translation of *CQM* III.7.

*Attribution:* The content of the treatise, the manuscript tradition, and self-references in Oresme’s works make the attribution of *CQM* to Oresme unquestionable.

*Title:* The title of this work as *Tractatus de configurationibus qualitatum et motuum* is still hypothetical. Apart of the confusion of the title with the *Tractatus de latitudinibus formarum*, which is not a work by Oresme (see below, group IX, item 4), other possible titles derived from the proemium and the colophon of some copies are the short versions “Tractatus gloriosus,” “Tractatus de configurationibus,” “Tractatus de configurationibus qualitatum.” Other possibilities are “Tractatus de intensione qualitatum,” “Tractatus de figuratione potentiarum et mensura potentiarum,” and “Tractatus de uniformitate et difformitate intensionum.”<sup>130</sup> Oresme refers to his text as *De difformitate (deformitate) qualitatum* in his French commentary on the Aristotelian *Politics*.

*Dating:* There is no evidence for a definitive determination of the date of composition of *CQM*. According to Marshall Clagett, *CQM* dates before 1364, perhaps even prior to 1362.<sup>131</sup> According to another hypothesis also advanced by Clagett, *CQM* could have been composed between 1351 and 1355. The newly discovered Metz manuscript does not add any new information to solve this problem.

*Self-references:*

Self-references to *CQM*: As Clagett has already pointed out, there are some clear references to *CQM* in other Oresmian works.<sup>132</sup> In his *LdD*, Oresme mentions

<sup>130</sup> For a discussion on the title and its different variants, see M. Clagett, *The Science of Mechanics in the Middle Ages* (Madison, 1961), 339 n. 12; and *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 135–46.

<sup>131</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 122–25.

<sup>132</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 137.

this text twice. In the first quotation, he mentions the long title as “Traite de la configuracion des qualites et des mouvemens.”<sup>133</sup> In the second one, he refers to the “Livre de la Figuration des Qualitez.”<sup>134</sup> In his *LdP*, there are two further references to *CQM*, which Clagett mentions using the old edition from Paris, 1489.<sup>135</sup> As Clagett has correctly noted, in both passages Oresme cites his own title as “De deformitate qualitatum,” which is not attested in the manuscript tradition of *CQM*. Additionally, one should also mention that Oresme affirms “si comme je declaray autre foiz en un Traictié appelé *De Deformitate Qualitatum*.”<sup>136</sup> Similarly, the second reference runs: “E les causes et la maniere comment tele chose peut estre naturelment je mis en un traictié appelé *De Difformitate Qualitatum*.”<sup>137</sup> Thus, in both passages Oresme is not only referring back to this treatise, but also clearly stating his preferred title for it.

Self-references in *CQM*: There are five self-references in *CQM*.<sup>138</sup>

1. To a treatise *De perfectione specierum* (I.20), which despite some useful indications in the scholarship has still to be definitively identified (see group VII, item 4).<sup>139</sup>
2. To a “special treatise,” in which Oresme deals with “harmonic difformity,” which Clagett identified as being the *Algorismus proportionum* (II.19).<sup>140</sup>
3. Unequivocally, but in a very different context and in another part of *CQM*, to this same treatise, when mentioning some of the rules of adding and subtracting ratios (III.6).<sup>141</sup>
4. To a question on divinations the identification of which is still controversial (II.26; for further discussion, see our Appendix 2).<sup>142</sup>
5. To a previous “more subtle and difficult” mathematical demonstration (III.8), which according to Clagett is a reference to the *Questions* on Euclid, but which more probably is (a hypothesis in fact advanced by Clagett himself) a reference to the text titled “conclusio mirabilis” (for a further discussion, see group VIII, item 1).<sup>143</sup>

<sup>133</sup> *LdD*, ed. Coopland, 60.

<sup>134</sup> *LdD*, ed. Coopland, 92.

<sup>135</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 138.

<sup>136</sup> *LdP*, ed. Menut, 349.

<sup>137</sup> *LdP*, ed. Menut, 355.

<sup>138</sup> See *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 125–33. For no apparent reason, however, Clagett groups the third and the fourth manuscripts together.

<sup>139</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 216, lines 15–18.

<sup>140</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 320, lines 43–44.

<sup>141</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 406, lines 19–20.

<sup>142</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 338, lines 9–13.

<sup>143</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 414–16, lines 43–44.

7. *Utrum aliqua res videatur tanta quanta est*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Watson's edition): "Quaestio est, utrum aliqua res videatur tanta quanta est. Primo arguitur hinc inde. Secundo ponentur aliquae suppositiones ex quibus patebit quid est cognoscere quantitatem rei vel mensuram . . . X . . . Et sicut non de se lucet speculum, sed de sole, ita non a se, sed ab antiquis huius studii doctoribus acceperunt alii quicquid dicitur noviter invenisse."

*Manuscripts:*

1. Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4° 231, fols. 146r–50r. Colophon: "Explicit questio determinata per magistrum Nicholaum Oresme normannum."
2. Seville, Bibl. Capitular y Colombina, 7–7–13, fols. 138r–40v (with *QsE*, *QdS*, *Pp* and *Conclusio mirabilis*).
3. Venice, BNM, Lat. VIII, 19 (3267), fols. 234r–42v.

*Modern edition:* L. B. Watson, *Quaestio de apparentia rei: A Hitherto Unedited Fourteenth-Century Scientific Treatise Ascribed to Nicholas Oresme* (B.A. thesis, Harvard University, 1973).

*Partial edition:* J. Celeyrette, "Une question de perspective disputée à Erfurt partiellement copiée sur une question d'Oresme," *Quaderni di Noctua* 5 (2015): 125–79, at 163–75.

*Title:* The title derives from the object of the question.

*Attribution:* The attribution, contested by Watson, was reaffirmed by Celeyrette on the basis of philosophical and historical arguments. Celeyrette showed that the question presents strong analogies with question III.1 of Oresme's *QsP*. Celeyrette also showed that Marsil of Saint-Sophia, a fourteenth-century Italian master, attributed the question *Utrum aliqua res videatur* to Oresme.<sup>144</sup>

*Dating:* No internal element allows us to date the text. Judging from its questio-form and from the subject, which was treated by Oresme in some of his early writings, such as *QsM*, *VS* and, as shown by Celeyrette, *QsP*, we can suppose that this text also belongs to this early phase of his career.

<sup>144</sup> For Watson's arguments, see *Utrum aliqua res videatur*, ed. L. B. Watson, in *Quaestio de apparentia rei: A Hitherto Unedited Fourteenth-Century Scientific Treatise Ascribed to Nicholas Oresme* (B.A. thesis, Harvard University, 1973), p. 78. For the corresponding passage in Oresme's *Physica* commentary, see question III.1: *Utrum ignorato motu necesse sit ignorare naturam*, in *QsP*, ed. Caroti et al., 293–303. For Celeyrette's discussion of this question, see J. Celeyrette, "Apparences et imaginations chez Nicole Oresme: Question III.1 sur la *Physique* et question sur l'apparence d'une chose," *Revue d'histoire des sciences* 60 (2007): 83–100, at 85 n. 8.

## III. WRITINGS AGAINST ASTROLOGY, MAGIC, AND DIVINATION

*Preliminary remarks:* Polemic against astrology, magic, and divination represents a central theme in Oresme's scientific production. Oresme never contested the general principle of astrology, namely, the action of the celestial region on the terrestrial one, but he rejected the sophisticated apparatus of aspects and influences by which astrologers attempted to forecast the future. Oresme elaborated the theoretical basis of his attack against astrology in his mathematical writings, in which he developed the theory of the incommensurability of the celestial movements. Yet, Oresme's polemic was not only intended against astrology, but also against every form of magic and superstition. His main epistemological principle was to explain natural phenomena with terrestrial causes, without resorting to a suspect explanation like celestial influence. Oresme devoted a series of pamphlets and treatises to this effort, some of which were conceived for a university milieu, such as the *Questio contra divinatores* and the *Problemata*, and others for a wider public, such as the *Tractatus contra astronomos judicarios* and the *Livre de divinations*, written in French (see next group, item 1).

1. *Tractatus contra astronomos judicarios (CAJ)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Coopland's edition): "Multi principes et mag-nates, noxia curiositate solliciti, vanis nituntur artibus occulta perquirere et inves-tigare futura. Ad cuius erroris impugnationem ordinavi tractatum qui sequitur in hunc modum . . . X. . . Quod facient melius si non vanis artibus et fatuitibus sed regine sapiencie et post prudencie politice sint semper intenti quoniam infallibilis veritas dicit: Rex insipiens perdet populum suum et principatus sensati stabilis erit."

*Manuscripts:*

1. Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4° 125, fols. 142r–49v.
2. Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4° 205, fols. 54r–60v. Initium: "Incipit tractatus magistri Nicolay Oresme contra astrologos." Colophon: "Explicit tractatus magistri Nicolay Oresme contra astrologos, finitus Wyenne M° CCC° nonagesimo sexto in ieiunio."
3. Florence, BML, Ashb. 210, fols. 84v–89r (with *AP, CVI, QCQP, Mm*). Colophon: "Explicit tractatus quem dedit vir profunde speculationis magister Nycholaus Orem Normannus contra astrologos iudici [*sic*] qui se prophetas volunt appellari."
4. Paris, BnF, lat. 14580, fols. 100v–101r (with *CQM, DCI, EcL, DMM*).
5. Paris, BnF, lat. 10709, fols. 52r–61r. Initium: "Tractatus magistri Nicholai Oresme contra judicarios astronomos qui se prophetas volunt appellari."
6. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 4275, fols. 35r–40r (with *Pp, CVI, VS, CAJ*).



7. Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 4613, fols. 147r–51v. Colophon: “Explicit tractatus Nicolai Orem contra iudicia astrologie.”
8. Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 4948, fols. 162r–68r. Colophon: “Explicit tractatus Nicolai Orem contra iudicia astrologie.”

*Editions:*

1. H. Pruckner, *Studien zu den astrologischen Schriften des Heinrich von Langenstein* (Leipzig, 1933), 227–45 and 284–86. Based on MS 1.
2. G. W. Coopland, *Nicole Oresme and the Astrologers: A Study of his “Livre de divinacions”* (Liverpool, 1952), 123–41. Based on MS 5.
3. An edition with French translation by Alain Boureau is forthcoming in *Nicole Oresme: Écrits métaphysiques, politiques et théologiques*.

*Attribution:* MS 1 attributes this text to Henri of Langenstein, but Pruckner, the first editor of this treatise, rejected this attribution and considered Oresme to be the author of the text.<sup>145</sup>

*Dating:* Around 1349.<sup>146</sup>

2. *Questio contra divinatores horoscopios, De causis mirabilium, Tabula prolematum and Problemata (QCQP)*

These four works are closely related in theme and are transmitted together in the manuscripts:

1. A question posed as follows: *Utrum res future per astrologiam possint presciri.*

*Incipit and explicit* (from Caroti’s edition): “Utrum res future per astrologiam possint presciri. — Arguitur quod sic per Aristotelem capitulo septimo primo Politice, qui ponit exemplum de etc. . . . X . . . Scotia etc., et tu respondes: ‘quia constellatio celi fuit talis,’ ita possem brevius respondere: ‘quia Deus vult, sicut autem dicunt multi.’”

<sup>145</sup> H. Pruckner, *Studien zu den astrologischen Schriften des Heinrich von Langenstein* (Leipzig, 1933), 7–8.

<sup>146</sup> For the chronology of Oresme’s anti-astrological writings, see M. Lejbowicz, “Chronologie des écrits anti-astrologiques de Nicole Oresme: Étude sur un cas de scepticisme dans la deuxième moitié du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle,” in *Autour de Nicole Oresme* (n. 1 above), 119–76. On *LdD*, see also S. Rapisarda, “From the *Tractatus contra astronomos judicarios* (1349) to the *Livre de divinacions* (1356): Nicole Oresme Lost in Translation,” in *El saber i les llenguës vernacles a l’època de Lull i Eiximenis. Estudis ICREA sobre vernacularització*, ed. A. Alberni et al. (Barcelone, 2012), 231–55.

2. A text consisting of four chapters, which has been edited under the title *De causis mirabilium*.

*Incipit and explicit* (from Hansen's edition): "Ut autem aequaliter pacificentur animi hominum, quamvis sit extra propositum, aliquorum que mirabilia videntur causas proposui hic declarare et quod naturaliter fiant sicut ceteri effectus de quibus communiter non miramur. . . X . . . quod nec ad demones nec ad influentiam ignotam oporteat recurrere effectus inferiores naturaliter fieri salvando."

3. A table of problems (*tabula problematum*) listing 216 questions. The first 44 are answered in detail, while the other 172 remain unanswered. The unanswered questions deal with perception (sight: 45–66; hearing: 67–78; smell: 79–80; taste: 81–86; and touch: 87–95), biology (digestion: 96–102; nourishment: 103–109; and generation: 110–24), the soul and its operations (125–92), and general problems of natural philosophy (193–216).

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Hansen's edition): "Sequuntur problemata per modum tabule sine responsionibus ad ea. Utrum Aristoteles et alii philosophi notabiles posuerunt demones concurrere ad effectus inferiores ut quod maniaci dicant futura vel preterita per demones . . . X . . . Non autem est in talibus magisterium scire contra arguere: sed causas probabiles reddere et non ad impossibilia figure ut ad demones vel influentiam ignotam aut ad Deum gloriosum immediate est subtilis intellectus. Reddat igitur cui iste non placent causas clariores."

4. *Forty-four questions with answers* (problemata)

*Incipit and explicit* (according to MS 4): "Ad primam questionem, utrum Aristoteles posuerit quod qui maniaci sunt demoniaci, etc., respondeo quod non, unde per aliquam doctrinam . . . X . . . vel forte quod ipsimet credunt fecisse vel saltem fingunt aut volunt fecisse videri."

*Manuscripts:*

1. Florence, BML, Ashb. 210 (fol. 2v: table of contents; fols. 3r–21r: *Questio contra divinatores horoscopios*; fols. 21r–39r: *De causis mirabilium*; fols. 39r–44v: *tabula problematum*; fols. 45r–70v: *problemata*). Initium (fol. 3r): "Incipit questio contra divinatores horoscopios qui facta in constellationibus ponunt per M. Ni. Oresme anno domini 1370, Parisius compilata et determinata." Colophon (fol. 70v): "Expliciunt quotlibeta magistri Nicolay Oresme" (with *AP*, *Pp*, *CAJ* and *CVI*).
2. Naples, BN, XI C 84 (fols. 1r–33v: *Questio contra divinatores horoscopios*; fols. 33va–67ra: *De causis mirabilium*; fols. 67rb–77va: *tabula problematum*; fols. 78r–120v: *problemata*). Colophon (fol. 33v): "Et sic finitur

- questio contra divinatores.” Colophon (fol. 120v): “Expliciunt quodlibeta magistri Nicholay Oresme.”
3. Paris, BnF, lat. 15126 (fols. 1r–39r: *Questio contra divinatores horoscopios*; fols. 39r–80r: *De causis mirabilium*; fols. 80r–93v: *tabula problematum*; fols. 95r–156v: *problemata* – incomplete). Note at fol. 157r, in the hand of Claude de Grandrue: “Que secuntur hic habentur, scilicet, questio determinata a magistro Nicholao Oresme utrum res future per astrologiam possint presciri (1); ab eodem rationes et cause plurium mirabilium in natura (39); plura quodlibeta et diverse questiones ab eodem (80); solutiones ab eodem predictorum problematum (95) et impugnationes. Talia faciunt c. 156 et usque 162.”
  4. Paris, BnF, lat. 15173 (fols. 96r–103v: *De causis mirabilium*; fols. 104r–15r: *tabula problematum*; fol. 115r–61v: *problemata*). The *Questio contra divinatores*, which precedes the *De causis mirabilium* in the other witnesses, is absent in this MS. The *De causis mirabilium* is listed in the table of contents by Claude de Grandrue as “plura quodlibeta et eorum solutiones.”
  5. A fifth copy (now lost) was probably preserved at Peterhouse Library in Cambridge. A sixteenth-century table of contents mentions the question *An res future possunt per astra presciri* followed by “Nicolai Oresme liber divinationum.” According to Bert Hansen, the latter work could be identified with *De causis mirabilium* (with or without *problemata*).<sup>147</sup>

*Editions:*

1. *Questio*: S. Caroti (ed.), “Nicole Oresme, *Questio contra divinatores horoscopios*,” *AHDLM* 43 (1976): 201–310.
2. *De causis mirabilium*: B. Hansen (ed.), *Nicole Oresme and the Marvels of Nature: A Study of His De causis mirabilium with Critical Edition, Translation, and Commentary* (Toronto, 1985), 136–393.
3. *Tabula problematum*: B. Hansen (ed.), *Nicole Oresme and the Marvels of Nature*, 366–93.
4. *Problemata*: Hansen announced his intention to publish some of these questions, but never did so.<sup>148</sup> Questions 43 and 44 have been published with a French translation in B. Delaurenti, “Contre la magie démoniaque et les incantations: Les questions 43 et 44 des *Quodlibeta*,” in *Nicole Oresme philosophe: Philosophie de la nature et philosophie de la connaissance à Paris au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, ed. J. Celeyrette and C. Grellard (Paris, 2014), 251–97, at 279–97.

<sup>147</sup> See B. Hansen, *Nicole Oresme and the Marvels of Nature: A Study of His De causis mirabilium with Critical Edition, Translation, and Commentary* (Toronto, 1985), 128–29.

<sup>148</sup> Hansen, *Nicole Oresme and the Marvels of Nature*, 27 n. 3.

5. An edition with French translation of items 1–4 by Alain Boureau is forthcoming in *Nicole Oresme: Écrits métaphysiques, politiques et théologiques*.

*Attribution:* The attribution to Nicole Oresme can be found in the *initia* and in the *colophona* of the different parts of this work in the extant manuscripts, as well as in the note in the hand of Claudre de Grandrue in MS 3 (see above).

*Title:* The title of the *Questio contra divinatores horoscopios* is drawn from the colophon of MS n. 2. The title *De causis mirabilium* is not attested in the manuscript tradition. Claude de Grandrue, who catalogued the library of St. Victor Abbey around 1500, refers to this work as “Questio determinata a magistro Nicholao Oresme utrum res future per astrologiam possint presciri. Ab eodem rationes et cause plurium mirabilium in natura. Solutiones ab eodem predictorum problematum.”<sup>149</sup> The modern editor, Bert Hansen, took the title *De causis mirabilium* from this statement. In the forthcoming edition by Alain Boureau, this work bears the title *De effectibus singularibus*. The denomination “problemata” (both for the 172 unanswered questions in the *tabula* than for the 44 others one) can be found in the incipit of the *tabula* (see above, incipit and explicit).

*Dating:* The date of 1370 is mentioned at the end of the *Questio contra divinatores*.<sup>150</sup>

*Additional remarks:* The problem of the 172 unanswered questions has raised debate among scholars. Alexander Birkenmajer considered that this was due to the incompleteness of the manuscript tradition.<sup>151</sup> This suggestion, which Béatrice Delaurenti also shares, seems to find confirmation in the colophon of MS Florence, BML, Ashb. 210, fol. 70v: “Expliciunt quotlibeta magistri Nicolay Oresme seu questions 44, diversas tangentes materias. Restant adhuc problemata

<sup>149</sup> L. Delisle, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque impériale: Étude sur la formation de ce dépôt, comprenant les éléments d'une histoire de la calligraphie, de la miniature, de la reliure, et du commerce des livres à Paris avant l'invention de l'imprimerie* (Paris, 1868–81), 2:209–32, at 228.

<sup>150</sup> *QCQP*, ed. Caroti, 310 (from the Napoli manuscript): “Et sic finitur questio contra divinatores facta anno 1370, quam non feci causa alicuius invidie nec causa apparentie, sed ut corrigant et advertant, quos detinuit error devius, quia sepe in astrologia studui et codices earum revolvi et cum actoribus contuli et ad experiendum musavi, sed ultra quam posuerim veritatem non inveni. Ergo vigilate.” The *De causis mirabilium* begins immediately thereafter without any title. The initium of MS Florence, Ashb. 210, fol. 3r, repeats the date of 1370. For a discussion about the date of composition of the whole work in four parts, see Hansen, *Nicole Oresme and the Marvels of Nature*, 43–48; and *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 128–130. Clagett presents some arguments against this later date.

<sup>151</sup> A. Birkenmajer, “Witelo, Oresme et le frater Claudius Caelestinus,” *Études d'Histoire des Sciences en Pologne, Ière partie* (Wrocław, 1972), 340–55 (Appendix III), esp. 342, line 10. Birkenmajer's original text in Polish dates back to 1921.

circa visum et alios sensus, et patet inspicienti tabulam in principio positam.”<sup>152</sup> We do not, however, share this interpretation. In fact, the Florentine manuscript does not state that the other 172 questions would be answered (this would have been the case, for instance, if we had found the verb “sequuntur” instead of the verb “restant”). For this reason, we prefer Lynn Thorndike and Bert Hansen’s opinion according to which it was not Oresme’s intention to answer all of the questions.<sup>153</sup> Oresme explains that he would not address all problems in detail, because each of them could give rise to a long debate or a prolix tract. Oresme’s aim is rather to push students and those who marvel at the mundane (“pro modico admirantes”), to search for the natural causes of apparently marvelous phenomena. As a consequence, Oresme clearly states that he would present the problems schematically (“per modum tabule”), leaving them without answer (“ipsa sine responsionibus posui”). He also invites those who remain unsatisfied with his short explanations to give clearer and more detailed solutions (“illis quibus responsiones sequentes non sufficient, aliis dent clariores”).<sup>154</sup>

The manuscript tradition and the content of the *Questio*, the four chapters, and the *Problemata* show that these tracts constitute a whole work.<sup>155</sup> The textual unity of the *De causis mirabilium* and the questions in the *Tabula* is confirmed by Oresme’s statement at the end of the *CQM* and by the fact that some questions refer to the first treatise.<sup>156</sup>

<sup>152</sup> B. Delaurenti, “Contre la magie démoniaque et les incantations: Les questions 43 et 44 des *Quodlibeta*,” in *Nicole Oresme philosophe: Philosophie de la nature et philosophie de la connaissance à Paris au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, ed. J. Celeyrette and C. Grellard (Paris, 2014), 251–97, at 255.

<sup>153</sup> L. Thorndike, *A History of Magic* (n. 8 above), 3:444; and Hansen, *Nicole Oresme and the Marvels of Nature*, 32–36.

<sup>154</sup> Hansen, *Nicole Oresme and the Marvels of Nature*, 392–93, lines 900–906: “Excusatio supra solutione problematum per modum tabule premissorum. Supradieta problemata non solum posita sunt ut superius dixi quod radicatus et improbabiler solvantur (de quolibet enim posset fieri longa questio et prolixus tractatus), sed ut in eis studentes et pro modico admirantes percipiant et inquirant effectuum causas naturales; et ideo per modum tabule ipsa sine responsionibus posui ut brevius videantur, et quod illis quibus responsiones sequentes non sufficient, aliis dent clariores.” We have added the punctuation, which is almost absent in Hansen’s edition.

<sup>155</sup> For the references to the *Questio* in the *Problemata*, see *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 128–29 n. 6.

<sup>156</sup> Hansen, *Nicole Oresme and the Marvels of Nature* (n. 147 above), 359, lines 1103–1105: “Sed de hoc et etiam de predictis quasi recapitulando et notabilia questionibus applicando magis succinte inferius tanguntur problemata particulariter ponendo et solvendo;” and 362, lines 24–29: “Per medium tamen cuiusdam tabule quasi recapitulando, questiones quasdam breves prius tactas, et ut aliqua minus sufficienter ostensa declarentur et addantur aliqua et etiam aliqua subtrahantur, predicta tamen supponendo, breviter subiungere proposui ut clare pateat quod nec ad demones nec ad influentiam ignotam oporteat recurrere effectus inferiores naturaliter fieri salvando.” Hansen, *Nicole Oresme and the Marvels of Nature* (n. 147 above), 39 stresses the fact that it is not clear whether Oresme is referring to the *Tabula problematum* or to the forty-four answered questions. See, for instance, question

## IV. WRITINGS IN THE VERNACULAR

*Preliminary remarks:* Oresme's vernacular production embraces six texts of different genres and themes. The *LdD*, which, according to Lefèvre, dates to 1356, is a pamphlet against magic and superstition, while the other five works, the major part of which were written at the end of Oresme's career, take the form of commentaries. Two of them (*TdE* and *LdC*) deal with natural philosophy, while the others (*LdE*, *LdP*, *LdY*) deal with moral philosophy. We have no documentary evidence for the translation of the Old Testament and the Gospels ascribed to Oresme in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*.<sup>157</sup> Oresme's vernacular works are written for a different audience than the Latin commentaries: not the university milieu, but a cultivated lay public — first of all, the court and the entourage of Charles V. In accordance with this project of vulgarisation, Oresme explains in the prologue of the *TdE* that he will not enter into subtleties, but only explain in plain French what is convenient to know for a free man of a noble spirit.<sup>158</sup> The Aristotelian translations were undertaken in the 1370s at the request of Charles V, who wished to make these works easily accessible to the members of his court, as clearly stated in the prologue of *LdE* (“Pource que les livres morals de Aristote furent faiz en grec, et nous les avons en latin moult fort a entendre, le Roy a voulu, pour le bien commun, faire les translater en François afin que il et ses conseulliers et autres les puissent mieulx entendre,” ed. Menut, 99).<sup>159</sup> It is important to remember that when Oresme started this translation project, French was not commonly used for scientific texts. This explains why

---

187 (“Consequencia tenet per unum quod fuit dictum superius in capitulo 3° et 15° notabili”) and question 194 (“Consequencia est nota et antecedens patuit ex 4 primis capitulis”).

<sup>157</sup> *Histoire littéraire de la France*, ed. J.-V. Leclerc (Paris, 1862), 24:182. In fact, the Oresmian attribution of a translation of the Bible is a story that may have begun much earlier and continued until the beginning of the eighteenth century, when philological-historical inquiry began to assume its definitive scientific shape.

<sup>158</sup> *TdE*, ed. McCarthy, 95–96: “La figure et la disposicion du monde, le nombre et ordre des elemens, et les mouvemens des corps du ciel appartiennent a savoir a tout homme qui est de franche condicion et de noble engin . . . Je veuil dire en françois generaument et pleniement ce qui en est convenable a savoir a tout homme sans me profundier es demonsttractions et es subtilitéz qui appartiennent es astrologiens.”

<sup>159</sup> Charles V's formal request to translate Aristotle's *Politics* and *Economics* dates back to 21 May 1372: “Nous faisons translater a nostre bien amé le doyen de Rouen, maistre Nicolle Oresme, deux livres, les quieux nous sont tres necessaires et pour cause, c'est assavoir polithiques et yconomiques, et pour ce que nous savons que ledit maistre Nicolle a a ce faire grant peine et grant dilligence, et que il convient que pour ce il laisse toutes ses autres œvrez et besoignes quelconques, voulons que, pour sa dicte peine, et aussi pour ce que il y entend et laisse toutes autres besoignes, quelles que elles soient, vous li bailliez ed delivrez tantost et sans nul delay la somme de deux cens franz d'or.” ed. L. Delisle, in *Mandements et actes divers de Charles V (1364–1380) recueillis dans les collections de la bibliothèque nationale* (Paris, 1874), 458. See also L. Delisle, *Recherches sur la librairie de Charles V*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1907); and, more generally on this topic, S. Lusignan, *Parler vulgairement: Les intellectuels et la langue française aux XIII<sup>e</sup> et XIV<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Paris, 1986).

Oresme expresses in numerous passages, especially in *LdD* and in *LdE*, his difficulty to write about philosophical matters in the vernacular.<sup>160</sup>

### 1. *Livre de divinacions (LdD)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Sylvie Lefèvre's edition, published in Rapisarda's volume): "Mon entencion est de monstrier en ce livret, par experience, par auctorités et par raison humaine que folle chose, malvaïse et perilleuse temporelment est mettre son entente a vouloir savoir ou diviner. . . X . . . et que plus est, qui sont tres perilleuses, certes," dist il, "il ne fussent pas tant gouvernés de Fortune comme il meismes gouvernassent Fortune."

#### *Manuscripts:*

1. Brussels, BR, MS 11203–11204. Colophon: "Ci fenist le livre de Maistre Nichole Oresme de divinacions."
2. Paris, BnF, franç. 1350, fols. 39r–61v (with *TdE*). Initium: "Ci commence le livre Maistre Nichole Oresme de divinacions." Colophon: "Ci fenist le livre de Maistre Nichole Oresme de divinacions."
3. Paris, BnF, fr. 19951, fols. 1r–31r. Colophon: "Explicit liber magistri Nicolai Oresme de divinationibus."

#### *Modern editions:*

1. G. W. Coopland (ed.), *Nicole Oresme and the Astrologers: A Study of his Livre de divinacions* (Liverpool, 1952), with English translation.
2. S. Rapisarda (ed.), *Contro la divinazione: Consigli antiastrologici al re di Francia (1356)* (Roma, 2009), with Italian translation. Stefano Rapisarda published the edition prepared by Sylvie Lefèvre for her doctoral dissertation in 1992. The manuscript that Lefèvre used as the base text, Brussels, BR, MS 11203–11204, dates to 1375–85 and was unknown to Coopland.
3. A new edition with French translation is forthcoming by Sylvie Lefèvre in Alain Boureau, *Nicole Oresme: Écrits métaphysiques, politiques et théologiques*.

#### *Translations:*

- a) English: in Coopland's edition (see above, 1).
- b) French: forthcoming in Boureau's edition (see above, 3).
- c) Italian: in Rapisarda's edition (see above, 2).

<sup>160</sup> On Oresme's attitude towards the scientific use of the vernacular, see S. Lefèvre, "Une 'rude manière de parler': L'enjeu rhétorique du prologue du *Livre de divinacions* de Nicole Oresme," in *Autour de Nicole Oresme* (n. 1 above), 176–94.

*Dating:* According to Coopland, the text dates to 1366; according to Lefèvre, it dates to 1356.<sup>161</sup>

*Attribution:* The text is attributed to Oresme in all extant manuscripts.

*Self-references:*

Self-references to *LdD*: Oresme refers to his *LdD* (though he does not quote it by title) in another work in French, *TdE*: “Et pour ce, selon astrologie mesmement, il appert que ceulx de ce pais ne peuvent pas communement prouffiter en astrologie judicative, et doit un peu de foy adjouster en leurs jugemens meameement quant aux effiex de fortune. Et ce ay declairé plus plainnement en un traicitié que j’ay fait de ceste matiere.”<sup>162</sup>

Self-references in *LdD*: In the second chapter of *LdD*, Oresme refers to his *CVI*: “La premiere partie d’astrologie est speculative et mathematique, tres noble et tres excellente science, et baillie es livres moult soubtilment et la peut on suffisamment savoir, mais ce ne peut estre precisement et a point, si comme j’ay declaire en mon traicitie de la Mesure des Mouvements du Ciel et l’ay prouve par raison fondee sur demoustracion mathematique.”<sup>163</sup>

*Additional remarks:* The *LdD* has many features in common with *CAJ*, to the point that it could well be considered as a French translation of *CAJ*. With this in mind, Rapisarda argues for the anteriority of *CAJ* to *LdD* and proposes to explain the writing of the latter by assuming the ineffectiveness of the Latin treatise, which was originally addressed to the king’s advisers, and Oresme’s willingness to address Charles directly in French.<sup>164</sup> An anonymous fifteenth-century Latin translation of *LdD* is transmitted in MSS Basel, UB, FV 6, fols. 48r–53v, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. Misc. 248, fols. 28r–33v. The text of the Basel manuscript, dated to 1411, bears the title: “Tractatus magistri Nicolai Oresmii contra judicarios astronomos et principes se in talibus occupantes.” The colophon states that the text was translated from a French work by Nicole Oresme: “Explicit liber magistri Nicholai Oresme *De divinationibus*, translatus in latinum quia ipsum composuit in gallico, scriptus anno domini mccc° xvi [*sic*], die decima septima mensis decembris, sed hic scriptus anno 1411 ipso die beati Remigii.”<sup>165</sup>

<sup>161</sup> Rapisarda mentions this difference without taking a position. See S. Rapisarda, *Contro la divinazione: Consigli antiastrologici al re di Francia (1356)* (Roma, 2009), p. 73.

<sup>162</sup> *TdE*, 43, ed. McCarthy, 1850–55.

<sup>163</sup> *LdD*, ed. Coopland, 54.

<sup>164</sup> Rapisarda, *Contro la divinazione*, 19–20, n. 4. For a comparison between *CAJ* and *LdD*, see G. W. Coopland, *Nicole Oresme and the Astrologers: A Study of His Livre de divinations* (Liverpool, 1952), 20–21; and S. Caroti, *La critica contro l’astrologia di Nicole Oresme e la sua influenza nel Medioevo e nel Rinascimento* (Rome, 1979), 545–685, at 555–71.

<sup>165</sup> H. O. Coxe, *Catalogi codicum manusccriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae pars tertia codices Graecos et Latinos Canonicianos complectens* (Oxford, 1854), col. 626. See also Coopland, *Nicole Oresme and the Astrologers*, 10 and 187 n. 38.



## 2. *Traictié de l'Espère (TdE)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Myers's edition): "La figure et la disposicion du monde, le nombre et ordre des elemens, et les mouvemens des corps du ciel . . . X . . . car chascun mot est exposé ou diffini ou chapitre ou il est premierement trouvé."

### *Manuscripts:*

1. Bern, Bugarbibl., MS 310, fols. 1r–27r (begins at the end of chapter 12; with *LdC*).
2. Bordeaux, Bibl. Municipale, MS 531, fols. 90r–127r.
3. Florence, BML, Ashb. 1604 (the text occupies the entire manuscript).
4. Leiden, UB, MS Vossius gall. fol. 10, fols. 1r–31v.
5. Oxford, Saint John's College, MS 164, fols. 1r–32v. This is the earliest copy, prepared for Charles V.<sup>166</sup>
6. Paris, BnF, franç. 565, fols. 1ra–22vb (with *LdC*).
7. Paris, BnF, franç. 1083, fols. 126r–45r (with *LdC*).
8. Paris, BnF, franç. 1350, fols. 1r–38v. Initium: "Cy commence de spera en françois que translate Maistre Nicole Oresme." Colophon: "Explicit le traictié que translata en françois tres excellent philosophe, Maistre Nicole Oresme." Owned by Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619–1683).
9. Paris, BnF, franç. 2240, fols. 61r–98r. Initium: "Cy commence le traictié de l'espere que translate de latin en François tres excellent philosophe Maestre Nychole Oresmes."
10. Paris, BnF, franç. 24278, fols. 140r–46r. Only chapters 37–50 (with *LdC*).
11. Paris, BnF, nouv. acq. fr. 1052, fols. 1r–38r. Initium: "Cy commence l'espere translate de latin en François par Maistre Nicole Oresme."
12. Paris, BnF, nouv. acq. fr. 10045, fols. 1r–39v.
13. Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 1337, fols. 29r–44v.

### *Early modern editions:*

1. Simon du Bois, Paris, about 1508 (*Le Traicté de la sphère, translaté de latin en françois par maistre Nicole Oresme*).

