

The Prologue to John of Morigny's

Liber Visionum:

Text and Translation

by Claire Fanger and Nicholas Watson

Introduction

1. The *Liber visionum*¹ or *Liber florum celestis doctrine* is an attempt to reconcile the goals of a condemned medieval ritual magic text, the *Ars notoria*, with late-medieval Catholic Christian orthodoxy. The text was written in stages between 1304 and 1317 by John, a Benedictine monk from the monastery of Morigny² who spent his school years at Chartres and later studied briefly at Orléans. Despite its protestations of its own orthodoxy and attempt to position itself in a positive way among the “apocrypha fidei,” the text was condemned as heretical and sorcerous (according to an entry in the *Grandes Chroniques de France*),³ and a copy burned at Paris in 1323.

The text offers readers two interrelated systems for attaining knowledge. The first system is exhaustively detailed in the second of its three books (the *Liber virginis marie*), composed in two phases from 1304-07 and probably from c.1308- c. 1311.⁴ This system consists of a series of prayers to God, the angels, the whole court of heaven, and especially the virgin Mary. By reciting the prayers with proper gestures and accompanying exercises—primarily, purification, fasting, and the recitation of the canonical office—over a period of nine weeks, the practitioner attains knowledge of the seven liberal arts, philosophy, theology, and any other branch of formal learning he or she may

desire. Since the structure of formal learning represents the mind of God as this is expressed in creation, and since the angelic powers are products of that mind in the realm of spirit, each of the nine angelic orders can be identified with a branch of knowledge.⁵ John's system follows the *Ars notoria* in exploiting this identification (so that from the Angels he learns Grammar, from the Archangels, Rhetoric, and so on), but submits his *opus* to the overarching control of the virgin Mary, queen of the angels and patron of his entire project.

The *Liber virginis marie* is in four parts (also, somewhat confusingly, referred to as *libri* by John). Three of these contain the prayers, in numbered groups of seven and thirty respectively, which take the practitioner through various stages of purification, ascent to the court of heaven, and reception of knowledge. The fourth consists of instructions for recitation of the prayers in conjunction with an Office of the Angels, as well as of information about how to teach children and others using the prayers, and instructions for making and consecrating new copies of the text which any practitioner must follow.

The second system is described less schematically in the third and final book of the *Liber visionum*, known as the *Liber figurarum*, a first version of which was composed in around 1311-13, before being completely rewritten as the *Nova compilatio* in 1315-17. This system, which is directed more towards finding out specific items of information than formal knowledge, partly involves the redeployment of prayers recorded in the second book towards new ends, but mainly turns on generating and interpreting visionary dreams and contemplating certain figures, with and without the aid of a consecrated ring. For example, after performing a night-time ritual, the practitioner petitions Mary for the answer to a question in a dream. Characteristically, she then appears to him or her, often in the

form of a statue or other image which may transmute into the likeness of flesh, and speak, gesture, or in some other way signify her response. By observing Mary, taking note of her often cryptic words, body language, clothing, and surroundings, the practitioner learns information on any subject that Mary deems worthy of elucidation.⁶ Other kinds of answer can be gained by contemplation of figures depicting Mary in certain attitudes, or by repeating prayers while wearing a ring consecrated to her.

The text leaves this second system open, in the sense that it offers suggestions and a limited set of prescriptions or guidelines, allowing practitioners to make their own *experimenta*. At the same time, John warns about the likelihood of diabolical deception, confessing that he has himself been deceived by corrupted visions in the course of writing, and describing the process of composition and revision of the entire *Liber visionum* as one in which his sinfulness and periodic inability to understand the Virgin's intentions have played a role from which others can learn. This book is divided into three shorter books, the *Liber figurarum*, the *Liber de particularibus experimentibus*, and the *Liber de confirmatione figurarum et annuli*. But the impression of harmonious calm conveyed by the prayers and instructions found in the earlier *Liber virginis marie* is absent here. The *Nova compilatio* is explicit about how it was born in the face of growing opposition to John's first version—especially its use of complex figures that to certain unnamed observers in Orléans smacked of necromancy—and about how this opposition forced him to full-scale rewriting of an extensive body of material, despite the fact that it had already been licenced by the Virgin, and so should theoretically have been beyond challenge from any merely earthly agency. Throughout the *Nova compilatio*, traces of rewriting or rejected drafts, passages cancelled or moved from one part to another, and formal defences of the

opus (as he calls the practices his text depicts) attest to John's increasing difficulties with his project.⁷

