



The anonymous Parisian prologue to Averroes' *De substantia orbis* from the end of the 13th century*

Łukasz TOMANEK**

ABSTRACT

The article examines the anonymously preserved prologue to Averroes' *De substantia orbis* dating to the end of the 13th century (manuscript Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14246, ff. 16r-v, 19rb) and presents its edition. Along with commentaries by Fernand of Spain and Giles of Orléans (lost), this work is a rare witness of the still scarcely known commenting practice of Averroes' work at the Faculty of Arts in Paris in this period. The codicological and paleographical examination conducted on the manuscript led to establishing the approximate dating and origin of the prologue. Additionally, the doctrinal analysis allowed us to place this opusculum within the context of other similar prologues and commentaries produced in this period. Of significant importance are similarities between the anonymous author and Fernand of Spain, whose prologue to his commentary on *De substantia orbis* provides an important context for the Anonymous Monacensis. Both works often employ the same examples and consider *De substantia orbis* the supplement to *De caelo et mundo*, which was an unusual addition to traditionally established *divisio librorum naturalium*.

KEYWORDS

Fernand of Spain; University of Paris; philosophy of nature; textual criticism; medieval manuscripts

* This article is a result of research financed from the grant of the Polish National Science Center (NCN) under grant agreement 2017/27/N/HS 1/02528. I wish to express my gratitude to Aurora Panzica for her helpful remarks.

** Ph.D. candidate, Institute of Philosophy, University of Silesia in Katowice. E-mail: lukaszmarektomanek@gmail.com.

The anonymous prologue to Averroes' *De substantia orbis* preserved in manuscript Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm. 14246, ff. 16r–v, 19rb (henceforth the Anonymus Monacensis) is one of those unattractive anonymous opuscula that, after closer acquaintance, might be found appealing to historians of late medieval philosophy. *De substantia orbis* appeared with the rest of Averroes' corpus translated by Michael Scot around the early thirties of the 13th century. It was to make a brilliant career for itself at universities shortly after its publication and, since then, has been extensively used by Latin schoolmen who referred to it along with Averroes' commentaries on natural philosophy.¹ The significant popularity is not, however, reflected in the number of commentaries, of which, as of yet, we know of only those by Alvaro de Toledo and Fernand of Spain, though only the latter originated in the academic milieu of Paris.² Given these circumstances, the Anonymus Monacensis has, as I will argue below, historical value as an important testimony for investigating some less known aspects of Averroes' reception in Paris. In the following, I will first focus on the dating, authorship, genre and content of this prologue; then, I will examine some doctrinal aspects of this work and its affinity with the commentary of Fernand of Spain.

* * *

The manuscript Clm. 14246 comprises three parts, each composed in a different period: the first one at the end of the 13th century, the second before 1347 and the third in the 15th century.³ The first section (1ra–48vb), which is of interest here, was initially a separate booklet consisting of a copy of the anonymous commentary on *Sophistici Elenchi*.⁴ It is composed of ten quires of various length: 1^{8(1–8)}; 2^{4(9–12)}; 3^{4(13–16)}; 4^{4–4(17–19)}; 5^{4–1(20–22)}; 6^{4+4(?) (23–27)}; 7^{4(28–31)}; 8^{4(32–35)}; 9^{8–2(36–40 bis*)}; 10^{8(41–48)}. The anonymous commentary is an exemplar copied in the pecia system by three different scribes. The last columns of quires 3, 4 and 10 were initially left empty and later, after completion of the exemplar,

¹ On the earliest reception of Averroes' commentaries and *De substantia orbis* in Paris, see: De Vaux, 1933; Gauthier, 1982 (Gauthier corrected several theses proposed by De Vaux in his article). On the career of *De substantia orbis* in the Latin West and the critical reception of its concepts, see: Lerner, 1996: 139–164. Also, for a general overview of the problems addressed by Averroes, see: Duhem, 1916: 532–559; Hyman, 1986: 28–35.

² For more information about these two commentaries, see note 18.

³ Martin Grabmann was probably the first to draw attention to the manuscript and its content, see: Grabmann, 1936b: 227–236, the Anonymus Monacensis is mentioned on pp. 227–228. The manuscript was described in the following publications: Shooner, 1973: 392–393; Mottoni, 1990: 134–141; Neske, 2005: 256–262. In this paper, I follow the codicological description contained in these studies. The remarks on paleography are mine.

⁴ A fragment of the commentary is edited in Ebbesen, 1997: 142–151. This manuscript was also mentioned by the same author in Ebbesen, 1981: 544. Another copy of this commentary is preserved in Admont, Stiftsbibliothek 241.

filled by another, i.e., fourth hand that added two prologues and one fragment of another commentary:

- ff. 16r–v, 19va: Anonymus, *Prooemium super Averrois De substantia orbis*,
- f. 48va: Albertus Remensis vel Leo Parisiensis, *Super Petri de Riga Auroram*,
- f. 48vb: Anonymus, *Super Analytica Posteriora* (fragmentum).

The Anonymus Monacensis begins on a space left after the scribe of the third pecia finished copying his part of the commentary on *Sophistici Elenchi*, i.e., around 2/3 of the right column. The completion of this part of pecia was indicated by another hand right below the last line: “hic nihil deficit immo continuatur litere subsequenti”. The reclamans at the bottom of the f. 16v refers to the fourth pecia: “quae petitio principii praecedit consequens”. Half of this page has been cut off, most likely shortly after the scribe finished his work. The first words of the anonymous prologue “Averrois commentatoris de substantia orbis” are written in capitals above “hic nihil deficit...” referring to the preceding commentary. The Anonymus Monacensis has 26 lines on f. 16r and 60 lines on f. 16v; the rest of the prologue, 10 lines, has been transposed to f. 19v, where it has been placed among other notes, some of them already written beforehand. The script, *littera textualis currens*, is very tight and, at times, hard to read since the line spacing is compromised and the pen brushes are very thick given the small size of the letters. The ductus is hasty and, at times, clumsy. In some cases, the scribe was probably trying to reproduce — with varying degrees of success — some words after the shape of letters, without knowing what these words actually meant. Also, the fact that the Anonymus Monacensis was written on a piece of parchment left after the rest of the page was trimmed suggests that it might have been copied by a student for his own use. Thus, a copy of the prologue preserved in the manuscript from Bayerische Staatsbibliothek is hardly to be considered the original.

The Anonymus Monacensis was finished shortly after the exemplar of the anonymous commentary on *Sophistici Elenchi*, which makes it, together with other works copied by this hand, the earliest part of the gathering. The date of this copy of the prologue might then be set in the last years of the 13th century. Regarding the composition of the prologue itself, it also must have been written in the last decade, as I will argue below referring to its close resemblance to the prologue of Fernand of Spain.

Unlike the time of composition, the authorship of the prologue is more difficult to establish since there is no clear evidence of who might have composed it. The copy does not contain any name in the explicit, nor are there any marginal notes that could have been of use. The one piece of information that could be found somehow promising appears at the end of the gathering. Another text copied by the same hand on f. 48va suggests one of two authors: “Alius prologus magistri Alberti Remensis vel magistri Leonis <Pari>siensis secundum quosdam”. The word *alius* used here indicates that it is the second

prologue by either of these masters. Nevertheless, given the difference between these two prologues — a production characteristic of the Faculty of Arts on the one hand and of the Faculty of Theology on the other — it is rather unlikely that *alius* refers to the prologue on *De substantia orbis* and that the alleged author of the prologue to *Aurora* of Peter Riga could also have been an author of the Anonymus Monacensis. As for now, for the lack of further evidence, the prologue to *De substantia orbis* needs to be considered anonymous.

* * *

The genre of philosophical introduction is very wide, and there are several types of works originating in 13th-century Paris that fall into this category.⁵ Some of them, meant as praise of philosophy in general, were independent treatises, such as those of Arnoul de Provence, Aubry de Reims, Herve le Breton, and Oliver le Breton;⁶ some were exclusively devoted to the division of sciences as *De ortu scientiarum* of Roberty Kilwardby;⁷ some served as manuals compiling material for exams, such as the anonymous *Compendium from Barcelona*, or *De communibus artium liberalium*;⁸ lastly, some were composed as prologues, or *principia* to particular works, such as the introductions of Nicolas of Paris, Adenulf of Agnani, John of Dacia, Thomas Aquinas, Peter of Auvergne, or Giles of Orleans, to name a few.⁹

The traditional composition common for philosophical prologues and eulogies bears several similarities to the *sermo modernus*, a preaching practice that evolved at the University in the middle of the 13th century.¹⁰ The philosophical

⁵ For classification of different types of introductions, see: Lafleur, 1988: 1–3, 159–160. See also the complementary overview of the genre in Imbach, 1991.

⁶ These prologues are critically edited in the following publications: Lafleur, 1988: 297–355; Gauthier, 1984: 29–48; Lafleur & Carrier, 1995: 380–396; Lafleur & Carrier, 1997b.

⁷ A critical edition: Judy, 1976. For Robert's division of sciences, see: Maierù, 2013.

⁸ The anonymous *Compendium from Barcelona* has been published in Lafleur & Carrier, 1992. The work and its functions has also been extensively discussed in the following publications: Grabmann, 1936a; Grabmann, 1941: 112–127; Grabmann, 1979a; Grabmann, 1979b; Lewry, 1982. The anonymous *De communibus artium liberalium* has been published in Lafleur & Carrier, 1994: 154–203. For further remarks on *compendia*, see: Lafleur, 1995.

