
Aristotle for women. On the Polish translation of the *Problemata Aristotelis (Omnes homines)* (1535)

Marta Wojtkowska-Maksymik

Abstract: The article contains a presentation of the Polish version of the *Problemata Aristotelis (Omnes homines)*. The author of the translation titled *Problemata Aristotelis. Considerations Duly Selected from the Writings of the Great Philosopher Aristotle, As Well As Other Wise Men, Both of Natural and Medical Science (Problemata Aristotelis. Gadki z pisma wielkiego philosopha Aristotela i też inszych mędrców tak przyrodzonej jako i lekarskiej nauki z pilnością wybrane)* was Andrzej Glaber of Kobylin, a professor at the Jagiellonian University, and his book was printed in Helena Ungler's printing house in 1535. The analysis of issues related primarily to women's medicine and physiology allowed us to determine how Glaber adapted the medieval text to the mentality of a Polish reader from the 16th century, especially women (to whom the work was dedicated).

Keywords: Aristotle, Renaissance translation, *Problemata Aristotelis (Omnes homines)*, Medieval encyclopedias.

In 1535 in Krakow Florian Ungler published a book titled the *Problemata Aristotelis*¹. *Considerations Duly Selected from the Writings of the Great Philosopher Aristotle, As Well As Other Wise Men, Both of Natural and Medical Science (Problemata Aristotelis. Gadki z pisma wielkiego philosopha Aristotela i też inszych mędrców tak przyrodzonej jako i lekarskiej nauki z pilnością wybrane)*.² The author was Andrzej Glaber of Kobylin, a figure then-known in the Krakow scientific world and associated with the Jagiellonian University, because from 1531 to 1543 Glaber taught in the department of liberal arts, and moreover in 1533-1535 he was additionally the superior of the artists' dormitory (*senior bursae philosophorum*). His fate after leaving the academic environment is unclear, but he probably moved to Wieluń, where he died after 1572.³ As we know from the preserved documents (mainly *Liber diligentiarum*), during the academic prelection he commented on *De caelo* and *De mundo* by Aristotle, but also on the works of Jan of Głogów (Johannes Glogoviensis, Johann von Glogau) who worked in Krakow for almost 40 years (1470-1507). Glaber also delivered lectures on arithmetic, introduction to astronomy and astrology, and other sciences included in *trivium* and *quadrivium*. In addition, he was involved in the translation and publishing of works written by others, as well as the popularization of knowledge. The *Gadki*, which are the subject of this

article, are associated with this area of his activity and literary output.

Andrzej Glaber dedicated the text to Jadwiga Kościelecka, the second wife of Seweryn Boner (1486-1549), court banker of the Polish King Sigismund I the Old of the Jagiellon dynasty. Boner owned numerous estates, and the wealth he gathered allowed him to satisfy his ambitions of a patron, for he willingly supported artists who worked, for example, during the rebuilding of the royal castle on the Wawel Hill, as well as scholars or poets (including Jerzy Libanus and Anselmus Ephorinus). It should also be remembered that Thomas Venatorius dedicated his Latin translation of *Plutus* by Aristophanes published in 1531 to Seweryn Boner,⁴ and Erasmus of Rotterdam attributed the edition of the comedy of Terence from 1532 to the sons of Boner, Jan and Stanisław.⁵ With women in mind, his mighty and wealthy protectors, Glaber also edited one of the first Polish 16th-century Catholic translations of the Book of Psalms. The work in question, *David's Psalter* in the translation of Walenty Wróbel, was published in 1539 in the printing house of Helena Ungler, the widow of Florian Ungler. The dedication letter signed by Andrzej of Kobylin and addressed to Piotr Kmita included the names of his first wife (Anna Górka) and mother-in-law (Katarzyna Górka née Szamotulska) – the latter is thought to have encouraged the translator to work on the psalms and commentary to them,⁶ as being important to general public, but in particular, emphasized Glaber, to the nuns, so that “when singing from the psalter they are able to understand [...] words they pronounce”⁷. The *Senatulus, That Is Female Parliament (Senatulus to jest sejm niewieści, 1534)*, preserved in fragments, was created with women in mind as well and modeled on the *Gynajkosyndejon* by Erasmus of Rotterdam. Andrzej of Kobylin is also credited with the authorship of texts on bloodletting, taking care of pregnant and lying-in women and the proceedings during the plague (“miasma”). Presumably, these works of Glaber were included in the gladly read and printed herbaria of the 16th century: by Stefan Falimirz, Hieronim Spiczyński and Marcin Siennik.⁸ It cannot be ruled out that the development of Andrzej Glaber's medical interests took place under the influence of his contacts with lecturers at the medical faculty of the Kraków University. From the first years of the 16th century, this faculty developed intensively and the credit for this development should go to Maciej Miechowita (Mattia de Miechow)⁹ and his pupil, Piotr Wedelicjusz (Petrus Vedelicus). The former contributed to the founding of the second department of medi-

cine, the renewal and reformation of the astrology department, and in popular consciousness he became famous as the author of the *Contra saevam pestem regimen accuratissimum*¹⁰ (1508) and a compendium of hygiene and medical dialectics titled the *Conservatio Sanitatis* (1522)¹¹. The latter, a follower of Hippocrates, published a Latin translation of several of his treatises in 1532,¹² in 1533 his *De diaeta humana libri III*, and two years later – *De morbis vulgaribus* were printed.¹³

The *Gadki* combine two typical features of the works of the Krakow Academy professors and of Glaber himself: the desire to simplify specialist knowledge and the intention to share this knowledge with the reader. Moreover, it is worth noting that women are the designed recipients of the text. The dedication letter to the aforementioned Jadwiga Boner née Kościelecka is devoted to the analysis of their situation. Andrzej of Kobylin criticizes the ban on acquiring knowledge by women and limiting their reading material to prayer books. The jealousy of men is responsible for this state of affairs because “they know it well from the teachings of Aristotle the philosopher who wrote in his books on the soul that people of a delicate body are more intelligent”¹⁴. Further, referring to the authority of the Stagirite and his *De anima*, he mentioned that a delicate and weak body was more easily subjected to the direction of the soul, that is why women absorb all knowledge faster than men, endowed with a strong and resistant body.¹⁵ For this reason, the majority of men, “afraid of losing their fame when women wanting to know more would surpass them in wisdom, stops them from reading worthwhile writings.”¹⁶ In the next part of the dedication, there is an argument well known from the *querelle des femmes* in the 16th century: on the equality between both sexes due to the specific act of creation performed by God.¹⁷ Glaber also mentioned wise and brave women known from history, and among them, along with Roman heroines, he included the mythical queen of the Polish state – Wanda (after the death of her father, she was elected with the votes of men to rule the Polish land).¹⁸ Finally, at the end of the dedication, Andrzej of Kobylin revealed the main source of his work, i.e. the *Problemata Aristotelis*, written, as he claimed, in Greek, later translated into Latin, and finally – thanks to his efforts – into Polish. The choice was not accidental – here the translator wanted to offer women who could read “scriptures full of wisdom”, not “gossips or lies, but explanation of the reasons of different things on the basis of the depth of philosophical knowledge”.¹⁹ Glaber also mentioned the same text – *Problemata Aristotelis* – in the *Metaphrastes ad lectorem* written in Latin:

Etsi non possum infitiri, candide lector, permulta huc esse translata ex eo tractatu, qui vulgo *Problemata Aristotelis*, licet falso, inscribitur, verum si quispiam diligentius contulerit, inveniet nonnulla magna ex parte mutata, quae illic negligentius scripta sunt, plurima ex autoribus probatis tum philosophis, tum medicis desumpta, quae huic operi consentire visa sunt, ut in sequentibus duobus tractatibus videre licebit. Tu eme et iudica.²⁰

Therefore, the readers received a peculiar work consisting of three parts. The first discussed anatomical issues, physiology of human and animal bodies, reasons for differences in the structure and functioning of humans and

animals. The second was related to diet, food and drinks harmful or useful to the body, the third contained instructions on how to recognize person’s customs and character traits from the look of their body parts. In principle, the sources of only the first of them are to be found in the *Problemata Aristotelis*, and the next two in – as Glaber mentioned in the *Ad lectorem adhortatio* before the last part – the *Decretis medicorum* and the *Physiognomonics* by Aristotle.²¹ Andrzej of Kobylin clearly explained the reasons for this combination of topics and sources: the beginning of the work described the reasons for the appearance, purpose, and function of individual members and organs of the human body, then the reader learned how to nourish the body, so as not to harm it and keep it in the best possible condition, because the body could provide knowledge about the nature of other people which is needed to choose one’s company properly. Thanks to such a choice of topics, the text became not a textbook of intricate philosophical issues, but rather a treatise teaching a difficult art of life which overriding goal should be avoiding evil as a source of sin because “each of us strives to obtain things that are good and protect oneself from things that are evil”.²²

