

DANA RŮŽIČKOVÁ

**WHERE TO SEEK THE MEETING POINT OF THE TREATISES
SUMMA RECREATORUM, MENSA PHILOSOPHICA
AND *RESPONSORIUM CURIOSORUM**
A Query into the History of their Origin**

All three treatises mentioned in the headline – the *Summa recreatorum*, the *Mensa philosophica* and the *Responsorium curiosorum* – are compilations originating in the area of Central Europe in the second half of the 14th and the first half of the 15th centuries. In the case of the first two, we do not know the author at all; the third one is identified in the old print as the work of Conrad of Halberstadt. Nevertheless, regarding the fact that this attribution is strongly questioned, even the *Responsorium* can be regarded as a work of an unknown author. However, all the texts do not share only a compilation character, place of origin and an anonymous source, but also their topic is partly similar and so is the wording of some passages. We will try to find out if and to what extent one can track a certain ‘family’ relationship between them. First, we will make a brief introduction of the works mentioned above and later on, we will take a closer look at their concordant parts.

As for its content, the *Summa recreatorum* is a very varied collection from the times of Charles IV., probably intended directly for his court. The first of the five tractates presents a list of questions and answers focused on some of the so-called *sex res non naturales* – it deals with the primary human needs, such as eating, drinking, breathing, sleeping (Chap.1), further on, the basic kinds of foods and drinks (Chap. 2) as well as what is harmful for human health (Chap. 3). The second tractate is already a coherent treatise; it gives characteristics, qualities and effects of various kinds of foods and drinks. Moreover, as opposed to the first tractate, it deals with herbs and spices at great length. The third tractate contains, above all, versified advice connected to human health and healthy lifestyle, most

* The paper originated as a part of the research project of Masaryk University in Brno, Research Centre for the History of Central Europe: sources, country, culture (MSM 0021622426). Partly, it draws on my unpublished dissertation thesis *Summa recreatorum. A Medieval Collection for Intellectual Entertainment* (FF MU Brno, 2004).

of its topics correspond with the subject matter of the second tractate. The fourth (and most voluminous) tractate consists of a prosaic part containing thirty stories, fables and exempla of various topics, and a poetic part (of a predominantly secular character). It is further divided into a part with rhythmical and a part with metric poetry according to the form of the verse. The fifth tractate, divided into four chapters according to the four cardinal virtues (*iusticia, prudentia, fortitudo, temperancia*), offers both an outline of these virtues and a moral lesson with the help of brief exempla about various rulers. The *Summa* has survived in four manuscripts¹ and unlike the *Mensa* and the *Responsorium* it has never been printed.² The prologue shows that it was dedicated to *nobility and educated prelates*, who could draw from it material for discussions as well as for entertainment at feasts.

The *Mensa philosophica* consists of four tractates; two of them contain the same material that we also find in the *Summa*. The first tractate corresponds with the third one and the third tractate again with the first tractate of the *Summa*. The second tractate collects sentences and exempla about the customs of individual social classes that one can meet at a feast (the source was, above all, the *Tripartitus moralium* by Conrad of Halberstadt³), the fourth is dedicated to the representatives of various classes; this time, it presents them in narratives of an anecdotic character that are truly aimed for the entertainment at a table. The treatise as a whole is not preserved in any medieval manuscript; on the other hand, it was printed many times,⁴ above all in the university centres – a fact that leads Wachinger to believe that the university attendants should have formed the main group of its readers.⁵ The time of its origin is not known exactly; *terminus post quem non* is represented by the *editio princeps* from around 1480. Nowadays, the bottom line is drawn in the middle of the 14th century,⁶ even though even its first half was considered in the older literature. However, the upper time line can be lowered still – at least to the middle of the 15th century, as the Leipzig Codex 1224 (from the first half of the 15th century), in which the *Summa* is preserved, includes

¹ Praha Národní knihovna ČR, IE 22, f. 51v–116r, Nelahozeves Roudnická lobkovická knihovna, VI Fc 34, Wien Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 5371, f. 185r–234r, Leipzig Universitätsbibliothek, 1224, f. 255r–312v. A. Vidmanová is preparing a critical edition of the fourth and the fifth tractate, edition of the first three tractates is included in the above-mentioned dissertation.

² The basic information offers RAUNER 1995, col. 503–506; VIDMANOVÁ 2001, 169–179; briefly also NECHUTOVÁ 2000, 174–175.

³ More on the relationship between the *Mensa* and the *Tripartitus* RAUNER 1989, 176–183, 186.

⁴ The list of extant prints prepared by DUNN 1934, 9–13, was updated by the facsimile editors of the *Mensa – Mensa philosophica* 1995, 167–177 (it is a facsimile of a print dated to 1487; the critical apparatus also records the different readings of two more prints). Facsimile edition is supplemented with a study dealing with the authorship, the time of origin and the sources of the *Mensa*.

⁵ *Mensa philosophica* 1995, 167.

⁶ WORSTBROCK 1987, col. 395; UThER – WAGNER 1999, 567.

also the first copy of the first book of the *Mensa* (f. 245v^b-251v^b), as was pointed out by Wachinger.⁷ According to the information in the manuscript catalogue, this text was copied by the same scribe as the *Summa*. If the dating of the codex is correct, it is the only hitherto known evidence of the *Mensa* older than we know from the prints.⁸ We will deal with the issue of its authorship later.