In the middle of the main period of the creation of these two systems—around 1313—John felt the need to write an autobiographical account of how he had arrived at them. John seems to have obtained Mary's permission for writing such an account as early as 1308, and may even have started recording his visions on an individual basis at that time (see paragraph 9 of the edited text below). In its present form, the account likely began life as the introduction to the discarded first version of the *Liber figurarum* (the *Antiqua compilatio*), and was written to defend this book from the charge of magic; the date of the autobiographical account, and various internal evidences, suggest as much. However, in the (very likely revised) form in which it survives, the account came to function as the first book of the complete *Liber visionum*: a lengthy prologue, also called the *Liber visionum*, that is the text's most sustained defence of its purity, authority, and efficacy. This prologue to John's book (which represents roughly one fifth of the complete text present in Graz University Library MS 680) we edit and translate into English for the first time here.

2. The prologue was not meant to be read independently, and we hope to republish it as part of an edition of the full *Liber visionum*, in which we also hope to clear up some of the mysteries as to the text's meaning and historical context we have not yet solved here. Nevertheless there are a number of reasons for putting out a separate edition of John's first book in advance of the full edition of this text. We have called this an "autobiographical account," though the text was not written primarily for the purpose of being autobiography (a genre in any case still in its infancy in this period).⁸ John himself would likely have said that the chief

purpose of his prologue was didactic (it served in part as a set of instructions and warnings to potential users of the text, as well as contributing to the experiential and theological justification of its ritual practices). Viewed simply as a narrative, however, it forms a nicely self-contained unit which is of considerable interest no less for its rich fund of exemplary, often puzzling, anecdotes about John's encounters with the devil, the Virgin, and God, than for what it reveals about the complexity of the negotiations between magic and orthodox Christian theology that could occur in this period.

The prologue is constructed as an argument that uses a selection of John's visionary experiences, as well as the experiences of others, as its evidence. At least on the face of it, the argument is a simple attempt to prove the evil of the *Ars notoria* and other forms of ritual magic and the legitimacy of what John offers in their stead—although he also insists “that in each vision a figure or mystery is always discovered,” so that, in theory, each of them performs at least a dual function.⁹ After an introduction that defends his presumption in writing what he does, the first vision is offered as a *thema* or proof text, which anticipates the course of the book's argument and John's spiritual evolution, by showing how, as a thirteen-year old boy living in Chartres (before he entered the novitiate at Morigny), he dreamed of being pursued by the devil into the cathedral, where he was rescued by the loving pity of the Virgin.¹⁰ The text then shifts the scene to Morigny and flashes forward a decade to September 1308, when John finally received his commission to write down what has happened to him, again from the Virgin. Only then, after the course of his development as a writer has been anticipated, and the Virgin's special care for all his doings established, do we go back to the history of his involvement with the *Ars notoria*, *The Rings of Solomon*, and an unnamed

necromantic text which he composed.

The convolutions of this personal history, ambiguous as it often appears, are recounted with startling vividness, and no less attention is given to the details of the demonic visions than to those of divine origin. The narrative is formally divided into two parts: the first recounting John's visions while he was involved in bad magic; the second those that followed his renunciation, culminating in the Virgin's granting him permission to compose the “book of thirty prayers” in which he is allowed to recuperate the theurgy of the *Ars notoria* in a purified and positive way. Finally, rather than taking us past 1308 into the years of composition of those prayers, the third part of the book brings forward two more witnesses to the evils of the *Ars notoria*, John's fifteen-year-old sister Gurgeta, and a colleague of John's (a Cistercian monk, also named John, from the monastery of Fontainejean some sixty miles to the southeast of Morigny), describing their visionary encounters with evil under its influence, and the redemption of Gurgeta, too, when she voluntarily submits herself to the will of the Virgin and Christ.