It is not surprising that Aristotle patronized such tasks, but – it needs to be pointed out – Andrzej of Kobylin based his work not on 900 issues attached to the classic editions of the Stagirite’s works, but on an anonymous work created in the 13th or 14th century and disseminated in the form of manuscripts before the invention of print. It contained approx. 380 *quaestiones* divided into sections and concerning various aspects of human anatomy and physiology.²³ Ann Blair, after Brian Lawn, describes this work as the *Omnes homines*²⁴ (these words started the preface to the text of my interest). Blair analyzed the Latin editions of the *Omnes homines* and the editions of German, French, Spanish, Italian and English translations (from the period from the end of the 15th to the 18th century) differing in the number of *quaestiones* and their division. This article can be treated as a supplement to the list she prepared with the missing Polish version of the *Omnes homines* from the 16th century. It should also be noted that the Latin text of the *Omnes homines* was also printed in Krakow in 1528 by Maciej Szarfenberg.²⁵ The Krakow edition, also complementing the Ann Blair’s list, kept the division into chapters typical for the editions of the *Omnes homines* from the end of the 15th – the first half of the 16th century, published in Germany (e.g. Magdeburg 1488²⁶, Leipzig ca. 1489/90²⁷, Cologne 1506²⁸) and will be referred to in the next part of the article when comparing Glaber’s work with the Latin version of the *Omnes homines*.²⁹

Despite its small, pocket-size format (16°), the book of Andrzej of Kobylin was published extremely elaborately and with 28 illustrations. The majority of the woodcuts (23) are illustrating the third part of the work, with four woodcuts illustrating the first pages of the book, and one at the end of the book before the information about the printer, place and year of publication. The latter woodcut – which is quite unusual for the Polish book of the 16th century – is not the signet of the Ungler’s publishing house, but the coat of arms of the (Ogończyk) family of Jadwiga Boner.³⁰ Moreover, the same coat of arms (ad-

ditionally equipped with a helmet and a turban) preceded the dedication.³¹ Perhaps the two instances of the woodcut with the signet of the Kościeleckis family was an expression of extraordinary respect for Jadwiga, but it could also be associated with hopes for care and support, held either by the printer or by Andrzej Glaber himself. It may also have suggested that the edition had been published thanks to the financial support of the Kościeleckis family or even Boner himself in order to honor the relatives of the wife or his wife alone.

Particular attention is paid to the title-page, which played an important role in old books, because thanks to it the potential buyer and reader learned about the content of the printed matter.³² Therefore, it should contain not only comprehensive comments about the content, but also an attractive graphic design encouraging the acquisition of the work. On the *Gadki* title-page there was a magnificent woodcut with an image of a man with a covered head and a long beard. He emerges from the calyx of the flower and elaborately braided ribbon floats above him. Illustrations of similar style and identical sizes could be found in the part of the *Gadki* modeled on the *Physiognomonics*: one in the chapter *On the head* and two in the chapter *On the chin*. In addition, eight woodcuts with figures in crowns and with a scepter in hand, sitting in the floral calyces, appeared in the same part in the chapters *On the growth of the whole human* (7) and *On the chin* (1). One of the woodcuts from chapter *On the chin*³³ was on the title-page of the Polish version of *De vita et moribus philosophorum* by Pseudo-Burley. The author of the translation, published in the same year as the *Gadki* and in the same printing house of Helena Ungler, was Marcin Bielski, and Andrzej Glaber provided the preface to this collection of lives of philosophers.³⁴ Repeated use of the same illustrations was one of the characteristics of the old printing, because it allowed – on the one hand – to reduce printing costs, and on the other – by using what is has been already known and popular – to persuade readers to acquire an artfully and richly decorated book. Also, the selection of illustrations of a wise man is consistent with a certain manner of publishing the *Omnes homines*, primarily in Germany in the first half of the 16th century (and later), which is discussed by Ann Blair. It cannot be ruled out that the widow of Florian Ungler from Bavaria was inspired by the books from Germany. The title pages of German editions of the Latin (e.g. Cologne, 1593, Cologne, Quentell, 1506), and vernacular versions (e.g. Strasburg, Hüpfuff, 1515, Augsburg, Froschauer, 1531) of the *Omnes homines* were illustrated by the woodcuts with a master during a lecture and students listening to him or with images of philosophers or scholars (often presented in an office).³⁵

In the Polish work from 1535, the following title was placed over the woodcut: *Problemata Aristotelis. Considerations Duly Selected from the Writings of the Great Philosopher Aristotle, as well as Other Wise Men, Both of Natural and Medical Science. Various Questions on the Human Body Structure for the Purpose of Both Enjoyment and Useful for Proficiency in Conversation*. The length of the title should be explained by the customary practice and the need to clarify the issue of authorship, as also mentioned by Blair. Here we learn that the *Proble-*

mata Aristotelis in the Glaber version are “considerations”, i.e. a discussion based on the works of the Stagirite, numerous philosophers and doctors not mentioned by name as opposed to the already mentioned Latin or German versions of the *Omnes homines* which usually mentioned Avicenna, Galen, Hippocrates and Albert the Great³⁶ to confirm the integrity of the collection and its correspondence and communication with the tradition, but no information was given about the purpose of the work except for obvious remarks that the *Problemata* contains what one needs to know about human and animal nature. In the Polish version, however, we have an interesting remark that the observations contained in the *Gadki* have been carefully selected and can be used both in discussions (“ku biegłości” – “for proficiency”), but also their reading, what seems important if we think about the fact that this text was dedicated to the mighty lady, was supposed to provide pleasure and utility. In this subtle way, Glaber (or perhaps the publisher) not only combined two important functions of expression: *docere* and *delectare*, but also referred to one of the genres typical for scholastic and academic practice, as well as for medieval “popular encyclopedias”³⁷, namely to *quaestiones* – questions.

The *quaestiones* undoubtedly grew out of curiosity and the resulting desire to acquire reliable knowledge and to this, as well as to the benefits of science, Andrzej Glaber of Kobylin dedicated the preface to the first book of the work. The beginning of this preface referred directly to the first words of the Latin introduction to the *Omnes homines*: “*Omnes homines naturaliter scire desiderant, ut scribit Aristoteles, philosophorum princeps, primo Metaphisicae*”³⁸ because thanks to knowledge, which perfects souls, man resembles “*primo enti, divino et immortali*”, who is identified by the Polish translator with God – the creator of all things. Among the disciplines worth of studying, the one Glaber valued the most – and this element also appeared in the Latin preface – was philosophy:

It is clear that science and knowledge are a great good. Because to be able and to know a lot is a useful quality and therefore it is right to start with what concerns us, which, if someone does not know it, makes it impossible to understand other things. For this reason, we will teach here philosophy, that is, innate wisdom, which provides greater pleasure than other teachings and benefits the man in the world, so his reason is enlightened so that in order to see the type and structure of created things he turns and raises himself to that first and eternal being – the Lord, and knowing him (because knowledge of him is real life), also wants to unite with him and strives to match him.³⁹

Despite the obvious correspondence with the text of the preface to the *Omnes homines*, Andrzej of Kobylin at the end added fragments which were not present in the Latin versions and which referred directly to the content of the work. Glaber explained why he had dealt primarily with the human body (because the human being is the noblest and commands all other creatures), and then he enumerated human senses (external: sight, hearing, smell, taste, touch and internal: sense, imagination, thought and memory). Apparently for a better understanding of this part of the argument, but also of the entire first part of the *Gadki*, a woodcut showing the head and the position of

individual senses in it was added in the first edition. The second of the woodcuts, entitled “The Anatomy of *corporis humani*”, presented the female body from the head to pubis with open guts and the captions of the most important organs and parts of the body. The appearance of these illustrations should be considered a sensation when we think of other editions of the *Omnes homines* from the first half of the 16th century. In fact, according to previous research, apart from the decorative title-page, there were practically no woodcuts inside.⁴⁰ Thus, those present in the Polish edition added value to the book published the printing house of Helena Ungler and distinguished it from the other editions of the *Problemata Aristotelis* and their translations, especially those German ones that could be known in Poland at that time. In addition, by posting an illustration of a woman’s body, revealing its secrets very clearly to the reader, Glaber or the publisher wanted to attract the attention of female readers (but not only them) and signal that the subject of female anatomy will appear in the text.

