

Constant J. Mews

Monash University, Melbourne

DEBATING THE AUTHORITY OF
PSEUDO-AUGUSTINE'S
DE SPIRITU ET ANIMA

I first met Zénon Kaluza in 1980, at the first seminar I attended of Jean Jolivet at the V^e section of the École pratique des hautes études, Paris. His friendship and willingness to help a young Anglophone student who had only just arrived in France after completing doctoral studies in Oxford made an enormous impression on me. My area of expertise was then strictly in the 12th century, more particularly the different versions of the *Theologia* of Peter Abelard, of which I wished to complete a critical edition left unfinished by the late Eligius-Marie Buytaert OFM. Even though Zénon Kaluza was working more on the later medieval period, I could see that we shared similar perspectives in pursuing our research, in appreciating the importance of historical context in understanding scholastic ideas. More than that, we were both from outside France, but found a common point of connection in studying the scholastic world of the medieval centuries. In a powerful sense, I learned from him the true cosmopolitanism of medieval Paris, where many outsiders could become part of a shared scholarly community, through both reasoned argument and friendship. In 1985 I moved back to the UK to work on Abelard's *Theologia* and other writings as a Leverhulme Research Fellow at the University of Sheffield, working under Professor David Luscombe. Two years later, I took up a position at Monash University in Melbourne, Australia. My friendship with and respect for Zénon Kaluza has remained undimmed over a period of almost forty years.

In what follows I offer preliminary reflections on the anthropological perspective of the *De spiritu et anima* [DSA], a 12th century text widely copied in subsequent centuries as a work of Augustine, but whose authorship and intellectual

coherence has long been contested.¹ As has long been noticed, it incorporates and modifies many passages from the much briefer *De anima* of Isaac of Stella.² In this treatise, addressed to his friend Alcher, Isaac says that he is responding to his request for a discussion about the soul, “not about how it was before, during and after sin, such as was taught by scripture, but about its essence and powers.”³

While there has been a resurgence of interest in Platonic themes in Isaac’s writing, most famously in his use of the image of a golden chain connecting the divine and material realms, the *DSA* has not attracted comparable attention.⁴ McGinn considered it was “largely devoid of originality, though not of importance [...] dependent on almost pure quotation and paraphrase from earlier authors.”⁵ Dismissive attitudes to the work go back to the mid 13th century. Albert the Great declared that it was by “a certain William the Cistercian, who said many false things,” presumably thinking it might have been written by

¹The *DSA* will be cited by chapter and column in the edition in PL 40, 779–832, reprinted from that of P. Coustant in *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis episcopi Operum*, vol. 6, Parisiis: Franciscus Muguet, 1685, Appendix, 35–64; see J. MACHIELSEN, *Clavis Patristica Pseudo-epigraphorum Medii Aevi* 2A, Turnhout: Brepols, 1994, p. 76–78, no. 153. The *DSA* was translated into English by E. Leiva and B. Ward, within *Three Treatises on Man. A Cistercian Anthropology*, edited by B. McGinn, Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1977, p. 177–282, alongside Isaac of Stella, *De anima* and Guillelmus de Sancto Theoderico, *De natura corporis et animae*. I am grateful to Caterina Tarlazzi for her generosity in discussing aspects of this paper.

²L. NORPOTH, *Der pseudo-augustinische Traktat “De spiritu et anima”*, Cologne: Institut für Geschichte der Medizin, 1971, p. 239–253 lists literary sources of *DSA*, including ISAAC, *De anima*.

³ISAAC DE STELLA, *De anima*, PL 194, 1875–1890. The *De anima* will be cited according to the columns of this edition, as well as that of C. TARLAZZI, “L’Epistola de anima di Isaaco di Stella: studio della tradizione ed edizione del testo,” *Medioevo*, vol. 36 (2011), p. 167–278, with the text on p. 256–278, in a volume titled *Tradizione agostiniana, aristotelismo e averroismo. Augustinian Heritage, Aristotelianism and Averroism*, edited by I. Tolomio. The translation in *Three Treatises on Man*, p. 177–282 (see n. 1 above) is reprinted in *The Selected Works of Isaac of Stella. A Cistercian Voice from the Twelfth Century*, edited by D. Deme, London: Ashgate, 2007, p. 143–157. See in particular ISAAC, *De anima*, p. 256 (1875B): “Dilecto suo ALCHERO frater ISAAC, se, et quod sibi. Cogis me, dilectissime, scire quod nescio; et quod nondum didici docere. Vis enim a nobis edoceri de anima, sed neque id quod in divinis Litteris didicimus, id est qualis fuerit ante peccatum, aut sit sub peccato, aut futura post peccatum; sed de ejus essentia et viribus, quomodo sit in corpore, vel quomodo exeat [...]”

⁴On Isaac, apart from the publications mentioned in n. 2 above, see B. MCGINN, *The Golden Chain: A Study in the Theological Anthropology of Isaac of Stella*, Washington: Cistercian Publications, 1972, and the comprehensive study by W. BUCHMÜLLER, *Isaak von Étoile: monastische Theologie im Dialog mit dem Neo-Platonismus des 12. Jahrhunderts*, Münster: Aschendorff, 2016. Useful comments on *DSA* within the broader context of thinking about the powers of the soul in the 12th century are made by P. MICHAUD-QUANTIN, “La classification des puissances de l’âme au XII^e siècle,” *Revue du Moyen Âge Latin*, vol. 5 (1949), p. 15–34 (especially p. 24–28).

⁵*Three Treatises on Man*, p. 63.

William of Saint-Thierry, author of the *De natura corporis et animae*.⁶ Thomas Aquinas followed his mentor in remarking that it had been compiled “by a certain Cistercian from the sayings of Augustine, adding certain other things, so that what is written there is not to be considered as authoritative.”⁷ Thomas repeated the claim in his *Quaestiones disputatae de anima*, arguing that it was by a Cistercian and that one should be not concerned with what it had to say.⁸ The *DSA* was still widely copied between the 13th and 15th century as a work of Augustine, especially in Franciscan circles in which it was revered not just as a text that could rival Aristotle’s *De anima*, but as a foundation for theological reflection and self-knowledge.⁹ While the *DSA* deserves a much fuller analysis of its textual tradition and literary sources than can be offered here, my intention is to identify certain aspects of its complex footprint, and to offer some suggestions as to why it should have generated such debate in the 13th century.

Erasmus included *DSA* in his edition of the works of Augustine, commenting that it had useful things to say even if it drew on several different authors.¹⁰ By contrast, Dom Pierre Coustant (1654–1721), who included the *DSA* within vol. 6 (1685) of the Maurist edition of the complete works of Augustine, was not as generous. He judged it to be an unoriginal paraphrase of a host of authors, not just Isaac of Stella, but Augustine, Gennadius, Boethius, Cassiodorus, Isidore, Bede, Alcuin, Hugh of Saint-Victor, and Bernard of Clairvaux.¹¹ He also criticised the ambivalence of the title given to it in 1664 by

⁶ ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *Super Sententiarum*, I, d. 8, a. 25, edited by A. Borgnet, *Opera omnia*, vol. 25, Paris: Vivès, 1893, p. 257b–258a: “[...] quod non est Augustini, sed cuiusdam Guillelmi Cisterciensis qui multa falsa dixit.”

⁷ THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Super IV Sent.*, d. 44, q. 3, a. 3, qc. 2, ad 1: “Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod liber ille negatur a quibusdam esse Augustini; dicitur enim fuisse cuiusdam Cisterciensis, qui eum ex dictis Augustini compilavit, et quaedam de suo addidit; unde quod ibi scribitur, pro auctoritate habendum non est.”

⁸ THOMAS DE AQUINO, *QQ. de anima*, a. 12, ad 1, edited by B.-C. Bazán, Paris: Cerf, 1996, p. 110: “Ad primum ergo dicendum quod liber iste De spiritu et anima non est Augustini, set dicitur cuiusdam Cisterciensis fuisse; nec est multum curandum de hiis que in eo dicuntur.”

⁹ See for example BONAVENTURA, *Sermones de tempore*, 12, 1, edited by J.G. Bougerol, Paris: Cerf, 1988, p. 65; IDEM, *Sermones dominicales*, 46, 12, edited by J.G. Bougerol, Grottaferrata: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1977, p. 451; and JOHANNES PECKAM, *Quaestiones de anima*, 5, 100; 8, 4; 11, 1 and 6, edited by J. Spettman, G.J. Etkorn, (Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica Medii Aevi, 28), Grottaferrata: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 2002, p. 390, 417, 434, 435.

¹⁰ ERASMUS in the introduction (p. 191) to his edition of *DSA*, within AUGUSTINUS, *Aurelii Augustini... Opera omnia*, Paris, 1571, vol. 3, p. 191–204, originally published in Basel by Froben in 1528–1529: “Interea quoque si quid fuerit hoc libello insertum quod verae pietate non respondeat illud (ceteris tamem salvis) iudicio bonorum virorum reformatur, uel omnino tanquam inutile membrum descindatur.”

¹¹ *Admonitio*, PL 40, 779–780: “Opus hoc, quemadmodum Erasmus probe iudicavit, hominis est variae multaeque lectionis, in quo non aliquid artis videas aut ingenii, sed quasi arenam sine

Bertrand Tissier, immediately after his edition of Isaac's *De anima*, namely *Ejusdem B. Isaac abbatis de Stella, seu ut ipsi placuit, Alcheri de anima liber*. Tissier's running title to the *DSA* was *Isaac de anima*. Although Tissier promised to discuss Alcher's possible authorship in an introduction, this never happened.¹² In another volume, Coustant commented that *DSA* was written in a similar style to two other pseudo-Augustinian texts from monastic milieu, the *De diligendo Deo* and *Manuale* both of which also draw on Augustine, St Anselm, Hugh of St Victor and St Bernard.¹³ Coustant observed that because many passages of *DSA* were taken verbatim from Isaac's *De anima*, it could have been written by Alcher, building on Isaac's treatise extended with other authors, but "without art."¹⁴ None of the surviving manuscripts of the *DSA* attribute the work to Alcher, with one possible exception, a now lost manuscript from the Cistercian abbey of Notre-Dame de la Merci-Dieu (diocese of Poitiers), physically close to Isaac's abbey, that contained both Isaac's *De anima* and *Liber Alcheri de anima*, if this is *DSA*.¹⁵

calce, dicta tantum et collectanea ex diversis locis exscripta: ex Augustino scilicet, ex Gennadio, Boethio, Cassiodoro, Isidoro Hispalensi, Beda, Alcuino, Hugone Victorino, Bernardo, Isaaco Stellensi abbate, etc."

¹² Coustant was referring back to the edition of *DSA* by B. Tissier, *Bibliotheca patrum Cistercensium*, vol. 6, Bonnefont: Renesson, 1664, p. 84–105. C. TARLAZZI demonstrates that Tissier first raised the possibility of Alcher's authorship of *DSA* (drawing on unknown manuscripts) in "Il manoscritto 469 della bibliotheca Teresiana di Mantova e Alchero 'di Clairvaux,'" *Medioevo*, vol. 35 (2010), p. 323–340. Coustant's contribution to distinguishing spurious from authentic attributions to Augustine is reported by R.P. TASSIN, *Histoire littéraire de la congrégation de Saint-Maur, ordre de S. Benoit*, Brussels – Paris: Hublot, 1770, p. 417–428 (especially p. 418), repeated in J.-B. VANEL, *Les Bénédictins de Saint-Maur à Saint-Germain-des-Prés, 1630–1790: nécrologe des religieux de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur, décédés à l'Abbaye de Saint-Germain-des-Prés*, Paris: Champion, 1896, p. 127–132 (especially p. 128).