The *Responsorium curiosorum* is an encyclopaedia of natural sciences, compiled entirely from questions and short answers; in contrast to the *Summa* or the *Mensa*, it has quite a large platform of topics. It is divided into four books (or tractates): the first one deals with *questiones de corporibus celestibus (sive elementis simplicibus et aliquibus mixtis, scilicet mineralibus et vegetalibus)*, the second one with *de animalibus in generali (et eorum membris et partibus)*, the third one is *de homine specialiter* and the fourth one *de animalibus in speciali*.⁹ It corresponds with the *Summa* and the *Mensa* in over thirty questions. Today the *Responsorium* is known only in one extant edition, i.e. the *editio princeps* printed in Lübeck in 1476 (Lucas Brandis).¹⁰ There was only one manuscript in Wolfenbütel, worthless however, as it was only a copy from a print.¹¹ The *Responsorium* is a practical handbook for the Dominicans that should give them support for having a conversation while visiting people of various social classes. In this respect, Lawn drew attention to the fact that at the time of the origin of the *Responsorium* there had already been established a rank of educated people outside the universities who liked to discuss such topics.¹² Moreover, the interest in similar topics is confirmed also by the *Summa* and the *Mensa*. It is hardly surprising that the *Responsorium* originated in the circle of the order of preachers whose enthusiasm for making compendia that collect natural-scientific knowledge is generally known – it can be proved, above all, by the encyclopaedias by Thomas of Cantimpré (*De natura rerum*)¹³ and Vincent of Beauvais (*Speculum naturale*).¹⁴ If we

⁷ WACHINGER 2001, 23. However, he does not reflect upon the dating of the treatise in this respect.

⁸ PENSEL 1998, 163 and 165.

⁹ Basic information on this work was given by LAWN 1963, 103–107. For an index of all questions see my article STŘELICKÁ 2004, 123–158.

¹⁰ *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*. VII. Leipzig, 1938, n. 7423. The text of the *Responsorium* on microfiche is a part of the collection of *Incunabula: the Printing Revolution in Europe, 1455–1500*. Unit 18: *Printing in and for the Baltic Area*. Part I, BA 32. Full-text of incunabula on microfiche. Ed. Lotte Hellinga. Reading, 1996.

¹¹ FRENKEN 1927, 116. It is probably the same manuscript (today lost – see RAUNER 1989, 1, 28) mentioned also by LAWN 1963, 103.

¹² LAWN 1963, 105. Orientation on natural-scientific topics stems from the everyday experience of the mendicants and it proves that people were indeed interested in such questions (this fact is reflected also in a sociological study by BILLER 2003, 11, footnote 49, in this respect there is even a direct reference to the *Responsorium curiosorum*. 2003 [quoted as of 2003–12–08]. Accessible from < <http://www.yale.edu/glc/events/race/Biller.pdf> >).

¹³ THOMAS CANTIMPRATENSIS, *Liber de natura rerum*, 1973.

¹⁴ VINCENTIUS BELLOVACENSIS, *Speculum quadruplex sive Speculum maius*, 1964–1965.

take into account all the mendicants, we can also add Bartholomew of England (*De proprietatibus rerum*).¹⁵

All three treatises contain *questiones curiose et delectabiles* that can be used in scholarly debates – in the *Summa* and the *Mensa* they make up one full tractate, the *Responsorium* consists only of these. In the *Summa* and the *Mensa*, there is also an important notion of *recreatio*, whose significance for the human mind is very elaborately explained in the Prologue to the fourth book of the *Mensa*. The authors do not deal with entertainment *per se* but they want to maintain mental health and well-being of an educated person. It is an argument very often stated in the prologues to books intended for entertaining humanistic intellectuals.¹⁶ Wachinger, in his minor study *Erzählen für die Gesundheit*, in which he follows Glending Olson¹⁷ and reflects (unlike him) predominantly the German part of the world, contemplates the conditions that introduced this argument into the so-called recreational literature – a term invented by Rauner.¹⁸

The close relationship between the *Summa recreatorum* and the treatise *Mensa philosophica* was first pointed out by Brian Lawn.¹⁹ The potential affinity of the *Responsorium* and the *Mensa* was considered already by Goswin Frenken four decades earlier.²⁰ The concordant passages served as a guide for reflections about the potential author (or authors) of these compilations. Unfortunately, they were always reduced only to a two-sided relationship; relations of all three collections have not been examined in detail yet, even though only the whole triangle can confirm or reject such hypotheses. The paper will first sum up conclusions of individual researchers and then describe in detail the similar passages of the *Summa*, the *Mensa* and the *Responsorium*, and based on this analysis, we will try to go back to the issue of the authorship.

The best would be to start with the *Mensa*. Wesselski was convinced that it was composed by two authors: the first one worked on it up to Chapter 9, Tractate 3, the other one then finished it. In his opinion, the first person was Michael Scotus, who is mentioned by several prints as the author, the other one was a member of the Dominican order of German nationality.²¹ Frenken observed that in the first and the third book a commentary by Averroes on *Super Canticum Avicennae* is quoted, which was translated into Latin only after the death of Michael Scotus († around 1235), thus he extended the authorship of an unknown German Dominican to the whole *Mensa*. Due to various reasons he declared Cologne upon

15 BARTHOLOMEUS ANGLICUS, *De genuinis rerum coelestium, terrestrium et inferarum Proprietatibus libri XVIII*, 1964.

16 For more on this topos see WACHINGER 2001, 16nn.

17 OLSON 1982.

18 RAUNER 1995, 505.

19 LAWN 1963, 107–111, he made a false assumption that the first and the third tractate of the *Mensa* were copied from the *Summa*.

20 FRENKEN 1927, 105–121.

21 WESSELSKI 1909, 43–45.

Rhine as the place of its origin and hence he came to Conrad of Halberstadt senior, who spent here some time due to the trial with M. Eckhart in 1327. Frenken assumed that it was Conrad who wrote the treatise *Responsorium curiosorum* and, as both texts have a similar focus, division into four books and a number of sources, he regarded Conrad's authorship of the *Mensa* as authenticated.²² According to Welter, the *Mensa* cannot have originated before 1468, which excludes Conrad's participation in the collection.²³ Both editors of the facsimile of the *Mensa* contemplated the author's personality in view of the *Tripartitus moralium* because some exempla of the *Tripartitus* appear both in the *Mensa* and in the *Summa*.²⁴ Rauner is in favour of Conrad of Halberstadt (as opposed to Frenken he thinks it was Conrad junior) and regards him as the author of the *Responsorium curiosorum* – for its print includes a note *Explicit tractatus mense philosophice et responsorii curiosorum Lubeck impressus MCCCCLXXVI*.²⁵ Rauner's other arguments include high degree of affinity of the second tractate of the *Mensa* and the second book of the *Tripartitus*, and the existence of the so-called Leipzig excerpts from the fourth tractate of the *Mensa*,²⁶ entitled in the manuscript *Nota quedam excerpta sumpta ex mensa philosophicali magistri et fratris Conradi de Halberstad*. Wachinger thinks that the *Mensa* and the *Tripartitus* used an identical source that was larger than the text contained in the *Tripartitus* and that the second tractate of the *Mensa* was taken from the source as a whole.²⁷ Parallels with the *Summa* show that the same must be anticipated for the third and the fourth tractate. The fourth tractate, which treats its original more freely, is regarded by Wachinger as a work by another author; and this is the only treatise where we may consider Conrad of Halberstadt as its author. In his opinion, the so-called Leipzig excerpts together with an entry from the *Responsorium* give evidence for the fact that Conrad did write a work entitled *Mensa philosophica* (or *philosophicalis*); however, it was not the *Mensa* in the form as we know it today but a treatise equivalent to its fourth tractate.²⁸