<sup>166</sup> This manuscript, which is not listed in any of the editions of the *TdE*, is mentioned in Coopland, *Nicole Oresme and the Astrologers*, 184 n. 7. On this manuscript, see also E. Poulle, "Horoscopes princiers des XIV<sup>ème</sup> et XV<sup>ème</sup> siècles," *Bulletin de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France* (1969): 63–77; M. Lejbowicz, "Nicole Oresme et les voyages circumterrestres ou le poème entre la science et la religion," *AHDLMA* 55 (1988): 99–142, at 107 n. 16; and E. Laird, "Astrology in the Court of Charles V of France, as Reflected in Oxford, St. John's College, MS 164," *Manuscripta* 34 (1990): 167–76.

2. Simon du Bois, Paris, about 1529 (*Le Traicté de la sphère, translaté de latin en françois par maistre Nicole Oresme*).

*Modern editions:*

1. J. V. Myers, “Maistre Nicole Oresme: Traité de la sphere” (Ph.D. diss., University of Syracuse, 1940).
2. L. M. McCarthy, “Maître Nicole Oresme, Traitié de l’Espère, Critically Edited” (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1943) (with English translation).
3. T. J. McGovern, “Traité de l’Espere and Minor Astrological Works: A Critical Edition” (Ph.D. diss., The Catholic University of America, 1974), 1–82.

*Translation:*

English: In McCarthy’s edition (see above, 2).

*Attribution:* Some of the extant manuscripts attribute the text to Nicole Oresme (see the list above). This attribution is confirmed by Oresme’s references to *TdE* in *LdC* (see below).

*Dating:* Oresme’s self-quotations allow us to date this work between *LdD* (1356) and *LdC* (1377).

*Self-references:*

Self-references to *TdE*: Oresme refers several times to *TdE* in *LdC*. Some of these references can be found in chapter II.31, which deals with circumterrestrial journeys:

1. “Eclipse de la lune est cause pour l’ombre de la terre qui atteint a la lune quant la terre est droit entre le soleil et la lune, si comme je declaray ou .xlviii. chapitre du Traité de l’Espere.”<sup>167</sup>
2. “Item, il appert par Aristote en ce desrenier chapitre que le circuite de la terre n’est pas grant, et se un homme pouvoit aller tousjours devant soy et il errast chascun jour .x. lieues, il avroit fait ce circuite en quatre ans et seze sepmaines et .iii. jours, si comme je declairay autrefois ou .xxvix. chapitre du *Traitié de l’Espere*.”<sup>168</sup>
3. “Item, par ce s’ensuit que se .ii. hommes partoient d’un lieu et fais-<oi>ent ce circuite en un meisme temps et partissent d’un lieu l’un quant l’autre et revenissent a ce lieu l’un quant l’autre, et l’un le feist

<sup>167</sup> *LdC*, II.31, ed. Menut and Denomy, 562, lines 3–5. For the source of this passage, see *TdE*, 48, ed. McCarthy, lines 2053–92.

<sup>168</sup> *LdC*, II.31, ed. Menut and Denomy, 576, lines 204–208. For the source of this passage, see *TdE*, 26, ed. McCarthy, lines 1046–49.

<en alant vers orient et l'autre> en alant vers occident, il convendroit par necessité que celui qui va vers orient eust en ce meisme temps deux jours et deux nuis artificielz plus que n'a en ce meisme temps celui qui va vers occident. Et ce je ay autrefois declairié ou .xxxii. e chapitre du traitié en françois que je fis *De l'esperere*.”<sup>169</sup>

*Additional remarks:* Oresme considered *TdE* as a sort of introduction to *LdC* and expressed his wish for them to be bound together: “Et ainsi a l'ouneur de Dieu et par sa grace je ay acomplis le premier et le secont livres de *Celo et mundo* pour lesquieux miex entendre est expedient le *Traitié de l'Espere* en françois dont je ay faite mencion. Et seroit bien que il fust mis en un volume aveques ces .ii. livres et me semble que ce sera i. livre de naturele philosophie noble et tres excellent.”<sup>170</sup> MS Yale, Yale University, Beinecke MS 335, fols. 15v–37v, contains an anonymous Latin translation of Oresme's *TdE*: “Incipit alius tractatus spere quem transtuli de galico in latinum. Liberi hominis et ingenij nobilis est figuram et dispositionem mundi numerum et ordinem elementorum . . . X . . . ut subito ad illum capitulum possit haberi reuersus et ipsius vocabuli seu nominis diffinicio repperiri. Explicit tractatus quem repperi in gallica lingua et transtuli in latinum substancia non mutata. Deo gracias amen.”<sup>171</sup>

### 3. *Livre de Éthiques (LdE)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Menut's edition): [Proemium] “En la confiance de l'aide de Nostre Seigneur Jhesu Crist, du commandement de tres noble et tres excellent prince Charles, par la grace de Dieu roy de France . . . X . . . Donques puis je bien encore conclurre que la consideracion et le propos de nostre bon roy Charles est a recommander, qui fait les bons livres et excellens translater en françois.” [Text] “Tout art et toute doctrine et semblablement tout fait ou operacion et eleccion appetent et desirent aucun bien . . . X . . . Et en quelle manière chascune policie doit estre ordenee. Et de quelles loys et de quelles coustumes chascune doit user. Or dison donques et commençons.” [Table] “La table des moz divers et etranges: Pour ceste science plus clerement entendre, je vueil de habondant esposer aucuns mot selon l'ordre de l'a.b.c., lesquelz par aventure sembleroient obscurs . . . X . . . Et cest livre c'est repos de

<sup>169</sup> *LdC*, II.31, ed. Menut and Denomy, 576–78, lines 223–30. For the source of this passage, see *TdE*, 39, ed. McCarthy, lines 1655–1720.

<sup>170</sup> *LdC*, II.31, ed. Menut and Denomy, 580, lines 260–64.

<sup>171</sup> On this text, see C. E. Lutz, “A Fourteenth-Century Argument for an International Date Line,” *Gazette* 47 (1973): 125–31, repr. in eadem, *Essays on Manuscripts and Rare Books* (Hamden, CT, 1975), 63–70.

labeur penible et de occupacions et negoces. Et de ce appert a plain ou .xiii.<sup>e</sup> chapitre du .x.<sup>e</sup>.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Brussels, BR, MS 2902, fols. 1–224. Initium: “Ci commence la translacion des Livres de Ethiques et Politiques, translaté par Maistre Nichole Oresme.” Colophon: “Explicit. Du comandement de tres noble puisant et excellent prince Charles par la grace de dieu Roy de France fu cest livre cy translaté de latin en françois par honorable homme et discret Maistre Nicole Oresme maistre en theologie et doien de leglise de nostre dame de Rouen. L’an de grace m.ccc.lxxii.”
2. Brussels, BR, MS 9089–9090, fols. 9r–193v (with *LdP*).
3. Brussels, BR, MS 9505–9506, fols. 1ra–224rb.
4. Chantilly, Musée Condé, MS 227, fols. 1ra–196vb. This copy stops at the first words of the definition of “tyrannie” in the table that follows the commentary.
5. Chantilly, Musée Condé, MS 278, fols. 1ra–182va (with *LdY*).
6. Le Hague, Rijksmuseum Meermanno-Westreenianum, MS 10 D 1. Colophon: “Ci fine le livre d’Ethiques, lequel fist faire tres noble, tres excellent et vray catholique prince Charles le quint, par la grace et loenge de Dieu roi de France, et l’escript Raoulet d’Orliens, l’an M. CCC.LXXVI.”
7. London, British Library, Egerton, MS 737.
8. New York, Columbia University, Rare Book and Manuscript Collections, MS 283.
9. Paris, BnF, Bibl. de l’Arsenal, MS 2668, fols. 1r–269v.
10. Paris, BnF, franç. 204, fols. 347–584 (with *LdP* and *LdY*).
11. Paris, BnF, franç. 205, fols. 1–211.
12. Paris, BnF, franç. 206, fols. 1r–180v.
13. Paris, BnF, franç. 207, fols. 1–291.
14. Paris, BnF, franç. 541, fols. 1ra–206ra.
15. Paris, BnF, franç. 542, fols. 1–339v.
16. Paris, BnF, franç. 16962, fols. 1r–243v.
17. Paris, BnF, franç. 19038, fols. 1–118 (incomplete).
18. Paris, BnF, franç. 19040, fols. 1–454.
19. Paris, BnF, franç. 24280, fols. 1–251.
20. Paris, BnF, nouv. acq. fr. 5386, fols. 14–15 (book VII, ch. 19).
21. Rouen, Bibl. Jacques Villon (formerly Bibl. municipale), 927, I 2, fols. 1ra–185vb (with *LdP* and *LdY*).

22. Valenciennes, Médiathèque Simone Veil (formerly Bibl. Municipale), MS M 286, fols. 1–396.
23. Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 1341.<sup>172</sup>

*Early modern edition:* Vêrard, Paris, 1488.

*Modern edition with English translation:* A. D. Menut (ed.), *Maistre Nicole Oresme: Le livre de Éthiques d’Aristote, published from the Text of MS. 2902, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, with a Critical Introduction and Notes* (New York, 1940).

*Attribution:* Oresme names himself in the prologue. See also the colophon of the Avranches MS (quoted in the next item of this group). This attribution is confirmed by the content of the text and stylistic features, as well as internal references.

*Dating:* Between 1369 and 1374.<sup>173</sup>

*Additional remarks:* Oresme bases his Latin-French translation on Robert Grosseteste’s Greek-Latin translation of the *Ethics*.

#### 4. *Livre de Politiques (LdP)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Menut’s edition): [Proemium] “A tres souverain et tres excellent prince Charles quint de ce nom, par la grace de Dieu roy de France . . . X . . . il seroit exprimé et nommé ainsi: ‘si comme il fu dit ou .xi. chapitre du quart livre ou du quint article.’” [Text] “Ou premier livre il met son entention et determine des premiers parties de communication politique ou de cité. Et contient .xviii. chapitres . . . X . . . Aussi comme se il vousist dire que ce ne est pas la fin ne tout ce que Aristote escript de politiques. Et de ce fu touchié en la fin du .xxii. chapitre du septime livre. Ci finist le .viii. livre de Politiques.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Avranches, Bibl. Municipale, MS 223, fols. 2va–328vb (with *LdE*; unique final redaction). Colophon: “Ce livre fut composé par maistre Nicolas Oresme avec lez livrez d’Ethiques, Yco[no]miques et De celo es ans de M CCC LXX jusques a LXXVII estant doyen de Rouen.

<sup>172</sup> In the introduction to his edition, A. D. Menut mentions eighteen manuscripts. Five manuscripts were added by S. Lefèvre, “Nicole Oresme, Cicéron et Varron ou les risques de la traduction,” *Actes du colloque «Translatio» médiévale (Mulhouse, 11–12 mai 2000)*, in *Perspectives médiévales*, supplément au n° 26 (2000): 83–103, esp. 100–101. O. Bertrand added two more manuscripts in the notice concerning *LdE* in *Traductions médiévales: Cinq siècles de traductions en français au Moyen Age (XI<sup>e</sup>–XV<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, ed. C. Galderisi (Turnhout, 2011), 2.1:62–63.

<sup>173</sup> *LdE*, ed. Menut, 5 and 15–18.

Puis fut evesque de Lisiex.” This manuscript belonged to Oresme’s nephew, Henri Oresme (fol. 349v: “Liber iste politicorum est henrici Oresme junioris canonici baiocensis”). According to Menut, this was Oresme’s personal copy.

2. Brussels, BR, MS 11201–11202 (formerly 2904), fols. 1ra–363rb (with *LdY*).
3. Brussels, BR, MS 9089–9090, fols. 195ra–476va (with *LdE*).
4. Carpentras, Bibl. Municipale, MS 302, fols. 1–364.
5. Chantilly, Musée Condé, MS 279, fols. 1ra–304rb (with *LdY*).
6. Jena, ThUB, MS M. Gallica fol. 91, fols. 1ra–323rb (with *LdY*).
7. Paris, Ancienne collection particulière de M. de Waziers (formerly Lille, Château du Sart, Bibl. van der Cruyssen Waziers), MS 203, fols. 1ra–372va. This is the oldest copy, dated 1373, written by Raoulet d’Orliens for Charles V.
8. Paris, BnF, franç. 125, fols. 1ra–360rb (with *LdY*).
9. Paris, BnF, franç. 204, fols. 1ra–326va (with *LdY*).
10. Paris, BnF, franç. 208, fols. 1ra–361vb (with *LdY*).
11. Paris, BnF, franç. 557, fols. 1–293.
12. Paris, BnF, franç. 9106, fols. 1ra–358ra (with *LdY*).
13. Paris, BnF, franç. 12233, fols. 1ra–367va.
14. Paris, BnF, franç. 22499, fols. 1–259.
15. Paris, BnF, franç. 24279, fols. 1ra–279va (with *LdY*).
16. Paris, BnF, franç. 22500, fols. 1–278.
17. Paris, Bibl. Ste. Geneviève, MS 1014, fols. 1–291.
18. Rouen, Bibl. Jacques Villon (formerly Bibl. municipale), MS 927, I 2 (with *LdE* and *LdY*).<sup>174</sup>

*Early modern edition:* Vérard, Paris, 1489 (from the manuscripts of the second and the third redaction; contains many errors).

*Modern edition:* A. D. Menut (ed.), *Maistre Nicole Oresme: Le livre de Politiques d’Aristote. Published from the Text of the Avranches Manuscript 223, with a Critical Introduction and Notes* (Philadelphia, 1970).

*Attribution:* Oresme names himself in the prologue. See also the colophon of the Avranches MS and the letter of Charles V. This attribution is confirmed by the content of the text and stylistic features, as well as internal references.

<sup>174</sup> Léopold Delisle classified the manuscripts into three groups and established the particular place of MS Avranches 223. See L. Delisle, *Observations sur plusieurs manuscrits de la Politique de N. Oresme* (Paris, 1869), 5:601–20, repr. in idem, *Inventaire général et méthodique des mss. français de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1878), 2:293–315.

*Dating:* Menut dates the text to the years 1372–1374. As we have seen above, the letter in which Charles V ordered Oresme to translate Aristotle’s *Politics* and *Economics* dates to 1372.<sup>175</sup>

*Self-references:* This text contains several references to other Oresmian works. For some examples, see group V, item 3.

*Additional remarks:* This work is based on Moerbeke’s Greek-Latin translation. Manuscripts Avranches, Brussels, BR, MS 11201–11202, and Paris, Bibl. Ste Geneviève Ms. 1014 transmit a “Table des choses notables” that, according to Menut, originally followed book VIII in all the copies of the first redaction.<sup>176</sup>

### 5. *Livre de Yconomique (LdY)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Menut’s edition): “Cy commence le livre appellé Yconomiques, lequel composa Aristote et ouquel il determine de gouvernement de maison . . . X. . . en la glose de cest livre ou il sunt exposés en la table des fors moz de Politiques.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Avranches, Bibl. Municipale, MS 223, fols. 329ra–48va (with *LdP*).  
Colophon: “Ce livre fut composé par maistre Nicolas Oresme avec lez livrez d’Ethiques, Yco[no]miques et De celo es ans de M CCC LXX jusques a LXXVII estant doyen de Rouen. Puis fut evesque de Lisieux.”
2. Bruxelles, BR, 11201–11202 (formerly 2904), fols. 363r–487ra (with *LdP*). Illuminated private copy of Charles V, copied by Raoulet d’Orléans.
3. Chantilly, Musée Condé, MS 279, fols. 183ra–97rb (with *LdE*).
4. Chantilly, Musée Condé, MS 279, fols. 304rb–22vb (with *LdP*).
5. Château du Sart (Lille), Bibl. van der Cruyssen Waziers, fols. 373ra–96rb (with *LdP*).
6. Jena, ThUB, M Gallica fol. 91, fols. 323va–55va (with *LdP*).
7. Paris, BnF, franç. 125, fols. 361ra–82rb (with *LdP*).
8. Paris, BnF, franç. 204, fols. 326va–46va (with *LdP*).
9. Paris, BnF, franç. 208, fols. 361vb–83ra (with *LdP*).
10. Paris, BnF, franç. 9106, fols. 358rb–79ra (with *LdP*).
11. Paris, BnF, franç. 24279, fols. 280r–97r (with *LdP*).

<sup>175</sup> On the dating, see also *LdE*, ed. Menut, 16–18.

<sup>176</sup> See *LdP*, ed. Menut, 358b–69b for an edition of this table; and 369b–74b for “la table des expositions des fors mos de *Politiques*.”

12. Rouen, Bibl. Jacques Villon (formerly Bibl. municipale), 927 I 2, fols. 426ra–41vb (with *LdE* and *LdP*).<sup>177</sup>

*Early modern edition:* Vérard, Paris, 1489 (second redaction, with *LdP*).

*Modern edition:* A. D. Menut (ed.), *Maistre Nicole Oresme, Le livre de Yconomique d'Aristote: Critical Edition of the French Text from the Avranches Manuscript with the Original Latin Version, Introduction and English Translation* (Philadelphia, 1957).

*Attribution:* See the colophon of the Avranches MS. The attribution to Nicole Oresme is confirmed by the content of the text and stylistic features, as well as internal references.

*Dating:* 1372–1374.<sup>178</sup>

*Additional remarks:* In all known manuscripts, as well as in the early modern edition, *LdY* follows *LdP*. This work is based on Durand of Auvergne's Greek-Latin translation of the pseudo-Aristotelian treatise, which consists only of book I and III. As a consequence, Oresme did not comment on book II.

#### 6. *Livre du ciel et du monde (LdC)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Menut's edition of 1968): [Proemium] "Ou nom de Dieu, ci commence le livre d'Aristote appelé Du ciel et du monde, lequel du commandememnt de tres souverain et tres excellent prince Charles, quint de cest nom, par la grace de Dieu roy de France, desirant et amant toutes nobles sciences, je, Nychole Oresme, doien de l'eglise de Rouen . . . X . . . ou quart, des elemens selon son opinion. Et contient le premier livre .xxxvi. chappitres." [Text] "En ce premier chapitre il monstre que le monde est .i. corps tres parfait. La science naturele, presque toute, est des corps et des magnitudes qui sont, et de leurs passions ou qualitez, et de leurs mouvemens . . . X . . . il n'est homme mortel qui onque veist plus bel ne meilleur livre de philosophie naturele que est cestui, ne en ebreu, ne en grec ou arabe ne en latin, ne en françois."

*Manuscripts:*

1. Bern, Burgerbibl., MS 310, fols. 28ra–152vb (with *TdE*).
2. Paris, BnF, franç. 565, fols. 23ra–171vb (with *TdE*).
3. Paris, BnF, franç. 571, fols. 1ra–234vb.
4. Paris, BnF, franç. 1082, fols. 1ra–209va.
5. Paris, BnF, franç. 1083, fols. 1ra–125rb (with *TdE*).
6. Paris, BnF, franç. 24278, fols. 1ra–146ra (with *TdE*).

<sup>177</sup> Menut distinguishes two redactions, which differ only by reason of a few additions in the glosses. The Avranches manuscript presents a unique, final redaction. See *LdE*, ed. Menut, 803–804; and A. D. Menut, "The French Version of Aristotle's *Economies* in Rouen, Bibl. Municipale, MS 927," *Romance Philology* 4 (1950): 55–62.

<sup>178</sup> See *LdY*, ed. Menut, 791–92.



*Modern editions:*

1. A. D. Menut and A. J. Denomy, "Maistre Nicole Oresme: *Le Livre du ciel et du monde* [1377], Text and Commentary," *Medieval Studies* 3 (1941): 185–280; 4 (1942): 159–297; and 5 (1943): 167–333.
2. J. E. Parker, "Nicole Oresme, *Le livre du ciel et du monde d'Aristote*, Books III and IV, prepared from the text of Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. fol. 1082, with a Critical Introduction and Variants from Bibl. Nat. MSS. fol. 565, 1083, & 24278, and Bern Stadtbibliothek MS. 3102" (M.A. thesis, Syracuse University, 1942).
3. A. D. Menut and A. J. Denomy (ed.), *Le livre du ciel et du monde* (Madison, 1968).

*Translations:* English translation in 3.

*Attribution:* Oresme names himself in the prologue and refers to other works by him at the end of the text. See also the colophon of MS Avranches 223 quoted above. The attribution to Nicole Oresme is confirmed by the content of the text and stylistic features, as well as internal references.

*Self-references:*

Self-references in *LdC*: As we have shown above (group I, item 3), Oresme refers to *QdG* in *LdC*. Oresme also refers to a *TdE*: "Et ce ay je autrefois declairié ou . xxxix<sup>e</sup> chapitre du traitié en françois que je fis De l'espere."<sup>179</sup> The *LdC* contains a reference to Oresme's commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*: "estre en une espace pour tel instant ou moment, c'est non estre en celle espace, pour ce que en quelcunq[ue] chose continue, successive ou permanente ne est selon verité telle mesure indivisible appelee instant ou point, si comme je monstrai pieça sur *Sentences*."<sup>180</sup> On this text, see group V, item 5.

*Dating:* 1377.<sup>181</sup>

*Additional remarks:* Oresme based his work primarily on Moerbeke's translation of Aristotle's *De celo*, but he also used Michel Scotus's translation and Averroes's *Middle Commentary*.

## V. THEOLOGICAL AND METAPHYSICAL WRITINGS

*Preliminary remarks:* As was common practice for all talented scholars of his time, after having completed his philosophical studies and having taught at the Faculty of Arts, Oresme embarked on his theology studies. His name appears on a list of scholarship holders in theology at the Collège of Navarre from 1348.

<sup>179</sup> *LdC*, II.31, ed. Menut and Denomy, 578, lines 229–30.

<sup>180</sup> *LdC*, II.2, ed. Menut and Denomy, 294, lines 345–48.

<sup>181</sup> *LdC*, ed. Menut and Denomy, 6.

Oresme obtained the degree of Doctor in Theology by 1356, the year in which he was appointed Great Master of the Collège of Navarre.

With regards to Oresme's preaching activity, the collection of sermons (*Sacre conciones*) and the manual for preaching (*Ars predicandi*) that had been attributed to him have recently been shown to be spurious (see below, group IX, item 1 and 17). Only a sermon pronounced to Pope Urban V at the papal court of Avignon on the fourth Sunday of Advent in 1363, which begins with the words *Iuxta est salus mea*, can be attributed to Nicole Oresme without hesitation. In this sermon, based mainly on quotations from the Old Testament, Oresme expresses criticism against the Church of his time and supports the Pope in his reforming activity.

In order to obtain a degree in Theology, Oresme had to comment on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. Oresme refers twice to his commentary on the *Sentences* in the *DCI* (group V, item 1) and once in his *LdC* (group IV, item 6). The content of one of the references in the *DCI* corresponds exactly to Oresme's *determinatio in resumpta Navarre* (group V, item 2), which Philoteus Böhner considers, as a consequence, to be a question from Oresme *Commentary on the Sentences*.<sup>182</sup> Max Lejbowicz contested Böhner's hypothesis arguing that Oresme's commentary was never set down in writing, neither as a *reportatio* — that is, course notes from a student —, nor as an *ordinatio*, namely, a corrected version.<sup>183</sup> We do not find Lejbowicz's arguments convincing. First and foremost, one may ask why Oresme would have referred in his *DCI* and his *LdC* to a work that had not received any written form, since these references would have been completely useless to his readers. Second, it seems very unlikely that Oresme's teaching on the *Sentences* did not leave any written trace. Even if Oresme did not deem it useful to give his commentary a definitive written form, he must have prepared some notes for his course. These notes must, in turn, have given rise to other notes on the part of his audience. According to Alain Boureau, Oresme's *Commentary on the Sentences* should be identified with the text transmitted at fols. 1ra–31vb and 116ra–21va of manuscript Vat. Lat. 986 (prologue, book I, distinctions 1 and 2, books II and III).<sup>184</sup>

### 1. *De communicatione idiomatum (DCI)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Borchert's edition): [Text] “De communicatione ydiomatum in Christo quedam alias dixi in tertio sententiarum, que nunc deo dante propono diffusius et ordinacius pertractare suppositis semper protestacionibus consuetis fieri parisiis in talibus et alias per me factis sub omni, quorum

<sup>182</sup> P. Böhner, “Eine *Quaestio* aus dem Sentenzenkommentar des Magisters Nikolaus Oresme,” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 14 (1947): 305–28, at 305–10.

<sup>183</sup> Lejbowicz, “Nicole Oresme, spectateur engagé” (n. 1 above), 33–48.

<sup>184</sup> See Alain Boureau, *Nicole Oresme: Écrits métaphysiques, politiques et théologiques* (Paris, 2021), 1:41–46.

interest, correctione benigna . . . X . . . ita quod si studiosi istam corrigiam, vide licet huius inexplicabilis nodum dissoluere non valeant, ipsius tamen misterii fidem in cordibus catholicis ab omni luto seu inquinamento paruitatis heretice mundam teneant et abstergant. Et sic est finis huius operis.” [Consequences] “Hec sunt consequencie apparentes et non necessarie recollecte ex capitulis prenotatis. De capitulo quarto: hic homo est assumptus a Deo in unitate persone, ergo hic homo fuit una persona cum Deo, non sequitur . . . X . . . et ideo cuilibet legenti ea humiliter supplico et rogo eum in caritate Christi, quod diligenter inspiciat, si in premissis reperiat aliquid corrigendum. Et sic est finis. Explicit tractatus magistri Nicolai Orem de communicatione ydiomatum.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Bamberg, SB, MS Theol. 76 (Q III 38), fols. 246v–53v (without the “consequences” that Oresme presents at the end of the text). Colophon: “Et sic est finis huius tractatus reuerendi magistri Nicolai de Orem scriptus per me fratrem Wolfhardum de Wienna.”
2. Bourges, Bibl. Publique, MS 58 (52), fols. 96r–107r.
3. Bruges, OB, lat. 181, fols. 253ra–64vb.
4. Brussels, BR, MS 1695, fols. 84rb–95vb. Colophon: “Et sic est finis istius tractatus subtilis et pulchri reverendi magistri Nicolay de Orem, profundissimi speculatoris, De communicationibus ydeomatum.”
5. Cremona, Bibl. statale, ms. 118 (6.5.9), fols. 232ra–36vb.\*<sup>185</sup>
6. Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4° 150, fols. 83v–92v (with *CQM*; without “consequences”). Colophon: “Explicit tractatus magistri Guillelmi Horem De communicatione ydiomatum.”
7. Hamburg, Staats- und UB Carl von Ossietzky, Jacobi 14, fols. 204va–208v.\* Incipit/explicit: “De communicatione ydyomatum in Christo quedam alias dixi que nunc Deo adiuuante propono diffusius et ordinatius pertractare . . . X . . . in casibus possibilibus secundum dei potentiam absolutam.” Colophon: “Explicit tractatus magistri Nicolai Orem de communicatione ydyomatum,” Note: the incipit does not contain the self-reference to the third book of the *Sentences*. Otherwise the text seems to be complete, except for the absence of the last five lines in Borchert’s edition: “. . . verumptamen quia [ . . . ] aliquid corrigendum. Et sic est finis.”<sup>186</sup>
8. Koblenz, Landeshauptarchiv, Best. 701, Nr. 163, fols. 75r–88v.\* Colophon: “Et sic explicit iste tractatus ordinatus et compositus per reverendum [*sup. lin. ab alia manu*: magistrum] Nycholaum Orem, nacione

<sup>185</sup> *Catalogo dei manoscritti filosofici nelle biblioteche italiane* (Florence, 1985), 5:51–52.

<sup>186</sup> T. Brandis, *Die Handschriften der S.-Petri-Kirche Hamburg* (Hamburg, 1967), 166–70, at 170.

- Normannum [corr. *ab alia manu*: Normannie], doctorem in sacra pagina eximium et decanum ecclesie Rothomagensis.”
9. Koblenz, Landeshaptarchiv, Best. 701, nr. 213, fols. 105v–15r, 120v–23v.\* Colophon: “Explicit tractatus de communicatione ydiomatum in Christo, editus per magistrum Nycolaum Orem nacionis Normannie, sacre Theologie professorem Parysiensem. Scriptus anno Domini 1423, feria quarta post assumptionem Marie virginis gloriose, per me Henricum Wolteri de Euskirgen.”<sup>187</sup>
  10. London, British Museum, Royal 10 C VI, fols. 1r–3v (incomplete).
  11. Lüneburg, Ratsbibl., MS Theol. 4° 5, unfoliated.
  12. Madrid, UB, MS 114, I 42, fols. 139r–47r: Colophon: “Explicit tractatus magistri Nicolai Orem de communicatione idiomatum.”
  13. Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, HS I 177, fols. 77v–78r (excerpt): “Ex tractatu magistri Nycolai Orem Parisiensis de communicatione ydiomatum in Christo.”\*<sup>188</sup>
  14. Munich, BSB, Clm 3590, fols. 56r–65v.
  15. Munich, BSB, Clm 26711, fols. 301rb–309vb (without “consequences”). Colophon: “Explicit tractatus De communicatione ydiomatum Nicolai Orem sacre theologie professoris.”
  16. Oxford, Oriel College, 15, fols. 222v–24v. Incipit: “Suppono primo cum doctoribus santis quod in Christo . . .”<sup>189</sup>
  17. Paris, BnF, Bibl. de l’Arsenal, lat. 522, fol. 88r (with *AP*, *CVI*, *CQM*, *De instantibus* and *Pvm*). This is a fragment beginning with the words: “nasebatur de virgine, ergo si nasebatur de virgine ipse fuit Christus.” Colophon: “Explicit totus tractatus de communicatione ydiomatum, editus a magistro Nycolao Oresme, sacre theologie.”
  18. Paris, BnF, Bibl. de l’Arsenal, lat. 2128 B, fols. 65r–76v.

<sup>187</sup> The same manuscript contains a copy of Henri of Langenstein’s *De contractibus*, at fols. 126r–182r. Ininitium: “Incipit primum capitulum huius tractatus magistri Henrici de Hassia”; colophon: “Explicit tractatus de contractibus magistri Henrici de Hassia, Parysius per eundem editus.” See the description in E. Overgaaauw, *Mittelalterliche Handschriften im Landeshauptarchiv Koblenz: Die nichtarchivischen Handschriften der Signaturengruppe Best. 701 Nr. 191–992* (Koblenz 2002), 2:136.

<sup>188</sup> See G. List and G. Powitz, *Die Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek Mainz: Bd. 2, Hs I 151 - Hs I 250* (Wiesbaden 1990), 132. *DCI* is mentioned also in the table of contents of MS Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, HS I 224: “Nicolaus Oresme De communicatione idiomatum.” See List and Powitz, *Die Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek Mainz*, 273.

<sup>189</sup> O. Hallamaa, *Science in Theology: Studies in the Interaction Between Late Medieval Natural Philosophy, Logic, and Theology* (Helsinki, 2005), 56; and H. O. Coxe, *Catalogus codicum mss. qui in collegiis aulisque oxoniensibus hodie adservantur* (Oxford, 1852), 5–6. Coxe gives the foliation 214r–16v, but the Bodleian Library kindly informed us that since then the piece has been refoiliated. In this copy, the foreword and the preliminary division of the text are lacking.

19. Paris, BnF, lat. 2831, fols. 47r–62r. Colophon: “Tractatus de communicatione idiomatum, editus a Nicolao Oresmio.”
20. Paris, BnF, lat. 3074, fols. 134v–42v. Colophon: “Explicit tractatus de communicatione ydiomatum compilatus et factus a venerabili viro subtili clerico magistro Nicolao Oresme normanno sacre theologie professore, scriptum per manum Richardi de Basochiis tunc temporis in facultate theologie studentis anno domini millesimo ccc<sup>o</sup> nonagesimo 3<sup>o</sup> die Mercurii post festum sanctorum Jacobi et Christofori.”
21. Paris, BnF, lat. 5755, fols. 31ra–37vb. Initium: “Tractatus de communicationibus idiomatum Orem.” Colophon: “Explicit tractatus de communicatione ydiomatum editus a magistro Nicolao Oreme, sacre pagine professore profundissimoque doctore.”
22. Paris, BnF, lat. 14579, fols. 38r–44v (with *CQM*, *Mm*, and *Iuxta est salus mea*). Colophon: “Explicit tractatus magistri Nicolay Orem de communicatione ydiomatum.”
23. Paris, BnF, lat. 14580, fols. 104rb–10va (with *CQM*, *LdD*, *EcL* and *DMM*).
24. Rome, Bibl. Casanatense, 267, fols. 203r–14v. Colophon: “Tractatus de diversitate ydiomatum in Christo editus per magistrum Nicholaum Oresme.”\*<sup>190</sup>
25. Seville, Bibl. Capitular y Colombina, 7–4–4, fols. 55r–58v.
26. Seville, Bibl. Capitular y Colombina, 57–2–33, fols. 1r–9r\*
27. Siena, Bibl. comunale degli Intronati, MS G IV 7, fols. 365v–74v. Ascribed to Francis of Mayrone: “Incipit tractatus illuminati Francisci de Mayronis de communicatione ydiomatum in Cristo.”
28. Tortosa, Bibl. Capitular, MS 249, fols. 106r–15r (ascribed to Peter of Candia).\*<sup>191</sup>
29. Tortosa, Bibl. Capitular, MS 143, fols. 39v–46v. Initium: “Tractatus magistri Nicholay Orem de communicatione ydiomatum.” Colophon: “et sic est finis huius tractatus magistri Nicholay Oreni de communicatione ydiomatum.”\*<sup>192</sup>
30. Toulouse, Bibl. d’Étude et du Patrimoine, MS 246, fols. 219v–25v. Initium: “Incipit tractatus de communicatione ydiomatum editus a magistro guillelmo Oreme, doctore in theologia Parisiensi.”

<sup>190</sup> M. Ceresi and E. Santovito, *Catalogo dei manoscritti della Biblioteca Casanatense* (Rome, 1956), 2:65 (item XXI).

<sup>191</sup> E. Bayerri y Bertomeu, *Los códices medievales de la catedral de Tortosa: Novísimo inventario descriptivo* (Barcelona, 1962): 419–22, at 420.

<sup>192</sup> Ramón O’Callaghan, *Los códices de la Catedral de Tortosa* (Tortosa, 1897), 103–104; and E. Bayerri y Bertomeu, *Los códices medievales*, 305–307, at 305–306. See also J. Martínez Gázquez and J. Gómez Pallarès, “Manuscritos científicos latinos de la Catedral de Tortosa,” *Hispania Sacra* 46 (1994): 413–24, at 416–17.

31. Trier, Bibl. des Bischöfl. Priesterseminars, MS 81 (R IV 17), fols. 172r–94r. Colophon: “Explicit opus reverendi magistri nicolay Orem optimum.”
32. Utrecht, UB, MS 181, fols. 73r–88r.
33. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 986, fols. 133va–37vb. Colophon: “Explicit tractatus magistri Nicolai Orem de communicatione ydiomatum.”
34. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 3088, fols. 1ra–10ra. Colophon: “Explicit tractatus magistri Nycolai Orem de communicatione ydiomatum.”\*
35. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 4545, fols. 57v–72r.
36. Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 4217, fols. 9vb–16ra.
37. Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 537, fols. 97r–105r.

\*Manuscripts 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 24, 26, 28, 29, and 34 have not yet been reported.

*Modern edition:* E. Borchert (ed.), “Der Einfluss des Nominalismus auf die Christologie der Spätscholastik nach dem Traktat ‘de communicatione idiomatum’ des Nicolaus Oresme,” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, Band 35, Heft 4/5 (Münster i. W., 1940).