¹³ Reprinted in PL 46, 22: "De Spiritu et Anima, Alcheri Cisterciensis monachi. Nec dissimili stilo conscriptus est liber de Diligendo Deo, ac Manuale." He is referring to the *De diligendo Deo* (PL 40, 847–864), a text which he says in its *Admonitio* (PL 40, 847–848) draws from Anselm, Hugh and Bernard and may be by the same author as the one who wrote *DSA*. He makes a similar comment in his introductions to Ps-AUGUSTINUS, *Meditationes* (PL 40, 901–942) and the *Manuale* (PL 40, 951–968). For further discussion of these texts and their bringing together ideas of St Anselm, Hugh and Bernard, see C. GIRAUD, *Spiritualité et histoire des textes entre moyen âge et époque moderne*, Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2016, p. 123, 138–140, and 168–170, in which he suggests that Ps-BERNARDUS, *Meditationes* (PL 184, 485–508), coming from a similar milieu to *DSA*, was composed in a monastic context between 1160 and 1190.

¹⁴ *Admonitio*, n. 11 above.

¹⁵ See C. TARLAZZI, "Il manoscritto 469 della bibliotheca Teresiana di Mantova e Alchero 'di Clairvaux,'" especially p. 330, n. 24, in a study of a manuscript of Isaac's *De anima* that adds a detail not otherwise preserved in manuscripts of Isaac's *De anima*, that Alcher was a monk of Clairvaux.

The fullest study of the *De spiritu et anima* to date is still that of Leo Norpoth in a Cologne PhD thesis submitted in 1924, but not published until 1971. He observed the significance of its arguments about human physiology but concluded that certainty about its authorship could not be obtained.¹⁶ He demonstrated that the shortest version (which contain all the quotations from Isaac's treatise) contains only 33 chapters, but that it also survives in a version of 44 chapters (printed by Tissier in 1660, equivalent to chapters 1–50 in the Coustant edition).¹⁷ Chapters 1–33 pursue the theme of the interaction that the soul and spirit (*animus* or *spiritus*) constitute a spiritual substance, endowed with reason while the flesh, where the senses are located, is a second, distinct substance. Chapters 34–50 dwell on the image of God within the soul, with a greater emphasis on the misery of the human condition, while the additional chapters 51–65 reflect on the consequences to be drawn for thoughts, words and actions.¹⁸ Chapter 49–50 (equivalent to chapter 44 in the version of *DSA* edited by Tissier) returns to the argument of chapter 3 about the soul and flesh as two substances. Norpoth did not realise that an unknown printer published it in Lauingen in 1472 in a version not divided into chapters and missing the prologue, but beginning with what is now chapter 3 and concluding with what became chapter 35.¹⁹ In Venice (1484) Andreas de Bonetis printed a longer

¹⁶L. NORPOTH, *Der pseudo-augustinische Traktat "De spiritu et anima,"* p. 107–114 on physiological themes and on authorship, p. 63–67.

¹⁷IBIDEM, p. 229–234. The beginning of *DSA* 34 (803) is taken from Ps-ALCUIN, *De dignitate conditionis humanae*, edited by J. Marenbon, *From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre: Logic, Theology and Philosophy in the Early Middle Ages*, Cambridge: CUP, 1981, p. 161 (PL 17, 1016B and PL 101, 1359A): "Anima nominatur totus homo interior, qua vivificatur, regitur et continetur lutea illa massa, humectata succis, ne arefacta dissolvatur." Its dependence on this text (as also on Anselm's *Meditations*, Gennadius and Bede) is studied by J. LEWICKI, "Filozoficzna nauka Alchera z Clairvaux o Bogu w świetle jej źródeł," *Roczniki Filozoficzne*, vol. 5 (1955–1957), p. 79–94; and M. LEBECH, J. McEvoy, "De Dignitate Conditionis Humanae: Translation, Commentary, and Reception History of the *Dicta Albini* (Ps.-Alcuin) and the *Dicta Candidi*," *Viator*, vol. 40/2 (2009), p. 1–34. The final chapter 44 of *DSA* in Tissier's edition ends "[...] cernere finis," equivalent to the penultimate sentence in c. 50 in PL 40, 816.

¹⁸*DSA* 51 (816–817): "Cum nulla scientia melior sit illa qua cognoscit homo semetipsum, discutiamus cogitationes, locutiones atque opera nostra." L. NORPOTH, *Der pseudo-augustinische Traktat "De spiritu et anima,"* p. 235–236 observes that certain manuscripts have an additional chapter inserted between chapters 33 and 34.

¹⁹AUGUSTINUS, *De anima et spiritu*, Lauingen [printer of De consensu evangelistarum], 9 November 1472 (ISTC ia01224000). Further details available on Incunabula Short Title Catalogue. It begins "Ex duabus substantiis constat homo [...]" (c. 3, 781) and concludes "[...] in se ipso reformavit. Explicit liber Augustini de anima et spiritu" (c. 35, 806). On fol. 7r, an extra sentence is added to c. 14 after "sibi soli et Deo loqui," not preserved in any other version: "Et hec est conscientia nostra que nihil aliud est quam intrare ad se. Iste est titulus huius tractatus." Exactly this version occurs in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 28596, fol. 21–26v, a Bavarian manuscript copied in 1472.

version, still without chapter divisions, but beginning with the prologue and ending with chapter 33.²⁰ The first version to be divided into 65 chapters was printed by Martin Flach in Strasburg in 1489, with an epilogue taken from Vincent of Beauvais, warning that it was more likely to be by Hugh of St Victor than Augustine.²¹ This was the version reprinted by Amorbach within volume 11 of Augustine's *Opera Omnia* in 1505, reprinted by Erasmus in 1528, and then by Coustant in 1685, reproduced by Migne in 1885. Paradoxically, Norporth could only identify a single manuscript of this version, copied in the mid 15th century in Münster.²² While more work is needed on the evolution of its text, its internal coherence suggests that a single author has extended *DSA* beyond chapters 1–33 over a period of time. The opening statement (which became c. 3) that man is made from two substances is repeated near the close of the work in its longest version.²³

Norporth's study was not known to G. Raciti in a study (1961), which questioned the attribution to Alcher on the grounds that while Isaac described Alcher as pre-eminent in *physica* (medicine or "physic"), he could see no evidence for this in the *DSA*, which he suggested could have been written by Peter Comestor.²⁴ McGinn followed Raciti's doubts about Alcher, while observing the fragility of his attribution to Comestor.²⁵ More recently Damien Boquet has recognised the significance of *DSA* as part of a broader Cistercian project to develop an anthropology of the soul that gave new attention to emotion,

²⁰ AUGUSTINUS, *Opuscula*, Venetiis: A. de Bonetis, 23 July 1484, a volume beginning with *Enchiridion* and concluding with *De Spiritu et anima* (ISTC ia01217000, unfoliated, but p. 566–586 of the pdf available at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek). It concludes: "[...] quod quidem in tantum sublime est" (= c. 33, 803), but adds "ut quicquid supra id est aliud non sit quam ratio, et hec est anima."

²¹ AUGUSTINUS, *Opuscula*, Argentoratum: Martin Flach, 20 March 1489 (ISTC ia01218000), with *DSA* on fol. 213ra–232ra, a volume printed in Venice by Dionysius Bertochus on 26 March 1491 (ISTC ia01219000) and reprinted by M. Flach on 11 August 1491 (ISTC ia01221000). This text is reproduced within AUGUSTINUS, *Opera omnia*, vol. 10, Basileae: Petri, Amerbach, Froben, 22. January 1506, unfoliated but accessible at <https://www.e-rara.ch/zuz/content/pageview/17500898>.

²² The only MS identified by Norporth as containing the complete text is Berlin, Staatsbibliothek theol. fol. 180, fol. 62r–101v, a miscellany compiled in Münster 1446–1463; V. Rose, *Verzeichnis der Lateinischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, vol. 2, Berlin: Asher, 1903, no. 853, p. 993–996.

²³ *DSA* 3 (781): "Ex duabus substantiis constat homo, anima et carne; anima cum ratione, carne cum sensibus suis: quos tamen sensus non movet caro absque animae societate; anima vero rationale suum tenet sine carne." *DSA* 49 (815): "Duabus substantiis tantum constat homo, anima et carne: anima cum ratione sua, et carne cum sensibus suis. Quos tamen sensus absque animae societate non movet caro, anima vero et sine carne rationale suum tenet."

²⁴ G. RACITI, "L'autore del *De spiritu et anima*," *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica*, vol. 53 (1961), p. 385–401.

²⁵ *Three Treatises on Man*, p. 65–67.

labelling the author as “pseudo-Alcher” even though no authentic writing of Alcher is otherwise known.²⁶

In a wide-ranging study of Isaac of Stella, W. Buchmüller has argued that chapters 1–33 of *DSA* might have been written by Isaac himself.²⁷ Yet the differences between *DSA* and Isaac's *De anima* are just as striking as the connections. While Isaac certainly reuses material from his sermons in his *De anima*, in which he twice refers to Augustine by name, he does not incorporate unacknowledged quotation from the Fathers in the manner of *DSA*, which never names any patristic author.²⁸ The *DSA* declares that it is consciously collecting the wisdom of the ancients, while maintaining that it still has something new to say.²⁹ This difference in style reflects a broader theological gulf between the two authors. In his *De anima* Isaac never refers to sin after his opening remark that Alcher was asking for a treatise on the essence and powers of the soul, not for what Scripture might teach about the soul, before, during and after sin. By contrast, the *DSA* lays much more emphasis than Isaac on the weight of sin, the emergence of phantasm from the senses, and the wretchedness of the human condition. These themes recur not just in the first 33 chapters, but in its subsequent sections as well.³⁰ Isaac never makes the frequent claim of *DSA* that both the soul and the *animus* or spirit are a rational and a spiritual substance, distinct from the substance of the flesh — a theme taken from Augustine and repeated by William of Saint-Thierry.³¹ Hugh of Saint-Victor also refers to them as separate substances

²⁶D. BOQUET, *L'ordre de l'affect au Moyen Âge : autour de l'anthropologie affective d'Aelred de Rievaulx*, Caen: Centre de Recherches Archéologiques et Médiévales, 2005, p. 120, 144, 155–156, 170.

²⁷W. BUCHMÜLLER, *Isaac von Étoile*, p. 98–124.

²⁸Tarlazzi discusses this in the introduction to her edition, p. 244–254.

²⁹*DSA* 43 (811): “Plura veteres de natura animae dixisse inveniuntur, sed nihil ita ut non aliquid restare videatur. Ego autem ex eorum dictis, quanto diligentius potui, breve istud et certum colligere, atque in unum studui redigere, quod memoriae commendetur.”