In the light of the above-mentioned, everything substantial has been said about the *Responsorium*, too. Frenken thought that its author was Conrad of Halberstadt senior,²⁹ Lawn believed the attribution of the old print but he was not

22 FRENKEN 1927, 106–121.

23 WELTER 1973, 446.

24 *Mensa philosophica* 1995, 202–207.

25 This argument is problematic as the authorship of Conrad of Halberstadt junior is not acknowledged without reservations, as will be shown below. Cf. relevant entries in COLBERG – WORSTBROCK 1985, col. 191–194; BERG 1991, col. 1359.

26 Leipzig Universitätsbibliothek, 1317, f. 239r-243v, for their edition see *Mensa philosophica* 1995, 189–201.

27 On the contrary Rauner supposes that the author of the *Mensa* did not accept the text of the *Tripartitus* literally but that he rewrote it (RAUNER 1989, 1, 188 a 1989, 2, 172*–174*).

28 The fact that Conrad's authorship of the *Mensa* is not approved is demonstrated also by WORSTBROCK 1987, 395; UTHER – WAGNER 1999, 567 a MAAZ 1996, col. 186–189.

29 See above.

sure whether the author was Conrad junior or senior. He stresses the similarity between the *Responsorium* and another, not much known Conrad's work, the *Liber similitudinum naturalium*, (where the authorship of Conrad junior is generally acknowledged³⁰), but also the main difference – the *Responsorium* does not have a moralising or religious character.³¹ Kaepelli ranks the *Responsorium* among the *dubia* but does not determine whether its alleged author was Conrad junior or senior.³² Given the present state of knowledge about both Conrads, the authorship cannot be determined yet. Encyclopaedic knowledge has been documented with certainty only in case of Conrad junior,³³ moreover it is true that Conrad junior liked to repeat the structure of his works (in his treatises the *Tripartitus moralium*, the *Trivium predicabilium* and the *Liber similitudinum naturalium*, there are even identical and verbatim used lemmata³⁴). With respect to the fact that the reliability of attributions stated in the print is often doubted, these ideas are not convincing. Iolanda Ventura strictly objects to Conrad's authorship, as the source bases of the *Liber similitudinum naturalium*, which is the original Conrad's treatise, and *Responsorium curiosorum* are not fully identical. However, in her opinion the *Responsorium* is certainly a product of the Dominican order intended for a lay audience.³⁵

Anežka Vidmanová, too, contemplated Conrad of Halberstadt junior as the potential author of the *Summa* with respect to close relationship between the *Summa* and the *Mensa* as well as the *Tripartitus moralium*. Finally, she rejects this hypothesis since the orientation of the *Summa* and mainly some of its parts do not correspond with the personality of a fifty-year-old author whose main interests in Prague were primarily theological.³⁶

Further on, let us take a look at the relations between the individual treatises and what can be derived from of them concerning their affinity. First, let us concentrate on the similarities and the differences between the *Summa* and the *Mensa*. They were examined already by Rauner and Wachinger, who printed a list

30 VENTURA 2001, 35, 353. The whole study is a profound query into the sources of this treatise. In a broader context, the same author deals with this work in an Internet article *Die moralisierten Enzyklopädien des späteren Mittelalters: ein Überblick unter Berücksichtigung der Fallbeispiele des „Lumen Anime“, des „Liber de exemplis et similitudinibus rerum“ und des „Liber Similitudinum Naturalium“* (VENTURA 2003, 4, 1).

31 LAWN 1963, 103.

32 KAEPELLI 1970, N. 772.

33 WORSTBROCK 1991, col. 190.

34 VENTURA 2001, 353–354. For more information on the treatise *Trivium praedicabilium* see an article of the same author *On Preachers and Their Handbooks: The Trivium praedicabilium of Conrad of Halberstadt (MS Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14203) and the Literature of Preaching Aids of the Fourteenth Century* (in print) – recent contributions of Iolanda Ventura regarding the treatise *Responsorium curiosorum* are also listed here (see note 14).

35 IBIDEM, 387–388.

36 VIDMANOVÁ 2001, 174–176.

of parallel places in both treatises.³⁷ At first sight, it is evident that the topics of the first tractate of the *Mensa* partially correspond with the material of the third tractate and, above all, the second tractate of the *Summa*. Furthermore, the third tractate of the *Mensa* again inspects the same questions as the first tractate of the *Summa*. According to Wachinger, the additional passages that the *Summa* has as opposed to the *Mensa* and vice versa indicate a common predecessor of both treatises.³⁸

This opinion can be confirmed if we examine deviations and correspondences in the wordings of individual chapters. At times, one compilation has, as opposed to the other, (mostly the *Mensa* contrary to the *Summa*, but also vice versa) one or more extra sentences, or there are some shorter facts missing in the lists of the effects of plants and their fruits. Sometimes, the citations disagree (e.g. in a book number), other times they are incomplete (only the authority is stated). It is valuable for us when the *Mensa* names an authority where the *Summa* conceals it completely and vice versa.³⁹ However, the text is not entirely identical; most frequently the formulations differ in slight changes in the word order, the use of synonyms (e.g. *in contrarium* instead of *in oppositum*, *fames* instead of *ieiunium*) or words with an approximately similar meaning (*irrorari* a *irrigari*) and minor omissions. Generally speaking, the author of the *Mensa* tended to express himself briefly and omit superfluous words, he placed sentences and their parts one after another without any linking words. (On the other hand, the author of the *Summa* shortened a number of citations and thus the critical edition of the *Mensa* would surely be a few pages longer than the edition of the *Summa*.) For better illustration, let us have a look at short examples:⁴⁰