Perhaps the most striking service this narrative renders modern historians is to throw open a new kind of window into what Richard Kieckhefer has called the “clerical underworld”¹¹—that territory of the late medieval *habitus* in which ritual magic texts were most often collected, shared, copied, translated, and put into practice. John's firsthand account of his own and his colleagues involvement in magic manifest all the ways in which the “clerical underworld” was nearer the surface, more closely entwined with ordinary people's ordinary lives (including the lives of laypersons like Gurgeta) than is readily apparent from other available sources of information. Generally speaking, whether in the familiar tales of magicians-coming-to-a-bad end to be found in exempla and saints' lives,

or in the records of charges of magic laid in this period,¹² or indeed—and perhaps most notably—in the ritual magic texts themselves,¹³ the magician’s works are portrayed as being performed in, or emerging from, a kind of solitary obscurity. Mythically, the private space of magic is cut off from the idea of community, just as, theologically, the private ends of magic are cut off from the public good.

Reading John’s book, however, one becomes conscious of how little obscurity (much less solitude) the ordinary medieval cleric or operator of ritual magic was likely to have. Throughout the time in which John’s experiments with the *Ars notoria* and necromancy were going on, we see him in his interactions with other people near at hand—monastic colleagues, physicians, family members, ready to give advice, begging or demanding to learn his magical methods from him, or perhaps listening at his door. At home, he sleeps near enough to his sister to answer her when, terrified by a demon, she calls out to him in the night. Solitude was uncertain enough that his guidelines for the performance of his own rituals later on in the book include instructions for what to do if the operator should be interrupted.¹⁴

But it is not merely the absence of solitude that marks John’s narrative; as it becomes clearer later on in the book, John of Morigny sees the three of them—himself, his sister Gurgeta, and his friend, the Cistercian monk John of Fontainejean—as the core of a very special community of people who have tested the *Liber visionum* and personally canonized it through their own experience of and intimacy with the virgin Mary.¹⁵ Their sense of community with each other, the special bond they share, comes not only from the Virgin’s protection, the divine visions achieved after demonic magic had been laid aside, but just as much through the mutuality of their quest for access to the divine in and through magic, through the *Ars notoria* itself. John

of Morigny, after all, is not merely the deliverer of the Virgin’s text (indeed, as it becomes clear later, he is not even its only deliverer); he is first and foremost the person who taught both the others the operation of the *Ars notoria*. He did this not out of mischief but (as one can see in all he says of his response to Gurgeta’s desire to read) in answer to a perceived need which was simply too strong, too urgent to be refused. In a sense, John’s own thirst for magical knowledge, his understanding of how intense that craving could be, led him to blaze trail through the demonic wasteland of impure and imperfect magic to the very doorstep of the Virgin’s dwelling, and the others—no less thirsty—follow him.

Through John’s narrative, then, we get a glimpse not merely of what it might have been like to do magic in early fourteenth-century France, but also, and really for the first time, what it might have been like to be part of a *group* of people doing magic in early fourteenth-century France. We learn other things from John’s narrative too: we gain confirmation that the *Ars notoria* was a practice that was taught and learned; it was not merely a text to be discovered by the curious novice alone in the farther reaches of a musty library, but a ritual system about which knowledge was shared, in which experienced operators could and did instruct new users anxious for the benefits the system claimed to provide. We see too, and really also for the first time, that the *Ars notoria* was used (at least by John and his colleagues) primarily as a method for inducing visions; and we see something of how easily procured the visionary state seems to be for these people.