³⁰*Miseria*, not mentioned by Isaac in the *De anima*, is mentioned in *DSA* 6, 29, 30, 35, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 55, 46 (784, 800, 806, 813, 816, 817, 821, 822). Isaac never mentions *peccatum* in the *De anima* after declaring he will not discuss this (n. 2 above). By contrast *peccatum* is mentioned thirty-two times in *DSA*: 5 (782–783), 6–8 (784), 14 (789), 17 (792), 20 (794), 23 (796), 36 (806), 40 (809), 41–43 (810–811), 45 (813), 48 (814–815), 52 (818), 54 (820), 56 (821), 57 (822), 59 (823), 31–32 (826). See also *DSA* 41 (810): “Habent enim originale peccatum, non per animam, sed per carnem utique contractum, animaeque refusum.” ISAAC, *Sermo* 31.15, edited by G. Raciti, SC 207, Paris: Cerf, 1974, p. 198–200 uses a phrase very similar to that appearing at the outset of *De anima*: “Cum enim tres sint humanae mutabilitatis status: ante peccatum, per peccatum, post peccatum, de unoquoque verus doctor et medicus aliquid in se exhibere voluit, ut quid fuimus, quid sumus, doctor admoneret; quid erimus, medicus exhiberet.”

³¹AUGUSTINUS, *De Trinitate*, XIII, 17, CCSL 50A, 412: “Quorum est unum quod demonstratum est homini quem locum haberet in rebus quas deus condidit quandoquidem sic deo coniungi potuit humana natura ut ex duabus substantiis fieret una persona ac per hoc iam ex tribus, deo,

in a short treatise, *De unione corporis et spiritus*.³² Isaac mentions *substantia* only twice in his *De anima*, and then in relation to the *primum incorporeum* rather than to the soul itself.³³ When Isaac discusses substance in his sermons, it is in relation to man rather than to the soul, and with a philosophical sophistication in discussing first and second substances simply not evident in *DSA*.³⁴

The contrast in perspective is also evident in the way *DSA* transforms the passage of the *De anima* in which Isaac invokes the poetic image (taken from Macrobius) of a golden chain by which the elements were connected like “the ladder of the prophet,” governing all things from the archetype to the states of all things, so that they could be what they are.³⁵ *DSA* draws on Isaac’s words about the elements, but omits reference to the image of the golden chain (which Isaac also mentions in a sermon), or to its connecting the archetype to the states of things.³⁶ *DSA* then revises Isaac’s argument to explain that reason makes prudence or knowledge, but then divine prudence turns reason into intelligence or wisdom.³⁷ It compares the distinction between prudence and wisdom to that

anima et carne [...]” Cf. GUILLELMUS DE SANCTO THEODERICO, *De natura corporis et animae*, 1, 27 and 2, 51, CCCM 88, 112, 121.

³²HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE, *De unione corporis et spiritus*, PL 177, 285–289, followed by a separate reflection on Christ (289–294).

³³*DSA* 8 (784): “Anima est substantia rationalis, intellectualis, a Deo facta spiritualis, non ex Dei natura, sed potius creatura ex nihilo facta, in bonum malum que convertibilis.” *DSA* 18 (793): “Hoc enim proprie est anima, substantia scilicet rationalis, id est, spiritus rationalis.” *DSA* 34 (804): “Non enim in hoc gemino vocabulo gemina substantia intelligitur: sed cum ad distinctionem ponitur gemina vis ejusdem essentiae, una superior per spiritum, alia inferior per animam designatur.” Isaac refers to *substantia* in only one passage of his *De anima* (1884BC), in relation to capacities rather than the soul itself: “Non enim inveniuntur secundae substantiae subsistere, nisi in primis [...] Secundae enim substantiae sunt in primis, sed primae a secundis.”

³⁴ISAAC, *Sermo* 19, 16–17, SC 207, 34: “Nullus enim est homo, si omnino non sit homo; sed nec usquam est homo, si nullus est homo. Similiter autem his et de ipsa substantia. Nam si ipsa substantia non est, nec ista nec illa substantia erit; sed tamen cum ipsa sit, nisi in ista vel illa esse nequaquam poterit. Substantia igitur omnibus per se existentibus, id est substantiis, ratione et causa, natura et quasi materia praeiacet, ut non solum sint, quod est essentiae, sed ut sint quod sunt, id est substantiae. Ipsa tamen talis, id est communis omnibus et generalis, nusquam subsistit.”

³⁵ISAAC, *De anima*, p. 272 (1885CD): “Ipsi quoque supremum corpus, id est ignis, quadam similitudine jungitur, et igni aer, aeri aqua, aquae terra. Hac igitur quasi aurea catena poete vel ima dependent a summis, vel erecta scala prophetae ascenditur ad summa de imis. Sicut igitur ordinem rerum attingit a fine usque ad finem, id est a summo ad imum, sapientia fortiter, ab archetypo quoque trahens in proprios status, ut sint quod sunt.” Cf. MACROBIUS, *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis*, 1, 4, 15, edited by J. Willis, Leipzig: Teubner, 1970, p. 58.

³⁶ISAAC, *Sermo* 54, 15, SC 339, 260.

³⁷*DSA* 11 (787), with phrases from the *De anima* in italics: “Intellectus namque quaedam *imago et similitudo* intelligentiae est, ratio intellectus, rationis *phantasticum spiritus*, cui etiam *supremum* corporis, *id est, ignis quadam similitudine jungitur, et igni aer, et aeri aqua, et aquae terra*. Sensus informat imaginationem, imaginatio rationem, facitque ratio scientiam sive prudentiam.

between woman and man, quoting in support (Ecclesiasticus 42: 14) "For better is the iniquity of a man, than a woman doing a good turn." This verse was never quoted by Augustine, Jerome or Isaac of Stella, but was used by Bernard of Clairvaux.³⁸ While *DSA* draws directly on Isaac's *De anima*, it offers not a paraphrase, but a response, much more shaped by Augustinian reflection on both the *anima* and the *animus* as a spiritual substance, capable of reason, but weighed down by the substance of the flesh. This two-substance anthropology, formulated by Augustine and announced in chapter 3 and repeated in chapter 49, would become hugely problematic in the 13th century for those who followed the hylomorphic definition proposed by Aristotle.

ISAAC OF STELLA AND CISTERCIAN TRADITION

Isaac, abbot of Stella, near Poitiers, from 1147 to around 1169, is a Cistercian author with a distinct literary and intellectual identity.³⁹ Unlike Bernard of Clairvaux, he voices respect for certain unnamed teachers in the schools, "who although not able to interpret the sacred Scriptures properly and while not distorting them as the heretics do, adapted them tastefully to their own purposes, and [...] played delightful games with authoritative texts".⁴⁰ Isaac may have acquired his familiarity with Platonist traditions from teachers like William of Conches and Hugh of Saint-Victor or even Gilbert, bishop of Poitiers (1142–1154).

Rursum rationi occurrens divina prudentia, informat eam, et facit intelligentiam sive sapientiam. Est itaque in ratione quiddam ad superna et coelestia intendens, et id dicitur sapientia; et est quiddam ad transitoria et caduca respiciens, et id vocatur prudentia. Haec duo ex ratione sunt, et in ratione consistunt. Et dividit se ratio in duo, scilicet in seorsum et deorsum: sursum, in sapientiam; deorsum, in prudentiam; quasi in virum et mulierem, ut vir sit superior et regat, mulier inferior et regatur. Unde dictum est: *Melior est iniquitas viri, quam benefaciens mulier* [Ecclus 42:14].

³⁸BERNARDUS CLARAEVELLENSIS, *Sermones super Cantica*, *Sermo* 12, 9 and *Sermones in assumptione beatae Mariae virginis*, *Sermo* 3, 3, in: *Sancti Bernardi Opera* [SBO], edited by J. Leclercq et al., Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957–1977, vol. 1, p. 66 and vol. 5, p. 240.

³⁹On Isaac's career, in particular doubts that the time he spent in a new foundation on the Ile-de-Re was a punishment, see E. DIETZ, "When Exile Is Home: The Biography of Isaac of Stella," *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, vol. 41 (2017), p. 141–165. While Buchmüller argues that Isaac's career continued after 1169 (when a new abbot was appointed to Stella), Dietz raises doubts about this in a review of his monograph in *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, vol. 52 (2017), p. 374–376.

⁴⁰ISAAC DE STELLA, *Sermo* 48, 5, SC 339, 156: "Emerserunt olim quidam, quorum nomina taceo, spectabilis ingenii homines et exercitationis mirae, qui Scripturas sanctas non quidem ut haeretici pervertentes, sed earum legitimum sensum ad manum minus habentes, ad sua studia elegantissime accommodarunt, et de authenticis litteris, non sine multorum admiratione et plurima morum aedificatione, suavissime, ut omnium pace loquamur, nugati sunt." Translated by McCaffery in *The Selected Works of Isaac of Stella*, p. 132.

In writing about the soul, he was extending a tradition of Cistercian inquiry developed by William of Saint-Thierry (c. 1085–1148) in his *De natura corporis et animae* to explain how medical understanding of the human person as a body might interact with Christian understanding of the soul.⁴¹ William's decision to divide his treatise into separate books about the body and the soul reinforced perception of the potential dualism in his perspective. Both Isaac's *De anima* and the *DSA* sought to overcome this by building on the theme, ultimately deriving from Plato's *Republic* and transmitted by both Jerome and Cassian, that there were three capacities in the soul, namely of reason (*rationabilis*), appetite (*concupiscibilis*) and anger (*irascibilis*).⁴² Whereas Augustine had considered human emotion as distorted by the corruption of the human will, Jerome and Cassian maintained the Platonic idea that these capacities were morally neutral in themselves, but needed to be directed to the good. The theme had been mentioned briefly in the early 12th century by Honorius Augustudonensis (c. 1080–c. 1140) and by William of Conches (c. 1090–c. 1154) in his glosses on the *Timaeus*.⁴³ Bernard of Clairvaux and William of Saint-Thierry also mentioned the idea, but emphasized its limited character, as against the positive character of the theological virtues of faith, hope and love.⁴⁴

The *DSA* followed closely this triad of capacities mentioned by Isaac, along with his recasting of what Boethius had said in the *Consolation of Philosophy* about four stages of perception, namely sense, imagination, reason and intelligence. The *DSA* generally follows Isaac (possibly under the influence of Hugh of Saint Victor), in adding the category of intellect, able to perceive the firmament and the angels, before intelligence, capable of contemplating God.⁴⁵ Through each of these five stages, the soul was capable of understanding all things, while the appetitive capacity (*concupiscibilitas*) could rise to love.⁴⁶ In one passage, *DSA* adds a sixth power, namely memory before intellect and

⁴¹ GUILLELMUS DE SANCTO THEODERICO, *De natura corporis et anime*, CCCM 88, 105–146.

⁴² HIERONIMUS, *Commentarii in euangelium Matthaei* 2, CCSL 77, p. 109; JOHANNES CASSIANUS, *Collationes* 24, 15 and 17, CSEL 13, 691 and 694.

⁴³ HONORIUS AUGUSTODUNENSIS, *Elucidarium*, 3, 2, PL 172, 1158B; IDEM, *Speculum Ecclesiae*, PL 172, 822B; GUILLELMUS DE CONCHIS, *Glosae super Timaeum*, 1, 75, CCCM 203, 132.

⁴⁴ BERNARDUS CLARAEVALLENSIS, *Parabola*, 5, 1, in: *SBO* 6.2, p. 276; and IDEM, *Sententiae*, 3, 9, in: *SBO* 6.2, p. 69; IDEM, *Sermones de diversis*, *Sermo* 74, in: *SBO* 6.1, p. 312; IDEM, *Sermones in festiuitate omnium sanctorum*, 4, 5, in: *SBO* 5, p. 358; GUILLELMUS DE SANCTO THEODERICO, *De natura corporis et animae*, 89, CCCM 88, 134.