Octavo queritur, utrum egri debeant sic comedere, sicut erant soliti, quando erant sani. Dicendum, quod consuetudo est altera natura, quare qui sanus consuevit multum comedere, quando est eger, nequit ieiunium sustinere. Quare debet refici uberius quam alius, qui parum comedit, dum est sanus, et tociens, quociens consuevit comedere, dum fuit sanus. (I.3.8. SR)

Octavo queritur, utrum egri comedere debeant, sicut fuerunt soliti sani. Dicendum, quod consuetudo est altera natura, unde qui sanus consuevit comedere multum, eger nequit sustinere ieiunium, ideo debet refici uberius quam alius, cum fuit sanus. (III, 2, 8 MPh)

³⁷ *Mensa philosophica* 1995, 224–313 (on pp. 264–265 the second tractate of the *Summa* instead of the first one is referred to several times by mistake). I will leave out possible analogies in other passages (i.e. in the fourth tractate of the *Summa*, and in the second or the fourth tractate of the *Mensa*), mainly in respect to the *Tripartitus moralium* and the *Breviloquium* by John of Wells, as they are not relevant for the needs of the comparison with the *Responsorium curiosorum*.

³⁸ *Mensa philosophica* 1995, 204nn.; WACHINGER 1993, 268.

³⁹ On the whole, the citations show greater or lesser differences on approximately 25 places.

⁴⁰ The misprints in the *Mensa* are tacitly corrected and the punctuation is implemented in accordance with the modern practice. I use abbreviations *SR* for the *Summa* and *MPh* for the *Mensa*.

Duodecima pars est de prunis, que secundum Ysaac, ubi supra, sunt duplicia: Quedam alba, que sunt dure digestionis et stomacho nociva, quedam nigra domestica, que quando sunt matura, stomachum humectant, ventrem molliunt, coleram rubeam abiciunt. Si tamen nimis sepe sumantur, stomacho nocent, sed ante cibum minus nocent. (II.12.12. SR)

Pruna secundum Ysaac, ubi supra, sunt duplicia: alba, que dure sunt digestionis, nociva stomacho, nigra domestica – matura stomachum humectant et molliunt ventrem, coleram rubeam abiciunt. Si tamen sepe sumantur, stomacho nocent, ante cibum minus nocent. (I, 30, 1 MPh)

Based on comparison of the *Summa* with the critical apparatus of the *Mensa*, it became clear that the *Summa* mostly agrees with the edition labelled as *L*, i.e. the *editio princeps*, and thus could help with the reconstruction of the text of the *Mensa*, for the shared passages of the *Summa* and *L* certainly have to do with the wording of their common archetype. Neither of the texts is without mistakes, we can correct or supplement the corrupted passages in the *Summa* with the *Mensa* and vice versa. The confrontation of both treatises also helps us better understand the places where the content is too compressed.

The comparison of both collections shows that both compilers proceeded in different ways while compiling the text. The author of the *Summa* strived for clarity and a lucid structure of the text; he divided the tractates into *capitula*, these into *partes*, under which there are other *particulae* (within them, he also uses numbers if necessary – *primo*, *secundo*, *tercio* etc). All parts have their own numbers and at the beginning of each of them we find out what its structure is (such a *capitulatio* can be usually found in the encyclopaedic literature). In the case of the *Mensa* it is different, only the tractates as well as the individual questions in the third tractate are numbered; the header that stands at the top, however, has no number, the topics are ordered loosely one after another, they are provided with a heading and the author does not state in advance what topics are going to be dealt with.⁴¹

By all means we can suppose that all “supplements” of one treatise as opposed to the other belonged to the source that both works drew on because the order of the surrounding chapters remains preserved and the relevant places with their content always fit perfectly into the entire context. The compiler could have hardly managed to insert a new paragraph in such a harmonic way. Moreover, it is impossible to presume that he would have searched for everything in the authorities in order to extend a citation that he found in his original. Should it really be so, we would expect that he would cite also other authorities and that these passages would be included rather at the end of the particular chapter and that they would not be in such a harmony with the surrounding context. It is much more likely that one of the compilers did not copy a particular passage in full length than that the other one looked up the quoted authority and skilfully inserted citations from it.

⁴¹ In the facsimile edition, chapters were numbered for better orientation.

In both cases the order of the chapters corresponds to a great extent; therefore, entire long segments were taken from a common source without any changes and they were reordered according to the overall conception of each compiler. It can be assumed that the lucid organization of the whole text into various levels, whose individual parts are numbered, including an appropriate announcement about its structure at the beginning of each chapter, is a personal contribution of the author of the *Summa*. It seems improbable that the author of the *Mensa* would ignore its clear structure, omit all numbers and order the chapters one after another only under individual headings if the mutual source had already been structured in this way (moreover, if we leave out the possibility that the headings were inserted into the text only when they were printed). In the common source only the groups of questions were probably numbered and their order remained in both texts basically unchanged. Despite the fact that this source was lost, a detailed analysis of both compilations and a comparison with the cited authorities might have shown which of them was closer to its source. Even without such an analysis, it is clear that the compilers made only minor stylistic changes and that they adopted the entire material from their source in an already compact form, just as Wachinger supposes for the second book of the *Mensa*. We will acquire a vague form of this source (or its part that was used) if we combine both texts and add to the common core everything that is extra in each of them.

