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THE NOTION OF PROPERTIES

Tensions between Scientia and Ars in medieval natural philosophy and magic

Isabelle Draelants

This chapter looks at a central notion used in medieval natural philosophy and magic: the properties of creatures and substances, called proprietas, vis, virtus (or virtus specifica), qualitas or even natura. The importance of this concept comes from its use both in traditional Western thought, in order to define the nature of a thing or physical action, and in Arabic medicine, as an essential concept to explain a transformation or an effect. The first half of the thirteenth century was the time when these disciplines came together most intensely, because it was the period when we see the assimilation of Aristotle’s natural philosophy and its commentators, and of the works of Arab physicians and philosophers which had been translated into Latin during the last hundred and fifty years. We also see in thirteenth-century scholasticism a growing curiosity about nature and about the science of the soul’s faculties (“psychology”, coming from the De anima of Aristotle), and a growing importance given to causation, all of which enhanced considerably theories of knowledge and the study of perceptions and sensations. In this period, the comprehensive notion of natural property served equally to describe and define nature for educational purposes, and to explain natural or magical properties for therapeutic or prophylactic purposes. Therefore, it helps us to address the intellectual context of the birth of natural magic in medieval Europe as a peripheral branch of natural philosophy.

The concepts of proprietas and virtus were the basis of the traditional study of De rerum natura (The Nature of Things) in the West. Medieval scholars read and interpreted the natural features of a body or a creature in terms of properties that allowed them to define it unequivocally. In the early thirteenth century, various explanatory traditions relating to physical dynamics in the world were connected under a common term, “property”: 1. The concept of the “property and nature of things” that underlay the traditional description of the universe, 2. The description of a sensible effect (i.e. one that could be seen or felt) of a transformation in the physical world, following Aristotelian physics. 3. A therapeutic operation, according to Arabic medicine, 4. The virtue of magical action. The notion of natural proprietas/virtus was particularly convenient for learned medieval thought, which was increasingly interested in causality and sensation, and it seemed, therefore, that it would play a central role in medieval physics. However, in its relationship with magic, the notion of properties did not have the expected epistemological success, for reasons that are partly due to competition between classifications coming from the various inherited sciences. Indeed,
the various traditions (Latin, Greek, Arabic) for classifying knowledge did not find a durable way to coexist in the West, at this time. First, medicine was attempting to gain a more important place as an intermediary between art and science, and second, the theoretical branches of natural philosophy were coming to be defined according to the Aristotelian books on nature.

Amid these epistemological developments, “natural magic” was a paradox that struggled to find its place in the West: in both a theoretical and practical sense, it also sought to marry the natural and the extraordinary, while at the same time avoiding the trap of superstition. Over the following centuries, as religious orthodoxy became increasingly defined, and scholarly disciplines increasingly professionalized, the “naturalistic bet” of natural magic was not won, although there were still numerous attempts to legitimize it during the Renaissance.

This chapter seeks to clarify the meaning of “natural magic” by focusing on the notion of the natural property in the thirteenth century, and examining the significant intellectual traditions and textual sources at this crucial moment in medieval thought. The chapter is divided into five parts: the first part examines the areas where the concept of property was applied; the second recalls the legacies and origins of this concept; the third is about the diverse vocabulary of medieval magic; the fourth argues that nigromancy was accepted as the science of properties and the final part examines attempts to theorize this science. The chapter concludes with some new research directions that could fruitfully develop from the current state of research.

**Proprietas, vis/virtus, natura: the ubiquity of the notion of property in medieval natura rerum literature**

Traditionally, the term “nature”, for a thing, covers its essence, that is the set of constant and universal characteristics that distinguishes it from other things and enables it to be defined. Philosophically, the form of a living being becomes approximately identified with its nature (physis) in its etiological and essential characterization. As for the properties of a living thing, they represent its internal and external characteristics that allow us to describe it as belonging to a given species, but also to explain how it can be the origin of a transformation, called operatio in medieval treatises.

In the Middle Ages, the quest for the nature of things and the conception of their properties was rooted in the long literary tradition of the Latin Natura rerum literature (for example, Varro, first century AD), and more distantly in the collections of physika and paradoxa in Hellenistic literature. In the twelfth century, the exegetical, tropological tradition, which was based on seeing the constant correspondences between things in the lower world as a reflection of the divine one, greatly influenced by Augustine of Hippo, was merged with a new philosophical conception influenced by Aristotelianism and the humoral theory of Galenic medicine. Physis then came to be seen as a reality apprehensible by the senses (a sensu), and physical transformations were explained by the four fundamental elements (earth, water, fire and air). Indeed, the craze for texts on natura rerum increased at the beginning of the thirteenth century, under the influence of two related factors: a new interest in nature for its own sake, and an explosion of the former quadrivium, now widened to “natural philosophy”, thanks to the translations of philosophical and medical texts from Arabic and Greek made during the twelfth century.