*Attribution:* Most of the manuscripts identified attribute the text to Nicole Oresme; only two to Guillaume Oresme; one to Francis of Mayrone; and one to Peter of Candia. The attribution to Nicole Oresme is confirmed by quotations of this text by fourteenth-century scholars: John of Basel, Heinrich Totting of Oyta, Marsil of Inghen, Peter of Ailly, and an anonymous Carmelitan friar.<sup>193</sup>

*Dating:* Ernst Borchert dates the first redaction of *DCI* to 1355.<sup>194</sup>

*Self-references:*

Self-references in *DCI*: Oresme quotes twice his commentary on Peter Lombard’s *Sentences* (see item 9 of group VII):

1. “De communicatione ydiomatum in Christo quedam alias dixi in tertio sententiarum, que nunc deo dante propono diffusius et ordinacius pertractare suppositis semper protestacionibus consuetis fieri parisius in talibus et alias per me factis sub omni, quorum interest, correctione benigna.”<sup>195</sup>
2. “Unde eciam alias in lectura super sententiarum ostendi, quomodo philosophi antiqui in lumine naturali perceperunt olim huius rei veritatem, licet tamen confuse et obscure et cum permixtione erroris.”<sup>196</sup>

<sup>193</sup> For the manuscripts transmitting these works and for the quotations of Oresme’s treatise, see E. Borchert, “Der Einfluss des Nominalismus auf die Christologie der Spätscholastik nach dem Traktat ‘de communicatione idiomatum’ des Nicolaus Oresme,” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, Band 35, Heft 4/5 (Münster i. W., 1940), 138–50.

<sup>194</sup> *DCI*, ed. Borchert, 14.

<sup>195</sup> *DCI*, ed. Borchert, 5\*, lines 1–5.

<sup>196</sup> *DCI*, ed. Borchert, 31\*, lines 22–25.

3. In a third self-reference in *DCI*, Oresme does not indicate his source: “Item sicut alias dixi, si dicatur, hec essentia est pater, hec essentia est filius, ergo filius est pater, iste syllogismus non valet, nisi regulatur per dici de omni, ut maior fiat talis: omne, quod est hec essentia, est pater, et tunc ipsa est falsa, modo in proposito nostro concedendum est, quod omne, quod est hec natura humana, fuit de virgine conceptum et natum, et tunc erit euidens et necessarium argumentum.”<sup>197</sup> The subject matter of this passage could indicate that the text referenced by Oresme is, again, his commentary on the *Sentences*. Indeed, a corresponding passage can be found in question V of the *Questions*, edited by Alain Boureau.<sup>198</sup> The mention of a syllogistic proof based on the reasoning “Dici de omni,” which follows after a few words, should not necessarily be interpreted as a reference to a precise text, as this was an important principle in medieval syllogistic logic and a highly debated topic in late medieval theological works.<sup>199</sup>

For the source of these self-references, see also items 2 in this group and item 9 in group VII.

2. *Determinatio facta a magistro Nicholao Oresme Parisiis in resumpta in domo Navarre* (Questio utrum Christus iustus legislator sit omnium cognitor)

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Böhner’s edition): “Utrum Christus iustus legislator sit omnium cognitor. Antequam ad alia accedam, determino questionem. Et dico primo quod Christus secundum divinam naturam est omnium cognitor. . . X. . . Unde in simili Papa consulit in quadam decretali quod in casu quis sustineat excommunicationem patienter et quod melius est hoc facere quam iudicio Ecclesiae contraire. Et sic finis huius dubii.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Paris, Bibl. Mazarine, 893, fols. 161ra–64ra.
2. Paris, BnF, lat. 16535, fols. 111r–14v (incomplete).<sup>200</sup>

MS 2 introduces the question with the words: “questio in aula fuit.” Note that seven articles are announced at the beginning of the text, but the seventh is

<sup>197</sup> *DCI*, ed. Borchert, 13\*, lines 24–30.

<sup>198</sup> Boureau, *Nicole Oresme: Écrits métaphysiques, politiques et théologiques* (n. 184 above), 2:120.

<sup>199</sup> Additionally, a treatise with this title is attributed to Henry of Langenstein, a philosopher influenced by Nicole Oresme in many ways. For the manuscript tradition of this text, see N. H. Steneck, *Science and Creation in the Middle Ages: Henry of Langenstein (d. 1397) on Genesis* (Notre Dame and London, 1976), 195.

<sup>200</sup> On this manuscript, see P. Glorieux, “Jean de Falisca: La formation d’un maître en théologie au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle,” *AHDLMA* 33 (1966): 23–104, at 31–33.

missing in the text that Philotheus Böhner edited. MS 2, which Philotheus Böhner did not know, is even more incomplete, as it stops at the end of the fifth article with the words: “ex amixtione novorum terminorum impositorum, et tunc iuvenes admirantur. Hoc ille doctor venerandus.”

*Modern edition:*

P. Böhner, “Eine *Quaestio* aus dem Sentenzenkommentar des Magisters Nikolaus Oresme,” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 14 (1947): 305–28 (based only on MS 1, of which Böhner does not provide a precise foliation).

*Attribution:* The text is attributed to Oresme in the table of contents of MS 2. Böhner mentions other arguments for the attribution, namely, some parallels between this text and other Oresmian works. First of all, the first article of the question presents a striking parallel with Oresme’s treatise *DCI* (see above, item 1 in this group); the third and the fourth articles present some similarities with his mathematical writings, especially *Pp* (see above, group II, item 4); and finally, Oresme discusses the topic of the seventh article in his *LdE* (see above, group IV, item 3).<sup>201</sup>

*Title:* MS 2 contains a table of contents (fol. 130v), in which this question is referred to as “quedam determinatio facta a Magistro Nicholao Oresme Parisiis in resumpta in domo Navarre.”

*Dating:* The text is Oresme’s inception in Theology, namely, the official disputation by which he was received in the corporation of the masters and started his teaching.<sup>202</sup> For this reason, it can be dated to the beginning of Oresme’s career as a theologian in 1356, the year in which he became Great Master at the Collège of Navarre.

*Self-references:*

According to Böhner, Oresme is probably referring to this question when he states in *DCI*: “De communicatione ydiomatum in Christo quedam alias dixi in tertio sententiarum, que nunc deo dante propono diffusius et ordinacius pertractare suppositis semper protestacionibus consuetis fieri parisiis in talibus et alias per me factis sub omni, quorum interest, correctione benigna.”<sup>203</sup> In fact, in the first article of the question, Oresme discusses the nature of Christ.<sup>204</sup> Alain Boureau does not agree with this hypothesis (see the Introduction to his forthcoming edition of Oresme’s commentary on the *Sentences*, as well as item 9 in group VII).

<sup>201</sup> Böhner, “Eine *Quaestio* aus dem Sentenzenkommentar” (n. 182 above), 307–10.

<sup>202</sup> On the ceremony of the *resumptio*, see P. Glorieux, “L’enseignement au Moyen Âge: Techniques et méthodes en usage à la Faculté de Théologie de Paris, au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle,” *AHDLMA* 35 (1968): 65–186, at 146–47; and Z. Kaluza, “L’œuvre théologique de Richard Brinkley, OFM,” *AHDLMA* 56 (1989): 169–273, at 72 n. 5.

<sup>203</sup> *DCI*, ed. Borchert, 5\*, lines 1–5.

<sup>204</sup> Böhner, “Eine *Quaestio* aus dem Sentenzenkommentar” (n. 182 above), 314–26.



*Additional remarks:* Up to now, the “*Determinatio in resumpta Navarre*” and the question edited by Böhner were considered two distinct, autonomous texts in Oresme’s inventories and in Oresmian literature.<sup>205</sup> Max Lejbowicz correctly identified them, but claimed that Böhner edited the *inceptio* under a wrong title. The reason for this divergence is that Böhner considers Oresme’s *resumptio* as a part of Oresme’s commentary on the *Sentences*, while Lejbowicz denies that the latter ever received a written form.<sup>206</sup> A comparison between the two manuscripts has recently confirmed that the text edited by Böhner and the text transmitted as Oresme’s *resumptio* in MS 2 is the same.

### 3. *Iuxta est salus mea*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Caesar’s edition): “*Sermo magistri Nicolay Oresme coram papa et cardinalibus, in uigilia natiuitatis Domini [. . .] Iuxta est salus mea ut ueniat et iusticia mea ut reueletur, Ysa. .lvi. Secundum sententiam apostoli ad Ro. .ii. et .iii. et pluribus locis, ante Christi natiuitatem totus mundus . . . X . . . ‘iuxta est salus mea ut ueniat,’ de qua Ysa .li.: salus mea in sempiternum erit. Hanc salutem nobis concedat, et cetera.*”

#### *Manuscripts:*

1. Koblenz, Landeshauptarchiv, Best. 701, Nr. 192, fols. 71v–80v.
2. Krakow, BJ, cod. 1383, fols. 360r–63v.
3. Kues, Bernkastel-Kues, Bibliothek des St. Nikolaus-Hospitals, 64, fols. 224r–28r.
4. Paris, BnF, lat. 1426A, fols. 31v–47r.
5. Paris, BnF, lat. 14579, fols. 306r–11v (with *CQM, DCI, Mm*).
6. Paris, BnF, lat. 14806, fols. 171r–79v (with *De malis venturis super ecclesiam*).
7. Paris, BnF, lat. 16534, fols. fols. 91r–94r.
8. Piacenza, Bibl. comunale, Landi 24, fols. 126v–38r.
9. Rouen, Bibl. Jacques Villon (formerly Bibl. municipale), A 465, fols. 136v–40.

<sup>205</sup> See, for instance, the inventory presented in *QdA*, ed. Patar, 27\*. Menut 1966 and 1969 do not mention the text edited by Böhner. Caroti is wrong in attributing to Böhner the idea that the *resumptio* is part of Oresme’s commentary on the *Sentences*. In fact, in his article, Böhner argues that the text transmitted in MS Paris, Bibl. Mazarine, 893 is part of Oresme’s commentary on the *Sentences*, but he does not identify it with Oresme’s *resumptio*. Although this identification is correct, Caroti did not report Böhner’s arguments correctly. See S. Caroti, “Ein Kapitel der mittelalterlichen Diskussion über *reactio*: Das *novum fundamentum* Nicole Oresmes und dessen Widerlegung durch Marsilius von Inghen,” in *Historia Philosophiae Medii Aevi: Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, ed. B. Mojsisch and O. Pluta (Amsterdam, 1991), 1:145–61, at 146 n 7.

<sup>206</sup> Lejbowicz, “Nicole Oresme spectateur engagé” (n. 1 above), 34 n. 43.

10. Rouen, Bibl. Jacques Villon , O 20, vol. I, fols. 93r–97v (with *De malis venturis super ecclesiam*).
11. Torino, Bibl. reale, Fondo Varia 121, fols. 175vb–79rb. Colophon: “Explicit sermo magistri Nicholai reverendissimi prelati coram papam et cardinales in vigilia natalis que fuit quarta dominica adventus anno domini 1363° pontificatus Urbani Pape quinti anno 2°.”
12. Tortosa Bibl. Capitular, MS 143, fols. 64ra–69rb: Colophon: “Explicit sermo magistri nicholay Oresme coram papa et cardinalibus in vigilia nativitatis domini que fuit quarta dominica adventus anno domini M.° CCC.° LVIII.° pontificatus Urbani pape quinti anno secundo.”<sup>207</sup>
13. Utrecht, UB, 261, fols. 181r–83v.
14. Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 4203, fols. 196r–200v.
15. Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 4217, fols. 282v–86v.

*Early modern editions and translations:*

1. Flaccus Illiricus (= Mathias Francowitz), *Catalogus testium veritatis qui ante nostram aetatem reclamarunt Papae. Opus varia rerum, hoc praesertim tempore scitu dignissimarum, cognitione refertum, ac lectu cum primis utile atque necessarium. Cum praefatione Mathiae Flacii Illyrici, qua operis huius et ratio et usus exponitur* (Basilea, 1556), 878–95 (further reissues in Strasbourg, 1562; Lyon, 1597; Geneva, 1608; Frankfort, 1666 and 1672).
2. Ortwin Gratius, *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum*, vol. 2 (London, 1690), 487–92.
3. Johannes Wolf, *Lectionum memorabilium et reconditarum*, vol. 1 (Lavin-gen, 1600), 648–53.
4. S. Gesner, *Concio coram papa Urbano V et cardinalibus, habita a Nicolao Orem anno 1346 [sic], id est, ante annos 259, dominica quarta adventus, una cum epistola Luciferi ad Pontificem Romanum, Luciferi fidelem locotenentem, praesidem et vicarium, quae ante hac aliquoties edita* (Wittenberg, 1604).
5. O. Gratius, *Scriptorum veterum (. . .) qui Ecclesiae Romanae Errores et Abusus detegunt et damnant, necessitatemque Reformationis urgent* (London, 1690).

*Modern editions:*

1. M. Caesar, “Prêcher coram Papa Urbano V: Édition et commentaire d’un sermon de Nicole Oresme,” *Revue Mabillon* 72 (2000): 191–229.

<sup>207</sup> E. Bayerri y Bertomeu, *Los códices medievales* (n. 192 above), 305–307, at 306.

2. An edition with French translation by Alain Boureau is forthcoming in *Nicole Oresme: Écrits métaphysiques, politiques et théologiques*.

*Early modern German translation: Eine Predigt welche vor zwey hundert und ein und viertzig Jahren ein Gottsfürchtiger und eiferiger Prediger M. Nicolaus Orem für dem Bapst Urbano V. und seinen Praelaten am 4. Sonntag des Advents im Jahr nach Christi Geburt 1364 gethan* (Wittenberg, 1605). The edition, and probably also the translation, was made by the same “doctor and professor zu Wittenberg” the Lutheran theologian Salomon Gesner (1559–1605). See *Early modern editions and translations* (no. 4), above.

*Attribution:* The text is attributed to Oresme in thirteen manuscripts.<sup>208</sup> This ascription is confirmed by Oresme’s references to this sermon in his *LdP* (see above, group IV, item 4).<sup>209</sup>

*Title:* The title of the sermon is based upon the words “*Iuxta est salus mea*” in Isaiah 56:1.

*Dating:* According to four manuscripts, the sermon was pronounced on the fourth Sunday of Advent in 1363.

*Self-references:*

Self-references to *Iuxta est salus mea*: In his *LdP*, Oresme writes: “Et ce que je di appert non pas seulement selon ceste philosophie; car a ce se accordent les saintes propheties selon l’exposition Saint Jerome et de Origines et d’autres docteurs, si comme je moustray autrefois en la presence du Pape Urbain quint.”<sup>210</sup> Again, in the next book, he repeats: “Et jouxte ceste consideration je monstray en un sermon devant le pape Urban quint et les cardinaulz par la Sainte Escripiture et par ceste philosophie les perilz, les causes, la proceineté, les remedes qui pouvoient resgarder ou toucher la perturbation ou mutation de la police de l’Eglise.”<sup>211</sup>

*Additional remarks:* The discourse pronounced to Pope Urban V in 1367 and previously attributed to Oresme should be actually attributed to Ancel Choquard.<sup>212</sup>

## VI. LEGAL AND ECONOMICAL WRITINGS

*Preliminary remarks:* Oresme’s ideas on economic theory found recognition as early as the mid-nineteenth century, that is, long before Pierre Duhem and

<sup>208</sup> M. Caesar, “Prêcher coram Papa Urbano V: Édition et commentaire d’un sermon de Nicole Oresme,” *Revue Mabillon* 72 (2000): 191–229, at 196–97.

<sup>209</sup> See Caesar, “Prêcher coram Papa Urbano V,” 197–98.

<sup>210</sup> *LdP*, IV.16, ed. Menut, 189b.

<sup>211</sup> *LdP*, V.14, ed. Menut, 226b.

<sup>212</sup> F. Morenzoni, “Parler au pape au nom du roi: Le discours d’Ancel Choquard au pape Urbain V (avril 1367),” *Studi medievali* 48 (2007): 317–65. The discourse was attributed to Oresme by C. E. Du Boulay, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis* (Paris 1665–73), 4:396–412.

others studied his scientific and philosophical writings.<sup>213</sup> In this field, Oresme composed a single work in Latin, the treatise *De mutationibus monetarum*, which was translated — probably soon after its composition — into French as the *Traictié de la premiere invention des monnoies*. Both texts deal with monetary theory. As we know, Oresme also commented on the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Yconomica* (see above, group IV, item 5), which deals with family management and not with economic matters in a modern sense. It was rather in his two principal Aristotelian commentaries in the field of practical philosophy, the *LdE* and the *LdP*, where he was able to engage once more with the same subject according to Aristotle's thought, confirming many thoughts he had worked out in his previous treatise.<sup>214</sup>

Oresme's ideas expressed in these texts are directly linked to the difficulties of the monetary policies of the French state, especially regarding devaluation and the resulting social problems during the reigns of Philip VI and John II, and the new politics initiated by the Dauphin, the future Charles V. In general, Oresme holds that the *moneta* should not be altered without a serious reason based on the prosperity of the whole *communitas*. The Prince has no right to change values for fiscal ends and even less to favor his own interest. Moreover, he has “the duty to mint and maintain good coinage in the realm.”<sup>215</sup> Some historians of economics have found in Oresme's writings the first formulation of the law that the English economist Thomas Gresham expressed two centuries later (also anticipated by Gabriel Biel and Nicholas Copernicus), according to which “bad money” with low precious metal content displaces “good money” with high precious metal content.<sup>216</sup>

This section also includes a brief juridical-theological text discussing a special case of “epikeia,” that is, the virtue that, according to Aristotle (*Eth. Nic. V*, 1137 a 31–1138 a 3), is to be used when the general rule does not exist or its

---

<sup>213</sup> G. F. Roscher, “Un grande économiste français du quatorzième siècle,” in *Traictie de Monnoies de Nicole Oresme*, ed. L. Wolowski (Paris, 1864), xi–xxvii, which is a French translation of idem, “Ein grosser Nationalökonom des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts,” *Zeitschrift für Staatswissenschaft* 2 (1863): 305–18.

<sup>214</sup> The link between economic thought and philosophical ideas in Oresme could be much closer than what is generally assumed. Thus, for example, Wolff has postulated a strong conceptual and historical connection between the economic theories of the fourteenth century and impetus theory with reference to Oresme, among others. See M. Wolff, *Geschichte der Impetustheorie* (Frankfurt, 1978), 199–211.

<sup>215</sup> H. Estrup, “Oresme and Monetary Theory,” *Scandinavian Economic History Review* 14 (1966): 97–116, at 99.

<sup>216</sup> T. W. Balch, “The Law of Oresme, Copernicus, and Gresham,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 47 (1908): 18–29. On the lesser-known figure of Gabriel Biel in this context, see H. Mäkelä, “Nicolas Oresme und Gabriel Biel: Zur Geldtheorie im späten Mittelalter,” *Scripta Mercaturae* 37 (2003): 56–94; and A. Labellarte, *Nicola Oresme. Trattato sull'origine, la natura, il diritto e i cambiamenti del denaro* (Bari, 2016), 81–93.

application is conflicting. The question that Oresme addresses in this text is whether a judge may condemn an innocent person to death. Oresme discusses the problem from legal, theological, and ethical points of view. The text overlaps with Oresme's glosses in its *LdE*.

### 1. *De mutationibus monetarum (Mm)*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Johnson's edition): "[Proemium] Quibusdam videtur quod aliquis rex aut princeps auctoritate propria possit de iure vel privilegio libere mutare monetas. . ." [Text] "*Propter quid moneta sit inventa*. 'Quando dividebat Altissimus gentes, quando separabat filios Adam, consuit terminos populorum.' Inde multiplicati sunt homines super terram. . . X. . . sed cum racione, ne ipse uideatur gratis et uoluntarie condemnare, quod non potest efficaciter impugnare."

#### *Manuscripts:*

1. Brussels, BR, MS 9899, fols. 204r–13v. Initium: "Incipit prohemium tractatus magistri Nycholai de Oresme egregii sacre pagine professoris et episcopi Lexoniensis de monetis. [Proemium] Quibusdam videtur quod . . . [Text] Incipit tractatus de origine et natura, jure et mutationibus monetarum (fol. 204v)." Colophon: "Finis tractatus de origine et natura jure et mutationibus monetarum editus per reverendum in Christo patrem dominum Nycholaum de Oresme sacre theologie professorem eximium et episcopum lexoviensem. Deo gratias."
2. Burgo de Osmá, Biblioteca Capitular, 29, fols. 63r–73r.\*
3. Florence, BML, Ashb. 210, fols. 133r–41v. Initium: "Tractatus de monetarum mutacione." Colophon: "Explicit liber magistri Nycholai Orem de mutacione monete"<sup>217</sup> (with *AP*, *CAJ*, *QCQP* and *CVI*).
4. Paris, BnF, lat. 8681, fols. 1r–16r: Initium: "Incipit quidam tractatus de origine, natura, jure et mutacionibus monetarum, compositus per magistrum N. Oresme, sacre theologie professore."
5. Paris, BnF, lat. 8733A, fols. 1r–44r. Initium: "Incipit tractatus de origine et natura jure et mutationibus monetarum." Colophon: "Explicit tractatus de mutacione monetarum."<sup>218</sup> A facsimile edition of this manuscript was printed as *Nicolas Oresmius, Tractatus de origine et natura, iure et mutationibus monetarum (BNF, Ms Latin 8733 A)*

<sup>217</sup> We take this information from Caroti's description of this manuscript in *QCQP*, ed. Caroti, 211.

<sup>218</sup> On this important manuscript, see F. Avril, "Die Handschrift 'De moneta' von Nicole Oresme (BNF, Ms. Latin 8733A)," in B. Schefold, *Vademecum zu einem Klassiker der mittelalterlichen Geldlehre* (Düsseldorf, 1995), 75–95.

- (Düsseldorf, 1995). For the companion commentary on this work, see below under German translations 2.
6. Paris, BnF, lat. 13965, fols. 1r–13r. On fol. 1r (at the top) by a medieval hand: “Magistri N. Orismi tractatus de mutationibus monetarum.”
  7. Paris, BnF, lat. 14579, fols. 336r–43r (with *CQM*, *DCI*, *Iuxta est salus mea*). Initium: “Tractatus de monetarum mutatione.” Colophon: “Explicit tractatus mag. N.O. de mutacione monete.”
  8. Paris, BnF, lat. 14580, fols. 213rb–20rb. Colophon: “Explicit tractatus de mutacionibus monetarum a magistro Nicolao Oresme, sacre pagine excellenti professore.”
  9. Paris, BnF, lat. 18205, fols. 103r–21v. Colophon: “Incipit quidam tractatus de origine, natura, iure et mutationibus monetarum compositus per magistrum Nicolaum Oresme sacre theologie professorem” (without proemium).
  10. Paris, Bibl. St. Geneviève, ms. 343/4, fols. 139vb–46va. Initium: “Sequitur tractatus de mutacionibus monetarum, editus a magistro Nicolao Oresme, theologie professore eximio.” Colophon: “Explicit tractatus de origine et natura, iure et mutationibus monetarum.”
  11. Philadelphia, Temple University Library, Coll. Cochran 501, fols. 20r–34r. Initium: “Incipit tractatus magistri Wilhelmi Orem doctoris et philosophi subtilissimi de moneta.\*”
  12. Poitiers, Médiathèque François Mitterand, Ms 93 (243), fols. 50r–70v. Initium: “Tractatus de mutacionibus monetarum editus a magistro Nicholao Oresme sacre theologie professore.” Colophon: “Explicit tractatus de origine, natura et mutacionibus monetarum, editus a magistro Nicholao Oresme, sacre theologie professore.”
  13. Utrecht, UB, 318 (4 H 1), fols. 114r–28v. Initium: “Incipit tractatus de origine, natura, jure et mutationibus monetarum.” Colophon: “Explicit tractatus de commutatione monetarum. Mag. Nycolao de Oresme.”
  14. Yale, UB, Beinecke MS 533, fols. 122v–43r. Initium: “Item tractatus de moneta eiusdem magistri Nicolai. Incipit tractatus magistri Nicholai de Oresme egregii sacre pagine professoris et episcopi Lexoviensis de monetis [. . .] Incipit tractatus de origine et natura, iure et mutacionibus monetarium.”\*<sup>219</sup>

---

<sup>219</sup> According to Patar, the manuscript Paris, BnF, lat. 902 transmits Oresme’s work: *QdA*, ed. Patar, 23\*. This seems to be wrong, however. According to the description available to us, this manuscript contains only a later evangeliary. See *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits Latins / Bibliothèque Nationale. Tome 1<sup>er</sup> (N<sup>os</sup> 1–1438)* (Paris, 1939), 320.

*Editions:*

(a) *Early modern editions:* The text appeared in print for the first time as part of the edition of Gerson's works. It was later reprinted several times. The list of editions we provide basically reproduces the list of nineteen items that E. Bridrey gathered (including the edition by Wolowski as 18).<sup>220</sup> We did not include one of Bridrey's references and added a further edition (7), which was not known to him, and a previous version (6) of the Voegelin edition that he quotes (8).<sup>221</sup>

1. *Gersonis Opera*, ed. J. Koelhoff (Cologne 1483–84) [= Hain 7621], 4, fols. 268v–80r.
2. *Gersonis Opera* (Paris, 1484).
3. Thomas Kees, *Tractatus brevissimus, optimis tamen sententiis refertissimus, de mutatione monetarum ac variatione facta per reges aut principes, editus a reverendo in Christo patre Nicolao Oresmio, Lexoviensi quondam Antistite, theologo pariter ac philosopho acutissimo* (Paris, s.d).
4. Margarinus de la Bigne, *Nicolai Oresmii, Lexoviensis episcopi, de mutatione monetarum tractatus*, in *Sacra Bibliotheca sanctorum Patrum seu scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum, per Margarinum la Bigne*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1589), 9:1291.
5. Budelius Ruremundanus (uncertain title): *De monetis et re nummaria libri duo; his accesserunt Tractatus varii atque utiles, tam veterum quam neotericorum auctorum* (Cologne, 1591).
6. Voegelin, Gotthard. *De re monetaria veterum Romanorum et hodierni apud Germanos Imperii libri duo. Marquardi Freheri Consiliarii Palatini: Accedit Nicolai Oresmii Episcopali Lexoviensis (qui fuit Praeceptor Caroli V. cognomento Sapientis Regis Galliae) de origine et potestate, nec non de mutatione monetarum, liber subtilissimus: cum succincto tractatu eiusdem argumenti Gabrielis Byel et notis in utrumque locupletissimis* (Lyon, 1605), 1–28.
7. Ed. Lüneburg: *De Mutatione Monetarum: Tractatus Nicolai Oresmii, Lexoviensis Episcopi, Lunaeburgi*, 1625. The full title on fol. A2 gives some further relevant indications: “Nicolai Oresmii Lexoviensis Episcopi (qui Caroli V. Francorum Regis, cognomento sapientis, praeceptor fuit et circa A.D. 1378 floruit) de mutatione monetarum, tractatus:

<sup>220</sup> Bridrey, *Nicole Oresme* (n. 3 above), 26–31. We mention Wolowski's edition under “modern editions” because of its influence on modern scholarship, although the less frequently used “Cunningham-Edition” was prepared much later.

<sup>221</sup> Bridrey, *Nicole Oresme* (n. 3 above), 31, includes as “titre incertain” F. C. J. Fischer, *Geschichte des teutschen Handels* (Hannover, 1785–92), 4:583, but we were unable to find Oresme's text in this work. We are grateful to the second anonymous referee for this valuable remark.

desumptus ex tomo octavo Bibliothecae Patrum, per *Magarinum de la Bigne*, editae.” Thus, this edition reissues volume eight of a previous edition prepared by Marginus de la Bigne, who is referred to by Bridrey as including Oresme’s text in volume 9.<sup>222</sup> If these references are correct, there must be one further reprinted edition by de la Bigne that Bridrey had not noticed. Oresme’s text in the Lüneburg “edition” (3–38) is made up of 23 chapters. It is followed by a brief text by Nicolaus de Clemangiis on *De lapsu et reparatione Justicie* (39–40) and another by Conradus Heresbachius on the book *Republica christiana administranda* (41–44).

8. Gothard Voegelin, *Nicolai Oresmii Lexoviensis episcopi, theologie pariter ac philosophi acutissimi, tractatus de origine et iure, nec non et de mutationibus monetarum*, in *Opuscula de monetis: De re monetaria veterum Romanorum et hodierni apud Germanos imperii libri duo Marquardi Freheri consilarii Palatini. Accedit Nicolai Oresmii episcopi Lexoviensis (qui fuit praeceptor Caroli V, cognomento sapientis, regis Galliae) liber subtilissimus* (Lyon, 1650).
9. Jacobus Genathius, *Nicolai Oresmii, Lexoviensis episcopi, theologi pariter ac philosophi acutissimi, tractatus de origine et jure, nec non et de mutationibus monetarum* (Basel, s. d. [but after 1617]).
10. *Nicolai Oresmii Lexoviensis episcopi, de mutatione monetarum tractatus*, in *Magna Bibliotheca veterum et antiquorum Scriptorum*, 3rd ed. (Paris, 1609), 8:785.
11. *Nicolai Oresmii Lexoviensis episcopi, de mutatione monetarum tractatus*, in *Bibliotheca magna veterum Patrum. . . nunc vero plus quam centum auctoribus locupletata*, in *XIV tomos distributa, opera et studio doctiss. theolog. universitatis* (Cologne, 1618–1622), 14:172.
12. Joannis a Fuchte, *Nicolai Oresmii, Lexoviensis episcopi, qui annis abhinc trecentis et amplius floruit, tractatus de mutatione monetarum, jam demum in gratiam veritatis ac justitiae amantium seorsim et emendate editus, studio Joannis a Fuchte, ss. theologiae doctoris ac professoris in Academia Julia* (Helmstadi, 1622).
13. *Nicolai Oresmii . . . etc.*, in *Maxima bibliotheca veterum Patrum. . .*, 4th ed. (Paris, 1624–1639), 9:661.
14. David Thomas de Hagelstein: *N. Oresmii, de origine et jure, nec non et de mutationibus monetarum*, in *Acta publica monetaria* (Augsburg, 1641–1642), vol. 1.

<sup>222</sup> Bridrey, *Nicole Oresme* (n. 3 above), 4.



15. *Nicolai Oresmii . . . etc.*, in *Magna Bibliotheca veterum Patrum et antiquorum scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum . . . locupletata et in XVII tomos distributa, sumptibus Algidii Morelli*, 4th ed. (Paris, 1644), 9:661.
16. *Nicolai Oresmii . . . etc.*, in *Sacra bibliotheca veterum Patrum et antiquorum . . . etc.*, 2nd ed. (Cologne, 1644), 8:78.
17. David Thomas de Hagelstein, *N. Oresmii, De origine et jure, nec non et de mutationibus monetarum*, in *Acta publica constitutiones et propositiones ad rem nummariam pertinentia in Germania*, 2nd ed. (Augsburg, 1692), 1:247.
18. *Nicolai Oresmii . . . etc.*, in *Maxima Bibliotheca veterum Patrum prius quidem a Margarino de la Bigne in lucem edita*, 3rd ed. (Lyon, 1677–1697), 26:226–34.
19. Wolowski (see *Modern editions* below).
20. W. Cunningham, “Incipit tractatus de origine, natura, jure et mutationibus monetarum, compositus per magistrum Nicolaum Oresme, sacrae theologiae professore,” in *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce during the Early and Middle Ages*, (Cambridge, 1890), 1:556 (Appendix E).

(b) *Modern editions:*

1. M. L. Wolowski, *Traictié de la première invention des monnoies* (Paris, 1864) [reprint: Rome, 1969 and Geneva, 1976]. This work includes the Latin text (lxxxvii–cxxxix) as well as the French version attributed to Nicole Oresme (see below, item 20 in group IX).<sup>223</sup>
2. C. Johnson (ed.), *The De Moneta of Nicholas Oresme and English Mint Documents* (New York, 1956). Critical edition of the Latin text (with substantial improvements over Wolowski’s text) with English translation.
3. An edition with French translation by Alain Boureau is forthcoming in *Nicole Oresme: Écrits métaphysiques, politiques et théologiques*.

*Additional remarks:* According to Émile Bridrey, two versions of the Latin text can be distinguished: one version dated 1357–58 consisting of twenty-six chapters, which is conveyed in all manuscripts (known to Bridrey), in the first Latin edition from 1484, and in the French edition by Mansion; and an earlier redaction in twenty-three chapters from 1355, which is conveyed in all early modern editions beginning with Thomas Kees’s edition from ca. 1511.<sup>224</sup> Albert D. Menut believes that Bridrey’s arguments are conclusive.<sup>225</sup> A. Landry, however, had previously

<sup>223</sup> Wolowski’s edition also contains Copernicus’s work on the same topic: *Traictié* (Paris, 1864), 48–79.

<sup>224</sup> Bridrey, *Nicole Oresme* (n. 3 above), 21–31.

<sup>225</sup> Menut 1966, 290.

argued against this distinction.<sup>226</sup> Additionally, there is a French version often considered to have been written by Oresme himself, the *Tracitié de la monnoie* (see below, group IX, item 20).

*Translations:* This is one of the most translated of Oresme's texts. Some of the translations also include a version of the Latin text and/or the old French version. In addition, motivated by the similarity of topic and approach, Oresme's text has been often translated or discussed in connection with Copernicus's treatises on the same matter and, more recently, in connection with medieval documents and some contemporary authors, like Bartoldus de Saxoferrato and John Buridan.

(a) English:

1. Charles Johnson, *The De Moneta of Nicholas Oresme* (see *Modern editions* above).
2. J. A. Fau, *Nicolas Oresme, Traité monétaire, 1355, latinus-français-english, édition trilingue juxtaposée* (Paris, 1990).<sup>227</sup>

(b) French:

1. C. Dupuy and F. Chartrain, *Traité des monnaies de Nicolas Oresme et autres écrits monétaires du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Jean Buridan, Bartole de Sassoferato) (Lyon, 1989). This is a translation of *Mm* according to the Latin text edited by Johnson, *The De Moneta* (see *Modern editions* above). It also includes translations of related passages in Oresme's commentaries on *Ethics* and *Politics* following the editions by Menut mentioned in this inventory (see above, group IV, items 3 and 4).
2. J. M. Viel, *Nicolas Oresme, Traité monétaire, 1355, latinus-français-english, édition trilingue juxtaposée* (Paris, 1990).

(c) German:

1. E. Schorer, *Traktat über Geldabwertungen: Nicolaus Oresme, Bischof von Lisieux (1325–1382)* (Jena, 1937). Schorer reproduces a Latin text (and translates it into German) distinguishing between two versions: an "original version" that he finds in Bigne's edition — mentioned above, and that he reproduces in its entirety (3–85) — and the one he calls the "second version," only some passages of which are in his

<sup>226</sup> A. Landry, "Notes critiques sur le 'Nicole Oresme' de M. Bridrey," *Le Moyen Age* 22 (1909): 145–78.

<sup>227</sup> Note that this work is the same as that listed again under "French translations." In one and the same book, a Latin text (perhaps Wolowski's edition) was printed with an English translation by J. A. Fau and a French translation by J. M. Viel.