⁹ Prologues listed here serve as illustrative examples of the development of this subgenre in the second part of the 13th century. For the first three authors see the editions: Lafleur & Carrier, 1997a; Lafleur & Carrier, 1997c; Otto, 1955: 3–44. The philosophical prologues of Aquinas have been gathered and commented in Cheneval & Imbach, 2014. Peter of Auvergne's prologues to Metaphysics has been published in O'Donnell, 1955: 148–177. Two prologues to *De caelo*, one arguably his own, another attributed to him, can be found in these publications: Galle, 2003: 7–21; Musatti, 2013. On Peter's division of sciences, see: Galle, 1998. On Giles of Orleans, see the prologue to *Nicomachean Ethics*: Costa, 2011: 235–239.

¹⁰ On the *sermo modernus* and its use among the mendicants, see: Mulchahey, 1998: 401–419; Smith, 2021: 45–67. On university practice of giving sermons and speeches among

sermon was based on a division into the following parts:¹¹ it begins with a *thema*, a fragment, usually from Aristotle or Seneca, chosen by a master as a starting point for further deliberation. From the *thema* comes the leading idea that brings the master to *commendatio*, i.e., praise of philosophy and its indispensable value for leading a fulfilling life. This value is usually compared and contrasted with the miserable moral condition of those who are ignorant and reject living a life devoted to philosophical contemplation. A *commendatio* is usually followed by a list of obstacles, *impedimenta* or *retrahentia* — external goods, sensual pleasures, poverty etc. — that draw away from philosophy. The last part of the introduction comprises the *divisio scientiarum* and has different variants, i.e., listing all branches of science, including philosophy, with books subjected to each of them; listing parts of philosophy and the dependency between books studied in each field (*philosophia speculativa*, *philosophia naturalis* etc.); or narrowing the division to the subject of commented work and to the branch of philosophy it falls into.

* * *

The Anonymous Monacensis, as an introduction to *De substantia orbis* of Averroes, belongs to the last group of philosophical introductions listed above. Although short and hardly elaborate, it contains, in a nutshell, all the elements typical of philosophical introductions produced in its time. It is mostly based on a moralistic and laudatory argument proving that philosophy is the noblest activity of man and a cure for all diseases afflicting the human soul. As a point of departure for his argument, the anonymous chose a fragment from Seneca's *letter on Ethics* 50: "With other sorts of treatments, pleasure comes after healing; philosophy, though, is at one and the same time both curative and sweet".¹² Seneca's sentence leads the anonymous to an argument that philosophy excels all remedies, especially those pertaining to the human soul and its diseases. To make his argument clear, the anonymous begins by explaining what disease is from a medical point of view and by listing its effects. According to the common definition, "disease is a bad quality proper to the natural action". As he explains, by "bad quality" induced by disease, he means deformity (*difformitas*), that affects the natural beauty (*formositas*) of the human form. As for the natural action, he names three effects of corporal disease. The first one, immobility (*immobilitas*), i.e., lack of natural power on movement; the second one, weakness (*debilitas*), i.e., inability to perform a physical operation; the

the theologians in Paris, see also: Bataillon, 1994. The philosophical parallel to this modern way of preaching has been discussed in Fioravanti, 1992.

¹¹ As an illustrative example of this model of dividing prologues into consecutive parts serves the anonymous prologue to *Isagoge* "Ut ait Tullius": Dahan, 1997: 6.

¹² Translation after Graver & Long, 2017: 146.

third one, corruption (*corruptio*), which is the result of long disease that causes erratic and ill behaviour (*deliratio*).

Physical disease, with its medical description, finds its parallel in diseases that affect the soul, being the area of philosophical investigation. Among these illnesses the most dangerous ones are vices (it is not precise which ones exactly) and ignorance, whose effects have the following consequences for a man. Deformity takes from a human being their proper form (*propria species*) and — here, the anonymous backs up his argument with a fragment from Averroes' prologue to his commentary on *Physics* — as such a human being that lacks form is no longer human in the proper sense, but only equivocally (*aequivoce*). As for weakness, the anonymous claims that a man affected by vices (*vitiosus homo*) lacks the ability to manage their operations in a right way (*recta ratione*). Similarly, immobility that also concerns one's actions comes from ignorance that prevents human intellect from rising from what falls into sense perception (*sensibilia*) to intelligible things (*intelligibilia*). In the case of the last of the morbid effects, the anonymous leaves the entire room for Seneca who in his letters speaks of pleasure and desire as the main causes of corruption.

Despite the beneficial effects philosophy exerts on the soul as the ultimate cure for all vices and ignorance, there are several obstacles that prevent and dissuade a man from devoting life to philosophical investigation. The anonymous names three, i.e., the effort (*labor*) one should invest in living a philosopher's life; the poverty (*paupertas*) that forces one to struggle for exterior goods (*bona exteriora*); and, lastly, desires (*voluptates*) whose appeal draws away from intellectual activity.

To conclude his argument, the author opposes the four effects of the disease to the impact brought by philosophy. The first is beauty (*formositas*), which transforms the distorted form of man into the proper one (*propria species*). Weakness is opposed to strength (*fortitudo*) which enables man to discover they are a composite of soul and body and, consequently, embrace their inevitably mortal condition. The immobility is juxtaposed with nobility by which a man (*homo nobilis*) has regard for celestial and terrestrial things and, also, for these that lay beneath them. Lastly, the anonymous argues that philosophy makes a man immortal (*immortalis*), by which he means what Aristotle writes in *Ethics X* that philosophical life has its value, not by a man him-/herself, but by what is the best (*optimum*) and the most precious (*praetiosissimum*) in a man, i.e., by the intellect which is incorruptible.

The eulogy of philosophy in general, i.e., as an ultimate remedy for vices and ignorance, leads to the last part in which a particular part of philosophy is at stake, i.e., the philosophy of nature. This part is connected directly to the subject matter of *De substantia orbis*. The philosophy of nature is of particular value for two reasons. First, by studying natural philosophy, a man reaches cognition of himself as a composite of soul and body (*De anima*) and

of elements of which the body is built (*De caelo*). Secondly, natural philosophy has as its subject things that fall into the senses (*sensata*), from which all natural cognition emerges. Here again, the anonymous author goes further pointing to the part of natural philosophy that pertains to the celestial and superior bodies that, although they partly exceed the cognitive capacity of man, are the noblest object of natural inquiry.

Having praised natural philosophy, the anonymous proceeds to a very brief *divisio librorum naturalium* in order to locate *De substantia orbis* among the works of Aristotle. As he explains, Averroes' treaty falls into the second branch of natural philosophy, i.e., the one that concerns celestial bodies and their movers, and as such, it complements Aristotle's *De caelo*, a book that comes as the second in order of *libri naturales*, i.e., right after *Physics*.

* * *

Although not original nor intricate in its content, the Anonymus Monacensis is an important piece of work for at least two reasons. The first one is the doctrinal inclinations one can find in the author's argument and the use of *authoritates*. The anonymous praise of philosophy bears, at least in some aspects, witness to a strongly intellectualistic view on the human condition and the nature of philosophy as such. In his description of deformity, the author argues that vices and ignorance deprive a man of their human form, which is a consequence of ignorance in particular, i.e., of the lack of knowledge. Such a man is no longer a man unless in the equivocal sense of the word. Averroes, whose commentary on *Physics* the anonymous refers to, specifies that this equivocation is to be meant as in the predication of a man alive and dead, rational and made of stone.¹³ This reference is usually considered the smoking gun of "Averroism", or "radical Aristotelianism", and the consequences it bears have a profound impact on philosophical anthropology and ethics.¹⁴ Assuming that only a man who possesses knowledge is a man in the proper sense of the word, the rest of society needs to be considered "less human" and, consequently, of lower value. This dichotomy was often stressed by the late 13th century masters of arts who frequently used Averroes' commentary on *De anima*¹⁵ to divide

¹³ For this fragment and its similar usage in other masters, see note 9.

¹⁴ On this dictum, its popularity and philosophical consequences, see: Bianchi, 1990: 156–158; Bianchi, 2003: 49–52; König-Pralong, 2011: 75–76; Köhler, 2014: 882–884. Nonetheless, Bianchi notes that a reference to this fragment does not necessarily indicate the radical position of the author; see especially: Bianchi, 2003: 51.

¹⁵ Cf. Averroes, 1953: 494–495: "Et cum ita sit, nos omnes homines, quod accidit nobis de ignorantiae istius scientiae aut erit quia adhuc non scimus propositiones quae inducunt nos ad hanc scientiam [...], aut hoc intelligere hoc acquiritur per exercitium et usum in rebus naturalibus, sed nondum habemus de exercitio et usu tantum per quod possumus acquirere hanc intellectionem, aut erit hoc propter diminutionem nostrae naturae naturaliter. Si igitur

men into those who devote their life to philosophy and those who do not. The former are *homines contemplativi*, the latter are often vividly pictured by other contemporary Parisian masters as *homines brutales* or *bruta*.¹⁶

The ethical aspect of such a sharp intellectualism might be seen in the claim that by acquiring knowledge a philosopher is granted several moral virtues, such as the strength to face death or the ability to overcome sensual pleasures and to scorn external goods. Although the anonymous does not use the word *felicitas* whose presence in similar commendations is nearly ubiquitous, he refers to the word *delectatio*, which in Aristotle (1098a7–17; 1102a5–6) and scholastic tradition is not required for happiness, but accompanies it.¹⁷ The appeal of *delectatio*, meant as *delectatio intellectualis* contrasted with other sensual *delectationes*, is illustrated with fragments from Seneca's *Letters on ethics* and Aristotle's *Ethics*, two of the most frequently quoted sources in the whole prologue. By referring to *Ethics* X, the anonymous compares and contrasts sensual and intellectual pleasure (*magna delectatio*), where great pleasure is juxtaposed with small pleasure (*parva delectatio*) which is preferred by those who

hoc accidit propter diminutionem in natura, tunc nos et omnes qui innati sunt acquirere hanc scientiam dicimur homines aequivoce. Et si hoc accidit propter ignorantiam propositionum inducentium in hanc scientiam, tunc scientia speculativa nondum perfecta est”.