In the thirteenth century, the literature on nature and on the properties of things provided an encyclopaedic description of the world, using the new concepts of materia and forma, and
organizing reality according to the four sublunary elements. This approach competed with the previous naturalistic discourse that was built according to the sequence of the Hexaemeron and described biblical realities. An excellent example of this new literature is the prologue of the De proprietatibus rerum (1230–40) of the Franciscan Bartholomaeus Anglicus. All these medieval works on nature divided up reality into short descriptive notes that tried to understand the essence of everything according to a number of properties or, ideally, a unique, symbolic property. This univocity is more convenient for allegorical thought, as every thing could play the role of a symbol, following the example of the Physiologus’ animal sections.

At the same time, in the natural philosophy of the thirteenth century, in Latin and in Hebrew, every compound sublunary body, whether it is mineral, vegetal or animal, was constituted of elements and primary qualities which together made up its complexion. This concept of complexion was well understood only after the translation from Arabic, in c. 1230, of the Aristotelian work De generatione et corruptione. As a consequence, whether in the field of physics, medicine, physiology, zoology or alchemy, the cause of a transformation was explained by the effect resulting from the property of the body at the origin of this action.

The lapidaries are another rich scholarly literature describing natural properties. Often incorporated into natural history, summae, or pharmacopoeias, some “scientific” or “philosophical” lapidaries aimed at describing and classifying the mineral realm and at explaining its chemical transformations and therapeutic applications. Most often, they took their main inspiration from the fifth book of the Greek herbal of Dioscorides (which had undergone several revisions in Greek, and then in Latin, before the twelfth century), and from Book 16 of Isidore of Seville’s Etymologiae, which classifies stones by colours and has as its main source Book 37 of Pliny’s Naturalis historia. Another ancient source was the syncretic Greek–Latin Damigeron-Evax lapidary. We tend to think that all these sources were gathered together in the environment of Montecassino c. 1100, along with some of the first Arabic contributions that emphasized celestial influences such as the Liber de gradibus, the Practica Pantegni of Constantine the African and the De physicus ligaturis of Qustā ibn Luqā. Written at the end of the eleventh century, the poem Liber lapidum by the bishop of Rennes, Marbode, remained the most significant testimony of this kind of philosophical lapidary until the remarkable rise of encyclopaedic lapidaries between 1220 and 1260. The De mineralibus (1250–63) of the Dominican Albertus Magnus offers, in this regard, a textbook example, accumulating all previous knowledge on the subject. Like the encyclopaedic lapidary of Arnoldus Saxo (c. 1230–45), which is the main source of the second and third tractatus of Albertus’s Book 2, it also integrates lapidaries that deal with astronomical seals, and these show clear antique and Eastern influence. The most famous of these astrological lapidaries is the work of the Jew Zael, known under the name of Thetel’s De sigillis in the versions transmitted by Arnoldus Saxo and by Thomas of Cantimpré’s De natura rerum (and consequently by Konrad von Megenberg and Camille Leonard). In these astrological lapidaries, the physical, medicinal and magical virtues of the stones are connected to a “seal” which is engraved, and which is supposed to strengthen the stone’s basic virtue by making a connection to the celestial power (virtus celestis). To this category of astrological lapidaries, we can add “magical” lapidaries, where stones are treated as talismans that should be worn in order to benefit from their powers, and sometimes consecrated with incantations as well. The mineral section of the Kyranides collection, first written in Greek in the Alexandrine period and attributed to Hermes-Harpocrate, and then translated into Latin c. 1168–69, is an example with which we may compare the later pseudo-Albertinian De virtutibus herbarum, plantarum et animalium, probably compiled c. 1240. The latter constituted the first part of the
so-called Liber aggregationis, an extremely famous collection of texts of natural magic, which was printed more than 300 times during the next two centuries, despite the fact that only a few manuscript copies are preserved.\textsuperscript{8}

In the middle of the thirteenth century, the border was thin and sometimes invisible, between the diverse types of literature on the properties of stones. They merge together in Book 3 of Albertus Magnus’ De mineralibus, as is shown by the following excerpt, which emphasizes the value of nigromancy as the science of natural, astrological and magical properties. This passage appears in the book dedicated to astrological seals that are supposed to strengthen the intrinsic virtue of the stone:

After that, it is necessary to speak about lapidary images and seals: although this section is a part of nigromancy, according to this sort of nigromancy which is subordinated to astronomy, and that we say concerns images and seals. However, because of the quality of this knowledge, and because our companions wish to learn it from us, reckoning as completely unfulfilled and false whatever we can find written about that by numerous [authors], we shall say something about it here. Because few know the writing of the ancient wise men concerning lapidary seals, and it cannot be known, unless one knows at the same time, astronomy, and magic things, and the necromantic sciences. […]\textsuperscript{9}