Indeed, this is what happened. However, before we proceed to a detailed analysis, it should be mentioned that Andrzej of Kobylin, what could be in principle expected after reading the preface, conducted the selection of the issues and not all topics related to women discussed in the *Omnes homines*, can be found in the *Gadki*. The most pronounced was the lack of *quaestiones* forming a part of the section usually titled *De coitu*. There are also no *problemata* concerning *hermafrodita* or *monstra*, but also dietary recommendations for women and curiosities concerning nature which were included at the end and usually starting with the formula: “*Sequuntur...*” The below list presents the outline of the *Gadki*. The work of Glaber is compared here with the already mentioned Latin version of the *Omnes homines* published in Krakow in 1528. Numbers in square brackets denote the number of topics in individual chapters:

<i>Omnes homines</i> (Krakow, 1528)	<i>Gadki</i> (Krakow, 1535)
Praefatio	Preface (Przedmowa)
Problemata without a title [21]	
1. De capite [29]	1. On the head (O głowie człowieka) [35]
	2. On the first sense that that is seeing (O pierwszym zmyśle, który jest widzenie) [17]
2. De naso [7]	3. On the nose (O nosie) [7]
3. De auribus [6]	4. On the ears and hearing (O uszach i słuchu) [6]
4. De ore [18]	5. On the mouth (O ustach) [6]
	6. On the teeth (O zębach) [14]
	7. On the tongue (O języku) [6]
	8. On the saliva (O ślinie) [8]
	9. On the taste (O smakowaniu) [4]
	10. On the spirit and the voice (O duchu i o głosie) [13]
6. De collo [7]	11. On the neck (O szyi) [5]
7. De humeris et brachiis [6]	12. On the arms and shoulders (O ramionach i o barkach) [6]
8. De manibus [8]	13. On the hands (O rękach) [10]
9. De ungibus [5]	14. On the nails (O paznokciach) [6]
10. De pectore [5]	15. On the breasts (O piersiach) [5]
11. De mamillis [28]	16. On the paps and dugs (O mammach albo o cycach) [11]
12. De fluxu hemoroidis [2]	17. On the back (O grzbiecie) [6]
	18. On the lungs and the liver (O płucach i o wątrobie) [7]
	19. On the heart (O sercu) [13]
	20. On the blood (O krwi) [5]
	21. On the bile (O żółci) [6]
13. De corde [24]	22. On the stomach (O żołądku) [13]

14. De stomacho [33]	23. On the spleen (O śłodzionie) [4]
15. De sanguine [3]	24. On the kidneys and of the bladder (pO nerkach i o męchierzu) [5]
16. De urina [2]	25. On the members lower than the hips down to the legs (O członkach niższych od biodr aż do nóg) [7]
17. De felle [3]	
18. De splene [3]	
19. De coitu [35]	
Sequuntur alia problemata utilia [17]	

Apparently, the Glaber division diverges from the layout of chapters in the Latin version, both in terms of their distribution and the number of specific issues raised in them, but in principle agrees with the “content” of woodcuts adorning the preface and discussed above, as at the beginning Andrzej of Kobylin described the head, the face and the senses (1-11), then (15-16, 18-19) the chest and the zone under the diaphragm (20-24) starting from the stomach and the spleen and ending on the kidneys and the bladder. In chapter 25, which is the result of his own invention, he briefly presented the structure and characteristics of the hips, thighs, knees, calves and feet, i.e. lower limbs, similarly in chapters 12-14 – on upper limbs, thus providing a comprehensive image of the human body anatomy. Perhaps this intention to concentrate on anatomy resulted in omission of *De coitu* chapter as the fragments devoted to the anatomy of reproductive organs are scarce and it rather concentrates on the intercourse, the formation of semen, the details of fertilization. Probably the objective to unify the message in relation to a specific topic prompted Glaber to transfer fragments related to nutrition to the second part of his work. The majority of dietary advice was in the chapters *De mamillis* and *De stomacho*, which is why they are much shorter in the Polish version.

Another important change – compared to both the Latin and German versions that could have influenced the creation of the Polish translation – is the omission of references to authorities and their writings. Here, a good example can be provided by the fragment of the first chapter *On the human head*:

Why do women grow longer hair than men? Answer: women are moister and fuller of phlegm than men, hence they have more matter for hair growth and their extension. And especially when the woman matures to menstruation, then more matter, which becomes hair, reaches the head. Why women do not grow a beard? Answer: as all the matter from which the beard grows goes to the head and the hair there, and not on the chin, are made thicker and longer than the man’s.⁴¹

Let us compare the relevant passages of the Latin (Kraków 1528) and German (*Ein schöner Tractat mancherlay Frag, Menschlicher v[n]d Thyerlicher natur...*, [Augsburg] 1531) version:

Quare mulieres habent longiores crines quam viri? Respondetur, quia mulieres sunt humidiores quam viri, et magis flegmaticae, ergo in eis plus est de materia pilosum, et per consequens sequitur longitudo pilorum. Et cum hoc talis materia cerebri magis augetur a membris interioribus, et maxime tempore menstrui, quia tunc materia ascendit et augmentatur humor pilorum. Ut dicit Albertus: si pilus menstruose mulieris ponatur sub fimo, ex illo generatur serpens venenosissimus. Secundo respondetur, quia mulieres non sunt barbatae? Quia materia barbe transit in materiam pilosum et sic pili mulierum prolongantur.⁴²

Waum haben die frawen lenger har dann die Mann? Albertus spricht: Die frawen sind feüchter natura dann die mann und sie der feutigkait mer im hirn haben unnd die har wachsen in allermeist, so sie ir gemain feucht haben und leiden, und darumb haben sie lenger har wann sie nicht bart haben.⁴³

The fragment of the Polish text quoted above omits the name of Albert and – just like the German one – information about poisonous snakes born from the hair of the menstruating woman. Andrzej of Kobylin departed from the principle of providing the names of philosophers only twice, in the chapter *On the heart* he referred to Pythagoreans and Aristotle himself:

Why is the heart in the middle of the body? Answer: that all members should be equally nourished like the Sun, which is placed in the middle of the planets, so that it gives all, both those above [the Sun] and below, the same light. Hence also the old Pythagorean philosophers said that the sky was like a great animal whose heart is the sun.

Why does the heart first come alive before all the members, as Aristotle writes: why does the heart come alive first and dies last? Answer: for it gives life to all the members which it revives, so that without it no one can live, that is why it is right that if someone wants to give something to somebody, he must have it first. So you need to know how the doctors write, that first in the female uterus a membrane from the semen is formed and it encapsulates the semen and closes it inside, there in the middle (as seen in the egg yolk) the spirit is born that first brings the heart to life, then from delicate blood it creates the liver, from resistant and cold moisture – the brain, and the bone marrow is enclosed by bones. Then the heart, having gained more power, provides these members with food, from which they and later [and others] multiply and gradually increase.⁴⁴

In addition, Glaber changed the order of some questions and answers in individual chapters,⁴⁵ combined two issues into one⁴⁶ or – vice versa – broke down one problem into two parts,⁴⁷ and all these efforts, it seems, result from the concern for the reader, whom the author of the translation did not want to bore with information useless from his point of view or irrelevant for the essence of the subject of the structure and functioning of particular parts of the human body and its internal organs (hence the abridgement) or – on the contrary – wanted to highlight important issues (hence dividing one problem into two, usually shorter ones). Perhaps the text would take a different form if addressed only to the scientific community, but in this case, the recipients were to be primarily women and the author wanted to provide reliable knowledge but in an accessible form.

What kind of knowledge was that about women, their physiology and functioning of their bodies? First of all, Andrzej of Kobylin concentrated on the characteristic features of female sex, but he was always discussing them in comparison with the analogical features of the male sex. Most of the differences concerned hair, more specifically longer hair on the head, lack of beard (or the presence of beards and / or mustaches on the faces of old women), hair around the genital area and the impossibility of baldness. Glaber also kept fragments about the causes of a higher density of female blood, lower number of teeth than men, a thinner voice (hence, less attractive for singing) and the chest being not as broad as male. The author

of the Polish version of the *Problemata Aristotelis* emphasized that the majority of these features (especially the growth of hair in the lower abdominal area, lack of voice mutation, growth of breasts) occurred at the time of puberty and they had a close relationship with menstruation (“discharge”), but also with the causes of the monthly bleeding, well recognized and described both by Hippocrates and in Aristotle’s writings on nature (especially in *On the Generation of Animals*).⁴⁸ They included the inherent moisture of women and the related coldness of their bodies. It is for these reasons that women were unable to completely digest food, which remains, along with blood (its outlet happened when food squeezed through blood vessels less efficient than men’s and extremely narrow as well as a result of effort), had to be expelled from the body so that the body could be cleansed from what is unnecessary or harmful and could function properly. Glaber did not forget about the positive effects of menstruation which in principle cleansed the system of toxic substances. Here he included: the beauty of the female body, its smoothness, less frequent nosebleeds or pains in various parts of the body:

Why women are gentler than husbands and have smoother bodies? Answer: because the density of matter forming the skin escapes during menstruation together with moisture, which remains in men, so women do not have hairy body parts (despite those which are hotter by birth). That’s why women do not have blood from the nose so often and they do not have pain in their armpits or elsewhere.⁴⁹

However, he did not omit those fragments that discussed the negative effects of the monthly bleeding, which led to the weakening of the female body, its even greater coldness and moisture, from removing the most valuable physiological liquid, i.e. hot, clean and healthy blood. And here there were considerations about headaches, frail legs or chests, lack of courage as great as in males or lack of equally effective and good use of both hands, and this trait was supposed to characterize particularly gifted people.⁵⁰ In the chapter *On the first sense that is seeing*, Andrzej of Kobylin has kept the excerpt about why a glance of a menstruating woman could spoil a mirror or contaminate a spring:

Then the woman emits poisonous fumes, reaching her head from the stomach, which through the eyes – rare and delicate – can penetrate more easily than by other members and then they also infect them. The sign of this is that they then have headaches, moist and teary eyes, and that when the moisture with the wind approaches a spring, it poisons and contaminates it.⁵¹

Secondly, the Polish translation identified the features of the female body that were directly related to the unique ability of women to become pregnant and then – to feed a child immediately after the birth.⁵² The considerations devoted to these issues fill chapter 16 *On the paps and dugs* almost entirely, where Glaber smuggles information about the way milk is made, i.e. as Aristotle has already argued in the *On the Generation of Animals* (777a), it is a perfectly boiled blood, ideal for nutrition of a newborn.⁵³ Breasts were used for its storage, as the medical tradition argued, it was where the menstrual blood went during

pregnancy, which happened after the completion of the fetus. The process of transferring the monthly blood to the breast glands caused its cleansing and digestion thanks to the heat of the beating heart, because, as Andrzej Glaber of Kobylin explained, “if it was not so, no fetus could survive for the poisonous moisture that turns into milk”.⁵⁴ This fate of women’s breasts also justified their quantity⁵⁵ and appropriate size.⁵⁶ In addition, the hardness or softness of the breasts indicated pregnancy, its absence or miscarriage, respectively. Differences in the degree of the hardness of the breast could also signify the sex of the fetus: a harder right breast indicated a boy, while left – a girl. The source of these views was, of course, the medical tradition, and above all the writings of Hippocrates⁵⁷ and Galen, for they were the ones who argued that the differentiation of the sexes depended on, among others, the place where the fetus is implanted in the uterus and the quality of the semen. The right part of the uterus was considered the better part because of the proximity of the liver – a source of life-giving heat that transforms the dietary juice into blood. For the same reason, the right testicle produced better quality sperm. No wonder that, as Galen claimed, a male fetus was made of a more refined seed produced in the right testicle, but only when it met the right conditions (i.e. it was located in a warmer, because of the proximity of the liver, right part of the uterus) and a female fetus developed from the lower quality semen (i.e. from the left testicle) and was located in the left part of the uterus.⁵⁸ In the Polish version of the *Problemata*, we read:

Why pregnant women have one breast harder than the other? Answer: It is a certain sign of the fetus’ sex, as when the right breast is harder, not the left one, it is a sign of conception of a male fetus, which begins on the right side, therefore this side draws more milk for its nutrition and the right breast hardens from it. It works the other way round when a girl is conceived.⁵⁹

The warmth of the fetuses, different in the case of a boy and different in the case of a girl, also affected the quality of milk produced in the breasts: a male, warmer, child gave heat to the mother who thus was capable of digesting excessive moisture and thickening milk. The body of a woman carrying a daughter in her womb produced thin milk because she was unable to effectively get rid of moisture.

Fragments referring to women, and included in the second part of the *Gadki* containing dietary recommendations, were in close connection with the specific state of pregnancy. Glaber warned women against gluttony and, above all, against eating raw fruit and drinking wine. The alcohol was supposed to warm up the pregnant woman excessively and lead to quick digestion of food intended for the developing fetus. No wonder that the offspring of mothers who drank wine was “sick, pale, inadequate in terms of speech”⁶⁰ or affected by epilepsy. On the other hand, Andrzej of Kobylin observed that pregnant women often want to eat coal, clay or raw fish because of the “thick, indigested as well as poisonous moist” lying in their stomachs, which “demands food of its own nature”.⁶¹ Thus, Glaber referred to pre-birth ailments which were one of the most frequently described in medical guides devoted to pregnancy and lying-in and were called

pica (or *kissa*), but also perhaps to the *Treatise on Child-birth, That Is on How the Fetus from the Mother’s Womb Emerges into the World* (*Traktat o rodzeniu człowieczym, jako a któremi obyczajmi płód z żywota matek swoich wychodzi na świat*) attributed to him, where the way of dealing with the unrestrained appetite for harmful substances is described. This *Treatise* was attached to the 16th-century herbaria and it recommended that future mothers should give up eating food impossible or difficult to digest, and in extreme cases, it ordered medication to weaken the appetite.⁶²

The aforementioned relationship of certain fragments from the *Considerations* with popular herbaria again pointed to the basic function of the Glaber’s work – a useful guide, in which anatomical issues were broadly discussed: from anatomical details, through nutrition, to the use of body parts to recognize character traits. The Andrzej of Kobylin’s translation facilitating the acquisition, but also – thanks to the illustrations – easier absorption of a fairly large dose of specialist knowledge has been adapted to the mentality of the recipients – primarily (although of course not only) educated women who could read. For this reason, Glaber, like the translators of the *Omnes homines* into German, often simplified (or shortened or divided – for greater clarity) particular issues. Some details that could offend the readers (such as information about venomous snakes formed from manure sprinkled with menstrual blood or monsters born by women) or which did not provide a meaningful content (as the names of philosophers and doctors or the titles of their works which probably did not sound familiar at all to Polish women, because they rarely explored the secrets of philosophical knowledge in the 16th century) were omitted in the text. However, the Polish version of the *Omnes homines* should be regarded as a prediction of new phenomena that would become popular in the culture of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which spread with a delay in comparison to the countries of Western Europe. We are dealing here with the first popular science text dedicated to women and created with them in mind in the history of the Polish literature. It is paradoxical that Glaber’s actions were patronized by a not-so-favorable tradition, the symbol of which was, not without reason, Aristotle, and which was used to show the characteristics of the female body, the separateness of its physiology and its causes. Thus, Andrzej of Kobylin pioneered the trail for other Polish writers of the second half of the 16th century: Łukasz Górnicki (author of *The Polish Courtier* from 1566 – the Polish translation of *Il Cortegiano* by Baldassare Castiglione), Maciej Wirzbięta (in 1575 he published *On the Nobility and Excellence of the Female Sex*, i.e. the Polish version of *De nobilitate et praecellentia foeminei sexus* by Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim) and Piotr Ciachowski at the beginning of the 17th century announcing in print the principles of caring for a pregnant woman (*On Diseases of Pregnant Women*, in Polish: *O przypadkach białychgłów brzemiennych*, 1624).

Bibliography

Ain Büchlin, *das durch die natürlichen Mayster Arestotelem, Avicennam, Galienum, Albertum unn andern natürlichen Maystern von man-*