¹⁶ Cf. Anonymus, 1991: 143: “Item, sciendum est ulterius quod triplex est genus hominis: quidam sunt qui parum aut nihil informati sunt istis virtutibus, ut sunt illi qui non habent intellectum elevatum; et tales sunt secundum quod dicitur in libro *De anima* qui habent intellectum immersum phantasiae et imaginationi et dicuntur homines brutales. Alii etiam sunt homines qui neque sunt istis virtutibus informati, sed magis erroribus virtutibus oppositis et vitiis moralibus oppositis, quod habetur per consuetudinem ad malum; et tales non tantum sunt pravi in se ipsis, immo semper faciunt prava actus. Unde tales peiores sunt prioribus. Alii vero sunt informati sufficienter istis virtutibus; et tales homines sunt contemplativi et valde boni”; Iacobus de Duaco, *Quaestiones in De anima*, III, qu. 18 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 14698, f. 62ra): “Unde cum in paucis hominibus sit intellectus, quia operationes intellectus in paucis inveniuntur, in omnibus tamen est sensus. Et ideo non est extra naturam si tales sequuntur appetitum sensualem, quia tales homines sunt bruta, et non differunt a brutis nisi parum, et in eo solum quod habent intellectum in potentia. Et illud est valde modicum, nec merentur isti homines dici homines, sicut neque scamnum in potentia meretur dici scamnum, sed tales homines sunt bruta deteriores cum non sequantur illud ad quod nati sunt”. I quote this fragment after Bianchi, 1990: 157.

¹⁷ Anonymus (=Iacobus de Duaco?), 2010: 157: “In delectationem autem intellectuali non consistit felicitas: delectatio intellectualis concomitatur felicitatem sicut accidens proprium eius, et non delectatio essentialiter felicitas: felicitas enim, sicut probat Philosophus inferius, consistit in operatione perfecta secundum virtutem; cum autem huiusmodi sit conveniens homini felici, istam operationem convenientem concomitatur delectatio quedam; in illa igitur operatione essentialiter consistit felicitas, et ipsam felicitatem et illam operationem concomitatur delectatio intellectualis”; Radulphus Brito, 2008: 205: “Felicitas non consistit in delectatione secundum intellectum: quia in illo quod est propria passio consequens operationem in qua consistit felicitas sive consequens felicitatem non consistit felicitas; modo delectatio secundum intellectum est quedam passio consequens operationem intellectus in qua consistit felicitas; ergo in tali delectatione secundum intellectum non consistit felicitas”.

recede into corruptible things. The same book of *Ethics* comes in useful when the author presents firmness (*firmitas*) and superiority (*principalitas*) as the admirable pleasures of philosophy. Likewise, a paraphrase of Seneca's letter — introduced to reprimand those discouraged by the effort needed for pursuing knowledge — is used in order to praise philosophy as a remedy which, while curing, gives pleasure and is both curative (*salubris*) and sweet (*dulcis*). The appealing consequence of taking medicine prescribed by the author is transformation into a beautiful (*formosus*), strong (*fortis*), noble (*nobilis*) and, in a sense, immortal (*immortal*) man.

Unfortunately, this ethical thread concerning the ideal of happiness is developed in the author almost exclusively by means of quotations rather than his own reflections, making it difficult to attempt to further extract any original thought from his argument. Nonetheless, the sources he refers to suggest a strong adherence to classical sources, seemingly more than to the tradition associated with Arabic philosophy and Averroes, who, in the context of moral virtues, is quoted only once.

The second aspect that might attract scholars' attention concerns the reception of *De substantia orbis*, a work which the anonymous arguably commented on at length. *De substantia orbis*, although widespread among schoolmen from its first appearance among the other Averroes' works translated by Michael Scot, did not find many commentators from the 13th century onwards. The earliest commentary we know is the one of Fernand of Spain, who commented upon Averroes in Paris probably around 1290.¹⁸ His commentary marks important yet apparently not entirely solitary interest in explaining *De substantia*

¹⁸ On Fernand of Spain, see: Zimmermann, 1968; Zimmermann, 1976; Kuksewicz, 1977; Zimmermann, 1982; Zimmermann, 2001; Zimmermann, 2002; Galle & Guildentops, 2004. Fernand's commentary on *De substantia orbis* is traditionally ascribed to John of Jandun and listed among his works. This double attribution has been mentioned in some publications: Zimmermann, 1994; Zimmermann, 1995; Hoffmann, 2001. One of the arguments for accepting that the commentary was composed in the nineties is that it contains references to the position of Giles of Rome on the matter of the heavens. Giles' view was clarified in his *De materia caeli* composed around 1288 and was discussed shortly afterwards by Godfrey of Fontaines. Moreover, in Fernand's commentary on *Metaphysics*, written in the mid-nineties, there are several references to the commentary on *De substantia orbis*, which must have been written earlier. For literature concerning the discussion on the celestial matter, see note 20. On some doctrinal aspects of Fernand's commentary on *De substantia orbis*, see: Lamy, 2012 (the commentary is ascribed here to John of Jandun); Tomanek, 2021 (esp. pp. 190–196). I do not list among the Parisian commentators on *De substantia orbis* Alvaro de Toledo whose commentary is contemporary to that of Fernand, yet there is no information about the author's studies and teaching activity in Paris. Also, Alvaro's commentary differs in its form from other commentaries produced at this time at the Faculty of Arts. It cannot be then excluded that it was composed outside of academic circles, most likely in Toledo. For more information, see the critical edition: Alonso, 1941. There are some scarce pieces of information about this author summarized by the editor on pp. 14–18.

orbis at the university. There are also solid reasons to believe that, during the same period, another commentary was composed by Giles of Orléans whose late commentary on *Physics* contains several references to his earlier questions on *De substantia orbis*, which proves that he commented on Averroes sometime before he finished the Padovan redaction of his commentary.¹⁹

Among these two commentaries — one extant, another known only from scarce testimonies — the Anonymous Monacensis casts some new light on the reception of *De substantia orbis* in Paris. Granted that the anonymous prologue was composed around 1300, it provides us with another piece of evidence that in the last decade of the 13th century and at the beginning of the century that followed, *De substantia orbis* attracted schoolmen's interest as teaching material and as a crucial point of reference in doctrinal disputes.²⁰

Among the contemporary Parisian masters, the one who seems to be directly connected with the anonymous author is Fernand of Spain himself. There are some suggestive signs of the Anonymous' affinity with Fernand, who was arguably his contemporary in commenting on Averroes' tract. The relationship between these two works is evident in the author's use of the references to Aristotle and Averroes, which in some respects resembles phrasing from Fernand's prologue to *De substantia orbis*, as seen in the following examples. (The numbers in square brackets indicate the order of appearance of the respective fragments in Fernand's prologue.)

¹⁹ Cf. Aegidius Aurelianensis. *Quaestiones in Phys.*, Ed. II, I, 11 (Padova, Pontifica Biblioteca Antoniana 380, f. 5rb): "Similiter etiam ratio illorum qui ponunt quod forma de se sit divisibilis parum valet, qualiter autem solvitur respicias in quaestionibus quas feci in *De substantia orbis*"; I, 13 (f. 6va): "Ad contrarium huius respice (*corr. ex respicere*) in quadam quaestione facta de hoc super librum *De substantia orbis* et omnino de hoc (*iter.*) nihil ad praesens dico"; I, 16 (f. 7vb): "Ad quaestionem dicendum breviter quod de hoc etiam habitum fuit in *De substantia orbis*"; I, 16 (f. 8ra): "Sed hoc solet adduci una instantia valde difficilis de divisione ignis minimi, sed solutionem eius inspicias in quaestione quae fuit facta in *De substantia orbis*". On redactions of Giles' commentary on *Physics*, see: Kuksewicz, 1992; Kuksewicz, 1994a. Kuksewicz was also the first to mention Giles' self-references in his second redaction of this commentary; see: Kuksewicz, 1994a: 29. On the problem of Giles' alleged 'Averroism', see: Kuksewicz, 1990; Kuksewicz, 1994b.

²⁰ At the same time, the growing interest in Averroes' doctrine from *De substantia orbis* is apparent in discussion on matter and interminate dimensions, especially in Henry of Ghent, Godfrey of Fontaines and Giles of Rome; see: Macken, 1979 (esp. pp. 171–172); Sylla, 1981; Donati, 1986; Donati, 1988; Donati, 2000; Donati, 2002.