Apart from the De virtutibus lapidum and the De virtute universali of Arnoldus Saxo, there is no doubt that one source in particular influenced Albert in his conception of how the lapidary virtue was connected with the celestial virtue: the letter De physicis ligaturis or Épistola de incantationibus of the Arabic mathematician and astronomer Qûstā ibn Luqā (830–910),\textsuperscript{10} an author that Albertus confuses with Constantine the African,\textsuperscript{11} as does Roger Bacon. This treatise is dedicated to talismans and ligatures, i.e. amulets made from natural substances, which are to be carried in order to achieve a therapeutic effect. Qûstā ibn Luqā, who used a Syriac or Arabic version of the pseudo-Aristotelian lapidary, considers that stones and animal substances worn as amulets act by means of an occult property that he does not want to conflate with their nature: “Ego quoque in multis antiquorum libris legi, suspensa collo suffragari occulta proprietate, non sua natura”.\textsuperscript{12} Certain causes of physical movement, or actions (operationes) or properties generated by certain bodies have effects that can be observed by experience, that is to say, by perception using the five senses. This effect is expressed in Qûstā ibn Luqā’s final words, after mentioning magnetic attraction and the inflammability of saltpetre:

All of which things, if not seen, we do not believe, yet if they are tested [tentata], they are confirmed [certificantur]; and perhaps the sayings of the Ancients are to be considered the same way. The action of these things is therefore of the order of properties and not of reasoning [enim actio ex proprietate est non rationibus]: this is why it cannot be understood by this pathway. Indeed, reasoning leads to understanding only of what is accessible to the senses. Certain substances therefore sometimes have a property that cannot be understood by reason because of its subtlety, providing nothing to the senses because of its great elevation.\textsuperscript{13}

The physician Arnau of Villanova would later attach great importance to this opuscule in his own treatise against nigromancy, Épistola de reprobacione nigromantice fictionis.\textsuperscript{14}
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The concept of natural properties: legacies from Hellenistic, Hermetic and Arabic thought

In naturalistic, medical and more particularly pharmacological Arabic literature relating to properties, the notion of khawāṣṣ (Pl. of khāṣṣa, تصاغ) dominates. This notion continues the Hellenistic neo-Pythagorean tradition of the Φυσικα developed in Egypt and Syria. It expresses the specific quality that characterises a compound natural body, that is to say a specific property (mujarrabīt) that allows the physical transformation defined by the medieval word operatio. This quality is expressed by its effect, often without the cause being detectable or demonstrable by the usual laws of natural science. In the collections of properties rooted in the Greek tradition, such as the Kyranides, the components of the mixed bodies that demonstrate these qualities are often introduced as pairs or triplets of associated qualities, linked by correspondences or mysterious sympathies. A Latin version of Ibn al-Jazzār’s Kitāb al-Khawāṣṣ, entitled the De proprietatibus, also survives, and this text became the main source of The Book of the Marvels of the World (De mirabilibus mundi), a work claiming to pertain to natural magic which was sometimes attributed to Albertus Magnus. Abû l-‘Ala’ Zuhr ibn Abd al-Malik (d. 1131), a Cordovan physician, wrote another book on occult sympathies, classifying numerous qualities in alphabetical order, illustrated with quotations from Hermes, Razi, Aristotle, Pythagoras, Serapio, Johannes Mesue, Galen, Dioscorides and other Persian and Roman authors; there is some evidence to suggest that the contents of this book were also transmitted in Latin.

The basis of a substance’s khawāṣṣ is the mixture of the primary qualities of the four elements (air, fire, water, earth) in proportions which are determined during the composition of a natural body. This corresponds with the teaching of Galenic medicine, in which the proper complexion of every body is determined by medical tradition, but the way in which the primary qualities are compounded is nevertheless not enough to explain the operations that result from the constitutions of certain compound bodies, which are owed to their specific form. The specific form constitutes the fourth and last kind of quality that Arabic physicians employed to characterize a medicinal action. The action (operatio) of the specific form is an “added value” that can only be determined by experience. Avicenna, in his Canon, delivered the most precise definition of the specific virtue emanating from a substance taken in its entirety (i.e. linked to the substantial form), in order to complement Galenic complexion theory.

In formulating a theory of compound medicines, Avicenna established the essential meaning of forma specifica as “that by which a thing is what it is [for] when simple elements mix with one another and an individual thing is generated from them, preparation is thus made for the reception of a species and a form is added to what its simple elements possess. A specific form therefore imbued the substance with particular occult powers. This form is “not from primary qualities … nor from the complexion generated from them, but is perfected more than acquired following the aptitude that [the form] acquired from [the matter’s] complexion, as in the attractive force of a magnet.”

This Avicennian quotation appeared for the first time in Latin c. 1235, in the preface of Part 4 of Arnoldus Saxo’s natural encyclopaedia, a work dedicated to the properties of the so-called “universal virtue”, and whose matter was afterwards reused in Book 2 of Albertus Magnus’ De mineralibus. In these works and in most others, the emblematic example of a specific virtue is the magnet’s attraction to iron. At the end of the thirteenth century, the virtus specifica, connected with tota substantia, supported by the assimilation of
Avicenna’s *Canon*, had become a causal commonplace in medicine. It was used in particular to explain the so-called “occult” action of poisons, which had been proved by experience, for example by Jean of Saint-Amand (d. 1303) in Paris; by Arnau of Villanova (d. 1311) in Montpellier; by Pietro d’Abano (d. 1316) in his *De venenis*; and also by Bernard of Gordon (d. 1320) in his *Lilium medicinae*.