⁴⁵ ISAAC, *De anima*, p. 263 and 273 (1879D and 1886B), taken over in *DSA*; cf. BOETHIUS, *Philosophiae consolatio* 5, 4, 27 and 3, 5, 3, CCSL 94, 98, 100; and HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Miscellanea*, I, 15 and III, 24, PL 177, 485B and 647B.

⁴⁶ ISAAC, *De anima*, p. 275 (1887C): “Et per quinque quidem sepe nominata que de rationabilitate ipsius oriuntur ad cognitionem, per concupiscibilitatem uero ad dilectionem.”

intelligence, a concession to Augustine.⁴⁷ In his *De anima*, Isaac avoided all reference to original sin, seeing the triad of natural capacities as a way of explaining how reason and emotion might co-exist in the human soul as a foundation for an ethical life.

Isaac is interested in the interaction between the soul and the body, as parallel to that between God and creation: "For the whole of creation is as it were the body of the divinity, and the individual parts like individual limbs".⁴⁸ Arguing that the head is the seat of the soul, he observes that Alcher, whom he reports is particularly eminent in *physica*, is aware of the physical structure of the head and the neck.⁴⁹ He says that: "If, perhaps under divine prompting, you were not loathe to write us a careful letter about the structure of the human body, you would receive something written in return from us".⁵⁰ Isaac seems to saying that Alcher should really have first offered more of his own thoughts on the subject, as he had expertise in medicine, if he was to get a reply. Isaac nonetheless sketches out how the soul and body might interact. Without speaking about sin (or defining the soul and the flesh as separate substances in the manner of *DSA*) Isaac argues that the capacity of the soul to understand God is ultimately higher than the capacity of the sense and imagination to understand the physical world. His letter concludes by lamenting the evils of plague and famine, details that may refer to events that were particularly serious in Aquitaine in 1162.⁵¹

ALCHER OF CLAIRVAUX, *physica*, AND THE *De spiritu et anima*

Nothing is known of Alcher of Clairvaux other than that he also asked Peter of Celle (1115–1183), who befriended many monks of Clairvaux while he was a Benedictine abbot at Troyes between 1150 and 1162, to write about

⁴⁷ *DSA* 13 (789): "Vires sunt, sensus, imaginatio, ratio, memoria, intellectus, intelligentia." Isaac mentions memory alongside *ingenium* and *ratio*, *De anima*, p. 257–258 (1876CD).

⁴⁸ ISAAC, *De anima*, p. 269 (1883CD): "Universitas etenim creaturae quasi corpus est Divinitatis, singulae autem quasi singula membra. Sicut vero Deus in toto, et in singulis totus, sed in semetipso; sic anima in toto suo corpore, et in singulis membris in semetipsa tota."

⁴⁹ *IBIDEM*, p. 266 (1882AB): "Caput siquidem, quod ipse melius nosti, qui in physica emines, sex ossibus compaginatum, septem columnis colli sustentatur."

⁵⁰ *IBIDEM*, p. 266–267 (1882B): "De compositione igitur corporis humani si nobis diligenter epistolam scribere non fueris dedignatus, forsan auctore Deo quomodo illud instrumentum operationis et delectationis anima libenter suscipiat, sollicita custodiat, invita dimittat, dimissum desiderabunda expectet et in recepto gratulabunda exsultet, sicut est apud Iohannem 'citharodorum citharizantium in citharis suis', a nobis aliquod rescriptum recipies."

⁵¹ *IBIDEM*, p. 278 (1890A): "Venerunt enim super regiones nostras hoc anno mala pestilentie et famis qualia omnia retro saecula, ut putatur, non uiderunt." The famine of 1162 in Aquitaine is mentioned in *Boso's Life of Alexander III*, translated by G.M. Ellis, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973, p. 54.

conscience — a theme not mentioned in Isaac’s *De anima*, but important mainly in the last section of *DSA*.⁵² Peter describes Alcher as engrossed in study and as “collecting food daily from the fertile fields of the holy doctors,” and yet as putting an important question to him about conscience.⁵³ While Raciti argued that there was not sufficient evidence of concern with *physica* for *DSA* to have been written by Alcher, he did not consider how this treatise subtly transforms Augustinian texts with medical learning. In a passage that modifies a medically crude statement of Augustine about veins as what are called arteries by doctors, the *DSA* adds the word *pulsatiles* or pulsating to signify important veins. Speaking of the vital force, *DSA* reports:

It gives life and health to the whole body by drawing and restoring breath to the heart, to temper fervour of the heart. By pure air, it spreads purified blood throughout the body through the “pulsating veins” or arteries. Doctors know about the temper or distemper of the heart through observing the movement of this vital force.⁵⁴

DSA here corrects Augustine on a point of medical detail.⁵⁵ This technical term, not employed by Isaac or any patristic author, is not much used before the medical writer Guido of Arezzo (late 12th or early 13th century) in his *Liber mitis*, Helinand of Froidmont (c. 1160–1221), and Thomas Aquinas, reporting physiological comments attributed to Gregory of Nyssa (in fact by Nemesius, whose

⁵²PETRUS DE CELLA, *De conscientia*, edited by J. Leclercq, *La spiritualité de Pierre de Celle*, (Études de Théologie et d’Histoire de la Spiritualité, 7), Paris: Vrin, 1946, p. 193–230 (PL 202, 1083–96); p. 193 (1083D): “Charissimo suo fratri ALCHERO, monacho Claraeuallis, frater PETRUS, Cellensis, salutem et conscientiam bonam. Revocatus siquidem tua quaestione ab evagatione mundani circuitus, quaestionem mihi de quaestione facio.” Conscience comes up as a theme in *DSA* 6 (784), 50 (816), 55 (821), 57 (822), 62 (826).

⁵³PETRUS DE CELLA, *De conscientia*, p. 198 (1089): “Animadverto proinde his te, bone amice et sancte monache Alcheri, sollicitum studiis, circa animae tuae res familiares cum non solum de agris sanctorum doctorum fertilissimis cibum quotidie, imo cibaria colligere spiritualia non desistas, sed etiam ad tenuissimum nostrae paupertatis promptuarium manum porrigis, a paupere non pauperem postulans stipem, videlicet conscientiam.” Peter often wrote to monks of Clairvaux between 1145 and 1162, when he moved from Troyes to Rheims, *The Letters of Peter of Celle*, edited by J. Haseldine, Oxford: OUP, 2001, p. 182–235, nos. 45–51. Two other treatises on conscience survived, both from a Cistercian milieu: Ps-BERNARDUS, *Tractatus de interiori domo seu de conscientia aedificanda* (PL 184, 501–552) and the shorter *Tractatus de conscientia* (PL 184, 551–560).

⁵⁴*DSA* 21 (795): “Vis vitalis est in corde, quae ad temperandum fervorem cordis aerem hauriendo atque reddendo, vitam et salutem toti corpori tribuit. Aere namque puro sanguinem purificatum per totum corpus impellit per venas pulsatiles, quae arteriae vocantur. Ex quarum motu temperantiam vel distemperantiam cordis physici cognoscunt.”

⁵⁵AUGUSTINUS, *De Genesi ad litteram*, 7, 13, CSEL 28.1, 212: “per uenas, quas arterias uocant.”

translators mention *pulsativum* but not *pulsatiles*).⁵⁶ It does occur, however, in the *Liber divisionum* of Rhazes (al-Rhazi or Rasis), translated by Gerard of Cremona (quite possibly revising Constantine the African) and quoted by Vincent of Beauvais within his *Speculum doctrinale*.⁵⁷ While Norporth did not notice this term, he was aware of the exposure of *DSA* to medical traditions emanating from Salerno. Its learning had been circulating in a monastic milieu since the time of St Anselm, who sought out medical texts becoming available from the time of Constantine the African, including the *De pulsibus*, about diagnosing patients through listening to the pulse.⁵⁸

There is a similar expansion of Augustine when *DSA* identifies the different capacities of parts of the brain, each of which is identified by particular ventricles with its own role, namely sense in the rear, movement in the front, and reason in the middle.⁵⁹ Yet where Augustine emphasises that the soul is in the body, but is not of the body (an argument repeated by William of Saint-Thierry), *DSA* emphasizes that the soul cannot act without the body, and that the imagination is the product of a corporeal spirit.⁶⁰

These powers can be said to be as much of the soul as of the body; because they are operated in the body by the soul and cannot come to be without the action of both. In the first or anterior part of the brain, the animal power is called phantasmal or imaginary, because in this part are contained the likenesses and images of corporeal things, and hence it is spoken of as the imaginative faculty. In the medial part of the brain, the power is termed rational, since there it probes and makes judgments upon the things that are represented through the imagination. In the third or posterior part of the brain the animal power

⁵⁶ GUIDO ARETINUS, *Liber mitis*, 1, 15, 13, edited by P. Licciardello, with the collaboration of K. Goehl, *Guido d'Arezzo Liber Mitis. Un trattato di medicina fra XII e XIII secolo*, Pisa: Pacini Editore, 2009, p. 90. See also HELINANDUS FRIGIDI MONTIS, *Flores Helinandi*, PL 212, 723A: "vena que pulsatiles affectionum pulsant." See also THOMAS AQUINAS, *ST* I-II, q. 17, a. 9, ad 2, quoting Nemesius, known as Gregory of Nyssa: "Unde Gregorius Nyssenus dicit quod sicut generativum et nutritivum non obedit rationi, ita nec pulsativum, quod est vitale. Pulsativum autem appellat motum cordis, qui manifestatur per venas pulsatiles."

⁵⁷ VINCENTIUS BELVACENSIS, *Speculum doctrinale*, 13, 35, in: IDEM, *Speculum maius*, 4 vols, Duaci: Ex Officina Typographica B. Belleri, 1624, reprinted Graz: Akademische Druk, 1964, vol. 2, col. 256.

⁵⁸ G.E.M. GASPER, F. WALLIS, "Anselm and the Articella," *Traditio*, vol. 59 (2004), p. 129–174.

⁵⁹ *DSA* 22 (795): "Tres namque sunt ventriculi cerebri. Unus anterior, a quo omnis sensus; alter posterior, a quo omnis motus; tertius inter utrumque medius, id est, rationalis." Cf. AUGUSTINUS, *De Genesi ad litteram*, 7, 18, CSEL 28.1, p. 215.

⁶⁰ AUGUSTINUS, *De Genesi ad litteram*, 7, 18, CSEL 28.1, 215; GUILLELMUS DE SANCTO THEODERICO, *De natura corporis et animae*, 24–25, CCCM 88, 111–112.

is termed memorial, because there it entrusts to memory whatever reason has judged.⁶¹

The phrase *phantastica, id est imaginaria* has no parallel either in Isaac or in Augustine or any other ancient author, while Aelred of Rievaulx distinguishes between them as two types of vision.⁶² It may well be inspired, however, by comments of Hugh of Saint-Victor in a short reflection on the union of the body and the spirit, on which the *DSA* builds in its analysis of the soul and the spirit.⁶³

The interest of *DSA* in *physica* is evident in its definition of the term as operating through the experiences of things (*per experimenta rerum*). This phrase was first used in a significant way by Hugh of Saint-Victor, who departed from Augustine's definition of the discipline as inquiry into nature.⁶⁴ Isaac never defines *physica* in the *De anima*, but he distinguishes between two disciplines, one natural and based on sensory experience, the other *mathematica*, which uses reason to explore the status of things.⁶⁵ The *DSA* may not have the philosophical subtlety of Isaac, but it is not just a paraphrase of Augustine.