<p>Fernandus Hispanus, <i>Sententia cum quaestionibus super De substantia orbis, prooemium</i> (Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat.lat. 845, f. 272ra)</p>	<p>Anonymus Monacensis, <i>Prooemium super De substantia orbis</i>, pp. 22–24</p>
<p>[1] Quia nihil magis necessarium est homini cognoscere quam seipsum, qui enim seipsum ignorat parum vel nihil de aliis scire potest; sed per naturalem philosophiam homo seipsum cognoscit; ergo naturalis philosophia est homini maxime necessaria. Quod autem per naturalem philosophiam homo seipsum cognoscit est manifestum quantum ad utramque partem hominis. Est enim scientia de anima pars scientiae naturalis, ut Commentator dicit prooemio <i>De anima</i>. “Plurima autem consideratio scientiae naturalis est de corporibus”, ut ait Philosophus 3 <i>Caeli et mundi</i> et Commentator circa principium 1 <i>eiusdem</i>, quare patet quod per philosophiam naturalem homo seipsum cognoscit.</p>	<p>Et sic philosophia inducens quattuor effectus bonos summe est appetenda, sed tamen specialiter una pars eius ut naturalis propter duo: primo propter hoc, quia per naturalem philosophiam cognoscit se homo, nam homo compositus ex anima et corpore habens notitiam libri <i>De anima</i> cognoscit animam suam; similiter habens cognitionem <libri> <i>De caelo</i> scit cognitionem corporis et elementorum ex quibus fit corpus.</p>
	<p>Ideo per naturalem philosophiam homo scit se et naturam suam et ob hoc naturalis philosophia maxime dicitur philosophia, nam secundum Isaac “philosophia est cognitio sui ipsius ab homine” ex quo tunc homo maxime cognoscit se per naturalem philosophiam</p>
<p>[2] Primum etiam apparet ex hoc quod naturalis philosophia dat pluribus scientiis plura principia, cum enim nostra cognitio surgat ex sensatis, hoc autem tradit cognitionem sensorum et sensuum.</p>	<p>Secundo, quia est de sensatis a quibus incipit omnis naturalis cognitio.</p>
<p>[4] Est etiam pars maxime sciri desiderata non solum, quia de nobilioribus entibus, verum etiam, quia modicum de eorum causis percipere possumus, eo quod sunt a nobis distantia situ et ratione. Magis diligimus etiam ‘parvas sufficientias de quibus habemus maximas dubitationes’ quam efficaciores rationes de rebus notioribus, ut vult Philosophus 2 <i>Caeli et mundi</i>. Et Commentator in eodem ait quod ‘melius est scire pauca de rebus nobilioribus quam multa de vilioribus’.</p>	<p>Et licet tota naturalis philosophia sit specialiter appetenda, adhuc tamen quaedam eius pars magis, ut illa quae est de corporibus caelestibus. Et hoc vult Philosophus in 2 <i>Caeli et mundi</i>. Similiter in <i>De generatione animalium</i> ubi dicit ‘Aliquid topicce scire de superioribus nobiliter est quam naturalia scire cum demonstratione de nobis propinquis’.</p>

<p>Fernandus Hispanus, <i>Sententia cum quaestionibus super De substantia orbis, prooemium</i> (Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat.lat. 845, f. 272ra)</p>	<p>Anonymus Monacensis, <i>Prooemium super De substantia orbis</i>, pp. 22–24</p>
<p>[3] Illa pars naturalis philosophiae videtur esse nobilior et naturaliter magis sciri desiderata quae de nobilioribus inquirat, ‘nam artes non differunt ab invicem in nobilitate nisi aut nobilitate subiecti aut confirmatione demonstrationis’, ut Philosophus et Commentator dicunt prooemio <i>De anima</i>. Haec autem pars videtur esse quae traditur in libro <i>Caeli et mundi</i>, saltem quantum ad eius maiorem partem. Tractat enim de nobilissimis corporibus et entibus habentibus optimam vitam per se sufficientissimam quam perficiunt toto aeterno a quibus aliis ‘communicatum est esse et vivere’, ut Philosophus scribit 1 eiusdem <i>Caeli et mundi</i>.</p>	<p>Hoc idem vult in prooemio <i>De anima</i>, ubi dicit: Scientia est nobilior alia propter duo, vel propter certiores demonstrationes vel propter subiecti nobilitatem; sed constat virtute quod corpora caelestia sunt nobiliora aliis corporibus; ergo et scientia de ipsis.</p>

What seems to be particularly important is unanimity in placing *De substantia orbis* between the other *libri naturales*, as a work following the investigations from Aristotle’s *De caelo*. Also, both authors explain in the same way why Averroes composed this treaty, i.e., to supplement Aristotle’s *De caelo* — Fernand additionally enumerates other works — and to clarify a number of problems associated with issues relating to the philosophy of nature.

<p>Fernandus Hispanus, <i>Sententia cum quaestionibus super De substantia orbis, prooemium</i>, f. 272ra–b</p>	<p>Anonymus Monacensis, <i>Prooemium super De substantia orbis</i>, p. 24</p>
<p>Et licet Philosophus de istis entibus nobilibus, videlicet corporibus caelestibus et eorum motoribus, principalius in dicto libro <i>Caeli et mundi</i> inquirat quam in alio loco naturalis philosophiae ob difficultatem, tamen eorum in pluribus aliis locis suorum librorum multa de ipsis interserit, ut patet 8 <i>Physicorum</i>, 2 <i>De generatione</i>, 1 <i>Metheororum</i> et in pluribus locis suae <i>Metaphysicae</i>, praecipue in 12. Et ideo sententia Aristotelis de natura caelestium corporum et eorum motoribus obscura necnon in quibusdam dubia esse videtur.</p>	

Fernandus Hispanus, <i>Sententia cum quaestionibus super De substantia orbis, prooemium</i> , f. 272ra–b	Anonymus Monacensis, <i>Prooemium super De substantia orbis</i> , p. 24
Propter quod Averroes, commentator Aristotelis et eius philosophiae singularis emulor, quemdam libellum edidit quem <i>De substantia orbis</i> intitulavit in quo Aristotelis sententiam de natura caelestium corporum et eorum motorum necnon differentiam et convenientiam eorum ad generabilia et corruptibilia in substantia et in actionibus, tam ex parte corporum quam ex parte formarum breviter et optime explicavit.	Sed propter difficultatem quae est circa notitiam corporum caelestium et motores caelorum Commentator fecit librum <i>De substantia orbis</i> in quod assumens multa principia philosophiae his notum deducit quae est de corpore caelesti, cum secunda pars naturalis philosophiae quae est de corporibus caelestibus sit specialiter appetenda, ergo et ille liber. Et intentio Commentatoris est talis, ut ostendat ex quibus principiis componatur corpus caeleste, quia ex materia et forma. Et hoc ostendit ex comparatione materiae caelestium corporum ad materiam corporum generabilium et formae ad formam. Similiter et ostendit omnes differentias et convenientias inter ea et tres <causas> inquit in eis, in se et in parte sumptis.
Patet etiam ordo huius libelli ad alios libros naturales, annectitur enim principaliter libro <i>Caeli et mundi</i> , et ideo est in eius ordine collocandus.	Et ipse continuatur ad librum <i>De caelo et mundo</i> et tenet secundum ordinem inter naturales libros cum libro <i>De caelo et mundo</i> .

The agreement of these two masters regarding the place of Averroes' tract as supplementing *De caelo* provides the earliest testimony of what appears to be important, yet we do not know how widespread was change in the reception of *De substantia orbis*, which was now perceived as an "independent" work having its own place among other books on the philosophy of nature. The continuity in adding this work to the commonly accepted *divisio librorum naturalium* was further maintained in the second decade of the 14th century in Maino de Maineri, who commented upon *De substantia orbis*, and John of Jandun, who listed this work in the division of science in his commentary on *Physics*.²¹ By that

²¹ Cf. Iohannes de Ianduno, 1544: sine folio: "Ipsa autem philosophia naturalis habet sex partes principales. Una quidem et prima est in qua consideratur de ente mobili et de motu et de principiis eius et passionibus in communi. Et haec traditur in 8 libris *Physicorum*. Secunda pars est de ente mobili ad ubi in qua considerantur corpora simplicia, scilicet corpora caelestia et quattuor elementa sub ratione qua mobilia sunt secundum ubi et de quibusdam aliis annexis huic considerationi. Et haec traditur in libro *Caeli et mundi*". Maino lists *De substantia orbis* as a work summarizing problems mentioned, yet not fully elaborated by Aristotle: Magninus de Maineriis, *Quaestiones super De substantia orbis, prooemium* (ed. Fioravanti, p. 223): "Cum tamen prima pars philosophiae naturalis sit de corpore mobili vel naturali, illa supposita ad praesens, intendo de secunda parte, scilicet de corpore mobili ad ubi, et non intendo de ipso in

time, the treaty apparently gained popularity and spread around Europe, especially in *studium generale* in Erfurt in the second half of the 14th century, where *De substantia orbis* received considerable attention and found several commentators.²² Later on, it also became an official textbook in Bologna, mentioned in statutes from the beginning of the 15th century, which also suggests that *De substantia orbis* was employed there over the years.²³

THE PRINCIPLES OF EDITION

As stated earlier, the scribe appears to be rather incompetent. There are some obvious omissions and repetitions of words used earlier in the fragment, such as *primi* instead of *secundi*, or *affectus* instead of *aspectus*. Likewise, the scribe misunderstood some fragments he copied, as one might notice in those places where the anonymous cites *auctoritates*. Hence, I have made some additions and conjectures in the text when needed. All incorrect readings have been indicated in the apparatus criticus.

Although short, the Anonymus Monacensis is filled with numerous quotations from authorities, especially Seneca, Aristotle and Averroes, of which he makes extensive use. In many cases, though, fragments incorporated within the text vary from those in sources and, in most cases, are cited either after some florilegium or from memory. For the sake of clarity, I have decided to cite some of these sources *in extenso* in the doctrinal apparatus, especially when the quotation, or reference in the text differs from what is in the source.