Up until now, no one has dealt with the relationship of the *Summa* and the *Responsorium*, as well as with their potential affinity with the encyclopaedia *Liber similitudinum naturalium*.⁴² Such a comparison will be facilitated by a critical edition of this encyclopaedia, which is being prepared by Iolanda Ventura.⁴³ In this paper, we will concentrate only on the similarities between the *Summa*, the *Mensa* and the *Responsorium*. To a certain extent, Wachinger was also interested in them; however, he does not note anything more than the fact that there are only a few of them and that they appear in the third and the fourth book of the *Responsorium*.⁴⁴ There are several authorities that these treatises identically refer to, for example Petrus Hispanus, Albert the Great, Macrobius, Avicenna, and others.

Similarly as the authors of the *Summa* and the *Mensa*, the author of the *Responsorium* was also more likely an editor of the already existing material. However, his procedure was different – he did not adopt individual books as a whole but he created them from the material collected in various natural-scientific treatises. It was not possible to examine his method of work more profoundly; therefore, we select only one but highly significant source – *Quaestiones super De animalibus*

⁴² Cf. RAUNER 1989, 188n and 2, 163*. Rauner also mentions several further titles (*ibidem*) that can be taken into the account in the given respect. Generally, it would be a prospective affinity with the fourth and the fifth tractate of the *Summa*, thus I leave them out. Moreover, also VENTURA 2001, 401 points out the necessity of examining the sixth book of the *Liber similitudinum naturalium* and the *Responsorium*.

⁴³ So far, she has published only the prologue to the whole work and the prologue to the sixth chapter (VENTURA 2001, 403–405).

⁴⁴ *Mensa philosophica* 1995, 203.

by Albert the Great.⁴⁵ The whole work is divided into 19 books that correspond with the number and the order of the books in Latin Aristotle and it consists of 442 questions. Conrad copied around 270 of them within books 2 to 4 of the *Responsorium* (altogether, these books amount to 633 questions; passages from Albert thus make up a significant part of their content). If we compare the original *Quaestiones* with their copy in the *Responsorium*, we will discover that they were copied basically word by word. The compiler only ordered them so that it suited his conception. He repeats some questions twice in different contexts (that was actually done also by Albert). If he liked Albert's order, he used it (e.g. questions 451-455 of the *Responsorium* correspond with Albert's questions 1-5 from book 19, questions 826-830 of the *Responsorium* with questions 4-8 from book 14 and we could list a number of other places).⁴⁶ However, he reordered the questions when he needed so. For instance, question 753 *Quare canes sequuntur frequenter homines coeuntes* is not included in the complex of the questions about sexual intercourse in Conrad's work as it is in Albert's (book 5, question 13), although the *Responsorium* does have this category as well, but in the passage *De animalibus quadrupedibus* under the heading *de cane*. Conrad indeed showed profound knowledge of his source (which can be anticipated also in other sources) when he relocated a series of questions (always one or two of them) into a wholly different context. In this respect, he was much more creative than the authors of the *Summa* or the *Mensa*, who adopted groups of questions in exactly the same order as they found them in their common source. Nevertheless, Conrad did not elaborate on them either, as we can see from the same questions adopted from various authors; he did not work with their wording in any way, even though it would have been natural to combine the opinions of both authorities into one answer.

Out of the total number of 846 questions that are included in the *Responsorium*, there are only a few of them useful for establishing parallels between the *Summa* and the *Mensa*. However, this is a point of view as seen in proportion to the large *Responsorium*, in which 35 analogical questions do not represent the same ratio as in the other two treatises – the *Summa* has 103 questions in the first tractate (the *Mensa* 110) and 35 then make up approximately one third of the overall material

⁴⁵ Edition: ALBERTUS MAGNUS. *Liber de natura et origine animae, Liber de principiis motus processivi, Quaestiones super De animalibus*. Ed. Bernhardus Geyer, Ephrem Filthaut. Monasterii Westfolorum, 1955.

⁴⁶ I analyzed the content of the *Responsorium* in a separate article (STŘELICKÁ 2004a, 123–158), where I tried to explain the unreliability of the numbering of questions and I pointed out the mistakes that originated during the transmission of the text and could not have originated from the author himself. Based on the comparison of the order of questions in the text with the order stated in the index, I compiled a new list of questions of the *Responsorium* that would correspond to the alleged original form as much as possible. In the following commentary I always refer to the question numbers of this new list because it would not be possible to determine the necessary places otherwise (the pagination of print shows many recurrent mistakes).

presented in the *modo quaestionis*.⁴⁷ The comparison of these passages clearly shows the close relationship of the *Responsorium*, the *Summa* and the *Mensa*, moreover it has been proved that the *Summa* and the *Mensa* drew on the same source. How can the *Responsorium*, or its specific part, be incorporated into this group of one anticipated and two extant texts? Could the *Summa*, the *Mensa* or their common source serve as the basis for some questions of the *Responsorium* or, on the other hand, could the *Responsorium* be the model for their unknown source? A relatively large amount of identical text allows us to explain the relations among these treatises with a certain degree of probability.

Let us now take a look at the findings that the comparison of the *Responsorium*, the *Summa* and the *Mensa* offer:

1. The *Responsorium* and the *Summa* sometimes correspond, as opposed to the *Mensa*, in formulations and individual expressions (use of the same words, identical word order in the *Responsorium* and the *Summa* or omissions in the *Mensa*).
2. The same can be said about the *Responsorium* and the *Mensa* as opposed to the *Summa*; nevertheless, this second case definitely prevails, as we come across such places in almost every question.
3. Occasionally, the *Responsorium* on the one hand and the *Summa* with the *Mensa* on the other hand have a distinctly different wording or the answer (e.g. in two cases, the *Responsorium* has shorter answers).
4. The *Responsorium* always mentions the source; i.e. even where it is concealed in the *Summa* and the *Mensa*.
5. Five questions in all three compilations have the same sequence; nonetheless, it is not a coherent text copied from one authority but there are questions in the very same order copied from Albert the Great and Peter Hispanus.