The *DSA* draws on Isaac's *De anima* for its discussion of the Platonic idea that the soul has three capacities, of reason, desire and anger, and of the Boethian notion of an ascent in awareness from sense and imagination to reason, intellect and intelligence. It never clearly resolves, however, how this theme connects to an Augustinian argument, not made by Isaac, that the soul and flesh are separate substances, and that the soul need not have a body, as with an angel. Whereas

⁶¹ *DSA* 22 (795): "Istae vires tam animae quam corporis dici possunt; quia ab anima in corpore fiunt, nec sine utroque fieri possunt. In prima parte cerebri vis animalis vocatur phantastica, id est imaginaria; quia in ea corporalium rerum similitudines et imagines continentur, unde et phantasticum dicitur. In media parte cerebri vocatur rationalis; quia ibi examinat et iudicat ea quae per imaginationem repraesentantur. In ultima parte vocatur memorialis; quia ibi commendat memoriae quae a ratione sunt iudicata." Translated by Leiva-Ward, p. 214.

⁶² AELREDUS RIEVALLENSIS, *Homilia de oneribus prophetis Isaiae*, 2, 2 and 14, CCCM 2D, 31 and 35 (dated by Raciti to 1163/1164).

⁶³ HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE, *De unione corporis et spiritus*, PL 177, 288A: "Quae quidem imaginatio in brutis animalibus phantasticam cellam non transcendit."

⁶⁴ *DSA* 37 (808): "Ratio vis est animae supra corporalia, et infra spiritalia collocata: secernit enim vera a falsis, quod est Logicae; virtutes a vitiis, quod est Ethicae; et per experimenta rerum investigat naturas, quod est Physicae. In his vero tribus tota Philosophia consistit." Cf. HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Epitome Dindimi in philosophiam*, edited by R. Baron, in: *Hugonis de Sancto Victore opera propaedeutica*, Notre Dame: University of Notre-Dame Press, 1966, p. 197; and IDEM, *De archa Noe*, 3, 11, CCCM 176, 77.

⁶⁵ ISAAC, *De anima*, p. 270 (1883C): "Sunt ergo rerum, circa quas percipiendas versantur et vident, sensus, imaginatio, ratio, status diversi, realis videlicet et rationalis: seu naturalis, ut quidam malunt, et doctrinalis. Unde duae illae disciplinae nominatae dignoscuntur, naturalis videlicet et mathematica."

Isaac provides an idealised picture of the soul, *DSA* seeks to relate his themes to the reality of the fallen world, and the path of reflecting on human wretchedness as a path to knowing God.⁶⁶ It follows Isaac's argument that the soul has the capacity of knowing and loving from nature, but that the soul has knowledge of truth and the ordering of love only from grace.⁶⁷ This was a distinction repeated by both William of Saint-Thierry and Hugh of Saint-Victor, both of whom emphasize the complementary rather than contrasting roles of grace and nature.⁶⁸ The *DSA* does not disagree with Isaac, but wants to combine reflection on the body and the soul which William of Saint-Thierry had avoided.

While Isaac emphasises that God is everywhere present in creation just as the soul is in the body, *DSA* goes further in explaining that the soul "is more intensely in the heart and in the brain, just as God is specially said to be in heaven."⁶⁹ The *DSA* author may be unable to make the same philosophical distinctions as Isaac about first and second substances, but he is more aware of the vital force that drives purified blood to the heart. This is evident in his comments about the body, adapted from Augustine, but also introducing non-Augustinian ideas, such as about the shape of the heart as like a flame and the brain as the firmament of the body.

The human body is made up of four elements. In the flesh and in the bones, because of their earthy solidness, earth predominates. Water is mostly found in the humors and air in the lungs. The lungs are always in motion as the bellows of the heart. It is the lung's function to keep the heart from being consumed and destroyed by an excess of heat. Fire makes its home in the heart, and this is why the heart resembles the shape of fire by being wider at the bottom and narrower at the top. There is a certain fiery power which, after being tempered by air, rises from the heart to the brain — our brain being the heaven of our body. In the brain, the fiery power is cleansed and purified, and then it goes outside the body through the eyes, ears, nostrils, and other sensory apparatus. The power

⁶⁶ *DSA* 8 (784): "Anima est substantia rationalis, intellectualis, a Deo facta spiritualis, non ex Dei natura, sed potius creatura ex nihilo facta, in bonum malumque convertibilis. Et ideo aliquatenus est mortalis in quantum in deterius mutari, et a voluntate Dei cujus participatione bona fit, alienari potest [...]"

⁶⁷ *DSA* 7 (784): "Verumtamen facultates et quasi instrumenta cognoscendi et diligendi habet ex natura; cognitionem tamen veritatis et ordinem dilectionis nequaquam habet nisi ex gratia." Taken from ISAAC, *De anima*, edited by C. Tarlazzi, p. 275 (1887D).

⁶⁸ GUILLELMUS DE SANCTO THEODERICO, *Epistula ad fratres de monte Dei*, 227 and 263, edited by P. Verdeyen, CCCM 88, 275 and 282; HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE, *De sacramentis*, 1, 6, 17 and 32, PL 176, 274 and 283.

⁶⁹ *DSA* 18 (794): "Sicut enim Deus ubique est totus in toto mundo, et in omni creatura sua: sic anima ubique tota in toto corpore suo, tanquam in quodam mundo suo, intensius tamen in corde et in cerebro, quemadmodum Deus praecipue dicitur esse in coelo."

is formed into a shape when it contacts things exterior to the body, and makes the body's five senses, that is sight, hearing, taste, smell and touch.⁷⁰

The author of *DSA* is seeking to combine Isaac's reflection on the nature of the soul with reflection on the unity of the physiological and the spiritual. He comments on the *spiritus*, which he sees as the eye of the soul, a *scintilla* or spark through which it can understand the divine — an interest in conscience that parallels that of Alcher of Clairvaux, according to Peter of Celle.⁷¹ The *DSA* explains that the soul needs to benefit from sight, reason and intellect, and needs health, appearance and vision to confer full understanding and happiness.⁷²

The *DSA* understands the relationship between soul and body very differently from Aristotle's *De anima*, which although translated in the mid 12th century by James of Venice, never circulated widely before the 13th century.⁷³ There is no evidence that either Isaac or Alcher was aware of the *De differentia spiritus et animae*, translated by John of Seville from Qustâ ibn Lûqâ, a Syrian bishop (c. 820–912), known in 13th century Paris as Constabulinus.⁷⁴ Yet Isaac and Alcher shared in a wider interest in the relationship between body and soul both within and outside a monastic milieu. As a monk of Clairvaux, Alcher was more conscious of Augustinian tradition than Isaac. To an outsider, the *De spiritu et anima* made more use of traditional Augustinian concepts than Isaac's

⁷⁰ *DSA* 33 (802): "Humanum siquidem corpus ex quatuor elementis compositum est; sed in carne et ossibus terra maxime apparet propter terrenam soliditatem. Aqua in humoribus, aer continetur in pulmone; idcirco semper est in motu, quia ventilabrum cordis est, ne nimio calore cor consumatur et dissolvatur. Sedes ignis est in corde; et ideo inferius est latum, et superius acutum; quoniam formam ignis retinet. Quaedam vis ignea aere temperata a corde ad cerebrum ascendit, tanquam in coelum corporis nostri: ibique purificata et colata per oculos, aures, nares, caeteraque instrumenta sensuum, foras progreditur, et ex contactu exteriorum formata quinque sensus corporis facit; visum videlicet, auditum, gustum, odoratum et tactum." Translated by Leiva-Ward, p. 230, with minor modifications. Cf. AUGUSTINUS, *De Genesi ad litteram*, 7, 13, CSEL 28.1, 212.

⁷¹ *DSA* 10 (785): "Dicitur spiritus mens rationalis, ubi est quaedam scintilla tanquam oculus animae, ad quem pertinet imago et cognitio Dei", adding the words "quaedam scintilla" to AUGUSTINUS, *De Genesi ad litteram* 12. 7, CSEL 28.1, 389.

⁷² *DSA* 10 (785): "Tria haec omni animae necessaria sunt: ut sanos oculos habeat, ut aspiciat, ut videat. [...] Sanitas facit illam securam, aspectus rectam, visio beatam."

⁷³ A critical edition of the translation of James of Venice by J. Decorte and J. Brams is available through the Aristoteles Latinus database (as Aristoteles Latinus XII.1), initially edited by J. Brams and P. Tombeur, Turnhout: Brepols, 2003, but has not yet been published.

⁷⁴ C. BURNETT, "Magister Iohannes Hispalensis et Limiensis and Qustâ ibn Lûqâ's *De differentia spiritus et anime*. A Portuguese contribution to the Arts curriculum?," IDEM, *Arabic into Latin in the Middle Ages. The Translators and their Intellectual and Social Context*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009, p. 221–267; D.N. HASSE, "Plato Arabico-Latinus," *The Platonic Tradition in the Middle Ages. A Doxographic Approach*, edited by S. Gersh, M.J.F.M. Hoenen, New York: De Gruyter, 2002, p. 35.

De anima. It was not completely absurd that it should circulate as a work of Augustine. Yet to any critically minded reader, it was evident that the *DSA* was marked by severe intellectual weaknesses when compared to Isaac's *De anima*, notably a propensity to gloss over the very real differences in perspective between Augustine and Boethius.

THE EARLY RECEPTION OF THE *De spiritu et anima*

A paradoxical aspect of the diffusion of the *DSA* (which deserves much greater study than given here) is that while Isaac's *De anima* enjoyed modest circulation during the later 12th century there is nothing like this for the *DSA*. Alan of Lille (c. 1128–1202/3) refers to a text *Perisichen* (a corruption of *Peri Psychen*) which also speaks about five digressions of the soul: sense, imagination, reason, intellect and intelligence, but it is not clear this is the *DSA*, which sometimes has the colophon *De spiritu et anima secundum Augustinum*.⁷⁵ Philip the Chancellor (1160–1236) suggests it could be by Isaac, writing *secundum Augustinum*, unless he is referring to Isaac's treatise.⁷⁶ William of Auxerre († 1231) never makes any explicit allusion to the *DSA* in his *Summa Aurea*, written in the 1220s.⁷⁷ The first master to exploit the treatise at length as a work of Augustine was Alexander of Hales (c. 1185–1245), who refers to the *De anima et spiritu* (as he calls the *DSA*) four times as often as Aristotle's *De anima* within his *Glossae* on the *Sentences*, also composed in the 1220s.⁷⁸ Alexander invokes the *DSA* for its passing claim (not made by Isaac) that memory was also power of the soul, after reason, but before intellect and intelligence.⁷⁹ He may have promoted the treatise

⁷⁵ ALANUS DE INSULIS, *Liber in distinctionibus dictionum theologialium*, PL 210, 330C: "unde in libro qui inscribitur *Perisichen*, id est *De anima*: Quinque sunt digressiones animae: sensus, imaginatio, ratio, intellectus et intelligentia." See C. TARLAZZI, "Alan of Lille and the *Perisichen Augustini*," *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale*, vol. 51 (2009), p. 45–54; and on the colophon see, W. BUCHMÜLLER, *Isaak von Étoile*, p. 101–102 and 680–682.

⁷⁶ PHILIPPUS CANCELLARIUS, *Summa de bono*, edited by N. Wicki, vol. 1, Bern: Franke, 1969, p. 748: "Item, Ysaac in libro *De anima et spiritu secundum Augustinum*."