Apart from the direct references, I have decided to indicate in the doctrinal apparatus some parallel sources from the second part of the 13th century that use similar references or discuss concepts close to those in the prologue. It could prove of use for understanding the historical context of this work, deeply immersed in the Parisian Faculty of Arts milieu.

In my edition, I classicize Latin, including so far unedited sources I quote in the doctrinal apparatus.

tota sui communitate, quia hoc modo de ipso determinatur in quattuor libris *Caeli et mundi*; sed intendo de corpore celesti solum et de his quae ad eum (!) pertinent, de quo quamvis Aristoteles declaravit in primis duobus libris *Caeli et mundi* et in multis aliorum suorum librorum fecit mentionem, sicut in secundo *De generatione* et octavo *Physicorum* et octavo *Metaphysice* et duodecimo, tamen nihilominus Averroes commentator egregius verborum Aristotilis voluit nobis tractatum de hoc facere, aggregans qua ab Aristotele dicta sunt diffuse in aliis, quedam tamen eliciens ex verbis Aristotelis de ipso caelo quae Aristoteles non expressit”.

²² On Averroes' popularity in Erfurt, see studies by Zdzisław Kuksewicz: Kuksewicz, 1978; Kuksewicz, 1986; Kuksewicz, 1997. Sönke Lorenz (Lorenz, 1989: 136–139) stresses a particular importance of *De substantia orbis* for schoolmen from *studium generale*.

²³ Cf. Malagola, 1888: 274, rubr. LXXVIII. For a broader context of teaching philosophy in Bologna, see: Maierù, 1994: 51–52.

NOTAE

In textu:

< > verba hic inclusa addenda esse videntur

> < verba hic inclusa delenda esse videntur

† † verba hic inclusa locum corruptum indicant

In apparatu critico:

add. = addidit

cancell. = cancellavit

coni. = conieci

iter. = iteravit

praem. = praemittit

s. l. = supra lineam

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations:

ALD *Aristoteles Latinus Database*. Turnhout: Union Académique Internationale KUL/BREP-OLiS (online).

Primary literature:

Manuscript sources

Aegidius Aurelianensis, *Questiones in De generatione*, Ed. I. London, British Library, Arundel, 4, ff. 17ra–26vb.

Aegidius Aurelianensis, *Quaestiones super Physicam*, Ed. I. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 3493, ff. 1ra–93vb.

Aegidius Aurelianensis, *Quaestiones super Physicam*, Ed. II. Padova, Pontifica Biblioteca Antoniana 380, ff. 1ra–69rb.

Fernandus Hispanus, *Sententia cum quaestionibus super De substantia orbis*. Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat.lat. 845, ff. 272ra–304ra.

Fernandus Hispanus, *Sententia libri Metaphysicae*. Oxford, Merton College, 281, ff. 41–149vb.

Early-modern print

Iohannes de Ianduno. (1544). *Quaestiones in libros Physicorum*. Venetiis: Apud Iuntas.

Printed sources

Anonymus. (1975). *Lectura in Ethicam novam* (pp. 94–141). In: R.A. Gauthier. *Le cours sur l'Éthica nova d'un maître ès Arts de Paris. Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, 42, 71–141.

Anonymus. (1991). *Prologus in Isagogen* (pp. 142–146). In: C. Marmo. *Anonymi philosophia Sicut dicitur ab Aristotile*. A Parisian prologue to Porphyry. *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge Grec et Latin*, 61, 140–146.

Anonymus. (1995). *Philosophiae commendatio "Dicit Aristotiles"* (pp. 363–389). In: C. Lafleur & J. Carrier (Eds.). *La Philosophia d'Hervé le Breton (alias Henri le Breton) et le recueil d'introductions à la philosophie du ms. Oxford, Corpus. Christi College 283 (Deuxième partie)*. *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*, 62, 359–442.

- Anonymus. (1997). Prologus *Ut ait Tullius* (pp. 36–53). In: G. Dahan. Une introduction à l'étude de la philosophie au XIIIe siècle: *Ut ait Tullius* [étude et édition] (pp. 3–58). In: J. Carrier & C. Laffeur (Eds.). *L'enseignement de la philosophie au XIIIe siècle: Autour du "Guide de l'étudiant" du ms. Ripoll 109: actes du colloque international* (=Studia Artistarum, 7). Turnhout: Brepols.
- Anonymus (=Iacobus de Duaco?). (2010). Quaestiones super librum Ethicorum (pp. 127–305). In: I. Costa (Ed.). *Anonymi artium magistri Questiones super librum ethicorum Aristotelis*: (Paris, BnF, lat. 14698) (=Studia Artistarum, 23). Turnhout: Brepols.
- Anonymus. (2011). Quaestiones super librum *Ethicorum* (pp. 240–245). In: I. Costa. Autour de deux *Commentaires* inédits sur l'*Éthique à Nicomaque*: Gilles d'Orléans et l'Anonyme d'Erfurt (pp. 211–272). In: L. Bianchi (Ed.). *Christian readings of Aristotle from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance* (=Studia Artistarum, 29). Turnhout: Brepols.
- Aristoteles. *De caelo et mundo*. (=ALD).
- Aristoteles. (1973). *Ethica Nicomachea*. (=Aristoteles Latinus, 26, 1–3, 4). Leiden–Bruxelles: De Brouwer & Brill.
- Aristoteles. (1990). *Physica. Translatio vetus* (=Aristoteles Latinus, 7, 1). (G. Verbeke, Ed.). Leiden: Brill.
- Aristoteles. (1961). *Politica (Libri I–II, 11). Translatio prior imperfecta interprete Guillelmo de Moerbeka* (?) (=Aristoteles Latinus, 29, 1). (P. Michaud-Quantin, Ed.). Bruges–Paris: De Brouwer.
- Aristoteles. (1961). *Praedicamenta*. In: Minio-Paluello, L. (Ed.). *Categoriae vel Praedicamenta* (=Aristoteles Latinus, 1, 1–5). Bruges–Paris: De Brouwer.
- Aristoteles. *De partibus animalium*. (=ALD).
- Aristoteles. *De sensu et sensato (translatio 'nova')*. (=ALD).
- Aspasius. (1991). *Commentum in Ethicam Nicomacheam* (pp. 106–195). In: H.P.F. Mercken (Ed.). *The Greek commentaries of the Nicomachean ethics of Aristotle: In the Latin translation of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln (1253). The Anonymous Commentator on Book VII, Aspasius on Book VIII and Michael of Ephesus on Books IX and X* (=Corpus Latinum commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum, 6,3). Leiden: Brill.
- Aubricus Remensis. (1984). *Philosophia* (pp. 29–48). In: R.-A. Gauthier. Notes sur Siger de Brabant: II. Siger en 1272–1275 Aubry de Reims et la Scission des Normands. *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 68(1), 3–49.
- Averroes. (1953). *Commentarium Magnum in Aristotelis De anima libros* (=Corpus Commentariorum Averrois in Aristotelem, 6,1). (F.S. Crawford, Ed.). Cambridge: The Mediaeval Academy of America.
- Averroes. (2003). Averrois Cordubensis commentum magnum super libro *De celo et mundo* Aristotelis (=Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales. Bibliotheca, 4). (A. Arnzen & F.J. Carmody, Eds.). Leuven: Peeters.
- Averroes. (1986). *Commentum in Physiam* (pp. 185–188). In: H. Schmieja. Drei Prologe im Großen Physikkommentar des Averroes? (pp. 175–189). In: A. Zimmermann (Ed.). *Aristotelisches Erbe im arabisch-lateinischen Mittelalter* (=Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 18). Berlin–New York: De Gruyter.
- Boethius. (2005). *De consolatione philosophiae* (pp. 1–162). In: C. Moreschini (Ed.). *Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius. De consolatione philosophiae. Opuscula Theologica*. München–Leipzig: De Gruyter.
- Boethius Dacus. (1969). *Modi significandi sive Quaestiones super Priscianum Maiorem* (=Corpus philosophorum danicorum Medii Aevi, 4). (J. Pinborg & H. Roos (Eds.)). Hauniae: Apud Librarium G.E.C. Gad.

