Concerning astrology, Albert the Great made two major contributions, one undoubtedly authentic, the other questionably so. First, he articulated astrology’s natural-philosophical foundations in his authentic Aristotle commentaries and related works. When I say “foundations”, I do not mean just a passage here or there; rather, for Albert, celestial influences (and thus astrology) are woven into the very heart of Aristotelian natural knowledge, appearing in central processes of nature in several fundamental works, including his paraphrase commentaries on Aristotle’s *De caelo* and *De generatione et corruptione*. “His” second contribution appears in the deliberately anonymous *Speculum astronomiae*, which circulated under Albert’s name for centuries. In it, the four canonical types of astrological practice were described and supplied with extensive bibliographies, and legitimate practices were authoritatively distinguished from illegitimate ones. Regardless of the *Speculum’s* authenticity, however, from the middle of the 14th century both contributions were increasingly connected with Albert’s name.
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1 The attribution has received significant but indecisive recent discussion, the most important of which are Paola Zambelli, *The Speculum astronomiae and its Enigma: Astrology, Theology and Science in Albert the Great and his Contemporaries* (Dordrecht: 1992) for a review of the scholarship and much incisive discussion, a Latin text and English translation (hereafter cited as Zambelli); Bruno Roy, “Richard de Fournival, auteur du *Speculum astronomiae*?” *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 67 (2000), 159–180; Agostino Paravicini Bagliani, *Le Speculum astronomiae, une énigme?: Enquête sur les manuscrits* (Florence: 2001); and, Nicolas Weill-Parot, *Les “images astrologiques” au Moyen Age et à la Renaissance: Spéculations intellectuelles et pratiques magiques (XIIe–XVe siècle)* (Paris: 2002), hereafter cited as Weill-Parot). Jeremiah Hackett discusses this question in his contribution to this volume, as do I, very briefly, in the conclusion to this chapter.

2 Among the many useful results of Paravicini Bagliani’s codicological investigations, we find that the first explicit manuscript attribution to Albert is to be dated after 1339, and the first literary witness to Albert as author is to be dated after 1346. Thereafter the attributions to Albert increase significantly, especially after Nicole Oresme (ca. 1323–82),
In this chapter, I will reconstruct central features of Albert's undoubtedly authentic astrologizing Aristotelian natural philosophy, primarily from his Aristotle commentaries and closely related works. I will also discuss relevant features of the most likely pseudonymous *Speculum astronomiae*. In addition to the astrological dimension, I will also address magic in these texts, especially the controversial theory and practice of making astrological images (*imaginés astronomicae*) or talismans. In what follows, two central questions should be clearly distinguished: (1) What were Albert's own views, for which we must rely on unquestionably authentic works? (2) And how did texts long attributed to Albert influence later understanding of his thought? I will focus on the former, but I hope also to contribute to the latter.

This chapter also addresses some thorny historiographic problems along the way. In general, it has not been properly realized that *both* astrology and its natural-philosophical foundations had deep roots in medieval and Renaissance Aristotelianism, and that Albert was a major figure in laying those foundations and making them accessible to the Latin-reading West. In particular, my reconstruction supplements and corrects Edward Grant’s boldly stated but erroneous interpretation of the relationship between astrology and Aristotelian natural philosophy in his magnum opus, *Planets, Stars and Orbs: The Medieval Cosmos, 1200–1687* (Cambridge, Eng.: 1994), where astrology’s centrality to medieval natural knowledge is overlooked and Albert significantly underrepresented.\(^5\)

---

\(^3\) Other pseudo-Albertan works with a significant astrological dimension are the *Secrets of Women* and *Liber aggregationis*, but their discussion would take us too far afield. For *Secrets of Women*, see Helen Rodnite Lemay, *Women’s Secrets: A Translation of Pseudo-Albert the Great’s De Secretis Mulierum with Commentaries* (Albany, N.Y.: 1992). For the *Liber aggregationis*, see Isabelle Draelants, *Le Liber de virtutibus herbarum, lapidum et animalium (Liber aggregationis)*, *Un texte à succès attribué à Albert le Grand* (Florence: 2007).

\(^4\) For much relevant information on this and many other issues, see *Albertus Magnus and the Sciences: Commemorative Essays 1980*, ed. James A. Weisheipl (Toronto: 1979); hereafter cited as Weisheipl, ed.

\(^5\) Also, in a widely cited article on celestial influences in the Middle Ages, John D. North does not discuss Albert’s contribution as he skips from Robert Grosseteste and Roger Bacon to Albert’s most distinguished student, Thomas Aquinas; “Celestial Influence—The Major Premise of Astrology,” in *‘Astrologi Hallucinati’: Stars and the End of the World in Luther’s Time*, ed. Paola Zambelli (Berlin: 1986), 45–100. The neglect of Albert is particularly surprising, since Lynn Thorndike had much earlier drawn attention to some of this material in the second volume of his indispensable *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, in