In natural magic, as in other works which discussed nature, the properties called “occult”, because their causes are invisible, are always considered in relationship with their actions (*operationes*). In fact, the word *occult* is related both to the nature of the object being studied and to the methods of investigation used in medieval natural science. Thomas Aquinas (c. 1225–74) traced the origin of occult properties to the heavens, while others attributed them to the “substantial form” of the matter itself. The latter is defined as follows by Saint Bonaventure: “The substantial form of every thing, considered in itself, is called *essence* and, is considered with regard to the operation, its *nature*.”

In natural philosophy, the notion of the “specific property” was spread from the beginning of the thirteenth century in the West because it was a useful concept for causal explanation. It was part of a typically medieval desire to explain everything in a rational way in order to reach the universal truth and extend the boundaries of the known. It seems that the specific virtue, which was known to Arabic physicians as the “fourth virtue”, was not really identified as such in the West, but it penetrated into the compilations of natural properties that linked the fields of natural philosophy and medicine to magic. Between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, this virtue passed from being seen as natural to supernatural. Largely illustrated by the *Speculum astronomiae’s* listing of astrological and Hermetic works (see below), the concept of *nigromancia* lays on the borders of natural philosophy; its magical part could also be considered as natural, if it did not use incantations and malefic powers. But little by little, the part of *nigromantia* which came to be defined as not natural became part of illicit occultism.

The medieval understanding and vocabulary of natural magic

The difficulty of defining “natural magic” lies especially in the evolution of intellectual categories between the Middle Ages and the present day, because the limits of and relations between science, magic and religion have changed so much that neither the retrospective vision of the progress of the sciences away from superstition (which is often employed in an anachronistic way by historians) nor anthropological distinctions between science and magic as formulated by modern structuralists as Marcel Mauss or Claude Levy-Strauss are useful.

The claim of medieval magic to be considered as a natural discipline, that is one in accord with nature, also renders inadequate the current definitions of medieval magic that emphasize the use of tricks and rites to provoke extraordinary effects. Only a precise investigation of this transitional stage in intellectual history, which seeks to define the contents and the characteristics of a natural discipline that acts as an intermediary between science and art(ifice) in the classification of natural philosophy, seems able to answer the following questions: Did the theoretical and philosophical texts, which some scholastic authors used to explain magical operations, give magic, in any sense, the status of a learned discipline? And for how long was it able to maintain this learned status? The discipline that scholars of the thirteenth century called the *science of properties* (see below) seems to be a valid candidate for the scholarly natural discipline that was defined as the “natural” part of nigromancy. In the thirteenth century, this discipline, which was both theoretical and practical at the same
time, not only distinguished itself from ancient necromancy (defined as divination using corpses, according to the definition infinitely repeated since Isidore of Seville) but it also extended beyond the territory of natural magic into the pure study of nature.

In the history of scholarship on magic, Lynn Thorndike was the first, in 1923, to find an adequate way of conceptualizing the domain of natural medieval magic as Experimental Science, that is to say a branch of knowledge that concerned the testing of certain effects by the senses whose repercussions would eventually develop into modern experimentation. A discipline that focused on effective, natural magic was an objective magic, that is to say that it was intended to have an effect on objects or people other than the operator. It is also worth highlighting that the works that transmit natural magic or claim to belong to it are testimonies to a learned discipline, not a popular practice, and argued from the basis of rationality, an important justification for medieval scholars. Two central medieval criteria that define natural magic are, on the one hand, natural causality, and on the other hand, the exclusion of rites, invocations or charms aimed at devils or spiritual entities, purely deceptive illusions, and “characters”. These criteria allow us to exclude from the field of natural magic the following arts: ritual magic, the so-called “solomonic” magic, which seeks to subdue demons; “theurgic” or angelic magic, which uses sacraments to let the operator contact God through angels – like the Ars notoria, which aimed at mastering universal knowledge – and also the forms of magic, which seek to increase the natural, physical efficiency of an action by using talismans (astral magic) or incantations (demonic magic). As regards textual sources, natural magic has a more “native” heritage in the Latin world than Solomonic magic, which has distant Jewish roots, or than Hermetic magic. In c. 1255, these demarcations clearly appear the first time in an essential repertory for the knowledge of works focusing on astral sciences: the Speculum astronomiae (see below).

To avoid anachronism, it is important to build on key medieval concepts and terminology. Generally speaking, when talking about magic, medieval Latin authors do not use the noun magia, which appears only in the fifteenth century at the time of Marsilio Ficino, but rather adjectives magica (feminine singular or neutral, plural) or magicalis. Particularly in the canonical literature or the penitentials, references are made to words such as ars magica/artes magicae that emphasize processes, tricks, fabrication, and demonic intervention, which are all considered to be superstitious practices. For instance, the words of Augustine in De doctrina christiana, taken up by Gratian’s Decretum, speak of ars magicae and, among the works translated from Arabic, the De radiis attributed to Al-Kindi – which tries to offer a universal theory of the celestial influence on naturalia – bears in manuscript copies the name of Theorica artium magicarum (the “theory of the arts of magic”). But it was in c. 1230 that the bishop of Paris, William of Auvergne, first used the term ars magica naturalis (considered below) to refer to the knowledge of surprising natural phenomena that we can experience.