Point number 5 shows that the succession of the authorities traceable in all three treatises cannot be regarded as a coincidence; there is one question from Peter Hispanus inserted among four questions extracted from Albert the Great (after the first one). Moreover, we cannot omit a crucial fact that Peter's question (*Quare ova in avibus sunt maiora secundum quantitatem et pauciora quam in piscibus*)⁴⁸ is dealt with also by Albert the Great (*Quaestiones super De animalibus*, VI, 8), and yet it was not used by the author of the *Responsorium*; instead, it has the same question by Peter. As a matter of fact, Albert has the very same order of all the five questions (including the one stated by Peter Hispanus); nonetheless, one of his questions is replaced by the same question that was already

⁴⁷ All common questions are printed in juxtaposition in the above-mentioned dissertation, pp. 39–52.

⁴⁸ Peter's commentary *Questiones de animalibus*, which has not been published yet, is preserved in a single manuscript from the end of the 13th century – Madrid Biblioteca nacional, 1877, the particular question is on f. 265r.

asked by Petrus Hispanus.⁴⁹ Therefore, it is highly probable that the stated group of questions was copied by the author of the *Responsorium* as a whole. He must have used a collection that was a predecessor of the *Summa* and the *Mensa*, or a text related with it. Furthermore, we have more particular evidence that Conrad did not cite directly from Albert. One of the common questions has, in fact, a text identical in the *Responsorium* (692), the *Mensa* (III, 6, 5) and the *Summa* (I.2.4.5) but Albert's wording is different in many ways (questions VI, 10). If the author of the *Responsorium* had drawn directly from Albert, he could have never had an absolutely identical answer to the *Summa* and the *Mensa*. In another question there are some minor differences between the *Responsorium* (725), the *Mensa* (III, 6, 5) and the *Summa* (I.2.5.3), yet again we encounter equivalent formulations (and also an omitted sentence) that cannot have been copied directly from Albert's commentary (VII, 11).

If we compare all answers from the *Responsorium* with Albert, we will find out that it is much like it in many respects; i.e. it preserves the original wording of questions better than the *Mensa* (which does it still better than the *Summa*). Nevertheless, could the author of the *Responsorium* have a common source of questions with the *Summa* and the *Mensa*? He indeed could not, or at least they could not have had a mutual direct source. In many details, the *Summa* corresponds with the *Mensa* and they deviate from the wording of the *Responsorium* and Albert and in one question they also have a common haplography. Besides that, it is also demonstrated by point number 4 from the overview mentioned above: the *Responsorium* always names the authority as it was listed in the original, the *Summa* and the *Mensa* conceal it. It is hardly imaginable that both compilers would have found in its original Albert the Great and Peter Hispanus as the authorities and that they would have omitted their names in both cases – the names had been probably lost from the tradition earlier on. Therefore, we can suppose that there was a „pre-collection“ of questions that was a source for the *Responsorium* or its predecessor, and a collection that was a common source of the *Summa* and the *Mensa*.

Nevertheless, we cannot declare in any case that the author of the *Responsorium* proceeded in the same way with other authorities; it is quite possible that he copied a part of the questions from already finished collections and that he himself completed a part from relevant authorities. In the *Responsorium*, we find a great amount of questions of a medicinal or dietetic character that are not found in the *Summa* or the *Mensa*, even though they would be suitable for their topic. Therefore, it is not certain what the original collection, from which the tradition led both towards the *Responsorium* and towards the *Summa* and the *Mensa*, re-

⁴⁹ Identical or similar questions are caused by the fact that Albert the Great knew and used Peter's commentary. The issue of interdependence of both commentaries was examined by Tamara Goldstein-Préaud and later by de Asúa: GOLDSTEIN-PRÉAUD 1981, 61–71; DE ASÚA 1997, 15–23, the correspondence of both commentaries was pointed out already by LAWN 1963, 85. Albert drew on Peter's commentary in case of more than half of his questions (i.e. 238). In the corpus of questions under examination, Albert's answers are different from Peter's.

ally looked like. This collection could offer to the *Responsorium* only a part of its material. In any case, it is sure that some of Albert's questions entered the *Responsorium* at least from a second-hand source.

The fact that the *Responsorium* very often shares a similar wording with the *Mensa* as opposed to the *Summa* moves us a bit further on in the knowledge of working procedures of both anonymous compilers. Up until recently, we did not know if it is the *Mensa* or the *Summa* that is closer to the anonymous original; nowadays, we can prove that the author of the *Mensa* followed the original more closely. The *Summa* tries to offer an intelligible commentary and therefore offers particular explanation links. If the *Mensa* and the *Summa* differ in the factual content, we also know which information is correct (e.g. interchanged *sal* in the *Mensa* III, 9, 2 instead of the correct *lac*, or *argilla* in the *Mensa* III, 7, 3 instead of *anguille*). It is generally true that the mistakes in the *Responsorium* can be emended via the text of the *Summa* and the *Mensa* and vice versa. Moreover, it is irrefutable that all mutual wordings of the *Responsorium* and the *Summa* or the *Responsorium* and the *Mensa* are original wordings that must have been present also in the mutual predecessor.

Apart from the 35 identical questions, all three treatises correspond in details also elsewhere; for example, if the same argument is used within an answer to various questions. More agreements can be found in the part of the *Summa* and the *Mensa* that is no longer presented in the form of questions and answers. Even here, there is compliance in using the citations from the authorities. At a closer look at the individual questions, it is clear that the citations differ from each other in the order and sometimes also in the extent. Furthermore, we have not managed to find an unusual formulation or mistake that would appear simultaneously in the *Responsorium*, the *Summa* and the *Mensa*, and not in the cited authority, so that it would be possible to document firmly the affinity of these passages. It would also mean that the author of the *Responsorium* sometimes made up questions and answers by himself from coherent treatises on a particular topic, which seems rather improbable. More likely, the compiler used a system of ready-made questions and answers – if we take a look at the part dealing with birds, fish, eggs and meat of some quadrupeds, where he cites, above all, Albert the Great and sometimes Peter Hispanus, we will find out that the questions already formed by other scholars were copied by Conrad in approximately 90 %. Where he refers to the authorities that did not use the form of questions (Pliny, Thomas of Cantimpré, Avicenna, Averroes, Rhazes and Ysaac), he probably conceals the real source.