⁷⁷ GUILLELMUS ALTISSIODORIENSIS, *Summa Aurea*, edited by J. Ribaillier, 5 vols in 7, Paris – Grottaferrata: Editions du CNRS – Editiones Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1980–1987. Although Ribaillier suggests possible allusions to *DSA* within his critical edition, none turn out to be completely convincing.

⁷⁸ ALEXANDER DE HALENSIS, *Glossa in libros Sententiarum I–IV*, edited by PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 4 vols, Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1951–1957. The indexes to each volume reveal that in Book 1 the *DSA* is cited against Aristotle's *De anima* in a ratio of 26:7, in Book 2 at 30:6, in Book 3 at 24:6 and in Book 4 at 4:4. In his *Quaestiones disputatae antquam esset frater*, edited by PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 3 vols, Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1960, this ratio becomes 68:23.

⁷⁹ ALEXANDER HALENSIS, *Glossae in IV Sententiarum*, II, d. 39, p. 378, quoting *DSA* 13 (789) (see n. 32 above).

as a conscious alternative to the writings of Aristotle and Avicenna about the soul, which had started to gain attention within the Arts Faculty since early 1200s.⁸⁰ Alexander countered their arguments by introducing many monastic authors within his teaching of theology, including St Anselm and Bernard of Clairvaux, as well as Hugh and Richard of Saint-Victor. Alexander had wide influence in Paris during the later 1220s, even before he joined the Franciscan Order, sometime after 1241. He may have influenced its inclusion in the widely diffused encyclopedia of Bartholomaeus Anglicus, from the 1230s.⁸¹ The work would continue to be cited as by Augustine in the *Summa Halensis*, continued after the death of John of La Rochelle in 1245 by both Eudes Rigaud and William of Melito.⁸²

The *DSA* would also have a major influence on Bonaventure (1221–1274), who often refers to the work in his *Sentences* commentary (1251–1252). He was particularly interested in the Platonic theme (never mentioned by Augustine, but emphasized in the *DSA*) that the soul had three core capacities, of reason, appetite and anger.⁸³ Although he does not often cite his authority for this triad of human capacities, mentioned some eighty-five times in his *Sentences* commentary, there can be little doubt that he drew it from the *DSA*.⁸⁴ It gave Augustinian authority to a Platonic notion that he also observed in Gregory Nazianzus and John of Damascus, that these were qualities in the soul before they existed in the body, a perspective quite at odds with Aristotle's teaching about knowledge being acquired through the senses.⁸⁵ By claiming the *DSA* as

⁸⁰JOHANNES BLUND, *Treatise on the Soul*, edited by D.A. Callus, R.W. Hunt, introduced and translated by M.W. DUNNE, Oxford: OUP, 2013; see also D. HASSE, *Avicenna's De anima in the Latin West*, (Warburg Institute Studies and Texts), London: Warburg Institute, 2000; and M. BIENIAK, *The Soul-Body Problem at Paris ca. 1200–1250: Hugh of St-Cher and his Contemporaries*, Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2010.

⁸¹BARTHOLOMAEUS ANGLICUS, *On the Properties of the Soul and Body. De proprietatibus rerum III and IV*, edited by R.J. Long, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1977; and M.C. SEYMOUR et al., *Bartholomaeus Anglicus and his Encyclopedia*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 1992, p. 49–50.

⁸²There are hundred explicit allusions to *DSA* (mostly as *De anima et spiritu*, Alexander's preferred title) in the *Summa fratris Alexandri* (or *Summa Halensis*), edited by C. Koser et al., 4 vols, Quaracci: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1924–1948; JOHANNES DE RUPELLA, *Tractatus de divisione multiplici potentiarum animae*, edited by P. Michaud-Quantin, Paris: Vrin, 1964, p. 211; and IDEM, *Summa de anima*, edited by J.G. Bougerol, Paris: Vrin, 1995, p. 294.

⁸³BOVAVENTURA, *Comm. in IV Sententiarum*, II, d. 39, q. 1, p. 909, referring back to the *Glossa* on Ezekiel for the account of the spark of conscience (*synderesis*) in HIERONYMUS, *Comm. in Ezechielem*, 1, 1, CCSL 75, 11.

⁸⁴*DSA* 4 and 13 (782 and 789), drawing on ISAAC, *De anima*, p. 278, 280 (1877B, 1878D) etc.

⁸⁵The Brepolis Library of Latin Texts (Series B) reveals twenty-six references to *DSA* (often cited as *De anima et spiritu*), almost half identified as by Augustine, in BOVAVENTURA, *Commentaria in IV libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi*, in *Bonaaventurae Opera omnia*, I–IV, edited

a work of Augustine, Bonaventure creates the image of a greater dependence on Augustine's thought than was in fact the case. In his *Breviloquium*, composed around 1254, Bonaventure discussed the five stages of cognition, namely sense, imagination, reason, intellect and intelligence, as leading the soul to wisdom, both in this world and the next.⁸⁶ In his *Itinerarium mentis ad Deum*, from the period 1257–1259, Bonaventure added a final stage of cognition, namely “the apex of the mind or the spark of *synderesis*,” a phrase perhaps prompted by a remark in *DSA* (not in Isaac's *De anima*) about the spirit as the mind and the eye of the soul.⁸⁷ It is noticeable, however, that Bonaventure does not specifically mention the *DSA* in either of these two works, or any later writings (such as the *Collationes in Hexameron*), perhaps because of increasing doubts about its authorship.

DOMINICAN CRITICISMS OF THE *De spiritu et anima*

Thomas of Cantimpré (1201–1272) quoted almost the complete text of the 33 chapter version of the *DSA* in the second book of his *Liber de natura rerum*, completed between 1229 and 1240, praising it in his prologue (as the first text he mentions) as a most useful work of Augustine.⁸⁸ The first authoritative figure to question the attribution of the *De spiritu et anima* to Augustine seems to be Vincent of Beauvais (1190–1264), who raised certain doubts in his *Speculum historiale*, dedicated to Louis IX in around 1244. Vincent introduced it as “most useful, composed elegantly, fluently and most fully, extracted from various writings of Augustine in the manner of Hugh of Saint-Victor.”⁸⁹ By 1246,

by PP. Collegii a S. Bonaventura, Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1882–1889. See for example his remarks in II, d. 18, a. 2, q. 2 conclusio, in *Opera omnia*, 2, 450: “Et sic intelligenda sunt verba Gregorii Nazianzeni et verba Damasceni et verba etiam Augustini in libro De anima et spiritu, qui dicit, quod concupiscibilitas et irascibilitas prius insunt animae, quam ipsa uniatur corpori.”

⁸⁶BONAVENTURA, *Breviloquium*, 5, 6, in: *Opera omnia*, 5, 260: “Quae quidem contemplatio in Prophetis fuit per revelationem quantum ad triplicem visionem, scilicet corporalem, imaginativam et intellectualem; in aliis vero iustis reperitur per speculationem, quae incipit a sensu et pervenit ad imaginationem et de imaginatione ad rationem, de ratione ad intellectum, de intellectu ad intelligentiam, de intelligentia vero ad vero ad sapientiam sive notitiam excessivam, quae hic in via incipit, sed consummatur in gloria sempiterna.”

⁸⁷BONAVENTURA, *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*, 1, 6, in: *Opera omnia*, 5, 297: “Iuxta igitur sex gradus ascensionis in Deum sex sunt gradus potentiarum animae, per quos ascendimus ab imis ad summa, ab exterioribus ad intima, a temporalibus conscendimus ad aeterna, scilicet sensus, imaginatio, ratio, intellectus, intelligentia et apex mentis seu synderesis scintilla.”

⁸⁸TOMAS CANTIMPRATENSIS, *Liber de natura rerum*, edited by H. Boese, Berlin: De Gruyter, 1973, p. 83–95 and Prologus, p. 3: “Postea vero tractatus brevis et utilis de anima, cuius virtutem doctor incomparabilis Augustinus in libro De anima et spiritu plenius lucidiusque distinxit.”

⁸⁹VINCENTIUS BELVACENSIS, *Speculum historiale*, 18, 55, in: *Speculum maius*, vol. 4.

when he had completed the *Speculum naturale*, Vincent had no doubt about its being a composition of Hugh.⁹⁰ While polite, Vincent was effectively weakening the authority of a text which Franciscans took to be by Augustine. Vincent's *Speculum maius* offered an overview of all the new learning of the day, including those Aristotelian texts prohibited by the bishop of Paris at least until 1231.

Albert the Great was much harsher in his evaluation of the work, when he suggested that it was written by a Cistercian called William.⁹¹ Having initially mentioned the *DSA* a number of times in his *Sentences* commentary as by Augustine, Albert occasionally raises his doubts, as when he mocks the notion that an angel, because it had a rational soul, could be angry "and this is held by no author at all except by the book which is falsely attributed to Augustine, which is said to be *About the Spirit and the Soul*."⁹² For reasons that are not fully clear, Albert sometimes referred to the *DSA* in his *Summa theologia* as by Augustine, sometimes saying "said to be of Augustine" or leaving it unattributed.⁹³

Thomas Aquinas was initially more diplomatic in his *Sentences* commentary, from the early 1250s, referring to the *DSA* only four times, and attributing it to Augustine in just one passage.⁹⁴ The first time Thomas raised his doubts was in his *Quaestiones disputatae de veritate*, delivered in Paris 1256–1259, in a passage in which he refused to accept that reason could be a different power from intellect within us. He suggested one could preserve its argument only by considering that it was talking about stages in knowledge.⁹⁵ His commitment to Aristotle's understanding about the priority of sense to all perception, led him

⁹⁰VINCENTIUS BELVACENSIS, *Speculum naturale*, II, 23, 6 (col. 1656), 23, 7 (col. 1657), 23, 11 (col. 1659), 23, 14 (col. 1661), 23, 24 (col. 1669), 23, 25 (col. 1670), 23, 42 (col. 1681), 23, 50 (col. 1687), 23, 53 (col. 1689); 24, 3 (col. 1711), 25, 1–4 (col. 1775–1777), 25, 8 (col. 1780). See also *Speculum doctrinale*, I, 23 (col. 286) and XV, 179 (col. 393).

⁹¹See above, n. 4. and the studies by G. THÉRY, "L'authenticité du *De spiritu et anima* dans S. Thomas et Albert le Grand," *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*, vol. 10 (1921), p. 373–377; and A. HIEDL, "Die pseudo-augustinische Schrift *De spiritu et anima* in den Frühwerken Alberts des Grossen," *Studia Anselmiana*, vol. 63 (1974), p. 97–121.

⁹²*Super Sententiarum*, I, d. 10, a. 2, edited by A. Borgnet, vol. 25, p. 312ab. *DSA* 18 (793) refers to angels as rational and corporeal (even though without flesh) and thus implicitly capable of desire and anger.

⁹³The *Summa theologiae*, edited by A. Borgnet (1894–1895) has twenty-nine references to *DSA*, ten attributed to Augustine, according to the website version <http://www.albertusmagnus.uwaterloo.ca>.

⁹⁴THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Super IV Sent.*, d. 44, q. 3, q. 1, ad 1; see J.-P. TORRELL, *Saint Thomas*, vol. 1: *The Person and his Work*, Washington DC: Catholic University of America, 2005, p. 330–361.

