

CHAPTER 5

The Tradition of Studying the *Categories* in the early Middle Ages (until c. 1200): a revised working catalogue of glosses, commentaries and treatises

John Marenbon

Those who specialize in medieval philosophy are used to the idea that commentaries on authoritative texts are the places where they will find much of the most thorough, systematic and original thinking of the time. But they have been inclined, at least until recently, to neglect *anonymous* commentaries. Most strikingly, Charles Lohr's catalogue of medieval commentaries on Aristotle is organized alphabetically, by authors, and omits those which cannot be attributed to a named master.¹ As a result, this indispensable tool for later medieval philosophy is almost useless as a guide to the Aristotelianism of the twelfth century and earlier. This Aristotelianism, based on the logical corpus available then, survives to a great extent in anonymous commentaries. The one celebrated counter-example, the commentaries of Peter Abelard, is precisely the exception which proves the rule, or at least which throws it into sharp relief.²

In order to make this wealth of material, central for understanding early medieval philosophy, more available, in the early 1990s I

1. All references are by short-title. Full titles and bibliographical details are to be found in the bibliography. See Lohr, 'Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries'.

2. There is, indeed, now doubt about the authenticity of all but the *Logica Ingredientibus* commentary by Abelard: see below under C₅ and note 10, below; and , for the *Logica Nostrorum Petitioni Sociorum*, see Marenbon, *Abelard in Four Dimensions*, Chapter 1.

compiled a 'Working Catalogue of Medieval Latin Commentaries and Glosses on Aristotelian Logical Texts, Before c. 1150 AD', which included commentaries on the two Aristotelian texts in the pre-1150 school syllabus, the *Categories* and *On Interpretation*, along with those on Porphyry's *Isagoge*, which had been part of the logical curriculum since antiquity. Although I was able to examine in the flesh or by microfilm most of the manuscripts concerned, the Catalogue drew greatly on the work of others. Though neglected, these commentaries had not been completely ignored. A handful of scholars, including some of the greatest, had examined them: from Cousin and Hauréau in the nineteenth century to Grabmann and De Rijk and Luscombe in the twentieth century, and, most recently, Yukio Iwakuma.³ My main purpose in the Catalogue was to bring together and systematize their work, especially by providing a simple system for referring to the individual commentaries, and for distinguishing between the main different types, indicating what studies and editions existed and suggesting, where possible, a rough date or milieu.⁴ Seven years later, I took the opportunity provided by a volume of my collected articles to add a supplement to the Catalogue, and to extend the finishing date to c. 1200.⁵ A great part of the extra information and additional entries came from Yukio Iwakuma, whose knowledge of the whole field is rivalled only by his generosity in sharing it. Yukio has also been the most important influence on this present, third version of the Catalogue, confined – in keeping with the volume – to the *Categories*. Initially, my intention had been just to amalgamate the original and the supplement into a single list, adding any new bibliography and also a few treatises, which are closely related to the commentary tradition. By providing me with transcriptions of almost all the material, Yukio made it possi-

3. See the entries under these names in the bibliography.

4. My model was the Catalogue of commentaries on Boethius's *De topicis differentiis* and Aristotle's *Topics* in Green-Pedersen, *The Tradition*. Like him, I gave each commentary an alphanumeric tag ('C1 ...' for the *Categories*, for example). These tags are now commonly used by specialists.

5. Marenbon, 'Supplement'.

ble for me to augment and revise my earlier list more substantially.⁶ Often, with more evidence, historians learn that they know less: some of these changes consist in removing suggested attributions or making datings broader and vaguer.

The Introduction to the original version of the Catalogue discusses in detail the literary genre of early medieval glosses and the typology of the twelfth-century commentaries, along with the techniques they used. Here I shall give only the briefest summary, so as to clarify the way the Catalogue is presented and the technical terms it uses. Following it, I provide a brief guide to the material catalogued, and some suggestions for further research.

The Types of Material: paraphrases, treatises, glosses and commentaries

There is a simple rule about how, in the main, scholars went about assimilating and teaching logical texts (and many other school-texts) in the early Middle Ages. In the earliest period, until the late ninth century, they worked by compilation and paraphrase. This period overlaps with one, starting c. 850, in which glossing became the usual method of study until it was replaced by teaching preserved in the form of continuous commentaries. The earliest such commentaries which survive date, with one exception, to 1100 or not long before, but it is likely that they were being produced during the later eleventh century.⁷ With regard to the *Categories*, the first two periods correspond roughly to the time when the main school-text for studying Aristotle's *Categories* was the *Categoriae Decem*, a Latin

6. Yukio Iwakuma is planning to make all his material available on a web-site. There are, however, considerable technical difficulties and, until then, any student or scholar contemplating serious work in this area should contact Professor Iwakuma.

7. See Marenbon, 'Synthesis', 199. The earliest datable continuous commentaries, other than *glossae collectae* and C4 – and its paired *Isagoge* commentary (P2) – which abbreviate and modify Boethius, are a commentary on *De topicis differentiis* (B3) and fragments of commentaries on the *Isagoge* (P4a and P4b) in MS Pommersfelden Schlossbibliothek 16/2764, which have been dated to the late eleventh century. B3 has been dated to c. 1090 and tentatively attributed to Arnulf of Laon: see Hansen, 'An Early Commentary', 46-7.

paraphrase, wrongly attributed to Augustine. From about 1000, a Boethian translation of Aristotle's own text came into general use.⁸

The term 'glosses' might suggest an individual reader's notes, but the interlinear and marginal annotations in question usually fall into sets, and it is clear that in many cases, either a text would be copied along with a set of glosses, or else a set would be added as a whole. But, although there are manuscripts which can be said to have the same (or, rather, similar) glosses, the sets of glosses lack the integrity and stability of independent literary works. Glossators add, omit, rearrange, combine and separate material; sometimes they copy glosses from more than one source; sometimes the same manuscript has glosses added at different times by different hands (the glosses in ms Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 12949 are a prime example). In the case of the *Categoriae Decem* glosses, the most important distinction is between a set of glosses heavily influenced by ideas from John Scottus Eriugena (see below) and a set of standard glosses, but it is important to bear in mind that neither set remains exactly the same from manuscript to manuscript, and there are also 'eccentric' glosses, not found elsewhere, in every copy. There are very few glossed manuscripts of the *Categoriae* itself in translation, as opposed to the *Categoriae Decem*, because it was only coming into use at the time when glossing was ceasing to be the main method of study. These glosses seem to be the work of individual readers.

Although glosses are sometimes written out to form a continuous commentary (*glossae collectae*), as in the case of C1 and C18, commentaries proper constitute a different genre. One of the bases for the logical commentary tradition were Boethius's commentaries on

8. See Minio-Paluello, 'Note' and Marenbon, 'The Latin Tradition', 38-9 and Marenbon 'La logique en occident latin' on the replacement of the *Categoriae Decem* by study of Aristotle's text in translation and the wider setting of this change in the turning from a 'Roman' to a 'Boethian' tradition of logic. Two Boethian translations of the *Categoriae* have been distinguished by their editor (see Catalogue below, (1)), one of which is his original translation, the other a composite version, probably made up from Boethian material. The composite version was the text normally used by twelfth-century logicians, and references to passages in the text below are given to the pages and lines of the edition of it in *Aristoteles Latinus*.

Aristotle and Porphyry – in the case of the *Categories*, a single one (if he wrote two, as he did for the *Isagoge* and *On Interpretation*, the second did not survive to the Middle Ages). A vivid illustration is provided by C₄, which antedates the other commentaries by nearly a century: it simply re-arranges material from Boethius in question-and-answer form.

Boethius continued to provide both the model and the basis for far more original and ambitious commentaries, but medieval teachers introduced a novel, non-Boethian element into their method. Boethius had assumed that he was writing for readers who, even if beginners, could understand the basic structure of Aristotle's argument. His commentary therefore takes the form of discursive discussion of Aristotle's points and their implications. Medieval teachers of logic tended to think that their pupils, who were often children or hardly older, needed more help in understanding the literal meaning of the text. They therefore introduced word by word explanation of the authoritative text, sometimes undertaken by means of explanatory paraphrase (which would often be put into the mouth of the author). In most cases, this literal element was joined with more discursive comments (on the Boethian model) to form what are called here 'composite commentaries'. Sometimes, however, a commentary consists just, or almost entirely, of the literal element ('literal commentary'). There are also a few commentaries ('problem commentaries') which include no detailed discussion of the letter of the text.

The distinction between what should count as a fragmentary commentary and what are merely logical notes is a fluid one. I have erred on the side of generosity here in including and numbering separately (C₂₉, C₃₀, C₃₃) note-like material which might well be taken from longer commentaries, or at least be based on lectures which, themselves, would have been commentaries on the *Categories*. By contrast, the twelfth-century works listed in Section 2 – the sections on the *Categories* in the *Dialecticas* of Garlandus and Abelard, and the *Tractatus Lemovicensis de praedicamentis* are substantial treatises, but in all three cases based very closely on the tradition of commentary on the *Categories*.