The study of texts and manuscripts of medieval intellectual magic is an emerging area of research. On the Anglo-American front, research pursuing questions of the transmission of manuscripts and ideas—particularly the Arabic strands of influence and the pertinent connections of

magic to natural philosophy (building on the work of the late Marie-Therese D'Alverny) has been done by Charles Burnett¹⁶ and David Pingree.¹⁷ Richard Kieckhefer's work has for a long time provided valuable insights into the Christian intellectual and religious context for magic texts in the middle ages,¹⁸ while younger scholars like Frank Klaassen and Sophie Page have more recently addressed questions of the codicology and ownership of magic manuscripts in dissertations. In France, the first edition of the *Ars notoria* to be attempted since the seventeenth century has recently been undertaken as a doctoral thesis by Julien Véronèse under the direction of Jean-Patrice Boudet; and Sylvie Barnay, who discovered a copy of the *Liber visionum* in a Turin library while engaged in a study of apparitions of the Virgin, was the first to comment on this text in print.¹⁹ Despite the information coming from these and other scholars working in the area, however, there are still many questions whose answers can only be guessed at. Since John's autobiographical first book, even when it is withdrawn from the larger context of the ritual materials that go with it, provides such a rich fund of information about the practices he describes—information which in many cases alters or nuances what can be known about ritual magic from other sources—it seemed important to make this part of the *Liber visionum* publically accessible as soon as it was feasible to do so.

3. Copies of the *Liber visionum*, or large portions of it, are known to survive in six (possibly seven), fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts which present the text in at least three versions. The first two of these manuscripts to be discovered by us (both, as it subsequently turned out, representing incomplete versions) were discussed in our essays in *Conjuring Spirits*.²⁰ One, found in a German manuscript from Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm

276 [MH], which was assembled by Hartmann Schedel in Nuremberg in the late fifteenth century, contains only most of the second book of the text, the *Liber virginis marie*. The other, Hamilton, McMaster University Library MS 107 (formerly Unnumbered MS) [McR]), probably originally from Italy and copied in 1461, is a careful independent redaction, also mostly taken from the second book of the text (but with a few elements of the third, including rituals for the consecration of the book and the ring). Neither of these manuscripts contains the autobiographical prologue, though MH contains a certain amount of autobiographical information in brief synopsis and preserves one of John's notes to the scribe indicating where the prologue was meant to be inserted. McR preserves and sometimes elaborates on the prayers and rituals, but eradicates all autobiographical content, indeed all reference to the author of the text.

Four other manuscripts (and perhaps a fifth, which is for the moment lost and may not have survived the Second World War, but was once MS ZA.74 in the library at Werenigerode) all appear to contain the text of the *Liber visionum* in something approaching its complete form, including the autobiographical prologue which we edit here. For the present edition we have looked at three of these manuscripts: Graz University Library 680 [GZ] (our base text, which dates from the early fifteenth century); London, British Library Additional 18027 [LN] (originally from Germany, copied and probably consecrated by one Albert of Judenberg in 1374); and Vienna, Schottenkloster Scotensis-Vindobonensis 140 (61) [VA] (a copy dated 1377 by the scribe, possibly a certain Hartmann whose name has been inserted into some of the prayers). The fourth complete manuscript version, discovered by Sylvie Barnay in the National Library at Turin, G II 25 [TO], which we learned of later than the other three, we have not yet been able to examine. Some prayers drawn from the *Liber*

visionum also appear in a related text, the *Septem dietas*, in one further manuscript (this is Mainz 44389 [MZ]).²¹

Two of the seven known manuscripts have associations with magic that become apparent from the manner of their compilation: in MH (a collection of esoteric texts owned by Hartmann Schedel, a well-known enthusiast for this kind of writing), the *Liber visionum* follows directly on a Solomonic *Ars notoria*, while in VA, the text is followed by a miscellany of other short *Ars notoria* texts²² (indicating that despite John's careful opposition of the *Liber visionum* to the Solomonic art, his own text might be viewed as a kissing cousin to the *Ars Notoria* by condemnator, collector, and operator alike). The missing Werenigerode manuscript, which was originally a Carthusian production, was a collection of materials pertaining to the pursuit of heretics, and (most unusually) contained the *Liber visionum* as an exemplary condemned text.

The *Liber visionum* is the only work in LN and McR, both of which were probably copies consecrated by their respective operators. McR, prepared for the use of someone named Bernard whose name has been inserted into all the prayers, is illustrated by images of the Virgin based on the *figurae* described in the *Liber figurarum* (McR is the only manuscript to contain these illustrations). LN is neatly and carefully done by the hand of Albert of Judenberg, who inserts his own name into the prayers in place of John's several times—more or less as the instructions for consecrating the book given at the end of the *Liber virginis marie* prescribe—and incorporates decorated initials in blue, purple and brown in addition to rubrication. Though figures are not present, large open areas have been left for them in the text.