- cherley seltzamen wunderlichen Fragen beschriben unn der menschlichen Natur gar nutzlich zewissen ist, unnd hayßt Propleumata Arestoteles, Ulm: no publisher, 1500.
- Andrzeja z Kobyłina Gadki o składności członków człowieczych z Arystotelesia i też z innych medrców wybrane 1535, ed. Józef Rostafiński, Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności, 1893.
- Aristophanes facetissimi comici Plutus, Norimbergae: Petreius, 1531.
- Barycz Henryk, "Glaber Andrzej", in *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 8, Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1959.
- Barycz Henryk, *Historia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w epoce humanizmu*, Kraków: no publisher, 1935.
- Bielski Marcin, *Zywoty filozofów*, ed. Jerzy Krocak, Jacek Sokolski, preface Jacek Sokolski, Wrocław: Oficyna Wydawnicza ATUT–Wrocławskie Wydawnictwo Oświatowe, 2015.
- Blair Ann, "Authorship in the popular *Problemata Aristotelis*", *Early Science and Medicine*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (1999).
- Blair Ann, "The "Problemata" as a Natural Philosophical Genre", in *Natural Particulars. Natur and the Disciplines in the Renaissance Europe*, ed. Anthony Grafton, Nancy Siraisi, Cambridge MA: The MIT Press, 1999.
- Bloemendal Jan, "Erasmus and Comedy between the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period: an Exploration", in *Syntagmatia. Essays on Neo-Latin Literature in Honour of Monique Mund-Dophie and Gilbert Tournoy*, ed. Dirk Sacré, Jan Papy, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006.
- Boylan Michael, "Galen's Conception Theory", *Journal of the History of Biology*, vol. 19/1 (1986).
- Dean-Jones Lesley, "Menstrual Bleeding according to the Hippocratics and Aristotle", *Transaction of the American Philological Association*, vol. 119 (1989).
- Deslauriers Marguerite, "Sexual Difference in Aristotle's Politics and His Biology", *The Classical World*, vol. 102/3 (2009).
- Ein schöner Tractat mancherlay Frag, Menschlicher v[n]d Thyerlicher natur...* [Augsburg]: no publisher, 1531.
- Evelyne Berriot-Salvadore, *Un corps, un destin. La femme dans la médecine de la Renaissance*, Paris: Honoré Champion, 1993.
- Falimirz Stefan, *O ziołach i mocy gich*, Kraków: Florian Ungler [Helena Ungler], 1534.
- Flemming Rebeca, *Medicine and the Making of Roman Women. Gender, Nature, and Authority from Celsus to Galen*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Horowitz Cline Maryanne, "Aristotle and Woman", *Journal of the History of Biology*, vol. 9/2 (1976).
- King Helen, *Hippocrates' Woman: Reading the Female Body in Ancient Greece*, London: Routledge, 1998.
- Knoll Paul, "A Pearl of Powerful Learning" *The University of Cracow in the Fifteenth Century*, Leyden: Brill, 2016.
- Kukiewicz Zenon, *Filozofia człowieka i teoria duszy*, Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1975.
- Kumaniecki Kazimierz, "Podanie o Wandzie w świetle źródeł starożytnych", *Pamiętnik Literacki*, vol. 22-23 (1925-1926).
- La page de titre à la Renaissance: treize études suivies de cinquante-quatre pages de titre commentées et d'un lexique des termes relatifs à la page de titre*, ed. Jean-François Gilmont, Alexandre Vanautgaerden, Françoise Deraedt, Bruxelles: Brepols, 2008.
- Lawn Brian, *The Salernitan Questions: An Introduction to the History of Medieval and Renaissance Problem Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Maclean Ian, *Woman Triumphant. Feminism in French Literature 1610-1652*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- Margolin Jean-Claude, "La nature de la femme sous regard médical à la Renaissance", in *Médecine et médecins au XVIe siècle. Actes du IXe colloque du Puy-en-Velay*, ed. Marie Viallon-Schoneveld, Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne, 2002.
- Matthias de Miechów, *Conservatio sanitatis*, Cracoviae: per Hieronymum Vietorem, 1522.
- Matthias de Miechów, *Contra saevam pestem regimen accuratissimum. Editio trilingua: latina polona, anglica*, transl. and ed. Teresa Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, Danuta Turkowska, Cracoviae: Universitas Jagellonica. Institutum Historiae Medicinae, 1995.
- Metan Saskia, *Wissen über das östliche Europa im Transfer. Edition, Übersetzung und Rezeption des "Tractatus de duabus Sarmatiis"*, Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 2019.
- P. Terentii Comoedias*, Basileae: in officina Frobeniana, 1532.
- Piechocki Katharina, "Discovering Eastern Europe: Cartography and Translation in Maciej Miechowita's "Tractatus de duabus Sarmatiis" (1517)", in *Polish culture in the Renaissance. Studies in the arts, humanism and political thought*, ed. Danilo Facca, Valentina Lepri, Firenze: Firenze University Press, 2013.
- Preus Anthony, "Galen's Criticism of Aristotle's Conception Theory", *Journal of the History of Biology*, vol. 10/1 (1977).
- Problemata Aristotelis determina[n]tia multas questiones de variis corporu[m] humanoru[m] dispositionibus valde audie[n]tib[us] suaues*, Kraków: Maciej Szarfenberg, 1520.
- Problemata Aristotelis determina[n]tia multas questiones de variis corporu[m] humanoru[m] disposito[n]ib[us]*, Cologne: Heinrich Quentell, 1506.
- Probleumata Arestotilis*, [Lipsk]: no publisher, ca. 1489/1490.
- Probleumata Arestotilis*, Magdeburg: no publisher, 1488.
- Propleumata Aristotelis, Avicenne, Galeni und Alberti Magni darinn menschlicher und thierlicher natur*, Strasburg: Camerlander, 1543.
- Siennik Marcin, *Herbarz to jest ziół tutecznych, postronnych i zamorskich opisanie*, Kraków: Mikołaj Szarffenberger, 1568.
- Spiczynski Hieronim, *O ziołach tutecznych y zamorskich*, [Kraków]: Helena Ungler, 1542.
- Ventura Iolanda, "Aristoteles fuit causa efficiens huius libri: On the Reception of Pseudo-Aristotle *Problemata* in Late Medieval Encyclopaedic Culture", in *Aristotle's "Problemata" in different Times and Tongues*, ed. by Pieter De Leemans, Michè Goyens, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009.
- Vita Hippocratis... Eiusdem... Aphorismorum...*, Cracoviae: Hieronym Vietor, 1532.
- Warner Lyndan, *The Ideas of Man and Woman in Renaissance France. Print, Rhetoric, Law*, Burlington: Ashgate, 2011.
- Wąsik Wiktor, "Andrzej Glaber z Kobyłina problematysta polski", *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, vol. 102 (1916).
- Żołtarz Dawidów przez Mistrza Walentego Wróbla z Poznania na rzecz polską wyłożony*, Cracoviae: ex officina Ungleriana, 1539.

Notes

- Part of this research was supported by a NCN grant (No. 2014/13/B/HS2/00469 – "Kwestia godności kobiecej i jej przesłanki w *O ślachetności a zacności płci niewieściej* (1575) Macieja Wirzbięty. Studium przekładu" / Women's Dignity and its Premises in the Treatise *O ślachetności a zacności płci niewieściej* (1575) by Maciej Wirzbięta. Study of the translation).
- Two incomplete copies of this edition have survived in the Ossoliński Library in Wrocław (hereafter: the *Gadki Wr*) and the Public Library of the Capital City of Warsaw (hereafter: the *Gadki Wa*).
- More extensive information about the life of Andrzej Glaber and his work at the Jagiellonian University can be found in the works of Henryk Barycz (*Historia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w epoce humanizmu*, Kraków: no publisher, 1935, pp. 257-258 [hereafter: Barycz 1935]; "Glaber Andrzej", in *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 8, Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1959, pp. 28-30) and Wiktor Wąsik ("Andrzej Glaber z Kobyłina problematysta polski", *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, vol. 102 (1916), pp. 72-89).
- Cf. Thomas Venatorius, "Clarissimo ac ornatissimo viro Severino Bonero...", in *Aristophanes facetissimi comici Plutus*, Norimbergae: Petreius, 1531, sig. A₂r.-A₃v.
- Cf. "Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus Ioanni et Stanislao Boneris fratribus Polonis s.d.", in *P. Terentii Comoedias*, Basileae: in officina Frobeniana, 1532, sig. a₂v.-a₃v. Erasmus' dedication was discussed by Jan Bloemendal ("Erasmus and Comedy between the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period: an Exploration", in *Syntagmatia. Essays on Neo-Latin Literature in Honour of Monique Mund-Dophie and Gilbert Tournoy*, ed. Dirk Sacré, Jan Papy, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006, pp. 181-182).
- Cf. Andrzej Glaber of Kobylin, *Oświeconemu Panu, Panu Piotrowi Kmicie...*, in *Żołtarz Dawidów przez Mistrza Walentego Wróbla z Poznania na rzecz polską wyłożony*, Cracoviae: ex officina Ungleriana, 1539, sig. A₂v.
- Ibid.*, sig. A₃v.
- See Stefan Falimirz, *O ziołach i mocy gich*, Kraków: Florian Ungler [Helena Ungler], 1534. Na sig. Cr.-P, apart from the treatise *O rodzeniu człowieczym*, there were dissertations on the care of a newborn and a small child. The same passages were added to the herbaria of Hieronim Spiczynski (*O ziołach tutecznych y zamorskich*, [Kraków]: Helena Ungler, 1542, sig. F₃r.-I₃v) and Marcin Siennik (*Herbarz to jest ziół tutecznych, postronnych i zamorskich opisanie*, Kraków: Mikołaj Szarffenberger, 1568, pp. 441-474).