A Survey of the Material

The material divides neatly at around the year 1100: too neatly, indeed, since it most likely that some commenting on the translation of the *Categories* on the twelfth-century model went on in the eleventh century; C₄, mentioned above, an abbreviation of Boethius's commentary, put into dialogue-form, is the only remaining trace of it. In the earliest period, there are the simplified accounts of Cassiodorus and, largely based on it, Isidore. Alcuin's *Dialectica* uses these two works, but he also includes long excerpts from the *Categoriae Decem*, thereby giving far more space to the *Categories* than to any other branch of logic. Fifty or so years later, Eriugena, impressed like Alcuin by the theological use Augustine made of the *Categories* in his *De trinitate* and by the supposed fact that he was responsible for the treatise which brought them to Latin readers, would give them prominence in his *Periphyseon*, and the tradition of *Categoriae Decem* glosses which grew up at the end of the ninth century would repay the compliment, by explaining the logical treatise in, often totally inappropriate, Eriugenan terms. There was also a strand (represented by the 'standard glosses') of more sober, logical explanation, which by the eleventh century ousted nearly all Eriugenan traces. The glossators to the *Categoriae Decem* manage for the most part without the help of Boethius's commentary (which, of course, is not a commentary on the text they had in front of them). But in Sankt Gallen 274, from the late ninth century, which combines Eriugenan, standard and other glosses, Boethius's commentary is used.⁹

The twelfth-century commentaries divide into five classes, though the first of them has just one member, and the fifth is an *omnium gatherum*. They consist of: I] C₁₀ – Abelard's *Logica Ingredientibus* commentary; II] C₇, C₈ and C₁₄ (the 'C8 Complex') – a 'standard' twelfth-century commentary on the *Categories*; III] C₁₅, C₁₆, C₁₇, C₂₀, C₂₁, C₂₅, C₂₉ – commentaries which report the views of Alberic (and sometimes other views), or are linked to such commentaries; IV] C₁₂, C₂₆ – commentaries which derive from particular

9. This is a quick summary of ideas I have developed at greater length elsewhere: *From the Circle*, 'The Latin Tradition', 21-40; 'La logique en occident latin'.

later twelfth-century schools (other than that of Alberic); V] C5, C6, C11, C13, C18, C22, C24, C27, C28, C30, C31, C32, C33 – others. I shall look at each group briefly in turn: -

I. Twelfth-century logicians are hardly ever named as the authors of their commentaries (and, in many cases, these commentaries are far from being literary works by a given, single author). Peter Abelard is the great exception. Probably because he was the most famous logician of the age, his name was attached both to a commentary of which he is certainly the author, the *Logica Ingredientibus*, and also to other commentaries which he probably did not write.¹⁰ Not only, then, is C10 the one twelfth-century *Categories* commentary which can be securely attributed to an author. It is also, thanks to knowledge about Abelard's life and the chronology of his works, the one commentary that can be dated with reasonable precision. Most probably, Abelard issued the *Logica Ingredientibus* as a whole c. 1119. Possibly he wrote up the commentaries one by one, but even so, there would not be reason to date the one on the *Categories* much later. Possibly he inserted a few discursive passages later – but this hypothesis is unproven.¹¹ Abelard's commentary therefore provides

10. The *Logica Ingredientibus* commentaries on the *Isagoge*, *Categories* and *On Interpretation* in ms Milan Ambrosiana M63 sup each have incipits and explicits attributing them to Abelard, and the commentary to *De differentiis topicis* in MS Paris Bibliothèque Nationale lat 7493 also has an attribution to him. The only other copy of part of this commentary (apart from a fragment), on *On Interpretation* in MS Berlin Staatsbibliothek 2° 624, is anonymous. Commentaries on the *Isagoge*, *On Interpretation* and *De divisione*, preceding C5 in MS Paris Bibliothèque Nationale lat 13368 are attributed to Abelard (but by a hand different from the scribe of the text): the case for dis-attributing them is made in the articles by Cameron and Martin cited below, in the entry for C5. The commentary on the *Isagoge* known as the *Logica Nostrorum Petitioni Sociorum* is attributed to Abelard in the only manuscript, MS Lunel Bibliothèque Municipale 6. Although most of the material here probably records Abelard's teaching, there is reason to believe that it is not a work compiled and checked by Abelard himself: see Marenbon, *Abelard in Four Dimensions*, Chapter 1. (My conclusions are subject to correction by the findings of Peter King and Chris Martin in their new edition, which will look much more thoroughly into the question of authenticity.)

11. See Marenbon, *Abelard in Four Dimensions*, Chapter 1, for detailed discussion. The suggestion that Abelard inserted some longer, discursive passages some time after he

researchers with a precious fixed point of reference. Not only are Abelard's discussions themselves fascinating – the best evidence, along with parallel passages in his *Dialectica* and a few texts in his *Isagoge* commentary, for his metaphysics; they may also offer a way of beginning to order and understand some of the other material.

II. A brief scan of the Catalogue will show that, in general, the *Categories* commentaries (and the same is true for commentaries on other logical texts) are each found in no more than one manuscript. But there is an exception. There are five manuscripts of C8 (counting the two different copies in the London codex as separate manuscripts), and C7 and C14 (each in a single manuscript) are close enough to C8 to be considered, in a broad sense, the same commentary, the 'C8 Complex'. The C8 Complex represents a common pattern in twelfth-century commentaries: for the other logical textbooks, there is also in each case a commentary which was copied in a few manuscripts and so might be called a 'standard' commentary; and the same phenomenon of standard commentaries is found for other school-texts: for example, the early twelfth-century *Glosulae* to Priscian, in five manuscripts, or William of Conches's commentary on Boethius's *De consolazione philosophiae*.¹²

The standard commentaries to logical and grammatical texts are, however, each single works only in a broad sense – they are layered, adaptive compositions: successive masters have taken an existing text, changing and adding to it according to their own ideas. Yukio Iwakuma has worked out in detail the textual relations between the different manuscripts of the C8 Complex.¹³ The earliest version of the text that survives is that contained in *L*, *L** and *M*, and which breaks off before Chapter 6 on quantity. It might well itself be made up of earlier layers; at its foundation is Boethius's commentary. *V* and *P* each add different extra material to this com-

had written the rest of his commentaries is made in Jacobi and Strub, 'Peter Abaelard'.

12. On the *Glosulae*, see Grondeux and Catach, 'Les *Glosulae*'; counting a treatise version, the early printed edition and lost or conjectural copies, there are 14 witnesses in all. For William's commentary, see William of Conches, *Glosae*, lxxx – cxii.

13. See 'Vocales Revisited', 89-91. I have been able to add some more detail by using Iwakuma's own collation of the texts and transcriptions.

mon text, and *P* re-writes various passages of the common text. For these chapters, *A* (C14) contains a text of which about a third consists of passages identical (or nearly) to ones in the common text, and two thirds of its own additions, and *Q* (C7) has its own text, which has some parallels with the common text and some with the additions in *V*. Chapter 6, on quantity, shows great diversity in the theories offered in the different manuscripts that include it (*VPAQ*), but also phrases in common. From Chapter 7 until they finish, *Q* and *A* have substantially the same text. From Chapter 7 until early in Chapter 8 (64.14; 9a14) *V*'s text has parallels with that of *QA* and fewer with that in *P*, but from then onwards *P* and *V* have largely the same text, with a few additions peculiar to each. The *QA* and *PV* texts from 9a14 onwards are different, but with some passages in common.

This comparison of the versions shows that each text is the result of a complicated process, many stages of which have probably vanished without trace. It is certainly unlikely that all the texts can be put into a single line of development, although for Chapters 1-5 it is at least reasonably sure that the *L*, *L**, *M* text and the layer of *VP* which it constitutes are earlier than the additions in *P* and *V*, the changes in *P*, the new material in *A* and the *Q* text.¹⁴ Iwakuma once attributed C8, as a whole, to William of Champeaux, but he now thinks that only the common material in Chapters 1 to 5 are by him, and that the *V* revision is the work of a pupil.¹⁵ Yet, despite the credit Iwakuma's deep familiarity with the material deserves, his arguments for this attribution are far from solid.¹⁶ In one case which has been studied – the question of to which category *vox* belongs –

14. Iwakuma also believes (*Vocales Revisited*, 90-1) that *P* and *Q* can be seen as fairly independent revisions of the common text; *V* as based on the common text, *P* and *Q*; and *A* as based on *V* and *Q*.

15. Iwakuma made the attribution in 'Pierre Abélard', 102-8, but in 'William of Champeaux on Aristotle's Categories', he restricts the attribution to the common text, and refines that position in *Vocales Revisited*.

16. For criticism, see (as well as the article cited in the following footnote) Cameron, *William of Champeaux*; Cameron, 'What's in a Name?'; Jacobi, 'William of Champeaux', 268-70 (who accepts that Iwakuma's arguments show that C8 and other texts belong at least (270) "to the surroundings of Master William."

where William's views are known from direct reports such as Abelard's, it seems that none of the versions of C8 presents them precisely, although his ideas have clearly been influential on many of them.¹⁷ The same study shows that there is also clearly a close connection between the issues discussed in these texts and those considered by Abelard in his *Dialectica* and *Logica Ingredientibus* in the second decade of the twelfth century. But it is not yet possible to place particular versions of C8 with any confidence before or after these works.¹⁸ Because of the way changes and additions between the texts highlight developments in thought, the C8 complex contains very precious evidence about the evolution of thought about logic and metaphysics in the earlier twelfth century, which it is not, however, possible, in the present state of research, fully to interpret.