- opinion to be included. Thus, he resorts to Wolowski's edition to complement the previous one.<sup>228</sup>
2. E. Schorer, reproduced in B. Schefold, *Vademecum zu einem Klassiker der mittelalterlichen Geldlehre. Nicolaus Oresmius — Die Geldlehre des Spätmittelalters. Die Handschrift "De Moneta" von Nicole Oresme. Oresme als ein klassischer Vertreter des mittelalterlichen Denkens über Geld und Münzverschlechterung. Nicolaus Oresmius und die geldpolitischen Probleme von heute. Übersetzung von N. Oresmius' "Tractatus de Moneta," mit Anmerkungen von Bertram Schefold* (Düsseldorf, 1995). This volume, which was conceived as a commentary companion to the facsimile edition of the manuscript Paris, BnF, lat. 8733A above mentioned, collects several valuable contributions on Oresme and medieval monetary theory. The German translation here included, however, literally reproduces Schorer's previous work.<sup>229</sup>
  3. W. Burckhardt, *De mutatione monetarum: tractatus. Traktat über Geldabwertungen* (Berlin, 1999). According to the introduction, this text offers a translation of Wolowski's Latin text, but this is not true: the Latin text (which is printed in the volume) does not correspond to Wolowski's edition. As the text printed and translated is made up of twenty-three chapters, we can only guess that one of the early modern printed editions was used (see *Additional remarks*, above). As a result, the German translation is not a complete translation of Wolowski's text.

(d) Italian:

1. G. Barbieri, "Nicola di Oresme (c. 1330–1382): Trattato relativo all'origine, alla natura, al diritto ed ai cambiamenti del denaro," in idem, *Fonti per la storia delle dottrine economiche. Dall'antichità alla prima scolastica. Appendice: Gli scritti etico-economici di San Tommaso; l'opera monetaria di Nicola Oresme* (Milano, 1958), 366–91. Barbieri does not indicate which Latin text he translates into Italian. Still, since in his short bibliography on "La teoria monetaria in Nicola Oresme" he does not mention Wolowski's edition, but the work of E. Schorer (see above, German translations), the introduction of which he praises, one may assume that he is translating this Latin text.<sup>230</sup>

<sup>228</sup> E. Schorer, *Traktat über Geldabwertungen: Nicolaus Oresme, Bischof von Lisieux (1325–1382)* (Jena, 1937), 86–101.

<sup>229</sup> Schorer, *Traktat über Geldabwertungen*, 86–101 and 149–83.

<sup>230</sup> G. Barbieri, "Nicola di Oresme (c. 1330–1382): Trattato relativo all'origine, alla natura, al diritto ed ai cambiamenti del denaro," in idem, *Fonti per la storia delle dottrine economiche. Dall'antichità alla prima scolastica. Appendice: Gli scritti etico-economici di San Tommaso; l'opera monetaria di Nicola Oresme* (Milano, 1958), 506 and 425 n. 11, respectively.

2. A. Labellarte, *Nicola Oresme: Trattato sull'origine, la natura, il diritto e i cambiamenti del denaro* (Bari, 2016). The Latin text included in this book is Wolowski's edition.<sup>231</sup>

(e) Portuguese:

1. M. T. Vicentini, *Nicole Oresme, Pequeno tratado da primeira invenção das moedas (1355). Nicolau Copernico. Sobre a moeda (1526)* [trad. A. E. Poersch Rolim de Moura] (Curitiba, 2004). Translation of Wolowski's Latin text.

(f) Spanish:

1. J. Hernando, "Tractatus de origine et natura, jure et mutationibus monetarum. Nicolas de Oresme (XIVe s.), Introducción, transcripción y traducción," *Acta Mediaevalia* 2 (1981): 9–65. This Spanish translation includes a Latin text following mainly MS 1 (which the translator considers to be from the fifteenth century), but also taking into consideration Johnson's edition.
2. J. Binaghi, *Nicolás Oresme. Tratado de la primera invención de las monedas. Nicolás Copérnico. Tratado de la moneda* (Barcelona, 1985), 39–125. The translator mainly follows Wolowski's Latin text, but complements it in some cases with the French version, which was also edited by Wolowski.
3. A. Tursi, *De moneta. Tratado acerca de la moneda* (Buenos Aires, 2000). This volume follows Johnson's text, while also considering variants in other editions and translations.
4. A. Tursi, *Nicolás de Oresme, Tratado sobre el origen y la naturaleza, el derecho y los cambios de las monedas* (Navarra, 2017). Corrected version of (3).

*Attribution:* Unquestioned. The great majority of manuscripts affirms it (MSS 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14). The Philadelphia manuscript 501 attributes the text incorrectly to "*Wilhelm Orem*."

*Title:* As additional remarks in the initia and colophons of the manuscript copies show, a longer denomination was usual for this text, including the notions of *origo*, *natura*, *jus*, and *mutationes* of the *monetae* (MSS 1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14), and a shorter one, referring to the *mutatio* or *mutationes* of money (MSS 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 12), and even a more concise one — often preferred

---

<sup>231</sup> As informed by A. Labellarte (personal communication on July 1, 2020).

in modern translations — *de moneta* (MSS 1, 11, and 14). Note that sometimes a manuscript includes two of these denominations (MSS 1, 10, and 12).

*Dating:* Around 1356–1357. According to Bridrey (see “Additional remarks,” above), Oresme prepared a first redaction of the text at the request of King John II of France. After his defeat at Poitiers in September 1356, he prepared a second redaction, most probably in 1357, when the Dauphin Charles was ruling on behalf of his father and negotiating his release from Edward III.

## 2. *Determinatio an liceat iudici occidere innocentem*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Borchert’s edition): “Questio est an in aliquo casu liceat iudici occidere eum quem certitudinaliter scit innocentem. Dicunt hic aliqui discordare theologos a iuristis, theologosque tenere quod non . . . X . . . quomodo accidit ex probatione falsa, et sic prout sapiens determinabit providere quantum potest sine peccato.”

### *Manuscripts:*

1. Brussels, BR, MS 1695, fols. 51v–54v. Initium: “Determinatio magistri Nicolai de Oresme sacre theologie professoris et episcopi Lexoviensis super dubio an liceat iudici occidere innocentem.”
2. Yale, UB, Beinecke MS 533, fols. 117r–22r. Initium: “Sequitur determinatio magistri Nicolai de Oresme sacre theologie professoris et episcopi Lexoviensis super dubio sequenti.” Colophon: “Finit hec determinatio magistri N. Oresme.” This work is also mentioned in the table of contents of MS Paris, BnF, lat. 14579, but it is missing in the codex. Meunier refers to this manuscript, affirming that this work is contained in Saint-Victor’s Library (old signature: 111).<sup>232</sup>

*Modern edition:* E. Borchert, “Todesurteil und richterliches Gewissen: Eine spätmittelalterliche determinatio magistralis des Nicolaus Oresme († 1382) zur Frage der Epikie,” *Wahrheit und Verkündigung: Festschrift M. Schmaus* (Munich, 1967), 1:877–924.

*Attribution:* The attribution to Nicole Oresme can be found in both manuscripts transmitting this text.

*Dating:* According to Borchert, this text should be dated before Oresme’s *LdE* (1369–1374).<sup>233</sup>

<sup>232</sup> Meunier, *Essai sur la vie* (n. 2 above), 118.

<sup>233</sup> E. Borchert, “Todesurteil und richterliches Gewissen: Eine spätmittelalterliche determinatio magistralis des Nicolaus Oresme († 1382) zur Frage der Epikie,” *Wahrheit und Verkündigung: Festschrift M. Schmaus* (Munich, 1967), 1:877–924, at 880–81.

*Additional remarks:* This text is a Latin version of five glosses drawn from *LdE* (V, chap. 9, n. 14; VI, chap. 7, n. 6; IX, chap. 3, n. 8 and the question; IX, ch. 11, n. 13 and n. 17). The same five glosses in French follow the *LdY* in MS Avranches 223, fols. 350r–60r, in a different hand from that of the main text.

## VII. WRITINGS WHOSE ORESMIAN ATTRIBUTION HAS NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED

### 1. *Conclusio mirabilis*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to MS Paris, BnF, lat. 16134 alone): “Moveatur a per horam et in prima medietate . . . X . . . igitur patet per prescriptum longis ambagibus et hic finis.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Leipzig, UB, MS 1480, fols. 153va–55ra.
2. Paris, BnF, lat. 16134, fols. 79vb–80vb.
3. Pommersfelden, Gräfliche und Schönbornsche Stiftsbibl., 236 (2858), fols. 128ra–28vb (with *Pp* and *De terminis confundentibus*).
4. Rome, Bibl. Casanatense, 267, fols. 127v–29r.
5. Seville, Bibl. Capitulare y Colombina, 7–13, fols. 125va–26rb (with *QsE*, *QdS*, *Pp* and *Utrum aliqua res videatur tanta quanta est*).

Besides these five manuscripts containing the text of the “conclusio mirabilis,” there are at least two further manuscripts that seem to be connected to the same text: Bruges, OB, lat. 466, fols. 131r–38v, and Paris, BnF, Bibl. de l’Arsenal, lat. 522, fols. 32rb–vb.<sup>234</sup>

*Modern edition:* A transcription from Paris, BnF, lat. 16134 was published in H. L. L. Busard, “Unendliche Reihen in *A est unum calidum*,” *Archive for History of Exact Sciences* 2 (1965): 387–97 and some parts of it (with relevant corrections) by M. Clagett in his edition of *CQM*.<sup>235</sup>

*Title:* Not established. Daniel Di Liscia proposed this title from the above-mentioned manuscripts.<sup>236</sup>

*Attribution:* The attribution of this text is not completely sure, but in any case possible. For further discussion, see Di Liscia’s aforementioned paper and the literature he mentions.

*Self-references:* In *CQM*, Oresme states: “Istud autem alias demonstravi demonstratione subtiliori et difficiliori. Sed ista est magis conformis huic tractatui et

<sup>234</sup> For an analysis of the textual problems involved and bibliography on the different manuscripts, see D. A. Di Liscia, “La *conclusio pulchra, mirabilis et bona*: Una ingeniosa demostración atribuible a Nicole Oresme,” *Medievalia: Textos e estudos* 37 (2018): 139–68.

<sup>235</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 499–501.

<sup>236</sup> Di Liscia, “La *conclusio pulchra*,” 167.

sufficit.”<sup>237</sup> The proof contained in the text that we have included here as “conclusio mirabilis” meets very well the required conditions.

## 2. *De malis venturis super ecclesiam*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the Paris MSS): [Proemium] “Beatus Petrus apostolus, in secunda canonica sua, capitulo primo, volens ostendere quare sit utile prophetarum dicta pensare, sic ait: ‘habemus firmiorem propheticum sermonem, quibus bene facitis attendentes’ [2 Pet. 19]. . . X . . . quod possit aliquando prodesse.” [Text] “Olim fuerunt duo regna gentis: Hebreorum, scilicet regum Israel, cuius caput erat civitas Samarie . . . X . . . Ezechiele septimo: ‘adducam pesimos de gentibus et possidebunt sanctuaria eorum’ [Ezek. 7:24].”

### *Manuscripts:*

1. Paris, BnF, lat. 14533, fols. 77r–83v. Colophon: “predicta sunt a magistro Nicholao Oresme, sacre theologie professore.”
2. Paris, BnF, lat. 14806, fols. 180r–94v (with *Iuxta est salus mea*).
3. Rouen, Bibl. Jacques Villon, O 20, vol. I, fols. 107r–13v (with *Iuxta est salus mea*).<sup>238</sup>

*Modern edition:* An edition with French translation is in preparation by Alain Boureau in *Nicole Oresme: Écrits métaphysiques, politiques et théologiques*.

*Attribution:* In MS 1, fol. 77rb, *marg. sup.*, the copyist wrote: “Prohemium Oresme.” In the bottom margin we read: “Oresme, Episcopus Lexoniensis.” In the table of contents written in a medieval hand at the beginning of the volume, we read again: “Tractatus magistri Nicholai Oresme de malis venturis super ecclesiam.” In MS 2, fol. 180r, *marg. sup.*, we read: “Tractatus imperfectus magistri Nicholai Oresme.” We do not rule out Oresme’s authorship, but in accordance with our general policy of attribution we consider that the colophons’s statements should be verified by a thorough investigation of this text in comparison with other works of established Oresmian authorship.

*Title:* In MS 2, fol. 180r, *marg. sup.*, we read: “Titulus huius tractatus est: de malis super ecclesiam venturis.”

*Additional remarks:* The topic of this treatise is the same as that of the sermon “*Iuxta est salus mea*.”<sup>239</sup>

<sup>237</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 414–16.

<sup>238</sup> Caesar, “Précher coram Papa Urbano V” (n. 208 above), 192–93.

<sup>239</sup> According to Menut, this sermon is an abridged version of the sermon *Iuxta est salus mea*. See Menut 1966, 295.

### 3. *Expositio cuiusdam legis (EcL)*

*Incipit, explicit, and specimina:* [MS Paris, BnF, lat. 14580, fol. 220rb] “Reverendissime pater et domine metuentissime, misistis michi per modum solacii, ut dicebatis, unam cedulam continentem quandam legem romanam aut eius partem, que incipiebat: ‘utrum ita concipiebas stipulationem,’ etc., quatenus dubium in ea scriptum vellem enucleare. Quamvis talis materia michi sit ignota et termini inusitati, nichilominus, omni excusatione postposita, vestris iussionibus obtemperans iuxta posse, primo illud ex quo in proposito maior provenit difficultas verbis michi familiaribus declarabo, deinde communiter textum legis exponam. Quantum ad primum, ponatur quod ex suppositione sic fuerit quod si hec vinea vel hec domus facta non esset infra diem martis, titius deberet decem, et cum hoc sit ita quod tempus illud prefixum transivit et vinea facta sit, et non domus, tunc queritur an titius debeat decem. Respondeo quod debet, quod ostendo sic: si domus aut vinea non fuit facta infra diem martis, titius debet decem, sed domus aut vinea non fuit facta infra diem martis, ergo titius debet decem. Maior patet ex suppositione, minor probatur sic: domus non fuit facta infra diem martis; ergo domus aut vinea non fuit facta, etc., sicut sequitur: Petrus non venit, ergo Petrus aut Iohannes non venit. Similiter sequitur: aurum non teneo; ergo librum aut aureum non teneo, et ita in omnibus.”<sup>240</sup>

[221ra]: “Hiis autem declaratis venio ad secundum, scilicet ad expositionem cedule michi misse, et considero duas stipulationes proposito pertinentes. Una est quasi talis: ‘si illud aut illud factum non erit, titius dabit decem, ut puta si domus aut vinea facta non erit’; et secunda est quasi talis: ‘si illud aut illud factum erit, titius dabit decem,’ ita quod utrumque est cum distinctione, sed una cum negatione, alia sine negatione. Dicit ergo iste legislator: ‘utrum ita concipias,’ etc.”

[222ra] “Ideo, ad removendum omne dubium, iste legislator docet modum et formam per quam quis obligatur ad faciendum de pluribus tantummodo unum, et qualiter debet petere qui vult alterum sibi obligare ad unum de pluribus. Et dicit: si quis autem in stipulata deducat quorum unum se voluit et non quodlibet eorum, ita comprehendere debet querendo a titio ‘illud aut illud fieri spondes, et si nichil horum actum erit, tantum dabis’; vel sic: ‘si non feceris aliquod horum, tantum dabis’; vel sic: ‘si non feceris hoc aut illud, tantum dabis,’ quod iste tres forme equivalent. Et tunc, isto concessio, sufficit unum eorum facere. Adhuc sunt tres alie quarum quelibet equipollet sive equivalet cuilibet de tribus predictis.”

<sup>240</sup> Since, to the best of our knowledge, no information about this text is available in inventories or any bibliography about Oresme, we deem it useful to provide its incipit and explicit, as well as longer extracts from it.



[222va, explicit] “Reverendissime pater et domine metuentissime, placuit solemnitati vestre michi scribere sub tali [222vb] modo loquendi quatenus dubium in cedula vestris litteris incarcerata contentum vellem enucleare. Sed regulativa sententia cedule fortius erat incarcerata, et nucleus eius quasi infra duras quorundam verborum testas absconsus ac in eis spissis erticibus [. . .] imperviis obvolutus, ita ut sicut clava de manu Herculis vix potuerit extorqui, misistis siquidem michi de veteri iure quoddam inenucleatum, et de vocatis Digestis negotium indigestum, cuius studium plus habet difficultatem quam conferat utilitatem, ubi preter quandam logicam inepte traditam et partim impertinentem, nichil aliud scribere sive sumere reperi nisi quod non tantum debet inspici rigor artis in verbis quantum est pensenda intentionem proferentis. Ista verba sunt ad excusationem querentis(?) legere, et bene, quia lex non debet imponi verbis, sed rebus, et ideo numquam lex ad litteram scire leges <oportet>, hoc non est verba earum tenere, sed mentem et intellectum, ne preiudicium pariat inexperto si loquendo deficiat in regulis logice, quando constat de ipsius voluntate. Et hoc potuisset multo lucidius exprimi et brevius comprehendi, sed iste vulpis [. . .], hoc quod naturali instinctu sumpserat equum, ignarus logice scripsit rudi quod et in composito genere eloquendi. Erat enim de illis de quibus Ovidius in libro *Fastorum* dicebat: ‘Iura dabat populis posito modo pretor aratro, pasebatque suas ipse senator oves.’<sup>241</sup> Itaque dominationi remitto cedulam cum expositione scripture huius ruricule seu forte bulbulci in qua, si quid ineptum dixerim, corrigite, si superfluum, rescidite, si quid omiserim, supplete, et si nimis tardamur scribere, dignemini indulgere.”

*Manuscript:* Paris, BnF, lat. 14580, fols. 220rb–222vb (with *CQM*, *LdD*, *DCI* and *Mm*).

*Attribution:* In his bibliography of Oresme’s writings, Menut mentions this text as Oresmian without discussing its attribution.<sup>242</sup> Scholars after Menut have uncritically accepted this attribution without adding any new information.<sup>243</sup> The text is transmitted anonymously. Despite the fact that the manuscript contains other writings by Oresme and that our text is copied directly after *Mm* and in the same hand, it does not contain any *initium* or *colophon* ascribing it to Oresme. Nor does the content of the text offer any relevant information concerning the attribution. The author declares himself to be ignorant of juridical matters (“Quamvis talis materia michi sit ignota et termini inusitati . . .”) and,

<sup>241</sup> Ovid, *Fasti* 1.207 and 204, respectively.

<sup>242</sup> Menut 1966, 294. The text is not mentioned in Meunier, *Essai sur la vie* (n. 2 above).

<sup>243</sup> This is, for example, the case with Patar, who, in the introduction to his edition of Oresme’s commentary on *De anima*, mentions the “Expositio cuiusdam legis” among Oresme’s religious and theological writings. See *QdA*, ed. Patar, 27\*. This shows the lack of interest of scholars in this text, the content of which is far removed from religious and theological matters.

at the end of the text, quotes Ovidius' *Fasti*, a source used by Oresme in other Latin texts.<sup>244</sup> Although it may seem that the content of this text is far removed from the interests and strengths of a theologian like Oresme, it is worth noting both that Oresme wrote about juridical and economic matters and that other theologians from the University of Paris, such as Peter of John Olivi, Henry of Langenstein, Henry Totting de Oyta, and John Gerson, wrote treatises about legal contracts as well.<sup>245</sup> Yet, these elements, which do not exclude the Oresmian authorship of the text, are clearly not sufficient to prove it either.

*Title:* The vague title under which this text is currently reported is drawn from the *colophon*, copied by the scribe: "explicit expositio cuiusdam legis" (fol. 222rb).

*Dating:* According to Menut, this text dates from the years in which Oresme was at the Collège of Navarre, but he does not provide any argument in support of Oresme's authorship or the date of composition.<sup>246</sup>

*Additional remarks:* The text is a commentary on a difficult passage from Julian's *De ambiguitatibus*. The passage concerns the formulation of contracts and opens with the words: "Utrum ita concipias stipulationem: si illud, aut illud factum non erit."<sup>247</sup> The text takes the form of an answer to a question posed by an illustrious figure (to whom the author refers, in the initium and at the end of the text, as "reverendissimus pater et dominus"). After having provided his solution to the juristic difficulty mentioned in *Dig.* 34., 5.13.3, the author insists with some humor on the subtlety and useless difficulty of the query ("de vocatis Digestis negotium indigestum, cuius studium plus habet difficultatem quam conferat utilitatem").

<sup>244</sup> Oresme quotes the *Fasti* in his *QsP* (question I.20, ed. Caroti et al., 152, line 21) and in the first redaction of his *QsM* (question I.31.16), ed. Panzica, forthcoming. On the dissemination of this work in the Middle Ages, see E. H. Alton, "The Medieval Commentators on Ovid's *Fasti*," *Hermathena* 20 (1930): 119–51; and H. Bütünwieser, "Manuscripts of Ovid's *Fasti*: The Ovidian Tradition in the Middle Ages," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 71 (1940): 45–51.

<sup>245</sup> Peter of John Olivi, *De emptioibus et venditionibus, de usuris, de restitutionibus* (Rome, 1980); *Traité des contrats*, ed. S. Piron (Paris 2012); Henry of Langenstein, *Tractatus bipartitus de contractibus*, in *Johannis Gersoni Opera Omnia*, ed. J. Koelhoff (Cologne, 1484), 185–224; Henricus Totting de Oyta, *De contractibus*, ed. J. Barbier and D. Roce (Paris, 1506); and John Gerson, *De contractibus*, in *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 9 (Paris, 1973).

<sup>246</sup> Menut 1966, 294.

<sup>247</sup> *Iustiniani digesta*, ed. T. Mommsen and P. Krüger (Berlin, 1889), 493–94. For a more recent edition of this passage, see L. De Ligt, "A Philologist Reads the Digest: D. 34, 5, 13(14), 2–3," *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis / Revue d'Histoire du Droit / The Legal History Review* 66 (1998): 53–66, at 54.

#### 4. *Questiones de perfectione specierum*

*Incipit and explicat:* “Consequenter queritur an universaliter entium alterius rationis alterum in infinitum sit perfectius et nobilius essentialiter altero . . . X . . . tunc essent immediata simpliciter quando possit esset minor immediata. Et sic patet de ista materia totali quid sciendum sit, etc.”

*Manuscript:* Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 986, fols. 125r–33v.

*Edition:* The list of questions was first included in Auguste Pelzer’s catalogue and reproduced in Katherine Tachau’s paper.<sup>248</sup> We present the list after having verified directly the questions:

<1> Consequenter queritur an universaliter entium alicuius rationis alterum in infinitum sit perfectius et nobilius essentialiter altero. Quod sic, quia illorum entium . . . (fol. 125rb).

<2> Consequenter quero magis particulariter an aliquod ens finitum in infinitum excedat essentialiter et quiditative aliud ens finitum alterius rationis. Quod sic, quia substantia est . . . (fol. 126va).

<3> Consequenter quero an quoddam individuum speciei superioris sit essentialiter perfectius et nobilius quolibet individuo speciei inferioris. Quod sic, quia quod est propinquus . . . (fol. 127va).

<4> Consequenter quero an entium alterius rationis alterum excedat alterum secundum perfectionem absolutam in certa proportione numerali. Quod non, quia homo non sic excedit asinum . . . (fol. 129ra).

<5> Consequenter queritur utrum in ordine universi differentia perfectionis maioris vel minoris attendatur penes differentiam accessus maioris vel minoris ad summum et perfectissimum sic quod tunc quanto ens est propinquus summo tanto est perfectius . . . (fol. 129va).

<6> Consequenter queritur an differentia vel inequalitas perfectionis inter quidditates specificas sequatur proportionaliter recessus et distantiam a non gradu. Quod non, quia differentia perfectionis non sequitur proportionaliter ratio . . . (fol. 130va).

<7> Postquam quesitum est de perfectione specierum in ordine universi, nunc quero de pluralitate earum positione, et questio prima: an quacumque specie data in ordine universi possibile sit dare perfectiorem speciem distinctam a qualibet alia. Et arguo quod non, quia . . . (fol. 131vb).

<8> Consequenter queritur an in ordine specierum sit dare aliquam infimam et imperfectissimam ita quod non sit processus in infinitum in deorsum. Quod non, quia 2° *Metaphysice* . . . (fol. 132va).

<sup>248</sup> A. Pelzer, *Codices Vaticani Latini / 2,1 Codices 679–1134* (Rome, 1931), 456; and K. H. Tachau, “French Theology in the Mid-Fourteenth Century: Vatican Latin 986 and Milich F. 64,” *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 51 (1984): 41–80, at 70–72.

<9> Consequenter quero an inter duas species eiusdem generis sit possibile esse infinitas eiusdem generis. Quod sic, quia inter species alterius generis. . . (fol. 133ra).

An edition with French translation is forthcoming by Alain Boureau in *Nicole Oresme: Écrits métaphysiques, politiques et théologiques*.

*Attribution:* Citing this manuscript, Albert D. Menut included this text as a work by Oresme in his bibliography.<sup>249</sup> Nevertheless, the current state of the question is by no means fully clarified. Anneliese Maier reported this manuscript for the first time in her *Die Vorläufer Galileis*.<sup>250</sup> Although the text is anonymously conveyed, she was convinced that these questions are the treatise *De perfectione specierum*, to which Oresme referred in his *CQM*, or at least a part of it. In her opinion they bear unmistakably Oresme's intellectual signature. For the list of the single questions, she referred to Pelzer's catalogue. The reference was also mentioned in her chapter on the latitude of forms in *An der Grenze* and later picked up by Clagett in his edition of *CQM* with further indications to related texts.<sup>251</sup> Of course, this text could be a part of a more extensive commentary on the *Sentences* by Oresme, since, as Maier indicated, the text is immediately followed by *De communicatione ydiomatum* ("Sequitur De communicatione ydiomatum in Christo;" fol. 133va, in the same hand). As Tachau concludes after having investigated other texts and several details of this manuscript, the attribution to Oresme requires further analysis.<sup>252</sup> Recently, Alain Boureau has provided new arguments in support of the attribution of this text to Oresme, as he has found many parallels between these questions and other Oresmian works.<sup>253</sup>

*Title:* Menut referred to this work as "De perfectione specierum seu rerum" and also improperly as "De perfectione figurarum."<sup>254</sup> The text we have included here from the Vatican Library is a collection of questions without a general title. Oresme refers to this work with the title *Tractatus de perfectione specierum*. Note that this title is generic. Thus, it should be kept in mind that, for example, Hugolino of Orvieto and Jacobus de Napoli have both written a *Tractatus de perfectione specierum*. Moreover, in the case of Hugolino, this "treatise" is undoubtedly a part of his *In Sententias*.

<sup>249</sup> Menut 1966, 294.

<sup>250</sup> Maier, *Die Vorläufer Galileis* (n. 22 above), 190 n. 69.

<sup>251</sup> Maier, *An der Grenze* (n. 52 above), 305 n. 37; and *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 125 n. 12 and 126 n. 1.

<sup>252</sup> Tachau, "French Theology in the Mid-Fourteenth Century," 72–73.

<sup>253</sup> See Alain Boureau's general introduction in volume 3 of *Nicole Oresme: Écrits métaphysiques, politiques et théologiques*," forthcoming.

<sup>254</sup> Menut 1966, 287 and 299. These references are confusing, because the first one includes this text (and the text conveyed in the Vatican manuscript 986) under the works by Oresme, but the second one (referring back to the first!) belongs to the "Works authored by Oresme, of which no copy has been recovered."

*Dating:* In *CQM*, Oresme refers to a work with this title to be written in the future (for the dating of *CQM*, which is itself quite uncertain, Clagett considered two possibilities; see the corresponding section). A starting point for dating may be the fact that the manuscript is datable according to William Courtney between 1360 and 1365.<sup>255</sup>

*Self-references:* “Nunc autem ita est quod angulus ex recta curva et angulus ex duabus curvis sunt inproportionabiles, ut demonstrari posset ex 15 3ii Euclidis et eius commento et per Dei gratiam hoc ostendam in tractatu de perfectionibus specierum.”<sup>256</sup>

5. *Questiones super De celo* in MS Munich, BSB, Clm 4375, fols. 47ra–76ra

*Incipit and explicit of each book* (according to the Munich manuscript): [book I, fols. 47ra–56ra] “Circa librum *De celo et mundo* queruntur aliqua. Et primo, circa primum, ut sit questio prima, utrum maxima pars scientie naturalis sit circa corpora aut magnitudines. Arguitur quod non. Primo, quia talis scientia de corporibus et magnitudinibus . . . X . . . Ad sextum dico quod non est possibile naturaliter de speciebus que sunt de perfectione universi, etc.” [II, fols. 56ra–74ra] “Circa secundum *De celo* queritur utrum celum moveatur sine labore et fatigatione et sine pena. Et arguitur primo quod non, quia omnis virtus naturalis est fatiganda . . . X . . . nisi eo modo quod dictum est propter equalem distantiam a centro, etc.” [III, fols. 74ra–74va] “Consequenter queritur circa tertium librum *De celo* utrum quatuor elementa determinant sibi figuras a natura. Quod sic, quia omne corpus . . . X . . . Ad quartam dico quod in naturalibus non valent persuasiones ex mathematica, licet Aristoteles adducat aliquando, quasi pro concordantia.” [IV, fols. 74va–76ra] “Queritur circa quartum librum utrum quodlibet grave vel leve simplex moveatur de potentia essentiali a suo generante. Et arguitur inquisitive primo sic: nullum leve movetur naturaliter a suo loco naturali . . . X . . . et non est ita de gravibus et levibus, ut dictum est in precedenti questione. [*rubeo*: Finitum anno domini 1423 in die Sancti Apollinari in domo sorori hora tertia. Deo gratias]. Expliciu[n]t questiones super librum *De celo et mundo*.”

*Manuscript:* Munich, BSB, Clm 4375, fols. 47ra–76ra.

*Attribution:* These questions are transmitted anonymously in the manuscript. The Oresmian authorship of this text was suggested by Stephan Kirschner, who found striking doctrinal parallelism between this set of questions and other

<sup>255</sup> W. J. Courtenay, *Adam Wodeham: An Introduction to His Life and Writings* (Leiden, 1978), 140–41. This information is also obviously relevant for the other texts contained in the same manuscript, such as *De communicatione idiomatum*.

<sup>256</sup> *CQM*, I.xx, ed. Clagett, 216, lines 15–18. On this self-citation, see also the introduction of Clagett’s edition of *CQM*, 125.

Oresmian texts.<sup>257</sup> Aurora Panzica collated several questions of this anonymous commentary with Oresme's *QdC* edited by Claudia Kren and found a strong parallelism between the two texts, which could be an argument supporting Oresme's authorship of the *Questions* transmitted in the Munich manuscript. Appendix I provides a comparison between the two sets of questions.

*Dating:* MS Clm 4375 is a composite codex made up of heterogeneous parts with different contents and dates. The watermarks on the part transmitting the *Questions on De celo* allow us to date the copy around 1340–50.<sup>258</sup>

*Self-references to Questiones super De celo:* Another argument for the attribution of this set of questions to Oresme comes from a self-reference. At the end of question I.8 of the second redaction of his *QsM*, Oresme refers to the discussion of impetus developed in the first book of his commentary on Aristotle's *De celo*.<sup>259</sup> In the *QdC* currently ascribed to Oresme and edited by Kren, the notion of impetus is analysed in the second book and not in the first, while in the set of questions on *De celo* transmitted in MS Clm 4375, this question is discussed in the first book.<sup>260</sup>

## 6. Questiones super *De sensu et sensato*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Agrimi's edition): "Queritur primo circa initium libri *De sensu et sensato*, utrum scientia de operationibus et passionibus anime et plantarum sit distincta a scientia libri *De anima* et aliorum librorum *De animalibus* et plantis. In ista questione unum supponitur et aliud queritur. . . X. . . tertio de actu ipsorum sensuum similiter et sensibilibium. Que pauca dicta sint super libro *De sensu et sensato*, salvo semper in omnibus iudicio meliori, etc."

*Manuscripts:*

1. Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4° 299, fols. 128r–57v.
2. Munich, BSB, Clm 761, fols. 41–47v (the text stops in the middle of question 8).

<sup>257</sup> S. Kirschner, "Eine weitere Fassung eines lateinischen 'De caelo-Kommentars' von Nicolaus Oresme?", in *Cosmographica et Geographica: Festschrift für Herbert M. Nobis zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. B. Fritscher and G. Brey (Munich, 1994), 1:209–22.

<sup>258</sup> For the description of the codex and the watermarks, see the introduction to *QsM de prima lectura*, ed. Panzica, forthcoming.

<sup>259</sup> Nicole Oresme, *Questiones in Meteorologica de ultima lectura*, I.8: "Et cum dicebatur: 'igitur in fine moveretur tardius quam in principio,' concedo, nisi aliud obset; sed modo in eius descensu acquirit quendam impetum de quo dicebatur super primum *Celi*," ed. Panzica, 162, lines 5–8.

<sup>260</sup> *QdC*, II.7: "Utrum motus naturalis sit velocior in fine quam in principio," ed. Kren, 559, lines 343–46. Compare *QdC*, I.22, in Munich, BSB, Clm 4375, fol. 61va: "omne motum naturaliter ab intrinseco in velocitando motum acquirit fortitudinem et habilitatem eo adiuvantem ipsum motum, quod potest dici impetus, vel inclinatio accidentalis." On this self-reference, see Panzica, "Nicole Oresme à la Faculté des Arts" (n. 8 above), 29.

3. Munich, BSB, Clm 4376, fols. 68ra–86rb. Colophon: “Expliciunt questiones super totalem librum *De sensu et sensato* collecte Parisius per reverendum magistrum Albertum de Richmersdorf, pronunciate Prage in quadam bursa tunc temporis anno MCCCLXV per Johannem Krichpauum de Ingolstat, finite in die sancti Bernardi.”

*Modern edition:* J. Agrimi (ed.), *Le “Quaestiones de sensu” attribuite a Oresme e Alberto di Sassonia* (Florence, 1983).

*Attribution:* Of the three manuscripts which transmit these questions, MS 3 attributes them to Albert of Saxony and MS 2 is anonymous. According to Jole Agrimi, this set of questions can be attributed to Oresme, Albert of Saxony, or another master of the same milieu, such as John Buridan.<sup>261</sup>

*Dating:* Second half of the fourteenth century (see *Attribution*).

7. *Questiones super De spera* in MS Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4° 299, fols. 113r–26r.

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the Erfurt manuscript): “Circa tractatum de spera queritur utrum diffinitio spere sit bona qua dicitur quod spera est transitus circumferentie, etc. Et videtur quod non . . . X . . . apparet simili variis coloribus.” Colophon: “Et in hoc terminantur questiones super *Speram* a magistro Nicholao Orim lecte.”

*Manuscript:* Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4° 299, fols. 113r–26r.

*Partial edition* (question 14): V. P. Zoubov, “Un voyage imaginaire autour du monde au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle,” *Congresso internacional de historia dos descobrimentos*, Actas 2 (Lisbon, 1961): 563–73; and (list of questions) M. Lejbowicz, “Nicole Oresme et les voyages circumterrestres ou le poème entre la science et la religion,” *AHDLMA* 55 (1988): 99–142, at 136–37.