Of all the manuscripts we have so far examined, only GZ seems entirely unconcerned with the fact that the

Liber visionum contained theurgic rituals. It was not apparently copied (as were McR, and LN) with an eye toward the performance of John's ritual, nor is it compiled (like VA and MH) with other versions of the *Ars notoria*. Rather, the text is preceded and followed by a miscellaneous group of devotional and instruction materials done in a variety of hands, including an "Elucidarium Anselmi" by Jacobus de Villaco, dated 1414, a "Speculum de viciis et virtutibus," and a selection of sermons and homilies, many of which are concerned with the life of the Virgin. Of all the texts collected in this beautifully preserved paper manuscript, the *Liber visionum* is certainly the most carefully prepared, the only one to incorporate green as well as red rubricating ink, and the only one to leave spaces for figures. The text appears all to have been copied at one time and all to be the work of the same hand (which differs from the hand of the texts that come before and after it).²³

Though it is the latest of our copies, GZ is so neatly done, so uniformly legible, and so consistent in providing sensible readings, that it suggested itself as a base manuscript for our edition. Occasionally we adopt readings from another manuscript where GZ presents us with a crux which VA or LN appears to have resolved intelligently. In a very few instances, where there is obvious difficulty with a passage and all three manuscripts disagree (or where there is an obvious error and all three manuscripts nevertheless agree), we have emended to the nearest sensible morphemes, recording the deviant readings in our apparatus. Otherwise we record variants from VA or LN only when we encounter readings in them which differ from GZ but also make sense and grossly or slightly alter the meaning of the passage. Very minor emendations (where a single letter has been omitted or miscopied in GZ, clearly a result scribal of inadvertence, e.g. the occasional forgotten stroke over the vowel in accusative endings) are made in

brackets without annotation.

In fact the text in the three manuscripts runs close together through this part of the *Liber visionum*, the most frequent variations being inconsequential and not much affecting substance (there are variants in pronouns, e.g. *ille* for *ipse*; adjectives, e.g. *beatus* for *sanctus*, or sometimes minor variations in verbal mood or tense). Graz does not appear to be a copy of either of the other two manuscripts or to derive from either of their exemplars, not consistently following either one in the matter of minor variations, nor in the occasionally larger differences that are found. A few short phrases or sentences present in both earlier manuscripts have been omitted from GZ, their omission by the GZ scribe most likely a result of eye-skip due to homeoteleuton. We have aimed to present here as complete and intelligible a version of John's first book as we could with the materials available to us, following GZ, but including all substantive variants from the two earlier texts.

In the translation our chief aims have been intelligibility and smoothness, though we have also made some attempt to capture the characteristic features of John's style, which is an endearing blend of the humble and the lofty, the colloquial and the rhetorical. For the most part (when he is not in full blown rhetorical mode or pompously trying to make a theological point), his tone is casual, that of a friend telling stories about what has happened to him, speaking informally to a sympathetic listener. Occasionally he gets carried away, waxing emotional or poetic when he remembers the transports of his divine visions (although accounts of visions are always notably precise in their rendition of location, space, direction, colour, and gesture, all of which can be bearers of spiritual meaning according to John's visionary hermeneutic).²⁴ Certain sections of this part of the text are denser and more careful—especially the introduction (paragraphs 1-

7), which is full of strategically placed biblical allusions and loosely syllogistic arguments. We have done our best to capture these shifting facets of John's written personality, from his habitual humble, loose and informal mode to his brief ascents into poetry.²⁵