⁹⁵THOMAS DE AQUINO, *De veritate*, q. 15, a. 1, ad 1, edited by Leonina, p. 481: "Ad primum igitur dicendum, quod liber de spiritu et anima non est authenticus, nec creditur esse Augustini." He had attributed it to Augustine in q. 13, a. 1, ad 7, edited by Leonina, p. 416, 218. On their date, see J.-P. TORRELL, *Saint Thomas*, p. 334.

to question a hierarchical notion of five different levels of perception, without publicly identifying the source of this claim.⁹⁶ He questioned not just the authorship of the *DSA*, but its authority as an analysis of the powers of the soul.

In his *Summa contra gentiles*, Thomas made no reference at all to the *De spiritu et anima*, relying instead on the authority of Aristotle and Dionysius.⁹⁷ Thomas reserved its fourth book to arguments based on Scripture, above all about sin and redemption. His understanding of the soul in the *Contra gentiles* was close to what he had absorbed from Albert, namely that the soul, the form of the body, was an intellectual substance, a Dionysian concept also used by Bonaventure.⁹⁸ His caution about *DSA* continued during the later 1260s, when he encountered William of Moerbeke's new translation of Aristotle's *De anima*, on which he lectured in Rome 1265–1267.⁹⁹ In the *Summa theologiae* Thomas reserves the notion of an intellectual substance to an angel rather than a soul, preferring to describe the soul as “the first principle of life.”¹⁰⁰ While he mentions the *DSA* on just five occasions, he never attributes it to Augustine, as compared to citing Aristotle's *De anima* over three hundred times. In his *Quaestiones disputatae de anima*, written in Rome in 1265/1267, he repeated that it was by a Cistercian author, and that its argument was “not worth attending to.”¹⁰¹ In his *Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis*, from 1268/1269, he is even more blunt: “To the second point, it must be said that the book *On spirit and soul* is apocryphal since the author is unknown and there are many things said there falsely or improperly, because he who composed the book did not understand the sayings of the saints from which he attempted to draw.”¹⁰² Thomas moves towards the primacy of the physical, without compromising its spiritual end: “The body is necessary for the activity of the intellect, not as the organ through which it acts, but in order to supply it with its object; for images (*phantasma*)

⁹⁶ THOMAS DE AQUINO, *De veritate*, q. 8, a. 3, arg. 1, 3; q. 15, a. 4, arg. 16 and a. 16 sed contra, edited by Marietti, p. 224, 229, 268; see also *In librum Boethii De Trinitate*, q. 6, a. 2, s.c. 3, 215.

⁹⁷ THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Contra Gentiles*, 1, 2, pericopa 4.

⁹⁸ THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Contra Gentiles*, 2, 68, pericopa 5.

⁹⁹ THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Sentencia libri de anima*, reproduced in *Thomae de Aquino Opera omnia*, vol. 44, p. 3–258.

¹⁰⁰ THOMAS DE AQUINO, *ST*, I, q. 75 art. 1; cf. A. C. PEGIS, “The Separated Soul and its Nature in St. Thomas,” in *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974. Commemorative Studies*, vol. 1, Toronto: Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies, 1974, p. 131–158.

¹⁰¹ THOMAS DE AQUINO, *QQ. disputatae de anima* 12.1, 110, with further doubts in 9.1, 83, but attributed to Augustine in 19.3, 162; see nn. 94–95 above.

¹⁰² THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Q. disputata de spiritualibus creaturis*, a. 3, 6, 378, but see also 11, 2, 413: “Ad secundum dicendum quod liber de spiritu et anima est apocryphus, cum enim auctor ignoretur, et sunt ibi multa vel falsa vel improprie dicta: quia ille qui librum composuit, non intellexit dicta sanctorum, a quibus accipere conatus fuit.”

stand in relation to the intellect as colour in relation to sight.”¹⁰³ Thomas still values the insight of Dionysius into the soul, but prefers the phrase “intellective principle” to “intellectual substance.”¹⁰⁴ While incorruptible by nature, the soul longs for the body.¹⁰⁵ Thomas combined Aristotle’s notion of the soul with a neo-Platonist perspective, mediated more through Dionysius than Augustine. Thomas re-asserted his argument that the *De spiritu et anima* was not by Augustine in his commentary on John, delivered in Paris in 1270/1271, implying that its authorship was still contested.¹⁰⁶ During these years, he encountered a Franciscan, John Peckham, who continued to quote the *De spiritu et anima* as an authoritative work of Augustine. Peckham would subsequently accuse Aquinas of implying that Christ had no soul immediately after his death on the cross, because it had left his body.¹⁰⁷ At stake were two very different views of the soul.

CONCLUSION

Much more work is needed on the text, the manuscript tradition and influence of the *De spiritu et anima* than can be offered here. Nonetheless, it does seem that Albert and Thomas Aquinas were not wrong to observe the intellectual limitations of the *DSA*. Its author had difficulties combining the neoplatonic perspective (mediated by Macrobius and Boethius) of the *De anima* of Isaac of Stella with an Augustinian understanding of the soul as a spiritual substance, corrupted by sin. The dependence of *DSA* on a wide range of authorities (far greater than can be documented here) militates against one suggestion that has been made, that it is a further expansion by Isaac himself of his original treatise. This would imply that Isaac underwent a radical shift in theological perspective and literary style for which there is otherwise no evidence. The discussion in *DSA* of how the “the vital force” in the body drives purified blood to the heart through the *venas pulsatiles* employs technical language specific to *physica*, in which Alcher of Clairvaux excelled, according to Isaac. Such details suggest that Alcher should not be dismissed as its possible author. While it may have none of the philosophical subtlety of Isaac, the *DSA* offers an attempt to combine an Augustinian awareness of the effects of sin on the human body with respect for the efforts of Isaac to develop an anthropological vision that gave attention

¹⁰³ THOMAS DE AQUINO, *ST I*, q. 75, a. 3: “Ad tertium dicendum quod corpus requiritur ad actionem intellectus, non sicut organum quo talis actio exerceatur, sed ratione obiecti, phantasma enim comparatur ad intellectum sicut color ad visum.”

¹⁰⁴ *ST I*, q. 76, a. 1.

¹⁰⁵ *ST I*, q. 75, a. 7.

¹⁰⁶ *Super Evangelium Iohannis reportatio*, 10, 2, edited by Marietti, p. 260.

¹⁰⁷ These accusations are studied by A. BOUREAU, *Théologie, science et censure au XIIIe siècle: le cas de Jean Peckham*, Paris: Belles Lettres, 1999.

to both reason and emotion within the human psyche. The remark of Erasmus that the *DSA* is worthy of respect still holds true.¹⁰⁸

While it seems difficult to argue that the *DSA* is an unidentified treatise of Isaac, expanding on the *De anima*, it may be just as misleading to argue that it is simply a patchwork of quotations from earlier authors. This does not do sufficient justice to the way in which its author does try to create a synthesis from a wealth of texts from which he quotes. Alcher shared with Isaac a profound interest in trying to formulate an anthropology that gave equal value to reason and the emotions within the human soul, drawing on Platonic ideas about the soul as *rationabilis*, *concupiscibilis* and *irascibilis*. He admired Isaac's enthusiasm for a Boethian ladder of ascent of perception from sense, through imagination, to reasoning about the world, and then to intellect and ultimately intelligence (itself influenced by comments made by Hugh of St Victor), even if he never succeeded in forging an original synthesis of ideas in the manner of Isaac of Stella. Its thoroughness, however, may have made it appealing to those, especially in the Franciscan Order, who valued what Augustine had to say. In its way, the *DSA* still formulated a vision of the divine as present in all creation that was attractive to its readers. Albert and Thomas mocked certain of its claims as not doing full justice to the role of the senses in the process of cognition. Yet while they may have been more focussed on showing how Aristotle's *De anima* could be integrated into a Christian vision of the world, we should not ignore the *De spiritu et anima* as offering a vision of the human person influenced by Platonist tradition, before the writings of Aristotle on the soul and its powers had become widely known. It is a work that deserves further exploration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

AELREDUS RIEVALLENSIS, *Homilia de oneribus propheticis Isaiae*, edited by G. Raciti, CCCM 2D, Turnhout: Brepols, 2005.

ALANUS DE INSULIS, *Liber in distinctionibus dictionum theologicium*, PL 210, 687–1012.

ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *Commentarii in IV libros sententiarum*, edited by A. Borgnet, *Opera omnia*, vol. 25–30, Paris: Vivès, 1893–1894.

ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *Opera omnia*, edited by A. Borgnet, 34 vols, Paris: Vivès, 1890–1895.

¹⁰⁸ See above n. 10.

- PS-ALCUIN, *De dignitate conditionis humanae*, PL 17, 1015–1018 and PL 101, 1359–1360.
- PS-ALCUIN, *De dignitate conditionis humanae*, edited by J. Marenbon, *From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre: Logic, Theology and Philosophy in the Early Middle Ages*, Cambridge: CUP, 1981, p. 149–166.
- ALEXANDER DE HALENSIS, *Glossa in libros Sententiarum I–IV*, edited by PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 4 vols, Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1951–1957.
- ALEXANDER DE HALENSIS, *Quaestiones disputatae antquam esset frater*, edited by PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 3 vols, Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1960.
- AUGUSTINUS, *De Genesi ad litteram*, ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 28.1, Vienna: Tempsky, 1894.
- AUGUSTINUS, *De Trinitate*, edited by W.J. Mountain, F. Florie, CCSL 50–50A, Turnhout: Brepols, 1968.
- PS-AUGUSTINUS, *De spiritu et anima*, in: *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis episcopi operum*, vol. 6, Paris: Franciscus Muguet, 1685, Appendix, p. 35–64.
- PS-AUGUSTINUS, *De spiritu et anima*, PL 40, 779–832.
- PS-AUGUSTINUS, *Manuale*, PL 40, 951–968.
- PS-AUGUSTINUS, *Meditationes*, PL 40, 901–942.
- BARTHOLOMAEUS ANGLICUS, *On the Properties of the Soul and Body. De proprietatibus rerum III and IV*, edited by R.J. Long, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1977.
- BERNARDUS CLARAEVELLENSIS, *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, edited by J. Leclercq et al., 8 vols, Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957–1977.
- PS-BERNARDUS, *De diligendo Deo*, PL 40, 847–864.
- PS-BERNARDUS, *Manuale*, PL 40, 951–968.
- PS-BERNARDUS, *Meditationes*, PL 184, 485–508.
- PS-BERNARDUS, *Tractatus de interiori domo seu de conscientia aedificanda*, PL 184, 501–552.
- PS-BERNARDUS, *Tractatus de conscientia*, PL 184, 551–560.
- BOETHIUS, *Philosophiae consolatio*, edited by L. Bieler, CCSL 94, Turnhout: Brepols, 1984.
- BONAVENTURA, *Breviarium*, edited by PP. Collegii a S. Bonaventura, vol. 5, Quaracci: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1891, p. 201–291.
- BONAVENTURA, *Commentaria in IV libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi*, edited by PP. Collegii a S. Bonaventura, vol. 1–4, Quaracci: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1887–1889.
- BONAVENTURA, *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*, edited by PP. Collegii a S. Bonaventura, vol. 5, Quaracci: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1891, p. 295–313.

