

Glorious Science or “Dead Dog”? Jean de Jandun and the Quarrel over Astrology in Fourteenth-Century Paris

C. Philipp E. Nothaft

All Souls College, Oxford

philipp.nothaft@all-souls.ox.ac.uk

Abstract:

This article examines a little-known epistolary treatise datable to 1322, which survives in a fifteenth-century manuscript in the Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel. The author of this work was engaged in a heated argument with the Parisian philosopher Jean de Jandun over the status and rationality of astrology. Jean’s pro-astrological stance is documented in a letter dated 28 October 1321, which survives for having been appended to the main treatise. In responding to Jean de Jandun’s letter, the author delivered a trenchant critique of astrology grounded almost entirely in philosophical, as opposed to theological, ideas, addressing issues such as empirical evidence, causality, and contingency. The author’s way of pointing out ruptures between astrology and Aristotelian natural philosophy marks him out as an intellectual precursor to the much better-known anti-astrological polemics written later in the same century by Parisian thinkers such as Nicole Oresme and Heinrich von Langenstein.

Keywords:

astrology - Jean de Jandun - Geoffroy de Meaux - University of Paris

A gallery of astrology’s fiercest critics, from Carneades to James Randi, would be incomplete without the inclusion of Nicole Oresme (c.1320–1382), who made his influence felt at both the University of Paris and the court of King Charles V (1364–1380). Of the various works Oresme devoted to the subject of astrology during the middle decades of the fourteenth century, the one that has attracted the most attention in modern scholarship is the French *Livre de divinacions*, which drew upon a rich pool of quotations from patristic and classical writers to warn a courtly audience against the dangers that arose if rulers and princes took advice from astrologers and other categories of diviners. As has often been pointed out, a major impetus for this intervention must have come from

the worrying tendencies displayed by Charles V, whose keen interest in the science of the stars is evident from the holdings of his personal library, but also from the expert astrologers who found employment at his court during the 1360s.¹ A different rationale and approach to the issue of astrology emerges from Oresme's labyrinthine *Quaestio contra divinatores horoscopios*, which the extant manuscripts date to 1370. Rather than worrying about the interactions between astrological prognostication and political decision-making, Oresme's main concern here is to pull the rug out from underneath all astrological theory by engaging in a careful analysis of the very idea of celestial influence and causation.² In contrast to the *Livre de divinations*, whose concrete political context seems well established, the background to the *Quaestio* remains less well understood. One thought that seems worth exploring is that some of the philosophical strands Oresme

¹ On astrology at the court of Charles V and Oresme's reaction to it, see C. Jourdain, "Nicolas Oresme et les astrologues de la cour de Charles V," *Revue des questions historiques* 18 (1875), 136–159; G.W. Coopland, *Nicole Oresme and the Astrologers: A Study of His Livre de divinations* (Cambridge, MA, 1952); J. Quillet, *Charles V, le Roi Lettré: essai sur la pensée politique d'un règne* (Paris, 1984), 105–110; eadem, *De Charles V à Christine de Pizan* (Paris, 2004), 91–99; S. Lefèvre, "Une 'rude manière de parler': l'enjeu rhétorique du prologue du *Livre de divinations* de Nicole Oresme," in *Autour de Nicole Oresme*, ed. J. Quillet (Paris, 1990), 177–194; F. Autrand, *Charles V: le Sage* (Paris, 1994), 742–747; C.R. Sherman, *Imaging Aristotle: Verbal and Visual Representation in Fourteenth-Century France* (Berkeley, 1995), 15–21; J. Cadden, "Charles V, Nicole Oresme, and Christine de Pizan: Unities and Uses of Knowledge in Fourteenth-Century France," in *Texts and Contexts in Ancient and Medieval Science: Studies on the Occasion John E. Murdoch's Seventieth Birthday*, ed. E. Sylla and M. McVaugh (Leiden, 1997), 208–244; J.-P. Boudet, *Le Recueil des plus célèbres astrologues de Simon de Phares*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1997–1999), vol. 2, 242–254; idem, "Charles V, Gervais Chrétien et les manuscrits scientifiques du Collège de Maître Gervais," *Médiévales* 52 (2007), 15–38; idem, "La science des étoiles dans la librairie de Charles V," in *Traduire au XIV^e siècle: Evrart de Conty et la vie intellectuelle à la cour de Charles V*, ed. J. Ducos and M. Goyens (Paris, 2015), 379–401; J. Véronèse, "Contre la divination et la magie à la cour: trois traités adressés à des grands aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles," *Micrologus* 16 (2008), 405–431, at 411–413, 427–430; S. Rapisarda, "Il principe e l'astrolabio: la divinazione nell'educazione dei principi medievali," in *L'éducation au gouvernement et à la vie: la tradition des 'règles de vie' de l'antiquité au Moyen-Âge*, ed. P. Odorico (Paris, 2009), 153–180, at 170–177; idem, ed., *Nicole Oresme: Contro la divinazione; consigli antiastrologici al re di Francia (1356)* (Rome, 2009), 43–59; S. Vanden Broecke, "Astrology and Politics," in *A Companion to Astrology in the Renaissance*, ed. B. Dooley (Leiden, 2014), 193–232, at 207–214. On the role of astrology at late medieval European courts, see also J.-P. Boudet, *Entre science et nigromance: astrologie, divination et magie dans l'Occident médiéval (XII^e–XV^e siècle)* (Paris, 2006), 168–203, 303–316; J.-P. Boudet, M. Ostorero, and A. Paravicini Bagliani, eds., *De Frédéric II à Rodolphe II: astrologie, divination et magie dans les cours (XIII^e–XVII^e siècle)* (Florence, 2017); S. Giralt, "Astrology in the Service of the Crown: Bartomeu de Tresbens, Physician and Astrologer to King Pere the Ceremonious of Aragon," *Journal of Medieval History* 44 (2017), 104–129 (with references to further literature).

² The text was edited by S. Caroti, "Nicole Oresme: Quaestio contra divinatores horoscopios," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 43 (1976), 201–310. For discussion, see S. Caroti, "La critica contro l'astrologia di Nicole Oresme e la sua influenza nel Medioevo e nel Rinascimento," *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei: Memorie della Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, 8th ser., 23 (1979), 545–685, at 587–611. Another relevant source are Oresme's unpublished *Quodlibeta*, as discussed in S. Caroti, "Nicole Oresme's Polemic against Astrology in His 'Quodlibeta,'" in *Astrology, Science and Society: Historical Essays*, ed. P. Curry (Woodbridge, 1987), 75–95. An edition of this text by Béatrice Delaurenti, Alain Boureau, and others is forthcoming.

developed in this work arose from ongoing debates within the Parisian faculties of arts and theology, where the status and validity of astrology had been a subject of controversy going back at least to the Condemnations of 1277.³

A unique source that enables us to shed light on the state of the debate at the beginning of the 1320s survives in the shape of an anonymous epistolary treatise,⁴ which has been all but completely ignored since it was first mentioned in 1857.⁵ The work in question comprises approximately 10,000 words and opens *Recolitis, ut estimo, quod scribenti michi...* I shall, for lack of a better title, refer to it as *Recolitis* in what follows. While the author of *Recolitis* remains unknown to us, the work itself was evidently written in reaction to the opinions of Jean de Jandun, a Parisian arts master well known for his commentaries on the works of Aristotle and Averroes.⁶ Jean's stance on the matter is documented in a letter dated 28 October 1321, which survives only for having been incorporated into *Recolitis*. In responding to Jean de Jandun's letter, the author delivers a critique of astrology that was grounded almost entirely in philosophical arguments, paying only very limited attention to the familiar moral and theological considerations one might expect from a work of this kind. His epistolary treatise hence makes for a noteworthy forerunner to Nicole Oresme's *Quaestio*, one that furnishes us with important new evidence of the controversial status of astrology in fourteenth-century university circles.

1 Transmission, Background, and Date of "Recolitis"

As far as I am aware, the text of *Recolitis* is preserved only in MS Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 83.5 Aug. 2^o, ff. 94vb–101vb, where it follows

³ On the role of astrology in the Parisian condemnations, see L. Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, 8 vols. (New York, 1923–1958), vol. 2, 709–712; Boudet, *Entre science* (n. 2), 251–258.

⁴ MS Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 83.5 Aug. 2^o, ff. 94vb–101vb (henceforth: W). An edition is included in the appendix to this article. In what follows, I shall cite this edition as *Recolitis*, followed by the relevant line number(s).

⁵ O. Hartwig, *Henricus de Langenstein, dictus de Hassia: Zwei Untersuchungen über das Leben und die Schriften Heinrichs von Langenstein* (Marburg, 1857), 27–30.

⁶ On Jean de Jandun, see O. Weijers, *Le travail intellectuel à la Faculté des arts de Paris: textes et maîtres (ca. 1200–1500)*, 9 vols. (Turnhout, 1994–2012), vol. 5, 87–104; S. MacClintock, *Perversity and Error: Studies on the 'Averroist' John of Jandun* (Bloomington, IN, 1956); L. Schmugge, *Johannes von Jandun (1285/89–1328): Untersuchungen zur Biographie und Sozialtheorie eines lateinischen Averroisten* (Stuttgart, 1966); C.J. Ermatinger, "John of Jandun in His Relations with Arts Masters and Theologians," in *Arts libéraux et philosophie au Moyen Âge* (Montreal, 1969), 1173–1184.

immediately upon Heinrich von Langenstein's *Tractatus contra astrologos coniunctionistas de eventibus futurorum* (1373).⁷ A colophon on f. 101vb informs us that the transcription was completed in the town of Hildesheim (Lower Saxony) on 5 August 1451,⁸ but nothing more is known about the identity of the scribe, whose copy of the text is occasionally marred by omissions and other signs of corruption. We shall see below that one of these errors has prevented earlier scholars from accurately determining the work's original date, which may also explain why it has received almost no attention in the literature.

Recolitis takes the form of a letter addressed to three unnamed friends,⁹ whom the author assumes to be already familiar with some of the background he is about to relate. He begins by mentioning "a certain cleric studying in Paris" [lines 1–2: *quodam clerico studenti Parisius*] who some time ago sent him an astrological prognostication, or *iudicium*, based on two eclipses, one solar, one lunar. The *iudicium* in question was authored by Geoffroy de Meaux, a Parisian physician and astrologer well known for having written a number of such prognostications, including one for the comet of 1315 and another for a planetary conjunction in 1325.¹⁰ None of his surviving texts corresponds to the prognostication mentioned at the start of *Recolitis*, which reportedly opened with an allusion to Genesis 1:14, its incipit being *Deus in celo duo fecit luminaria magna, solem, ut preesset diei* [4–5]. From a brief quotation provided later in our text [337–345], it appears that Geoffroy predicted a general surge in violence and a serious disturbance within the Church. "And from the way Jupiter is impeded in several ways I say that the faith of many people will be weakened and there will be many heresies" [344–345].

The author of *Recolitis* informs us that he responded to the cleric who sent him this text with a general critique of astrological judgments based on planetary conjunctions, which he dismissed as "vain" or "foolish" [6: *vana*] and containing nothing in terms of

⁷ See O. von Heinemann, *Kataloge der Herzog-August-Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel*, vol. 7, *Die Augusteischen Handschriften*, pt. 4 (Wolfenbüttel, 1900), 51–54, and the brief description in H. Pruckner, *Studien zu den astrologischen Schriften des Heinrich von Langenstein* (Leipzig, 1933), 19.

⁸ W, f. 101vb: "Sic est finis, Deo ymnpus cum sanctis eius in secula Amen. Finitus est tractatus iste in Hildesheim, anno Domini 1451^o, in die Oswaldi regis."

⁹ Their number is revealed in *Recolitis*, 47.

¹⁰ See Thorndike, *A History* (n. 3), vol. 3, 281–293, 715–717; D. Jacquart, "Médecine et astrologie à Paris dans la première moitié du XIV^e siècle," in *Filosofia, scienza e astologia nel Trecento europeo: Biagio Pelacani Parmense*, ed. G. Federici Vescovini and F. Barocelli (Padua, 1992), 121–134; P. Charon, "Note sur Geoffroy de Meaux, médecin et astrologue du XIV^e siècle," *Bulletin de la société historique de Meaux et sa région* 7 (2010), 101–114; Weijers, *Le travail* (n. 6), vol. 3, 65–66.

certainty. What made them foolish was *inter alia* the implicit attempt to predict a contingent outcome from a natural event that happened out of pure necessity [8: *ex mera necessitate*] and was hence perfectly predictable. To try to link the two together, for example by claiming that God uses eclipses as signs for political events in this world, was akin to committing a category error. An eclipse happened with mathematical certainty, whereas the death of a ruler did not. “If I say that the sign for the fact that Philip, king of France, died this year was that the first perfect number is 6, followed by 28, who would not laugh at me?” [18–20]. A necessary event could never be a sign for a contingent one, from which it followed that planetary conjunctions afforded no certain knowledge about the future. Yet a discipline that afforded no certain knowledge could not be called a science.

The letter to the cleric, which apparently contained a host of further such arguments,¹¹ provoked the ire of Jean de Jandun (*Iohannes de Ganduno*), whom our author refers to as “a certain master of arts, far more reverend than I am” [38]. Jean responded with a letter of his own, dated 28 October 1321, which only reached our author’s hand some time after Candlemas (2 February) the following year [43–44]. One reason for this delay may have been that the recipient lived some distance away from Paris. In the letter’s closing paragraphs [898–900, 907–909], Jean de Jandun challenged his opponent to come to the city to defend his ideas in public, implying that he was no longer there at the time of writing. Similarly, the author responsible for *Recolitis* brought his treatise to a close by mentioning that he first arrived in Paris 30 years ago and that he stayed on for 16 years [929–930], which puts his departure from the city approximately 14 years in the past. From one of the jibes Jean directed at him in his letter it may also be inferred that during his Parisian years he earned a degree in theology, as he allegedly boasted about his lengthy disputations on the second book of Lombard’s *Sentences* [906–907].

If we accept that Jean de Jandun finished his letter in October 1321 and that it reached its intended recipient in early 1322, the information just cited would allow us to conclude that the author of *Recolitis* had studied and taught in Paris from *c.*1292 to *c.*1308. There is, however, an obvious conflict between the dating clause attached to Jean de Jandun’s letter [913–914: *Scriptum fuit hoc opusculum anno Domini nostri Ihesu Christi*

¹¹ As suggested in *Recolitis*, 29–32. Two brief quotations from this lost letter are included in the letter by Jean de Jandun. They indicate that the author likened astrology to fables and superstition. See *Recolitis*, 739–743.

MCCC^oXXI, V kalendas Novembris] and the year of the two eclipses that were the subject of Geoffroy de Meaux's *iudicium*, which in the surviving manuscript is twice given as 1341 rather than 1321 [3 and 336]. Since the text in each case refers to these eclipses as phenomena actually seen (*visarum*) in the year in question, it is hardly likely that Geoffroy's *iudicium* dealt with eclipses that had been calculated to occur two decades in the future. Matters are complicated further by the author's mention of the death of King Philip of France, which happened "this year" (*isto anno*) [19], presumably the year when *Recolitis* was written. Given the unclear date of our text, we are here faced with a *prima facie* choice between Philip IV (†29 November 1314), Philip V (†3 January 1322), and Philip VI (†22 August 1350), none of whom died in the vicinity of 1341.

The first and hitherto only attempt to make sense of this contradictory information on the basis of the actual manuscript is due to Otto Hartwig (1830–1903), who included a brief summary of *Recolitis* in his 1857 dissertation on Heinrich von Langenstein.¹² Hartwig accepted at face value 1341 as the year of the two eclipses and accordingly decided that the dating clause at the end of Jean de Jandun's letter, which he misinterpreted as referring to 1324,¹³ must be erroneous. For the king mentioned early on in the text he picked Philip VI, concluding that *Recolitis* must necessarily have been written after his death in 1350.¹⁴ From Hartwig's dissertation, the year 1341 as the year of Geoffroy de Meaux's *iudicium* passed into the third volume of Lynn Thorndike's great *History of Magic and Experimental Science*. Thorndike, who had not seen the Wolfenbüttel manuscript himself, concluded from the late date that the *Iohannes de Ganduno* (or *Gauduno*) whose letter is reproduced at the end of *Recolitis* could not have been the well-known philosopher Jean de Jandun, who had already left Paris for Munich in the mid-1320s.¹⁵

Thorndike's doubts turn out to be unfounded. While it is true that the year 1341 was the occasion of lunar (23 November) and solar (9 December) eclipses that were both visible from Paris, the solar eclipse would have only been a partial one, with a magnitude

¹² See n. 5.

¹³ Hartwig apparently misread *MCCC^oXXI, V kalendas Novembris* in l. 914 as *MCCC^oXXIV, kalendas Novembris*. See Hartwig, *Henricus de Langenstein* (n. 5), 27 (n. 1).

¹⁴ Hartwig, *Henricus de Langenstein* (n. 5), 27 (n. 1).