The word prestigia, or rather the expression in prestigis, appears also to underline the prodigious illusions worked by the magus. It is used, for instance, in Isidore’s Etymologiae, and in the prologue of Ps.-Appolonius of Tyana’s De secretis creaturae, which begins: in prestigis et prodigiorum novitate ammirandus. It is also found in the mineralogical notes of the naturalistic compendia, which list, among others, the following property for iscustos in unnatural circumstances: et prestigis valet contra dolorem oculorum (Arnoldus Saxo); or describe how it acts as a natural protection against magical illusions: veneficiis resistit omnibus et precipue magorum prestigis (Thomas of Cantimpré, Liber de naturis rerum, 14. 40).

It is significant that in some theoretical and practical contexts, however, natural magic is related to nigromancia. This is the case, for example, in the important work of spiritual
astral magic entitled the *Picatrix*, which has roots in Harranian doctrines and dedicates a whole chapter to the question *quid sit nigromancia*. This last term is frequently used in the thirteenth century, in the context of both natural magic and astral divination, and it is often associated with a Toledan origin, reflecting both the origin of the translations that introduced it and the reputation of this Spanish city in the teaching of magic. Astrology and other divinatory or magical sciences may well have been the prime driving forces for the translating activity in Spain, as Charles Burnett has argued. In this context, it is likely that the term *nigromantia* was used to describe magic in a broad sense, from the beginning of the twelfth century, by translators and scholars in touch with Arab culture, such as the Spanish Jew Petrus Alfonsi, who converted to Christianity at the very beginning of the twelfth century and lived in al-Andalus before spending some years in England as a *magister* of Arts. These translators began to use the term *nigromantia* to translate the Arabic word *sihr*, which has no real Latin equivalent. A crucial question is why this term prevailed over *prestigium* or *magica*, which were also recorded in the Latin tradition. Once again, the answer lies most likely in the fame of the *Isidorian* words (“νεκρόν means dead and μαντεία divination”) that were constantly reiterated. The transmission of this quotation led to a confusion between *necros* and *nigrum* to identify a sort of ancient divination through the animation of the dead or the use of the blood of dead bodies that was no longer a well-known practice at the time of Arabic–Latin translations. The *Isidorian* distinction provided the word *necromancy*, inherited from the semantic field of the demonic, as the correct designation for a new multifaceted science, and was used to cover the recently translated works that did not qualify for other categories of knowledge.

**Experimenta and the birth of nigromancy as the “Science of Properties” at the beginning of the thirteenth century**

In his *Disciplina clericalis* on the training of clerks, Petrus Alfonsi lists the six main liberal arts as follows: (1) dialectic (standing in for the rest of the *trivium*), and then (2) arithmetic, (3) geometry, (4) medicine (i.e. *phisica*), (5) music and (6) astronomy. But he said the following about the seventh art: “The philosophers who are adept at prophecies say that the seventh art is *nigromancia*; some of those who do not, say it is philosophy ... and those who do not study philosophy say that it is grammar.” It can therefore be inferred that for Petrus Alfonsi philosophy stemmed from an extended *quadrivium* and that *nigromancia* became the science that headed all the subdivisions of philosophy. Petrus Alfonsi was more precise about the “art” of *nigromancia* in his *Dialogus contra Judeos*, which subdivided this science into nine sections. The first four concern the study of the four elements, characterizing the content of what became “natural magic” in the West during the thirteenth century. According to Alfonsi, the other five sections of *nigromancia* operated by means of the invocation of evil spirits. As has been shown by Charles Burnett, the division in the *Speculum astronomiae* of *nigromancia* into three disciplines – two unlawful and one permitted, “depending on whether they operate naturally” or not, was thus prefigured by Petrus Alfonsi.