- BONAVENTURA, *Opera Omnia*, edited by PP. Collegii a S. Bonaventura, 11 vols., Quaracci: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1882–1951.
- BONAVENTURA, *Sermones de tempore*, edited by J.G. Bougerol, Paris: Cerf, 1988.
- BONAVENTURA, *Sermones dominicales*, edited by J.G. Bougerol, Grottaferrata: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1977.
- BOSO, *Vita Papae Alexandri*, translated by G.M. Ellis, *Boso's Life of Alexander III*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973.
- GUIDO ARETINUS, *Liber mitis*, edited by P. Licciardello, *Guido d'Arezzo Liber Mitis. Un trattato di medicina fra XII e XIII secolo*, Pisa: Pacini Editore, 2009.
- GUILLELMUS ALTISSIODORIENSIS, *Summa Aurea*, edited by J. Ribaillier, 5 vols. in 7, Paris – Grottaferrata: Editions du CNRS – Editions Collegii S. Bonaventura, 1980–1987.
- GUILLELMUS DE CONCHIS, *Glosae super Timaeum*, edited by E.A. Jeaneau, CCCM 203, Turnhout: Brepols, 2006.
- GUILLELMUS DE SANCTO THEODERICO, *De natura corporis et anime*, edited by P. Verdeyen, CCCM 88, Turnhout: Brepols, 2003, p. 105–146.
- GUILLELMUS DE SANCTO THEODERICO, *Epistula ad fratres de monte Dei*, edited by P. Verdeyen, CCCM 88, Turnhout: Brepols, 2003, p. 225–289.
- HELINANDUS FRIGIDI MONTIS, *Flores Helinandi*, PL 212, 721–746.
- HIERONIMUS, *Commentarii in euangelium Matthaei*, edited by D. Hurst, M. Adriaen, CCSL 77, Turnhout: Brepols, 1969.
- HIERONYMUS, *Commentarii in Ezechielem*, edited by F. Glorie, CCSL 75, Turnhout: Brepols, 1964.
- HONORIUS AUGUSTODUNENSIS, *Elucidarium*, PL 172, 1109–1192.
- HONORIUS AUGUSTODUNENSIS, *Speculum Ecclesiae*, PL 172, 803–1108.
- HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE, *De archa Noe*, edited by P. Sicard, CCCM 176, Turnhout: Brepols, 2001.
- HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE, *De sacramentis*, PL 176, 173–618.
- HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE, *De unione corporis et spiritus*, PL 177, 285–289.
- HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Hugonis de Sancto Victore opera propaedeutica*, edited by R. Baron, Notre Dame: University of Notre-Dame Press, 1966.
- HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Miscellanea*, PL 177, 469–898.
- ISAAC DE STELLA, *De anima*, edited by C. Tarlazzi, “L’*Epistola de anima* di Isaaco di Stella: studio della tradizione ed edizione del testo,” *Medioevo*, vol. 36 (2011), p. 167–278.
- ISAAC DE STELLA, *De anima*, PL 194, 1875–1890.
- ISAAC DE STELLA, *The Selected Works of Isaac of Stella. A Cistercian Voice from the Twelfth Century*, edited by D. Deme, London: Ashgate, 2007.

- ISAAC DE STELLA, *Sermons*, edited by A. Hoste, G. Raciti, SC 130, 207, 39, Paris: Cerf, 1967–1987.
- JOHANNES BLUND, *Treatise on the Soul*, edited by D.A. Callus, R.W. Hunt, introduced and translated by M.W. Dunne, Oxford: OUP, 2013.
- JOHANNES CASSIANUS, *Collationes*, edited by M. Petschenig, CSEL 13, Vienna: Temp-sky, 1886.
- JOHANNES DE RUPELLA, *Tractatus de divisione multiplici potentiarum animae*, edited by P. Michaud-Quantin, Paris: Vrin, 1964.
- JOHANNES DE RUPELLA, *Summa de anima*, edited by J.G. Bougerol, Paris: Vrin, 1995.
- JOHANNES PECKAM, *Quaestiones de anima*, edited by J. Spettman, G.J. Etzkorn, (Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica Medii Aevi, 28), Grottaferrata: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 2002.
- MACROBIUS, *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis*, edited by J. Willis, Leipzig: Teubner, 1970.
- PETRUS DE CELLA, *De conscientia*, edited by J. Leclercq, *La spiritualité de Pierre de Celle*, (Études de Théologie et d'Histoire de la Spiritualité, 7), Paris: Vrin, 1946, p. 193–230.
- PETRUS DE CELLA, *De conscientia*, PL 202, 1083–1096.
- PETRUS DE CELLA, *The Letters of Peter of Celle*, edited by J. Haseldine, Oxford: OUP, 2001.
- PHILIPPUS CANCELLARIUS, *Summa de bono*, edited by N. Wicki, 2 vols, Bern: Franke, 1969.
- Summa fratris Alexandri (Summa Halensis)*, edited by C. Koser et al., 4 vols, Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1924–1948.
- THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Opera omnia*, 48 vols, Rome: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1884–.
- THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Quaestiones disputatae de anima*, edited by B.-C. Bazán, Paris: Cerf, 1996.
- THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum magistri Petri Lombardi episcopi Parisiensis*, edited by P. Mandonnet, 2 vols, Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1929.
- Three Treatises on Man. A Cistercian Anthropology*, edited by B. McGinn, Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1977.
- TOMAS CANTIMPRATENSIS, *Liber de natura rerum*, edited by H. Boese, Berlin: De Gruyter, 1973.
- VINCENTIUS BELVACENSIS, *Speculum maius*, 4 vols, Duaci: Ex Officina Typographica B. Belleri, 1624.

Secondary Sources

- BIENIAK, M., *The Soul-Body Problem at Paris ca. 1200–1250: Hugh of St-Cher and His Contemporaries*, Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2010.
- BOQUET, D., *L'ordre de l'affect au Moyen Âge: autour de l'anthropologie affective d'Aelred de Rievaulx*, Caen: Centre de Recherches Archéologiques et Médiévales, 2005.
- BOUREAU, A., *Théologie, science et censure au XIIIe siècle: le cas de Jean Peckham*, Paris: Belles Lettres, 1999.
- BUCHMÜLLER, W., *Isaak von Étoile: monastische Theologie im Dialog mit dem Neoplatonismus des 12. Jahrhunderts*, Münster: Aschendorff, 2016.
- BURNETT, C., "Magister Iohannes Hispalensis et Limiensis and Qustâ ibn Lûqâ's *De differentia spiritus et anime*. A Portuguese contribution to the Arts curriculum?," *idem*, *Arabic into Latin in the Middle Ages: The Translators and their Intellectual and Social Context*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009, p. 221–267.
- DIETZ, E., "When Exile Is Home: The Biography of Isaac of Stella," *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, vol. 41 (2017), p. 141–165.
- FOURNIER, P., "Alcher de Clairvaux," *Dictionnaire d'histoire et géographie ecclésiastique*, vol. 2, Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1914, p. 14–15.
- GIRAUD, C., *Spiritualité et histoire des textes entre moyen âge et époque moderne*, Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2016.
- GASPER, G.E.M., WALLIS, F., "Anselm and the Articella," *Traditio*, vol. 59 (2004), p. 129–174.
- HAIN, L., *Augustinus. Repertorium bibliographicum*, Paris: Renouard, 1826.
- HASSE, D., *Avicenna's "De anima" in the Latin West*, (Warburg Institute Studies and Texts), London: Warburg Institute, 2000.
- HASSE, D.N., "Plato Arabico-Latinus," *The Platonic Tradition in the Middle Ages. A Doxographic Approach*, edited by S. Gersh, M.J.F.M. Hoenen, New York: De Gruyter, 2002.
- HIEDL, A., "Die pseudo-augustinische Schrift *De spiritu et anima* in den Hruhwerken Alberts des Grossen," *Studia Anselmiana*, vol. 63 (1974), p. 97–121.
- LEBECH, M., McEVROY, J., "De Dignitate Conditionis Humanae: Translation, Commentary, and Reception History of the *Dicta Albini* (Ps.-Alcuin) and the *Dicta Candidi*," *Viator*, vol. 40/2 (2009), p. 1–34.
- LEWICKI, J., "Filozoficzna nauka Alchera z Clairvaux o Bogu w świetle jej źródeł," *Roczniki Filozoficzne*, vol. 5 (1955–1957), p. 79–94.
- MACHIELSEN, J., *Clavis Patristica Pseudoepigraphorum Medii Aevi 2A*, Turnhout: Brepols, 1994.
- MCGINN, B., *The Golden Chain: A Study in the Theological Anthropology of Isaac of Stella*, Washington: Cistercian Publications, 1972.

- MICHAUD-QUANTIN, P., "La classification des puissances de l'âme au XII^e siècle," *Revue du Moyen Âge Latin*, vol. 5 (1949), p. 15–34.
- NORPOTH, L., *Der pseudo-augustinische Traktat "De spiritu et anima"*, Cologne: Institut für Geschichte der Medizin, 1971.
- PEGIS, A.C., "The Separated Soul and its Nature in St. Thomas," *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974. Commemorative Studies*, vol. 1, Toronto: Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies, 1974, p. 131–158.
- RACITI, G., "L'autore del *De spiritu et anima*," *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica*, vol. 53 (1961), p. 385–401.
- ROSE, V., *Verzeichniss der Lateinischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, vol. 2, Berlin: Asher, 1903.
- SEYMOUR, M.C. et al., *Bartholomaeus Anglicus and his Encyclopedia*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 1992.
- TARLAZZI, C., "Alan of Lille and the *Periesichen Augustini*," *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale*, vol. 51 (2009), p. 45–54.
- TARLAZZI, C., "Il manoscritto 469 della bibliotheca Teresiana di Mantova e Alchero 'di Clairvaux'," *Medioevo*, vol. 35 (2010), p. 323–340.
- TASSIN, R.P., *Histoire littéraire de la congrégation de Saint-Maur, ordre de S. Benoit*, Brussels – Paris: Hublot, 1770.
- THÉRY, G., "L'authenticité du *De spiritu et anima* dans S. Thomas et Albert le Grand," *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*, vol. 10 (1921), p. 373–377.
- TORRELL, J.-P., *Saint Thomas*, vol. 1: *The Person and his Work*, translated by R. Royal, Washington: Catholic University of America, 2005.
- VANEL, J.-B., *Les Bénédictins de Saint-Maur à Saint-Germain-des-Prés, 1630–1790: nécrologe des religieux de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur, décédés à l'Abbaye de Saint-Germain-des-Prés*, Paris: Champion, 1896.

DEBATING THE AUTHORITY OF PSEUDO-AUGUSTINE'S *DE SPIRITU ET ANIMA*

S U M M A R Y

This paper introduces the *De spiritu et anima*, widely copied in the medieval period as a work of Augustine, but whose authority and authorship was much contested in the 13th century, in particular by Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. The text draws on and paraphrases ideas about the soul from a wide range of texts, none thematically more important than the *De anima* of Isaac of Stella, who addressed his treatise to Alcher, a monk of Clairvaux, reportedly of some

eminence in medicine. The suggestion made in the late 17th century within the Maurist edition of the works of Augustine (and re-affirmed by McGinn) that *DSA* is a derivative compilation, is very different from an alternative perspective that has been raised, that it is by Isaac of Stella himself. This paper argues that while it draws heavily on Isaac's *De anima*, it modifies Isaac's perspectives in the light of both a more Augustinian approach and an interest in the physical body and that the hypothesis of Alcher's authorship should not be dismissed out of hand. *DSA* formulates an anthropological perspective about the soul that would rival that of Aristotle and find strong support in the Franciscan Order.

KEYWORDS: Isaac of Stella; Alcher of Clairvaux; Pseudo-Augustine; medieval theories of the soul; Cistercian anthropology