¹⁵ Thorndike, *A History* (n. 3), vol. 3, 282–283. See also Charon, "Note" (n. 10), 104–105, who simply follows Thorndike.

slightly below 0.5.¹⁶ By contrast, the recorded date of Jean de Jandun's letter, 28 October 1321, would have come just four months after a solar eclipse that had appeared near-total over Paris in the early hours of 26 June.¹⁷ This eclipse had been preceded five months earlier by a partial eclipse of the Moon on 14 January, but on a year count starting on Easter Sunday, or an astronomical year reckoned from the vernal equinox, this event would have still belonged to 1320. That the author operated with a year of the latter type becomes apparent from a reference to the Sun's entry into Aries, which is treated as the start of the imminent year [664–665]. It is therefore not unlikely that the lunar eclipse discussed in Geoffroy de Meaux's *iudicium* was not the one on 14 January 1321, but a partial eclipse on 10 July 1321, which would have been visible close to sunrise, just as the Moon was dipping below the horizon. It was followed less than half a year later, on 3 January, by the death of King Philip V, which on the author's count would have still belonged to the year 1321. The same is true for the completion of *Recolitis*, which based on the available hints may be dated between Candlemas (2 February) and the following vernal equinox (12/13 March).

Accepting this chronology removes any obstacle to identifying the *Iohannes de Ganduno* mentioned in *Recolitis* with Jean de Jandun, who is first attested as a master at the Parisian arts faculty in 1310. In 1315, he became a master at the newly founded Collège de Navarre, where he would remain until at least the year 1320.¹⁸ He was probably still in Paris on 23 December 1321, the day he finished his *Expositio* of the third book of Aristotle's *De anima*.¹⁹ A remark contained in his treatise *De laudibus Parisius* suggests that he had moved to Senlis by July 1323 to take up a benefice,²⁰ but a rental contract dated 19 June 1324 indicates Jean's intention to remain settled in Paris on a long-term basis.²¹ He left the city for good two years later, when his involvement in the

¹⁶ For information on solar and lunar eclipses visible from Paris, I have relied on NASA's eclipse website: <https://eclipse.gsfc.nasa.gov/eclipse.html>.

¹⁷ For observers in France, this eclipse happened close to sunrise, as confirmed by the detailed observational note in MS El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo, O-II-10, f. 218v. See L. Gushee, "New Sources for the Biography of Johannes de Muris," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 22 (1969), 3–26, at 14.

¹⁸ Schmugge, *Johannes von Jandun* (n. 6), 20.

¹⁹ Schmugge, *Johannes von Jandun* (n. 6), 22.

²⁰ Schmugge, *Johannes von Jandun* (n. 6), 23.

²¹ Schmugge, *Johannes von Jandun* (n. 6), 25–26.

publication of Marsilius of Padua's *Defensor pacis* forced him to seek refuge at the court of Louis the Bavarian.²²

2 Jean de Jandun's Defence of Astrology

The main purpose of *Recolitis* was to provide a response to Jean de Jandun's letter, which the author disparaged as "vacuous" and "full of blasphemies, reproofs, and insults" while doing nothing "to dissolve even the least of all my arguments" [39–41]. From a look at the actual content of the letter, it is difficult to find fault with this judgment. One of Jean's main rhetorical strategies was to deny that his opponent was even worthy of hearing the arguments one might easily provide in defence of the art of astrology. This sort of *ad hominem* tactic is already on display in the opening sentence, in which Jean proclaimed that God, in his wisdom, had decided to withhold the secrets of astrology from his opponent, lest they be coarsened by his ignorance [821–825]. And yet, he still had the temerity to go against the consensus of the ancients by casting aspersions on this venerable science:

Who are you to think yourself smarter than Ptolemy and those who came before and after him, Arabs and Latins, pagans and Christians, who, in order to honour God, laboured with such care for reason and rationality to find and complete this philosophy, the one you (and who are you even?) dare to disparage so rashly, so proudly, so unreasoningly? [842–847]

Maintaining this dismissive tone, Jean went on to allude to a handful of stock arguments that were commonly used in his time to establish the influence of the celestial bodies on the sub-lunar realm: the effects of the Sun on vegetation, the effects of the Moon on the tides, the fact that the mating season of animals was tied to the solar year [857–861]. A slight oddity here is Jean's mention of the floods that are supposed to result when all planets are joined together in a watery sign of the zodiac [861–863]. This claim is reminiscent of a passage in Albertus Magnus's *De causis proprietatum elementorum*, which suggested in no unclear terms that even universal floods like the one described in

²² Schmugge, *Johannes von Jandun* (n. 6), 29–30.

the Book of Genesis could be caused at least in part by the stars.²³ The celebrated Albertus is mentioned by name only a few paragraphs later in Jean's letter, where he brings up a treatise beginning *Occasione quorundam librorum apud quos* [889–891]. This is an unmistakable reference to the famous *Speculum astronomiae*, which by surveying the astrological literature and categorizing its different branches had offered a powerful defence of the legitimacy of most forms of astrology. Jean shows himself convinced that reading this text would make his opponent change his “puerile opinion” [892–893]. It is interesting to note, however, that he merely states that the text was “attributed” [889] to Albertus Magnus, which may reflect a degree of uncertainty about its authorship—an uncertainty that continues until today.²⁴

Jean was of course well aware that the principal thrust of his opponent's complaint had not been against the prediction of natural events such as tides or floods. The real bone of contention concerned wholly contingent events such as actions dependent on free will or anything subject to an efficient cause that could be impeded by nature.²⁵ How could it be deemed possible to predict these from the configuration of the stars? Jean responded by spelling out a compromise position that was widely accepted by theologians and philosophers alike: predictions about the future behaviour of individuals could not be made with certainty, as human beings were in a position to act freely against their own inclinations. Indeed, even a person dying of thirst could muster the will power not to drink. Even then, however, it was still true that “the celestial light that carries to us all the powers of the [celestial] orb” affected the human body in ways that gave rise to a strong inclination towards one particular course of action, making one outcome more likely than

²³ Albertus Magnus, *De causis proprietatum elementorum* I, tr. 2, c. 9 (ed. P. Hossfeld, *Alberti Magni Opera Omnia* 5.2, Münster, 1980, 76–79).

²⁴ On the *Speculum astronomiae* and the contentious question of its authorship, see P. Zambelli, *The Speculum astronomiae and Its Enigma: Astrology, Theology and Science in Albertus Magnus and His Contemporaries* (Dordrecht, 1992); A. Paravicini Bagliani, *La Speculum Astronomiae, une énigme? Enquête sur les manuscrits* (Florence, 2001); B. Roy, “Richard de Fournival, auteur du *Speculum astronomie*?” *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 67 (2000), 159–180; H.D. Rutkin, “Astrology and Magic,” in *A Companion to Albert the Great: Theology, Philosophy, and the Sciences*, ed. I.M. Resnick (Leiden, 2013), 451–505, at 483–490, 501–503; Jeremiah Hackett, “Albert the Great and the *Speculum astronomiae*: The State of Research at the Beginning of the 21st Century,” *ibid.*, 437–449. Albertus Magnus's authorship was last affirmed by S.E. Hendrix, *How Albert the Great's Speculum astronomiae Was Interpreted and Used by Four Centuries of Readers: A Study in Late Medieval Medicine, Astronomy, and Astrology* (Lewiston, NY, 2010), but his contribution must be used with great caution. Cf. Charles Burnett's review in *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft* 7 (2012), 220–221.

²⁵ For this definition of contingency, see *Recolitis*, 160–163.

another. “And why,” Jean asked, “is it not good to foresee [these influences], so that reason may be helped towards the better outcome (God willing)?”²⁶

The position Jean de Jandun staked out in his letter of 1321 is wholly consistent with the statements he had made six years earlier in his *Quaestiones* on Aristotle’s *Physics* (c.1315),²⁷ where he asserted that the heavens influenced the intellect and will of a human being not directly and by necessity, but indirectly through their effects on the body and the environment.²⁸ In principle, the individual remained free to do the opposite of what these influences suggested, in line with the often-cited (pseudo-)Ptolemaic maxim “the wise man shall rule the stars” (*vir sapiens dominabitur astris*).²⁹ In practice, however, most people went about living their lives in accordance with the inclinations that celestial forces instilled in them. For someone whom the heavens had given a strong natural disposition towards anger and self-indulgence to turn out perfectly gentle and disciplined was “very difficult” and happened rarely, “even though it is possible.”³⁰ To this completely conventional set of claims about celestial influence, Jean’s letter added the suggestion that the predictive use of astrology could be advantageous to the individual and that it was a science “through which God the eternal Father and his blessed Son, the most pious law-giver our Lord Jesus Christ, as well as the Holy Spirit are most clearly discerned and most sincerely loved” [828–830].

²⁶ *Recolitis*, 876–880. For the viewpoint expressed here (the theory of *inclinatio*), see the excellent discussion in M. Sorokina, *Les théologiens face à la question de l’influence celeste: science et foi dans les commentaires des Sentences* (v. 1220–v. 1340), Ph.D. dissertation, Université Paris-Est, 2017, 303–356.

²⁷ For the date of this work, see Schmutge, *Johannes von Jandun* (n. 6), 127.

²⁸ Iohannes de Ianduno, *Quaestiones super libros Physicorum VIII*, q. 6 (*Ioannis de Ianduno philosophi acutissimi super octo libros Aristotelis de Physico auditu subtilissimae quaestiones* etc., Venice, 1560, cols. 497–501).

²⁹ Iohannes de Ianduno, *Quaestiones super libros Physicorum VIII*, q. 6 (n. 28) (col. 499): “Et propter hoc dicit Ptolemaeus, quod vir sapiens dominabitur astris, in quantum per suum intellectum potest iudicare aliquod esse bonum & faciendum, ad cuius oppositum inclinant corpora coelestia quantum est de se.” On the pseudo-Ptolemaic maxim cited here, see J.-P. Boudet, “Ptolémée dans l’Occident médiéval: roi, savant et philosophe,” *Micrologus* 21 (2013), 193–217, at 206–217.

³⁰ Iohannes de Ianduno, *Quaestiones super libros Physicorum VIII*, q. 6 (n. 28) (cols. 499–500): “Quod enim aliquis habens a figura coelesti vehementem inclinationem ad iram & luxuriam, sit mansuetus & temperatus perfecte, hoc est multum difficile & quasi rarum, licet sit possibile.” See also Iohannes de Ianduno, *Quaestiones super libros De coelo et mundo I*, q. 1 (*Ioannis de Ianduno in libros Aristotelis de Coelo et mundo quae extant quaestiones subtilissimae* etc., Venice, 1564, f. 2vb): “Unde in uno conveniunt doctores, quod coelum non necessitat intellectum & voluntatem, tamen inclinatur aliquo modo & facit multas inclinationes in humano appetitu: & aliquo modo prosequitur illas inclinationes, sed alii non prosequuntur, unde est libertas in his actibus humanis.”

3 Anti-Astrological Arguments in “Recolitis”

The claim that astrology was a discipline approved of by the Christian God, one apt to connect its practitioners with the divine, was an affront in the eyes of the author of *Recolitis*, who repeatedly qualified the letter he received from Jean de Jandun as being replete with “blasphemies” [48, 482, 814]. What seems to have irked him more than anything else, however, was Jean’s way of lining up condescending taunts rather than seeking to refute his opponent through sound syllogisms. As he wrote at the very end:

I do not know whether this is the way debates are held in Paris nowadays. One thing I do know: 30 years ago, when I was there for the first time, and 16 years after that, when I was there for the last time, it was never this way. Instead it was the case that what one man argued, another refuted, if he was able to. He did not give back taunts or insults in exchange for arguments. [928–932]

In the introductory part to *Recolitis*, the author expressed his hope that the counterarguments he was about to present were going to enable his three addressees to defend his stance in public [46–52]—an interesting remark suggesting that the spat between him and Jean de Jandun had already come to the attention of a wider audience. He went on to reveal something about his own intellectual background by admitting that, at one stage in his life, he had been a passionate student of both astronomy and astrology, to the extent that he had read all the foundational works of the latter discipline, written by authors such as Ptolemy, Abū Ma‘shar, and Māshā’allāh. It was from these texts, “and not from the little treatises” [77] of Albertus Magnus, that he had learned the art of astrological judgments:³¹

And now I have already studied [these books] for myself for the last 26 years and found that they contain nothing by way of certainty or solidity, but only some conjectures of the sort a diviner brandishes without knowledge. And I have found

³¹ Another reference to Albertus’s *tractatuli* appears in *Recolitis*, 331–332, where the author denies that any of them teach astrology. This would seem to indicate his rejection of Albertus Magnus’s authorship of the *Speculum astronomiae* (see n. 24 above).

that the principles from which these judgments arise are not true, but are just a bunch of frivolities that lack any cogent reason. [77–81]

In the end, his careful study of the astrological literature had brought him to the same conclusion that had already been drawn long ago by Fathers of the Church such as Gregory the Great, according to whom astrology was a vain superstition. Nevertheless, if the goal was to refute and convince a man like Jean de Jandun, it seemed preferable to argue not from theology, but from the principles of the art itself. By drawing logical conclusions from these principles, the author hoped to be in a position to show by way of reason what the Fathers had done by relying on Scripture and faith.³² One important component of this approach was the use of Aristotle, whom the author repeatedly invoked as a powerful weapon against Jean de Jandun, claiming that his “adversary” would readily assent to certain propositions simply because they were found in works by the Stagirite. *Recolitis* was hence an explicitly philosophical exercise that consciously bypassed the standard theological arguments in an effort to demonstrate that astrology lacked the essential features necessary for it to qualify as a ‘scientific’ discipline.³³

As one may expect from this statement of intent, some of the 14 arguments that followed these remarks were predicated on a specific Aristotelian definition of science, or *scientia*, that astrology could not possibly aspire to. Argument no. 2, for instance, began with a dictum contained in the *Metaphysics* according to which *scientia* cannot be sometimes *scientia* and sometimes ignorance,³⁴ while argument no. 3 cited the *Nicomachean Ethics* in insisting that one of the hallmarks of *scientia* was that it led the soul to speak the truth without fail. Astrology, of course, could by definition only offer fallible judgments concerning the future, as it dealt with contingent events and those that depended on free will.³⁵ By contrast, in argument no. 11 the author criticized astrologers

³² *Recolitis*, 58–64, 83–90. For the patristic criticism of astrology, see T. Hegedus, *Early Christianity and Ancient Astrology* (New York, 2007).

³³ The question of whether astrology could be classified as a true science occupied more than one thinker in this period. For a discussion of this question that comes to the opposite conclusion, see the text edited in S. Balle, “Anonymous *Quaestiones de astronomia* in CLM 14401,” *Cahiers de l’Institut du Moyen-Âge grec et latin* 44 (1983), 151–180, at 158–166. These *Quaestiones* appear to date from the late-thirteenth or early-fourteenth century and were presumably written in a Parisian milieu.

³⁴ Aristoteles, *Metaphysica* VII, c. 15 (1039b–1040a) (trans. Guillelmus de Moerbeka, ed. G. Vuillemin-Diem, *Aristoteles Latinus* 25.3, 2 vols., Leiden, 1995, vol. 2, 162). See *Recolitis*, 216–303.

³⁵ Aristoteles, *Ethica Nicomachea* VI, c. 3 (1139b) (trans. Robertus Grossetesta, ed. R.-A. Gauthier, *Aristoteles Latinus* 26, 5 vols., Leiden, 1972–1974, vol. 3, 255; vol. 4, 480). See *Recolitis*, 305–356.

for presupposing that events that seemed contingent and voluntary were in reality governed by a hidden causality (*occultus ordo causarum*) that made them occur with necessity. To believe this was tantamount to believing in fate (*fatum*), a stance already harshly rejected by Gregory the Great [552–573].

None of the arguments just mentioned would have done much to impress defenders of astrology such as Jean de Jandun, who, as already seen, was perfectly aware of the fallibility of astrological predictions. Indeed, accepting this fallibility was a prerequisite for making astrology palatable as an art capable of predicting human behaviour without falling prey to the charge of fatalism or determinism. The conjectural nature of astrology was accordingly not just a widely conceded point in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century discussions, but it worked in the discipline's favour. Simply put, it could be regarded as licit precisely because its predictions were not true all the time, which would have amounted to an infringement on human freedom. An example of this stance is Augustinus Triumphus's *Tractatus contra divinatores et sompniatores* (1310), written about a decade before *Recolitis*. Although harsh in condemning most forms of divination, Augustinus was remarkably mild on astrology, acknowledging that its predictions were not true by necessity.³⁶

The question, of course, was whether the success rate of astrological predictions was sufficiently high to make them worth anyone's time. The answer *Recolitis* gave to this question was a resounding 'no'. According to this text, to seek advice from an astrologer about a specific outcome was barely different from a game of chance [226–254]. The author added to this point later in his discussion by poking fun at the pretensions of astrologers to be able to predict meteorological phenomena. If it were at all possible to predict the future from the stars, the one area where this should have been easiest to demonstrate was astrological weather forecasting, as here the celestial causes stood in a much more immediate relation to their terrestrial effects than in the case of human behaviour. In reality, the various rulebooks on astro-meteorology were notoriously unsuccessful in making good on their promises. To those who claimed otherwise our author responded with a bold challenge:

³⁶ Augustinus Triumphus, *Tractatus contra divinatores et sompniatores*, c. 19 (ed. P. Giglioni: "Il 'Tractatus contra divinatores et sompniatores' di Agostino d'Ancona: introduzione e edizione del testo," *Analecta Augustiniana* 48 (1985), 5–111, at 105–107.