- ⁹ The activities of Maciej Miechowita at the University are discussed by Henryk Barycz (Barycz 1935, pp. 223-227) and Paul Knoll (“A Pearl of Powerful Learning” *The University of Cracow in the Fifteenth Century*, Leyden: Brill, 2016, pp. 217-218, 632). It should be mentioned that Andrzej Glaber also translated into Polish the work of Maciej Miechowita titled *De duabus Sarmatiis* (1517). The work titled *Polskie wypisanie dwojej krainy świata, który po łacinie Sarmatia zowq*, which was published for the first time in 1535, was analysed by Saskia Metan (*Wissen über das östliche Europa im Transfer. Edition, Übersetzung und Rezeption des “Tractatus de duabus Sarmatiis”*, Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 2019, pp. 115-156). See also: Katharina Piechocki, “Discovering Eastern Europe: Cartography and Translation in Maciej Miechowita’s “Tractatus de duabus Sarmatiis” (1517)”, in *Polish culture in the Renaissance. Studies in the arts, humanism and political thought*, ed. Danilo Facca, Valentina Lepri, Firenze: Firenze University Press, 2013, pp. 53-69.
- ¹⁰ See Matthias de Miechow, *Contra saevam pestem regimen accuratissimum. Editio trilingua: latina polona, anglica, transl.* and ed. Teresa Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, Danuta Turkowska, Cracoviae: Universitas Jagellonica. Institutum Historiae Medicinae, 1995.
- ¹¹ See Matthias de Miechow, *Conservatio sanitatis*, Cracoviae: per Hieronymum Vietorem, 1522.
- ¹² See *Vita Hippocratis... Eiusdem... Aphorismorum...*, Cracoviae: Hieronymus Vietor, 1532.
- ¹³ See H. Barycz 1935, p. 233.
- ¹⁴ *Andrzeja z Kobyłina Gadki o składności członków człowieczych z Arystotelesia i też z inszych medrców wybrane 1535*, ed. Józef Rostański, Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności, 1893, p. 3. All quotes from this work of Glaber come from this edition (hereafter: the *Gadki*).
- ¹⁵ Andrzej Glaber recalls here a fragment of the second book of *De anima* (421a). This book, already from the beginning of the 15th century, has been of interest to the professors of the Krakow Academy, who, like Glaber, often devoted lectures and printed comments on its subject. See Zenon Kukiewicz, *Filozofia człowieka i teoria duszy*, Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1975, pp. 14-76.
- ¹⁶ The *Gadki*, pp. 3-4.
- ¹⁷ See more on this subject: Ian Maclean, *Woman Triumphant. Feminism in French Literature 1610-1652*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966, pp. 3-12; Lyndan Warner, *The Ideas of Man and Woman in Renaissance France. Print, Rhetoric, Law*, Burlington: Ashgate, 2011, pp. 74-79.
- ¹⁸ The character of Wanda, the legendary ruler of Polish lands, who probably did not exist, was introduced to the tradition (also literary) by Wincenty Kadłubek, the author of *Chronica Polonorum* (ca. 1190-1208). The genesis of this character was discussed by Kazimierz Kumaniecki, “Podanie o Wandzie w świetle źródeł starożytnych”, *Pamiętnik Literacki*, vol. 22-23 (1925-1926), pp. 46-55.
- ¹⁹ The *Gadki*, p. 5.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 6.
- ²¹ “Admonimus, candide lector, in ipso statim limine nostrum hoc, quaecunque sit, congestum tractatui illi, qui vulgo *Problemata Aristotelis* inscribit, non omnino respondere, quandoquidem ille etsi non omnino reiciendus sit, neque tamen in omnibus probandus ob multa tum perperam scripta, tum obscoena et auribus Polonorum feminarumque praesertim minime digna. Quibus reiectis placuit alia in eorum locum substituere partim ex *Decretis medicorum*, partim ex ipsa *Aristotelis Physiognomia* desumptis, aequae utilia atque huic rei consentientia, id quod in secunda et tertia partibus cuilibet videre licebit. Libuit tamen titulum *Problematum* adfigere, quo votis plurimorum (qui chalcographum pro dicto tractatu lingua nobis vernacula imprimendo urgerent) responderet. Tu, quidquid id sit boni, consulto” (*ibid.*, p. 128).
- ²² “każdy z nas k temu się ciągnie, aby trzymał rzecz dobrą, a zasię chronił się rzeczy złej” (*ibid.*, p. 126).
- ²³ Those differences were noted by Iolanda Ventura (“Aristoteles fuit causa efficiens huius libri: On the Reception of Pseudo-Aristotle *Problemata* in Late Medieval Encyclopaedic Culture”, in *Aristotle’s “Problemata” in different Times and Tongues*, ed. by Pieter De Leemans, Michè Goyens, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009, p. 120-122 [hereafter Ventura 2009] and Ann Blair (“Authorship in the popular *Problemata Aristotelis*”, *Early Science and Medicine*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (1999), pp. 195-218 [hereafter: Blair 1999]).
- ²⁴ See Brian Lawn, *The Salernitan Questions: An Introduction to the History of Medieval and Renaissance Problem Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963, pp. 99-103; Blair 1999, p. 190. See also *ead.*, “The “*Problemata*” as a Natural Philosophical Genre”, in *Natural Particulars. Natur and the Disciplines in the Renaissance Europe*, ed. Anthony Grafton, Nancy Siraisi, Cambridge MA: The MIT Press, 1999, pp. 183-2004; Ventura 2009, pp. 113-144.
- ²⁵ See *Problemata Aristotelis determina[n]tia multas questiones de variis corporu[m] humanoru[m] dispositionibus valde audie[n]tib[us]* *suaues*, Kraków: Maciej Szarfenberg, 1520 (hereafter: *Problemata Aristotelis* Kr.).
- ²⁶ See *Problemata Arestotilis*, Magdeburg 1488.
- ²⁷ See *Problemata Arestotilis*, [Lipsk] ca. 1489/1490.
- ²⁸ See *Problemata Aristotelis determina[n]tia multas questiones de variis corporu[m] humanoru[m] dispositio[n]ib[us]*, Cologne: Heinrich Quentell, 1506.
- ²⁹ According to Blair 1999 (pp. 202-204), German translations, called “shortened”, could have been based on the Latin editions of the *Omnes homines* printed in Germany.
- ³⁰ See the *Gadki* Wa, sig. Q₂v.
- ³¹ See *ibid.*, sig. A₁v.
- ³² The development of title-pages, their functions in the Renaissance book are discussed in the studies included in the volumes: Margaret M. Smith, *The title-page, its early development 1460-1510*, London: The British Library-Oak Knoll Press, 2000; *La page de titre à la Renaissance: treize études suivies de cinquante-quatre pages de titre commentées et d’un lexique des termes relatifs à la page de titre*, ed. Jean-François Gilmont, Alexandre Vanautgaerden, Françoise Deraedt, Bruxelles: Brepols, 2008.
- ³³ It is a woodcut from sig. O₆v. of the copy of the *Gadki* Wr.
- ³⁴ Cf. Andrzej z Kobyłina, „Wszelkiemu człowiekowi dobrej wolej”, in Marcin Bielski, *Żywoty filozofów*, ed. Jerzy Krocak, Jacek Sokolski, preface Jacek Sokolski, Wrocław: Oficyna Wydawnicza ATUT–Wrocławskie Wydawnictwo Oświatowe, 2015, pp. 34-37.
- ³⁵ See Blair 1999, p. 212. It is interesting to compare here the title-page of the book published in Ulm in 1500: *Ain Büchlin, das durch die natürlichen Mayster Arestotelem, Avicennam, Galienum, Albertum unn andern natürlichen Maystern von mancherley seltzamen wunderlichen Fragen beschriben unn der menschlichen Natur gar nutzlich zewissen ist, unnd hayßt Propleumata Arestoteles*. The illustration depicts a female figure resting on the bed, wearing a crown on her head and a figure of a man in a crown standing next to her, holding her hand with one hand and lifting the other in a gesture of blessing. Three other men accompany him.
- ³⁶ See Blair 1999, pp. 198-199.
- ³⁷ See Ventura 2009, pp. 114-115.
- ³⁸ This is how the work began. Here, I quote the Kraków edition (*Problemata Aristotelis* Kr., sig. A₁r. Cf. also the editions: Magdeburg: no publisher, 1488, sig. A₁v.; Leipzig (?), ca. 1489/90, sig. A₂r., Cologne: Quentell, 1506, sig. A₁r.; Kraków: Szarfenberg, 1528, sig. A₁r. Compare also the fragment of the edition from 1569 (Lyon: Paganus) quoted by Blair 1999 (p. 197). For comparison, the quote from the beginning of the preface in the translation of Glaber (the *Gadki*, p. 7): “Aristoteles, nawyższy filozof u Greków, w księgach swych piwrszych, które nazwał *Metaphisica*, to jest o rzeczach nad przyrodzenie, pisze, iż każdy człowiek z natury swej ma tę żądzą, aby nieco umiał i wiedział” (“Aristotle, the greatest Greek philosopher, in his first books titled *Metaphisica*, i.e. about supernatural things, writes that by nature every man has a desire for knowledge and learning”).
- ³⁹ “Także to już jawno jest, iż nauka a umiejętność jest dobro wielkie. Aczkolwiek tedy wiele rzeczy umieć a wiedzieć jest pożyteczna rzecz, wszakoż od tego słuza początek uczynić, co sie około nas dzieje, czego kto nie wie, jakoż może rzeczy insze pobaczyć. Przeto tu nauka będzie dawana filozofij, to jest mądrości przyrodzonej, która nad insze nauki rozkosz czyni niemałą i pożytek człowiekowi na świecie, tak jego rozum oświecając, iż dla obaczenia rodu i składności rzeczy przyrodzonych obraca się i podnosi ku onej piwrszej a wiecznej bytności Pana Boga, a także go poznawszy (bowiem jego poznanie jest prawy żywot), chce się z nim złączyć a niejako porównać” (the *Gadki*, p. 8).
- ⁴⁰ At this stage of research, only one similar illustration has been found inside the *Omnes homines*, which depicted the female body and its anatomy. The woodcut in question is included in *Propleumata Aristotelis, Avicenne, Galeni und Alberti Magni darinn menschlicher und thierlicher natur* (Strasburg: Camerlander, 1543, sig. A₁r.). In this edition, the woodcut reappears next to an illustration depicting a male body, but without visible internal organs (*ibid.*, sig. F4v.-r.).
- ⁴¹ “Czemu u niewiast dłuższe włosy rosta, niżli u otroków? Odpowiedź: bowiem niewiasty wilgotniejsze są i pełniejsze flegmy, niżli otrocy, a tak więcej materyjej mają ku włosów rośnieniu i przedłużeniu. A zwłaszcza gdy już białej głowie przyrodzenie odpławu bywa, tedy więcej materyjej w głowę pochodzi, która włosy mnoży.
- Przecż niewiastam broda nie obrasta? Odpowiedź: Iż wszytka ona materyja, z której takowa broda pochodzi, wstępuje w głowę, a tak włosy gęstsze czyni i dłuższe, niż u otroka, a nie na brodzie” (The *Gadki*, p. 11).
- ⁴² *Problemata Aristotelis Omnes homines* Kr., sig. A₂v.