III. Alberic was probably the leading logician in Paris in the 1130s apart from Abelard, and he was Abelard's determined opponent. His most notable achievement was to have pointed out the fatal flaw which undermined Abelard's beautifully contrived system of propositional logic.¹⁹ But he attacked Abelard on many issues, and presented himself as the opponent of vocalism or nominalism. No work attributable to him survives,²⁰ but de Rijk has discovered commentaries, including two on the *Categorías* (C15, C17), which stem from his milieu and report his views. To this group a number of others can be added, either because they refer to him (C16, C25, C29)

17. Rosier-Catach, 'Vox and Oratio'; cf. Grondeux and Rosier-Catach, 'Sur la nature catégorielle'.

18. Iwakuma dates the common material to the very beginning of the twelfth century ('Vocales Revisited', 171 and the V revision to before 1110 ('William of Champeaux', 320), but he places the latest version (A = C14) as late as the mid-twelfth century ('William of Champeaux', 323-4).

19. This achievement has been documented and discussed by Christopher Martin: see, e.g. C.J. Martin, 'Logic', 191-2.

20. In 'Vocalism, Nominalism', 55, I suggested that C21, the fragmentary beginning of a commentary, was Alberic's, because views attributed elsewhere to Alberic are put forward here by the writer himself. But there is not an exact correspondence, and this method of attribution is unreliable in an area where ideas were routinely taken and repeated.

or are linked in their concerns to these five commentaries (C16, C20, C21). Abelard, too, is an important presence in some of this material. In particular, C15 and C17 very often juxtapose the views of ‘Master P.’ (Abelard) and ‘Master A.’ (Alberic), whilst C20 (a fragment which does not, in fact, name Alberic) mentions the views of Roscelin and Abelard, but rejects them (and, indeed, is generally critical of those who hold the *sententia nominum* or who say that genera and species are *voces*). Although the links with Alberic allow these commentaries to be grouped together and suggest that those which contrast his views with Abelard’s are reporting on logical teaching in Paris in the 1130s, some of them may be later. For example, C16 – which like C20 is strongly critical of the *vocales* – refers to what happened “before the time of Alberic”, before giving Alberic’s views and then his own, suggesting that its writer is a master of the generation after Alberic.²¹

IV. The *Albricani*, or followers of Alberic, formed one of the logico-philosophical schools of the second half of the twelfth century. Two commentaries have been shown to stem from members of two other, important schools: the *Porretani*, followers of Gilbert of Poitiers (C16), and the *nominales*, followers of Abelard (C 26). These two texts are among the most substantial philosophically, but also the most challenging, of all those catalogued – fortunately they have both been properly edited by Sten Ebbesen who has also begun the business of interpreting them.²²

V. The list of commentaries which do not fall into any of these classes may seem dauntingly long, but half of its members (C11, C13,

21. The fullest study of one of these commentaries, that by Joke Spruyt (‘Twelfth-century glosses’) on C15, concludes that the work is lacking in depth compared with Abelard, and points out especially the peculiarity of this commentary – that it contains many *instantiae*-like arguments: objections and counter-arguments which seem like logical exercises, unrelated to the text. But perhaps scholars should not be attempting to evaluate a text like C15 as a work in its own right, but should see it as a valuable record, through the eyes of a student, of discussions that were going on in the classrooms.

22. See bibliography under C16 and C26.

C22, C28, C30, C31 and C33) are very short fragments, and one (C18) is a throw-back to earlier centuries, a set of *glossae collectae* on the *Categoriae Decem*. C6 is a literal commentary of the most extreme pedantry, clearly aimed at beginning students. C5 is the commentary which, until recently, was thought to be by Abelard. Yukio Iwakuma still considers it to be his, and to be an important witness to his thinking when he arrived in Paris c. 1100. Once the attribution to Abelard is removed, however, there seems to be no pressing reason to date it early, and the loose resemblances it has to Abelard's *Logica Ingredientibus* commentary may well be because it looks back to it. Another commentary which poses problems about attribution is C27. This text, discovered by Yukio Iwakuma, is one of the rare exceptions to the rule of anonymity, since it is attributed to 'Ros.' – an abbreviation which almost certainly stands for Roscelin. Whoever wrote this attribution therefore probably thought that it was the work of this famous master. But the commentary seems clearly to depend on Abelard's teaching from the time of the *Logica Ingredientibus*, and it is hard to believe that Roscelin, who was Abelard's bitter enemy, would have followed the ideas of his former pupil in this way, even at the end of his life.

C24 is interesting primarily because of its form. The element of literal commentary has been dropped entirely, and the writer discusses each section of the text by raising a question (such as, for instance, at the beginning of Chapter 6 on quantity: "It is usual to ask whether the division which Aristotle makes at the beginning of the chapter on quantity – 'One sort of quantity is continuous, the other discrete' – is sufficient.") The contents of these questions are not, however, generally different from what was normally discussed in the course of a composite commentary. The most recently discovered of all these commentaries, C32, is unfortunately very short, hardly extending beyond the Prologue. It does, however, speculate – as some of the commentaries linked to Alberic also do – about Boethius's lost second commentary on the *Categoriae*, designed for more advanced students.

The three twelfth-century treatises listed are closely connected to the commentary tradition. Abelard's *Dialectica* is clearly based on the same teaching material – though almost certainly an earlier ver-

sion of it – as he wrote up in the *Logica Ingredientibus*.²³ Garlandus, who seems to be a representative of the linguistic approach to logic linked to the name of Roscelin, follows the logical set-texts closely through his *Dialectica*, offering in effect a commentary on them in continuous form. The same seems to be true for the *Tractatus Lemovicensis*, although parts of it seem very rough and more like notes than a literary work. This treatise needs more study: its discoverer, Yukio Iwakuma, sees in it an important witness to the linguistic (‘protovocalist’) approach to logic at the turn of the twelfth century, but the writer’s allegiances are not altogether clear, nor is the date firmly established.²⁴

Future Research

The aim of the survey above is to divide up the material, so that researchers are not faced with an undigested list. But the serious work of studying these texts and seeing their precise relations to each other and to other writings of the time has still to be done. Here are a few pathways.

One method would be to use Abelard’s *Logica Ingredientibus* commentary as a fixed point. How do the problems raised and solutions given in the anonymous commentaries compare to what is found there? Can the comparison be used to establish a chronology? It is true that, so far, this method has not given any definite results when used in connection with the C8 complex, but then it has only been applied to one issue. As the treatment of a wider range of problems is compared, the lines of development may become clearer.

Another method – useful for those working on the ‘Alberic’ group (Class III) – is to try to reconstruct views master by master, treating the commentaries not as integral works but as reports of what different masters proposed. It would be possible, from looking at texts such as C15 and C17, to build up a good idea of Alberic’s views on problems connected with the *Categories*, and indeed to build

23. See Marenbon, *Abelard*, 44.

24. On language-centred logic at the turn of the twelfth century, see Marenbon, ‘Synthesis’ 201-15 and the references cited there.

up an idea of Abelard's views which might well not correspond exactly to what is found in the *Logica Ingredientibus*.

Alternatively, researchers could orientate themselves problem by problem – establishing what questions were raised in connection with a given passage and what was the range of solutions. The difficulty here is the lack of an external chronological guide and the danger of making assumptions about which positions and arguments are more developed than others.

Finally, an easier, but still demanding route is to stick to the commentaries that are most solid and philosophically interesting – not just Abelard's but the Porretan commentary (C16) and the Nominalist one (C26). There is still plenty of analytical work to be done here, and it is less dangerous for the researcher's sanity than studying C8.

Catalogue

- 1 Translations and paraphrases
- 2 Encyclopaedic and text-book presentations
- 3 Glosses
- 4 Commentaries
- 5 Bibliography

1. *Translations and paraphrases*

The *Categories* was known in two versions of Boethius's Latin translation – one his own, final translation (*AL*[*Aristoteles Latinus*] I, 1-5, 5-41), the other a composite version, apparently derived in part from Boethius's final translation, in part from another translation, perhaps an earlier draft by Boethius.²⁵ There was also a Latin paraphrase of the *Categories*, incorporating elements of commentary, known as the *Categoriae Decem* and usually attributed in the early Middle Ages to Augustine (*AL* I, 1-5, 133-75). Internal references to the fourth-century Roman philosopher Themistius suggest that it

25. Boethius's own version: (*AL* [*Aristoteles Latinus*] I, 1-5, 5-41); composite version: (*AL* I, 1-5, 47-79; cf. *ibid.* ix-lxiii and Minio-Paluello, 'Note').

originated in his circle (cf. *ibid.*, lxxviii), although a suggestion has recently been made, based on conjecture rather than strong evidence, that the author of the paraphrase was Marius Victorinus (Kenny, 'Les Catégories', 130-3).