For smoothness it has sometimes been necessary to break up his longer sentences, occasionally rendering participles as finite verbs. His syntax tends to be loose, occasionally lacks connections, and fairly consistently uses *postquam* and *priusquam* as adverbs. Frequently he conjoins long and meandering strings of clauses together with "et"; thus, to minimize repetition, "et" is variously translated "and," "well," "anyway," or sometimes dropped altogether. John also has a habitual tendency to sprinkle his prose with the word "ecce," most frequently to introduce visions, but occasionally in other places as well. While this word is easily rendered into French without sounding stilted ("et voilà que...") it is very difficult to find a colloquial English equivalent (both "lo" and "behold" having an undesirable archaic feel). We have compromised by rendering "ecce" as "lo" where this could not be avoided, and elsewhere omitting it altogether. Where John alludes to scriptural passages we have tried to make his speech sound biblical, echoing the wording of the King James Bible. We hope the decisions we have made result in a lively and readable translation which is true to the spirit of John's work.

¹We are grateful to the Graz University Library for permission to consult with and edit MS 680, and the staff of the Rare Books Collection for their kind assistance when Claire Fanger was in Graz. We would also like to thank George Rigg who read and critiqued a preliminary draft of this edition with his usual scrupulous care; the work is of a higher quality thanks to his attention. Any errors remaining are our own responsibility. Finally, we are indebted to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for the generous funding

which facilitated our work on this project.

²Morigny was a Benedictine monastery at the edge of Étampes, about thirty miles south of Paris. Founded in 1106, it was an important religious centre during the twelfth century, but not much is known about it during John's lifetime. For bibliography, see Dom L. H. Cottineau, *Répertoire Topo-Bibliographique des abbayes et prieuries* (Macon: Protat Frères, 1935), cols. 1984-85; and Maxime Legrand and Michel Billard, *Morigny-Champigny: Histoire locale et Bibliographie* (Étampes: Éditions du Soleil, 1978).

³For the text of this entry see Nicholas Watson "John the Monk's *Book of Visions of the Blessed and Undefined Virgin Mary*" in *Conjuring Spirits: Texts and Traditions of Medieval Ritual Magic* ed. Claire Fanger, Magic in History (Stroud, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing/University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 164.

⁴Some of the dates given in this summary are from the text itself; others have to be inferred (see note to paragraph 31 of the text edited below). For a more extensive summary analysis of this part of the text as it is redacted in Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 276 and McMaster MS 107 (formerly Unnumbered MS), see Watson, "John the Monk's *Book of Visions*" (cited above), 186-215.

⁵Philosophical systems which trace inbuilt correspondences between the orders of heaven, earth and human knowledge are common in the later middle ages. Diverse as to detail but always under neo-platonic influence, such systems are elaborated for example in Bonaventures *De reductione artium ad theologiam*, which John may have known, as well as in a more nearly contemporary text which John could not have known, Dante's *Paradiso*. (Some reflections on this neo-platonic aspect of John's ritual system will appear in Fanger/Watson, "The Open Secret: John of Morigny, the Blessed Virgin, and the Redemption of Ritual Magic," in progress.)

⁶For another extensive discussion of the many ways in which Mary appears and how to interpret them, see paragraphs 46-9 of the *Liber visionum* edited and translated below.

⁷The *Nova compilatio* is not included in the redaction of Clm 276 (apart from a closing passage that refers to the old and new compilations), and has not previously been described in print. The McMaster redaction does include the making and consecration of the ring and the book, but it is not the same as the fuller version of the *Nova compilatio* present in the Austrian manuscripts. For more information on the manuscript versions we have been able to examine, as well as some we have not, see part 3 of this Introduction. At present we know of no surviving copy of the first version of the *Nova compilatio*, which was

apparently originally entitled the *Liber figurarum*, but which the *Nova compilatio* refers to as the *Antiqua compilatio*.

⁸This makes the autobiographical content of the prologue to the *Liber visionum* all the more interesting. For an examination of some early autobiographical writings, see Chris Ferguson, "Autobiography as Therapy: Guibert de Nogent, Peter Abelard, and the making of Medieval Autobiography," *JMRS* 13 (1983): 187-212. John's prologue does not show quite the same motivation as that which Ferguson attributes to Guibert and Abelard, though there are nevertheless some interesting parallels.