⁴³ *Ein schöner Tractat mancherlay Frag, Menschlicher v[n]d Thyerlicher natur...*, [Augsburg]: no publisher, 1531, sig. A₁v.

⁴⁴ “Czemu serce jest wpośród ciała? Odpowiedź: Aby tak wszystkim członkom jednako dawało żywność, jako słońce dlatego też jest w pośrodku planet postawiono, aby wszystkim tak wirzchnim, jako i spodnim światłość jednako podawało. Tak iż też starzy filozofi Pitagorycy powiadali, jakoby niebo było wielkie zwierzę, którego serce jest słońce. Czemu między wszystkimi członkami serce napierwej ożywa, jako pisze Arystoteles: serce (praw) naprzód żywie a pośledz umiera? Odpowiedź: Bowiem ono jest początkiem żywota wszystkich członków, które ożywia, tak iż bez niego żaden nie może żyw być; godzi się tedy, iż kto chce nieco komu dać, musi to sam pirwej mieć. Tu się godzi wiedzieć, jako piszą lekarze, iż z nasienia albo z plemienia męskiego w macy niewieściej naprzód się uczyni błonka, która ono plemię okrążywszy w sobie zadzierza, tamże w pośrodku (jako widzimy w żółtku jajecznym) zarodzi się niejaki duch sprawujący, który naprzód serce sprawi, potym ze krwi co najsubtylniejszy zniagnała sprawi wątrobę, ztym z grubszej a z zimnej wilgoty sprawi mózg i tuk w kości. Tamże więc serce, wzięwszy większą moc, podawa onym członkom żywność, z której się i drugie potym mnożą, zniagnała narastając” (The *Gadki*, p. 49). Cf. *Problemata Aristotelis* Kr, sig. C₃v.-C₄r.: “Quare cor sit in medio animalis? Respondetur quod ideo, ut aequaliter omnibus membris influat vitam, et ergo compartur Soli, qui est situatus in medio planetarum, ut aliis planetis influat lumen. Et ergo Pythagorici dicentes celum esse magnum animal, dixerunt Solem esse cor illius animalis [...]. Quare inter omnia membra cor primo generatur, ut dicit Aristoteles, quod cor est primum vivens et ultimum moriens. Respondetur secundum Aristotelem in Libro de iuventute et senectute, quia cor est principium et origo vite et omnium membrorum et sine illo nullum membrum vivere potest. Nota secundum physicos, de semine in matrice retento, primo generatur quedam pellicula, circumstans ipsum semen post hoc generatur typus formativus, qui ex subtiliori sanguine primo facit cor, et de sanguine minus subtili successive facit epar, et de sanguine crasso e frigido facit medullam et cerebrum.”

⁴⁵ A good example is provided here by Chapter 3 titled *On the nose* (The *Gadki*, pp. 22-23).

⁴⁶ See, for example, a fragment of Chapter 11 *On the neck* (*ibid.*, p. 37): “Czemu szyja ma w sobie pustość, jaka jest w gardle na przodku od języka począwszy? Odpowiedź: bowiem tam jest potrzebna sprawa dwu części: jednej ku wpuszczaniu pokarmu w żołądek i w jelita, ta po grecku zowią isophagus, jakoby połykając; drugiej ku braniu i wypuszczaniu wiatru od płuc i ku sercu, ta jest sucha i okrąga, jakoby z obrączek złożona, a to dla wypuszczania lepszego dźwięku w mowie” (“Why is the neck empty in the throat from the beginning of the tongue? Answer: for two activities: one is letting the food into the stomach and into intestines, which is called isophagus in Greek, or swallowing; the other is to inhale and exhale the air from the lungs to the heart and it is dry, round and composed as if of rings to release a better sound while speaking”). Cf. *Problemata Aristotelis* Kr, sig. B₄r.: “Quare collum sit concavum, et maxime in anteriori parte circa linguam? Respondetur, quia ibi sunt duo meatus, unus deferens cibum ad membra nutritiva, ut ad stomachum et ad epar. Et talis, secundum medicos, dicitur hysophagus, a fagin grece, quod est comedere latine. Quare vocalis arteria sit anulosa? Respondetur, quod est propter flexibilitatem, que producit bonam resonantiam”.

⁴⁷ See the fragment of Chapter 9 *On the taste* (The *Gadki*, pp. 32-33): “Czemu w słodkim smaku człowiek więcej się kocha, niż w inszym? Odpowiedź: Bowiem on jest ciepły a wilgotny, a tak ku zachowaniu natury własniejszy, aby też ciepłem swym zbytkie zimne rozpuszczał, a wilgotnością plugawstwa wszystkie opłókawał. Ale smak kwaśny, cirkpi albo ostry dla zimna w nim panującego ścisła członki, ściąga i obraża, przeto się w nim nie kochamy. Gorzki też smak barzo zapala, dlatego rzeczy gorzkie zdrowsze są ku pożywieniu lecie, aniżeli zimie. Czemu lekarstwa pospolicie gorzkie bywają? Odpowiedź: Dla lepszego rozpuszczenia grubych zbytków. Bowiem tak lekarze piszą, iż kwaśne rzeczy wysuszają, gorzkie grzejąc roztopiają, słodkie zatykają, a to iż słodką rzecz żyły więcej w się ciągną, niżli jaką inszą, dla przyrodzonej przyjaźni ku smakowi słodkiemu, który też człowieka więcej tuczy” (“Why does a man love sweet taste more than others? Answer: Because it is warm and humid, and naturally more appropriate to dissolve the unnecessary cold, and to cleanse all filthiness with moisture. While the sour, tart or spicy taste, because of the cold in it, squeezes the members, shrinks and irritates them, and that is why we do not love it. The bitter taste is too hot, that is why it is healthier to eat bitter things in summer and not in winter. Why are medicines usually bitter? Answer: for a more effective dissolution of what is dense and unnecessary. This is how the doctors write that acidic things dry out, bitter create heat and melt, sweet

glue shut, and, therefore the veins attract the sweet food more than anything else, for the innate taste preference for the sweet taste, which also fattens man”). Cf. *Problemata Aristotelis* Kr, sig. B₃v.-B₄r.: “Quare magis delectatur de dulci sapore, quam amaro, vel in alio? Respondetur, quia natura iocunda delectatur dulcetudine. Ratio, quia dulce est calidum et humidum, et per caliditatem humiditates superfluas dissolvit, et per humiditatem abluit immundicia. Sed sapor acetosus, sive stipticus, vel ponticus, propter frigus in ipso praedominans, nimium constringit, et pungit, et membra offendit in purgatione. Ergo non delectatur in illo sapore, quia medici volunt, quod homines in estate et in vehementi calore non debet comedere aliquid amarum. Ratio est, quia amaritudo generat calorem. Sed solummodo in hyme debemus comedere amara, ergo dicit Aristoteles in Libro de nutrimento et nutribili, quod dulce est amicum nature et maxime nutrit.”