In Toledo in the mid-twelfth century, Dominicus Gundisalvi, a Spanish translator of treatises on natural philosophy, adapted the classification of sciences set out by Alfarabi (d. 950). In his *De divisione philosophiae*, Gundisalvi separated *humana scientia*, or what he called “universal natural science” (*scientia naturalis universalis*) into eight parts: (1) medicine, (2) (astrological) judgements, (3) necromancy (*nigromancia*), specifying *secundum physicam* – which recalls the interpretation given by Petrus Alfonsi, (4) the science of images, that is
to say talismans or astral magic in a more general sense, (5) agriculture, (6) navigation, (7) the science of mirrors (catoptrics) and (8) alchemy.\footnote{40 Charles Burnett has shown that Gundisalvi's division was taken from the \textit{De ortu scientiarum}, a work on the division of sciences that was adapted from an anonymous Arabic work.\footnote{41 This text probably also influenced Daniel of Morley, an Englishman who said that he went to Toledo at the end of the twelfth century to observe the dynamism of the new Arabic sciences. In his \textit{Liber de naturis inferiorum et superiorum} (between 1175 and 1187), he mentioned “those who calumniate astrology” (astronomia).\footnote{12 He classifies nigromancia among the eight sciences that derived from astrology and benefited from it. For Daniel of Morley, in comparison with the writings of Gundisalvi, the \textit{scientia de prestigiis} replaced navigation, and astrology took the predominant place in a universal natural science divided into the following hierarchy: (1) \textit{scientia de iudiciis} (astrological judgements), (2) \textit{de medicina}, (3) \textit{de nigromancia “secundum physicam”}, (4) \textit{de agricultura}, (5) \textit{de prestigiis} (illusionism), (6) \textit{de alchimia}, (7) \textit{de ymaginibus} (astrological images) “which the great and universal book of Venus published by Thoz Grecus transmitted,” and finally (8) \textit{de speculis}, catoptrics.\footnote{13 In the same vein, the translator Michael Scot uses the term \textit{scientia de proprietatibus} as an equivalent of \textit{nigromancia}. Both a translator of Arabic to Latin and an original author, he worked as an astrologer in Toledo and then in Sicily at the Court of Emperor Frederick II Hohenstaufen. These three features make him a close witness to the establishment of new notions coming from Arabic science. Before 1237 (the presumed year of his death), he offered a division of the sciences that only Vincent of Beauvais passed on.\footnote{14 There, he placed \textit{nigromancia} within practical philosophy, which was not the usual position of the \textit{quadrivium} in the tree of sciences:}

Also the practical (part of) philosophy is divided into three parts, of which the first is that which was invented on the model of natural things and pertains to natural things \textit{[ad similitudinem naturalium et quae pertinet ad naturalia]}, such as medicine, agriculture, alchemy, and also the science which is concerned with the properties of things \textit{[scientia quoque de proprietatibus rerum]}, which is called \textit{nigromancia}; but also the science concerning the significations of things, which is called the science of judgements; moreover, the sciences of optics, navigation and many other sciences which have a relation to that part of theory which is called natural \textit{[partem Theoricae quae dicitur naturalis]}, belong to it as if to its practical (part).\footnote{45 This division agreed fundamentally with what we have read in the works of Dominicus Gundisalvi and Daniel of Morley. However, it stresses three linked aspects that enrich the definition of \textit{nigromantia}. First, the fact that all these disciplines are practical; this option for the new sciences at a time when the \textit{quadrivium} had changed was probably influenced by the last part of the \textit{Didascalicon} (bef. 1137) of Hugh of St. Victor, where the passage involving divination (ch. 15) makes astrology a part of the mechanical sciences, said to be \textit{adulterine}, that copy natural reality by art or artifice.\footnote{46 Second, the fact that the disciplines formed part of \textit{philosophia naturalis} insofar as they involved resemblances to the products of nature, \textit{naturalia} (referred to as mixed bodies, as seen above). In the third place, the fact that as a result, \textit{nigromancia} is par excellence the science of the properties of natural things (resulting from occult causes), referring presumably to the word \textit{khâṣṣa}, pl. \textit{khawâṣṣ} in Arabic. Therefore, the works compiling and listing the properties of stones, plants and animals in order to form collections of \textit{experimenta} are part of natural science.}
The Parisian bishop William of Auvergne seems to have been the first person in the West to talk of “natural magic” in the form of *ars magica naturalis*, in which he sees the *nigromancia secundum physicam* found in the writings of Gundisalvi and Daniel of Morley as part of natural science or astrology. However, he says that it is wrong to describe it in this way: “the science of this kind of operation [wonders that have natural causes but that are considered by ignorant people to be the work of demons] is natural magic, that philosophers call *nigromanciam* according to physics, but in a very inappropriate manner, and that is the eleventh part of natural science.” From the context, we can understand that William includes in natural philosophy magic, alchemy and the knowledge collected in the books of *experimenta*, all of which are acceptable to the Creator as they are all natural things coming from his beneficence, and because their operations have natural sources. He says something similar in his impressive *De universo* (written c. 1220, with additions until 1240), where he draws a parallel between the knowledge of how human and animal organs can be linked with “spiritual substances,” and seemingly used as amulets or talismans, and “magica naturalis as a part of natural science.” Like Michael Scot, he associates “magic works” (*opera magica*) with “necromantic” works in his chapter devoted to the arts of illusion (*ludificationes – praestigium*) in the introduction to the third part of the second volume of *De universo*, but the part of necromancy that is related to apparitions and the summoning of demons is not considered to be natural and tends towards idolatry. It should be stressed that in the same part of *De universo*, in a passage concerning *libri experimentorum* in the chapter *De tribus generibus magicorum operum, et de mirificis virtutibus quarundam rerum*, William links the notion of the art of natural magic (*ars magica naturalis*) with the natural properties of the plants listed in these books. He underlines that this art of natural magic is much practised “among the Indians,” who were to the Arabs what the Arabs were to the Europeans, and that the *libri naturalium narrationum* aim at explaining the causes of wonderful phenomena. In these so-called books, we may see works on *de natura rerum* and compilations *de proprietatibus*:

From all that and from similar things which can be read in the books of *experimenta*, and in many books on nature, you could in one way or another know the cause and the reasons for certain magical acts which are proper to natural magic (*ex arte magica naturali*). Again in 2, pars 3, c. 25, 1 (col. 1060aG-H), William gives examples of natural virtues arising from the properties of natural (animal and vegetal) bodies. It therefore seems that William of Auvergne did not always draw a clear distinction between the marvellous effects of natural substances that have natural and knowable causes, and the wonders that result from vivification caused in nature by the action of a demon. He keeps the former within natural science and condemns the latter but he seems to consider that the term *nigromancia* applies to both practices.

Magic was a particularly rich discipline in the Iberian Peninsula, especially under King Alfonso X, who encouraged, from 1250 to 1260 onwards, the translation of Arabic works into the vernacular, and sometimes into Latin afterwards. Among other works, he ordered in 1256 the Castilian translation of the *Ghāyāt al-hakīm*, a work written in Arabic probably in the eleventh century, whose Latin version, retranslated from Castilian, was titled *Picatrix*. This work transmitted the idea that *nigromancia* was a science, and attributed to Thābit ibn Qurra, a Sabean of the eleventh century, the idea that “the most noble part
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of astrology is the science of (astrological) images." The "natural" part of nigromancia dealing with natural properties seems then to have disappeared, in favour of the science of talismans and prestigia. Consequently, in the Book of Seven Parts that bears the name of Alfonso X, there is in the seventh part a chapter devoted to the "nigromancers" (VII, title 24, law 2 and 3), giving the following definition: "Nigromancia dicen en latin a un saber estrano que es para escantar los espíritus malos." This knowledge became the prerogative of a few, which somehow manifests how it had failed to be recognized as an "honest" and useful science.

Towards a Western "Natural" magic: philosophical theorization and problems of orthodoxy

The thirteenth century was a period of dynamic assimilation of new knowledge coming from competing and complementary traditions that saw important strides in the classification and subdivision of the sciences. Medieval authors working at the crossroads of Jewish, Arabic and Latin influences extended the scope of nature, out of a desire to explain the transformations of the world in a rational way, and the need to make a distinction between what was lawful and what was forbidden, in order to build religious orthodoxy and draw the boundaries of superstition. In the medieval debate about the interrelations of religion, science, magic and superstition, the scholastics revised the definition of superstition to include incorrect or improper Christian practice, usually on the basis of Gratian’s Decretum. The final result was that in the late Middle Ages, Christian thinkers endorsed the thoughtful deployment of natural and divinely aided magic.

The Speculum astronomie attributed to Albertus Magnus illustrates plainly the rational preoccupation to list works covering “astral science” and to identify the works that were suspected of employing demonic intervention. The author justifies the “naturalness” of talismans by arguing that the power that acts through them is a natural virtue used by man. He succeeds in rendering the science of talismans compatible with Aristotelian science and Christian rational theology, by referring to the theory of the hierarchy of causes and subtracting phenomena from the devil, while preserving free will.

The animation of mixed bodies must be limited to recognizing or stimulating in them the action of their specific virtue, as in encyclopaedic pharmacopoeias or lapidaries, and not, in addition, employing the calling up of demons by invocations and inscriptions. Within the broad field of scholastic natural philosophy, this limit marks the boundary of the study of naturalia in the “books of experiments” mentioned several times by William of Auvergne; but natural properties are also described in the lists of stones, plants and animals in thirteenth-century encyclopaedias. However, this did not make them worthy of being called nigromantic works. The sources they use gather together various classical and patristic Latin authors of compilations about nature, such as Pliny the Elder, Ambrose of Milan, Isidore of Seville, but also authorities coming from late Hellenistic Antiquity, such as Hermes, Evax and Aaron, Belbetus-Bàlinus (Apollonius of Tyana), Ps-Aesculapius and Thetel the Jew, all these last close enough to the ancient tradition of physika.

With Marsilio Ficino’s translation of the Corpus hermeticum at the end of the fourteenth century grows a learned magic increasingly ruled by platonism and hermetism; the principle of universal animation spreads and magic is addressed as an anti-religion heresy, causing a clearer and different split from the thirteenth century.
Future directions

David Pingree traced the routes of the spreading of magic as an independent art, surveying the movement and transmission of magical texts.61 This initial mapping of the dissemination of magic (dealt with in more detail elsewhere in the volume) deserves to be put to the test and qualified, by an investigation dealing with the regional assimilation of the distinctive doctrinal concepts of medieval physics such as specific “force”, “property” and “form”, and “occult virtue”. Among the concepts that deserve to be explored more deeply, it seems that the shared territory and the slight differences between “universal virtue”, virtus celestis, and the platonic and neo-platonic doctrines of anima mundi should be further investigated to establish new definitions, bearing in mind both the importance of textual source transmission (Greek, Jewish and Arabic hermeticism) and all the areas in which these concepts were applied: medicine, astrology, sciences of the properties, mineralogy and talismans. It would also be useful to further explore the doctrinal connections with the theory of rays that is found in the works of Ps.-Al-Kindi, Roger Bacon or later Agrippa von Nettesheim.