Behold, I shall designate for you twelve days, one in each month of the upcoming year [that starts] after the Sun has entered Aries. I will calculate for you the planets and their aspects based on the longitude and latitude of Paris for the moment when the Sun enters the first minute of the first degree of Aries in March, so you can reliably find the Lord of the Year. Afterwards I shall give you the true positions of these planets, calculated faithfully for the noon of each of these twelve days. And you, aided by all the rules of prognostication that have been written on this, shall predict for me what the air will be like at noon on each of these twelve days—clear or rainy, hot or cold, stormy or calm. And if you manage to make a true prediction in each case, I shall confess that the art of [astrological] prognostication is a true art and science. [664–673]

The inability of astrologers to predict the weather with any accuracy appears to have been something of a commonplace in the author's day, explaining why John Duns Scotus, in his Paris lectures on the *Sentences*, felt the need to stress that only angels possessed the requisite knowledge of celestial influences and their effects.³⁷ A polemical stance similar to that in *Recolitis* was taken a few decades later by Nicole Oresme, who in his *Livre de divinacions* conceded that the use of astronomical data to make weather forecasts was feasible in principle, but at the same time insisted that the rules used for this purpose were largely invalid, to the extent that "sailors and husbandmen can prophesy changes in the weather better than the astronomers."³⁸ He concluded that it is

ridiculous to believe that an astrologer or geomancer or other of the sort can make sure predictions as to things in the future, which are fortuitous and under control of the changeable human will, when he can't say what sort of a day it will be tomorrow or prophesy a change in the weather or in the wind.³⁹

³⁷ Iohannes Duns Scotus, *Super Sententias (Reportatio)* II, d. 14, q. 3 (*Opera omnia: editio nova*, vol. 23, Paris, 1894, 60): "Dices, igitur Astronomi non iudicant quod debet esse pluvia et quanta et in qua regione. Dico quod qui scitet [*sic*] speculativam et practicam, perfecte posset hoc iudicare, nullus tamen hoc scit. Sed quilibet Angelus novit naturaliter, quando erit pluvia et quanta et in qua regione."

³⁸ Nicole Oresme, *Livre de divinacions*, c. 2, trans. Coopland, *Nicole Oresme* (n. 2), 57.

³⁹ Nicole Oresme, *Livre de divinacions*, c. 11, trans. Coopland, *Nicole Oresme* (n. 2), 91. See also Nicolaus Oresme, *Quaestio contra divinatores horoscopios* (ed. Caroti, "Nicole Oresme" [n. 2], 224, 236, 243–244).

According to *Recolitis*, the reasons why astrology failed so badly in an area where it should have been at its most successful were manifold. One was that the rules employed by contemporary astrologers lacked a sound empirical basis. Core elements of their theory, such as the assignment of elemental natures to the zodiacal signs, appeared entirely arbitrary and were propped up by nothing but the authority of those who had written on these things in the past. Yet a science entirely divorced from sensory data was not a science at all.⁴⁰ The problem was already apparent in the work of Abū Ma‘shar, who repeatedly signalled that the reason why a particular celestial parameter signified a particular outcome was unknown to him and that he relied on the authority of the ancients.⁴¹ Such trust in the ancients, however, was warranted only if the rules of astrology could have been derived as a result of cumulative experience. The author denied that this was possible even in principle. None of the key parameters involved in astrological predictions, which included planetary rulership, exaltation, triplicity, term, and face, were properly derived from the senses:

On the contrary, if someone stood here for the entire duration of his life contemplating the stars day and night, he would not be able to arrive at the knowledge of any of these things through any sensory impression. Instead, each and everyone of these is believed on the testimony of someone else, and it is not known whose [testimony] it is, as in who [gave] it first, but it is believed only on account of its being old. [527–530]

The author’s complaints targeted more than just the specific set of rules used in contemporary astrology. There was also the more general question of whether an astrological theory could be established in principle. One obvious problem for any attempt to derive predictive rules from experience was the risk of arguing fallaciously on the basis of *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. The author of *Recolitis* put the problem as follows:

⁴⁰ This is the substance of argument no. 8: *Recolitis*, 445–464.

⁴¹ *Recolitis*, 161–166. This description is best matched by the fifth book of Abū Ma‘shar’s *Introductorium maius*, as translated by John of Seville in AD 1133. See R. Lemay, ed., *Abū Ma‘šar al-Balḥī [Albumasar]: Liber introductorii maioris ad scientiam judiciorum astrorum*, 9 vols. (Naples, 1995–1996), vol. 5, 175–209.

I ask you: on what basis do you think you can prove the following consequence: 'Such and such things happened when the stars were in such and such a state, therefore the same will happen when they are again in such a state'? [...] Or what is the basis on which you could prove a consequence of this type: 'This thing happens while the heavens are like this, therefore this state of the heavens signifies that this will happen'—especially considering that the state of the heavens is wholly necessary and the thing that happens is wholly contingent? [499–506]

That the rules on which astrological forecasts rested were unknowable through inductive reasoning became even clearer if one considered the extremely long periods of recurrence implied by some celestial motions. According to Ptolemy, the cycle of precession took 36,000 years to complete, from which it basically followed that no configuration of the heavens had ever presented itself to human observers more than once.⁴² A defender of astrology might have been quick to retort that an astrological judgment relied not on every single element in a celestial configuration, but only on those whose effects were relevant to the specific prediction. In response, the author pointed out that any judgment could draw on a very large variety of different signifiers, ranging from a planet's rulership over a particular region on earth to its aspects relative to other planets and its potencies in different parts of the zodiac. On further analysis, the astrological rulebooks offered such a cornucopia of potentially significant parameters that it was practically

impossible for one man to take all of them into account when making a judgement [...]. On the contrary, it often happens that one astrologer paying attention to some of the aforementioned signifiers will prognosticate the opposite of one who pays attention to others. No one can doubt, therefore, that all of these together are completely untrustworthy. [421–426]

Another fundamental flaw of astrology was its attempt to reduce changes in the elements of the lower spheres to the position of the stars and the angle at which they sent

⁴² *Recolitis*, 365–378. For a similar argument see Nicolaus Oresme, *Quaestio contra divinatores horoscopios* (ed. Caroti, "Nicole Oresme" [n. 2], 224).

their rays of influence down towards the centre of the universe. What was completely missing in this causal picture was any consideration of optical effects such as atmospheric refraction, which could change the direction or alter the force of a ray (as seen, for instance, from the effects of exposing a burning mirror to rays from the Sun). Astrologers also appeared to have nothing to say about the much stronger influence exerted by the motors that moved these celestial bodies in their spheres. In doing so, they effectively ignored the doctrines of Aristotle, who treated motion as the primary cause of change in works such as the *Physics*, *On the Heavens*, and the *Meteorology*. It followed that an attempt to predict meteorological phenomena had to factor in the way the elements were constantly stirred and swirled up by the movements of the celestial spheres. Yet these processes were utterly unpredictable for any human being.⁴³ No wonder, then, that astro-meteorology had turned out to be the astrologer's Achilles' heel rather than his greatest asset. If his knowledge did not suffice to forecast the weather or other changes in the elements, his attempts were bound to be all the more futile when it came to the human body, which was causally much more remote from the heavens. By way of example, the author pointed out that human beings did not become more warlike in summer, even though the elements then underwent their most vehement changes [745–755]. The truth was that the human body was far more susceptible to food and drink than to the celestial influences imagined by the astrologers, “which is why in a year in which a good and strong wine grows all around, this can be used much more reliably to make predictions about the arousal of the soul's passions than can this made-up influence of the stars” [757–759].

There is a clear and noteworthy parallel between these objections drawn from natural philosophy and the arguments developed some decades later by Nicole Oresme and Heinrich von Langenstein, both of whom considered astrology a blunt instrument in light of the manifold and oftentimes unpredictable effects that arose from the dispositions of the elements. In their shared view, the heavens could be regarded as causes only in the most general sense, as they were too far removed from the effects witnessed in the lower spheres to support a viable system of astrological prognostication.⁴⁴ The author of

⁴³ This is the substance of arguments nos. 12 and 13: *Recolitis*, 592–764.

⁴⁴ On Heinrich von Langenstein, see F. Alessio, "Causalità naturale e causalità divina nel 'De habitudine causarum' di Enrico di Langenstein," in *La filosofia della natura nel medioevo* (Milan, 1966), 597–604; P. Pirzio, "Le prospettive filosofiche del trattato di Enrico di Langenstein (1325–1397) 'De habitudine causarum'," *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 24 (1969), 363–373; N.H. Steneck, *Science and Creation*

Recolitis likewise accepted that the heavens could act on the things below as common causes, but never as proper ones, which were instead located down in the elemental spheres [153–159].

He brought his discussion to a close by looking at the problem from a more traditional, moralistic angle, which involved a purposeful blurring of the boundaries between astrology, divination, and magic. His fourteenth and final argument used the following premise: among the hallmarks of a false art is that the human race at large has always regarded it as disreputable and that only deceitful and worthless individuals practice it [766–769]. According to the author, astrology fell into this invidious category owing to its links to the magical arts, which were especially conspicuous in a work such as al-Kindi's *De radiis* [774–787]. No wonder, our author argued, that the Fathers of the Church and even those who persecuted Christians during the early centuries of Christianity had always held astrology and magic in contempt and worked towards their eradication [788–795]. In belabouring this point, he reminded his addressees of a certain Master Franco, who not only had “extolled this kind of art despite knowing little of it,” but had made the outrageous claim that “the holy Bible and Holy Scripture are founded on fables” [796–799]:

I remember well how I came to Paris the year immediately following [this incident] and I know what disturbance and what a divide [it had caused] in the whole body of the Church. For to wish to extol this art as a true art and glorious science is no more than to bring a dead dog back to life. [799–802]

The author locates Franco and his controversial claims 30 or 29 years in the past [797], which would imply a date in 1292 or 1293. Unfortunately, the sources for this period appear to be silent on any such incident. At most, one might think of Franco of Poland, who in 1284 wrote a treatise on the turquet (an astronomical instrument) and who is presumably identical with the Franco who carried out solar observations with Pierre de

in the Middle Ages: Henry of Langenstein (d. 1397) on Genesis (Notre Dame, 1976), 100–104; Caroti, “La critica” (n. 2), 613–629; M. van der Lugt, *Le Ver, le démon et la Vierge: les théories médiévales de la génération extraordinaire* (Paris, 2004), 146–149, 458–461; N. Weill-Parot, “Nature universelle et harmonie du monde (XIII^e–XIV^e siècle),” *Micrologus* 25 (2017), 197–221, at 212–221.

Limoges in 1281 and 1283.⁴⁵ Whatever the case may be here, the final argument of *Recolitis* reveals very clearly that the case against astrology the author sought to make was motivated by something more than just philosophical analysis. Like many a critic before and after him, the author of this treatise treated astrology as a dangerous superstition Christians were called upon to avoid at all costs.⁴⁶ That this art still had its admirers in Paris was to him a deplorable sign of the times. Defenders like Jean de Jandun were according to him guilty of trying to revive a folly that should have died a long time ago—or, to put it in his words: to resurrect a dead dog [770, 801].

Conclusion

As the foregoing remarks have hopefully shown, the long-neglected epistolary treatise *Recolitis* offers us valuable new insights into the state of the debate surrounding astrology in Paris at the beginning of the 1320s. Through it we encounter Jean de Jandun as a staunch defender of the positive view, as established most forcefully in the thirteenth-century *Speculum astronomiae*. It was predicated on the assumption that celestial influence permeated and directed all parts of the physical world, including the human body, which in turn inclined individuals towards certain actions and outcomes. Astrology made it possible to predict these inclinations and thereby aid the individual in preparing for the future. According to Jean de Jandun, it was a noble and truly divine discipline for this reason. Against this position stood the author of *Recolitis*, who saw no reason to trust in either the rationality or the success of astrology. Although in formal terms his treatise was mainly there to argue that astrology was no true *scientia* as defined by the Aristotelian corpus, some of his actual criticisms cut much deeper. One factor that made this unknown author a formidable opponent to admirers of astrology was his familiarity with the principal texts and rules that underpinned the art. In this regard, his approach may be

⁴⁵ On Franco of Poland, see A. Birkenmajer, "Les astronomes et les astrologues silésiens au Moyen Âge," [1937], in idem, *Études d'histoire des sciences en Pologne* (Wrocław, 1972), 437–468, at 444–448; L. Thorndike, "Franco de Polonia and the Turquet," *Isis* 36 (1945), 6–7. For the observations of 1281 and 1283, see Peter of Limoges's autograph note in MS Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1191, f. 139r, which is transcribed (but misattributed) in F.M. Delorme, "Manuscrit du 'Computus' de Roger Bacon annoté par Guillaume de Saint-Cloud," *Antonianum* 11 (1936), 554–562, at 559.

⁴⁶ See *Recolitis*, 803–812, where the author concludes his harangue by bringing up the example of Toledo as a place where astrologers are peddling their prognostications to passers-by at all city gates. He explains this situation by the fact that Toledo has a large Jewish and Muslim population and therefore lacks adequate *disciplina fidei*.

compared to the critique that had been launched in *c.*1265 by the Dominican Gerard of Feltre, whose *Summa de astris* exposed the absurdity of astrological doctrines based on an excellent first-hand knowledge of the relevant literature.⁴⁷ In a way not dissimilar to Gerard, the author of *Recolitis* had studied the works of Ptolemy, Abū Maʿshar, and others for long enough to conclude that the rules on which astrologers relied were arbitrary and lacked any proper grounding in experience. The specific causal forces these rules were supposed to track were unsubstantiated and implausible to such an extent that their very existence could be called into doubt. Whether or not the heavens possessed the causative powers attributed to them, the fact remained that astrologers seemed incapable of predicting even the weather, which went to confirm the uselessness of their discipline.

A point of divergence between him and Gerard of Feltre concerns the role they each accorded to the Fathers of the Church. Unlike Gerard, whose work had a strong theological bent and was replete with quotes from Augustine, Ambrose, Gregory the Great, and Isidore of Seville, the author of *Recolitis* saw no major need to take recourse to Scripture or the Fathers to support his point that astrology was a futile and false practice and that its practitioners should be shunned.⁴⁸ Indeed, perhaps his greatest overall innovation consisted in his assertion that the incoherence of astrology could be demonstrated from reason alone and was hence available to anybody, whether Christian or not. All it took was to pick up the astrologers' rulebook and apply to it the principles of natural philosophy, as codified in the works of Aristotle. Given the way Aristotle had served up to this point as a key witness to the idea of celestial influence, and hence to astrology's rational justification,⁴⁹ this recourse to philosophy may be considered an iconoclastic move, one that was apt to cause much discussion at the contemporary arts

⁴⁷ See M. Sorokina, "Une source inconnue de la *Disputatio contra iudicium astrologorum* de Marsile Ficin: la *Summa de astris* de Gérard de Feltre," *Bruniana & Campanelliana* 21 (2015), 169–189; eadem, "Un tournant dans la critique de l'astrologie? La *Summa de astris* de Gérard de Feltre," *Philosophical Readings* 7 (2015), 71–92; eadem, *Les théologiens* (n. 26), 422–428.

⁴⁸ There are minor exceptions, as when the author brings up Gregory the Great's dismissal of the idea of *fatum*. See *Recolitis*, 579–580.

⁴⁹ See J.D. North, "Celestial Influence: The Major Premiss of Astrology," in *'Astrologi hallucinati': Stars and the End of the World in Luther's Time*, ed. P. Zambelli (Berlin, 1986), 45–100; idem, "Medieval Concepts of Celestial Influence: A Survey," in *Astrology, Science and Society: Historical Essays*, ed. P. Curry (Woodbridge, 1987), 5–17; E. Grant, "Medieval and Renaissance Scholastic Conceptions of the Influence of the Celestial Region on the Terrestrial," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 17 (1987), 1–23; G. Freudenthal, "The Astrologization of the Aristotelian Cosmos: Celestial Influences on the Sublunary World in Aristotle, Alexander of Aphrodisias, and Averroes," in *New Perspectives on Aristotle's De Caelo*, ed. A.C. Bowen and C. Wildberg (Leiden, 2009), 239–281; D. Juste, "Les textes astrologiques latins attribués à Aristote," *Micrologus* 21 (2013), 145–164.

faculty. In addressing issues such as empirical evidence, celestial influence, causality, and contingency, and using them to undermine contemporary astrological thought, *Recolitis* stands as a noteworthy intellectual precursor to the anti-astrological campaigns launched later in the same century by Nicole Oresme, Heinrich von Langenstein, and Heinrich Selder.⁵⁰

Note on the Edition

The edition below reproduces the text as found in W = Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 83.5 Aug. 2^o, ff. 94vb–101vb. It mostly follows the orthography of the manuscript, the only significant exception being the use of *c/t*, which has been normalized throughout (e.g., by writing *etiam* instead of *eciam*, or *necesse* instead of *neccesse*). I have used <pointy brackets> to highlight conjectures and other insertions and †daggers† to mark words and phrases that appeared unintelligible or corrupt. Text found in the margins of the manuscript has been marked as such by placing it between \slashes/.