⁹The *thema* vision does indeed hide a "figure or mystery," for "the right hand door of the main entrance on the west front" through which he says he entered the church, is underneath the famous tympanum whose sculptural program articulates much the same relationship between the Virgin, the orders of angels, and the liberal arts, that structure all three books of the *Liber visionum*. See paragraph 7 of the edited text (and notes). In this vision, John thus presents us with an image not only of his flight from Satan into the arms of Mary but of his education in the whole structure of human and divine knowledge that followed, and the book he wrote to pass what he learned on to others.

¹⁰See paragraph 8 of the edited text (and note).

¹¹"Necromancy in the Clerical Underworld" is the title of chapter 7 of *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

¹²For some instances see Kieckhefer, *MMA*, 153-156; Cohn, *Europe's Inner Demons* (London: Chatto, 1975), chapter 10.

¹³Necromantic experiments often prescribe dark, secret or solitary places for their performance. For examples see Richard Kieckhefer, *Forbidden Rites: A Necromancer's Manual of the Fifteenth Century*, Magic in History (Stroud, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing/University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), experiments 3, 5, 7, 10, 11, etc.

¹⁴Et si aliquis peruenerit siue aliquo modo operantem hoc opus excitauerit, non est vis; tantum excitanti non loquatur (nisi necessitate fuerit compulsus cui obediencia debeatur vt est aliquis magistrorum ordinis). Et si loqui ei contingerit, non est vis in medio alicuius oracionis antequam opus illius hore tantum, et non tocuis diei. Graz University Library 680, f. 131r col.1.

¹⁵Ergo ista sciencia legenda decern[i]tur et tamquam de iure commune canonizata habetur, quia communionis ipsius Romane ecclesie gracia Dei usque ad presentem diem per totum tempus vite mee participem me

credo fuisse. Et si in aliquo erravi me reuocet dominus ouem suam quia ignoro. Graz University Library 680, f. 147v col. 2. See also paragraph 7 below.

¹⁶Numerous important articles, particularly those collected in *Magic and Divination in the Middle Ages* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1996).

¹⁷Important articles and especially his edition of *Picatrix: The Latin Version of the Ghayat al-Hakim*, Studies of the Warburg Institute no.39 (London: Warburg Institute, 1986).

¹⁸Numerous pieces but especially the edition *Forbidden Rites*.

¹⁹See “Désir de voir et interdits visionnaires ou la ‘mariophonie’ selon Jean de Morigny (XIV siècle)” in *Homo Religiosus* (Paris: Fayard, 1997), 519-26; and “La mariophonie au regard de Jean de Morigny: magie ou miracle de la vision mariale?”, in Société des Historiens Médiévistes de l’Enseignement Supérieur Public, *Miracles, prodiges et merveilles au Moyen Age* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1995), 173-90.

²⁰Cited above, note 1.

²¹A late (sixteenth-century) manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris attributes a brief *Ars notoria* of ten prayers to “Johannes Monachus,” but the prayers themselves appear to have no connection with John’s *Liber visionum* (this is BN 7170A, mentioned by Lynn Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1923-58], Vol 2, 282).

²²Interestingly, one of these short texts following the *Liber visionum* is written in imitation of John’s manner and, similar to the *Septem dietas* in MZ, contains some excerpts from the prayers.

²³Although it seems to share a quire with the following text.

²⁴An important secondary interest of the *Liber visionum* hence lies in its intense response to art objects and iconography. The text is a rich repository of passages that show what it was like for a susceptible late-medieval person to contemplate images of the Virgin, or watch liturgical processions traverse Chartres cathedral, or priests celebrate mass. These evocations are particularly significant because they emanate from the pen of a male member of a religious order, when the response to visual stimuli is so often associated, in medieval and modern sources, with religious women or the laity (see, e.g., Jeffrey F. Hamburger, *The Visual and the Visionary: Art and Female Spirituality in Late Medieval Germany* [New York: Zone Books, 1998]).

²⁵Brief in this Prologue, but not in the *Liber visionum* as a whole, especially the *Liber virginis marie*. Not represented in this section of the *Liber visionum* is one of John’s major literary talents as a writer of prayers, where he shows a consistent ability to produce ornate and

lengthy invocations or supplications within a tightly controlled dramatic and theological structure.