*Attribution:* The attribution to Oresme can be found in the colophon of the MS (fol. 126r) and is repeated in Amplonius’s and in Schum’s catalogues.<sup>262</sup> It is, however, important to note that Albert of Saxony’s *Questions on the Meteorologica*, transmitted on fols. 53r–103v of the same manuscript, is erroneously attributed to

<sup>261</sup> J. Agrimi, “Les *Quaestiones De sensu* attribuées à Albert de Saxe: Quelques remarques sur les rapports entre philosophie naturelle et médecine chez Buridan, Oresme et Albert,” in *Itinéraires d’Albert de Saxe. Paris-Vienne au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle: Actes du colloque organisé le 19–22 juin 1990 dans le cadre des activités de l’URA 1085 du CNRS à l’occasion du 600<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de la mort d’Albert de Saxe*, ed. J. Biard (Paris, 1991), 191–204, at 194.

<sup>262</sup> Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge* (n. 37 above), 36; and W. Schum, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der Amplonianischen Handschriften-Sammlung zu Erfurt* (Berlin, 1887), 539.

Oresme.<sup>263</sup> Lejbowicz is in favor of the attribution of this commentary to Oresme based on his analysis of the discussion of circumterrestrial travels treated in question 14, *Utrum tota plaga que est inter tropicum Cancrici et circulum arctico est habitabilis*.<sup>264</sup> In addition, Lejbowicz points out that Borchert and Menut do not distinguish two different sets of questions on *De spera*: the one edited by Droppers, the Oresmian authorship of which is commonly accepted (see above, group I, item 9), and the one transmitted in MS Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4° 299, fols. 113r–26, the Oresmian authorship of which is only a possibility.<sup>265</sup>

*Dating:* The copy can be dated to the second half of the fourteenth century.

### 8. *Sententia super De generatione et corruptione*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the Darmstadt manuscript): [I, fol. 1ra] “De generatione quidem et corruptione et notitia generatorum,” etc. Iste est tertius liber naturalis post librum *De celo*, in quo determinatum est de motu ad ubi. In hoc determinatur de motu ad formam . . . X . . . et ideo dicitur quasi forma sicut es colorat stagnum. ‘Manifestum igitur.’ Hic recapitulat” . . . [incomplete]. [II, fol. 8ra] “De mixtione quidem et tactu et facere et pati dictum est.’ Iste est secundus liber de generatione. Postquam determinatum est in primo de generatione et corruptione et aliis motibus consequentibus istos, in hoc secundo determinatur in speciali de generatione et corruptione ipsorum elementorum . . . X . . . et per motum sursum erunt etiam causa efficiens” . . . [incomplete].

*Remarks:* This copy, which so far is the only one that has been identified, presents many lacunas. It is interesting to note that the second book starts again on fol. 12ra in a similar but not identical way: “De mixtione quidem igitur et tactu et de facere et pati dictum est. Postquam Aristoteles determinavit de his que considerantur in ista scientia per modum passionis . . .” This text ends at fol. 14va with the words: “consideratio est alterius contemplatio, scilicet ad librum *De anima* vel *De memoria et reminiscencia*.” The same manuscript contains a double ending of the first book and a double beginning of the second book of Oresme’s *QsM*. In the case of the *QsM*, this can easily be explained by the fact that these portions of the text were copied by two different students, but in fact it seems as though one and the same scribe wrote the beginning of the second book of the literal commentary on *De generatione* twice.<sup>266</sup> Further research may clarify whether these

<sup>263</sup> See the colophon on fol. 103v: “Expliciunt questiones super toto librorum *Meteororum* lecte a magistro Nicolao Horem Parisius.” On Albert’s commentary, see A. Panzica, “Albert of Saxony’s Questions on *Meteorology*: Introduction, Study of the Manuscript Tradition and Edition of Book I–II.2,” *AHDLMA* 86 (2019): 231–356.

<sup>264</sup> Lejbowicz, “Nicole Oresme et les voyages circumterrestres” (n. 166 above), 102–12.

<sup>265</sup> Lejbowicz, “Nicole Oresme et les voyages circumterrestres” (n. 166 above), 133–34.

<sup>266</sup> Panzica, “Nicole Oresme à la Faculté des Arts” (n. 8 above), 17–19.



portions of commentaries on the second book belong to two different commentaries.

*Manuscript:* Darmstadt, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek 2197, fols. 1r–9v.

*Attribution:* No attribution can be found in the manuscript, but it is possible to attribute the commentary to Nicole Oresme. The Darmstadt manuscript, which contains original *reportationes*, transmits Oresme's literal and question commentaries on the *Meteorologica* (see above, group I, items 4 and 5). It is, therefore, possible that the students who transcribed these texts attended Oresme's lectures on these two closely related Aristotelian treatises.

*Dating:* As we have shown above (group I, item 4), the Darmstadt MS dates to 1346. This text, which is also a *reportatio*, should therefore be dated to the same year.

### 9. *Questiones super libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi*

*Manuscript:* Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 986, fols. 1ra–31vb and 116ra–121va.<sup>267</sup>

According to Alain Boureau, the text transmitted on these folios belongs to Oresme's *Commentary on the Sentences*. This text comprises a prologue, eight questions on the first book (fols. 1ra–31vb), one question on the third book (fols. 118va–21va), and one question on the fourth book (fols. 116ra–18va). The titles of the questions are as follows:

- I. Utrum fidelis catholicus habeat concedere hoc principium theologicum ‘Deus potest facere quidquid fieri,’ non implicat contradictionem.
- II. Utrum omni re sit utendum vel fruendum et de nulla simul.
- III. Utrum usus vel fruitio sit sui obiecti aliqua representatio vel cognitio.
- IV. Utrum ex notitia quam habet creatura viatrix de Deo possit evidenter concludi quod in universo sit unum principium infinitum.
- V. Utrum ex hoc quod Deus est ubique eo modo quo est et non aliter concludatur sufficienter Deum esse simplicem et immutabilem.
- VI. Utrum aliquis viator sine gratia possit acceptari ad vitam eternam.
- VII. Utrum cum Dei prescientia et certa scientia stet vel stare possit rerum contingentia.

<sup>267</sup> The same manuscript contains two important texts that, according to Alain Boureau, should be ascribed to Oresme: fols. 93rb–102va (“Queritur utrum linea gradualis bene essendi in regno superiori sit equalis lineae male essendi in regno inferiori”); and fols. 102va–6rb (“Utrum Deus potuit ab initio universum perfectius quam sit facere”). These texts, copied in the same hand, are anonymous in the manuscript. Both texts are forthcoming in Alain Boureau, *Nicole Oresme: Écrits métaphysiques, politiques et théologiques*.

- VIII. Utrum cum actione voluntatis divine stet contingentia in voluntate nostra.
- IX. Circa materiam quarti libri quero istam questionem, utrum quilibet viator omnipotenti Deo pro universis beneficiis suis equaliter gratias agere teneatur, etc.
- X. Circa tertium *Sententiarum*, quero utrum propter benedictam unionem nature humane ad verbum, sit veridice concedendum quod Deus factus est noviter homo.

*Modern edition:* Alain Boureau (ed.), *Nicole Oresme: Écrits métaphysiques, politiques et théologiques* (Paris, 2021), 1:12–365; and 2:18–458.

*Attribution:* Oresme's commentary was thought to be lost until Alain Boureau claimed to have found it at fols. 1ra–31vb and 116ra–21va of Vat. Lat. 986. According to Boureau, the attribution of these questions to Oresme is confirmed by many correspondences with other Oresmian writings. For instance, a passage from the third question (fols. 15rb–16va) corresponds to Oresme's ideas exposed in *Mm*: “Sed arguitur contra hoc de mutatione monete per solum tractum temporis et voluntatem principis antiquam [16va]. Respondeo ad istud quod requiritur aliquid, puta nova acceptatio talis monete quando sic acceptatur a recipientibus et hoc est novum quod requiritur ad eius valorem.”

*Dating:* According to Boureau, these questions were completed shortly before 1362, the year in which Oresme obtained his degree in Theology.<sup>268</sup>

*Self-references:* As we have shown above, Oresme refers twice to his commentary on the *Sentences* in the *DCI* (group V, item 1), and once in his *LdC* (group IV, item 6). The topic treated in the self-references of *DCI*, namely the double nature, divine and human, of Christ, is addressed in the tenth question of manuscript Vat. Lat. 986 (“Circa tertium *Sententiarum*, quero utrum propter benedictam unionem nature humane ad verbum sit veridice concedendum quod Deus factus est noviter homo”). The topic treated in the self-reference in *LdC*, namely, the instant, is addressed in the third question of manuscript Vat. Lat. 986 (“utrum usus vel fruitio sit sui obiecti aliqua representatio vel cognitio”).

#### 10. *Utrum dyiameter alicuius quadrati sit commensurabilis costa eiusdem*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Suter's edition): “Item alia quaestio de portione dyametri quadrati ad costam eiusdem. Utrum dyiameter alicuius quadrati sit commensurabilis costae ejusdem. Et arguitur primo quod sic: Dyiameter est dupla ad suam costam . . . X . . . ergo proportio primi ad secundum est et dicitur medietas duplae, quae est .a.b. ad b.c. scil. dyametri ad costam.”

*Manuscript:* Bern, Burgerbibl., Cod. A 50. fols. 172r–76v (with *AP*).

<sup>268</sup> See the introduction to Alain Boureau's edition, forthcoming.

*Edition:* H. Suter, “Die Questio *De proportione diametri quadrati ad costam ejusdem* des Albertus de Saxonia,” *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik* 32 (1887): 41–56, at 43–52.

*Attribution:* Heinrich Suter attributed this text to Albert of Saxony. This attribution was questioned first by Pierre Duhem and later by Vassilii Zoubov according to whom the question clearly displays an Oresmian character.<sup>269</sup> For the same reason, Edward Grant is also inclined to attribute this text to Oresme.<sup>270</sup> A definitive attribution to an author is unlikely, however, given the current state of knowledge. As Clagett implied, this question could have been “one of a series of geometrical questions.”<sup>271</sup> A further question about the problem of the squaring of the circle in the same Bern manuscript (fols. 169r–72r), belonging probably to the same bulk of questions (if there was such a collection of questions), was first edited by Suter using only the Bern manuscript, and later by Clagett also using the Vienna manuscript, ÖNB, Cod. 5257, fols. 64v–67r (which presents less significant differences of reading) under the name of Albert of Saxony.<sup>272</sup> As for the authorship of this question dealing with the proportion of the diameter of the square to its side, Clagett mentions both possible authors, Albert of Saxony and Oresme, without declaring any preference for one over the other. In fact, there is one collection of geometrical questions closely connected to these two questions: Oresme’s *Questions on Euclid’s Elements*, from which Clagett edited and translated the questions related to the configurations doctrine (see above, group I, item 9 and group II, item 6), of which questions 6–9 all deal with the problem of the diagonal of the square. As its editor has pointed out, “there is a striking resemblance between this part of Oresme’s *Questiones* [ . . . ] and the text ascribed by H. Suter to Albert of Saxony.”<sup>273</sup> As Hubert Busard reports, however, the content of this text contradicts some well-established doctrines of Oresme. A direct attribution is therefore questionable. Returning to Clagett’s inference that the author could have been “a disciple of Oresme, who made free use of Oresme’s conclusions,” Busard is “inclined to think that the author of the tract was one of the auditors who have collected the *Questions*.”<sup>274</sup> Thus, the attribution of the text should remain open to further research, since (a) there is apparently a conceptual difficulty consisting in the incompatibility of the so-called “Oresmian character” of a text that contradicts well-established

<sup>269</sup> P. Duhem, *Études sur Léonard de Vinci* (Paris, 1955), 1:341–44; and V. P. Zoubov, “Quelques Observations sur l’Auteur du Traité Anonyme ‘Utrum dyameter alicuius quadrati sit commensurabilis costae ejusdem,’” *Isis* 50 (1959): 130–34, at 134.

<sup>270</sup> *Pp*, ed. Grant, 77–78, n. 101.

<sup>271</sup> Clagett, *Archimedes in the Middle Ages, Volume I* (n. 91 above), 399.

<sup>272</sup> H. Suter, “Der Tractatus ‘De quadratura circuli’ des Albertus de Saxonia,” *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik* 29 (1884): 81–101.

<sup>273</sup> *QsE*, ed. Busard, 14–15.

<sup>274</sup> *QsE*, ed. Busard, 15.

Oresmian opinions; and (b) if Clagett and Bussard are correct, it is by no means clear why this author could not be Albert of Saxony (at least until it is shown that this text also contradicts Albert's opinions).

*Title:* As mentioned in the incipit.

*Dating:* Without any clear indication in the manuscript itself and considering the circumstances described above concerning the attribution, the dating of this text is a matter of speculation. If the text was written by Albert, it seems likely that it was produced before he moved to Vienna, that is, before 1365. If Oresme was the author, it is likely that it was written even earlier, perhaps around the years 1343–1351, which Busard proposed for the date of *QsE* (but even this is hypothetical). If there is a third possible author, dependent on Oresme, then the date becomes even more uncertain.

#### VIII. WRITINGS NOT YET IDENTIFIED

##### 1. *Expositio super libros I–VIII Physicorum*

As we have shown above (group I, item 1), in his *QsP* Oresme refers to a literal commentary on Aristotle's *Physica*, which has not yet been identified.

##### 2. *Questiones super libros I–VIII or Questiones super librum VIII Physicorum*

As we have shown above (group I, items 1 and 2), in *QsP* and in *QdC* Oresme refers to the eighth book of a question commentary on the *Physica*, a text which has not yet been identified.

##### 3. *Question against divinatory arts*

Oresme refers to a previous question discussing the magical arts in his *CQM*. For further discussion of this problem, see Appendix II.

#### IX. SPURIOUS WRITINGS

##### 1. *Ars predicandi*

*Incipit and explicit:* [first text] “Notandum quod sancti doctores sine sumpto themate predicabant, scilicet prout Spiritus Sanctus dabat eloqui illis; sed moderni, qui non sunt tanta gratia repleti, antequam predicent habent providere. Diversus est modus predicandi modernorum: quidam enim predicant de toto Evangelio non sumpto themate, scilicet per membra dividendo, moralizando et spiritualiter exponendo, et iste modus est satis naturalis. Alii predicant sumpto themate quoad debet esse de epistula vel Evangelio presentis diei, vel saltem de aliquo loco Sacre Scripture, quia ipsa est fundamentum fidei nostre.” [incomplete;

second text] “Omnis res initio, medio et fine metitur” . . . X . . . “et multis modis aliis quos studioso relinquo lectori.”

*Manuscript:* Paris, BnF, lat. 7371, fols. 279r–90v (with *Pp* and *CQM*). These folios contain two handbooks for preaching copied by two different hands: the first one is transmitted on fols. 279r–82v, and the second on fols. 283r–90r.

*Edition* (the text transmitted at fols. 283r–90r): F. Morenzoni, “A propos d’une *Ars Praedicandi* attribuée à Nicole Oresme,” *Archivum Franciscanum historicum* 99 (2006): 251–81, at 261–81.

*Attribution:* The attribution to Oresme can be found in a medieval table of contents (fol. 63v) and has been assumed by Clagett.<sup>275</sup> The probable reason for this attribution is that this manuscript contains two other Oresmian writings. This attribution has been rejected by Sylvie Lefèvre.<sup>276</sup> In fact, the text consists of two different treatises whose authors are still unknown.<sup>277</sup>

*Additional remarks:* The beginning of the first text transmitted in the Paris manuscript, which we have transcribed above, is very similar to Géraud of Pescher’s *Ars faciendi sermones* (sixth article) and to the anonymous *Ars predicandi* transmitted in MS Bruges, OB, lat. 371, fols. 41r–85r (first article).<sup>278</sup> Moreover, the incipits of some chapters in the Bruges *Ars predicandi* display a certain

<sup>275</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 647. Clagett adds another copy of this work in MS Munich, BSB, Clm 18225, without giving any information about the foliation: *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 229. Fols. 338ra–340ra of this manuscript do indeed transmit a treatise on preaching (incipit: “De arte ponendi sermones vel propositiones sub themate a magistris editos;” colophon: “Explicit tractatus de arte predicandi et materias proponendi bonus et utilis”), but this treatise does not correspond to that of the Paris manuscript.

<sup>276</sup> On this text, see F. Morenzoni, “La littérature des artes praedicandi de la fin du XII<sup>e</sup> au début du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle,” in *Geschichte der Sprachtheorie 3: Sprachtheorien in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, ed. Sten Ebbesen (Tübingen, 1995), 339–59, at 351; and idem, “À propos d’une *Ars sermocinandi* attribuée à Oresme,” *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 99 (2006): 251–81.

<sup>277</sup> Morenzoni, “A propos d’une *Ars Praedicandi*,” 251–81; and Caesar, “Prêcher coram papa Urbano V” (n. 208 above), 192 n. 7.

<sup>278</sup> See F. Delorme, “L’*Ars faciendi sermones* de Géraud du Pescher,” *Antonianum* 19 (1944): 180–98, at 185–86: “Sciendum est quod Sancti doctores qui in Ecclesia precesserunt sine sumpto themate predicabant et non predicationis materiam ordinabant, quia non indigebant alic[is] [sic ut semper in Delorme pro aliquo] predictivo, cum predicabant Spiritu sancto inspirati: unde predicabant prout Spiritus sanctus dabat eloqui illis. Set [sic] moderni, qui non sunt sancti nec sunt sic divina gratia illustrati, primo antequam predicent debent predicationis materiam ordinare, nec sic debent presumere de divino auxilio quin ad predicandum studeant [. . .]. Diversus est autem modus predicandi. Nam aliqui predicant de toto Evangelio non sumpto themate, quando de ipso predicant, ipsum dividendo per membra; aliqui ipsum moralizando [sic] et spiritualiter ipsum exponendo quasi si postillarent, et iste modus fuit anticus alicorum et est utilis populo. Set modo communiter predicatur sumpto themate de Evangelio vel de epistola vel de alic[is] loco sacre pagine thema dividendo”; and anonymous, *Ars predicandi*, MS Bruges, OB, lat. 371, fols. 41r–85r, at fol. 41vb: “Circa primum est sciendum quod sancti doctores qui in ecclesia precesserunt, sine sumpto themate predicabant, scilicet prout Spiritus Sanctus dabat eloqui illis, sed moderni, qui non sunt sancti, indigent

similarity with the incipits of the chapters in Géraud of Pescher's *Ars faciendi sermones*.<sup>279</sup> A detailed comparative analysis of these handbooks for preachings is necessary to clarify their respective relationship and establish if one qualifies as a source for the others, or if the three texts rely on a common source.

## 2. *De conceptione Beate Marie virginis*

According to Francis Meunier, Nicole Gilles's compilation on the history of France is the only authority that attributes to Oresme a treatise that defends the Immaculate Conception of Mary and begins with the words "necum erant abyssi et ego concepta eram" [Prov. 8:24].<sup>280</sup> Menut writes that Oresme refers to this text in his *DCI*.<sup>281</sup> We were not able to find this quotation in *DCI*, which we have consulted in Borchert's edition (see above, group V, item 1). *DCI* does indeed contain a self-reference, but the expression that Oresme used ("sicut alias dixi") is too vague to determine to which text he is referring.<sup>282</sup>

## 3. *De instantibus* (John of Holland)

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the manuscript Venice, BNM, Lat. VI, 62): "Philosophus in octavo Phisicorum ponit aliquas regulas de primo instanti et ultimo . . . X . . . quod sint singula vel vera, sed sufficit quod sint utilia."

---

primo, antequam predicent, totam materiam ordinare," in A. De Poorter, "Manuscrits de predication médiévale à Bruges," *Revue d'histoire de l'Église* 24 (1929): 62–124, at 111.

<sup>279</sup> The incipits of the chapters of the *Ars predicandi* transmitted in the Bruges manuscript can be consulted in De Poorter, "Manuscrits de prédication médiévale à Bruges," 111–12. The similarity with Géraud of Pescher's *Ars faciendi sermones* can be observed particularly in the third chapter. Compare "Circa tertium de modo subdividendi et distinguendi est sciendum quod in themate est quedam divisio seu distinctio propria et formalis, quedam solum materialis" (ed. Delorme, in "L'ars faciendi sermones de Géraud du Pescher," 182); and "Nunc ergo videndum est de modo subdividendi et subdividendi, ubi sciendum quod in themate est quedam condistinctio propria et formalis, quedam solum materialis" (Anonymus, *Ars predicandi*, Bruges, OB, lat. 371, fol. 47rb).

<sup>280</sup> Meunier, *Essai sur la vie* (see n. 2 above), 136. Compare N. Gilles, *Croniques et annales de France, depuis la destruction de Troye jusques au temps du roy Louys onzieme* (Paris, 1566), vol. 2, fol. 40r. Other compilers take this information from Gilles, for example, P.-D. Huet, *Les origines de la ville de Caen* (Rouen, 1706), 322, who explicitly refers to his source: "Nicole Gilles parle d'un traité qu'il [Oresme] composita pour la défense de l'Immaculée Conception de la Sainte Vierge."

<sup>281</sup> Menut 1966, 299.

<sup>282</sup> *DCI*, ed. Borchert, 13\*b, lines 24–30: "Item sicut alias dixi, si dicatur, hec essentia est pater, hec essentia est filius, ergo filius est pater, iste syllogismus non valet, nisi regulatur per dici de omni, ut maior fiat talis: omne, quod est hec essentia, est pater, et tunc ipsa est falsa, modo in proposito nostro concedendum est, quod omne, quod est hec natura humana, fuit de virgine conceptum et natum, et tunc erit evidens et necessarium argumentum."

*Manuscripts:*

1. Boston, Medical Library, Ms. 41 (Ballard 739), fols. 194ra–99vb. The text stops incomplete with the words: “et bene inducet calori et longiori determinatione secundum quod possit modicum.”<sup>283</sup>
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Can. misc. 177, fols. 48va–61vb. Colophon: “Explicit tractatus de instanti [Wilson: disert] magistri Johannis de Halandy in universitate Pragii [sic] sub anno Domini 1369, compilatum et scriptum per Donatum de Monte, anno Domini 1391 die 3 Septembris Padue, regnante domino Francisco de Kararia Juniori, 2da vice, et maximam tunc habente gueram contra comitem Virtuti [sic], alias ipsum de civitate expellentem” (74vb).<sup>284</sup>
3. Paris, BnF, lat. 16401, fols. 128r–49v. Colophon: “Explicit tractatus de instantibus longus et utilis.”
4. Paris, BnF, Bibl. de l’Arsenal, 522, fols. 169va–87vb. Colophon: “Oresme de instantibus. Explicit tractatus de instantibus” (with *AP*, *CVI*, *CQM*, *DCI* and *Pvm*).
5. Venice, BNM, Lat. VI, 30 (2547), fols. 137ra–52ra.
6. Venice, BNM, Lat. VI, 62 (2549), fols. 80ra–98vb: Colophon: “Et sic explicit tractatus de instanti per Johannem de Holandia editus.”
7. Venice, BNM, Lat. VI, 155 (3377), fols. 43r–64v (with *Pr*, *Pp*).

*Attribution:* The text is attributed to Oresme in Bibl. de l’Arsenal 522, which contains many other writings by Oresme. As Zoubov has shown, this is the same work contained in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. misc. 177, which is attributable to John of Hollands.<sup>285</sup> Venice, BNM, Lat. VI, 62 (2549) is also attributed to John of Holland.

*Title:* *De instantibus* or *Tractatus de instantibus*, as it is frequently attested in the manuscripts.

*Dating:* 1369 according to Wilson.<sup>286</sup>

<sup>283</sup> The catalogue in S. de Ricci, *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (New York, 1935), 1:900–16 does not include any useful details about this manuscript, but its supplement does: C. U. Faye and W. H. Bond, *Supplement to the Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (New York, 1962), 206. This copy is also mentioned by T. R. Ward, “The Theorist Johannes Hollandrinus,” *Musica Antiqua* 7 (1985): 575–98, at 595. This manuscript also contains a copy of Jacobus de Forlivo’s *Questiones super Tegni Galeni*, which, according to the information provided by the librarians, may have been misplaced for a decade and rediscovered in the seventies.

<sup>284</sup> C. Wilson, *William Heytesbury: Medieval Logic and the Rise of Mathematical Physics* (Madison, 1960), 175 n. 71.

<sup>285</sup> V. P. Zoubov, “Sur un écrit faussement attribué à Nicolas Oresme,” *Archives internationales d’histoire des sciences* 11 (1958): 377–78.

<sup>286</sup> Wilson, *William Heytesbury*, 210.

4. *De latitudinibus formarum* (*LF*; Jacobus de Sancto Martino? Jacobus de Napoli?)

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Smith's edition): "Quia formarum latitudines multipliciter variantur que multiplicitas difficulter discernitur . . . X . . . Plura alia corollaria circa presentem materiam elici possunt ex predictis que considerantibus faciliter possunt occurrere. Ideo transeo."

*Manuscripts*: At the time of Marshall Clagett's edition of *CVI*, twenty-eight manuscripts were known. Since then, Daniel Di Liscia has provided detailed information about fifty-four manuscripts and four early printed editions. This text can be ranked among the most widespread in late medieval science.

*Early modern editions*: Since Maximilian Curtze's and Heinrich Wieleitner's pioneering investigations, four early modern printed editions of *LF* are known, two of which were produced in Padua (in 1482 and 1486), one in Venice (1505), and one Vienna (1515).<sup>287</sup>

*Edition and English translation*: T. M. Smith, "A Critical Text and Commentary upon *De latitudinibus formarum*" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1954). There is still no edition that takes into account all of the extant manuscripts. Smith produced a semi-critical edition using a selection of manuscripts. This edition includes a useful English translation. An earlier partial English translation by Wallis is unsatisfactory according to Clagett.<sup>288</sup> Di Liscia's study of a commentary on *LF*, which is found in two manuscripts, includes an edition of this text on the basis of these two manuscripts (and remarks on Smith's edition).<sup>289</sup>

*Attribution*: There is a long tradition of attributing *LF* to Oresme, which is mainly based on two reasons: (a) a great number of manuscripts and early editions attribute this text to Oresme; and (b) there is an apparent similarity of the doctrine presented here with Oresme's doctrine of configurations as presented in *CQM* and *QsE*. Scholars have generally rejected the attribution on the grounds that *LF* was produced too late to be a work by Oresme.<sup>290</sup> Moreover, only a superficial understanding of Oresme's theory could account for the similarity between

<sup>287</sup> M. Curtze, *Die mathematischen Schriften des Nicole Oresme (circa 1320–1382)* (Berlin, 1870); and H. Wieleitner, "Der 'Tractatus de latitudinibus formarum' des Oresme," *Bibliotheca Mathematica* 13 (1913): 115–45. See also D. A. Di Liscia, *Zwischen Geometrie und Naturphilosophie: Die Entwicklung der Formlatitudenlehre im deutschen Sprachraum* (Munich, 2002), 426–28 (published as a microfiche: Munich, Universitätsbibliothek, sign.: 0001/UMC 18387 2003).

<sup>288</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 85, n. 15. See C. G. Wallis, *An Abstract of Nicholas Oresme's Treatise on the Breadths of Forms* (Annapolis, 1941).

<sup>289</sup> Di Liscia, *Zwischen Geometrie und Naturphilosophie*, 213–355, esp. 253–307 for the edition of the text. A new edition with commentary is forthcoming: D. A. Di Liscia, *Eine Wiener Expositio zum Tractatus de latitudinibus formarum. Edition mit Einführung und Kommentar* (Vienna, 2022).

<sup>290</sup> See Di Liscia, *Zwischen Geometrie und Naturphilosophie*, 2–10.



Oresme's doctrine of configurations and the theory presented in *LF*. In fact, *LF* uses one of the notions of "latitude" that Oresme directly contradicts in his *CQM*.<sup>291</sup> Thus, *LF* could have been written during Oresme's lifetime, and even before *CQM*, without necessarily implying that it was a work by Oresme. Anneliese Maier has argued on the basis of one manuscript (Vat., Chis. F IV 66) that the author was most probably "Jacobus de Sancto Martino," also known as "Jacobus de Napoli," the author of the treatise *De perfectione specierum*, which was copied together with *LF* in the two manuscripts mentioned by Maier and also in others not known to her.<sup>292</sup> This attribution remains open to question, despite the research done on a great number of manuscripts of *LF* and on Jacob of Naple's treatise.<sup>293</sup>

*Title:* The title of *LF* is conveyed with some minor variants in the majority of the manuscripts and early modern editions.

*Dating:* The manuscript tradition provides no clue for the date of composition. Maier has indicated that this text could have emerged around 1370 as a simplification of Oresme's *CQM*. Clagett assumes a similar context for its creation, but not until 1390. In contrast, Di Liscia has provided some arguments in favor of an earlier date.<sup>294</sup>

##### 5. *De proportionibus velocitatum in motibus* (*Pvm*; Symon de Castello)

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the Paris manuscript): "Ut circa ardua asperaque fantasmata ex difformibus ac multifariam descisis conceptibus de proportionibus velocitatum in motibus ad conatum inexpertus intellectus clarius et uniformius sic reflectat . . . X . . . His ergo taliter qualiter dictis mei operis perscripti hic tamen firmabo quod si non plenarie a principio promissa servavi, item tam mei intellectus ac fantasie debilitas quam scabrositas operis, et sex mensium interpalatorum brevitatis, me publice Symonem de Castello efficaciter excusando, concordinter perhibeant testimonium veritatis."

*Manuscript:* Paris, BnF, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, lat. 522, fols. 126va–68vb (with *AP*, *CVI*, *CQM*, *DCI*, *De instantibus*).<sup>295</sup> Colophon: "Explicit tractatus de proportionibus velocitatum in motibus, compilatus per magistrum egregium Nicolaum

<sup>291</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 172: "Sed qualitercumque sit, patet ex dicis quod quidam moderni non bene vocant latitudinem qualitatis ipsam totam, sicut abusio esset per latitudinem superficiei intelligere totam superficiem vel figuram."

<sup>292</sup> Maier, *An der Grenze* (n. 52 above), 371–72.

<sup>293</sup> Di Liscia, *Zwischen Geometrie und Naturphilosophie*, 417–26.

<sup>294</sup> Maier, *An der Grenze* (n. 52 above), 371–72; and Di Liscia, *Zwischen Geometrie und Naturphilosophie*, 417–26.

<sup>295</sup> For a description of this manuscript, see D. A. Di Liscia, "Excerpta de uniformitate et difformitate: Una compilación físico-matemática en Ms. Paris, Bl. de l'Arsenal, Lat. 522 hasta ahora desconocida," *Patristica et Mediaevalia* 27 (2007): 25–53, at 31–35.

Oresme, scriptus Parisius per manum Iohannis Monachi, Suessionensis diocesis, scriptus in vigilia Sancti Pauli.”

*Modern edition:* James F. McCue, “The Treatise “De proportionibus velocitatum in motibus” attributed to Nicholas Oresme” (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1961).

*Attribution:* The text is wrongly attributed to Oresme in the colophon of the manuscript (see above). The final paragraph of the text clearly states that the author is not Oresme, but Symon de Castello, a master also active in Bologna, as established Graziella Federici Vescovini.<sup>296</sup>

*Title:* As noted in the colophon of the only extant manuscript.

*Dating:* According to McCue, this copy could not have been written earlier than 1395, although it is possible that there were at least two further copies of this work.<sup>297</sup>

## 6. *De terminis confundentibus*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Di Liscia’s edition): “Hic incipit tractatus de terminis confundentibus. Sciendum est quod ‘differt’ et ‘aliud’ et ‘non idem’ eodem modo confundunt terminum in propositione . . . X . . . Consequentia est bona quia arguitur ab uno convertibilium ad reliquum, igitur et caetera.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Pommersfelden, Graf von Schönborn Schlossbibl. 236 [2858], fols. 131vb–32vb (with *Pp* and *Conclusio mirabilis*). The continuation of the text is missing. The text overlaps with two other texts conveyed in manuscripts 2 (“Tractatus Potheye”) and 3.
2. Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4° 76, fols. 72ra–82va.
3. Padova, UB, 1123, fols. 6va–7ra.

*Modern edition:* D. A. Di Liscia, “Der von Amplonius Rattinck dem Oresme zugeschriebene *Tractatus de terminis confundentibus* und dessen verschollene Handschrift (Hs. Pommersfelden, *Graf von Schönborn Schloßbibliothek*, 236 [2858]),” *Traditio* 56 (2001): 89–108.

*Attribution:* In his catalogue from ca. 1412, Amplonius Rating de Berka refers to a manuscript bearing the shelfmark 7 under the category of logic, which is now identified as the above-mentioned Pommersfelden manuscript. On a list of the

<sup>296</sup> For further details, see James F. McCue, “The Treatise ‘De proportionibus velocitatum in motibus’ attributed to Nicholas Oresme” (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1961), xxi–xxv; and G. Federici Vescovini, “Simone di Castello e la medicina dei ‘moderni,’” in eadem, *Arti” e filosofia nel secolo XIV: Studi sulla tradizione aristotelica e i “moderni”* (Florence, 1983), 215–29.

<sup>297</sup> McCue, “The Treatise,” xxii–xxiii.

texts included in this manuscript, Amplonius mentions the “tractatus eiusdem Orem de terminis confundentibus.”<sup>298</sup> This attribution seems highly unlikely, however, especially if we consider that in the same catalogue Amplonius also wrongly attributed *De latitudinibus formarum* to Oresme.

*Title:* As noted by Amplonius.

*Dating:* Amplonius’s catalogue is the *terminus ante quem*, but the text could have been written many decades earlier.

### 7. *Epistola Luciferi*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Schabel’s edition): “*Lucifer princeps tenebrarum, tristia profundi regens Acherontis imperia . . . X . . . ad nostrum consistorium dolorosum sub nostri terribilis signiti caractere in robore praemissorum.*”

*Manuscripts:* This text is conveyed in over 150 manuscripts.<sup>299</sup> Another incomplete copy is found in Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Carl von Ossietzky, Petri 41, fols. 181v–183v: Incipit [proemium]: “Hec demon clero transmisit scripta moderno.” [Text] “Lucifer princeps tenebrarum; explicit: “Caractere in robore premissorum etc.”<sup>300</sup>

*Early modern editions:* There are many early printed editions, including translations into English and German. The edition by Flacius Illyricus seems to have been one of the most widespread: *Epistola Luciferi ad Spirituales circiter ante annos centum, ut ex codicis vetustate apparet, descripta. Autore Nicolao Oren* (Magdebourg, 1549).<sup>301</sup>

*Attribution:* According to Meunier, the first attribution to Oresme was by Flacius Illyricus.<sup>302</sup> Although the author has not yet been definitively identified, there seems to be consensus about the fact that it was not Oresme.<sup>303</sup> Some scholars attributed this letter to Henry of Langenstein.<sup>304</sup> D. Trapp pointed to Pierre Ceffons as the author.<sup>305</sup> H. Feng has rejected this attribution following

<sup>298</sup> Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge* (n. 37 above), 16.

<sup>299</sup> For a list, see H. Feng, “Devil’s Letters: Their History and Significance in Church and Society, 1100–1500” (Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, 1982), 450–55, which has been updated in C. Schabel, “*Lucifer princeps tenebrarum: The Epistola Luciferi and Other Correspondence of the Cistercian Pierre Ceffons* (fl. 1348–1353),” *Vivarium* 56 (2018): 126–75, at 173–74.

<sup>300</sup> Brandis, *Die Handschriften der S.-Petri-Kirche* (n. 186 above), 89–93, at 92.