A brief look into the mutual relationships of some parts of the *Responsorium*, the *Summa* and the *Mensa* has shown that the *Responsorium* did not draw on the same source as the *Summa* and the *Mensa*; however, it was their source that used the same collection as a model. It implies that these texts cannot have had the same author. Thus, the hypothesis that Conrad of Halberstadt was the author of both the *Responsorium* and all of the *Mensa* must be rejected. Conrad's authorship of both treatises would have meant that the same person used certain parts from his already existing work again for the needs of another work; however, he

would not have copied it in its known form but used a different wording, sometimes even worse, and would not even try to correct mistakes (e.g. the mutual haplography did not originate during the manuscript tradition of the *Mensa*, see III, 7, 1). The question of Conrad's of Halberstadt authorship of the *Responsorium*, as well as the fourth book of the *Mensa* will have to be examined thoroughly with respect to the *Liber similitudinum naturalium*.

The affinity of the *Responsorium*, the *Mensa* and the *Summa* also allows us to think about the collection mentioned as the last one. Even though a Bohemian origin of the *Summa* is being considered, it can be accepted only with certain reservations. The compilation itself might have been put together in the area of Prague but as far as the first three tractates are considered, only from a foreign material.⁵⁰ The predecessor of all three compilations may have originated in Central Europe. The *Mensa* and the *Responsorium* lead us into the German environment from where a mutual original of the *Summa* and the *Mensa* could have come to us as a copy, or the author of the *Summa* could have come across the text during his studies in a German town. Consequently, he started to write the *Summa* on the basis of this text either directly there or he took the original with him to Prague (of course, this does not mean that it must have been a person of Czech nationality). Regarding the fact that in the case of the *Summa* we can without doubt accept Wachinger's hypothesis about a very complex tradition of similar compilations according to various intentions of their authors,⁵¹ the rather complex entanglement of mutual relations among the *Summa*, the *Mensa*, the *Responsorium* and other similar texts will hardly ever be disentangled in a satisfactory manner.

(Transl. by Petra Trávníková)

SOURCES

ALBERTUS MAGNUS (1955). *Liber de natura et origine animae, Liber de principiis motus processivi, Quaestiones super De animalibus*. Ed. Bernhardus Geyer, Ephrem Filthaut. Monasterii Westfalorum, 1955.

Mensa philosophica: Faksimile und Kommentar. Hg. von Erwin Rauner und Burghart Wachinger. Tübingen, 1995.

BARTHOLOMEUS ANGLICUS (1964). *De genuinis rerum coelestium, terrestrium et inferarum Proprietatibus libri XVIII*. Francofurti MDCL. Nachdruck Frankfurt a. M., 1964.

Nota quedam excerpta sumpta ex mensa philosophicali magistri et fratris Conradi de Halberstad. Leipzig Universitätsbibliothek, 1317, f. 239r–243v.

PETRUS HISPANUS. *Questiones super libro De animalibus*. Madrid Biblioteca nacional, 1877, f. 256r–290v.

[*Responsorium curiosorum*.] *Incipit Responsorium curiosorum compilatum per fratrem Conradum de Halberstad ordinis predicatorum*. Lübeck: [Lucas Brandis], 1476. Microfiche edition of *In-*

⁵⁰ As it was pointed out by A. Vidmanová, the same can be said about the other two tractates (VIDMANOVÁ 2004, 143–150).

⁵¹ *Mensa philosophica* 1995, 203.

- cunabula : the Printing Revolution in Europe, 1455–1500*. Unit 18: *Printing in and for the Baltic Area*. Part I, BA 32. Full-text incunabula on microfiche. Ed. Lotte Hellinga. Reading, 1996.
- Summa recreatorum*. Praha Národní knihovna ČR, I E 22, f. 51v–116r; Nelahozeves Roudnická Lobkovická knihovna, VI Fc 34; Wien Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 5371, f. 185r–234r; Leipzig Universitätsbibliothek, 1224, f. 255r–312v.
- THOMAS CANTIMPRATENSIS (1973). *Liber de natura rerum*. Editio princeps secundum codices manuscriptos. Hg. von Helmut Boese. Vol. 1. Text. Berlin – New York, 1973.
- VINCENTIUS BELLOVACENSIS (1964-65). *Speculum quadruplex sive Speculum maius*. 1-4. Douai 1624. Reprint Graz, 1964-1965.

LITERATURE

- DE ASÚA, MIGUEL (1997). Peter of Spain, Albert the Great and the «*Quaestiones de animalibus*». *Physis. Rivista internazionale di storia della scienza*, 1997, 34, 1–30.
- BERG, D. (1991). 'Konrad d. J. v. Halberstadt OP'. In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*. Bd. 5. München, 1991, col. 1359.
- BILLER, P. (2003). *The Black in Medieval Science: What Significance?* [online]. Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Gilder Lehrman Center International Conference at Yale University *Collective Degradation: Slavery and the Construction of Race*. November 7-8, 2003. New Haven: Yale University [quoted as of 2003-12-08]. Accessible from < <http://www.yale.edu/glc/events/race/Biller.pdf> >.
- COLBERG, K., WORSTBROCK, F. (1985). 'Konrad von Halberstadt d. J. OP'. In *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*. Bd. 5. Berlin – New York, 1985, col. 191–194.
- DUNN, T[HOMAS] F[RANKLIN] (1934). *The facetiae of the Mensa philosophica*. St. Louis, 1934.
- Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* (1938). VII. Hrsg. von der Kommission für den Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke. Leipzig, 1938.
- GOLDSTEIN-PRÉAUD, TAMARA (1981). Albert le Grand et les questions du XIII^e siècle sur le «*De animalibus*» d'Aristote. *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences*, 1981, 3, 61–71.
- FRENKEN, GOSWIN (1927). *Die älteste Schwanksammlung des Mittelalters (Die Mensa philosophica eines Kölner Dominikaners)*. Jahrbuch des Kölnischen Geschichtsvereins 8; 9. Köln, 1927, 105–121.
- KAEPPELLI, T. (1970). *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*. I. Romae, 1970.
- LAWN, B. (1963). *The Salernitan Questions: an Introduction to the History of Medieval and Renaissance Problem Literature*. Oxford, 1963.
- MAAZ, WOLFGANG (1996). 'Konrad von Halberstadt (d. J.)'. In *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*. Bd. 8. Berlin – New York, 1996, col. 186–189.
- NECHUTOVÁ, JANA (2000). *Latinská literatura českého středověku do roku 1400*. Praha, 2000.
- OLSON, GLENDING (1982). *Literature as Recreation in the Later Middle Ages*. Ithaca – London, 1982.
- PENSEL, FRANZJOSEF (1998). *Verzeichnis der deutschen mittelalterlichen Handschriften in der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig*. Zum Druck gebracht von Irene Stahl. Berlin, 1998.
- RAUNER, ERWIN (1989). *Konrads von Halberstadt O.P. „tripartitus moralium“: Studien zum Nachleben antiker Literatur im späteren Mittelalter*. Bd. 1–2. Frankfurt am Main, 1989.
- (1995). 'Summa recreatorum'. In *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*. Bd. 9. Berlin – New York, 1995, col. 503–506.
- STŘELICKÁ, DANA (2004a). »Responsorium curiosorum«: Pokus o rekonstrukci dosahu. *SPFF-BU. Graeco-Latina Brunensia*, 2004, N 9, 123–158.
- (2004b) *Summa recreatorum. Středověký sborník intelektuální zábavy*. An unpublished dissertation thesis (FF MU Brno, 2004).