2. *Encyclopaedic and text-book presentations*

[No bibliography is given for the first three items, which are well-known encyclopaedias. Brief comments and further references concerning the sections on logic are found in Marenbon 'Latin Tradition', 21-2]

- (5th C.) Martianus Capella *De nuptiis Mercurii et Philologiae*, IV, ed. Willis, 115-29 – paraphrase.
- (late 6th C) Cassiodorus *Institutiones*, II, 9-10, ed. Mynors, 113-4 – brief, encyclopaedic presentation.
- (early 7th C) Isidore of Seville *Etymologiae* II, 26, ed. Lindsay – brief, encyclopaedic presentation.
- (late 8th C) Alcuin, *Dialectica*, *Patrologia Latina* 101, 954-64 – text-book discussion.

[See Prantl *Geschichte*, 16-19; Lehmann, 'Cassiodorstudien. VIII', 370-83; Bullough, 'Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven'; Kneepkens, 'Some Notes'; Bullough, 'Alcuin before Frankfort'; Marenbon, 'Alcuin', 606-9; Bullough, *Alcuin*; Bohn *Candidus*; Marenbon, 'Logical Tradition', 23-4; Marenbon, 'Postfazione'; Marenbon, 'La logique' 8-9]

- (early 12th C) *Tractatus Lemovicensis de praedicamentis* in ms Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 544, fol. 94r-101v – a treatise on the *Categories*, unfinished and anonymous, discovered by Yukio Iwakuma.

According to Yukio Iwakuma, who discovered it, the treatise should be placed in Paris, c. 1100, and it may come from the (lost) *Dialectica* of Robert of Paris.

[See Marenbon, 'Logic at the Turn', 71, 74-5; Iwakuma, 'Vocales Revisited', 86-9, 116-24 (extracts); Iwakuma, 'Alberic of Paris']

- (early 12th C) Garlandus *Dialectica* I, ed. De Rijk, 12 – 41 – detailed text-book presentation, involving his own interpretation. Iwakuma gives a strong argument for a dating to the first decade

of the twelfth century; but a later dating remains possible (Marenbon).

[See De Rijk's Introduction to his edition; Iwakuma, 'Vocales', 47-54; de Vregille, '2. Gerland'; '3. Gerland'; Marenbon, 'Logic at the Turn', 70; Marenbon, 'Synthesis', 194-6]

- (c. 1110 or earlier - 1117) Peter Abelard *Dialectica*, ed. De Rijk, 51-120 (first section missing) - detailed, interpretative discussion.

[There is a large secondary literature about the content of this very important work, though only a little of it concerns the section on the *Categories*. For recent discussion of the dating, see Mews, 'On Dating' 1985, 74-104; Marenbon, *Abelard*, 41-43; Marenbon, *Abelard in Four Dimensions*.]

3. Glosses

(a) *To the pseudo-Augustinian paraphrase (Categoriae decem)*

Standard glosses (S-glosses) are found in a number of mss; glosses linked to the thought of John Scottus Eriugena (E-glosses) are found on their own in one manuscript and mixed with S-glosses in some others. There are other sets with striking peculiarities - for example, the glosses in ms St Gallen 274.

Edition: a selection of glosses in Marenbon, *From the Circle*, 185-206.

Literature: Peter Abelard, *Ouvrages inédits*, 618-24; Cousin, *Fragments*, 252-62; Hauréau, *Histoire*, I, 84-96 (with extracts); Barach, 'Zur Geschichte des Nominalismus', 5-22; Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik*, II, 40-1 and 44-5; Reiners, *Nominalismus*, 5-9 and 22-5; Van de Vyver, 'Vroeg-Middeleeuwsche wijsgeerige verhandelingen', 175-6; Lohr, 'Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries', *Traditio*, 24, 214; Marenbon, *From the Circle of Alcuin*, 121-138 and 173-9; Jeauneau, 'Israël Scot', 7-20 (for the St Petersburg ms and Paris BN 12949); Marenbon, 'Glosses and Commentaries', 25-29; Luscombe, 'Dialectic and Rhetoric', 5,9; Marenbon, 'Latin Tradition', 35-6

Manuscripts:

[AL 406] Avranches, Bibliothèque municipale, 229 (s. x), fols 194r-229v: mainly S

[AL 2036] Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 206 (s. x), fols 24r-39v : mainly S

[AL 1698] St. Petersburg, Publichnaja Biblioteka im. M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina, E V. class lat 7 (s. ix), fols 34v-40v, 1r-10r: mainly S

[AL 2159] Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B 71 sup. (s. ix), fols 34r-68v: E

[AL 2106] Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 6373 (s. x), fols 1r-32v: mainly S

[AL 2104] Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 6367 (s. xi), fols 2r-16v: mainly S (AL mistakenly prints the number '6327')

[AL 2062] Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 1750 (s. x ex/xi in), fols 12r-27r: mainly S

[AL 621] Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 12949, (s. x), fols 24r-39v: S + E

[AL 2126] St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, 274 (s. ix^a), pp. 4-65: S + E and a considerable number of non-standard glosses; use of Boethius's commentary

[AL 2190] Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 567 (s. xii), fols 53f-66v: S

[AL 2187] Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 233 (s. xi), fols iv -27r: mainly S

[AL 2023] Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, cvp. 843 (s. x), fols iv - 36r: mainly S

Less fully glossed:

[AL 2090] Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Phillipps 176 (s. x): abbreviated glosses, some based on S

[AL 2119] Bern, Burgerbibliothek, C 219 (s. ix ex/ x in): abbreviation of S-glosses

[AL 2152] Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Gadd. Plut. LXXXIX sup. 80 (s.xi/xii): mainly S-glosses

[AL 2054] Orléans, Bibliothèque municipale, 263 (s. x): mainly non-standard

[AL 1653J Vercelli, Archivio Capitolare Eusebiano, CXXXVIII (143) (s. ix).

(b) *To the Categories in the 'composite' translation.*

Literature: Leonardi, *Catalogo di manoscritti filosofici*, I, 38 (for the Florence MS); Ferrari, *Sancti Willibrordi*, (for the Luxembourg MS); Marenbon, 'Glosses and Commentaries', 29; Marenbon, 'The Latin Tradition', 37.

Manuscripts:

[AL 839] Cologne, Dombibliothek, 191 (s. xi), fols 23L 70v: few glosses after fol. 47r.

[AL 1386] Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, S. Marco 125 (s. xi/xii), fols 1 L 1 Sf: probably from school of Alberic.

[---] Luxembourg, Bibliothèque Nationale I:9 (c. 1100), ff. 21v-40v, 57r-80v; 49r-50v.

[AL 1511] Padua, Biblioteca Antoniana, Scaff. XXII, 553 (s. xii), fols 12r-32v.

[AL 1698] St. Petersburg, Publichnaja Biblioteka im. M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina, E V. class 1ar. 7 (s. ix) fols 21/23L 32/34 v.

(c) *To the Categories in Boethius's genuine translation*

Literature: Minio-Paluello, 'The Genuine Text', 158; *Bibliothèque nationale. Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, IV, 65-6; Aristotle, *Categories*, xiii; Senko, *Repertorium*, I, 12 (where the glosses are wrongly ascribed to Peter Abelard); Marenbon, 'Glosses and Commentaries', 29; Marenbon, 'The Latin Tradition', 37.

Manuscript: [AL 538] Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 2788 (s. x^{ex} for this section), fols 49r-50v.

4. *Commentaries*²⁶**C1** (to *Categoriae decem*)*Type:* collected glosses.*Date:* compiled in first half of the tenth century.*Edition:* extracts in Marenbon, *From the Circle of Alcuin*, 181-206. *Incipit:* *Disciplinaque a disciplina ars quaelibet...**Explicit:* (incomplete; ends, badly damaged, glossing *Categoriae*, p. 147.11 ff.).*Manuscript:* Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 13953, fols 50L-54v.*Affiliation:* consists of S-glosses (see Section A above); cf. C18.*Literature:* as for glosses to *Categoriae decem* (Section A above).**C3***Author:* Notker Labeo.*Type:* brief additions to text used in his German translation of the *Categoriae*. *Date:* early eleventh century.*Edition:* Notker the German, *Die Werke*, V.*Literature:* Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik*, II, 62-3; Van de Vyver, 'Les Étapes', 441; Lewry, 'Boethian Logic', 93-4.**C4***Title:* *Excerta Categogarum et Isagogarum**Date:* probably early eleventh century.*Type:* question-and-answer treatise, closely based on Boethius's commentary*Manuscript:* Vatican, Reg. lat. 1281, ff. 18v-25r.*Edition:* *Excerpta Isagogarum*, ed. G. D'Onofrio

26. I have decided to omit the entries for testimonies to works that no longer survive, which were each given a number in my earlier catalogue. They are C2 (Richer on Gerbert's teaching); C9a, b (list of books at Michelsberg monastery Bamberg in 1112-23); C19 (12th-century catalogue of St Amand); C23 (before 1178 in Abbot Frowin of Engelberg's list of schoolbooks). In the bibliography, I have not cited my 'Logic at the Turn' where I just briefly list a commentary there, which I or others discuss in greater detail elsewhere.

Literature: Van de Vyver, 'Vroeg-Middeleeuwsche verhandelingen', 183, 195; De Rijk, 'On the Curriculum', 57-64; D'Onofrio (in edition)

C5

Author: Until recently attributed to Peter Abelard, but this attribution has been convincingly challenged. Unlike the other commentaries from the same manuscript also attributed to Abelard, this one is a fragment without any ascription.