- Iacobus de Duaco. (1990). Quaestiones in *De anima* (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 14698) (p. 157). In: L. Bianchi. *Il vescovo e i filosofi: la condanna parigina del 1277 e l'evoluzione dell'aristotelismo scolastico*. Bergamo: Lubrina.
- Iohannes Dacus. (1955). *Divisio scientiae* (pp. 1–44). In: A. Otto (Ed.). *Iohannis Daci opera* (=Corpus philosophorum danicorum Medii Aevi, 1,1). Haunia: Apud Librarium G.E.C. Gad.
- Iohannes de Fonte. (1974). Auctoritates Aristotelis Senecae, Boethii, Platonis, Apulei Africani, Porphyrii et Gilberti Porretani (pp. 111–335). In: J. Hamesse. *Les Auctoritates Aristotelis. Un florilège medieval: Étude historique et édition critique*. Louvain–Paris: Publications Universitaires — Beatrice Nauwefalaerts.
- Iohannes de Sancto Amando. (1894). *Die Concordanciae des Johannes de Sancto Amando*. (J.L. Pagel, Ed.). Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer.
- Isaac Israeli. (1937). De definitionibus (pp. 300–340). In: J. T. Muckle. Isaac Israeli, *Liber de definitionibus*. *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*, 11, 299–340.
- Magninus de Maineriis. (2017). Quaestiones super *De substantia orbis* (pp. 216–223). In: G. Fioravanti. Due principia di Maino de' Maineri (pp. 209–223). In: G. Zuccolin (Ed.). *Summa doctrina et certa experientia. Studi su medicina e filosofia per Chiara Crisciani*. Firenze: SISMELE — Edizioni del Galluzzo.
- Oliver Brito. (1997). *Philosophia* (pp. 474–487). In: J. Carrier & C. Lafleur. L'Introduction à la philosophie de maître Olivier le Breton (pp. 467–487). In: J. Carrier & C. Lafleur (Eds.). *L'enseignement de la philosophie au XIIIe siècle: Autour du "Guide de l'étudiant" du ms. Ripoll 109: actes du colloque international* (=Studia Artistarum, 7). Turnhout: Brepols.
- Ps.-Boethius de Dacia. (1991). Quaestiones super *Analityca Priora* (Brugge, Stadtbibliothek, 509) (p. 143). In: C. Marmo. *Anonymi Philosophia Sicut dicitur ab Aristotile*. A Parisian prologue to Porphyry. *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge Grec et Latin*, 61, 140–146.
- Radulphus Brito. (2014). Quaestiones in *De anima* (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 12971) (vol. 2.2, pp. 884–885). In: T. W. Köhler. *Homo animal nobilissimum. Konturen des spezifisch Menschlichen in der naturphilosophischen Aristoteleskommentierung des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts*. Leiden–Boston: Brill.
- Radulphus Brito. (2008). Quaestiones supra *Ethicam Nicomacheam* (pp. 171–563). In: I. Costa. *Le questiones di Radulfo Brito sull' Etica Nicomachea* (=Studia Artistarum, 17). Turnhout: Brepols.
- Robertus Grosseteste. (1981). *Commentum in Analytica Posteriora* (pp. 93–408). In: P. Rossi (Ed.). *Robertus Grosseteste. Commentarius in Posteriorum analyticorum libros* (=Testi e studi per il Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi, 2). Firenze: L.S. Olschki.
- Seneca. (1965). *L. Annaei Senecae Ad Lucilium epistulae morales*. (L.D. Reynolds, Ed.). (Vol. I). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seneca. (2017). *Seneca. Letters on Ethics: To Lucilius*. (M. Graver & A.A. Long, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Secondary literature:

- Alonso, M. (1941). *Alvaro de Toledo. Comentario al "De substantia orbis" de Averroes: aristotelismo y averroismo* (=Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Filosófico Luis Vives. Serie A, 11). Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Filosófico Luis Vives.
- Bataillon, L.-J. (1994). Sermoni e orazioni d'ambiente universitario parigino nel sec. XIII. *Documenti e Studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale*, 5, 297–329.
- Bianchi, L. (1990). *Il vescovo e i filosofi: la condanna parigina del 1277 e l'evoluzione dell'aristotelismo scolastico*. Bergamo: Lubrina.

- Bianchi, L. (2003). Filosofi, uomini e bruti. Note per la storia di un'antropologia averroista (pp. 42–61). In: L. Bianchi. *Studi sull'aristotelismo del Rinascimento*. Padova: Il Poligrafo.
- Cheneval, F. & Imbach, R. (2014). *Thomas von Aquin, Prologe zu den Aristoteles-Kommentaren*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.
- Costa, I. (2011). Autour de deux *Commentaires* inédits sur l'Éthique à Nicomaque: Gilles d'Orléans et l'Anonyme d'Erfurt (pp. 211–272). In: L. Bianchi (Ed.). *Christian readings of Aristotle from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance* (= *Studia Artistarum*, 29). Turnhout: Brepols.
- Dahan, G. (1997). Une introduction à l'étude de la philosophie au XIIIe siècle: *Ut ait Tullius* [étude et édition] (pp. 3–58). In: J. Carrier & C. Lafleur (Eds.). *L'enseignement de la philosophie au XIIIe siècle: Autour du "Guide de l'étudiant" du ms. Ripoll 109: actes du colloque international* (= *Studia Artistarum*, 7). Turnhout: Brepols.
- De Vaux, R. (1933). La première entrée d'Averroès chez les Latins. *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 22(2), 193–243.
- Donati, S. (1986). La dottrina di Egidio Romano sulla materia dei corpi celesti. Discussioni sulla natura dei corpi celesti alla fine del tredicesimo secolo. *Medioevo*, 12, 229–280.
- Donati, S. (1988). La dottrina delle dimensioni indeterminate in Egidio Romano. *Medioevo*, 14, 149–233.
- Donati, S. (2000). La discussione sulle dimensioni indeterminate in un commento alla *Metafisica* della fine del XIII secolo. *Medioevo*, 25, 237–312.
- Donati, S. (2002). The notion of dimensions indeterminatae in the commentary tradition of the *Physics* in the thirteenth and in the early fourteenth century (pp. 189–223). In: C.H. Leijenhorst, J.M.M.H. Thijssen, & C. Lüthy (Eds.). *The dynamics of Aristotelian natural philosophy from antiquity to the seventeenth century* (= *Medieval and Early Modern Philosophy and Science*, 5). Leiden–Boston–Köln: Brill
- Duhem, P. (1916). *Le système du monde: histoire des doctrines cosmologiques de Platon à Copernic* (vol. IV). Paris: Hermann.
- Ebbesen, S. (1981). *Commentators and commentaries on Aristotle's Sophistici Elenchi: A study of post-Aristotelian ancient and medieval writings on fallacies* (= *Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum*, 7,2). Leiden: Brill
- Ebbesen, S. (1997). Texts on Equivocation. Part I. Ca. 1130–1270. *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge Grec et Latin*, 67, 127–199.
- Fioravanti, G. (1992). Sermones in lode della filosofia e della logica a Bologna nella prima metà del XIV secolo (pp. 165–185). In: D. Buzzetti, M. Ferriani, & A. Tabarroni (Eds.). *L'insegnamento della logica a Bologna nel XIV secolo*. Bologna: Presso l'Istituto per la Storia dell'Università.
- Galle, G. (1998). The division of science in the prologue to the questions on *De Caelo* by Peter of Auvergne (pp. 774–783). In: J. Aersten & A. Speer (Eds.). *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter? Qu'est-ce que la philosophie au moyen âge? What is Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (= *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 26). Berlin–New York: De Gruyter.
- Galle, G. (2003). *Peter of Auvergne, Questions on Aristotle's De caelo*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Galle, G. & Guildentops, G. (2004). Ferrandus Hispanus on *Ideas* (pp. 51–80). In: *Platonic ideas and concept formation in ancient and medieval thought* (= *Ancient and Medieval Philosophy. Series 1*, 32). Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Gauthier, R.A. (1982). Notes sur les *Débuts* (1225–1240) du Premier "Averroïsme". *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 66(3), 321–374.
- Gauthier, R.A. (1984). Notes sur Siger de Brabant: II. Siger en 1272–1275 Aubry de Reims et la Scission des Normands. *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 68(1), 3–49.

- Grabmann, M. (1936a). Eine für Examinazwecke abgefasste Quaestionensammlung der Pariser Artistenfakultät aus der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhundert (vol. 2, pp. 183–199). In: M. Grabmann. *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben, Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Scholastik und Mystik*. München: Max Hueber Verlag.
- Grabmann, M. (1936b). Mitteilungen aus Münchener Handschriften über bisher unbekannte Philosophen der Artistenfakultät (Codd. lat. 14246 und 14383) (vol. 2, pp. 225–238). In: M. Grabmann. *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben. Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Scholastik und Mystik*. München: Max Hueber Verlag.
- Grabmann, M. (1941). *I divieti ecclesiastici di Aristotele sotto Innocenzo III e Gregorio IX*. Roma: Pontificia Università Gregoriana.
- Grabmann, M. (1979a). Methoden und Hilfsmittel des Aristotelesstudiums im Mittelalter (vol. 2, pp. 1558–1562). In: M. Grabmann. *Gesammelte Akademieabhandlungen*. München: F. Schöningh.
- Grabmann, M. (1979b). Mittelalterliche lateinische Aristotelesübersetzungen und Aristotelescommentare (vol. 2, pp. 412–419). In: M. Grabmann. *Handschriften spanischer Bibliotheken*. In: M. Grabmann. *Gesammelte Akademieabhandlungen*. München: F. Schöningh.
- Graver, M. & Long, A. A. (trans.). (2017). *Seneca. Letters on ethics: To Lucilius*. Chiago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hoffmann, R. (2001). Der Metaphysikkommentar Des Fernandus Hispanus. *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, 34, 95–101.
- Hyman, A. (1986). *Averroes' De Substantia Orbis. Critical edition of the Hebrew text with English translation and commentary*. Cambridge–Massachusetts–Jerusalem: The Medieval Academy of America — The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.
- Imbach, R. (1991). Einführungen in die Philosophie aus dem XIII. Jahrhundert. *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie*, 38, 471–493.
- Judy, A.G. (Ed.). (1976). *Robert Kilwardby O.P. De ortu scientiarum (=Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi, 4)*. London: British Academy.
- Köhler, T.W. (2014). Homo animal nobilissimum. *Konturen des spezifisch Menschlichen in der naturphilosophischen Aristoteleskommentierung des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts* (vol. 2.2). Leiden–Boston: Brill.
- König-Pralong, C. (2011). Animal équivoque. De Lincoln à Paris via Cologne (pp. 67–76). In: I. Atucha, D. Calma, C. König-Pralong, & I. Zavattero (Eds.). *Mots médiévaux offerts à Ruedi Imbach (=Textes et Études du Moyen Âge, 57)*. Brepols: Porto.
- Kuksewicz, Z. (1977). Ferrandus Hyspanus 'De specie intelligibili'. *Medioevo*, 3, 187–235.
- Kuksewicz, Z. (1978). L'influence d'Averroès sur des universités en Europe centrale l'expansion de l'Averroïsme Latin (pp. 275–281). In: J. Jolivet (Ed.). *Multiple Averroes*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Kuksewicz, Z. (1986). Un nouveau témoignage de l'averroïsme à Erfurt. *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, 28, 27–32.
- Kuksewicz, Z. (1990). Gilles d'Orléans était-il averroïste?. *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, 88(1), 5–24.
- Kuksewicz, Z. (1992). Ein Unbekanntes Werk von Aegidius von Orleans *Quaestiones super Physicam*. *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, 31, 3–21.
- Kuksewicz, Z. (1994a). Une seconde version de *Quaestiones super Physicam* de Gilles d'Orleans retrouvée. *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, 32, 3–32.
- Kuksewicz, Z. (1994b). Le problème de l'averroïsme de Gilles D'Orléans encore une fois. *Medioevo*, 20, 131–178.
- Kuksewicz, Z. (1997). Some remarks on Erfurt Averroists. *Studia Mediewistyczne*, 32, 93–121.