It remains for me to thank Christopher D. Schabel very much for procuring images of the manuscript and for checking my transcription of the text against them. This edition could not have been completed without his generous help.

⁵⁰ On Heinrich Selder, see C.P.E. Nothaft, "*Vanitas vanitatum et super omnia vanitas*: The Astronomer Heinrich Selder and a Newly Discovered Fourteenth-Century Critique of Astrology," *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 1 (2016), 261–304.

Edition of *Recolitis*

[94vb] *Recolitis*, ut estimo, quod scribenti michi nuper quodam clerico studenti Parisius de significatione eclipsium solis et lune visarum anno Domini MCCC^oXXI^o¹ iudicium secundum magistrum Gaufredum de Mellis, Parisius in astronomia regentem²—cuius sic incipiunt verba que de hac ponit: “Deus in celo duo fecit luminaria magna, solem, ut
 5 preesset diei” etc.—ego tunc illico clerico rescripsi vana esse huiusmodi iudicia et nichil certitudinis continere, ita etiam ut si omnia fierent que predixerat, hec omnino per accidens se haberent ad eclipses illas, eo quod eclipses ille proveniebant ex mera necessitate, in tantum ut unus bonus calculator ex tabulis astronomie ante mille annos eas
 10 potuerit eque certe predixisse tunc futuras sicut die immediate precedenti—et istud nullus negat qui aliquid intelligit de terminis astronomie et de regularitate motuum celestium—et qualitercumque in mundo se habuissent homines et haberent, sive Deus hominibus esset multum iratus, sive multum placatus, sive omnes homines essent multum mali, sive essent multum boni, eque utique contigissent illo tempore predictae eclipses.

Quomodo ergo Deus volebat significare per illas ea que contingenter fiunt in mundo?
 15 Quis hoc concedet quod rem contingenter evenientem Deus significet per illud quod necesse est esse? Si dixero quod signum huius rei quod dominus Philippus rex Francie isto anno erat mortuus erat hoc quod primus numerus perfectus est originale VI, proximus XXVIII, quis me non derideret? Et tamen eque <im>mutabiliter statutum erat in principio mundi per indicia <et> regularitatem motuum celestium ipsis speris pro tunc fieri eclipses
 20 illas quando fiebant sicut immutabili necessitate statutum est a Deo proximum numerum perfectum post VI esse XXVIII. Cum signum aliquem certum respectum habere oporteat

¹ mccc^oxxi^o] mccc^oxli^o W

² regentem] regentis W

ad signatum, aliter enim nichil certi significaret, \quomodo/³ illud quod est necesse fieri certam posset habere aliquam significationem super contingenti et possibili aliter se habere omnino? Hoc nullus potest intelligere, nisi ponat vel necessarium esse contingens
 25 vel utrumque esse necessarium. Si enim signum est necessarium et signatum contingens, sicut in proposito, veritas significans omnino contingens erit et incerta et talis ac si nulla [95ra] sit significatio. Et istud est omnino tale quale illud quod Philosophus in libro Priorum probat, capitulo de mixtionibus, quod ex necessario et contingente non sequitur nisi contingens.¹ Ego enim tunc scripsi illam rationem cum multis aliis rationibus, quibus
 30 ostendi etiam generaliter artem iudiciorum astrologie in pronosticando de contingentibus in istis inferioribus nec esse scientiam nec aliquid vere certitudinis aut scientialis necessitatis continere.

Recolitis nichilominus, ut certa fide teneo, quia vidistis et legistis, quomodo magister quidam in artibus, magis michi reverendus quam ego sibi, nomine magister Iohannes de
 35 Ganduno, <litteram> argumentis omnino vacuam, sed blasphemias et increpationibus ac contumeliis plenam, nec minimum omnium argumentorum meorum solvendo (eius littere seriem hic inferius annotavi de verbo ad verbum) michi rescripsit. Dominus Iohannes enim clerico tradidit, et ipse eam vobis legendo ostendit, ac demum michi misit, quam litteram bene post festum Purificationis Virginis primo recepi. Et nunc ad illam tranquillo
 40 animo cum nulla iracundia respondeo per presentes, non quomodolibet, sed plene et copiose. Quapropter, cum de predictis omnibus optime vobis constet, rogo quemlibet ex vobis tribus et omnes vos tres, velut sic vidistis et legistis prefatas iam dicti magistri Iohannis de Ganduno absque rationibus et argumentis et absque omni qualicumque rationum mearum solutione bla<s>phemias et increpationes et contumelias in me et

³ quomodo] quoniam *a.c.* *W*

45 contra me irrationabiliter iactatas, ita videre et perlegere et in publico perducere velitis,
sive ad eum, sive ad alios, rationes et probationes et argumentationes infra scriptas.

Et vere puto quod non modica res sit id de quo agitur: eliminare et extirpare ab
Ecclesia verissimis et insolubilibus rationibus, procedentibus omnino ex propriis materie
tantum, errorem illorum qui putant omnia ista inferiora, omnem hominis vitam, actum,
50 ingressum, progressum et finem, ex constellationibus dependere. Circa quod ab antiquo
multum laboraverunt doctores Ecclesie, sanctus Gregorius et ceteri, ut hanc a fidelibus
cordibus extirparent opinionem, ne ad mathematicos recurrerent, ne astrologos
consulerent, ne fatum aliquid esse crederent. Sic de hoc omnes libri sacrorum doctorum
Ecclesie sunt pleni. Ex quorum tamen auctoritatibus ego non intendo arguere [95rb] in
55 ista materia, quia non reciperet adversarius talia, sed hiis tantum uti intendo que quilibet
concedit et ratio necessaria concludit.

Unum autem dico, quod ego in veritate a primo tempore quo cepi aliquid a
mathematicis intelligere et scivi equare planetas, calculare eclipses, certificare
ascendentem sive descendentem cum ceteris sibi domibus et qui planeta conclusive, ubi
60 exaltationes singulorum, que triplicitates, que domus singulorum, qui termini, que
facies—postquam, inquam, ego didiceram⁴ de huiusmodi, avidissime desideravi scire
iudicia astrologie, ut scirem iudicare per astra de futuris contingentibus in mundo hic
inferius. Unde diligentissime perlegi et studui omnia que autentica reputantur circa
principia artis illius, sicut est Quadripartitum Ptholomei †archas† et Centiloquium
65 Ptholomei et iterum Introductorium maius ipsius Albumasar et Introductorium minus et
Flores Albumasar, libellum itinerarium quem portabat in gremio quocumque ibat, et
iterum Librum iudiciorum et Messehala. Ex huius<modi libris> ego didici iudicium seu

⁴ didiceram] post *add. W*

artem iudiciorum, non ex tractatulis domini Alberti. Et iam a XXVI annis examinavi apud
 me ipsa et inveni nichil in eis contineri certitudinis aut firmitatis, sed tantum esse quasdam
 70 coniecturas, sicut ariolus concutit et ignorat, et principia ex quibus iudicia huiusmodi
 procedunt inveni veras non esse, sed nugas quasdam et sine ratione aliqua cogente
 presump^{at}tas mirabil^{es}, sicut inferius ostendam.

Et ex hoc audaciam accepi <dicendi> per rationem et ex principiis illius artis hoc quod
 certi ab antiquo de illa ostenderunt, sanctus Gregorius et ceteri doctores, ex auctoritate
 75 sacre scripture et principiis fidei et sacre theolo<g>ye, videlicet quod ars illa iudiciorum,
 que est caput omnium artium magicarum, astrologia videlicet iudiciorum, vana sit et
 superstitiosa, non scientia, non ars, non habitus aliquis quo anima infallibiliter verum
 dicat. Sicut hoc ostenderunt sacri doctores ex principiis theolo<g>ie et auctoritate sacre
 scripture, ita ego puto me posse ostendere descendendo ad propria⁵ principia illius artis.
 80 Et ita per rationem discutiendo ego, \vero/,⁶ in quantum mathematicus, bene possum
 disputare de certificatione principiorum scientiarum specialium, sicut ostendit [95va]
 Avicenna in sua Methaphisica et Phisicorum. Nunc ergo incipiam agere de isto.

Et ne procedam in equivoco distingo primo de qua arte astronomie intendo. Duplex
 est enim scientia dicta astronomia, una que est vere mathematica, et est de quantitate
 85 continua contracta ad materiam talem que est corpus celeste et omnes motus illius. Sicut
 enim perspectiva considerat de quantitate et linea ut contracta est ad radiosum, ita
 astronomia considerat de quantitate continua et contracta ad materiam talem que est
 corpus celeste et regulares motus illius. Isto modo dicta astronomia traditur a Ptholomeo
 in Almagesti, vere demonstrative, et ab Alfragano, narrative. Agebat iterum⁷

⁵ propria] propinqua W

⁶ vero] non a.c. W

⁷ iterum] de necessitate *add. sed exp.* W

90 demonstrative quo ad aliqua obmissa a Ptholomeo vel minus perfecta tradita. Tabulatur autem ista astronomia a Ptholomeo in Almagesti, perfectius tamen et magis certificative ab Arzachele⁸ in Tabulis Toletanis. Et est vere proprie scientia et pulcherrima scientia, in qua nichil est vanum, nichil superstitiosum, et que numquam fuit ab Ecclesia dampnata, quia est scientia bona et honesta.

95 Alio modo dicitur astronomia que supposita est certis sitibus et locis et aspectibus planetarum et stellarum, ut scilicet per astronomiam primo modo dictam, per hoc ulterius iudicat coniecturando et coniciendo⁹ de hiis que debeant contingere in istis inferioribus.

Et ista dicitur astronomia iudiciorum et est illa de qua queritur utrum sit vere et proprie dicta scientia. Et ista astronomia docetur in aliis libris. Huius enim aliqua principia dat

100 Ptholomeus in Quadripartito et in Centilogio et Haly super Centilogium et Albumasar in Introductoriiis et in Floribus et in Messehala. Et non sunt in ista astronomia ulla demonstrationes, sed pure narrationes cum aliquibus superficialibus probationibus, verbi gratia quod exaltatio talis planete sit in tali signo, tali gradu, quod talis planete domus sit tale signum, et quod XII domorum computando ab horizonte subtus prima, que est
 105 ascendens, significet corpus et vitam et abilitatem et \cause/¹⁰ omnis rei initium ac motus, secunda substantiam, thesaurizationem substantie, aggregationem, acceptionem et dominationem. Et sic omnia principia huius artis sunt narrationes pure et nulla ratione, nulla demonstratione suffulte, ex [95vb] quibus tunc ulterius iudicia fiunt secundum quasdam vanas et superficiales probabilitates.

110 Tunc dico quod astronomia primo modo dicta non potest esse eadem scientia cum astronomia secundo modo dicta. Primo quia illa est vere mathematica scientia, ista non,

⁸ arzachele] arachele W

⁹ coniciendo] conniciendo W

¹⁰ cause] esse a.c. W

sed coniectura quedam de hiis que hic contingenter veniunt, illa demonstrativa et ex necessariis, ista narrativa et ex talibus que nullam vel modicam probabilitatem habent. Et secundum Philosophum non est descendere de genere in genus demonstrare¹¹.ⁱⁱ Scientia
 115 autem vere proprie dicta per demonstrationem habetur. Et aliud¹² utique genus est immutabilis necessitas illorum motuum superiorum, de quibus fiunt demonstratione<s>, aliud mutabilis contingentia istorum inferiorum, de qua coniecturatur per astronomiam secundo modo dictam, ergo nequaquam sunt una scientia ambe. Prima ergo, que est vere scientia, appellatur astronomia, alia autem, que est quedam coniecturatio, appellatur
 120 astrologia. Tunc aggrediendo principale propositum intendo¹³ dicere quod ars ista iudiciorum astrologie non sit proprie dicta scientia.

\Prima ratio/

Arguo primo sic: secundum Philosophum, primo Posteriorum, prima, id est proprie dicta scientia,¹⁴ habet esse de primis et per se notis et necessariis et propriis causis¹⁵
 125 conclusionum;ⁱⁱⁱ in ea arte qua aliquis per constellationem se putat posse convincere de futuris contingentibus hec non est ista; ergo ipsa non est vere proprie dicta scientia.

Maior sufficienter probata est in eo quod adversarius non vult negare Philosophum. Probo minorem: quia ea que assumunt coniectores in arte ista non sunt cause conclusionum, prout omnes huius artis traditores confitentur, dicendo quod talis planeta
 130 in ascendente vel alia domo hoc vel illud signat, non dicendo quod hoc vel illud causat. Quod etiam bene signatur Genesis primo, ubi dicitur: “Dixit Dominus Deus, ‘fiant

¹¹ demonstrare] demonstrative W

¹² aliud] aliis W

¹³ intendo] intendere W

¹⁴ id est proprie dicta scientia] idem proprie dicte scientie W

¹⁵ causis] causisque W

luminaria magna in firmamento celi et dividant diem et noctem et sint in signa et tempora et dies et annos, ut¹⁶ luceant in firmamento celi et illuminent terram’.”^{iv} Ecce nusquam positum est ibi ut sint cause. Ergo ars illa non procedit ex causis.

135 Non etiam procedit ex propriis, quia proprie cause effective omnium effectuum talium de quibus ut futuris pronosticant sunt plerumque homines hic in mundo vel alia agentia naturalia hic apud nos. Celum autem et stelle, si aliquarum sunt cause, nequaquam sunt proprie, sed generales et communes, ymmo extra ordinem naturaliter agentium, [96ra] quia “omne agens naturale in agendo repatitur,” secundum Philosophum,^v et astra non
140 repatiuntur. Unde patet quod ars illa nullo modo procedit ex propriis causis.

Non etiam procedit ex necessariis, prout superius fuit probatum, quia est pronosticatio de contingentibus et possibilibus¹⁷ aliter se habere, sicut sunt ea que dependent ex libero arbitrio et ex causis efficientibus que possunt impediri per naturam. Et licet¹⁸ habitudo constellationis illa ex qua procedunt sit¹⁹ necessaria, quia tamen²⁰ id quod prenosticare
145 intendit est contingens, et ex necessario et contingenti non sequitur nisi contingens ut contingens est ex scientia, nec descendente de genere in genus est demonstrare, ergo etc.

Non etiam procedit ex aliquibus per se notis in illa scientia, vel in alia, vel omnibus vel pluribus vel maxime sapientibus. Probatio: quia ea que supponit ars ista ex
150 astronomia, scilicet certa loca planetarum, illa non sunt principia huius artis, quia non est descendente de genere in genus demonstrare. Unde artis principia non sunt nota in astronomia. Nusquam Ptholomeus²¹ in Almagesti aliquid vel minimum tangit de naturis

¹⁶ ut] et *W*

¹⁷ possibilibus] post libet *W*

¹⁸ licet] habet *W*

¹⁹ sit] sicut *W*

²⁰ tamen] cum *W*

²¹ Ptholomeus] P^{inca}(?)

signorum, vel de naturis planetarum, vel de significatione domorum, vel quis planeta
 masculinus, quis femineus, quis benivolus, quis malivolus, que aut ubi exaltatio huius
 155 planete, que aut ubi exaltatio illius, que triplicitates, qui termini, que facies, que signa
 istorum singulorum, quid significet genzahar, quid nadir²² ipsius genzahar in singulis
 planetis, id est super quibus rebus significet caput, super quibus cauda, que signa ignea,
 que terrea, que aerea, que aquatica. Que tamen omnia sunt principia huius artis, ut patet
 ex Albumazar et omnibus aliquid tradentibus de arte ista, quorum omnium nichil notum
 160 est in aliis scientiis, nec aliquid illorum vel notum est aut omnibus aut pluribus aut²³ etiam
 maxime sapientibus, quia nullus, etiam inter illos maxime sapiens, scit dicere aut miniam
 rationem dare qualia talia super talibus significant, sicut per totum illum librum qui
 appellatur Introductorium maius ipsius Albumazar [96rb] apparet.

Quia ipse Albumazar, cum tamen sit multum copiosus in dictis suis, nullam omnino
 165 scit dare rationem quare tale significet super tali effectu ex illis infinitis que ipse ponit de
 significationibus signorum et planetarum, domorum, exaltationum, triplicitatum,
 terminorum, sed ultimum quod potest dicere de ratione est hoc quod sic tradiderunt
 Caldei, sic tradiderunt Babilonici, sic Egiptii, sic Indi,²⁴ allegando semper antiquitatem
 quod sic sit tradendum, numquam ponendo rationem qua per evidentiam sciatur sic se
 170 habere. Aliquando enim ipse miratur unde antiqui ista potuerunt habere, cum per nullum²⁵
 sensum nec aliquam viam rationis haberi possit, et tunc dicit quod forte aliquibus
 antiquorum revelata <est> per spiritum sive per angelos vel per Deum vel a Deo.^{vi} Ex quo
 ergo Ptholomeus²⁶ et Albumazar et Messehala et Hermes et Haly fuerunt maxime

²² nadir] nadit W

²³ aut] et W

²⁴ Indi] Iudei W

²⁵ sensum] sensam W

²⁶ ptholomeus] p^{inca}(?) W

sapientes in arte ista iudiciorum inter omnes quorum de hoc scripta habemus, et nulli
 175 illorum fuerunt ista per se nota, sed tantum ab antiquis tradita, et ex hiis procedit ars illa,
 ergo non procedit ex aliquibus per se notis, vel omnibus, vel etiam maxime sapientibus.