⁴⁸ Cf. Lesley Dean-Jones, “Menstrual Bleeding according to the Hippocratics and Aristotle”, *Transaction of the American Philological Association*, vol. 119 (1989), pp. 177-191. The subject of the popularity and modification of the views of Hippocrates and Aristotle in the later medieval and early modern tradition was discussed by Rebeca Flemming (*Medicine and the Making of Roman Women. Gender, Nature, and Authority from Celsus to Galen*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, pp. 288-357).

⁴⁹ “Czemu niewiasty mają gładszą skórę i subtelniejszą, niżli mężowie? Odpowiedź: Bowiem wszytką miąższość materyjej, z której skóra bywa, wybiega precz wilgocią upławów, która u otroków zostawa, a przeto one nie tak bywają kudłate na ciele (chyba iżby która była gorętszego przyrodzenia nad inne). Przeto też białym głowom nie tak często cieką krew z nosa i nie miewają częstych bolączek pod pachą albo gdzie indziej” (The *Gadki*, pp. 12-13). Cf. *Problemata Aristotelis* Kr, sig. A₃v.: “Quare mulieres sunt valde plane et formose respectu virorum? Respondetur secundum Aristotelem, Primo de generatione animalium, quia in mulieribus tota humiditas et superfluitas (quae est materia pilorum corporis) expellitur cum materia menstruali, que manet in viris, per vapores transiens in pilos. Et huius signum est, quia mulieres raro habent fluxum ex naribus et apostemata, et ulcera, quia talis materia eiicitur cum menstruo.”

⁵⁰ Cf. the *Gadki*, s, p. 17, 40, 42.

⁵¹ “Bowiem tego czasu pochodzą z niewiasty duchy a pary jadowite, w głowę jej z żołądka wstępujące, które przez oczy jako przez rzadką rzecz a subtylną mają rychlejsze przejście, niżli przez insze członki, a także je w ten czas zarażają. Znamię tego jest, iż tego czasu one miewają też głowy bolenie, oczy wilgoci pełne a drugim ciekące, któraż z wiatrem ku onemu źrządu pochodząca zaraża je i psuje” (*ibid.*, p. 21).

⁵² This quality, since the times of Aristotle, was considered one of the most important women’s characteristics, allowing to justify and emphasize other differences of the female sex (not only physiological, but also related to the character traits of women). More on this subject, see Maryanne Cline Horowitz, “Aristotle and Woman”, *Journal of the History of Biology*, vol. 9/2 (1976), pp. 183-213; Marguerite Deslauriers, “Sexual Difference in Aristotle’s Politics and His Biology”, *The Classical World*, vol. 102/3 (2009), pp. 215-231, but also Evelyn Berriot-Salvadore, *Un corps, un destin. La femme dans la médecine de la Renaissance*, Paris: Honoré Champion, 1993, pp. 17-23; Jean-Claude Margolin, “La nature de la femme sous regard médical à la Renaissance”, in *Médecine et médecins au XVIe siècle. Actes du IXe colloque du Puy-en-Velay*, ed. Marie Viallon-Schoneveld, Saint-Etienne: Publications de l’Université de Saint-Étienne, 2002, pp. 29-30.

⁵³ Cf. “Czemu cyce rostą na piersiach? Odpowiedź: Aby tam dla bliskości ciepła serdecznego trawiła sie a dostawała gruba ona krew ciała, z której sie mleko czyni ku pokarmu dziecięcemu” (“Why do breasts grow on the chest? Answer: Due to the proximity of the warmth of the heart so that the dense blood from the body was transported and digested there to produce milk - food for the child”; the *Gadki*, p. 43). Cf. *Problemata Aristotelis* Kr., sig. B₄r.: “Quare mamille sunt posite supra pectus? Respondetur, quod pectus est sedes cordis calidissimi, ergo ibi mamille generantur, ut menstruum ad eas missum, calori cordis vicinum, citius dequeretur et in materiam lactis converteretur”.

⁵⁴ “gdyby tak nie było, tedy nie mógłby żaden płód trwać dla jadowitej onej wilgoty, która sie w mleko obraca” (The *Gadki*, p. 43).

⁵⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 43: “Czemu niewiasty tylko dwa cyce, gdyż u inszych zwierząt bywa więcej? Odpowiedź: Bowiem niewiasta tylko jedno dziecię miewa, czasem dwoje, przeto dosyć ma parę cyców, ale drugie zwierzęta iż więcej dzieci rodzą, przeto też więcej naczynia takiego potrzebują” (“Why do women have two breasts, although other animals have more? Answer: because a woman has only one child, sometimes two, that is why one pair of breasts is enough, and with other animals where more babies are born, more such organs are needed.”). Cf. *Pro-*

blemata Aristotelis Kr., sig. B8r.: “Quare mulier habet tantum duas mamillas et aliqua bruta, ut porca et canicula, habent decem vel plures? Respondetur, quia frequenter mulier concipit masculum unum vel femellam, et huic sufficit una mamilla vel due. Sed alia bruta habent multas mamillas: primo fetui primam, secundo secundam et sic de aliis per ordinem.”

⁵⁶ Cf. the *Gadki*, p. 44: “Jakie cyce nalepsze ku żywieniu dziecięcia, jestli wielkie, małe albo średnie? Odpowiedź: [...] Ale średnie najlepsze, bo co wczas, to dobrze, gdyż wszytka dobroć rzeczy każdej w szrodku zależy” (“What breasts are the best for feeding a baby: big, small or medium? Answer: [...] but average are the best, because what is in the middle, is good, and all goodness of every thing depends on the middle.” Cf. *Problemata Aristotelis* Kr., sig. B8v.: “Queritur, que mamille sunt magis valentes pueri lactantibus, an parve, vel magre, an mediocres? [...] mediocres sunt optime: ex quo omne medium est optimum.”

⁵⁷ Helen King wrote about the participation of women in the process of fertilization in Hippocrates' writings (*Hippocrates' Woman: Reading the Female Body in Ancient Greece*, London: Routledge, 1998).

⁵⁸ A detailed discussion of the fertilization process according to Galen can be found in: Anthony Preus, “Galen's Criticism of Aristotle's Conception Theory”, *Journal of the History of Biology*, vol. 10/1 (1977), pp. 78-80; Michael Boylan, “Galen's Conception Theory”, *Journal of the History of Biology*, vol. 19/1 (1986), pp. 69-77.

⁵⁹ “Czemu u brzemienniej jeden cycek twardszy bywa, niż drugi? Odpowiedź: Jest to pewne znamię płci płodu, bowiem gdy cycek prawy twardszy, niż lewy, znamię jest poczęcia płodu otrocego, który zawsze przy prawej stronie boku się poczyna; przeto też ku onej stronie więcej sie mleka schadza ku żywieniu, a tak prawy cycek od niego twardnieje. Zasię przeciwnym obyczajem bywa na lewej stronie, gdy sie samica poczyna” (The *Gadki*, p. 45). Cf. *Problemata Aristotelis* Kr., sig. B8r.: “Quare mulier impregnata, concipiens masculum in utero, dextram mamillam habet duriorem quam sinistram? Respondetur, secundum Hippocratem, quia masculi concipiuntur in dextro latere matricis, ergo tunc menstruum fluit ad dextram mamillam ipsam indurando.”

⁶⁰ “chore, blade, niedostateczne w mowie” (The *Gadki*, p. 81).

⁶¹ “wilgot grubych, niestrawnych i też zakażonych [...] żądają k sobie potraw też swej natury” (*ibid.*, pp. 73-74). For comparison, this passage in the Krakow edition of the Latin version reads as follows: “Quare mulieres et maxime pregnantis primo et tertio mense habunt appetitum inordinatum edendo argillam, carbones, pisces et sic de aliis. Respondetur, secundum Constantinum ut supra, quia quales sunt humores in stomacho illarum mulierum, consimilia nutrimenta appetunt et quia in mulieribus impregnatis sunt putridi et corrupti humores replentes stomachum, ideo appetunt similia; cum omne simile applaudat sibi simili” (sig. C3v.). It is found in *De stomacho* chapter.

⁶² Cf. a similar fragment in the herbarium by Falimirz (*O ziolach i moczogich*, sig. C3r.).