- Lafleur, C. (1988). *Quatre introductions a la philosophie au XIIIe siecle. Textes critiques et etude historique*. Montréal–Paris: Institut d'Études Médiévales & Vrin.
- Lafleur, C. (1995). Les 'guides de l'étudiant' de la Faculté des arts de l'Université de Paris au XIIIe siècle (pp. 137–200). In: M.J.F. M. Hoenen, J.H.J. Schneider, & G. Wieland (Eds.). *Philosophy and learning: Universities in the Middle Ages (=Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, 6)*. Leiden–New York: Brill.
- Lafleur, C. & Carrier, J. (1992). *Le guide de l'étudiant d'un maître anonyme de la Faculté des arts de Paris au XIIIe siècle. Édition critique provisoire du ms. Barcelona, Arxiu de la Corona d'Aragó, ms. Ripoll 109, fol. 134ra–158va*. Quebec: Université Laval.
- Lafleur, C. & Carrier, J. (1994). Un instrument de révision destiné aux candidats à la licence de la Faculté des Arts de Paris, le *De communibus artium liberalium*. *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale, 5*, 129–204.
- Lafleur, C. & Carrier, J. (1995). La philosophia d'Hervé le Breton (alias Henri le Breton) et le recueil d'introductions à la philosophie du ms. Oxford, Corpus. Christi College 283 (Deuxième partie). *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge, 62*, 359–442.
- Lafleur, C. & Carrier, J. (1997a). L'introduction à la philosophie de maître Nicolas de Paris (pp. 447–465). In: C. Lafleur & J. Carrier (Eds.). *L'enseignement de la philosophie au XIIIe siècle: Autour du "Guide de l'étudiant" du ms. Ripoll 109 (=Studia Artistarum, 7)*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Lafleur, C. & Carrier, J. (1997b). L'introduction à la philosophie de maître Olivier le Breton (pp. 468–487). In: C. Lafleur & J. Carrier (Eds.). *L'enseignement de la philosophie au XIIIe siècle: Autour du "Guide de l'étudiant" du ms. Ripoll 109. Actes du colloque international (=Studia Artistarum, 7)*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Lafleur, C. & Carrier, J. (1997c). Le prologue "Triplex est principium" du commentaire d'Adénulfe d'Anagni sur les *Topiques* d'Aristote (extrait) (pp. 421–446). In: C. Lafleur & J. Carrier (Eds.). *L'enseignement de la philosophie au XIIIe siècle: Autour du "Guide de l'étudiant" du ms. Ripoll 109 (=Studia Artistarum, 7)*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Lamy, A. (2012). La quantité indéterminée de la matière selon Jean de Jandun. Principes et problèmes ontologiques. *Revue de métaphysique et de morale, 74(2)*, 147–160.
- Lerner, M.-P. (1996). *Le monde des sphères I. Genèse et triomphe d'une représentation cosmique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Lewry, O.P. (1982). Thirteenth-century examination compendia from the faculty of arts (pp. 101–116). In: *Les genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Publications de l'Institut d'études médiévales.
- Lorenz, S. (1989). *Studium Generale Erfordense. Zum Erfurter Schulleben im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert*. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann.
- Macken, R. (1979). Le statut de la matière première dans la philosophie d'Henri de Gand. *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, 46*, 130–182.
- Maierù, A. (1994). *University training in medieval Europe (=Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, 3)*. Leiden–New York–Köln: Brill.
- Maierù, A. (2013). Robert Kilwardby on the division of sciences (pp. 353–389). In: H. Lagerlund & P. Thom (Eds.). *A companion to the philosophy of Robert Kilwardby*. Leiden–Boston: Brill.
- Malagola, C. (1888). *Statuti delle Università e dei Collegi dello Studio Bolognese*. Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli.
- Marmo, C. (1991). Anonymi philosophia *Sicut dicitur ab Aristotile*. A Parisian prologue to Porphyry. *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge Grec et Latin, 61*, 140–146.
- Mottoni, B.F.D. (1990). *Catalogo dei manoscritti (457–505)*. Repubblica Federale di Germania (Monaco) (=Aegidii Romani Opera Omnia, 1, 1/5). Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore.

- Mulchahey, M.M. (1998). *“First the bow is bent in study...”: Dominican education before 1350*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- Musatti, C.A. (2013). Due prologhi al *De caelo* di Aristotele: l'anonimo commento del ms. Escorial h. II. 1 e un commento attribuito a Pietro d'Alvernia (pp. 173–190). In: M. Lenzi, C. Musatti, & L. Valente (Eds.). *Medioevo e filosofia: Per Alfonso Maierù*. Roma: Viella.
- Neske, I. (2005). *Katalog Der Lateinischen Handschriften Der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München Die Handschriften Aus St. Emmeram in Regensburg, Bd. 2 Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Monacensis. T. 4 Ser. Nova Ps. 2 2: Katalog Der Lateinischen Handschriften Der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München Clm 14131–14260*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.
- O'Donnell, J.R. (1955). *Nine mediaeval thinkers. A collection of hitherto unedited texts*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- Otto, A. (1955). *Iohannis Daci opera (=Corpus philosophorum Danicorum Medii Aevi, 1, 1)*. Hauniae: Apud Librarium G.E.C. Gad.
- Schmieja, H. (1986). Drei Prologe im grossen Physikkommentar des Averroes (pp. 175–189). In: A. Zimmermann (Ed.). *Aristotelisches Erbe im arabisch-lateinischen Mittelalter (=Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 18)*. Berlin–New York: De Gruyter.
- Shooner, H.V. (1973). *Codices manuscripti operum Thomae de Aquino* (vol. 2). Roma: Commissio Leonina.
- Smith, R. (2021). *Aquinas, Bonaventure, and the scholastic culture of medieval Paris: Preaching, prologues, and biblical commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sylla, E. (1981). Godfrey of Fontaines on motion with respect to quantity of the Eucharist (pp. 105–141). In: A. Maierù & A. Paravicini Bagliani (Eds.). *Studi sul XIV secolo in Memoria di Anneliese Maier*. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Tomanek, Ł. (2021). Natural reason and God's infinite power. Diversity of approaches in the late 13th and 14th century commentaries on Averroes's *De substantia orbis*. *Analiza i Egzystencja*, 54, 181–215.
- Zimmermann, A. (1968). Ein Averroist des späten 13. Jahrhunderts: Ferrandus de Hispania. *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, 50(1–2), 145–164.
- Zimmermann, A. (1976). Die Kritik an Thomas von Aquin im Metaphysikkommentar des Ferrandus de Hispania (pp. 259–267). In: *Tommaso d'Aquino nella storia del pensiero. Dal medioevo ad oggi*. Napoli: Ed. Domenicane Italiane.
- Zimmermann, A. (1982). Aristote et Averroès dans le commentaire de Ferrandus de Hispania sur la *Métaphysique* d'Aristote. *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, 26, 3–6.
- Zimmermann, A. (1994). Remarques et questions relatives à l'oeuvre de Ferrand d'Espagne (pp. 213–228). In: H. Santiago-Otero (Ed.). *Diálogo filosófico-religioso entre cristianismo, judaísmo e islamismo durante la edad media en la península ibérica: Actes du Colloque international de San Lorenzo de El Escorial 23–26 juin 1991*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Zimmermann, A. (2001). Ferrandus Hispanus — ein Verteidiger des Averroes (pp. 297–306). In: J.A. Aertsen, K. Emery, & A. Speer (Eds.). *Nach der Verurteilung von 1277 / After the Condemnation of 1277 (=Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 28)*. Berlin–New York: De Gruyter.
- Zimmermann, A. (2002). Averroes im Werk des Magisters Ferrandus de Hispania (pp. 297–306). In: R.G. Khoury (Ed.). *Averroes (1126–1198), oder, der Triumph des Rationalismus: Internationales Symposium anlässlich des 800. Todestages des islamischen Philosophen, Heidelberg, 7.–11.– Oktober 1998*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Zimmermann, I. (1995). Kommentare zu der Schrift des Averroes *De substantia orbis* in der Bibliotheca Amploniana (pp. 122–126). In: A. Speer (Ed.). *Die Bibliotheca Amploniana. Ihre Bedeutung im Spannungsfeld von Aristotelismus, Nominalismus und Humanismus (=Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 23)*. Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter.