Forte dices ad infirmandum rationem principalem primo factam quod non oportet quod
 in quacumque scientia concurrant omnia illa que Philosophus primo Posteriorum ponit
 esse requisita ad scientiam propriissime dictam, quia talis scientia est valde rara. Ego
 180 concedo dictum illud. Sed dico simul cum hoc quod aliud est in aliqua scientia non
 inveniri omnes condiciones requisitas ad scientiam proprie dictam, aliud nullam omnino
 ibi esse vel inveniri condicionem scientie. Ita autem est in proposito quod in arte
 iudiciorum astronomie nulla omnino invenitur condicio ad veraciter dictam scientiam
 requisita, quia neque est ex principiis per se notis, aut necessariis, aut propriis, aut causis
 185 conclusionum, sicut hec omnia per singula sunt probata.

Unde potest argui sic: illud non est in veritate scientia quod nullam habet condicionem
 ad scientiam requisitam; ars iudiciorum astronomie est huiusmodi, ut supra probatum fuit
 per singulas condiciones ad scientiam requisitas; ergo illa nullo modo est vere scientia.
 Hec ergo sit prima ratio cum paralogizationibus suis, quam solvat qui poterit.

190 \2^a ratio/

Secundo arguo sic: dicit Philosophus VII^o Methaphisice: “Non contingit scientiam
 [96va] quandoque ignorantiam esse, sicut nec diffinitionem quandoque diffinitionem,
 quandoque non diffinitionem, nec demonstrationem quandoque demonstrationem,
 quandoque non demonstrationem.”^{vii} Ex hoc arguo sic: illa ars non est vere scientia que
 195 aliquando aliquorum eventuum putatur esse scientia, aliquando invenitur quorundam

evenientium de quibus iudicat ut venturis esse omnimoda ignorantia; ars iudicandi de futuris contingentibus per astra est huiusmodi; ergo ars illa non est aliqua vera scientia.

Maiores sufficienter est probata adversario meo, quia est verbum Philosophi, quem ipse non vult negare, quod²⁷ scientiam non contingit aliquando esse scientiam, aliquando
 200 ignorantiam. Probatio minoris, videlicet quod frequenter iudicet astrologus aliquid quod sit venturum quod sic non evenit: hoc manifestum est scientibus terminos huius artis quibus loquor. Nonne in libro iudiciorum †diversis signis†, sive quos Albumasar in gremio portare consuevit de expertis in suo tempore, sive aliis, frequenter invenitur quod cum aliquis interrogavit astronomum de eventu alicuius rei, si in ascendente pro tunc
 205 fuerit planeta malivulus fortunatus, quod debet ei dicere ut veniat alio²⁸ tempore sub hac quesiturus, et si tibi semper inveniat signum malum, tunc non debet ei dare aliquam spem de bona fortuna aliqua? Ergo, ex quo venire potuit ad querendum quando voluit, et si in primo eius adventu invenisset planetam fortunatum in ascendente, tunc non iussisset eum in aliquo tempore reverti, patet similiter quod nulla fuit omnino necessitas eveniendi sibi
 210 fortunam ex eo quod tali tempore et sic se habente celo venit ad querendum, ymmo nullum agens in iudiciis astronomie est \quin/²⁹ hoc sciat et hoc fateatur quod frequenter in prenosticando deficit et quod res aliter evenit.

Unde iudicia astronomie habent se ut ludi puerorum quibus ludunt consulendo utrum in tali cumulo sit par vel impar. Cum enim oporteat necessario alterum esse, ita bene
 215 contingit quod dicendo ‘par’ dicat sicut est, sicut dicat ‘impar’ sicuti non est. Et vere in illo ludo pueri sunt prudentiores et magis sensati quam illi qui putant astrologum aliquid scire de eventu contingente eo quod semel ita accidit. Nullus enim puerorum est ita fatuus

²⁷ quod] quia W

²⁸ alio] illo W

²⁹ quin] quando a.c. W

qui ex hoc quod alius frequenter lucratur dicendo sicuti est putet illum scivisse quod sic
 esset, sed omnino casui deputat. Isti vero qui experiuntur astrologum bis vel ter prosperari
 220 ut ita eveniat sicut dicit statim putant eum scivisse quod ita deberet evenire, cum tamen
 ipse consulat [96vb] et fortuitu inter contradictoria eum presentem que vere est tangat
 sicut puer inter par et impar, quia sicut hic necesse est alterum esse par vel impar, ita illic
 necesse est evenire sic vel non sic evenire et eque contingit ut iudicando dicat illud quod
 verum sicut illud quod falsum.

225 Sicut Augustinus, in libro De civitate Dei,^{viii} narrat de duobus quorum neuter tantum
 sciret de astronomia quod sciret esse XII signa in celo, qui iter facientes vespere
 declinaverunt in domum simplicis bene creduli astrologis, quorum iunior de socio suo
 seniori dixit occulte domino domus, “Iste socius meus est maximus astrologus, quare
 querite ab eo que volueritis, occultissima pandet vobis.” Habebat autem filium in
 230 peregrinatione de cuius salute et actibus non modicum erat sollicitus, et cum ab eo
 quesisset quomodo succederet filio suo in negotiis, an esset sanus et quando esset
 venturus domum, exeuntes illi duo ostium³⁰ domus contemplati sunt sidera per aliquod
 tempus, et non timentes deprehendi de mendacio, eo quod mane essent recessuri,
 responderunt ei prospera dicentes: “En, filius tuus sanus est et incolumis, prospere
 235 successerunt omnia in negotiis suis. Cras, cum posueris mensam tuam ad prandeum, ecce
 intrabit domum istam filius tuus et ita invenies ut diximus.” Recesserunt illi mane et, ecce,
 tempore prandii evenerunt omnia ut dixerunt. Misit post eos famulum in equo et eos ad
 se reduxit et tantos magistros honoravit.

Forte dices michi, “Fabule sunt ista, non argumenta.” Et ego respondeo et dico quod
 240 ex huiusmodi expertis fabulis dependet credulitas qua creditur iudiciis astrologie. Ecce

³⁰ ostium] hostium W

probo et dico: in commento Centiloquii commentator ille narrat quod ipse tempore suo expertus fuit de significatione illius constellationis que dicitur caput Algol,³¹ sub quo signo, si quis natus sit et sic se habente aspectu nativitatis, homo ille qui tunc nascitur iudicatur ab astrologis esse suspendendus vel truncandus et tali morte mori[97ra]turus.

245 Dicit ille commentator quod ipse in tali civitate novit iuvenem quemdam multum legalem et pacificum et caventem ab omni crimine, de quo ipse fuit interrogatus quomodo esset terminaturus vitam suam. “Et cum quesissem,” inquit “de hora nativitatis sue et puncto et certificassem pro illo puncto temporis ascendentem³² cum ceteris domibus, inveni caput Algol in tali situ quod non dabat bonum iudicium de fine vite ipsius. Distuli tamen
250 iudicium et non audebam eum iudicare esse infurcandum aut truncandum, considerando bonam vitam et bonos mores, et dixi esse deferendum iudicium donec magis adolesceret iuvenis. Contigit autem ut post paucos annos ego ad civitatem illam reverterer et vidi eum actu infurcatum, truncatum manibus et pedibus, sicut dederat signum capitis Algol.”^{ix}

255 Ecce ergo quali narratione iste commentator confirmat esse veram significationem capitis Algol. Nonne ego narratione tanti doctoris, scilicet Augustini, possum confirmare contingentiam et casum in huiusmodi iudiciis? Tu nullam habes certam rationem quare sic sit ut dant iudicia astronomie, nisi quia expertum est sic evenisse. Et ego dico tibi quod illud non sufficit, quia similiter expertum est in illo qui casualiter dixit sicut postea evenit,
260 et tamen propter hoc nullus putat quod ille eventum illius presciverit³³ quem predixerit.³⁴ Unde si in medicina “experimentum est fallax,” ut dicit Ypocras,^x cum tamen hic reiterari possit experimentum, multo magis in proposito experimentum est fallax cum numquam

³¹ algol] algat *W*

³² ascendentem] aspectus *W*

³³ presciverit] presciverunt *W*

³⁴ predixerit] predixerunt *W*

possit inveniri hic celum secundum omnem statum illum in quo erat cum per ipsum illud vel istud experiebatur.

265 Sit ergo ista summa probatio istius minoris secunde principalis rationis, quod³⁵ non est scientia cum aliquando possit esse ignorantia, quia si ponas esse necesse sic evenire sicut dant iudicia astronomie, et iudicia astronomie se extendunt ad quecumque contingentia, ergo quecumque contingentia evenirent ex necessitate, quia in conclusionibus, opinionibus et quibuslibet aspectibus planetarum et astrorum nichil omnino fit casu.

270 \3^a ratio/

Tertio arguo sic: Philosophus in VII Eticorum dicit quod quinque sunt quibus anima infallibiliter verum dicit: ars, scientia, prudentia, etc. Unde ista sunt verba Phylosophi: “Sunt utique quibus anima verum dicit affirmando vel negando, [97rb] quinque secundum numerum. Hec autem sunt ars, scientia, prudentia, sapientia, intellectus. Suspicionem enim et opinionem contingit falsum dicere.”^{xi} Ex hoc arguo sic: illa facultas qua contingit falsum dicere, licet illa possit esse suspicio vel opinio, non tamen potest esse ars vel scientia vel prudentia vel sapientia vel intellectus, quia hiis anima infallibiliter verum dicit; sed ea facultate que dicitur iudicium astrologorum contingit animam falsum dicere; ergo talis facultas non est ars nec scientia etc.

280 Maior patet per Philosophum, que probatio sufficit adversario meo. Minorem probo, quia illa facultate contingit animam falsum dicere que est iudicativa de contingentibus per ea respectu quorum omnia³⁶ illa contingentia contingit aliter se habere. Facultas iudiciorum astrologie est huiusmodi, quia de multis vere contingentibus iudicat et de multis que ex libro arbitrio dependent. Vera autem contingentia respectu nullius

³⁵ quod] quia W

³⁶ omnia] anima W

285 habitudinis astrorum³⁷ sunt necessaria, quia illud non est vere contingens quod respectu
 alterius necessario evenientis necessario evenit. Omnis autem habitudo astrorum pro tunc
 et nunc semper <est> necessaria, ergo nichil quod respectu illius evenit necessario potest
 esse vere contingens. Iudicat autem astrologia de vere contingentibus, ergo per eam
 contingit aliquando falsum dicere ipsam animam. Iudicat etiam de hiis que ex libero
 290 arbitrio dependent, que respectu nullius constellationis necesse est sic evenire. Ergo in
 talibus iudiciis contingit aliquando falsum dicere ipsam animam, vel, si dicas ipsam
 animam per astronomiam semper verum dicere necessario, omnia contingentia erunt
 necessaria, quia de omnibus contingentibus se intromittit iudicare, ut patet scientibus
 aliquid de arte illa. Qui autem de illa loquuntur ex tractatulis domini Alberti illis non
 295 constant ista, quia Albertus nusquam docet astronomiam iudiciorum.

Quod etiam iudicet astronomia frequenter de hiis que ex libero arbitrio dependent nulli
 dubium est qui aliquid vidit de canonibus artis illius. Et iam michi³⁸ attestatur in hoc ille
 qui nuper³⁹ scribens de significatione eclipsium visarum⁴⁰ anno Domini MCCC^oXXI^o,⁴¹
 magister Ganfredus de Mellis, sicut dixit quod “ratione coniunctionis Martis cum Saturno
 300 et ratione suorum statuum in eclipsi debent esse rancores et odia, et quod in locis aliquibus
 insurget gens in gentem, et cum hoc signat extorsiones, robur et rapinas et in multis
 statibus paupertatem. Sed ratione Iovis et Mercurii⁴² et suorum aspectuum ad invicem et
 ad eclipses dico quod in scribis et phariseis et sapientibus seu personis ecclesiasticis
 aliquibus turbatio grandis erit, et illud ratione Martis, professoris huius anni, et ratione

³⁷ astorum] astronomorum *a.c.* *W*

³⁸ michi] *m^e* *W*

³⁹ nuper] *nupar* *W*

⁴⁰ visarum] *usitarum* *W*

⁴¹ *mccc^oxxi^o*] *mccc^oxli^o* *W*

⁴² mercurii] *marcurii* *W*

305 Mercurii,⁴³ dignioris in hoc anno, et ratione significationis eorum cum eclipsi. Et [97va] ratione Iovis pluribus modis impediti dico quod fides in pluribus vacillabit et hereses erunt plures.” Nonne, queso, omnium istorum effectus ultimatim⁴⁴ ex libero arbitrio dependent, et nonne iudice ipsomet,⁴⁵ qui sic dicit, aliter potest evenire? Ergo in huiusmodi contingit falsum dicere et aliter quam res ventura sit.

310 Forte dices, “Ego non dixi quod ita venturum esset necessario, sed dixi quod eclipses et relique facies celi ita venturum esse significabant⁴⁶ quod cum huiusmodi significationibus constat et resideat orbis.” <Respondeo>: aut necessarium⁴⁷ est sic evenire ut astra signant, et tunc peribit libertas arbitrii, aut potest aliter evenire, et tunc contingit animam per hanc facultatem quandoque falsum dicere, et per consequens neque
 315 erit ars, neque scientia, neque prudentia, neque sapientia, neque intellectus, secundum Philosophum, sed vel suspicio vel opinio, de quibus homines intelligentes parum curant.

\4^a ratio/

Quarto iterum arguo sic: in scientia non vere certificata, si contingat aliquando verum dicere, non ex hoc dicenda est scientia, si contingat aliquando verum esse quod per eam
 320 predicatur et prenosticatur; scientia iudiciorum astronomie numquam fuit adhuc vere certificata; ergo si aliquando per eam verum dicit qui per eam de futuris pronosticat, non propter hoc dicenda est vere scientia.

Maior patet, quia incerta nondum certificata: si quid verum dicitur, non tamen vere dicitur, quia nondum est ad necessariam veritatem certificatum. Minorem probo: quia

⁴³ mercurii] marcurii W

⁴⁴ ultimatim] ultimi(m)ati W

⁴⁵ ipsomet] ipsemet *a.c.* W; ipsimet *p.c.* W

⁴⁶ significabant] significabat W

⁴⁷ necessarium] est *add. sed del.* W

325 Ptholomeus in principio primi verbi Centiloquii sic dicit quod “ex te et illis,” scilicet
 astris, “est.”^{xii} Si hoc asseras in iudiciis quod ex te et ex illis⁴⁸ expertus fueris, numquam
 autem aliquis vel aliqui de iudiciis astrorum experti fuerunt omnia, ymmo a principio
 mundi usque huc numquam est dare duo instantia aliqua in quorum secundo omnia que
 330 non ex se vel sic evenisse, sed aliquotiens iuxta idem, per hoc ex multis sensibus
 experimentum, ex pluribus experimentis unum universale, quod est principium artis et
 scientie.⁴⁹ Ergo adhuc numquam ars iudiciorum astrorum fuit certificata, quia adhuc
 numquam rediit habitudo celi per omnia similis ei que umquam fuit. Unde Ptholomeus
 ponit motum octave spere esse in centum annis gradu uno et sic non compleretur motus
 335 ille nisi infra XXXVI milia annorum, et cum hoc esset etiam tunc necesse omnia loca
 planetarum esse illa que erant a principio mundi.

\5^a ratio/

Quinto: ars illa que non est ars nisi certificetur experimento, illam, si impossibile est
 experimento certificare vere, impossibile est vere artem esse;⁵⁰ ars iudiciorum, quo ad
 340 ascensum ad singula tunc vel tunc futura, non est ars nisi certificetur experimento, et
 impossibile [97vb] est eam experimentis vere certificari; ergo impossibile est eam vere
 artem esse.