- UTHER, HANS-JÖRG; WAGNER, FRITZ (1999). 'Mensa philosophica'. In *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*. Bd. 9. Berlin – New York, 1999, 567–572.
- VENTURA, IOLANDA (2001). Der 'Liber similitudinum naturalium' Konrads von Halberstadt und seine Quellen: ein Fallbeispiel aus der naturwissenschaftlichen Textüberlieferung im Spätmittelalter. *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 2001, 35, 349–406.
- (2003). Die moralisierten Enzyklopädien des späteren Mittelalters: ein Überblick unter Berücksichtigung der Fallbeispiele des „Lumen Anime“, des „Liber de exemplis et similitudinibus rerum“ und des „Liber Similitudinum Naturalium“. *Reti medievali* [online], 2003, 4; 1 [quoted as of 2003-11-10]. Accessible from z WWW: <<http://www.dssg.unifi.it/~rm; rivista; saggi; ventura.htm/>> .
- VIDMANOVÁ, ANEŽKA (2004). Antika ve sborníku *Summa recreatorum*. In *Druhý život antického mýtu*. Ed. Jana Nechutová. Brno, 2004, 143–150.
- (2001). 'Summa recreatorum'. In *Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters in Böhmen und über Böhmen*. Vorträge der internationalen Tagung, veranstaltet vom Institut für Germanistik der Pädagogischen Fakultät der Südböhmischen Universität České Budějovice. České Budějovice, 8. bis 11. September 1999. Hg. von Dominique Flieger und Václav Bok. Wien, 2001, 169–179.
- WACHINGER, BURGHART (1993). Convivium fabulosum: Erzählen bei Tisch im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert, besonders in der >Mensa philosophica< und bei Erasmus und Luther. In *Kleinere Erzählformen des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts*. Hg. von Walter Haug und Burghart Wachinger. Tübingen, 1993, 256–286.
- (2001). *Erzählen für die Gesundheit, Diätetik und Literatur im Mittelalter*. Heidelberg, 2001.
- WELTER, J.-TH. (1973). *L'exemplum : dans la littérature religieuse et didactique du moyen âge*. Genève, 1973.
- WESSELSKI, ALBERT (1909). *Mönchslatein: Erzählungen aus geistlichen Schriften des XIII. Jahrhunderts*. Leipzig, 1909.
- WORSTBROCK, F[RANZ] J[OSEF] (1991). 'Konrad von Halberstadt d. Ä. OP'. In *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*. Bd. 5., 1991, col. 189–191.
- (1987). 'Mensa philosophica'. In *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*. Bd. 6. Berlin – New York, 1987, col. 395–398.

KDE HLEDAT PRŮSEČÍK SPISŮ *SUMMA RECREATORUM*, *MENSA PHILOSOPHICA* A *RESPONSORIUM CURIOSORUM* (sonda do historie jejich vzniku)

V předkládaném článku jsou nejprve představeny tři pozdně středověké spisy, vyjmenované v titulu, především pokud jde o dobu jejich vzniku a otázku autorství. Jelikož se jedná o kompilace s velice pestrým obsahem, lze se domnívat, že tradice jednotlivých částí těchto spisů byla značně složitá. Všechny tři spisy jsou středoevropského původu a obsahují částečné tematické shody, přičemž některé jejich pasáže jsou dokonce zcela identické. Tato společná místa (psaná ve formě *quaestio – responsio*) mohou sloužit k objasnění vzájemných vztahů a k vysvětlení historie vzniku těchto kompilací. V odborné literatuře, která se věnuje spisu *Mensa philosophica* je již několik desetiletí známo, že *Mensa* (její první a třetí kniha) i *Summa* (její první, druhý a částečně také třetí traktát) čerpaly z téhož pramene, bohužel dnes nedochovaného. Autorka článku analyzuje 35 otázek a odpovědí (původně formulovaných Petrem Hispánským a Albertem Velikým), které se objevují jak v *Summě* a *Mense*, tak i v *Responsoriu curiosorum*, a na základě jejich srovnání vyslovuje hypotézu, že příslušné pasáže *Responsoria* pravděpodobně nebyly opsány z předpokládané, ale nedochované předlohy *Summy* a *Mensy*, nýbrž že teprve tato předloha měla s *Responsoriem* stejný (pro nás však opět neznámý) pramen, psaný formou otázek a odpovědí. Tento závěr umožňuje nové

zamyšlení nad otázkou autorství (především Konráda z Halberstadtu) – existuje několik argumentů, jež nedovolují všechny tyto kompilace pokládat za dílo jednoho jediného autora, jak se o tom v odborné literatuře uvažovalo.

Dana Růžičková
Ústav klasických studií FF MU
(ruzaruz@mail.muni.cz)