Date: early twelfth century, more probably second quarter than first. But Iwakuma dates it to c. 1100.

Type: fragment from a composite commentary. (begins commenting on *Categories*, p. 49.5, ends glossing *Categories*, p. 55.15).

Manuscript: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 13368, ff. 164r-168r.

Edition: Peter Abelard, *Scritti di logica*, 43-67.

Literature: dal Pra, 'Le glosse', 147-9; Peter Abelard, *Scritti di logica*, xxiii-xxvi; Lohr, 'Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries', *Traditio*, 28; Senko, *Repertorium*, I, 140; Barrow, Burnett and Luscombe, 'Checklist', 249-50; Mews, 'Dating', 74-5; Marenbon, 'Logic at the Turn', 69; Iwakuma, 'Vocales Revisited', 116-71; Martin, 'A Note'; Cameron, 'Abelard's Early Glosses' (esp. 658-61).

Remarks: This commentary is often treated as if it formed a set with the commentaries on the *Isagoge*, *Peri hermeneias* and *De divisione* in the same MS, Paris, BN lat 13368. But it is often a different type, part of a composite commentary rather than a literal one. Moreover, although the other commentaries do have ascriptions to Peter Abelard, there are strong arguments against Abelard's having been their author either: see the articles by Martin and Cameron cited above. Iwakuma, however, is strongly persuaded that it is the work of Abelard.

C6

Date: twelfth century.

Type: literal.

Incipit: <S>ubtilis indagator rerum Aristoteles de decem generibus que pro excellentis continentie causa...

Explicit: (unfinished; ends glossing *Categories*, p. 29.23-4).

Manuscript: Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MacClean 165 [AL 258], fols 102r-116v. *Literature:* James, *A Descriptive Catalogue*, 316-9; Marenbon, 'Glosses and Commentaries', 33.

C7 < cf. C8 Complex >

This commentary (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 17813, fols 19bis-54v) is sufficiently close to the different version of C8 and to C14 to be seen as a version within a single 'complex'.

C8 < cf. C8 Complex >

This commentary in its various versions is sufficiently close to C7 and C14 to be seen as a version within a single 'complex'.

C8 Complex

Author: See above, pp. 147-148.

Date: evolving during the first half of the twelfth century

Type: composite.

Incipits: <In>tentio Aristotelis est in hoc opere de decem primis vocabulis decem prima rerum genera significantibus in eo quod res significant disputare... (Vatican MS; minor differences in other MSS); Decem sunt collectiones rerum a se invicem naturaliter diverse que predicamenta vocantur (BN 17813 – C7).

Explicit: ... [various; some end with Chapter 5, others continue to the penultimate chapter, 14, on motion]

Manuscripts: (A) Assisi, Biblioteca Conv. Franc. 573, fols 15v-48r (= C14); (L) London, British Library, Royal 7. D. XXV, fols 55r-63r (ends glossing 49.26; 2b7); (L*) London, British Library, Royal 7. D. XXV, fols. 60v-62r (from 47.15; 1a16 to introductory discussion to Chapter 5, 48.12; 2a12) (M) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 14458, fols 95r-102r (finishes at 54.13; 4b17); (P) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 13368, fols 195r-214v; (Q) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 17813, fols 19bis-54v (= C7); (V) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, reg. lat. 230, fols 41r-71r

Affiliation: See above, pp. 146-148.

Literature: Hauréau, *Notices et extraits*, V, 333-8 (with a few extracts); Wilmart, *Codices reginenses Latini*, I, 546-7; Senko, *Repertorium*, II, 93; de Rijk, *Logica modernorum*, II.I, 49; Peter Abelard, *Scritti di logica*, xix, n.

13; Senko, *Repertorium*, I, 140; Barrow, Burnett and Luscombe, 'Checklist', 268; Marenbon, 'Glosses and Commentaries' 34, 36-9; Marenbon, 'Vocalism', 52-3; Marenbon, *Abelard*, 110-11, 134, 140, 145-6, 171; Biard, 'Le langage', 233; Iwakuma, 'Pierre Abélard', 101-8, 118 (extracts); Iwakuma, 'Introductiones', 17-25 (extracts); Iwakuma, 'William of Champeaux' (extracts), *passim*; Cameron, 'What's in a Name?' (extracts); Iwakuma, 'Vocales revisited', 89-171; Cameron, 'When does a word signify', 183-5; Grondeux and Rosier-Catach, 'Sur la nature catégorielle'; Rosier-Catach, 'Vox and Oratio'.

C10

Title: Glossae magistri Petri Abaelardi super Praedicamenta Aristotelis.

Author: Peter Abelard.

Date: c. 1117-21.

Type: composite.

Manuscript: Milano, Bibl. Ambrosiana, M 63 sup., ff. 16ra-43vb.

Edition: Peter Abelard, *Philosophische Schriften*, pp. 111-305.

Affiliation: some relation to the C8 Complex (see above, pp. 146-148)

Literature: prolific: cf. Barrow, Burnett and Luscombe, 'Checklist', p. 250; Mews, 'Dating', pp. 76-92; Marenbon, *Abelard*, 46-8; Marenbon, *Abelard in Four Dimensions*

C11

Date: twelfth century.

Type: mainly literal; with a little fuller discussion of problems.

Incipit: <Q>UOCIENS SOLET OPPONI. Expeditis omnibus predicamentis cur praeter

propositum suum... (lemma = *Categories*, p. 69, apparatus to line 12; beginning of gloss

= beginning of Book IV of Boethius's commentary).

Explicit: huiusmodi mutatione in contrarium qualitatis alteratur subiectum. A causa.

Finis laboris.

Manuscript: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 13368, fols 185r-191r.

Literature: Peter Abelard, *Scritti di logica*, p. xix, n.13 (where it is said, wrongly, to begin on fol. 183r).

C12

Author: a follower of Gilbert of Poitiers

Date: probably middle or later twelfth century

Type: composite

Manuscript: Paris Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 7094A, fols 74ra-79ra.

Edition: Ebbesen, 'A Porretanean Commentary'.

Literature: Ebbesen, 'Porretaneans'

C13

Date: probably first half of twelfth century.

Type: literal (fragment).

Incipit: (only a few paragraphs of the very end of the commentary survive; first gloss is to *Categories*, p. 78.6).

Explicit: ... id est qui in frequentiori usu habentur. OMNES PENE ENUMERATI SUNT. Et de predicamentis ista sufficiant.

Manuscript: Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 233, fol. 127r.

Literature: Thomson, *Catalogue*, I, 268-70.

C14 < cf. C8 complex >

This commentary (Assisi, Biblioteca Conv. Franc. 573, fol. 15v-48r is sufficiently close to C7 and C8 to be seen as a version within a single 'complex'.

C15

Date: late 1130s (de Rijk).

Type: problem commentary (with many *instantia*-type discussions)

Incipit: ... universale, ergo nec divisio illa est totius universalis nec vocis nec ... (the commentary is missing its very beginning; but it starts in the introductory section).

Explicit: ... Aristotiles tractaverat de predicamenta... fine predicamen ...

Manuscripts: Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria, 2087, fols 1-48vb.

Affiliation: material in common with C17 (de Rijk); and also with C16, C20, C21.

Literature: de Rijk, 'Some New Evidence', 36-9; de Rijk, *Logica modernorum*, II.1, 89-90 and 214-5 (where the manuscript number is mistakenly given as 2084); Marangon, *Alle origini dell' aristotelismo padovano*, 14, 27; Bottin, 'Quelques discussions', 57-72; Ebbesen, 'Opinion', 72-

73 (short extract); Iwakuma and Ebbesen, 'Logico-Theological Schools', 175 (brief extract); XIII Marenbon, 'Vocalism', 55, 59-60; Marenbon, *Abelard*, 51; Iwakuma, 'Prologues'; Spruyt, 'Twelfth-century glosses', *passim* (extracts); Ebbesen, 'Anonymous D'Orvillensis on the *Categories*', 359 (with extract)

C16

Date: probably 1140s or later

Type: composite.

Incipit: (The section treating the *antepredicamenta* is missing or was never there) *Premissis quibusdam que ad predicamenta necessaria sunt de ipsis tractare incipit. Agit autem de predicamento substantie ...*

Explicit: ... ut ostendat ex praemissis sequi ista, et sic firmior est argumentatio. (unfinished; finishes glossing *Categories*, 52.1).

Manuscript: Paris, Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal, 910, fols 145r-147r.

Affiliation: material in common with C 15, C17, C20, C21.

Literature: de Rijk, *Logica modernorum*, I, 116-20; Senko, *Repertorium*, II, 131 (for description of MS; this commentary is not itself noted by either); Marenbon, 'Vocalism', 55

C17

Author: probably a pupil of Alberic (de Rijk).

Date: late 1130s or 1140s.

Type: composite.

Incipit: <D>icit Boethius in comento predicamentorum: Intentio Aristotelis est tractare de primis vocibus . . .