<sup>301</sup> For a recent edition from three manuscripts and a modern English translation, see Schabel, “*Lucifer princeps tenebrarum.*”

<sup>302</sup> Meunier, *Essai sur la vie* (n. 2 above), 39.

<sup>303</sup> Caesar, “Prêcher coram Papa Urbano V” (n. 208 above), 192 n. 7.

<sup>304</sup> W. Wattenbach, “Über erfundene Briefe in Handschriften des Mittelalters, besonders Teufelsbriefe,” *Sitzungsberichte der königlich Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 1 (1982): 91–123, at 95–96.

<sup>305</sup> D. Trapp, “Peter Ceffons of Clairvaux,” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 24 (1957): 101–54, esp. 114–22.

K. J. Heilig's work.<sup>306</sup> More recently, Chris Schabel has supported Ceffons' authorship.<sup>307</sup>

*Title:* There is no doubt about the title, as it is well established following the incipit of the letter itself.

*Dating:* ca. 1351/1352.<sup>308</sup>

### 8. *Expositio libri De physiognomia*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the Erfurt manuscript): “‘Quoniam anime sequuntur corpora’ — Iste liber de *Physiognomia* Aristotelis in quo docet cognoscere passiones anime per dispositiones membrorum exteriorum corporis . . . X . . . investigare dispositionem anime ex dispositione corporis, quia mirabili et substantiali compositione Deus composuit, qui sit benedictus in secula seculorum.”

*Manuscript:* Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 4° 299, fols. 158v–65v. Colophon: “Expliciunt scripta super librum Physiognomie Aristotelis. [rubro:] Expliciunt questiones utiles et bone a reverendo magistro Buridano pertracte, ab Amplonio Ratincq difficulter notate, quoniam exemplar studentium erat incorrectum.”

*Attribution:* The colophon attributes the text to Buridan. Although the colophon refers to some “questiones,” the manuscript contains a literal commentary (*expositio*) on the pseudo-aristotelian *Physiognomics*. The commentary is ascribed to Oresme in Amplonius's catalogue.<sup>309</sup> Lisa Devriese has recently discovered a manuscript containing the same text: Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibl., 4° 220, fols. 1r–9v. This manuscript dates to 1355 and attributes the commentary to Johannes Saxo.<sup>310</sup>

*Dating:* The colophon of the Augsburg manuscript, which transmits the same text as the Erfurt exemplar, informs us that the commentary was taught in Paris in 1355.

### 9. *Inter omnes impressiones*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the Paris manuscript): “Inter omnes impressiones que sunt in sublimi est iris oculis omnium hominum manifestissima et

<sup>306</sup> K. J. Heilig, “Zu zwei ‘Teufelsbriefen’ des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts,” *Historisches Jahrbuch* 52 (1932): 495–500.

<sup>307</sup> For a detailed description of the current state of research, see Schabel, “*Lucifer princeps tenebrarum*” (n. 299 above), 133–40.

<sup>308</sup> See Schabel, “*Lucifer princeps tenebrarum*” (n. 299 above), 126.

<sup>309</sup> Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge* (n. 37 above), 36: “questiones parvorum naturalium Orem; commentum super phisionomiam eiusdem.”

<sup>310</sup> Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibl., 4° 220, fol. 9v: “Explicit fisionomia lecta Parisius per Magistrum Johannem Saxonem Gisilberti filii Ade de Brunsip anno Domini 1355.” See L. Devriese, “An Inventory of Medieval Commentaries on pseudo-Aristotle's *Physiognomica*,” *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale* 59 (2018): 215–46, at 232–33.

eorum rationi minus nota . . . X . . . licet incredibilia videantur, experientia tamen et ratione clarescant. Adhuc restant quedam que specialibus agent de demonstrationibus quibus propter temporis brevitatem supersedemus ad presens.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Paris, BnF, lat. 7434, fols. 49vb–50rb.
2. Vatican City, BAV, Barb. lat. 165, fols. 403vb–404rb.
3. Florence, BNC, Conv. Sopp. G 3 464, fols. 41va–43vb.\*<sup>311</sup>

*Edition:* G. Dinkova-Bruun and C. Panti, “The *Tractatus de iride* ‘*Inter omnes impressiones*’ Formerly Attributed to Oresme and Its Grossetestian Milieu: Introduction and Edition,” *Vivarium* 59 (2021): 287–323.

*Attribution:* In the first redaction of his *QsM* (group I, item 5) and his *LdC* (group IV, item 6), Oresme refers to a treatise beginning with the words “*Inter omnes impressiones*.”<sup>312</sup> In 1959, René Mathieu identified this text with two anonymous questions transmitted in MS Vatican, BAV, Vat. lat. 4082, fols. 82vb–85va.<sup>313</sup> Following the complete collation of the text transmitted in the Vatican manuscript, Aurora Panzica has shown that these questions are drawn from Blasius of Parma’s *Questions on the Meteorologica*, as their content corresponds directly to that of questions I.8–9.<sup>314</sup> Cecilia Panti has recently discovered

<sup>311</sup> This copy was identified in October 2020 by A. Panzica.

<sup>312</sup> *LdC*, IV.12, ed. Menut and Denomy, 726–28; and *QsM de prima lectura*, III.5.6, ed. Panzica, forthcoming: “Sicut dicitur in quodam tractatu de iride, in principio: ‘*Inter omnes impressiones que sunt in sublimi est iris oculis omnium hominum manifestissima et eorum rationi minus nota*’”; and III.5.9, ed. Panzica, forthcoming: “Sed occurrit una pulchra dubitatio quare tales colores non apparent inter istam et concursum radiorum, sed post illum concursum, dum radii iterum disgregantur per figuram pyramidis concavate, sicut ponitur in tractatu predicto.”

<sup>313</sup> R. Mathieu, “L’*Inter omnes impressiones* de Nicole Oresme,” *AHDLMA* 26 (1959): 277–94.

<sup>314</sup> A. Panzica, “Les Questions sur les *Météorologiques* du manuscrit Vat. Lat. 4082: Blaise de Parme, Nicole Oresme et l’*Inter omnes impressiones*,” *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 61 (2019): 153–82. The incipit and the explicit of these questions are as follows: “*Utrum omnes impressiones que sunt in parte superiori aeris regionis sint eiusdem speciei vel ab invicem differant. Et arguitur quod differant ab invicem specificè. Primo ex parte materie . . . X . . . Et verum est quod sepe, dum est grossa et terrestri multum, ipsa nequit transire, sed respiratur in deorsum, et tunc fiunt fulmina et tonitrua, ut postea videbitur. Ad ultimum patet solutio per iam dicta. Et hoc de questione.*” The other manuscripts transmitting Blasius of Parma’s *Questions on Meteorology* are as follows: (1) Florence, BML, Ashb. 165, fols. 12vb–16va; (2) Vatican City, BAV, Chigi IV O 41, fols. 66va–69ra; (3) Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 2160, fols. 76vb–81va; and (4) Chicago, University Library, Ms.10, fols. 1ra–37va. Blasius of Parma’s *Questions on Meteorology* (of which this text is an extract) can be dated to the 1380s.

a treatise that begins with the words “Inter omnes impressiones,” identifying two manuscripts that transmit it.<sup>315</sup> The content of this text, which deals with the rainbow, corresponds to Oresme’s references. The treatise remains anonymous, but it cannot be attributed to Oresme, since the manuscripts transmitting them are dated to the thirteenth century.<sup>316</sup>

*Title:* The title (in this case, the incipit) of this work is not, as Mathieu argued, “utrum omnes impressiones,” but rather “inter omnes impressiones.”

*Dating:* Thirteenth century (see above).

10. *Les remèdes contre l’une et l’autre fortune* (Latin-French translation of Petrarch’s *De remediis utriusque fortune*)

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the manuscript Paris, BnF, franç. 224, fols. 2v–266r): [Proemium] “Prologue ou preface du translateur de ce present livre. Combien que la commune oppinion des docteurs l’eglise et aultres philosophes moraulx . . . X . . . et acquerir la gloire de paradis, a laquelle Dieu par sa grace vous veuille mener.” [Text] “Pologue du tres cler et tres excellent poethe maistre François Petrarque sur ce present livre intitule les remedes de l’une et l’autre fortune. Quand je pense et considere les choses et le fortunes de humaine nature et les douteux et soudains mouvemens des autres choses . . . X . . . fays les besognes, laisse de ce convenir à ceulx qui vivent.”

*Manuscripts:* A list of manuscripts was provided by Léopold Delisle and later updated by Nicholas Mann.<sup>317</sup>

<sup>315</sup> C. Panti, “The Oxford-Paris Connection of Optics and the Theory of Rainbow: Grosseteste’s *De iride*, pseudo-Oresme’s *Inter omnes impressiones*, and Bacon’s *Perspectiva* in Paris, BnF, lat. 7434,” in *Le Moyen Âge et les sciences*, ed. D. Jacquart and A. Paravicini-Bagliani (Florence, 2020), 251–80.

<sup>316</sup> On the date of the Vatican manuscript, see G. Dinkova-Bruun and C. Panti, “Robert Grosseteste’s *De iride* and its *Addendum* in the Vatican Manuscript Barb. Lat. 165: Transmission, Reception, Meaning,” in *Manuscripts in the Making: Art and Science*, ed. S. Panayotova and P. Ricciardi (London, 2018), 2:23–31. On the date of the Parisian manuscript, see J. Hackett, “The Hand of Roger Bacon, the Writing of the *Perspectiva* and MS Paris BN Lat. 7434,” in *Roma, magistra mundi: Itineraria culturae medievalis. Mélanges offerts au Père L. E. Boyle à l’occasion de son 75<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*, ed. J. Hamesse (Turnhout 1998), 1:323–36; and R. Newhauser, “*Inter Scientiam et Populum*: Roger Bacon, Pierre de Limoges and the *Tractatus moralis de oculo*,” in *After the Condemnation of 1277: Philosophy and Theology at the University of Paris in the Last Quarter of the Thirteenth Century. Studies and Texts*, ed. J. A. Aertsen et al. (Berlin, 2001), 682–703.

<sup>317</sup> L. Delisle, “Anciennes traductions française du Traité de Pétrarque sur les *Remèdes de l’une et l’autre fortune*,” *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale* 39 (1891): 273–304; and N. Mann, “La fortune de Pétrarque en France: Recherches sur le ‘De Remediis,’” *Studi francesi* 13 (1969): 1–15, at 11.

*Early modern editions:*

1. Galliot du Pré, Paris, 1523. Initium: “Messire François Petracque, Des remedes de l’une et l’autre fortune, prospere et adverse, nouvellement imprime à Paris.” Colophon: “Ci finist le livre de François Petracque [. . .] nouvellement translate de latin en françois, imprime à Paris pour Galiot du Pré [. . .] et fut acheve le XV jours de mars mil cinq cens vingt trois avant Pasques.”<sup>318</sup>
2. Pierre Cousin, *Des Remedes de l’une et de l’autre fortune, prospere et adverse*, Paris, 1534.

*Attribution:* This translation should in fact be attributed to Jean Daudin, who names himself in the prologue of “son tres humble et tres petit subiet, son orateur Jehan Daudin, indigne chanoine de la saincte chappelle royal.”<sup>319</sup>

*Dating:* The translation, ordered by Charles V, was completed in 1378.<sup>320</sup>

11. *Le Quadripartit* (Latin-French translation of Ptolemy’s *Quadripartitum* and of Haly’s commentary)

*Incipit and explicit* (according to MS Paris, BnF, franç. 1348): “Anciennement le commun language du peuple roman estoit latin, mais les estudians usoiert de grec . . . X . . . Et puis que nous avons parfait en general et universelement le iugement des nativites, il nous samble que ce est chose convenable de metre fin en tel lieu a cel livre.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Paris, BnF, franç. 1348, fols. 1ra–223vb.
2. Paris, BnF, franç. 1349, fols. 1r–214v.
3. Paris, BnF, lat. 7321, fols. 58r–171v.

<sup>318</sup> For a comprehensive list of editions and translations of this text, see C. Carraud, *Les remèdes aux deux fortunes: De remediis utriusque fortune, 1354–1366* (Grenoble, 2002), 2:99–139.

<sup>319</sup> On this attribution, see L. Delisle, “Anciennes traductions françaises du traité de Pétrarque sur les remèdes de l’une et de l’autre fortune,” *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du roi* 34 (1891): 273–304; É. Pellegrin, “Manuscrits de Pétrarque dans les bibliothèques de France,” *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 7 (1964): 341–431, at 405; and Carraud, *Les remèdes aux deux fortunes*, 2:43–44. On Jean Daudin, see F. Hamm, “Jean Daudin, chanoine, traducteur et moraliste,” *Romania* 116 (1998): 215–38; S. Lefèvre, “Jean Daudin,” in *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises: Le Moyen Âge*, ed. G. Hasenohr and M. Zink (Paris, 1992), 767; and L. Evdokimova, “Le *De Remediis utriusque Fortunae* de Pétrarque dans la traduction de Jean Daudin: Entre commentaire et imitation de l’original,” *Le Moyen Âge* 121 (2015): 629–44.

<sup>320</sup> Carraud, *Les remèdes aux deux fortunes*, 43; N. Mann, “La fortune de Pétrarque en France: Recherches sur le ‘De Remediis,’” *Studi francesi* 13 (1969): 1–15, at 2 n. 6; and Delisle, “Anciennes traductions françaises,” 273 and 277.

*Edition:* J. W. Gossner, “Le Quadripartit Phtolomee, Edited from the Text of MS Français 1348 of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris” (Ph.D. diss., Syracuse University, 1951).

*Attribution:* This translation is not by Nicole Oresme, but by Guillaume Oresme, who names himself in the prologue: “Et quant a present et son commentement, par moy, G. Oresme, sera translaté a l’aide de Dieu de latin en françois le *Quadriparti* de Phtolomee avecques le comment de Haly afin que li tres noble science ne perisse mais soit manifeste a l’honneur de Dieu et au prouffit publique.”<sup>321</sup>

## 12. *Liber de Antichristo*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the manuscript): “Quoniam quidam in tantam audaciam sunt prolapsi ut Sancte Ecclesie, cui in hoc seculo non nisi persecutiones restant, tempora pacifica cum adventu Spiritus Sancti promittant . . . X . . . ante filium hominis securus stare, dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, cui cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto honor est, et imperium per eterna secula seculorum.”

*Manuscript:* Paris, BnF, lat. 14578, fols. 172r–243v.

*Edition:* E. Martene and U. Durand, *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum historicorum, dogmaticorum, moralium amplissima collectio* (Paris, 1733), 9:1271–446. This edition presents the text of the Paris manuscript (“ex manuscripto S. Victoris”, col. 1271).

*Title:* The complete title given in the manuscript is “Magistri Nicolai Oresme de antichristo et eius ministris, ac de eiusdem adventus signis propinquis simul et remotis ex diversis Sacrarum Scripturarum testimoniis elegantissime compilatus, quatuor continens particulas” (fol. 172r). This title is repeated in the printed edition.

*Attribution:* Some words in the manuscript have been scratched out before the words “Magistri Nicolai Oresme.” The printed edition restores these words in a footnote to the title of the work: “in codice Victorino titulus hoc modo effertur: ‘Liber Bonaventure secundum aliquos, secundum alios Magistri Nicolai Oresme’” (col. 1271). The attribution of this treatise to Nicole Oresme, defended by Jean de Launoy, has been rejected by Francis Meunier.<sup>322</sup> The correct author is Guillaume de Saint-Amour’s disciple, Nicolas de Lisieux.

*Dating:* According to Meunier, the text was composed between 1263 and 1273.<sup>323</sup>

<sup>321</sup> Quoted from J. W. Gossner, “Le Quadripartit Phtolomee, Edited from the Text of MS Français 1348 of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris” (Ph.D. diss., Syracuse University, 1951), 23. On this attribution, see also M. Lejbowicz, “Guillaume Oresme, traducteur de la *Tétrabible* de Claude Ptolémée,” *Pallas* 30 (1983): 107–33.

<sup>322</sup> Meunier, *Essai sur la vie* (n. 2 above), 120.

<sup>323</sup> Meunier, *Essai sur la vie* (n. 2 above), 120.



### 13. *Milleloquium veritatis Augustini* (Bartholomew of Urbino)

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the manuscript Paris, BnF, lat. 14806): [Proemium] “<B>eati Aurelii Augustini doctoris eximii intelligentia ad mirabilem sapientiam . . . X . . . et ortus eius mentis fiat ut opus finiam per completum.”

*Manuscripts and editions:* This work was widespread. About sixty manuscripts and five printed editions are known to date. We mention only the Paris manuscript, because the colophon of this copy attributes the work to Oresme: Paris, BnF, lat. 14806, fols. 195r–202r. Initium: “Incipit Milleloquium veritatis Augustini compilatum a fratre Bartolomeo de Urbino ordinis Heremitarum.” Colophon: “Explicit a magistro Nicolao Oresme episcopo Lexoniensi.”<sup>324</sup>

*Attribution:* This text should not be attributed to Nicole Oresme. The colophon of MS Paris, BnF, lat. 14806 (a codex that contains other Oresmian writings, namely the sermons *Iuxta est salus mea* and *De malis venturis super ecclesiam*) wrongly attributes this compilation to him. The initium of the same manuscript attributes the work more plausibly to the Augustinian friar Bartholomew of Urbino.<sup>325</sup>

*Title:* The title derives from the fact that the writing embraces a thousand chapters. Bartholomew of Urbino chose the title at the suggestion of Denis of Modena, one of his teachers at the Augustinian *Studium generale* in Bologna.

*Dating.* This compilation, which is Bartholomew of Urbino’s most extensive and popular work, was composed between 1343 and 1344.

*Additional remarks:* The work consists of an alphabetically ordered collection of extensive passages from the works of Augustine accompanied by an index.

### 14. *Questiones de Perspectiva* (Henry of Langenstein)

*Incipit and explicit* (according to MS 3): [Prologue] “Presens huic operi sit gratia neumatis.” [text]: “Circa communem perspectivam primo queritur utrum lux multiplicetur per radios. Et arguitur primo quod non, quia multiplicatur per piramidem, ergo questio falsa . . . X . . . latera contingunt convexitatem secunde periferie, scilicet, iridis.”

<sup>324</sup> Further on the circulation of the *Milleloquium*, see V. A. Fitzpatrick, “Bartholomaeus of Urbino: The Sermons Embraced in his *Milleloquium S. Augustini*” (Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1954), 39–41; and A. Zumkeller, “Manuskripte von Werken der Autoren des Augustiner-Eremitenordens in mitteleuropäischen Bibliotheken. (Fortsetzung) I: Die älteren Autoren (bis ca. 1550): Augustinus de Ancona — Henricus de Alemannia,” *Augustiniana* 11 (1961): 261–319, at 282.

<sup>325</sup> On Bartholomew of Urbino, see U. Mariani, *Il Petrarca e gli Agostiniani*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Rome, 1959), 33–37; and R. Arbesman, *Die Augustinereremitenorden und der Beginn der humanistischen Bewegung* (Würzburg, 1965), 36–55. On the authorship of the *Milleloquium*, see R. Arbesman, “The Question of the Authorship of the *Milleloquium veritatis sancti Augustini*,” *Analecta Augustiniana* 43 (1980): 165–85.

*Manuscripts:*

1. Erfurt, Dep. Erf., CA 2° 380, fols. 29r–40v.
2. Florence, BNC, Conv. Sopp., J X 19, fols. 56r–85v (with *VS*). Table on fol. 115r: “Tabula librorum . . . Item questiones magistri Henrici de Azia super communi perspectiva.”
3. Paris, BnF, Bibl. de l’Arsenal, lat. 522, fols. 66ra–87rb (with *CVI*, *CQM*, *DCI*, *De instantibus* and *Pvm*). Initium: “Questiones communis perspective, edite a magistro Henrico de Hacia.” Colophon: “Expliciunt questiones communis perspective, edite a magistro Henrico de Hacia, sacre pagine professore.”
4. Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 4992, fols. 169v–72v.
5. Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 5437, fols. 150r–60v.

Another manuscript is mentioned in Olga Weijers’s inventory: Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibl., 212, fols. 85v–92r.<sup>326</sup> The librarians at Herzog-August library affirmed, however, that no manuscript corresponds to this signature and that this work is not kept in the collection of the Herzog-August Library. Neither David Lindberg’s catalogue of optical manuscripts nor Nicholas Steneck’s inventory of Henri’s manuscripts mention any copy of this text in Wolfenbüttel.<sup>327</sup>

*Early modern edition:* Valence, 1503 (“Mathematicorum opus in quo continentur Thome Bradvardini arithmetica geometriaque, necnon Perspectiva Pissani Carturiensis unacum questionibus Enrici de Assia in sacra theologia magistri”), fols. 47r–65v. A critical edition was announced by Hubert Busard and David Lindberg in 1973, but it has not appeared.<sup>328</sup>

*Attribution:* The rubric at the beginning of the text and the colophon of the Paris manuscript attribute this work to Henry of Langenstein. This attribution can also be found in the table of contents of the Florentine manuscript and in the colophon of the early modern edition. The catalogue of the Amplonian library by Amplonius ascribes this work to Nicole Oresme: “Optime questiones Orem super perspectiva.” This attribution has been repeated in the modern catalogue of the Erfurt library by Wilhelm Schum.<sup>329</sup> Modern scholars attribute this work to Henry of Langenstein.<sup>330</sup>

<sup>326</sup> O. Weijers, *Le travail intellectuel* (n. 5 above), 67.

<sup>327</sup> D. Lindberg, *A Catalogue of Medieval and Renaissance Optical Manuscripts* (Toronto, 1975), 62–63; and Steneck, *Science and Creation* (n. 199 above), 195–96.

<sup>328</sup> H. L. L. Busard, “Henry of Hesse,” *DSB* 8:275–76.

<sup>329</sup> Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge* (n. 37 above), 27. The old signature of this manuscript in the Amplonius collection is “42 mathematice.” See Schum, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis* (n. 262 above), 266.

<sup>330</sup> On this work, see G. Federici-Vescovini, *Studi sulla prospettiva medievale* (Turin, 1965), 165–93.

*Dating:* The third quarter of the fourteenth century.

15. *Questiones super De generatione et corruptione* in MS Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 2185 and 3097 (John Buridan)

*Incipit and explicit* (according to MS Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 3097): [Prologue] “Circa primum librum *De generatione et corruptione* notandum quod scientia huius libri est pars quedam scientie naturalis. Ideo ad videndum quem locum teneat inter partes principales scientie naturalis, enumerentur ille partes principales scientie naturalis. Prima pars tractat de entibus naturalibus in communi . . .” Text: “Primo queritur utrum vox significet idem re existente et non existente. Ponamus exemplum de hoc nomine ‘rosa,’ posito quod in estate sunt rose, in hieme nulle . . . X . . . Hoc intendit Aristoteles. Tamen alio modo etiam potest corrumpi.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Cesena, Bibl. Malatestiana, cod. S. VIII 5, fol. 3r–4vb (only a shortened version of the prologue and the list of questions). Title of the table of questions, fol. 4va: “Hec est tabula questionum libri *De generatione et corruptione* disputatarum Parisius per reverendum doctorem magistrum Iohannem Bridani.”
2. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 2185, fols. 40v–61r. Colophon, fol. 51v: “Expliciu[n]t questiones primi *De generatione* secundum illum, sed ponuntur alie due disputate per Iohannem Bridam cum quodam suo prohemio.” Table of contents, fol. IIr: “Questiones de generatione et corruptione Aristotelis, partim secundum Bridanum.”<sup>331</sup>
3. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 3097, fols. 103r–45v (with *CQM*).

*Edition:* There is no complete edition of this text. The prologue is edited in J. M. M. H. Thijssen, “Johannes Buridanus over het oneindige: Een onderzoek naar zijn theorie over het oneindige in het kader van zijn wetenschaps- en natuurfilosofie” (Ph.D. diss., Radboud University, 1988), 2:118–21.<sup>332</sup>

*Attribution:* The text is anonymous in MS 3; MS 2 attributes it partially to Buridan; and the fragmentary MS 1 attributes it to Buridan. Anneliese Maier proposed attributing the questions transmitted in the Vatican manuscripts to Nicole

<sup>331</sup> A. Maier, *Codices Vaticani latini, Codices 2118–2192* (Rome, 1961), 195–98.

<sup>332</sup> The list of questions transmitted at fols. 4ra–rb of MS 1 can be consulted in J. M. M. H. Thijssen, “Buridan, Albert of Saxony and Oresme, and a Fourteenth-Century Collection of *Quaestiones* on the *Physica* and on *De Generatione et Corruptione*,” *Vivarium* 24 (1986): 70–82, at 73–75. The list of questions in MS 3 can be consulted in A. Maier, “Verschollene Aristoteleskommentare des 14. Jahrhunderts,” in eadem, *Ausgehendes Mittelalter. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geistesgeschichte des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Rome, 1964), 1:237–64, at 257–59.

Oresme.<sup>333</sup> The discovery of the Cesena MS and Oresme's authentic *Questions on De generatione* (group I, item 3) undermined this attribution. The commentary is currently ascribed to Buridan (redactio A).<sup>334</sup>

16. *Questiones super libros I–VIII Physicorum* in MS Krakow, BJ 635, pp. 1a–170b

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the Krakow manuscript): “Queritur primo circa librum *Physicorum* utrum de omnibus rebus pertineat considerare ad scientiam naturalem. Arguitur primo quod non . . . X . . . ad alias rationes dicendum quod Aristoteles non intendebat loqui nisi de potentiis activis, ille auteum sunt de passivis, etc.” Colophon: “Expliciunt Questiones Pyridani [sic] reportate Erfordie anno Domini M<sup>o</sup>CCC<sup>o</sup>LXIII, feria tertia, terminate et finite hora ex-  
<er>citationis proxima ante festum Iohannis, videlicet Decollationis per manus Iohannis de Leone Medii, cuius manus sit benedicta etc. Buntschuch hadern.”

*Manuscript*: Krakow, BJ 635, pp. 1a–170b.<sup>335</sup>

*Attribution*: The commentary is attributed to Buridan in the colophon, but Mieczysław Markowski proposed attributing to Oresme the *Questions on the Physica* transmitted in MS Krakow, BJ, 635, pp. 1a–170b.<sup>336</sup> This attribution has been commonly rejected by the scholars.<sup>337</sup>

*Dating*: The copy bears the date of 1363.

17. *Sacre conciones*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the Paris manuscript): “Dominica prima adventus. In divinum dominum Jhesum Christum: Ro. 13. lex antiquorum regum fuisse dinoscitur ut nullus ante eos accederet pro aliqua gratia impetranda

<sup>333</sup> Maier, *An der Grenze* (n. 52 above), 123–24.

<sup>334</sup> On Buridan's two redactions of the question commentary on *De generatione et corruptione*, see B. Michael, *Johannes Buridan: Studien zu seinen Leben, seinem Werken und zur Rezeption seiner Theorien im Europa des Späten Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1985), 2:631–48; M. Streijger, “Johannes Buridanus' commentaar op ‘De generatione et corruptione’: Editie en inleidende studie” (Ph.D diss., Radboud University, 2008), 35–64; and *John Buridan, Quaestiones super libros De generatione et corruptione Aristotelis: A Critical Edition with an Introduction*, ed. M. Streijger et al. (Leiden and Boston, 2010), 9–12.

<sup>335</sup> For a detailed description of this codex, see M. Kowalczyk et al., *Catalogus codicum mancriptorum medii aevi latinorum qui in Bibliotheca Jagellonica Cracoviae asservantur, Vol. 4: Numeros continens inde a 564 usque ad 66* (Warsaw, 1988), 361–64.

<sup>336</sup> M. Markowski, “Les ‘Quaestiones super I–VIII libros Physicorum Aristotelis’ de Nicolas Oresme retrouvées?,” *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 26 (1982): 19–41.

<sup>337</sup> J. M. M. H. Thijssen, “The Short Redaction of John Buridan's *Questions on the Physics* and their Relation to the *Questions on the Physics* Attributed to Marsilius of Inghen,” *AHDLMA* 52 (1985): 237–66, esp. 239–40; Kirschner, *Nicolaus Oresmes Kommentar zur Physik* (n. 13 above), 11 and 18–22; and *QsP*, ed. Caroti et al., xx–xxi.

nisi esset veste preciosa . . . X . . . pro dominica secunda post Penthecostem secundum abbatem expositio evangelii litteralis. Explicit.”

*Manuscript:* Paris, BnF, lat 16893, fols. 1ra–128vb. Colophon: “Expliciunt sermones compilati a reverendo in Christo patre et domino magistro Nicolao Oresme, sacre theologie professore ac episcopo lexoniensi.”

*Attribution:* This collection of sermons is attributed to Oresme in the colophon. On fol. 1ra, a modern hand wrote: “Sermones Oresme.” Although there is a long tradition of attributing this work to Oresme, mainly based on the remarks at the beginning of the manuscript and in the colophon, further research has shown that these sermons cannot be Oresme’s.<sup>338</sup> According to Mathieu Caesar, sermons 1–118 were composed by Nicoluccio of Ascoli, a Dominican preacher active in the early fourteenth century, since most of these sermons are contained in his *Sermones de Epistolis et Evangeliiis dominicalibus*.<sup>339</sup> Caesar came to this conclusion based on the comparison between the incipit and the explicit of sermons 1–118 in the Parisian collection with the incipit and the explicit of Nicoluccio of Ascoli’s collection of *Sermones de Epistolis et Evangeliiis dominicalibus* registered in Johannes Schneyer’s inventory.<sup>340</sup> Most of the manuscripts transmitting this collection by Nicoluccio of Ascoli present a prologue that identifies the author and explains the structure of the sermons. This prologue is missing in the Parisian manuscript attributed to Oresme, but the structure of the sermons corresponds to that of the other manuscripts attributed to Nicoluccio. A further argument that led Caesar to attribute this collection of sermons to Nicoluccio of Ascoli is the abundance of Italian examples, a feature that is easier to explain for an Italian preacher than for a French one. The last sermon (119) should be attributed to Franciscus de Abbatibus, a theologian probably from the region of Asti and active in the first half of the fourteenth century.<sup>341</sup>

<sup>338</sup> These sermons are attributed to Oresme in L. E. Du-Pin, *Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques: Histoire des controverses et des matières ecclésiastiques dans le quatorzième siècle* (Paris, 1701), 280; *Gallia christiana* (Paris, 1759), 11:789; and L. Moréri, *Le grand dictionnaire historique* (Paris, 1759), 8:94.

<sup>339</sup> M. Caesar, “De la France à l’Italie: Nicole Oresme et la prédication de Nicoluccio da Ascoli OP,” *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 72 (2002): 161–85. See also X. Masson, *Une voix dominicaine dans la cité: Le comportement exemplaire du chrétien dans l’Italie du Trecento d’après le recueil des sermons de Nicoluccio da Ascoli* (Rennes, 2009). Caesar pointed out that this collection of sermons is not mentioned in Schneyer’s *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters* and also noticed some minor differences between the collection of sermons in the Parisian manuscript and Nicoluccio of Ascoli’s collection of *Sermones de Epistolis et Evangeliiis dominicalibus*. See Caesar, “De la France à l’Italie,” 164 and 173.

<sup>340</sup> J. B. Schneyer, *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters* (Munster, 1969–74), 4:224.

<sup>341</sup> Caesar, “De la France à l’Italie,” 166–67. Caesar compared the incipit and the explicit of the sermon 119 in the Parisian collection with the incipit and the explicit of a sermon

*Title:* There is, in fact, no such work with the title “Sacre conciones” either by Oresme or by any other author who wrote some of the individual sermons collected in this manuscript. Rather, it seems as though the title was introduced by the scribe of the manuscript.

*Dating:* The manuscript does not contain any information about the date of the copy. Nor can the date of the redaction of the sermons can be inferred from internal elements, as the text does not contain any reference to contemporary events.<sup>342</sup> According to Thomas Kaeppli, the *terminus post quem* for sermons 1–118, namely those by Nicoluccio of Ascoli, is 1342.<sup>343</sup>

*Additional remarks:* The collection contains 119 sermons preached on Sunday. In his list, Jean de Launoy omits four sermons, which has led to an error in some modern inventories.<sup>344</sup> Sermons 1–118 were conceived as a textual unit, as they have the same structure and contain some internal references.<sup>345</sup>

### 18. *Sermo contra mendicationem*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the Munich manuscript): “‘Dives sepultus est in inferno,’ *Luc.* XVI. Dubitatur circa hoc utrum omnis dives in rebus temporalibus sepultus sit in inferno. Videtur quod sic, *Math.* XXVII: ‘De vobis divitibus’ . . . X . . . Ad presens non scribo plura, ne prolixus videatur. Has veritates aperuit michi Deus contra fatuos mendicantes.”

*Manuscripts:*

1. Augsburg, UB, cod. II 1, fol. 173, fols. 249ra–56ra.
2. Frankfurt am Main, UB, ms. Praed. 59, fols. 48ra–48va (anonymous fragments).
3. Frankfurt am Main, UB, ms. Praed. 138, fols. 85r–96r. Title in the upper margin: “Orem contra mendicationem.”
4. Kiel, UB, Cod. ms. Bord. 46, fols. 1r–7r. Colophon: “Explicit tractatus magistri Nicolay Orem contra mendicantes.”<sup>346</sup>

---

attributed to Franciscus de Abbatibus in Schneyer, *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters*, 2:57, and found them to correspond perfectly.

<sup>342</sup> Caesar, “De la France à l’Italie,” 167–68.

<sup>343</sup> T. Kaeppli, “Opere latine attribuite a Jacopo Passavanti,” *Archivum fratrum Praedicatorum* 32 (1962): 145–79, at 169–70. Kaeppli came to this conclusion based on an *exemplum* contained in the sermon *In omnibus exhibeamus nosmetipsos sicut Dei ministros* (2 Cor. 6:4). See also Caesar, “De la France à l’Italie,” 172.

<sup>344</sup> Jean de Launoy, *Opera omnia* (Geneva, 1732), 4.1:505. See also Caesar, “De la France à l’Italie,” 165–66; and *QdA*, ed. Patar, 28\*.

<sup>345</sup> Caesar, “De la France à l’Italie”, 168–69.

<sup>346</sup> Caesar, “De la France à l’Italie”, 162, mentions this manuscript as “Kiel, UB, 127.” Kiel University Library, however, holds three groups of manuscripts with three corresponding forms of signatures: (1) “Cod. ms. Bord,” a group that contains only 121 manuscripts; (2)

5. Munich, BSB, Clm 14265, fols. 237ra–42va. Title in the upper margin: “Sermo Magistri Nicolai de Oresme, doctoris in Theologia, contra mendicitatem.” Colophon: “Explicit tractatus magistri Nicolai de Orem, doctoris in Theologia, contra mendicationem.”
6. Seville, Bibl. Capitular y Colombina, 05–3–34, fols. 86r–103r\*.
7. Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 4923, fols. 43v–46v (fragment). Title in the upper margin: “Magister Nicolaus Orem contra mendicationem.”
8. Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 11799, fols. 116r–31v.

\*MS 6 has not been reported.

*Attribution:* The text has to be attributed to Guillaume de Saint-Amour because it contains explicit references to his *Tractatus brevis de periculis novissimorum temporum*. The fact that the text is anonymous is perhaps due to Guillaume de Saint-Amour’s condemnation in 1257. Oresme’s statements hostile to voluntary poverty in the *LdP* II.6 must have suggested his authorship.<sup>347</sup> Menut mentions this work among Oresme’s writings of uncertain attribution.<sup>348</sup>

*Title:* As in the manuscripts. MS 6 adds: “Sermo contra mendicationem, imprimis Begardorum et Beguinarum.”