Maior est per se manifesta. Minor, quo⁵¹ ad hoc quod ars iudiciorum non sit ars nisi
 verificetur experimento, patet per Ptholomeum in prima positione Centilogii, qua dicit
 345 quod “ex te et ex illis” est astrorum iudicium. Et iterum patet per Albumasar, in libello

⁴⁸ illis] aliis W

⁴⁹ scientie] inventio scientie *add. mg. W*

⁵⁰ esse] nota hoc simile de medicina *add. mg. W*

⁵¹ quo] qua W

qui dicitur Flores Albumasar, ubi ipse ponit ea que suo tempore expertus fuit sic se habere. Et in infinitis aliorum libellis invenitur quod sic et sic se habentibus astris taliter respondendum est ad talem et ad talem questionem et talia et talia fiant. Patet ergo ex ipsa arte quod⁵² per talia generalia principia que ars illa tradit non debet aliquis in speciali
 350 iudicare, nisi ex se et ex illis, scilicet astris, prius per experimentum sumptum, iuxta illud Ptholomei quod “ex te et ex illis.”⁵³

Aliam autem partem minoris, scilicet quod impossibile sit artem illam quo ad singula, ymmo quo ad aliquid singulorum, experiri vere et certificari, probo sic: quia ille non potest de aliquo efficaciter de efficacia alicuius rei experiri aut alicuius cause qui eandem
 355 causam non potest simili effectui pluries applicare, ex pluribus enim sensibus sumitur experimentum; celum autem cum omnimoda facie et simili effectum numquam adhuc fuerat replicatum et iteratum; ergo impossibile fuit aliquod adhuc umquam certum esse acceptare documentum de aliquo futuro et de situ astrorum, quia a principio mundi usque huc numquam inveniebatur⁵⁴ bis similis situs astrorum quo ad omnia que in iudiciis
 360 aliquando attenduntur que \prius/.⁵⁵

Forte dices, “Non oportet in iudiciis⁵⁶ attendere ad omnem motum totius celi et eorum que in celo sunt habitudinum, sed sufficit attendere ad signatores rei talis.” Et ego respondeo et dico quod secundum traditionem artis illius nulla est ita vehemens signatio quin aliquando ei addatur vel detrahatur per attentionem ad quedam alia, que, etiam <si>
 365 illa pars 120^a signata esset,⁵⁷ omnia talia impossibile est simul concurrere. Unde in

⁵² quod] quia *W*

⁵³ illis] aliis *W*

⁵⁴ inveniebatur] inveniabatur *W*

⁵⁵ prius] plus *a.c.* *W*

⁵⁶ iudiciis] hominum *add. sed del.* *W*

⁵⁷ signata esset] signatam esse et *W*

pronosticationibus singularibus quidam⁵⁸ attendunt principalius ad initia rerum et
 nativitatem, ut si velis iudicare de hiis que futura sunt in regno Francie attendas ad
 signatorem illius regni, alii principalius attendunt ad planetam quem dicunt dominum
 regionis illius, prout diversis regionibus diversi⁵⁹ planete assignantur domini perpetui, alii
 370 attendunt ad dominum illius anni, alii ad naturas signorum, alii ad naturas planetarum,
 alii ad permutationem triplici[98ra]tatum,⁶⁰ alii ad peregrinationem, alii ad planete in sua
 domo locationem, alii ad aspectus cum ceteris tribus angulis et collateralibus eis domibus
 orientalibus et occidentalibus, alii ad exaltationes et puteos planetarum, alii ad
 distinctiones et naturas terminorum, alii ad ea que ascendunt in quacumque facie trium
 375 facierum cuiuslibet XII signorum—et tanta est in huiusmodi diversitas ut impossibile esset
 aliquem unum hominem ad omnia illa attendere in iudicando, quanto magis impossibile
 ut omnia servet experimento, ymmo frequenter unus astrologus attendens ad quasdam
 predictarum signationum oppositum iudicabit eius quod iudicat alius qui ad alias attendit
 signationes. Unde nulli potest esse dubium quin simul omnia vanissima sint.

380 \6a ratio/

Sexto sic: illa sunt omnia vana et incerta que arbitrio cuiuslibet iudicantis relinquuntur
 et a nullo vere autentico traduntur, sed quilibet iudicat secundum suam estimationem, et
 si ita evenit illud conscribit tamquam experimentum; omnia ultimata iudicia
 astronomorum sunt huiusmodi, quo ad particularia; ergo etc.

385 Probatio minoris ex ipsamet arte illa, quia hoc scit quilibet qui vidit aliquid de arte illa,
 quod omnes qui in arte illa autentici sunt et autores artis, ut Ptholomeus in Quadripartito

⁵⁸ quidam] quedam W

⁵⁹ diversi] diverse W

⁶⁰ triplicitatum] triplicatatum W

et in Centilogio et Albumazar in Introductorio et Messehala in suo Introductorio et Haly, omnes id quod tradunt tradunt in generali, verbi gratia quod tale signum inter XII signa sit igneum, tale terreum, et sic quod omnia ignea sint de una triplicitate, ut⁶¹ Aries, Leo, Sagittarius, et omnia terrea in secunda triplicitate, ut Thaurus, Virgo, Capricornus, et sic de aliis, et quomodo quedam⁶² illorum signorum sint mobilia, quedam fixa, quedam communia, sicut dicit Albumazar, tractatu secundo,⁶³ differentia VI et differentia VII, et iterum que signa masculina, que feminina, sicut ipse ostendit differentia VIII, et iterum que signa sint diurna, que nocturna, sicut ipse ostendit ibidem, differentia IX.^{xiii}

395 Iterum Albumazar tractatu tertio, differentia prima illius tractatus, diffiniens quid est scientia iudiciorum, dicit sic: “Diffinitio scientie iudiciorum astrorum est: scientia eorum que signat fortitudo motus <planetarum> ex tempore noto super tempus illud et tempus futurum diffinitum.”^{xiv} Iterum tractatu III^o, per omnes illas IX differentias illius tractatus, ipse <tradit> de naturis planetarum, [98rb] qui benivoli, qui malivoli, que nature planetarum sint eis fixe et inseparabiles, que mobiles et ab eis separabiles. Iterum qui planete masculini, qui feminini, qui diurni, qui nocturni.^{xv} Iterum in tractatu V^o,⁶⁴ per XXII⁶⁵ differentias istius tractatus, ipse tradidit de v dignitatibus planetarum prolixè per singulas quid sit domus, exaltatio, triplicitas, terminus, facies et qui putei planetarum.^{xvi}

400 In tractatu VI^o prosequitur de ascensionibus singulorum ad⁶⁶ singula VII⁶⁷ climata et qui planete quibus climatibus et quibus provinciis dominantur, et in XXVI <differentia> illius tractatus sexti tradit de ascendente et ceteris domibus et earum significationibus et de

405

⁶¹ ut] *iter.* W

⁶² quedam] quidam W

⁶³ secundo] tractatu *add. sed exp.* W

⁶⁴ v^o] v W

⁶⁵ xxii] xxvi W

⁶⁶ ad] signa *add. sed exp.* W

⁶⁷ vii] v W

gaudiis planetarum. Et in differentia XXVIII de commixtione signorum in signatione
 elementorum.^{xvii} In tractatu VII determinat de “XXI⁶⁸ esse planetarum,” qui “sunt
 aspectus, coniunctio, separatio, vacuatio cursus, feralitas, translatio, <collectio>, redditus
 410 luminis, prohibitio, pulsatio⁶⁹ nature, pulsatio⁷⁰ fortitudinis, pulsatio utraque naturarum,
 pulsatio dispositionis, redditus, refrenatio, accidentalis⁷¹ <eventus>, evasio, abscisio
 luminis, largitio, retributio et receptio.”^{xviii}

Hec omnia ideo posui ut erubescant qui de iudiciis se intromittunt et de arte illa nichil
 noverunt, et ut pateat probatio illius minoris, videlicet quod ars illa non descendit ad
 415 particularia iudicia, sed tantum quedam generalia tradat et iudicia particularia arbitrio
 iudicantium derelinquat, quorum tunc tot sunt ulterius sensus quot capita. Et nullus
 autenticus invenitur aliquid tradere de illis, nec in quantum Albumazar in Floribus de hiis
 que sic esse dicit suo tempore experta, que paucissima sunt et omnino incerta. Multi vero
 ribaldi currentes per terras tradunt talia sub nominibus quorundam antiquorum
 420 mentiendo, sicut Augustinus narrat in De civitate Dei,^{xix} quod erat tempore suo inter
 astronomos quidam libellus de iudiciis in particulari maxime reputatus, cuius titulus erat
 “Epistola de iudiciis astrorum quam⁷² misit Christus apostolo suo Paulo cum adhuc
 versaretur cum hominibus in terra.” Ecce, quanto veritas tituli, tanta veritas contentorum
 in libello illo! Paulus enim Christo adhuc in terra existente⁷³ numquam [98va] erat
 425 apostolus. Forte istius libelli prenosticationes erant quas de eclipsibus solis et lune nuper
 scripserat Ganfredus de Mellis; idcirco tam indignum fuit magistro Iohanni de Ganduno
 quod ego audebam illis contradicere, ut ideo michi rescriberet tales blasphemias que

⁶⁸ xxi] xii W

⁶⁹ pulsatio] plantatio W

⁷⁰ pulsatio] plantatio W

⁷¹ accidentalis] evacuatio *add. sed exp.* W

⁷² quam] quem W

⁷³ existente] existentis W

inferius annotantur. Ego autem bene scio hoc: quod in toto Albumazar magister Iohannes
 de Ganduno nichil invenit de talibus significationibus eclipsium,⁷⁴ nec ullum poterit
 430 proferre autenticum librum unde talia habeat. Ptholomeus, cum dicat quod “ex te et ex
 illis”⁷⁵ sit iudicium astrorum, si ex illis⁷⁶ habuerit, ostendat ex illis;⁷⁷ si ex se, ostendat
 quando talia alias expertus fuerit.

\7^a ratio/

Septimo sic: si duplici existente medicinali arte,⁷⁸ una que traditur modo artis
 435 negligente quibusdam gradibus, et docetur in scolis, alia que cottidianis experimentis
 sumitur circa particularia, in qua cottidie proficiunt illi qui talibus particularibus dediti
 sunt, si ista, inquam, medicinalis secunda non est vere ars nec scientia, propter frequenter
 mentiri ex nimia vicinitate ad materiam, quanto magis duplici existente arte iudiciorum,
 una que traditur scientialiter per scripturam, alia que cottidianis experimentationibus
 440 acquiritur, vana erit et non scientia ista secundo modo dicta, non tantum propter esse
 vicinum <ad> materie mutabilitatem, sed propter omnimodam contingentiam et
 casualitatem et propter non posse iterare experimentum.

Rogo: unde putas te probare posse istam consequentiam: ‘tali existente habitudine
 astrorum talia contigerunt, ergo iterum tali existente similia contingent’, maxime cum tu
 445 respicias ad quedam paucissima et non ad totam celi habitudinem? Et si ad totam et
 omnem celi habitudinem respiceres, que utique adhuc numquam fuerit vel semel iterata,
 adhuc non posses probare talem consequentiam. Vel unde posses probare talem

⁷⁴ eclipsium] et omnia terrea in 2^a triplicitate thaurus virgo capricornus et sic de aliis et quomodo quedam
 illorum *add. sed exp. W*

⁷⁵ illis] aliis *W*

⁷⁶ illis] aliis *W*

⁷⁷ illis] aliis *W*

⁷⁸ arte] de duplici medicina *add. mg. W*

consequentiam: ‘celo sic se habente hoc fit, ergo illa habitudo celi hoc sic futurum significat’, maxime cum illa habitudo celi omnino fuerit necessaria et illud quod fit
 450 omnino contingens?

\8^a ratio/

Sed potestne illa ars iudiciorum habere rationem scientie que quibusdam generalibus regulis scripta traditur ac deinde sic vel sic applicanda ad materiam arbitrio iudicantis relinquitur? Ecce, probo quod non, quia illud non est vere scientia neque ars cuius notitia
 455 a nullo sensu depen[98vb]det, sed tantum creditur testimonio alterius et nescitur cuius ut primi, ymmo tantum creditur antiquitati; illud quod de iudiciis astronomie traditur, sive a Ptholomeo, sive ab Albumazar, est huiusmodi, puta quod tale signum in celo sit igneum, scilicet Sagittarius, quod contrarium est utique omni sensui, cum sole ibi existente sit hyems, et quod Thaurus, ubi sol est in estate, sit signum terreum et frigidum,^{xx} istud utique
 460 nullo sensu compertum est, sed magis oppositum. Crediderunt⁷⁹ nichilominus Ptholomeus et Albumazar Caldeis et Egiptiis qui sic posuerunt, cum nec ipsi ex sensu hoc habere potuerunt. Similiter cum in celo per totum semper post igneum signum immediate sequitur terreum, deinde aereum, post aquaticum—verbi gratia: Aries est signum igneum, Thaurus terreum, Gemini aereum, Cancer aquaticum, Leo iterum igneum et sic per
 465 totum—queso te, unde veniat ista ordinatio que sic aliena ab ordinatione est elementorum? Ita de omnibus terminis planetarum, de omnibus quinque dignitatibus planetarum, domibus, exaltationibus, triplicitatibus, terminis, faciebus, de omnibus illis XXI esse planetarum dictis superius. Nichil omnium illorum est acceptum a sensu, ymmo si staret hic toto tempore vite sue contemplando celum die ac nocte, nullo sensu pervenire

⁷⁹ crediderunt] creditur W

470 posset in notitiam alicuius omnium illorum, sed in omnibus illis et singulis creditur
testimonio alterius et nescitur cuius ut primi, sed tantum ut antiquitati creditur. Ergo nulla
ars est illa scientia.

\9^a ratio/

475 Nono sic: forte dices quod “si quid in arte illa est imperfectionis et mendacii, hoc non
est ex parte artis, sed artificis non habentis adhuc plenam artem, non ex parte scientie, sed
ex parte scientis, sicut quecumque scientia, licet a nullo perfecte habeatur, non tamen est
minus vere scientia ratione subiecti et passionum de illo⁸⁰ scibilium. Sic est in proposito.”

480 Quod sic <non> sit in proposito arguo sic: quod non est, non est scibile, ergo ubi non
est certa dependentia unius ab altero, ibi non potest esse certa scientia unius per alterum.
Et non est ibi defectus ex parte scientis, sed ex parte scibilis, quia quod non est, non est
scibile. Sic autem est in proposito, quia nulla ex parte rei certa dependentia est istorum
omnium hic contingentium ad habitudinem celestem. Alias omnia que hic evenirent
contingerent ex necessitate, quia in habitudine celi et planetarum nichil eve[99ra]niet
contingenter et contingentis ad necessarium nulla potest esse certa dependentia quoad
485 certam partem contradictionis. Unde verum est quod omnia contingentia a necessariis
dependent, sed dicere quod quoad certam partem contradictionis ab illis dependeant, hoc
est <dicere> contingentia non esse contingentia, sed necessaria. Unde satis patet quod
non solum est defectus ex parte scientis quod non est ars vel scientia, sed est defectus ex
parte scibilis, quare non est ars neque scientia.

490 \10^a ratio/

⁸⁰ illo] *lectio incerta W*

Decimo sic: nulla est astris indita occulta ratio aut occultus ordo causalitatis omnium hic contingentium vel etiam ex libero arbitrio dependentium, ergo per astra nichil potest iudicari certum de omnibus hic contingenter evenientibus vel ex libero arbitrio principiatis.

495 Probo primo consequentiam, secundo post hoc antecedens. Quod enim illa consequentia sit bona—'si nulla est in astris indita ratio aut occultus ordo causalitatis omnium hic contingenter evenientium aut ex proposito, ergo nichil certum potest per astra de contingentibus et hiis que fiunt ex proposito iudicari'—istud per se patet, quia quorum principia non habent in se vel occulta vel aperta principiatorum rationem, per illa principia
500 non possunt certitudinaliter cognosci principiata. Antecedens probo <esse> verum, quod 'astris nulla sit indita ratio occulta vel occultus ordo causalitatis istorum contingentium principiandorum': quia quorumcumque principia sunt necessaria, quamvis ordo illorum ad principiata sit occultus nobis, dummodo tamen in se sit verus et certus, non minus propter hoc sunt vere necessaria, quia propter esse nobis occultum ordinem non
505 diminuitur ratio necessitatis; sed⁸¹ omnia contingentia hic et que ex proposito fiunt non eveniunt vere ex necessitate, neque sunt vere necessaria; ergo non est in astris occulta aliqua ratio aut aliquis ordo occultus respectu omnium hic contingentium certitudinaliter eveniendorum. Astronomia autem iudicativa de omnibus contingentibus se intromittit, et de hiis etiam que ex proposito⁸² <fiunt>, ut patet in diversis libellis quorum autores
510 ignorantur et <qui> a diversis trufatoribus sunt conscripti.

<11^a ratio>

⁸¹ sed] non *add.* W

⁸² proposito] opposito W

Undecimo sic: qui ponit occultam inditam virtutem respectu contingentium et eorum que libero arbitrio fiunt, ille ponit fatum, quia si fatum esset aliquid, nichil aliud esset quam occultus ordo causarum respectu cuius necessario evenit quod putatur contingenter
 515 evenire; sed fatum nichil aliud est nisi fatuum fictitium,⁸³ [99rb] dicente Gregorio: “Absit a fidelium cordibus ut fatum aliquid esse dicant”,^{xxi} ergo scientia iudicativa per astra est nulla, quia supponit in astris esse rationem fatalem, id est occultum ordinem causarum respectu cuius eveniunt necessario que putamus evenire contingenter.

Forte dices, “Nonne Boethius in *De con<solatione>* ponit⁸⁴ huiusmodi fatum occultum
 520 ordinem causarum?” Tamen⁸⁵ ipse non dicit illum consistere totaliter in sitibus astrorum, nec etiam posse vere sciri illud per scientiam situum astorum, nec ipse ostendit omnium contingentium esse tale fatum sicut astrologi de omnibus contingentibus iudicare presumunt, nec ipse intendit illud esse scibile sicut astrologi putant se illud scire posse—
 tales, inquam, astrologi sunt qui per eclipses solis et lune posse se scire putant de
 525 contingentibus et de hiis que sunt liberi arbitrii prenosticare.

\12^a ratio/

Duodecimo sic: illius scientia de aliquo futuro eventu vana est et incerta et nulla qui, cum eventus illius plures sunt cause, ad quasdam illarum respicit tantum et plures et⁸⁶ potiores negligit et dimittit; scientia astrologi putantis ex solo situ astrorum de futuris
 530 pronosticare est huiusmodi; ergo⁸⁷ illa scientia vana est et incerta et nulla.