Explicit: ... convenientius dicere quod quies secundum eundem locum sit contraria motui secundum locum (possibly unfinished; no discussion of *Categories*, 78.23 ff.)

Manuscript: Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, lat. fol. 624, fols 81r-87v.

Affiliation: material in common with C15 (de Rijk); and also C16, C20, C21.

Literature: Grabmann, *Kommentare zur aristotelischen Logik*, 18; Minio-Paluello, *Twelfth-Century Logic*, II, xii-xiii; de Rijk, 'Some New Evidence', 31-6 (with extracts); Marenbon, 'Vocalism', 55-6; Ebbesen,

‘Opinion’, 72, 74 (short extracts); Ebbesen, ‘Anonymous D’Orvillensis on the Categories’, 363; Iwakuma ‘*Vocales revisited*’

C18 (to Categoriae decem)

Type: collected glosses.

Date: compiled in the twelfth century; much of the material is earlier.

Edition: some of the material in Marenbon, *From the Circle of Alcuin*, 181-206, but this MS is not noted.

Incipit: <C>ategorie grece cum aspiratione latine dicuntur praedicamenta...

Explicit: (unfinished).

Manuscript: Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, S. Marco 113, fols 26r-28v.

Affiliation: consists in part of S-glosses, but also contains non-standard material; cf. C1.

Literature: Leonardi, *Catalogo di manoscritti filosofici*, I, p. 32-3.

C20

Author: a follower of Alberic.

Date: probably 1130s-50s.

Type: composite.

Incipit: Ut ait Boethius in commento: intentio Aristotelis in hoc opere de decem primis vocibus ...

Explicit: ... differentiam inter passibilem qua<litatem> et pas<sionem> dare intendit (unfinished; ends during gloss on *Categories*, p. 65.13).

Manuscript: Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 910, fols 147r-162v.

Affiliation: C15, C16, C17 and C21.

Literature: de Rijk, *Logica modernorum*, I, 120; Marenbon, ‘Vocalism’, 55-58; de Libera, *Universaux*, 50, *Généralités*, 348; Iwakuma, ‘*Vocales revisited*’

C21

Date: probably 1130s -1150s

Type: fragment - only preface and very beginning of commentary on the first lemma survive). There is not enough of the first comment to be sure whether it is a composite or problem commentary.

Incipit: <I>ncipiunt Cathegorie Aristotelis: quia hoc nomen predica-
menta sonat apud latinos hoc idem sonat . . .

Explicit: ... ut suas purgent doctrinas ab his per quae possunt inpe-
dire.

Manuscript: Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 910, fols 143r- 144r.

Affiliation: C15, C17 and C20.

Literature: de Rijk, *Logica modernorum*, I, p. 120; Senko, *Repertorium*, II,
p. 131; Marenbon, 'Vocalism' 55; Iwakuma, 'Prologues'

C22

Date: almost certainly after 1120; probably mid-twelfth century.

Type: note on logical problems (fragment).

Manuscript: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale 13368, f. 179v

Edition: Dal Pra, 'Sulla dottrina', 393- 5.

Literature: Dal Pra, 'Sulla dottrina', 396-9; Peter Abelard, *Scritti di log-
ica*, xix, n. 13 (Dal Pra mistakenly says that the piece is found on fol.
79v)

C24

Title: Incipiunt de categoriis pauce.

Date: mid- or late-twelfth century.

Type: problem commentary

Incipit: Querendum est cur dicit Aristoteles denominativa ...

Explicit: ... et corruptio corrupto substantiale sit.

Manuscript: St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 833, pp. 7-17.

Literature: Boethius, *In Isagogen Porphyrii*, lxix, n. 77; Grabmann, *Kom-
mentare zur aristotelischen Logik*, pp. 46-7.

C25

Author: a follower of Alberic

Date: mid- to later- 12th C.

Type: fragmentary beginning of composite commentary.

Incipit: Summus et dux peripateticorum ...

Explicit: ... ratio uero substantiae diuersa secundum nomen.

Manuscript: Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, vpl 2237,
ff.27r-28v.

Literature: Iwakuma, 'Prologues'

Notes: This commentary was discovered by Yukio Iwakuma, who has provided me with information on it. It refers to ‘Magister noster Albericus’ (f. 27r), though also to ‘Magister noster’ and, most frequently, ‘Magistri nostri’.

C26

Author: a member of the school of *Nominales*.

Date: c. 1200.

Type: composite

Manuscript: Oxford, Bodleian Library D’Orville 207.

Edition: Ebbesen, ‘Anonymous D’Orvillensis’ Commentary’

Literature: Lewry, ‘Liber Sex Principiorum’; Ebbesen, ‘Two Nominalist Texts’, 429-40 (extracts); Ebbesen, ‘Opinion’, 70-71 (short extracts); Ebbesen, ‘Anonymous D’Orvillensis on the Categories’; Thomson, *Catalogue*, I, 154.

C27

Author: ‘Ros.’ (see *Remarks*)

Title: Incipiunt Ros. Glossulae categoricarum, quae auree gemme uocantur.

Date: probably between 1120 and 1140

Type: composite.

Incipit: Praedicamentum diuersas habet acceptiones ...

Explicit: ... contraria in se suscipere potest.

Manuscript: Milan, Archivio Capitolare della Basilica Ambrosiana M2, fols. 1ra-15rb.

Remarks: The existence of this commentary was first noted by de Rijk. The *incipit* was first noticed by Yukio Iwakuma, who has transcribed the text except where illegible and made his transcription available to other specialists. On the attribution, see above, p. 150.

Literature: Iwakuma, ‘*Vocales Revisited*’ (brief mention)

C28

Date: late 12th or early 13th C.

Type: The ending of a composite commentary, from the beginning of Chapter 14 (77: 19; 15a14).

Incipit: Non videtur secundum philosophicam sententiam ...

Explicit: Et de praedicamentis ista sufficient.

Manuscript: Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek C.924, f. 74r-v.

Literature: Ebbesen, 'Anonymi Parisiensis', pp. 253-54.

C29

Date: Mid-twelfth century

Type: Notes, which begin in the middle of a discussion of 1a20 (47 :19 ff.) and end with a general comment on the beginning of Chapter 5(2a12; 48:32 ff.)

Incipit: Dici de subiecto tribus modis dicitur. Dici de subiecto est esse universale ...

Manuscript: Vienna, Wien, Österreichische Staatsbibl., BPL 2486, f. 4r

Explicit: 'hoc universale animal est secunda substantia' 'hoc universale homo est secunda substantia'.

Remarks: The master from whose teaching the notes derive refers to one of Alberic's ideas, but rejects it.

C30

Date: It, or the commentary from which it is copied, seems to be from lifetime of Abelard, since Master P. is referred to in the present.

Type: A single comment in a group of miscellaneous logical notes; probably taken from a composite or problem commentary, but it might just be a note.

Incipit: Quantitas alia continua, alia discreta. Quidam dicunt quod non ponenda sit haec divisio 'quantitas alia simplex, alia composita' ...

Explicit: Unde in qualitate est ut forma, in aere vero ut accidens in subiecto.

Manuscript: Vienna, Österreichische Staatsbibl., BPL 2486, f. 6v

Literature: De Rijk, 'Some New Evidence', 38 [extract]

C31

Date: Twelfth century

Type: fragment (on denominatives etc.). Perhaps just a note.

Incipit: <D>enominativa `vero dicuntur' id est illae res dicuntur denominativae Cathegorie Aristotelis: quia hoc nomen predicamenta sonat at apud latinos hoc idem sonat . . .

Explicit: ... vel quam substantiales differentiae aggregatae praeter genus conveniens efficiunt.

Manuscript: Paris Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 544, f. 138r-139r

Literature: Iwakuma, 'Vocalism Revisited', 86.

C32

Date: no later than c. 1150

Type: probably composite, but because only the very first part of the commentary, after the prologue, survives, it is impossible to be sure.

Incipit: [N]ec de huius operis auctore nec de auctoris intencione constabat apud ueteres. Super his ergo Boecius consulamus ...

Explicit: ... aliquid sit qualitatem id est quale aliquis sit. (Breaks off abruptly, commenting passage beginning 48 :20; 1b25)

Manuscript: Cambridge, St John's College 100, ff. 113r-v

Literature: Thomson, *Catalogue*, II.

Remarks: There is an ascription in a fourteenth-century hand, "Expositio Egidii super Predicamenta". The discovery of the commentary is due to Rod Thomson, who noticed that this section of the composite manuscript dates from the second quarter of the twelfth century.

C33

Date: Twelfth century

Type: Notes, often in the form of questions, closely related to passages from the end of the section on quantity and to the section on relation.

Incipit: Dicit Aristoteles quantitati nihil esse contrarium. (cf. 57:1; 5b13)

Explicit: ... in proprio autem esse consideratae relationes faciunt divisionem generis. (The discussion is related to the passage beginning 59:17; 6b29)

Manuscript: Munich clm 14735 ff. 33v-34r.