*Dating:* Probably around 1250–1260.

### 19. *Songe du Vergier*

*Incipit and explicit* (according to the modern edition): [Text] “Audite so[m]pnium meum quod vidi.’ Ces paroles sont escriptes Genesis . . . X . . . et sit semen vestrum benedictum a Domino Deo Israel, qui regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.”

#### *Manuscripts:*

1. Carpentras, Bibl. Inguimbertaine, ms. 1816, fols. 299–309 (excerpts).
2. Chantilly, Musée Condé, ms. 220.
3. Leiden, UB, MS Vossius gall., fol. 11.
4. London, British Library, Royal 19 C IV, fols. 2–232. This is the earliest manuscript. It belonged to King Charles V, as indicated in this note at the end of the volume: “Cest livre nomme le Songe du Vergier est a nous

---

“Cod. ms. KB,” a group in which MS 127 does not contain the sermon *Contra mendicationem*; and (3) “Cod. ms. SH,” a group that contains only manuscripts related to the history of Schleswig-Holstein.

<sup>347</sup> See *LdP*, ed. Menut, 82–84. On this text, see also Caesar, “Prêcher coram Papa Urbano V” (n. 208 above), 193–94. The *Contra mendicationem* is mentioned in the inventory of Latin medieval sermons: Schneyer, *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters* (n. 340 above), 4:375–76.

<sup>348</sup> Menut 1966, 295.

Charles Ve de ce nom roy de France et le fimes compiler translater et escrire l'an MIL CCC LXXVIII."<sup>349</sup>

5. Kraków, BJ, Gall. fol. 205 (formerly: Berlin, Königliche Bibliothek, Gall. fol. 205).
6. Geneva, Bibl. de la ville de Genève, ms. 184.
7. Lyon, Bibl. des Augustins déchaussés de la Croix Rousse, ms. fs. 186.
8. Montpellier, UB, ms. 6.
9. Nîmes, Bibl. Municipale, ms. 228.
10. Oxford, Bod. Libr., Ashmole 764, fols. 17–21 (book I, chap. CXLVIII, par. 1–16), fols. 55–62 (book I, chap. CLXI and CLXII).
11. Oxford, Bod. Libr., MS. e Mus. 43.
12. Paris, Bibl. Mazarine, 3522.
13. Paris, BnF, franç. 215, fols. 2r–179v.
14. Paris, BnF, franç. 537, fols. 2r–154v. Colophon: “Mon tres redoute et puissant seigneur, monsieur le conte d’Angoulesme, German du Foy, me fist escripre cestui [. . .] en l’an de grace mil quatre cens quarante et deux.”
15. Paris, BnF, franç. 1066.
16. Paris, BnF, franç. 9195.
17. Paris, BnF, franç. 12442.
18. Paris, BnF, franç. 24290.
19. Paris, BnF, franç. 24291.
20. Paris, BnF, nouv. acq. franç. 1048.
21. Soissons, Bibl. Municipale, ms. 192.
22. Torino, BNU, M VI, 7.
23. Toulouse, Bibl. Municipale, ms. 819.
24. Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 2053.
25. Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 2652, fols. 13r–16v and 46r–51v (book I, chap. CXLVIII, par. 1–16), fols. 55–62 (book I, chap. CLXI and CLXII).<sup>350</sup>

*Early modern editions:*

1. Jacques Maillet, Lyon, 1491. Reprinted in J.-L. Brunet, *Traitez des droitz et libertez de l’Eglise gallicane* (Paris, 1731), 2:3–152.
2. Jehan Petit, Paris, ca. 1499–1505.

<sup>349</sup> M. Lièvre, “Notes sur le manuscrit original du *Songe du Vergier* et sur la librairie de Charles V,” *Romania* 77 (1956): 352–60.

<sup>350</sup> The list of these manuscripts, as well as their descriptions, can be found in M. Schnerb-Lièvre, *Évart de Trémaugon, Le Songe du Vergier édité d’après le manuscrit Royal 19 C IV de la British Library* (Paris, 1982), xxviii–xxxv.



*Modern edition:* M. Schnerb-Lièvre (ed.), *Le Songe du Vergier édité d'après le manuscrit Royal 19 C IV de la British Library* (Paris, 1982). Based on MSS 4 (primary manuscript), 12, and 14.

*Attribution:* There has been a long debate about the authorship of this text, which is anonymous in the manuscripts. Several authors have been suggested. Léopold Marcel attributed it to Charles de Louviers, counselor of the King Charles V.<sup>351</sup> In 1896, Nicolas Iorga attributed this work to Philippe of Mézières, one of Oresme's intimate friends and the author of the *Songe du vieil pèlerin*.<sup>352</sup> In 1933, Alfred Coville provided historical evidence for the attribution of the Latin *Somnium viridarii* and its French version, *Le Songe du Vergier*, to Evrart de Trémaugon, a French jurist and royal counselor, who was bishop of Dol from 1382 until his death in 1386. Coville showed that, in a letter that dates to 1374, Pope Gregory XI allowed Trémaugon to give up his chair at the University to devote his efforts to a new endeavor, which, according to Coville, was the translation of the *Somnium viridarii*, written under the order of King Charles V.<sup>353</sup> In 1947, the French medievalist Robert Bossuat argued in favor of Nicole Oresme's authorship.<sup>354</sup> Bossuat's arguments were based on the style of text, but most of the *Songe* was a collection of passages from many contemporary writers. Following Coville, Marion Schnerb-Lièvre, who prepared a critical edition of the French text, has shown that it should probably be attributed to Evrart de Trémaugon. Schnerb-Lièvre came to this conclusion based on a comparison of the *Songe*, its Latin source (the *Somnium viridarii*), and Trémaugon's lectures at the University of Paris. This analysis allowed Schnerb-Lièvre to affirm that Trémaugon is one of the probable authors of the Latin text, if not the primary author, and that he directed and advised the French translator.<sup>355</sup>

*Dating:* This translation was produced in 1378 by order of King Charles V from an original Latin text (*Somnium viridarii*) written two years previously.<sup>356</sup>

<sup>351</sup> L. Marcel, *Analyse du songe du vergier, suivie d'une dissertation sur l'auteur de cet ouvrage célèbre avec conclusion en faveur de Charles de Louviers* (Paris, 1863).

<sup>352</sup> N. Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières, 1327–1405 et la croisade au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1896). For a modern edition of the *Songe du Vieil Pèlerin*, see G. W. Coopland, *Philippe de Mezières, Le Songe du Vieil Pèlerin (1386–1389)* (Cambridge, 1969).

<sup>353</sup> A. Coville, *Evrart de Trémaugon et le Songe du Vergier* (Paris, 1933).

<sup>354</sup> R. Bossuat, "Nicole Oresme et le Songe du Vergier," *Le Moyen Âge* 53 (1947): 83–130.

<sup>355</sup> Schnerb-Lièvre, *Le Songe du Vergier*, lxxvii–lxxxviii. See also eadem, *Somnium viridarii* (Paris, 1993), xlvii–li. For additional arguments against the attribution of this text to Nicole Oresme, see idem, "Nicole Oresme et le Songe du Vergier," *Romania* 113 (1992): 545–53.

<sup>356</sup> For a modern edition of the Latin text, see Schnerb-Lièvre, *Somnium viridarii*.

20. *Traictié de la premiere invention des monnoies* (Old French version of *Mn*)

*Incipit and explicit* (according to Wolowski's edition, 1): "Cy commence ung petit Traictié de la premiere Invention des monnoies et des causes et manières d'Icelle. . . X. . . temerairement condamner ce que bonnement ne se peult impugner ne contredire."

*Manuscripts:*

1. Paris, BnF, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, lat. 4594, fols. 19r–64r.
2. Paris, BnF, franç. 5913, fols. 1r–49r. Initium: "Traittie de la première origine et nature du droit et mutacion des monoyes." For Émile Bridrey this manuscript is the closest one to the (lost) original.<sup>357</sup>
3. Paris, BnF, franç. 11159, fols. 79r–129v.
4. Paris, BnF, franç. 23926, fols. 2r–47v (formerly Notre-Dame 172). Initium: "Traite de la premiere invention des monnoies par Nicolas Oresme." Colophon: "Finis tractatus de mutationibus monetarum a magistro Nycholao Oresme, sacre pagine professore, editus."
5. Paris, BnF, franç. 23927, fols. 2r–65v. Initium: "Traite de la premiere invention des monnaies par Nicole Oresme."
6. Paris, BnF, franç. 25153, fols. 1r–33v. Initium: "Petit traictie de la premiere invention des monnoies et des causes et manieres dicelles." Colophon: "Finit tractatus de mutacionibus monetarum a magistro Nicholao Oresme sacre pagine editus [*alia manu*: floruit sub Carolo quinto Francorum rege anno Domini 1364]."

*Early modern edition:* *Traité des monnoies*, Colard Mansion, Bruges, between 1477 and 1484.<sup>358</sup>

*Remarks:* The manuscripts, which date back to the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, are later than the edition.

*Modern editions:*

1. M. L. Wolowski, *Traictié de la première invention des monnoies*, 1–86, with the Latin text (see group VI, item 1), from MS Paris, BnF, franç. 23926.
2. J. E. Parker, "Maistre Nicole Oresme: Traictie des monnoyes" (Ph.D. diss., Syracuse University, 1952).<sup>359</sup>

<sup>357</sup> Bridrey, *Nicole Oresme* (n. 3 above), 76.

<sup>358</sup> According to Menut 1966, 290, the only known copy of this edition is at the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris.

<sup>359</sup> Menut 1966, 290 mentions this dissertation without a title. After an extensive correspondence with several libraries and research on different bibliographic databases, we could verify the existence of this dissertation in the following catalogue (from which we are obtaining our references): <https://catalog.syr.edu/vwebv/holdingsInfo?bibId=2081621> (accessed 12

3. Alain Boureau (ed.), *Nicole Oresme: Écrits métaphysiques, politiques et théologiques*, forthcoming.

*Attribution:* Nicole Oresme's authorship of this translation, which has been traditionally accepted, has recently been questioned. Meunier points to the lexicographical similarity with other works that are undoubtedly of Oresmian authorship.<sup>360</sup> Accepting this argument, Bridrey believes that the similarity of style is less decisive than some expressions that occur in the translator's foreword and conclusion, which would make clear that Oresme is addressing the Dauphin.<sup>361</sup> Sylvie Lefèvre points out that the translation style of the text is quite different from Oresme's Aristotelian translations.<sup>362</sup> Alain Boureau has recently provided additional arguments against the Oresmian authorship of this work. Following this line of research, we decided to label this text as spurious. See, however, the remarks in *Self-references*, below.

*Title:* The complete title is clearly established in the incipit of the text, although in the bibliography it is often referred to in an abbreviated form: *Traictié des monnoies*.

*Dating:* According to Bridrey, the text should be dated between 1358 and 1360.<sup>363</sup> A short passage in the text, which mentions the "temps en ça avons asséz veu par default de chief," has been considered as a clue for a date of composition when the dauphin Charles V was ruling at the behest of his father King Jean.<sup>364</sup>

*Self-references:* Oresme refers to a French treatise *de mutations de monnoies* once in *LdE* V, 11 ("... Et de ce ai je autre fois dit plus plainement en un *Traictié de Mutations de Monnoies*", ed. Menut, 297) and twice in *LdP*: I, 10 ("... ou *Traictey* que je fis de mutations de monnoie", ed. Menut, 64) and I, 12 ("... si comme il appert ou *Traitey due mutations de monnoiez*", ed. Menut, 67). As both sources, the *LdE* and the *LdP*, are in French, it is difficult to decide whether these self-references actually refer to the *Traictié de la premiere invention des monnoies* or to the previous *Mm* written in Latin. Contrary to Menut's indication, however, it is possible that Oresme is referring by this name "Traité" to the French version, and not to the Latin *Mm*. The aforementioned references to *CQM* (see above, group II, item 6) show that Oresme refers in both French writings to this text by its original Latin name, when he could have used a French expression

---

July 2021). This dissertation is held at the University of Syracuse Library under the call number "Microfilm 300."

<sup>360</sup> For example, by Menut 1966, 290–91.

<sup>361</sup> Bridrey, *Nicole Oresme* (n. 3 above), 69–71.

<sup>362</sup> See *Translations médiévales*, ed. Galderisi (n. 172 above), 702–703 (entry 403). For further details, see H. Laurent, "Le Problème des Traductions françaises du Traité des Monnaies d'Oresme dans les Pays-Bas bourguignons (fin du XIV<sup>e</sup> – début du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle)," *Revue d'histoire économique et sociale* 21 (1933): 13–24.

<sup>363</sup> Bridrey, *Nicole Oresme* (n. 3 above), 46.

<sup>364</sup> See Menut 1966, 291.

for it. Thus, we may assume that he would have used Latin to refer to *Mm*, had he wished to refer to this text. By using the French title instead, we believe that he is referring to the French *Traictié*.

Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München  
[d.diliscia@lrz.uni-muenchen.de](mailto:d.diliscia@lrz.uni-muenchen.de)

Université de Fribourg; Fonds National Suisse pour la Recherche Scientifique  
[aurora.panzica@unifr.ch](mailto:aurora.panzica@unifr.ch)

**Keywords:** Nicole Oresme, Inventory, fourteenth-century philosophy, manuscripts, John Buridan, history of science

#### APPENDIX I:

##### THE *QUESTIONS ON DE CELO* IN MS MUNICH, BSB, CLM 4375

As we have shown above (group VII, item 5), some elements suggest that the anonymous *Questions on Aristotle's De Celo* transmitted in MS Munich, BSB, Clm 4375 can be attributed to Nicole Oresme. In the following table we present a comparison between the *QdC* currently attributed to Oresme and edited by Claudia Kren (the left column) and the anonymous set of *Questions* on the same text transmitted in the Munich manuscript (the right column). The questions of Kren's edition are accompanied by their page numbers, while the questions from the Munich manuscript are accompanied by their folio numbers. As Kren's edition does not contain any table of contents for Oresme's commentary, this table is intended to guide the reader.

Oresme, <i>QdC</i> , ed. Kren	Munich, BSB, Clm 4375
I.1 Utrum ens mobile localiter sit subiectum in hoc libro (1)	I.1 Utrum maxima pars scientie naturalis sit circa corpora et magnitudines (fol. 47ra)
I.2 Utrum tantum sint tres dimensiones (16)	I.2 Utrum cuiuslibet corporis sint tantum tres dimensiones (fol. 47va)
	I.3 Utrum ternarius sit perfectissimus numerorum (fol. 48ra)
I.3 Utrum mundus sit perfectus (37)	I.4 Utrum mundus sit perfectus (fol. 48va)
I.4 Utrum mundus possit perfici (51)	
I.5 Utrum omne corpus naturale sit natu- raliter mobile secundum locum (65)	I.5 Utrum omne corpus naturale sit natu- raliter mobile secundum locum (fol. 49ra)

- I.6 Utrum tantum sint tres motus locales simplices secundum speciem, scilicet motus sursum et motus deorsum et circularis (81)
- I.7 Utrum cuiuslibet corporis simplicis sit tantum unus motus simplex secundum naturam et e contrario, scilicet an quilibet motus simplex sit tantum unius corporis simplicis secundum speciem (97)
- I.8 Utrum quodlibet mixtum sit naturaliter mobile secundum naturam elementi dominantis in ipso (111)
- I.9 Utrum celum sit alterius nature ab istis inferioribus (125)
- I.10 Utrum celum sit ingenitum, incorruptibile, inaugmentabile, inalterabile (143)
- I.11 Utrum in celo sit materia (159)
- I.12 Utrum motus circularis celi habeat contrarium (173)
- I.13 Utrum possit esse aliquod corpus infinitum immobile (189)
- I.14 Utrum possibile sit esse aliquod corpus infinitum mobile circulariter (201)
- I.15 Utrum possit esse aliquod infinitum mobile motu recto (218)
- I.16 Utrum possit esse aliqua res infinita (225)
- I.17 Utrum, si esset alter mundus, terra illius mundi moveretur ad centrum istius (243)
- I.18 Utrum sit possibile plures mundos esse (265)
- I.6 Utrum tantum sint tres motus locales secundum speciem simplices et non plures (fol. 49vb)
- I.7 Utrum aliquod corpus posset moveri localiter pluribus motibus simplicibus naturaliter (fol. 50rb)
- I.8 Utrum mixtum moveatur secundum motum simplicis dominantis (fol. 51ra)
- I.9 <Utrum> celum sit grave aut leve, calidum frigidum (fol. 52ra)
- I.10 Utrum celum habeat materiam (fol. 52va)
- I.11 Utrum celum sit ingenitum et incorruptibile, inaugmentabile  
<et> indissolubile (fol. 53rb)
- I.12 Utrum motus circularis celi habeat contrarium (fol. 53vb)
- I.13 Utrum aliqua pars celi possit moveri motu recto (fol. 54va)
- I.14 Utrum in hoc libro debeat determinari de infinito (fol. 55rb)
- I.17 Utrum sit possibile esse corpus infinitum (fol. 57ra)
- I.16 Utrum corpus infinitum, si esset, posset moveri (fol. 56rb)
- I.15 Utrum sit aliqua magnitudo infinita (fol. 55vb)
- I.18 Utrum, si esset alter mundus, terra illius mundi moveretur ad terram istius (fol. 57vb)
- I.19 Utrum sit possibile plures mundos esse (fol. 58vb)
- I.20 Utrum de facto sunt plures mundi (fol. 59rb)

---

*Continued*

*Continued*

Oresme, <i>QdC</i> , ed. Kren	Munich, BSB, Clm 4375
I.19 Utrum extra celum sit aliquid vel possit esse (279)	I.21 Utrum extra celum sit vel possit esse aliquid (fol. 59vb)
I.20 Utrum quelibet potentia activa determinetur per maximum in quod potest (295)	I.23 Utrum quelibet potentia passiva definiatur et determinetur per maximum in quod potest (fol. 62va)
I.21 Utrum quelibet potentia passiva terminetur per minimum a quo potest pati (353)	I.24 Utrum quelibet potentia passiva terminetur per minimum a quo potest pati (fol. 63va)
I.22 Utrum omne ens habeat potentiam durationis terminatam per maximum tempus quod potest durare (369)	I.25 Utrum quodlibet habeat potentiam ad durationem infinitam vel terminatam per maximum tempus per quod potest durare (fol. 64ra)
I.23 Utrum omne corruptibile de necessitate corrumpetur (389)	I.26 Utrum omne corruptibile de necessitate corrumpetur (fol. 64va)
I.24 Utrum genitum possit perpetuari, et utrum etiam aliquid quod fuit ab eterno corrumpi (409)	I.27 Utrum aliquid de novo genitum possit perpetuari in infinitum et aliquid quod fuit ab eterno possit corrumpi (fol. 65ra)
	I.28 Utrum possibile sit quod aliquid incipiat esse cui numquam fuit simile aliquid in specie specialissima aut quod aliquid desinat esse cui numquam erit aliquid simile (fol. 65va)
II.1 Utrum violentia vel contrarietas sit causa fatigationis (427)	
II.2 Utrum celum moveatur sine fatigatione (445)	II.1 Utrum celum moveatur sine labore et fatigatione et sine pena (fol. 66ra)
II.3 Utrum sex differentie positionis naturaliter distinguuntur in celo, que sunt sursum et deorsum, ante et retro, dextrum et sinistrum (461)	II.2 Utrum omnes differentie positionis in celo naturaliter sint distincte, scilicet sursum, deorsum, ante, retro, dexterum, sinistrum (fol. 67ra)
II.4 Utrum in celo polus antarcticus sit sursum et polus arcticus deorsum et oriens sit dextrum et occidens sinistrum, meridies ante et punctus oppositus scilicet medie noctis sit retro (477)	II.3 Utrum sex differentie positionis naturaliter distinguantur in celo eo modo quo ponit Aristoteles et Commentator, videlicet quod polus nobis semper sit occultus, scilicet antarcticus sit sursum, et polus apparens sit deorsum, et oriens sit dextrum et occidens sinistrum, et meridies sit ante et punctus oppositus, scilicet medie noctis, sit retro (fol. 67va)
II.5 Utrum talis consequentia sit bona: si celum movetur, igitur necesse est terram quiescere (493)	II.4 Utrum ista consequentia sit bona: si celum semper movetur, necesse est terram semper quiescere (fol. 68ra)

- II.6 Utrum ista consequentia sit bona:  
celum semper movetur, ergo ipsum  
necesse est moveri pluribus motis (507)
- II.7 Utrum motus naturalis sit velocior in  
fine quam in principio (525)
- II.12 Utrum macula que apparet in luna  
sit de natura ipsius lune (653)
- II.8 Utrum stelle moveantur regulariter et  
ad motum sui orbis (575)
- II.11 Utrum omnes stelle habeant lumen  
a sole vel alique ex se (637)
- II.9 Utrum corpora celestia in movendo  
faciunt vel causant sonum (591)
- II.10 Utrum omnes stelle et omnes  
<planete> sint eiusdem speciei specialis-  
sime (603)
- II.13 Utrum tota terra semper quiescat  
(667)
- III.1 Utrum ex eo quod elementa sunt  
gravia vel levia possit probari corpora  
non componi ex athomis (693)
- III.2 Utrum quatuor elementa determi-  
nant sibi figuras a natura (713)
- III.3 Utrum forme substantiales elemen-  
torum intendantur et remittantur, vel  
utrum suscipiunt magis et minus (743)
- IV.1 Utrum aliquod elementum sit grave  
in proprio loco (773)
- IV.2 Utrum aliquod simplex elementum  
sit non grave simpliciter vel non leve  
simpliciter (789)
- IV.3 Utrum grave in respectu vel leve  
possit ubique quiescere naturaliter  
(823)
- II.5 Utrum hec consequentia <sit bona>:  
celum semper movetur, ergo necesse est  
ipsum moveri pluribus motibus (fol. 68va)
- II.6 Utrum celum sit sphericum (fol. 69ra)
- I.22 Utrum motus naturalis sit velocior in  
fine quam in principio (fol. 60rb)
- II.7 Utrum macule que apparent in luna sint  
de eius natura (fol. 69va)
- II.11 Utrum stelle move<a>ntur per se vel  
ad motum sui orbis (fol. 71vb)
- II.8 Utrum stelle habeant lucem ex se vel a  
sole (fol. 70ra)
- II.10 Utrum stelle generent calorem in istis  
inferioribus per suum lumen (fol. 71rb)
- II.9 Utrum aliqua corpora celestia differant  
specie inter se (fol. 70va)
- II.12 Utrum sit aliqua sphaera nona ultra vel  
supra celum stellatum (fol. 72rb)
- II.13 Utrum tota terra circulariter moveatur  
(fol. 72vb)
- II.14 Utrum terra sit rotunda (fol. 73va)
- III.1 Utrum quatuor elementa determinant  
sibi figuras a natura (fol. 74ra)
- IV.1 Utrum quodlibet grave vel leve simplex  
moveatur de potentia essentiali a suo ge-  
nerante (fol. 74va)

---

*Continued*

*Continued*

Oresme, <i>QdC</i> , ed. Kren	Munich, BSB, Clm 4375
IV.4 Utrum aliquod grave vel leve possit naturaliter quiescere in medio alterius elementi alterius speciei (843)	IV.2 Utrum grave simplex moveatur a se (fol. 75va)
IV.5 Utrum quelibet duo corpora quorum unum est gravius in aere sic se habeant quod illud idem sit gravius in aqua vel in alio medio (867)	

## APPENDIX II:

## THE QUESTION AGAINST DIVINATION AND SUPERSTITION IN MS METZ 378

*Introductory Remarks*

In his *Tractatus de configurationibus qualitatum et motuum* Oresme deals not only with the geometrisation of magnitudes, like velocities and accelerations, but also with “intensities” broadly speaking. This comprehensive analysis of intensities leads Oresme to the consideration of other branches of knowledge, such as psychology, music theory, and, in general, “the occult causes of certain natural actions.”<sup>365</sup> The consideration of these matters within the doctrine of configurations makes a particular criticism of divination possible, something not unusual for Oresme, as we know from his works against astrology and especially from his *Livre de divinations*. He starts by establishing the “many arts or sciences by means of which men are accustomed to enquire into the future of things occult, secret, and hidden, or which can be applied to such uses.”<sup>366</sup> After mentioning the six parts of astrology, each of which he elaborates in the second chapter, Oresme warns that there are other “sciences,” like geomancy, hydromancy, palmistry, “experiments,” superstitions, the interpretation of sneezing, of encounters, of the song and flight of birds or the parts of dead animals, the magical art, nigromancy and the interpretation of dreams, for which the term ‘science’ itself cannot be properly used without abusing it, for they are vanities.<sup>367</sup> Magic (“ars magica”)

<sup>365</sup> *CQM*, I.28, ed. Clagett, 242–44.

<sup>366</sup> *LdD*, ed. Coopland, 52–53: “Premier chappitre. Plusieurs ars ou sciences sont, par lesquelles on seult enquerir des choses avenir, ou occultes, secretes, mucies, ou qui a ce puent estre appliquees.”

<sup>367</sup> *LdD*, ed. Coopland, 54: “Les autres sciences sont geomance, ydromance, et telx sors, cyromance, experimens, supersticions, et d’euspicias d’esternuer, de encontres, d’argumens par le chant des oyseaux, per les membres des bestes mortes, ars magian, nigromance, interpretations de songes, et plusieurs autres vanitez qui ne sont pas sciences fors a parler improprement.”



is included in this list among the pseudo-sciences and it occurs again (as “art magique”) as a characteristic component of the fifth and sixth parts of astrology that, in fact, “have no reasonable foundation and there is not truth in them.”<sup>368</sup>

In the second part of *De configurationibus*, where Oresme explains the utility of his doctrine of configurations for those things the parts of which cannot exist simultaneously, like time and motion (*successiva*), he deals again with matters that lie outside of the realm of physics as a “science of motion.” He is convinced that his new doctrine, especially as it involves an accurate analysis of the notion of difformity (*difformitas*), could offer a causal explanation of several unusual effects, for example, the effect of music on the passions of the soul. It is within this context that Oresme gives a critical account of the “magical arts,” since they “are based in part on the power and force of a certain configuration of sounds, both in melody and in words.”<sup>369</sup> He begins by distinguishing between two main parts of the magical arts. Oresme avoids discussing the first part, properly called “geomancy,” which involves the invocation of demons and is alien to natural philosophy. Instead, he concentrates on the second part of the magical arts “where some natural reason can be assigned and where a demon, even though invoked, does not operate externally at all.”<sup>370</sup> Oresme proposes a detailed exploration of the “roots” (*radices*) of the second part of magic: the “false conviction” (*falsa persuasio*), the “application of things (*rerum applicatio*), and “the power of words (*verborum virtus*). Oresme is aware that he is digressing from the question to be studied in this treatise. He insists on dealing with these matters, however, for the sake of laying bare “the falsity of this malign art,” and thus protecting every person of sound mind in the future. Before introducing the three roots of magic, he presents a self-referring passage, which runs as follows: “I have on another occasion demonstrated in a certain question by means of authority, argument, and induction that every man who has meddled in these things has been affected badly.”<sup>371</sup>

<sup>368</sup> *LdD*, ed. Coopland, 56–57: “La quinte partie, des interrogacions, et la sixte, des elections, n’ont point de raisonnable fondement et n’y a point de verite [. . .] ne telx ymages n’ont point d’effect se ce n’est par art magique ou par nigromance.”

<sup>369</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 334–35: “Inde est quod artes magice fundantur pro parte in quorundam sonorum certe configurationibus potentia et virtute tam in melodia quam in verbis.”

<sup>370</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 336–37: “Artis namque magice generaliter dicte due sunt partes: una que fit per demonem et alia que non fit per demonem. Ea namque que in demonum invocatione consistit ac eorum ministerio exercetur nigromantia proprius appellatur [. . .]. Hac igitur parte dimissa ad illam transire volo de qua potest assignari aliqua ratio naturalis.”

<sup>371</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 338–39: “Nunc autem utilitatis causa etsi in parte a proposito disgreddiar volo tamen circa hoc aliquantulum insistere et in declaratione istarum radicum huius artis maligne detegere falsitatem, ita ut opinor quod nullus sane mentis qui hic dicenda pensaverit ad tales artes afficietur in posterum, *et cum hoc alias in quadam questione per auctoritates, per rationes, et per inductionem ostendi omni homini male contingisse qui se immiscuit in hiis rebus*” (our italics).

As Marshall Clagett has pointed out, the only two candidates for this reference were the *Questio contra divinatores*, and the *Tractatus contra iudiciarios astronomos*.<sup>372</sup> The *Questio contra divinatores* can be excluded because it deals strictly with astrology. Likewise, according to Clagett, Oresme is not referring to the *Tractatus contra iudiciarios astronomos*, since the self-reference is to a *questio* and not to a treatise. Yet one could argue that this text has the form a *questio*, as it contains arguments in favor of princes devoting themselves to astrology (“in primo capitulo arguitur quod principes debeant studere in astrologia”) and their solutions (“in septimo solvuntur rationes adducte in principio questionis”). Moreover, the content of the *Tractatus* seems to correspond exactly to Oresme’s quotation in *CQM*. This is particularly evident in the second chapter, the content of which Oresme summarizes at the beginning of the text as follows: “in secundo inducitur, quomodo reges astrologi fuerunt infortunati.” The correspondence with the quotation in *CQM* concerns not only the content (*CQM*: “per inductionem ostendi omni homini male contingisse qui se immiscuit in hiis rebus”), but also the expression used (*Tractatus*: “in secundo inducitur”; *CQM*: “per inductionem ostendi”). Finally, Clagett mentions the possibility that the so-called “*Quodlibeta*” are the source for Oresme self-reference in *CQM*.<sup>373</sup>

Another reference to an Oresmian question/treatise about the negative social effects of divination can be found in an anti-astrological treatise by one of Oresme’s followers: Henry of Langenstein. In his *Tractatus contra astrologos coniunctionistas*, Henry refers twice to a question on astrology by Oresme.<sup>374</sup> Even though the first reference is to a “treatise” and the second to a “questio,” the content of the two passages seems to indicate that Henry is referring to one and the same work, in which Oresme, based on historical examples, shows the social uselessness of astrologers.<sup>375</sup> The content of the only Oresmian *questio* devoted to astrology, namely the *Questio contra divinatores horoscopios*, does not

<sup>372</sup> *QcD*, ed. Caroti; and *CAJ*, which has been edited twice: H. Pruckner, *Studien zu den astrologischen Schriften des Heinrich von Langenstein* (Leipzig, 1933), 227–45 and 284–86; and G. W. Coopland, *Nicole Oresme and the Astrologers: A Study of his “Livre de divinacions”* (Liverpool, 1952), 123–41.

<sup>373</sup> *CQM*, ed. Clagett, 127. This collection of questions, however, displays a highly complex structure. On this work, see also Delaurenti, “Contre la magie démoniaque et les incantations” (n. 152 above), 251–97.

<sup>374</sup> Henry of Langenstein, *Tractatus contra astrologos coniunctionistas*, ed. Pruckner, 139–206.

<sup>375</sup> Henry of Langenstein, *Tractatus contra astrologos coniunctionistas*, II.8, ed. Pruckner, 193: “Item res publica numquam profecit ex parte illius facultatis, pocius fatuitatis, ut deduxit magister Nicholaus Orem ex hystoriis in quodam tractatu;” and III.3, ed. Pruckner, 200–201: “Ad quid ergo tenentur apud principes et sustentantur bonis communitatis, si in nullo proficiant rei publice, sed pocius officiant et noceant in gubernatione humane politie, ut deduxit magister Nicolaus Orem in questione, utrum principibus expediat habere astrologos, per multas hystorias” (our italics).

fit this context, as this text represents a general attack against the philosophical foundation of astrology, and does not deal with its negative social effects. Again, the *Tractatus* seems to provide a better source for these quotations. As we have already pointed out, this text presents a structure that, without being a “questio” in a strict sense, comes very close to it. It is for this reason that Hubert Pruckner identifies the “quodam tractatu” of the first quotation with the “question” of the second, and both with the *Tractatus contra astronomos judicarios*.<sup>376</sup>

Whereas the identification of Langenstein’s quotations in his *Tractatus contra astrologos coniunctionistas* and Oresme’s quotation in *CQM* with Oresme’s *Tractatus* seems quite probable, there is a significant new document that should be considered in this deliberation. This document is a single incomplete question conveyed in a neglected Oresmian manuscript: Metz, Bibliothèques-Médiathèques, MS 378. This manuscript, which for a long time was misplaced, contains only two texts in two different hands. Fols. 1r–58r convey a complete copy of Oresme’s *CQM*. According to our knowledge, this is the only manuscript of Oresme’s *CQM* that has been identified after Clagett’s edition in 1968. The second text, on fols. 58r–60r, is a question on the subject matter of divinations entitled: *Utrum magicis et supersticiosis artibus, que scilicet tractant de prestigiis, auguriis et vaticiniis futurorum, sint licite usus, fides et studium adhibendi vel non*.<sup>377</sup> We offer here a transcription of this text as it appears in the manuscript, which, incidentally, is the only witness we are aware of. It is also worth noticing that the manuscript has been damaged. The original length and contents are unknown. Only the text of *CQM* is complete, but not the text of the question on divination. We estimate that the manuscript preserves approximately a third of the original text: the setting of the problem, the *oppositum*, and the beginning of the answer to the question. The fragmentary state of the text makes impossible a decision regarding its authorship, but a transcription of this text could help to identify further witnesses that in turn could result in a better answer to this problem. For this reason, we do not affirm Oresme’s authorship conclusively, but we do not exclude it either.

The content of the fragmentary question is a refutation of divinations. Its structure is clear. It starts by giving eleven *argumenta pro*, according to which there is nothing in these arts that would require them to be prohibited. These arguments are followed by an *oppositum* made up of five arguments against divination, sortileges, and the like. Finally, there follows the resolutive section, of which we only have the beginning. Before this section, a short paragraph offers

<sup>376</sup> Pruckner, *Studien zu den astrologischen Schriften*, 193 and 200 (apparatus fontium).

<sup>377</sup> The manuscript was first reported by D. A. Di Liscia, *Zwischen Geometrie und Naturphilosophie* (n. 287 above), 420, and later with further details in idem, “La ‘latitud de las formas’” (n. 129 above), 92–94.

a description of the discussion to come, so that we can estimate with a certain degree of accuracy how much we have lost, namely, almost all of this final section:

“Ista questio propter prolixitatem in quinque dividitur: primo erit sicut propositum in principio; secundo an effectus quatuor qui magicis artibus attribuuntur qui postea dicentur sint homini possibles per naturam; tertio an sint homini possibles cum adiuvio dyaboli; quarto an sit homini commutabiles a Dei potentia absoluta; quinto an eius usus et studium sint licite exhibendi.”