Furthermore, the importance of Toledo in the philosophical Arabic–Latin translations has been thoroughly studied for the twelfth century, to the extent of being overestimated at the expense of other regions, but the map of the dissemination of knowledge through medieval translations has been extended and become far more diversified. Very recently, the scholarly gaze, criticized for being too Eurocentric, is starting to look not only at the original productions in Greek, Syriac, Arabic and Hebrew but also towards the intellectual context of the areas in which these texts were produced, and to retrieve them and assess their sources. This trend must continue and should perhaps revisit nineteenth-century orientalism, which had the advantage of considering various textual contents, without drawing an unnatural border between the various civilizations and languages that produced or received them.

To give an example that probably led to the legend of the Faustian pact, it would be worth examining in greater depth and on a comparative basis the recurring theme of the magus’ initiation, crystallized in some medieval Western tales in the form of the meeting between a member of a religious order and a Toledan necromancer which results, sometimes briefly, in an agreement giving privileged knowledge of magic. The pattern can already be identified in Syriac literature but also in the pseudo-Clementinian tradition in Ethiopian, Latin and Spanish, in the form of the teaching of magic to Ïdhāshîr or Ardeshir (in the Syriac Cave of Treasures)62 or to ‘Esdzîr (in the Ethiopic “Qelementos”, the seven-book Revelation of Peter to Clement).63 It may be compared with the episode featuring the future pope Gerbert of Aurillac64 (e.g. in William of Malmesbury’s Gesta regum Anglorum, in the Chronicle of Pseudo-Turpin or in Michael Scot’s Liber introductorius) and all its later variations (such as Salimbene de Adam’s Chronicle).

In medieval scholasticism, a particular science is defined by its interest in the nature of a being and its properties. The concept of property and virtue, on which we have particularly focused in this chapter, needs to be explored further as it became integrated into various philosophical disciplines in the period by focusing on a single author, and on a comparative basis by focusing on various medieval authors and various languages. In this way, the definition of property in Albertian works on natural philosophy, such as the De mineralibus, De animalibus and De vegetabilibus et plantis, should be investigated in comparison with the term’s meanings in his Logic, a work which was strongly influenced by the grammatical legacy of Avicenna, Al-Ghazzâlî and Al-Fârâbî. This is shown for instance in this section of Albert’s commentary on Porphyrian Isagôgē, dealing with the unequivocal property of “biting”:

\[\text{\textit{future directions}}\]
The notion of properties

The various names of various things are equivocal, owing to the fact that the one who imposes [these names] was influenced in instituting them, by the various properties of various things, like “horse” and “donkey”. [Names] are equivocal when a name was imposed on various things, but according to a diversity of definitions, owing to the fact that some unique property found in these various things, influences the ones who name them; however, this property cannot be found in them according to a single definition. For instance, “dog”: this name was imposed on [the animal] able to bark, on a celestial star, and on a sea fish because of a single property found in them, which is that all these things can bite, although they do so not according to a single definition.65

This chronological horizontal approach will also provide a better and more detailed appreciation of the difference of the treatment of the physical concept in pseudepigraphic works attributed to a key author such as Albert us Magnus. But the concept should also be better studied in Jewish works written in the West in a key period such as these of Abraham ibn Ezra in the twelfth century:

This resemblance between living creatures is called sympathy since this matter is not more precisely understood. So things which act by their whole essence are called segula (propriety) by agreement, in other words this is the uniqueness of sympathy. (…) It does not matter if you call it force or propriety or similarity, since all of these refer to the notion of propriety alone. This is the view of Hippocrates and Plato and their precursors on the axiomatic statement which has no proof.66

In the literature dealing with magic and the so-called occult sciences which derived from them in the Renaissance, emphasis has been placed chronologically on the end of Middle Ages and on humanists such as Agrippa von Nettlesheim, Giordano Bruno and Marsilio Ficino. More recently, attention has focused on older authors like Arnau de Villanova, Pietro d’Abano, and Hieronymus Torrella. The defining moment of the attempt of magic to assert itself between 1230 and 1260, and the importance of the testimonies of William of Auvergne and of the Speculum astronomiae for the definition of it are now recognized because of the decisive works of David Pingree, Charles Burnett, Paola Zambelli, Paolo Lucentini and Vittoria Perrone-Compagni. Recent historiography has investigated further, examining accurately some short works translated between 1130 and 1230, following up and correcting some cases of attribution and authentication at the border of naturalistic knowledge,67 examining further angelology and demonology, and developing titles and classifications suitable for medieval magic such as the concept of “addressativity” formulated by N. Weill-Parot. The remarkable progress of the Micrologus journal and series in dealing with natural medieval philosophy testifies to a keen interest in these fields of study. It remains, however, to explore certain aspects or authors whom the attentive interest of scholars has maybe not considered enough.
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