PRIMARY LITERATURE

- Alcuin, *De dialectica*, J.-P. Migne, Patrologia Latina 101, 949-76.
 Cassiodorus, *Institutiones*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors, Oxford 1937.
 Aristoteles, *Categoriae*, ed. L. Minio-Paluello, Aristoteles Latinus 1.1-5, Bruges and Paris 1961.
Excerpta Isagogarum et Categoriarum, ed. G. D'Onofrio, Corpus Christianorum continuatio mediaevalis 120, Brepols: Turnhout 1995.
 Garlandus, *Dialectica*, ed. L.M. De Rijk, Assen 1959.
 Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, ed. W. M. Lindsay, Oxford 1911.
 Martianus Capella, *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, ed. J. Willis, Leipzig 1983
 Notker the German, *Die Werke*, new ed., ed. E. H. Sehrt et al., Tübingen 1972-8.
 Peter Abelard *Ouvrages inédits*, ed. V. Cousin, Paris 1836.
 Peter Abelard *Philosophische Schriften*, ed. B. Geyer, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, 2 1, Münster 1919-33.
 Peter Abelard *Scritti di logica*, ed. M. dal Pra, 2nd edn, Milan 1969.
 Peter Abelard *Dialectica*, ed. L.M. de Rijk, 2nd edn, Assen 1970.
 Richer *Liber Historiarum IIII*, ed. G. Waitz, Hannover 1877.
 William of Conches, *Glosae super Boetium*, ed. L. Nauta, Corpus Christianorum, continuatio mediaevalis, 158, Turnhout, 1999.

SECONDARY LITERATURE

- Aristoteles Latinus. *Codices. Pars posterior*, ed. G. Lacombe, Cambridge 1955.
 Aristoteles Latinus. *Codices. Pars prior*, ed. G. Lacombe, 2nd edn, Bruges and Paris 1957.
 Aristoteles Latinus. *Codices. Supplementa altera*, ed. L. Minio-Paluello, Bruges and Paris 1961.
 Barach, C. S. 1878. 'Zur Geschichte des Nominalismus vor Roscelin' in *id.*, *Kleine philosophische Schriften*, Vienna.
 Barrow, J., C. Burnett & D. Luscombe 1984-5. 'A Checklist of the Manuscripts Containing the Writings of Peter Abelard and Heloise and Other Works Closely Associated with Abelard and his School', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 14-15: 183-302.
 Becker, G. 1885. *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui*, Bonn.
 Bibliothèque nationale 1939. *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, Paris.
 Biard, J. (ed.) 1999a. *Langage, sciences, philosophie au XII^e siècle*, Paris.
 – 1999b. 'Le langage et l'incorporel. Quelques réflexions à partir de l'*Ars meliduna*' in Biard 1999a, 217-34.
 – & I. Rosier-Catach 2003. *La Tradition médiévale des Catégories (XII^e-XV^e siècles)*, Philosophes Médiévaux 45, Louvain-la-Neuve, Paris and Dudley, MA.

- Bohn, E. 2004. *Candidus and the Continuity of Carolingian Intellectual Life after Alcuin*, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Bottin, F. 1987. 'Quelques discussions sur la transitivité de la prédication dans l'école d'Albéric du Mont' in J. Jolivet and A. de Libera (eds.), *Gilbert de Poitiers et ses contemporains*, Naples.
- Braakhuis, H.A.G. & C.H. Kneepkens (eds.) 2003. *Aristotle's Peri Hermeneias in the Latin Middle Ages. Essays on the Commentary Tradition*, Artistarium supplementa 10, Groningen-Haren.
- Bruun, O. & L. Corti (eds.) 2005. *Les Catégories et leur histoire*, Paris.
- Bullough, D.A. 1983. 'Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven: liturgy, theology and the Carolingian age' in *Carolingian Essays*, ed. U.-R. Blumenthal, Washington, D.C., 1983, pp. 1-69, rp. in D. A. Bullough *Carolingian Renewal: sources and heritage*, Manchester 1991.
- 1997. 'Alcuin before Frankfort' in R. Berndt (ed.), *Das Frankfurter Konzil von 794 im Spannungsfeld von Kirche, Politik und Theologie*, Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelhessischen Kirchengeschichte 80, Mainz, 571-85.
- 2004. *Alcuin. Reputation and achievement*, Education and society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 16, Leiden.
- Cameron, M. 2004. 'What's in a Name? Students of William of Champeaux on the *vox significativa*', *Bochumer Philosophisches Jahrbuch für Antike und Mittelalter* 9: 93-114.
- 2005. *William of Champeaux and Early Twelfth Century Dialectic*, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Toronto.
- 2011a. 'When Does a Word Signify? Debates from Peter Abelard's Milieu and the Early Thirteenth Century', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire* 73: 179-94.
- 2011b. 'Abelard's Early Glosses: Some Questions' in Rosier-Catach 2011b, 647-62.
- Cappuyns, M. J. 1933. *Jean Scot Erigène: sa vie, son œuvre, sa pensée*, Louvain and Paris.
- Cousin, V. 1855. *Fragments de philosophie du moyen âge*, Paris.
- Dal Pra, M. 1954. 'Sulla dottrina della "impositio prima et secunda"', *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 9: 390-9.
- 1955. 'Le glosse alle Categorie de ms. Parigi N. lat. 13368', in *Medioevo e Rinascimento: Studi in onore di Bruno Nardi I*, Florence, 147-73.1
- De Libera, A. 1996. *La querelle des universaux de Platon à la fin du Moyen Age*, Paris.
- 1999. *L'Art des généralités. Théories de l'abstraction*, Paris.
- De Rijk, L. M. 1962-67. *Logica modernorum*, 2 vols, Assen.
- 1963. 'On the Curriculum of the Arts of the Trivium at St. Gall from c. 850-c.1000', *Vivarium* 1: 35-86.
- 1966. 'Some New Evidence on Twelfth-Century Logic', *Vivarium* 4: 1-57.

- 1986. ‘Peter Abelard’s Semantics and his Doctrine of Being’, *Vivarium* 24: 85-127.
- Ebbesen, S. 1991. ‘Two Nominalist Texts’, *Cahiers de l’Institut du Moyen Âge grec et latin* 61: 429-40.
- 1992. ‘What Must one have an Opinion About?’, *Vivarium* 30, 1992, 62-79, reprinted in Ebbesen 2009: 69-84.
- 1996. ‘Anonymi Parisiensis Compendium Sophisticorum Elenchorum: the Uppsala version’, *Cahiers de l’Institut du Moyen Âge grec et latin* 66 : 253-312.
- 1999. ‘Anonymous D’Orvillensis’ Commentary on Aristotle’s Categories’, *Cahiers de l’Institut du Moyen Âge grec et latin* 7: 229-423, with corrigenda in CIMAGL 71 (2000) 279.
- 2001. ‘A Porretanean Commentary on Aristotle’s Categories’, *Cahiers de l’Institut du Moyen Âge grec et latin* 72: 35-88.
- 2003. ‘Anonymous D’Orvillensis on the *Categories*’ in Biard & Rosier-Catach 2003: 347-63.
- 2004. ‘Porretaneans on Propositions’ in A. Maierù and L. Valente (eds.), *Medieval Theories on Assertive and Non-Assertive Language*, Florence, 129-39, rp. in Ebbesen 2009: 85-94.
- 2009. *Topics in Latin Philosophy from the Twelfth to Fourteenth Centuries*, Collected Essays of Sten Ebbesen vol. 2, Farnham and Burlington, Ver.
- Ferrari, C. 1994. *Sancti Willibrordi venerantes memoriam. Echternacher Schreiber und Schriftsteller von den Angelsachsen bis Johann Bertels. Ein Überblick*, Publications du Centre Luxembourgeois de Documentation et d’Études Médiévales [CLUDEM] 6, Luxembourg.
- Fried, J. (ed.) 1997. *Dialektik und Rhetorik im früheren und hohen Mittelalter*, Schriften des Historischen Kollegs, Kolloquien 27, Munich.
- Gabbay, D. & J. Woods (eds.) 2008. *A Handbook of the History of Logic, Medieval and Renaissance Logic*, Amsterdam,;
- Gibson, M. 1982. ‘Latin Commentaries on Logic before 1200’, *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 24: (1982), 54-64.
- Grabmann, M. 1938. *Kommentare zur aristotelischen Logik aus dem 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1938, Phil. hist. Klasse, 8, Berlin; rp. in *id.* 1979: 1419-1446.
- 1979. *Gesammelte Akademieabhandlungen*, 2 vols, Paderborn etc.
- Green-Pedersen, N.J. 1984. *The Tradition of the Topics in the Middle Ages*, Munich.
- Grondeux, A. & I. Rosier-Catach 2011a, ‘Sur la nature catégorielle de la vox au XIIe siècle. Trois versions des Glosulae in Priscianum’, *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire*, 73: 259-333.
- 2011b. ‘Les *Glosulae super Priscianum* et leur tradition’ in Rosier-Catach 2011b, 107-79.