While we cannot assume Oresme’s authorship, we affirm that an uncritical rejection of it seems at least equally problematic. Moreover, we find that there are some indications that make a provisional attribution to Oresme at least plausible:

1. The self-referring passage in *CQM* mentions a *questio* on the problem of magic and divinations. Generally speaking, there are many questions related to this topic in Oresme’s works, including the *Questio contra divinatores* and many of the questions mentioned in the “*Tabula problematum*.” None of these, however, seems to match the sense of Oresme’s self-reference.<sup>378</sup>
2. The text is included in an Oresme manuscript accompanying *CQM*, the work that contains the self-reference.
3. The matter of the question is quite typical of Oresme’s approach, emphasizing the negative impact of such “bad arts” on social life.
4. The sources of this work speak in favor of Oresme’s authorship or, at least, make it difficult to deny an attribution to Oresme. These sources are the same authors and often the same passages that Oresme mentions in other works on astrology: biblical passages on prophecies and divinations, Aristotle, Seneca, Augustine, Ambrosius, Cassiodorus, Isidore of Seville, Rabanus Maurus, Gratian, and Thomas Aquinas. Even though these sources are present in Oresme’s works, they are not *exclusive* to Oresme. In fact, they are common sources for discussing this subject matter. One may consider it especially problematic that Thomas Aquinas is mentioned as “sanctus doctor.” This expression is not usual in Oresme’s writings, but he refers explicitly to “Sanctus Thomas” in the last redaction of his commentary on the *Meteorologica*.<sup>379</sup> Finally,

<sup>378</sup> The question *contra divinatores* edited by S. Caroti is devoted to astrology throughout, which is not the main issue. The following questions are particularly relevant in the *Tabula problematum*: 1, 2, 3, 4, 29, 30, 35, 37, 43, 44, 152, 154, and 170. See Hansen, *Nicole Oresme and the Marvels of Nature* (n. 147 above), 365–93.

<sup>379</sup> Alain Boureau pointed out to D. A. Di Liscia this difficulty for an attribution to Oresme. In general, Boureau is of the opinion that this text is only an insignificant collection of sources made perhaps by a Dominican friar (hence the reference to Aquinas as “sanctus doctor”), which can in no way be attributed to Oresme (personal communication 16 May

several sources are “self-contained,” especially those belonging to the core of the traditional Christian refutation of astrology. Starting with some of well-known passages of the Bible, the discussion moves directly to Augustine, whose fight against astrologers and diviners remained emblematic in the later Middle Ages. Then the text continues with Isidore of Seville (the author’s preferred authority). From Isidore the argument jumps to Rabanus Maurus’ *De magicis artibus* and, finally, to the *Decretum Gratiani*, a very well-known work that could have assumed the function of an ideal vehicle of transmission for these sorts of materials.<sup>380</sup>

5. It is true that the extant part of this text is a simple collection of sources, but this is not unusual for anticipating the arguments *pro* and *contra* for any scholastic question, whoever the author may be. It is still possible that a later author could have collected these sources and given to the discussion a sort of “Oresmian touch,” for there is evidence that Oresme’s approach was influential in some later authors. This argument, one should bear in mind, is valid for Oresme as well, who could have also prepared such a collection of arguments by picking up these passages in different sources before proceeding to the discussion.

Thus, nothing in this question is contrary to Oresme, either in method or content. And, of course, we do not know how the text concluded. Nevertheless, as long as no definitive argument for the opposite position can be convincingly adduced, we should include this short fragment to the discussion. It may be a first step toward the identification of Oresme’s self-reference in *CQM*.

#### *Latin Text*

<Quaestio utrum magicis et superstitiosis artibus, que scilicet tractant de prestigiis, auguriis et vaticiniis futurorum, sint licite usus, fides et studium adhibendi

---

2019). Regarding this argument, one should determine whether there is a significant difference between referring to Thomas Aquinas as “sanctus” or “beatus,” for this second term is, in fact, used by Oresme in his *Questio contra divinatores*: “Et ideo male dicit beatus Thomas” (*QCQP*, ed. Caroti, 233). In addition, the passage in Oresme’s commentary on the *Meteorologica* runs: “Quantum ad primum sciendum est quod fuit *opinio Sancti Thome* quod motus localis est causa calefactionis quia in genere motuum motus localis est primus.” See *QsM de ultima lectura*, questio I.8, ed. Panzica, 158, line 5. Moreover, Oresme refers at least twice to “saint Tomas d’Aquin” in his *LdC* (ed. Menut and Denomy, 472, line 73; and 690, line 95).

<sup>380</sup> This is a work with a complex structure that was conveyed in different versions. On this problem, see A. Winroth, “The Two Recensions of Gratian’s Decretum,” *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung* 83 (1997): 22–31; and idem, *The Making of Gratian’s Decretum* (Cambridge, 2000).

vel non>. [58r] <. . .>atio istam questionem<sup>381</sup> utrum magicis et superstitiosis artibus, que scilicet tractant de prestigiis, auguriis et vaticiniis futurorum, sint licite usus, fides et studium adhibendi vel non.

Arguitur quod sic, quia omnis ars, et per consequens magica, est recta ratio factibilium, sexto *Ethicorum*,<sup>382</sup> et aliquid bonum appetens et intendens, primo *Ethicorum*.<sup>383</sup> Unde Augustinus: “quis audet dicere disciplinam aliquam esse malam”? Dicit etiam nullo modo aliquam intelligentiam esse malam,<sup>384</sup> quia secundum Aristotelem omnis doctrina est de numero bonorum honorabilium,<sup>385</sup> sed constat nichil tale esse illicitum, ergo, etc.

Secundo: vel scibilia artium magicarum sunt bona — et propositum —, vel mala — et propositum adhuc, quia nedum licet, sed expedit malum scire ut evitetur, quia secundum Boetium non evitatur malum nisi cognitum prius.<sup>386</sup> Et ideo dicit Alexander super *Elenchos* quod Aristoteles docuit ibi dolum sine dolo.<sup>387</sup> Unde

<sup>381</sup> The manuscript begins with “-atio,” which could be the ending of several Latin words, all appropriate in this context, like *affirmatio*, *disputatio*, *determinatio*, *enuntiatio*, and so on. More astonishing, however, is the accusative that follows (*istam quaestionem*), clearly legible in the manuscript, where one would expect a genitive form (*iste quaestionis* . . .). Perhaps this was the first word of a participial construction.

<sup>382</sup> Aristotle, *Ethica* VI.4, 1140a21–22. Compare J. Hamesse, *Les Auctoritates Aristotelis: Un florilège médiéval. Étude historique et édition critique* (Louvain, 1974), 240 (111): “ars est recta ratio factibilium.”

<sup>383</sup> Aristotle, *Ethica* I.1, 1094b12–30: “Omnis ars et omnis doctrina, similiter autem et actus et electio, bonum quoddam appetere videtur,” AL 26.1–3 (Leiden, 1972), 141.

<sup>384</sup> Augustine, *De libero arbitrio libri tres*: “A.: Aliquid boni existimas esse disciplinam? E.: Quis audeat dicere malum esse disciplinam?” in *S. Avrelii Augustini Contra academicos. De beata vita. De ordine. De magistro. De libero arbitrio*, ed. W. M. Green and K. D. Daur, CCL 29 (Turnhout, 1970), 212.

<sup>385</sup> Aristotle, *De anima* I.1, 402a1; and Hamesse, *Les Auctoritates Aristotelis*, 174 (1): “Scientia est de numero bonorum honorabilium.” See also Oresme’s commentary in his *QdA*, ed. Patar, 5.

<sup>386</sup> The statement “non evitatur malum nisi prius cognitum” is not included in the *Auctoritates Aristotelis*, but, it appears, for instance, in the *Chronica Aegidii Muisis* dated from 1349. See J.-J. De Smet, “Recueil des Chroniques de Flandre,” in *Collection de Chroniques Belges inédites publiée par ordre du Gouvernement et par les soins de la Commission Royale d’Histoire* (Brussels, 1841), 2:342. It is a direct borrowing from Boethius’s *De topicis differentiis*, where Boethius’s compares syllogism to induction, giving the following example of the latter: “Qui scit canere cantor est, et qui luctari luctator est, quique aedificare, aedificator est. Quibus multis simili ratione collectis inferri potest, qui scit igitur malum malus est, quod non procedit. Mali quippe notitia deesse bono non potest, virtus enim sese diligit et aspernatur contraria, nec vitare vitium nisi cognitur queat.” See Boethius, *De differentiis topicis libri duo*, PL 64, col. 1184AB.

<sup>387</sup> This quotation cannot be found in any Greek text of Alexander’s commentary on the *Sophistici Elenchi*, but it occurs in several medieval authors. The work referred to as Alexander’s commentary on the *Sophistici Elenchi* is, in fact, a translation of Michael of Ephesus’s commentary. This text can be consulted in S. Ebbesen, *Commentators and Commentaries on*

Ambrosius super *Lucam* et in tertia: “legimus aliqua ne negligantur [58v], legimus aliqua ne ignoremus, et legimus ut repudiemus.”<sup>388</sup>

Tertio: si forent illicite, hoc potissime esset quia ille videntur continere aliqua non consona catholice veritati; sed hoc non obstante tamen, quia doctrine gentium expressam heresim continent, permittuntur de facto, sicut patet in studiis generalibus, sicut pluribus testimoniis sanctorum habetur in decreto 37 “de pluribus” capitulo,<sup>389</sup> tum etiam, quia ipse non modicum edificare videntur ad veritatis catholice firmitatem et ad incredulorum hereses confundendas propter multos effectus nature qui per invocationem nominum demonum, sicut ille artes docent, narrantur evenire et evenisse, sicut de infideli doctissimo fertur ipsum propter eorum admirationem fuisse ad fidem conversum.

Quarto: licitum videtur veritates ignotas inquirere, presertim quando proficit eas sciri et nulli homini preiudicium generatur, quia omnes homines eas naturaliter scire desiderant.<sup>390</sup> Sed ita potest fieri per artes magicas, ergo, etc.

Quinto: tales divini dicuntur quasi Deo pleni secundum Ysidorum,<sup>391</sup> ut videtur, sed nichil tale est illicitum, ergo, etc.

Sexto: prudentia nos invitat ad providentiam futurorum, secundum Senecam, *De quattuor virtutibus cardinalibus*.<sup>392</sup> Sed providentia futurorum esse non potest sine eorum prescientia, que precise per artes magicas ignotescit, ergo, etc.

Septimo: tales artes fuerunt licite et permisse usque ad evidentiam nove legis secundum Ysidorum.<sup>393</sup> Sed eadem ratione videntur nunc esse licite, ergo, etc.

---

*Aristotle's Sophistici Elenchi: A Study of Post-Aristotelian Ancient and Medieval Writings on Fallacies* (Leiden, 1981), 2:371–74 and 3:157–58.

<sup>388</sup> Ambrose, *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam*: “Legimus aliqua, ne legantur: legimus, ne ignoremus: legimus non ut teneamus, sed ut repudiemus, et ut sciamus qualia sint in quibus magnifici isti cor exaltant suum,” ed. M. Adriaen, in *Sancti Ambrosii Mediolanensis Opera*, CSL 14 (Turnhout, 1957), 1:7, lines 21–24.

<sup>389</sup> *Locus non inventus*.

<sup>390</sup> These are exactly Aristotle's famous opening words in *Metaphysica* I,1, 980a21: “Omnes homines scire desiderant natura” AL 25.1–1a (Leiden, 1970), 3.

<sup>391</sup> Isidore, *Etymologiae*, VIII.7, ed. W. M. Lindsay (Oxford, 1911), vol. 1, par. 14, lines 9–10. The sentence occurs also in *Decretum Gratiani (De multipli genere divinationis)*, where, after the fourfold division of the divination genre proposed by Varro (mentioned below), it is stated: “divini dicti sunt, quasi deo pleni” (PL 187, col. 1342A).

<sup>392</sup> Pseudo-Seneca, Martin of Braga (?), “Si prudens esse cupis in futura prospectum intende,” in *Seneca de quattuor virtutibus cardinalibus* (Colonia, 1504), fol. Aiii. About this author in this context, see *LdD*, ed. Coopland, 178–80. The *Auctoritates Aristotelis* contains a section called also “De quattuor virtutibus cardinalibus,” which is also based on Martin of Braga. Compare *Les auctoritates Aristotelis*, ed. Hamesse (n. 382 above), 281–82. Our quotation is not there.

<sup>393</sup> After defining several concepts belonging to astrology and divinations, Isidore explains: “Primum autem iidem stellarum interpretes magi nuncupabantur, sicut de his legitur qui in Evangelio natum Christum annuntiaverunt; postea hoc nomine soli mathematici. Cujus artis scientia usque ad Evangelium fuit concessa, ut Christo edito nemo exinde

Item nullius artis ad finem ad quem ordinatur est abusus, nec per consequens illicitus; aliter fieret frustra. Etiam, quia omnis ars bonum intendit, primo *Ethicorum*.<sup>394</sup> Sed artes magice ad divinationes et auguria[s] ordinantur.

Item primo *Regum*, 28 capitulo, dicitur Samuelem prophetiam ad mulierem habentem phitonem pronosticare Sauli adventum vel eventum belli futuri Philisteis.<sup>395</sup> Sed sanctorum anime non videntur favere interrogationibus nec artibus illicitis, ergo, etc.

Item viros sanctos legimus usus fuisse divinare divinationibus sompniorum et auguriis, sicut Daniel propheta, qui interpretatus est sompna regis Babilonis, sicut patet *Daniele* 3, 24.<sup>396</sup> Sicut etiam Joseph filius Jacob<i> qui ex sompniis suis et sompniis eunuchorum regis pharaonis Egipti certiter prognosticavit futura, sicut legitur *Genesis* 37 et 40.<sup>397</sup> Similiter de eo legitur *Genesis* 20<sup>398</sup> suis [59r] fratribus se dixisse: “an ignoratis quia non sit mei similis in augurando vel in augurandi scientia?” Ideo videtur esse licitum eas scire et eis uti.

Item, posito quod sint illicite ille per quas mali angeli adiuvantur, saltem ille sunt bone et licite per quas non nisi boni angeli adiuvantur. Sed alique sunt tales, sicut patet, tum quia aliquo modo fiunt per invocationem nominum demonorum, tum quia multa<sup>399</sup> horrida videntur per eas invocari, ergo, etc.

Oppositum patet primo quia tales artes sunt prohibite in iure canonico et divino, unde *Deuteronomio* 18: “non inveniatur in te qui ariolos sciscitetur aut

---

nativitatem alicujus de coelo interpretaretur.” Isidore, *Etymologiae*, VIII.9, ed. Lindsay, vol. 1, par. 25, lines 8–13.

<sup>394</sup> Aristotle, *Ethica* I.1, 1094b12–30.

<sup>395</sup> The passage, however, is 1 Sam. 28:5–9: “Et vidit Saul castra Philisthijm, et timuit, et expavit cor ejus nimis. Consuluitque Dominum, et non respondit ei neque per sacerdotes (!) neque per somnia, neque per prophetas. Dixitque Saul servis suis: *Quaerite mihi mulierem habentem pythonem*, et vadam ad eam, et sciscitabor per illam. Et dixerunt servi ejus ad eum: Est mulier pythonem habens in Endor. Mutavit ergo habitum suum, vestitusque est aliis vestimentis, et abiit ipse, et duo viri cum eo: veneruntque ad mulierem nocte, et ait illi: Divina mihi in pithone, et suscita mihi quem dixeris tibi. Et ait mulier ad eum: Ecce, tu nosti quanta fecerit Saul, et quomodo eraserit magos et ariolos de terra: quare ergo insidiaris animae meae, ut occidar?” (our emphasis), *Biblia latina cum glosa ordinaria* (Strasbourg 1480–81), cited from the facsimile reprint of the Editio princeps by Adolph Rusch of Strassbourg (Turnhout, 1992), 2:44–45. Instead of “Philisteis,” the manuscript conveys the ending “-iens,” which could be a Gallicism.

<sup>396</sup> In fact, the passage involved is the one immediately following, that is, Dan. 4:1–3 on Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, which Daniel had to interpret.

<sup>397</sup> Gen. 37:1–36 narrates the story of Joseph, Jacob’s favorite son, who was betrayed by his own brothers because of his dreams. Gen. 40:8–15 is about Joseph’s interpretation of the dreams of the Pharaoh’s two eunuchs.

<sup>398</sup> Gen. 20:1–18 narrates God’s appearance in dreams to Abimelech, who married Abraham’s wife unknowingly. The passage quoted here is Gen. 44:15–16, where Joseph asks his brothers: “cur sic agere voluistis an ignoratis quod non sit similis mei in augurandi scientia” See *Biblia latina*, 1:100.

<sup>399</sup> multa] *correximus ex* milla.



observet sompnia aut auguria, nec sit maleficus, neque incantator, neque phitones consulat ut demones, nec inquirat a mortuis veritatem. Omnia enim hec abominatur Deus.”<sup>400</sup>

Item in decreto 26,<sup>401</sup> questio 5, totum sacris canonibus et conciliis prohibet, etiam sanctorum auctoritatibus tales artes dampnantur, et anathematizantur eorum secutores tamquam cultores ydolorum et ab ecclesia et communione sanctorum fidelium repellendi, et nedum uxores, sed etiam illi qui eas crediderunt observandas. Unde eadem questio, capitulo “nec mirum,” in rubrica, dicitur quod ea que magorum prestigiis fiunt, non vera, sed fantastica esse probantur.<sup>402</sup> Etiam hoc patet ex multis dictis beati Augustini et ab Ysidoro undecimo *Ethimologiarum*<sup>403</sup> capitulo quarto, quod “magi sunt qui vulgo malefici ob facinorum magnitudinem nuncupantur.” Unde Ysidorus in eodem capitulo prope finem dicit quod “in omnibus talibus artibus ars demonum est ex quadam pestifera societate hominum et angelorum malorum exorta.” Etiam sequitur: “unde cuncta sunt evitanda a Christiano et omni penitus execratione cavenda atque dampnanda.”<sup>404</sup>

In *Decretalibus* habetur extra de sortilegiis, primo capitulo et capitulo “ex mare,” ubi de quodam presbytero qui <cum> quodam infami, scilicet mago, ad locum privatum accessit, non ea intentione ut immolaret demonem, sed ut inspectione astrolabii furtum cuiusdam ecclesie posset recuperari.<sup>405</sup> Dico quod licet hoc

<sup>400</sup> Deut. 18:10–12: “Nec inveniatur in te qui lustret filium suum, aut filiam, ducens per ignem: aut qui ariolos sciscitetur, aut observet somnia atque auguria, nec sit maleficus, nec incantator, necque pythones consulat, nec divinos, et querat a mortuis veritatem. Omnia enim hec abominatur dominus.” See *Biblia latina*, 1:397–98. This passage is a *locus classicus* in the Christian criticism of astrology and occult sciences. See, for instance, Augustine, *De scriptura sacra speculum*, PL 34, col. 899.

<sup>401</sup> *Decretum Gratiani, pars secunda, causa 26*, q. 5: “Quod autem sortilegii et divini, si cessare noluerint, excommunicandi sint, ratione et auctoritate probatur” (PL 187, cols. 1345–46).

<sup>402</sup> Our author refers here to the important fourteenth chapter of the *Decretum Gratiani* by its incipit “nec mirum . . .” He then makes his argument against astrology by calling attention to the title of the chapter: “*Quae magorum praestigiis fiunt non vera, sed phantastica esse probantur. Nec mirum de magorum praestigiis*,” PL 187, col. 1352B.

<sup>403</sup> Verbatim from Isidore, *Etymologiae*, VIII.7, ed. Lindsay (n. 391 above), vol. 1, par. 9, lines 16–19: “Magi sunt qui vulgo malefici ob facinorum magnitudinem nuncupantur. Hi et elementa concutiunt, turbant mentes hominum, ac sine ullo veneni haustu violentia tantum carminis interimunt.” The same sentence is mentioned again below.

<sup>404</sup> Isidore, *Etymologiae*, VIII.10, ed. Lindsay (n. 391 above), vol. 1, par. 31, lines 23–26: “In quibus omnibus ars daemonum est ex quadam pestifera societate hominum et angelorum malorum exorta. Vnde cuncta vitanda sunt a Christiano et omni penitus execratione repudianda atque damnanda.”

<sup>405</sup> The reference goes back to the *Decretalium Gregorii papae IX complicationis liber V* by Raymond of Penyafort, where one finds *Titulus XXI: De sortilegiis*. Chapter 1 states: “Sortilegia pro futuris inveniendis vel divinationibus faciendis prohibentur, et contra facientibus poena imponitur.” Moreover, Chapter 2 includes a text to which our author refers: “Presbyter,

ex bono zelo et simplicitate se fecisse proponat, illud tamen gravissimum fuit et non modicum inde traxit maculam.

Item Cassiodorus super *Psalmm* “astrologiam sacrilegam summa intentione fugiamus, quam etiam nobilium philosophorum iudicia dampnaverunt”,<sup>406</sup> quod etiam intelligetur quantum [59v] ad illam partem astrologie que divinatur futura. Concordatur Ysidorus, libro tertio *Etymologiarum*, capitulo ante penultimum,<sup>407</sup> ubi prope finem dicit “horum igitur signorum observatores fidei nostre sine dubio contrarii sunt.” Aliique rerum veritate commoti concordi sententia damnauerunt, et subdunt rationem Aristotelis, quia si homines ad actus varios nascendi necessitate premerentur, cur aut laudes mereantur boni aut mali legum percipiant ultionem? Quasi dicens quod omnia de necessitate fierent, et sic nullus esset pro meritis vel demeritis suis vituperandus vel laudandus, permitendus nec prohibendus, sicut dicit Aristoteles primo *Peri Hermeneias* et tertio huius.<sup>408</sup>

---

qui per inspectionem astrolabii furta requirit, ad tempus suspenditur ab altaris ministerio. Ita communiter summatur; sed in veritate haec summatio non est indistincte vera, quia acrius potest puniri.” This statement goes back further to the pronouncement by Pope Alexander III (d. 1181), which, as incorporated into the *Decretalia*, runs as follows: “Alexander III. Grandensi Patriarchae. Ex tuarum tenore literarum accepimus, quod V. presbyter, *lator praesentium, iuvenili levitate usus*, cum quodam infami ad privatum locum *immundum spiritum invocaturus* accessit. *Unde tu eum, quia propter hoc infamia laborabat, et facinus publicum et notorium erat, ab officio et beneficio ecclesiastico suspendisti. Ipse autem coram nobis viva voce proposuit, quod non ea intentione, ut vocaret daemonium, ierat, sed ut inspectione astrolabii furtum cuiusdam ecclesiae posset recuperari. Verum, licet hoc ex bono zelo et ex simplicitate se fecisse proponat: id tamen gravissimum fuit, et non modicum inde maculam peccati contraxit.*” See *Corpus Iuris Canonici, Pars Secunda: Decretalium Collectiones; Decretales Gregorii p. IX*, ed. E. L. Richter and E. Friedberg (Leipzig, 1881), 822–23. See also A. J. Duggan, “Master of Decretals: A Reassessment of Alexander III’s Contribution to Canon Law,” in *Pope Alexander III (1159–81): The Art of Survival*, ed. P. Clarke and A. Duggan (Farnham 2012), 365–417.

<sup>406</sup> Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalmum LXX*: “Tantum est ut astrologiam sacrilegam summa intentione fugiamus, quam etiam nobilium philosophorum iudicia dampnaverunt,” ed. M. Adriaen, in *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Expositio Psalmorum I-LXX*, CSL 97 (Turnhout, 1958), 1:640, lines 515–17.

<sup>407</sup> This reading is conjectural.

<sup>408</sup> This passage is a reworking of Isidore’s *Etymologiae*, III.71, ed. Lindsay (n. 391 above), vol. 1, par. 38–41, lines 6–21: “Horum igitur signorum observationes, vel geneses, vel cetera superstitiosa, quae se ad cognitionem siderum coniungunt, id est ad notitiam fatorum, et fidei nostrae sine dubitatione contraria sunt, sic ignorari debent a Christianis ut nec scripta esse videantur. Sed nonnulli, siderum pulchritudine et claritate pellecti, in lapsus stellarum caecatis mentibus corruerunt, ita ut per supputationes noxias, quae mathe-sis dicitur, eventus rerum praescire posse conentur; quos non solum Christianae religionis doctores, sed etiam gentilium, Plato, Aristoteles, atque alii, rerum veritate commoti, concordi sententia damnauerunt, dicentes confusionem rerum potius de tali persuasione generari. Nam si (ut dicunt) genus humanum ad varios actus nascendi necessitate premitur, cur, aut laudem mereantur boni, aut mali legum percipiant ultionem? Et quamvis ipsi non fuerint

Item quarto *De trinitate*, capitulo octavo, dicitur quod magi, quidquid possunt, per demonem possunt.<sup>409</sup> Et Augustinus octavo *De civitate Dei*, capitulo decimo octavo et capitulo secundo, secundum aliam quotationem, dicit quod “crimen artium magicarum a se alienum deffendit seque aliter non vult innocentem videri nisi ea negando que non possunt ab innocente committi, ac omnia miracula magorum, quos recte censant esse dampnandos doctrinis fiunt et operibus demonum.”<sup>410</sup> Et igitur septimo capitulo Augustinus dicit quod non immerito creditur quod, cum astrologi vera respondent, occulta influentia fit spirituum non honorum. Item in eodem libro et pluries alibi ipse plures artes dampnabiles dicit et etiam earum sequutores, et dyabolicas vocat eas ipse et alii quamplures.<sup>411</sup>

Ista questio propter prolixitatem in quinque dividitur: primo erit sicut propositum in principio; secundo an effectus quatuor qui magicis artibus ascribuntur, que postea dicentur sint homini possibiles per naturam; tertio an sint homini possibiles cum adiuvio dyaboli; quarto an sint homini commutabiles<sup>412</sup> a Dei potentia absoluta; quinto an eius usus et studium sint licite exhibendi.

---

coelesti sapientiae dediti, veritatis tamen testimonio, errores eorum merito perculerunt.” Such a statement does not appear in Aristotle’s *Peri Hermenias*, nor can anything similar be found in the *Auctoritates Aristotelis*. Moreover, as we saw in the quoted passage, there is no such reference to Aristotle’s *Peri Hermeneias* in Isidore’s *Etymologiae*. This is an indication that the author is probably taking some of his references from another compilation or *florilegium*.

<sup>409</sup> Augustine, *De Trinitate*, III.12: “Hic video quid infirmæ cogitationi possit occurrere, cur scilicet ista miracula etiam magicis artibus fiant. Nam et magi pharaonis similiter serpentes fecerunt et alia similia. [. . .] Unde intellegi datur ne ipsos quidem transgressores angelos et aerias potestates in imam istam caliginem tamquam in sui generis carcerem ab illius sublimis aetheriae puritatis habitatione detrusas, per quas magicae artes possunt quidquid possunt, valere aliquid nisi data desuper potestate.” ed. W. J. Mountain and F. Glorie, in *Augustini de trinitate libri XV*, CCL 50A (Turnhout, 1968), 138–39.

<sup>410</sup> In *De civitate Dei*, Augustine critically discusses astrology and divinatory arts several times, especially in Book 8, Chapter 19, from where the same passage was taken verbatim: “Huius autem philosophi Platonici copiosissima et disertissima extat oratio, qua crimen artium magicarum a se alienum esse defendit seque aliter non vult innocentem uideri nisi ea negando, quae non possunt ab innocente committi. At omnia miracula magorum, quos recte sentit esse damnandos, doctrinis fiunt et operibus daemonum, quos uiderit cur censeat honorandos, eos necessarios adserens perferendis ad deos precibus nostris, quorum debemus opera deuitare, si ad deum uerum preces nostras uolumus peruenire,” Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, VIII.19, ed. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, in *Augustini de civitate Dei libri I–X*, CCL 47 (Turnhout, 1955), 236.

<sup>411</sup> Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, V.7: “His omnibus consideratis, non immerito creditur, cum astrologi mirabiliter multa vera respondent, occulto instinctu fieri spirituum non bonorum, quorum cura est has falsas et noxias opiniones de astralibus fatibus inserere humanis mentibus atque firmare, non horoscopi notati et inspecti aliqua arte, quae nulla est,” ed. Dombart and Kalb, 135.

<sup>412</sup> This reading is conjectural.

Sed pro ista questione volo in summa colligere omnia genera istarum artium magicarum secundum quod numerat eas Ysidorus, quinto *Etymologiarum* capitulo nono, Augustinus, nono *De civitate Dei*, Gratianus, 26a questione et sanctus Doctor in 2<sup>a</sup> 2<sup>c</sup>, q. 99, articulo tertio; et specialiter sequatur Ysidorus, qui eas integrius tradit et quem etiam alii imitantur, et posterius respondebitur ad quesitum.<sup>413</sup>

Quantum ad primum, sciendum est quod Ysidorus duos modos illarum artium enumerat, et licet aliqua alia commendat et aliqua se habeant secundum communis et minus communis, nichilominus propter reverentiam volo eius ordinem observare.

Dicitur ergo prima ars ‘magica,’ que licet communiter accepta omnis alias contineat, nichilominus stricte capi potest [60r] pro una eius specie. Unde Ysidorus et Augustinus, ubi prius: “magi sunt qui vulgo ‘malefici’ propter facinorum magnitudinem nuncupantur, hii premissa<sup>414</sup> Dei et elementa concutiunt, turbant mentes hominum ac sine ullo veneni haustu violentia tantum carminis interimunt.” Unde Lucanus: “mens hausta nulla sanie polluta veneni, incantata perit,” et sequitur: “demonibus et accitis aprobatibus audent ventillare, ut quousque suos perimant malis artibus inimicos; etiam sanguine utuntur et victimis et sepe contingunt corpora mortuorum.”<sup>415</sup>

<sup>413</sup> As indicated before, Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiae* is the main source, which according to our author has dealt best with the subject and has played an exemplary role in the later tradition. Augustine’s *De civitate Dei*, as well as the corresponding passages in Gratian’s *Decretum*, are standard sources for the Christian condemnation of the divinatory arts. Finally, Thomas Aquinas explicitly addresses the topic of the magical arts, specifically dealing with the kinds of sacrileges (*de speciebus sacrilegi*) in his *Summa Theologiae*, II.2ae, q. 99.

<sup>414</sup> Instead of *premissu*.

<sup>415</sup> The complete paragraph occurs almost verbatim, including the reference to Lucanus, in *Decretum Gratiani*: “Que magorum prestigiis fiunt non vera, sed fantastica esse probantur,” PL 187, col. 1352B–1353A: “Magi sunt qui vulgo malefici ob facinorum magnitudinem nuncupantur. Hi sunt qui permissu Dei elementa concutiunt, mentes hominum turbant minus confidentium in Deo, ac sine ullo veneni haustu violentia tantum carminis interimunt. Unde et Lucanus: ‘Mens hausti nulla sanie polluta veneni, incantata perit.’ Demonibus enim accitis audent ventillare, ut quosque suos perimant malis artibus inimicos. Hi etiam sanguine utuntur et victimis sepe contingunt corpora mortuorum.” For his part, Gratian is following verbatim Rabanus Maurus’s *De consanguineorum nuptiis et magorum praestigiiis falsisque divinationibus tractatus, De magicis artibus*, PL 110, cols. 1095–1110. Maurus’s *De universo* XV.40 (*De magis*), PL 111, col. 422B–25D, could have also been an relevant source. One finds the following passage in this text: “Sortilegi sunt, qui sub nomine fictae religionis per quasdam, quas sortes sanctorum vocant, divinationis scientiam profitentur, aut quarumcunque scripturarum inspectione futura promittunt” (col. 424A). The first sentence of this paragraph comes from Isidore’s *Etymologiae* VIII.9, ed. Lindsay (n. 391 above), vol. 1, par. 28, lines 15–16.

Secunda species est nygromantia. Unde predicti nygromantici sunt quorum precantationibus videntur resuscitari mortui, divinare et ad interrogata respondere. ‘Nyro’ enim grece ‘mortui’ latine, et ‘mantia,’ ‘divinatio’ nuncupatur, ad quos suscitandos<sup>416</sup> sanguis cadaveris adicitur, nam amare sanguinem demones dicunt, et ideo quotiescumque nygromantia fit, cruor aque mixtus ut colore sanguinis provocatur.<sup>417</sup>

Sequuntur quattuor divinationis genera ab elementis quatuor nominata. Unde dicit Varro, sicut allegat Ysidorus, scilicet ‘ydromantia’ ab ‘aqua.’ Unde Ysidorus ubi prius, et habetur in decreto: “ydromantia est in aquarum inspectione umbras demonum evocare<sup>418</sup> et ymagines vel ludificationes eorum videre ubique, aliqua ab eis audire, ubi<sup>419</sup> adhibito sanguine, etiam infans perhibetur suscitare.”<sup>420</sup>

Alia est aeromantia, ab aere, quando scilicet ex aere divinat aliquis, sicut dictum est de ydromantia. Alia es pyromantia, ab igne, quando scilicet ex igne divinatur, secundum Ysidorum.<sup>421</sup> Alia est geomantia, a terra; verum est quod geomantia que nunc currit est ars quedam vaticinaria qua, per figuras quindecim ex punctis scriptis in tabula et diversimode calculatis, demonstrantur occulta. Sic ergo habentur sex species divinationis.

Alia est divinatio que, licet communem nomen habeat, tamen speciali<ter interpretatur>.<sup>422</sup> ‘Divini’ secundum Ysidorum dicuntur quasi Deo pleni; divinitati enim se plenos simulant et astutia quadam fraudulenta hominibus futura coniecturant. Et hoc dicit esse duo genera, scilicet ars et furor. Similiter est incantatio, que licet sit nomen commune, tamen specialiter ‘incantatores’ Ysidorus vocat qui rem seu incantationem verbis peragunt. Nona est ‘ariolorum’ ab ‘ara,’ quia secundum Ysidorum circa aras ydolorum nepharias voces emittunt, offerendo sacrificia funesta, id est fellata vel sumen [ . . . ].

<sup>416</sup> “Suscitandos” is conjectural. The manuscript reads “suscita(n)d”, which could also be read as “suscitandum.”

<sup>417</sup> The text continues parallel to the same passage in the *Decretum Gratiani*, PL 187, col. 1353A: “Negromantici sunt quorum precantationibus videntur resuscitari mortui, diuinare et ad interrogata respondere. Νεκρὸς enim graece mortuus, μαντεῖα diuinatio nuncupatur, ad quos suscitandos cadaveri sanguis adicitur. Nam amare sanguinem daemones dicuntur, ideoque, quotiescumque nigromantia fit, cruor aquae miscetur, ut colore sanguinis facilius prouocatur.”

<sup>418</sup> The manuscript reads: “evocatorum.”

<sup>419</sup> The manuscript reads: “ibi.”

<sup>420</sup> *Decretum Gratiani*, PL 187, col. 1353B: “Ydromantici ab aqua dicti. Est enim ydromantia in aquae inspectione umbras demonum euocare, et imagineas ludificationes eorum uidere, ibique ab eis aliqua audire, ubi adhibito sanguine etiam inferos perhibentur suscitare.” Our text contains “infans” for the *Decretum*’s reading “inferos.”

<sup>421</sup> *Decretum Gratiani*, PL 187, col. 1342A: “Varro autem dixit quatuor esse genera diuinationum, terram, aquam, aerem, et ignem: hinc geomanticam, ydromanticam, aeromanticam, piromanticam dictam autumant.” Similar references can be found in Isidore, *Etymologiae*, VIII.9, ed. Lindsay (n. 391 above), vol. 1, par. 13, lines 6–8.

<sup>422</sup> This reading is purely conjectural. Here the manuscript presents a blank space.