⁸³ fictitium] *iter. W (99rb)*

⁸⁴ in *de con<solatione>* ponit] inde componit *W*

⁸⁵ tamen] *tum W*

⁸⁶ et] posteriores *add. sed. exp. W*

⁸⁷ ergo] etc. *add. W*

Maior patet. Probatio minoris, quia vere supponunt et theologi et naturales philosophi, et etiam ipsi astrologi, quod Deus mundum istum inferiorem amministrat per mundum superiorem mediantibus illis superiorum motibus et superioribus⁸⁸ motoribus et situ astrorum et traditionibus illorum; iudicia autem astronomie tantum respiciunt ad situm
 535 astrorum et nullam mentionem faciunt de virtutibus et influentiis motorum qui movent, a quibus tamen magis dependet influentia quam a situ.

Item nullam mentionem faciunt de motu corporali et locali quo motus illius quinte essentie respicit orbem elementarem, nunc in una parte circuli magis excutiendo ex spera ignis positionem aliquam ad inferius, nunc ex aere ad superius, sicut contingit. Ex
 540 quibusdam motibus fiunt innumerabiles immutationes in istis inferioribus secundum calidum, frigidum, humidum et siccum, ut sit in tantum ut Philosophus, in 4^o De celo et primo Methaurorum,⁸⁹ non ponit celum aliquid efficere in istis inferioribus nisi per huiusmodi motus locales quibus rapit elementa et partes elementorum, nunc sic, nunc aliter, sicut contingit. Unde sic dicit Philosophus in primo Methaurorum: “Oportet autem
 545 intelligere sic et hinc⁹⁰ incipientes. Quod enim sub ea⁹¹ que sursum circulatione corpus, velud materia quedam existens et potentia calida et frigida,⁹² sicca et humida, et quecumque alie hiis assequuntur⁹³ passi[99va]ones, fit talis et est a motu et <im>mobilitate, cuius causam et principium prius diximus.”^{xxii}

Ecce, quia Philosophus a motu et <im>mobilitate corporum celestium rapientium
 550 speras elementorum tamquam materiam diversimode⁹⁴ formabilem dicit dependere,

⁸⁸ superioribus] motibus *add. sed. exp. W*

⁸⁹ methaurorum] metheororum *W*

⁹⁰ et hinc] ex hoc *W*

⁹¹ sub] substantia *W*

⁹² frigida] et *add. s.l. W*

⁹³ assequuntur] has sequuntur *W*

⁹⁴ diversimode] diversitate *W*

calefactivam, calefactionem et in frigidationem, exsiccationem et humectationem et omnia consequentia ad ista, et non ex aliquibus sitibus planetarum, cum ergo secundum Philosophum omnia in isto mundo inferiori fiant ex huiusmodi locali raptu elementorum et diversimode ex hoc illorum immutatione, et illud omnino negligant et pretermittant
 555 astrologi, patet quod ipsi potiores causas effectuum hic evenientium negligunt et dimittunt et assumunt ea per que nichil certi potest prenosticari.

Item iudicia astronomie nichil omnino tangunt de diversitate irradiationum ipsorum planetarum, cuiusmodi sunt irradiatio recta, fracta, reflexa, in quibus tamen constitit maxima diversitas virtutum, sicut ad sensum patet quod etiam ex fractione radorum solis
 560 transeuntium per glaciem et fractorum fit ut <si> concurrant ad punctum unum ignis accenditur in puncto illo, et multum diversimode franguntur radii planetarum in confiniis orbium, qui sunt diverse transparentie, prout fuerit aliquis planeta prope vel remote ab oriente, sicut patet tam ex Perspectiva Alaze quam ex Perspectiva Ptholomei. Ymmo Averroys, commentator Philosophi,⁹⁵ qui dicit Philosophum esse sequendum tamquam
 565 eum quem natura posuit ut regulam veritatis, in De celo⁹⁶ et mundo dicit Philosophum minus perfecte in hoc sensisse quod ipse putabat omnes transmutationes istorum⁹⁷ inferiorum dependere ex solo motu locali ipsius celi diversimode rapiente⁹⁸ speras elementares, cum videamus ad sensum quod irradiatio multum effective immutat, ad tantum ut ex concursu radorum post berillum vel urinale ignis accendatur.^{xxiii}

570 Sic ergo perfectissime probata est minor illius rationis, que dicit quod pluribus existentibus causis inferioribus eventuum qui hic eveniunt astronomia⁹⁹ solum¹⁰⁰ attendit

⁹⁵ philosophi] de commendatione phylosophi *add. mg. W*

⁹⁶ in de celo] inde ipse *W*

⁹⁷ istorum] istas *W*

⁹⁸ rapiente] capiente *W*

⁹⁹ astronomia] ad *add. sed del. W*

¹⁰⁰ solum] istum aspectum *add. sed del. W*

ad situm astrorum et potiores et plures et veriores negligit et dimittit, sicut est efficacia
 motuum et influentia motorum et diversitas irradiationum, quam ita negligunt astronomi
 ut nec minimum tangant, ymmo maioris virtutis ponunt¹⁰¹ planetam in ascendente, ubi
 575 nullum ad nos radium mittere potest, quam in medio celi.

\13^a ratio/

Tridecimo: si per astra posset aliquid certi pre[99vb]noscari de aliquibus futuris, hoc
 maxime esset de immutatione aeris, pluvia,¹⁰² serenitate vel tempestate, vento, gelu et
 caumate; sed de istis nichil potest certi per astra prenoscari; ergo nichilominus de
 580 aliquibus aliis. Probatio: quia si situs istorum super aliquo haberet efficaciam, maxime
 haberet efficaciam super aeris immutatione et elementorum qualitatibus, quia triplicitates
 et nature planetarum et omnia ex quibus procedunt iudicia distinguentur penes igneum,
 terreum, aereum, aqueum, calidum, humidum, frigidum et siccum. Etiam, si scientia illa
 umquam quo ad aliquas pronosticationes fuisset certificata, maxime quo ad huiusmodi
 585 fuisset certificata, quia homines semper summe desiderabant talia prescire. Probatio
 minoris experimento patet, quia cum sint multi et varii canones facti de immutatione aeris
 et elementorum pronosticanda, nulli omnino inveniuntur secundum quos aliquid certi
 experiri¹⁰³ possit. Et qui illud experti sunt, non dubitant ita esse.

Si quis autem experimentum huiusmodi falsitatis et vanitatis negaverit, probo illud sic:
 590 ecce nominabo tibi XII dies singulos in singulis mensibus anni instantis post introitum
 solis in Arietem. Adequabo tibi planetas et aspectus ad longitudinem et latitudinem

¹⁰¹ ponunt] plantam *add. sed del. W*

¹⁰² pluvia] plurima *W*

¹⁰³ experiri] experti *W*

Parisiensem¹⁰⁴ pro instanti introitus¹⁰⁵ solis in primum minutum primi gradus Arietis in Martio, ut certum possis invenire dominum anni. Deinde dabo tibi planetas omnes equatos fideliter ad meridiem singulorum illorum XII dierum. Et tu, adiutus omnibus canonibus
 595 iudiciorum¹⁰⁶ que de hoc scripta fuerunt, prenosticabis michi qualis aura erit in meridie singulorum illorum XII dierum, serena vel pluviosa, calida vel frigida, tempestuosa vel tranquilla. Et si verum predixeris in omnibus, ego fatebor artem iudiciorum esse veram artem et scientiam. Si vero inventum fuerit aliter esse quam predixeris, tu confitere non esse artem vel scientiam cui possibile erat subesse falsum et qua contingit animam non
 600 dicere verum affirmando vel negando. Et tunc cognosces eam esse quamdam vilem suspicionem aut opinionem iuxta illud Philosophi VI Eticorum positum superius: “Ratione suspicionis,” inquit, “et opinionis contingit falsum dicere.”

Eya, nunc ad laudem tam gloriose scientie ingredi mecum de predictis XII diebus tu, quicumque es, Parisius, qui hanc putas esse scientiam. Non oportet timere, sicut in hiis
 605 que sunt liberi arbitrii, [100ra] ne forte iudicium non capiat effectum propter indispositionem aliquam in materia, quia communem aerem totius terre non potest facere aliquid¹⁰⁷ indispositum nisi influenza celestis, per quam tu te putas iudicare. Ecce ergo quanta dementia et quanta stultitia est, ut aliquis per habitudinem et situm astrorum se putat posse iudicare de hiis que dependent ex libero arbitrio, vel ex divino iudicio, vel
 610 contingentia, cum non possit omnibus viribus iudicare certitudinaliter de serenitate aut pluvia, calore aut frigiditate unius diei, cum tamen istius rei celum sit causa totalis et dispositiva et perfectiva, illorum nequaquam¹⁰⁸ sit causa totalis vel partialis, et fortassis

¹⁰⁴ parisiensem] pariensem *W*

¹⁰⁵ introitus] introitum *W*

¹⁰⁶ iudiciorum] omnibus *add. W*

¹⁰⁸ nequaquam] nequamquam *W*

non causa, sed accidens concurrens cum causa! Quod per illud quod vere causa est nichil
 possit certe iudicare et de illis per astra possit aliquid certi iudicare et vere scientialiter
 615 quorum astra et celum non sunt cause, illud est ita absurdum quod nullus intelligit nec
 quis intelligens capit. Astrologia ergo astrologorum, que est primo de iudiciis, aliquid
 certi prenosticet de pluvia et serenitate, calore et frigore, tempestuositate et tranquillitate,
 quod tunc magis credimus ei in hiis que alias habent causas quam celum.

Forte dices, “Si celum est causa totalis elementorum, quare ergo aliquis sciens omnem
 620 dispositionem et ordinem astrorum non possit certe iudicare de quacumque immutatione
 aeris et elementorum? Unde, si est defectus in hoc, magis videtur esse defectus ex parte
 scientis quam ex parte scibilis, et per consequens astronomia, quo ad iudicia talia, esset
 vere scientia, licet pauci invenirentur qui illam sciant.” Ecce respondeo et dico quod aliud
 est dicere quod celum suis motibus et suis motoribus, suorum astrorum irradiationibus et
 625 simul cum hoc astrorum sitibus sit causa totalis immutationis elementorum, aliud quod
 solus situs astrorum, aliis omnibus neglectis, sit causa totalis, sicut iudicia astrologorum
 supponunt. Et illud secundum ego non credo, quia omnino falsum est. Primum autem
 concedo naturaliter loquendo, cum supernaturaliter Deus omnium contingentium est
 ordinator et causam complens totalem. Et quia astrologus ad solum aspicit situm
 630 planetarum, nichil agendo de tumultuatione elementorum, que fit per motum raptus, sicut
 tumultuatur in aere per tempestates, que tumultuationes aliquando proveniunt usque ad
 fundum maris, aliquando tantum aguntur in superficie, sicut tunc contingit; et ista
 tumultuatio in tantum est causa immutationis elementorum ut Philosophus, in VIII
 Phisicorum et in De celo et in primo Methaurorum, illud solum ponit esse causam
 635 omnium immutationum que fiunt in elementis quod celum tali motu locali rapit sic
 diversimode elementa, nunc excutiendo ad partem istam, nunc ad [100rb] illam, sicut

contingit, ut fiat nunc quasi subito calor, nunc frigus, nunc humiditas, nunc siccitas, prout talis portio in superioribus que est modica pars circuli,¹⁰⁹ iuxta terram autem veniens propter parvitatem circuli terre est valde magna, per illud contingit fieri mirabiles
 640 immutationes elementorum; de isto autem nichil considerat astrologus, quia subest considerationi humane et multo minus quam fluxus maris, et fit sicut contingit; ideo de illo nulla potest esse scientia, non propter defectum ex parte scientis, sed ex parte scibilis, quod non est aliquid determinatum, sed contingens.

Hec est ergo ratio quare non est scibile per situm astrorum, quia ex illo non dependet
 645 immutatio elementorum ut ex causa totali, sed magis ex motu et tumultuatione spere elementorum, que contingenter fit nunc sic, nunc aliter, sicut et in fluctibus maris, quamvis ventus uniformiter se habeat, cum sit multiplex diversitas. Deinde est efficacia irradiationum, de qua nichil considerat astrologus, et iterum efficacia virtutum moventium, propter que omnia certa immutatio elementorum nequaquam est scibilis. Nec
 650 est defectus tantum ex parte scientis, sed ex parte scibilis, quod non est aliquid determinatum, sed <fit> sicut contingit.

Quando iudicant astrologi de hiis que ex libero arbitrio dependunt, consueverunt dicere, “Non intendo quod necessario sic fiat quin homo ex libero arbitrio possit aliter agere, sed intendo quod generalis inclinatio fiat in hominibus secundum eas partes anime
 655 que sunt alligate organis super quas influentia celestis bene habet efficaciam. Et quia pluries homines sunt qui¹¹⁰ magis reguntur suis passionibus quam ratione, ad concitandum passiones in appetitu sensitivo bene contingit efficacia virtutis celestis, licet non possit attingere ad imprimendum aliquid ipsi intellectui vel voluntati que sunt sine

¹⁰⁹ circuli] est *add. sed del. W*

¹¹⁰ qui] quod *W*

organis, ideo possunt multa prenosticari que de actibus humanis per¹¹¹ astra, non ut
 660 necessario sic fiant, sed quia habitudo astrorum ad talia disponit et habilitat.”

Istud dictum, licet prima facie aliquam videatur pretendere probabilitatem, tamen
 nichil omnino valet. Probatio: quia si talis vel talis habitudo astrorum aliquam talem
 notabilem mutationem faceret in corporibus humanis, multo certius faceret in elementis,
 que sunt primo receptiva huius immutationis; et de immutatione elementorum nichil
 665 faciunt in speciali¹¹² certum prenosticare; ergo multo minus de tali immutatione
 mixtorum. Talis etiam immutatio secundum qualitates primas [100va] multo vehementior
 fit secundum estatem et hy<e>mem quam secundum illam habitudinem astrorum, quam
 tu fingis esse causam, et tamen per estatem nullus prenosticat futura esse bella, quamvis
 tunc corpora hominum magis exsiccentur quam in hyeme et maior fiat motus colere. Iam
 670 enim videmus concitari bella in hyeme sicut in estate.

Preterea corpus humanum magis immutatur ex cibis et potibus quam a talibus a te fictis
 influentiis. Unde anno isto quo communiter crescit bonum et forte vinum multo certius
 potest per hoc iudicari de concitatione passionum anime quam per talem confictam
 influentiam astrorum.

675 Preterea astrologi talem situm astrorum per quem iudicant de futuris non dicunt esse
 causam, sed signum talium futurorum. Tu autem in isto dicto loqueris de causa influentia,
 dicendo quod astra possunt habere influentiam super virtutes anime alligatas organis, non
 super intellectum aut voluntatem. Unde nichil omnino est ad propositum.

\14^a ratio/

¹¹¹ per] ista *add. sed exp. W*

¹¹² speciali] ssali *W*

680 Quartodecimo sic: illam artem dico falsam que fuit infamis et odiosa generi humano,
 in qua non agunt nisi mendaces et persone viles quibus pro modico est falsas et mendaces
 inveniri, et que ibi maxime viget ubi non est disciplina et bonum. Illam, inquam, artem
 velle nunc extollere Parisius et dicere esse veram artem \et/¹¹³ gloriosam scientiam, hoc
 est velle suscitare canem mortuum et innovare errorem olim exterminatum; scientia
 685 iudiciorum astronomie est huiusmodi; ergo infamis est et antiqui erroris suscitatio velle
 commendare et exaltare artem illam.

Probatio minoris, quod ars illa iudiciorum semper fuit infamis, patet quia ipsa <est>
 caput et principium omnium artium magicarum: geomantie, cyromantie, pyromantie,
 nigromantie, augurorum, auspicio, aruspicio et quarumcumque¹¹⁴ divinationum.
 690 Vide in principio \Geomantie/,¹¹⁵ quam vocant scientiam de punctis, ex hoc commendatur
 quod sit prima et immediata post astronomiam generalem iudiciorum.^{xxiv} Vide iterum in
 libro Iacobi¹¹⁶ Alkindi, qui intitulatur Liber de radiis, cuius principalis intentio est omnia
 principia magicarum artium salvare per naturalia, ubi hoc expresse dicit ille Alkindus
 quod caput et principium omnium artium magicarum est illa magica que est iudicativa de
 695 hiis que hic contingunt per aspectum ad astra. In quo etiam libro dicitur quod summe in
 huiusmodi magicis efficaciam habent sacrificia et vic[100vb]time et immolationes, quod
 <quanto> mactatur et immolatur tanto maioris efficacie est ad immutandum elementa
 mundi et affectus hominum.^{xxv} Ecce tua gloriosa scientia!