- Hansen, H. 2005. 'An Early Commentary on Boethius's De topicis differentiis', *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge grec et latin* 76: 45-130.
- Hauréau, B. 1850. *De la philosophie scolastique*, 2 vols, Paris, 1850.
- 1872-80. *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique*, 3 vols, Paris.
- 1890-93. *Notices et extraits de quelques manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale*, 6 vols, Paris, 1890-3.
- Iwakuma, Y. 'Prologues of Commentaries on the Logica vetus Literature in the 12th century' (advertised as forthcoming in *Didascalía* 3 (1997), but this volume has not to my knowledge been produced).
- 1999. 'Pierre Abélard et Guillaume de Champeaux dans les premières années du XIIe siècle: une étude préliminaire' in Biard 1999a: 92-123.
- 2003a. 'William of Champeaux and the Introductiones' in Braakhuis & Kneepkens 2003: 1-30.
- 2003b. 'William of Champeaux on Aristotle's Categories' in Biard & Rosier-Catach 2003: 313-28.
- 2009. 'Vocales revisited' in T. Shimizu and C.S.F. Burnett (eds.), *The Word in Medieval Logic, Theology and Psychology*, Brepols:Turnhout, 81-171.
- 2013. 'Alberic of Paris on Mont Ste Geneviève against Peter Abelard' in *Logic and Language in the Middle Ages. A volume in honour of Sten Ebbesen*, ed. J.L. Fink, H.Hansen and A. M. Mora-Márquez, Leiden; Brill (Investigating Medieval Philosophy 4), 27-47.
- & S. Ebbesen 2002. 'Logico-Theological Schools from the second half of the 12th Century: a list of sources', *Vivarium* 30: 173-210.
- Jacobi, K. 2011. 'William of Champeaux. Remarks on the Tradition in the Manuscripts' in Rosier-Catach 2011b: 261-71.
- & C. Strub 1995. 'Peter Abaelard als Kommentator' in F. Dominguez Reboiras, R. Imbach, T. Pindl, P. Walter (eds.), *Aristotelica et Lulliana magistro doctissimo Charles H. Lohr septuagesimum annum feliciter agenti dedicata*, Instrumenta Patristica 26, The Hague, 11-34.
- James, M. R. 1912. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the MacCleave Collection of Manuscripts in the Fitzwilliam Museum*, Cambridge.
- Jeaneau, E. 1985. 'Pour le dossier d'Israël Scot', *Archives doctrinales et littéraire du moyen âge* 52: 7-72, 1p. in E. Jeaneau, *Études érigéniennes*, Paris, 1987, 641-706.
- Kenny, A. 2005. 'Les Catégories chez les Pères de l'Église latins' in Bruun & Corti 2005: 121-33.
- Kneepkens, C.H. 1988. 'Some Notes on Alcuin's De perhermeniis with an Edition of the Text' in L.A.J.R. Houwen & A.A. MacDonald (eds.), *Alcuin of York. Scholar at the Carolingian Court*, Groningen.
- Lehmann, P. 1917. 'Cassiodorstudien. VIII: Cassiodor-Isidor-Beda-Alchvine', *Philologus* 74: 357-83.

- Leonardi, C. 1959-60. 'I codici di Marziano Capella', *Aevum* 33: 443-89; 34: 1-99 and 411-524
- 1980. *Catalogo di manoscritti filosofici nelle biblioteche italiane*, Florence.
- Lewry, O. 1981. 'Boethian Logic in the Medieval West', in M. Gibson (ed.), *Boethius: His Life, Thought and Influence*, Oxford, 90-134.
- Lohr, C.H. 1967-74. 'Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries', *Traditio*, 23 (1967) 315-413; 24 (1968) 149-245; 26 (1970) 135-216; 27 (1971): 251-351; 28 (1972) 281-396; 29 (1973) 93-197; *Bulletin de philosophie medievale* 14 (1973) 116-26; *Traditio* 30 (1974) 119-44. (Authors M-Z are now available in book form: C. H. Lohr, *Latin Aristotle Commentaries. I.2. Medieval Authors, M-Z*, *Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi. Subsidia*, 18, Florence 2010. Volume 1.1, containing Authors A-L, will soon be published).
- Luscombe, D. 'Dialectic and Rhetoric in the Ninth and Twelfth Centuries: Continuity and Change' in Fried 1997: 1-20.
- Marangon, P., 1977. *Alle origini dell' aristotelismo padovano, sec. XII-XIII*, Padua.
- Marenbon, J., 1981. *From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre*, Cambridge.
- 1992. 'Vocalism, Nominalism and the Commentaries on the *Categories* from the earlier Twelfth Century', *Vivarium*, 30: 51-61; 1p. in *id.* 2000.
- 1993. 'Medieval Latin Commentaries and Glosses on Aristotelian Logical texts, Before c. 1150 A.D.' in *Glosses and Commentaries on Aristotelian Logical texts: the Syriac, Arabic and Medieval Latin traditions*, ed. C. Burnett, London, 77-127.
- 1997a. 'Glosses and Commentaries on the *Categories* and *De interpretatione* before Abelard' in Fried 1997.
- 1997b. *The Philosophy of Peter Abelard*, Cambridge.
- 1997c. 'Alcuin, the Council of Frankfurt and the Beginnings of Medieval Philosophy' in R. Berndt (ed.) *Das Frankfurter Konzil von 794. Kristallisationspunkt karolingischer Kultur*, II, Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelrheinischen Kirchengeschichte 80,2, Mainz, 603-15.
- 2000a. *Aristotelian Logic, Platonism and the Context of Early Medieval Philosophy in the West*, Aldershot and Burlington, VER.
- 2000b. 'Supplement to the Working Catalogue and Supplementary Bibliography' in Marenbon, 2000a (where it follows the reprint of 'Medieval Latin Commentaries')
- 2008a. 'The Latin Tradition of Logic to 1100' in Gabbay & Woods 2008: 1-63.
- 2008b. 'Logic at the Turn of the Twelfth Century' in in Gabbay & Woods 2008: 64-81.
- 2009. 'Postfazione' to translated extracts from Marenbon *From the Circle* in I Biffi and C. Marabelli (eds.), *Figure del pensiero medievale. I. Fondamenti e inizi. IV - IX secolo*, Jaca Book: Milan and Rome, 430-33.
- 2011. 'Logic at the Turn of the Twelfth Century: a synthesis' in *Arts du langage*

- et théologie aux confins des XIe-XIIe siècles. Textes, maîtres, débats*, in Rosier-Catach (ed.) 2011: 181-217. [Cited as ‘Synthesis’ – this is a quite different article from ‘Logic at the Turn’ above (2008)].
- forthcoming a. ‘La logique en occident latin (ca.780 – ca. 1150): le programme des études et ses enjeux’ in J. Brumberg-Chaumont (ed.), *L’Organon dans la translatio studiorum à l’époque d’Albert le Grand*, Studia artistarum, Turnhout, 2013.
- forthcoming b. *Abelard in Four Dimensions*, Notre Dame.
- Martin, C.J. 2004. ‘Logic’ in J. Brower & K. Guilfooy (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Abelard*, Cambridge 158-99.
- 2011. ‘A Note on the Attribution of the *Literal Glosses* in Paris, BNF, lat. 13368 to Peter Abelard’ in Rosier-Catach 2011b, 605-46.
- Mews, C. 1985. ‘On Dating the Works of Peter Abelard’, *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 52: 73-134, 1p. in C.J. Mews, *Abelard and his Legacy*, Aldershot and Burlington, VER 2001.
- Minio-Paluello, L. 1956-8. *Twelfth-Century Logic. Texts and Studies*, 2 vols, Rome.
- 1962. ‘Note sull’Aristotele latino medievale: XV. Dalle Categoriae. decem pseudo-agostiniane (temistiane) al testo vulgato aristotelico boeziano’, *Rivista di filosofia neoscolastica* 54: 137-47; 1p. in L. Minio-Paluello, *Opuscula: The Latin Aristotle*, Amsterdam 1972, 448-58.
- Prantl, K. 1885. *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*, II, 2nd ed., Leipzig.
- Reiners, J. 1910. *Der Nominalismus in der Frühscholastik*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, 8.5, Münster.
- Rosier-Catach, I. 2011a. ‘Vox and Oratio in Early Twelfth Century Grammar and Dialectics’, *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire*, 73: 47-129.
- (ed.) 2011b. *Arts du langage et théologie aux confins des XI^e-XII^e siècles. Textes, maîtres, débats*, Studia artistarum 26, Turnhout.
- Senko, W. 1982. *Repertorium commentariorum medii aevi in Aristotelem Latinorum quae in bibliothecis publicis Parisiis asservantur*, 2 vols, Warsaw, 1982.
- Spruyt, J. ‘Twelfth-century Glosses on Aristotle’s Category of “Relational Being” (“Pros ti”)’ in Biard & Rosier-Catach 2003: 329-45.
- Thomson, R.M. 2011-13. *Catalogue of Medieval Manuscripts of Latin Commentaries on Aristotle in British Libraries, I. Oxford*, Turnhout 2011. *II. Cambridge*. Turnhout 2013.
- Van de Vyver, A. 1929. ‘Les étapes du développement philosophique du haut moyen âge’, *Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire*, 8: 425-53.
- 1942. ‘Vroeg-Middeleeuwsche wijsgeerige verhandelingen’, *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie*, 4: 156-99.
- de Vregille, B. ‘2. Gerland’ and ‘3. Gerland’ in *Dictionnaire d’histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique* 20, 884-6.
- Wilmart, A. 1937. *Codices Reginenses Latini*, Vatican City.