Quod etiam ars iudiciorum, sicut et omnis magica, fuit semper odiosa humano generi
 700 patet in legendis multorum martirum passorum tempore Maxentii imperatoris, ubi
 frequenter legitur in legendis impositum Christianis pro crimine quod Christus docuerit

¹¹³ et] in *a.c.* *W*

¹¹⁴ quarumcumque] querumcumque *W*

¹¹⁵ geomantie] seemantie *a.c.* *W*

¹¹⁶ iacobi] iohannis *W*

eos artem magicam. Si ergo illi pessimi ydolatres¹¹⁷ odiosam habebant artem illam, quanto magis Christiani et fideles et maxime universitas Parisiensis. Quanto etiam fervore fidei catholice artem istam exterminaverunt catholici doctores, Augustinus, Gregorius et
 705 ceteres quique doctores Ecclesie, noverunt illi qui eorum libros et scripta perlegerunt.

Nonne adhuc recens memoria est Parisius illius magistri Franconis cum quo ante XXX annos vel XXIX tantum fuit occupata universitas Parisiensis, qui artem huiusmodi extollebat quamvis parum de ea nosceret et totam bibliam et sacram scripturam asserebat fundari super fabulas? Ego bene recordor quod¹¹⁸ anno immediate sequenti veni Parisius
 710 et scio quanta fuit ex hoc turbatio et cisma in universitate Ecclesie. Quia non est nisi suscitare canem mortuum velle artem illam extollere veram artem et gloriosam scientiam.

Quod etiam in arte ista non agant nisi mendaces et viles persone quibus pro modico est falsos et mendaces inveniri experimento patet. Queras hiis qui Parisius sunt in studio de remotioribus Hyspanie, si non in Toletis in qualibet¹¹⁹ porta civitatis sedeant qui se
 715 asserant magistros in arte iudiciorum et pro oblongo pro modico omni intranti et exeunti vendunt pronosticando quid accidere sibi debeat, quid evenire in negotio tali et tali. Ibidem etiam in Toletis, quia ibi non est aliqua disciplina fidei propter inhabitantes civitatem illam Iudeos et Serracenos et Christianos conmixtos,¹²⁰ ideo ibi magis viget ars ista cum omnibus artibus aliis magicis, quorum omnium caput est ista astrologia
 720 iudiciorum. Ecce ergo quale sit inter Christianos vellere extollere istam superstitiosam tamquam gloriosam artem et scientiam!

¹¹⁷ ydolatres] ydolatre W

¹¹⁸ quod] quem W

¹¹⁹ qualibet] parte *add. sed. exp.* W

¹²⁰ conmixtos] conmixti W

Nunc ergo ponam hic copiam illius epistole continentis blasphemias et increpationes et contumelias, non argumenta, non probationes, nullas omnino rationum mearum solutiones, quam scribenti michi Parisius sententiam hactenus prosecutam cum pluribus
 725 [101ra] supra dictis rationibus rescribit suo et meo et tacitis nominibus quidam magister in artibus nomine magister Iohannes de Ganduno, cuius copia hec est. Sequitur epistola:

<Epistola magistri Iohannis de Ganduno>

Aristotelice auctoritatis tuba proclamat quod “ille maiestatem minuit secretorum qui indignis secreta revelat” (ex Alano in De planctu nature).^{xxvi} Divina sibi
 730 maiestas ab eterno, illa gloriosa notitia secretorum iudiciorum per stellas te indignum fore prospiciens, suo quippe certissimo iudicio te privavit eadem. Sed illud quo tibi caritativa compassione compatimur ex tue temeritatis exesu et presumptionis contra Dei beneplacitum credimus processisse, quod tu in illam innoxiam, ymmo reverendam, scientiam, per quam Deus Pater eternus eiusque
 735 benedictus Filius, piissimus legislator noster Dominus Ihesus Christus, necnon et Spiritus Sanctus lucidissime dinoscuntur et sincerissime diliguntur, ausus es libello diffamationis impingere eamque non per superne humilitatis exhortationes dissuadens, sed quasi fastigio superbie exaltatus spiritum elationis eructuans et velud tyrannice severitatis nequitia obiurgationes excogitans, superstitiosam et
 740 infamem tuo pernicioso mendacio dicere non vereris.

O tu, qui sedes in cathedra doctoris, cur non consideras auctoritatem magistri Phylosophi circa principium 2ⁱ libri De celo, ubi sic loquitur: Oportet “bene persuasibilem¹²¹ se exhibere antiquis et maxime patrum nostrorum veros credere

¹²¹ persuasibilem] persuasibilium W

esse sermones”?^{xxvii} Et iterum Eticorum 6^{to}: “Oportet attendere expertorum et
 745 antiquorum indemonstrabilibus opinionibus et enunciationibus, non minus
 demonstrationum.¹²² Propter habere enim ex experientia¹²³ visum, vident
 principia.”^{124xxviii} Quis es tu qui prudentiorem te putas Ptolomeo et eius prioribus et
 posteris, Arabibus atque Latinis, gentilibus et Christianis, qui ad honorem Dei cum
 tanta diligentia de ratione et rationabilitate laboraverunt ad inventionem et
 750 complementum illius philosophie quam tu, nescio quis es, sic precipitans, sic
 superbe, sic irrationabiliter dehonestare presumis? Scripsisti inter cetera unam
 burram¹²⁵ verbis interser<t>am quidem¹²⁶ magnis, et sic hic respondeo “quod de
 fabulose sophizantibus¹²⁷ non est dignum cum studio intendere.”^{xxix} Insuper
 aperuisti liberius os maliloquium,¹²⁸ dicens quod similis est comparatio exitus
 755 vetule per ostium orientale sue domus ad tonitruum venturum sicut aspectuum
 celestium ad ea que hic in inferiori mundo contingunt.

Veni Sancte Spiritus! Quid dicit homo iste? Tacere nequeo, loqui prohibeor. Si
 tacuero, victor videbitur et velabitur facilitas sui verbi spe veritatis apud illos qui
 [101rb] credunt huic loquenti. Si respondeo, ipsum docebo quo non reputarem eum
 760 dignum nisi ipsum penitere sperarem. Quid ergo faciam? Ecce: inchoabo sed non
 perficiam! Quero a te si ascensus solis ad regionem si casualiter et fortuitu se habeat
 ad virorem terre nascentium et ad frondes, flores et fructus eorum? An fluxus maris
 et refluxus pure per accidens respiciat lumen lune? Utrum in quo tempore anni

¹²² demonstrationum] demonstratorum *W*

¹²³ ex experientia] experientiam *W*

¹²⁴ vident principia] vidiunt(?) principium *W*

¹²⁵ burdam] burram *W*

¹²⁶ quidem] quidam *W*

¹²⁷ sophizantibus] sophisticantibus *W*

¹²⁸ maliloquium] mali laqueum *W*

765 quelibet animalia generent aut parturiant? Numquid vera coniunctione omnium
 planetarum in signo aqueo contingente probabile esse fieri diluvium satis magnum?
 Plura tibi scriberem, sed non eligo. Nam oculos tuos determinandis quibuslibet
 determinabilibus inclinatos in quarum determinationibus determinatores sibi
 invicem contradicere gloriantur in tantum quod vix duo reperiuntur in consimili
 770 determinatione concordēs, oculos, inquam, tuos inspiciendis gloriosis et
 uniformibus divine virtutis affectibus elevare non curo.

Sed forsitan omnia predicta concedes, quia naturalia sunt. De humanis vero negotiis
 aut actibus omnino negabis quippiam per signa celestia posse probare. Et ego
 voluntarie tibi concedo quod¹²⁹ per viam simpliciter necessitatis non affirmantur
 futura, ymmo concedo tantum humanarum virium esse libertatem quod
 775 quantumcumque tu es a radiis solis calefactus et exsiccatus extense, ymmo usque
 ad sitim vehementissimam et mortalem, tu posses per intellectum tuum iudicare non
 esse bibendum et per voluntatem eligere non potare. Hoc tamen non obstante,
 tenetur quod lumen celeste devehens ad nos omnes virtutes orbis taliter efficiat
 humana corpora et animas organicas ut ad talia prosequenda vel fugienda fortiter
 780 inclinentur et ea causa ut in pluribus prosequantur. Et quare non est bonum ea
 providere, ut ratio iuvetur ad melius nutu Dei?

Multa pulchra tibi dicerem, si te huius discipline¹³⁰ nobilis et divine discipulum
 aptum putarem. Amplius hic tibi volo tacere quod de animi libertate modo quo
 estimas tale tibi argumentum facerem, ad cuius solutionem paucis adplicationibus
 785 intervenientibus cogereris concedere oppositum prime dignitatis, non concedende

¹²⁹ quod] quam W

¹³⁰ discipline] oculos *add. sed del. W*

ex astrolo<g>ya vel theolo<g>ia legali, sed ab hiis que de omnibus hominibus conceduntur.

Et hoc concedendo dictum sit ad superbiam reprimendam. Frater, vide! Si peccasti, redi ad animam! Peniteas, veniam pete! Sed si michi, amico tuo ignoto, non credis, 790 vide illum tractatum qui attribuitur domino Alberto celebris memorie doctori et quondam Coloniensi episcopo, qui sic incipit: “Occasione quorundam librorum, apud quos” etc.^{xxx} Et cum illum diligenter et amicabiliter inspexeris, putamus te mutare puerilem [101va] opinionem. Qualiter autem secundum bonos mores licitum sit mutare opinionem et qualiter incontinentie attribuitur opinionem 795 propriam immutare, respice in VII Eticorum, si tibi visum fuerit bonum. Si vero tue pertinacie radix sit a Deo profundata, ut eam evellere per te non possis, non loquaris in parabolis, nisi solum coram illis qui tue auctoritati sine rationabilitate fidem adhibent. Sed veni Parisius ad disputatores Christianorum et ibi per Dei gratiam inuenies multos qui publice tecum tractabunt et veritatem defendunt, iubente Deo!

800 Quod vero arguebas, quo te sciolum pretendis, de significatione eclipsium, non dissolvo. Non mireris, quia reputo ea ridiculosa, ut indignum sit de earum solutione replere papirum. Et puto quod si quid sapis quod eas non reputando, sed deridendo propones. Presertim recale quod contradictiones implicas in verbis tuis. Nisi te nominis vigor ad veritatem reduxerit, locis et temporibus non tacebo. Allegas nobis 805 disputationes tuas super 2^m Sententiarum copiosas. Et hoc est verbum iactantie, quia si esses Parisius coram multitudine sapientum non nisi derisio sequeretur, nec mirum, quia qui se ipsum laudat cito derisorem inuenit. Turpe est de se ipso predicare magna et cum irritatione audientium imitari multitudinem gloriosam

dignitate. Te Deus ad honorem sui sanctissimi nominis, ut ipse cognitus adoretur in
 810 terris, ad veritatem reducat. Amen.

In fine subiungit dicens sic: “Scriptum fuit hoc opusculum anno Domini nostri Ihesu
 Christi MCCC^oXXI, V kalendas Novembris.”

Hiis omnibus responsis primo dico quod Apostolus dicit: Si quis [lacuna].^{xxxi}

815 Non expedit michi cum domino meo scribenti predicta verbis contendere
 contumeliosis similibus predictis. Verumtamen, cum dicat Sapiens, “Non respondeas
 stulto secundum stultitiam suam <ne efficiaris ei similis. Responde stulto iuxta stultitiam
 suam> ne sibi sapiens videatur,”^{xxxii} et non respondebo et respondebo. Non respondebo
 secundum modum domini mei loquentis per impropria et increpationes, ne sibi similis
 820 efficiar. Respondebo vero iam et in premissis respondi per argumenta valida et
 evidentissimas rationes, ne sibi sapiens videatur. Nescio enim blasphemare, tamen bene
 scio arguere et propositum meum probare. Attendat et iudicet qui voluerit an in omnibus
 predictis magistri et domini mei scribentis unum inveniat silogismum in modo et in figura,
 unam rationem vel unam minimam omnium mearum rationum multarum quas scripseram
 825 solutionem—non sibi, sed necessaria [101vb] circa principium nominato clerico
 solutionem. Nescio si modus disputandi Parisius nunc sit talis. Unum scio: quod ante xxx
 annos, cum primo essem ibi, et postea ad xvi annos, cum ultimo essem ibi, numquam erat
 talis, ymmo quod unus arguebat, hoc alius si potuit solvebat, non pro argumentis
 impropria aut contumelia reddebat. Amen.

ⁱ Pseudo-Thomas Aquinas, *Summa totius Logicae Aristotelis* VII, c. 15, <http://www.corpusthomicum.org/xpl.html>; cf. Aristoteles, *Analytica priora* 1.9 (30a–b).

ⁱⁱ Aristoteles, *Analytica posteriora* 1.7 (75a).

- iii Pseudo-Thomas Aquinas, *Summa totius logicae Aristotelis* VIII, c. 1, <http://www.corpusthomicum.org/xpl.html>; cf. Aristoteles, *Analytica posteriora* I, cc. 1 (71a), 2 (71b), 4 (73a), 6 (74b).
- iv Gn 1:14–15.
- v *Auctoritates Aristotelis*, De generatione I, ed. J. Hamesse, *Les Auctoritates Aristotelis: un florilège médiéval* (Louvain, 1974), 168 (no. 12); cf. Aristoteles, *De generatione et corruptione* I, c. 7 (324b).
- vi *Non inveni*.
- vii Cf. Aristoteles, *Metaphysica* VII, c. 15 (1039b–1040a), trans. Guillelmus de Moerbeka (ed. G. Guillemin-Diem, AL 25.3, 2 vols., Leiden, 1995, vol. 2, 162).
- viii Cf. Augustinus, *De Genesi ad litteram* XII, c. 22 (ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 28.1, Prague, 1894, 412–413).
- ix Cf. pseudo-Ptolemaeus, *Centiloquium*, trans. Plato Tiburtinus, commentator, no. 73 (ed. *Liber Quadripartiti Ptholemei*, Venice, 1493, f. 114ra).
- x Hippocrates, *Aphorismi* I, c. 1 (in *Articella nuperrime impressa*, ed. Petrus Pomarius Valentinus Hipsanus, Lyon, 1515, f. 23v).
- xi Aristoteles, *Ethica Nicomachea* VII, c. 4 (1139b), trans. Robertus Grossetesta (ed. R.-A. Gauthier, AL 26, 5 vols., Leiden, 1972–1974, vol. 3, 255).
- xii Pseudo-Ptolemaeus, *Centiloquium*, trans. Plato Tiburtinus, no. 1 (ed. *Liber Quadripartiti Ptholemei* [n. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**], f. 107ra).
- xiii Albumasar [Abū Ma‘shar], *Introductorium maius*, tract. II, diff. 6–9, trans. Johannes Hispalensis (ed. R. Lemay, 9 vols., Naples, 1995–1996, vol. 5, 79–84).
- xiv Albumasar, *Introductorium maius*, tract. III, diff. 2 (ed. Lemay, , vol. 5, 90).
- xv Albumasar, *Introductorium maius*, tract. IV (ed. Lemay, vol. 5, 136–173).
- xvi Albumasar, *Introductorium maius*, tract. V (ed. Lemay, vol. 5, 175–209).
- xvii Albumasar, *Introductorium maius*, tract. VI (ed. Lemay, vol. 5, 211–270).
- xviii Albumasar, *Introductorium maius*, tract. VII, diff. 5 (ed. Lemay, vol. 5, 292).
- xix *Non inveni*.
- xx Cf. Albumasar, *Introductorium maius*, tract. II, diff. 3 (ed. Lemay, vol. 5, 72–73).
- xxi Gregorius Magnus, *Homiliae in Evangelia* X, 4 (ed. R. Étaix, CCL 141, Turnhout, 1999, 68.67–68).
- xxii Aristoteles, *Meteorologica* I, c. 3 (340b), trans. Guillelmus de Morbeka (ed. G. Vuillemin-Diem, AL X 2.2, Brussels, 2008, 13).
- xxiii Averroes, *Commentum magnum super libro De celo et mundo Aristotelis* II, c. 7 (289a19–21), comm. 42 (ed. F.J. Carmody et R. Arnzen, 2 vols., Leuven, 2003, vol. 2, 349–356).
- xxiv Cf. Bartholomaeus de Parma, *Breviloquium artis geomantiae* (MS Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 489, f. 61r): “Ipsa geomantia sequitur astrologiam in omnibus et per omnia, licet per alium modum, per alia verba et sine tot libris et instrumentis.”
- xxv Cf. al-Kindi, *De radiis*, c. 9 (ed. M.-T. d’Alverny et F. Hudry, “Al-Kindi: De Radiis,” *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 41 (1974), 139–260, at 254–257).
- xxvi Alanus ab Insulis, *De planctu naturae* (PL 210, col. 445C).
- xxvii Aristoteles, *De caelo et mundo* II, c. 1 (284a).
- xxviii Aristoteles, *Ethica Nicomachea* VI, c. 12 (1143b), trans. Robertus Grossetesta (ed. Gauthier, 267).
- xxix Aristoteles, *Metaphysica* III, c. 4 (1000a), trans. Guillelmus de Moerbeka (ed. Vuillemin-Diem, 60).
- xxx Pseudo-Albertus Magnus, *Speculum astronomiae*, prooemium (ed. P. Zambelli, *The Speculum Astronomiae and its Enigma: Astrology, Theology and Science in Albertus Magnus and his Contemporaries*, Dordrecht, 1992, 208).
- xxxi Cf. 1 Cor 8:2: “Si quis se existimat scire aliquid nondum cognovit quemadmodum oporteat eum scire.”
- xxxii Sap 26:4–5.