<ANONYMUS MONACENSIS>

<PROOEMIUM SUPER *DE SUBSTANTIA ORBIS*>

1 Averrois commentatoris *De substantia orbis*. De substantia orbis, prooemium.
 Seneca in 61 *Epistola ad Lucilium* dicit sic: “Aliorum remediorum post san-
 nitatem est voluptas, philosophia autem pariter salubris et dulcis est”. In verbis
 propositis allicit nos Seneca ad amorem philosophiae, per duo dumque est
 5 remedium quorundam morborum, tum quia est remedium excellens alia re-
 media: primum tangit, cum dicit ‘salubris’, secundum tangit, cum dicit ‘dulcis’.
 Ad intellectum propositionis praedictae notandum dupliciter est secundum
 viam medicorum.

Morbus corporis quattuor defectus inducit: primo difformitatem, secundo
 10 debilitatem, tertio immobilitatem, quarto corruptionem. Ratio primi talis est:
 Per quodcumque corpus acquirit materialem dispositionem, hoc inducit dif-
 formitatem, quia omnis naturalis dispositio est quaedam formositas; morbus
 inducit materialem dispositionem, ut sensui patet; ergo etc.

Ratio secundi est talis ex operatione ipsa quodcumque corpus non potest
 15 in operationem propriam propter aliquid sibi additum, hoc idem additum in-
 ducit debilitatem, quia tunc dicitur ‘ad debilem’, cum non potest in propriam
 operationem; sed quando corpori inest morbus non potest in operationem
 propriam...

2–3 Cf. Seneca, *Ep. ad Lucilium* 50, 9 (ed. Reynolds, pp. 132–133, vv. 25–2). 14–17 Terminus “propria operatio” fere ad intellectum refertur, cf. Ps.-Boethius de Dacia, *Quaestiones super An. Priora*, prologus (Brugge, Stadsbibliotheek, 509, f.31ra): “Homo enim maxime dicitur ‘homo’ cum potest in suam propriam operationem, que est ratiocinari. Cum autem non potest non dicitur homo nisi aequivoce. Et hoc plane testatur Commentator supra principium VIII *Phisicorum*. Dicit enim quod ‘homo’ dicitur aequivoce de homine perfecto per scientias speculativas, et de homine non perfecto, sicut dicitur de homine picto et vero”; Radulphus Brito, *Quaestiones in De anima*, prologus (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 12971, fol. 1ra): “Sicut dicit Commentator prologo octavi *phisicorum*, homo dicitur aequivoce de homine sciente et ignorante in scientiis speculativis sicut de homine vivo et mortuo, immo, quod plus est, sicut de rationali et irrationali. Et illud potest sic declarari, quia — sicut dicitur IV *Metheororum* versus finem — unumquodque habet propriam operationem; in quam cum potest, dicitur illud, et quando non potest, non dicitur illud nisi aequivoce, modo propria operatio humana est operatio secundum intellectum, quia per istam homo dividitur ab animalibus; per istas autem [et] operationes, sicut per augeri et nutriri et sentire et consimiles, homo non distinguitur a ceteris animalibus”. Fragmentum primum citatus est ex articulo Marmo, 1991: 143; fragmentum alterum editum est in Köhler, 2014: 884–885, n. 746. Terminus “propria operatio” hic usitatus refertur directe ad verba “non dicitur homo nisi aequivoce” quae infra sunt citata; vide p. 372–373, apparatus ad vv. 42–45.

6 dicit] salubris *add. sed cancell.*

Ratio tertii est, quia per quodcumque aufertur vigor naturalis et specie sub-
 20 tiles apti ad motum, per hoc inducitur immobilitas; morbus est huiusmodi, ut
 sensui patet; ergo etc.

Ratio quarti patet ex dictis, quod longitudo morbi causat eius deliratio-
 <nem>; sed deliratio corruptionem; ergo apparet quod morbus habet inducere
 praedicta quattuor et hoc per rationes patet.

25 Secundo apparet idem per definitionem morbi datam per medicos qui di-
 cunt: "Morbus est <mala> qualitas actioni naturali propria". Per hoc quod di-
 citur 'mala qualitas' tangitur quod inducat difformitatem. Per hoc quod dicitur
 'actioni naturali propria' tangitur quod habet inducere immobilitatem, debilita-
 tem, corruptionem, nam ex libro 6 *Physicorum* et vero omnis passio mala facta
 30 abicit a se natura, ideo morbus corporalis habet corruptionem inducere.

Et ulterius advertendum est quod duplex est morbus: quidam corporalis
 de cuius effectibus iam dictum; aliter est quidam morbus animae et talis est
 morbus vitium et ignorantia animae. Et ut hoc verum sit, patet per sententiam
 dicentem: "Morbus animae est inveteratum et durum vitium".

35 Ulterius advertendum est quod sicut morbus corporis inducit quattuor de-
 fectus corporis, sic morbus animae inducit quattuor defectus animae. Et con-
 firmatur primo difformitate, secundo debilitate, tertio immobilitate, quarto
 corruptione.

Ratio primi est per quodcumque aufertur alicui rei propria species, hoc
 40 inducit difformitatem; vitium et ignorantia sunt huiusmodi; ergo etc. Maior
 manifesta est ex eo, quia alius dicitur esse formosus a forma <ut albus> per

22–24 Iohannes Dacus enumerat longitudinem morbi inter ea quae impediunt scientiam: Iohannes Dacus, *Divisio scientiae* (ed. Otto, pp. 16–17): "Scientia autem in habitu potest impediri quatuor modis: Primo modo per corruptionem phantasmatum, nam dicit Philosophus libro *De anima*: corrupto quodam interius in nobis corrumpitur nostrum intelligere. Secundo modo impeditur ex ebrietate continua. Tertio modo ex somno nimio. Quarto modo ex morbo diurno et longaevo. Et de his tribus dicit Boethius super *Praedicamenta* capitulo de qualitate, quod tria sunt, quae impediunt scientiam, scilicet continua ebrietas, nimius somnus et morbus diuturnus". 26 Cf. Iohannes de Sancto Amando, *Concordantiae* (ed. Pagel, p. 211): "Quod autem sanitas radicalis sit simul cum morbo probatur sic: morbus est mala qualitas nocens naturali actioni, id est actioni procedenti a naturali sanitate, ergo naturalis sanitas est et remanet; sequitur enim: noceo sordi, ergo sordes est". 29–30 Cf. Arist., *Phys.* VI, 3 (247a16–21): "Neque circa animae virtutes et malitias. Virtus enim perfectio quaedam est; unumquodque enim tunc maxime perfectum est, cum attingit proprie virtuti, et tunc est maxime secundum naturam, sicut circulus tunc maxime secundum naturam est, cum maxime circulus sit; malitia autem corruptio horum et remotio est". 33–34 Cf. Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae*, 4, 4, 41 (ed. Moreschini, p. 118, vv. 141–142): "Nam si, uti corporum languor, ita vitiositas quidam est quasi morbus animorum". Cf. etiam *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (ed. Hamesse, p. 292, n. 74). 41–42 Cf. Arist., *Praedicamenta* 8, tr. Guillelmi (10a27–31): "Qualitates quidem igitur sunt quae dictae, qualia autem que secundum ipsas denominative dicuntur, vel quomodocumque

29 vero] primo *scr. sed cancell. et vero s. l.*

album sicut <in> *De praedicamentis*, si ergo caret forma, dicitur difformis. Minor patet per Commentatorem in prologo | 8 *Physicorum*, ubi dicit: “Qui non habet scientiam non est homo <nisi> aequivoce”; sed homo non dicitur homo 16v
45 aequivoce nisi carens forma hominis; ergo ignorantia inducit difformitatem.

aliter ab ipsis. In plurimis quidem igitur et fere in omnibus denominative dicuntur, velut ab albedine albus et a grammatica grammaticus et a iustitia iustus; similiter autem et in aliis”. 43–45 Averroes, *In Phys.* VIII, prologus (ed. Schmieja, p. 186): “Utilitas autem istius scientiae est pars utilitatis scientiae speculativae et declaratum est in scientia morali, scilicet quae considerat de actionibus voluntaries quod esse hominis in sua ultima perfectione est ipsum esse perfectum per scientias speculativas, et quod ista dispositio est ultima fortunitas, et secundum fatuos vita aeterna, et apparet in illa scientia quod hoc nomen homo dicitur aequivoce de eo, qui perfectus est per scientias speculativas et de aliis hominibus, et hoc secundum insipientes philosophos sicut dicitur de homine vivo et mortuo, immo sicut dicitur de animali rationali et picto”. Idem prologus in editione apud Iuntas librum I praecedit et ea quae hic apparent quibusdam aliis verbis exprimuntur (ed. Iuntina IV, f. 1vaH–I): “Utilitas autem eius est pars utilitatis scientiae speculativae, et declaratum est in scientia considerante de operibus voluntariis quod esse hominis secundum ultimam perfectionem ipsius et substantia eius perfecta est ipsum esse perfectum per scientiam speculativam. Et ista dispositio est sibi felicitas ultima et sempiterna vita, cum in hac scientia manifestum est quod praedicatio hominis perfecti in scientia speculativa et non perfecti sive non habentis aptitudinem, quod perfici posset, est aequivoca, sicut nomen hominis praedicatur de homine vivo et mortuo sive praedicatio hominis de rationali et lapideo”. Cf. etiam *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (ed. Hamesse, p. 159, n. 229). De Averrois prologis variis super *Physicam* quae ad nos pervenerunt cf. Schmieja, 1986; de prologo super librum VIII, cf. Schmieja, 1986: 184–189. Verba similia eis quae hic apparent inveniuntur etiam apud aliud commentum Commentatoris: Averroes, *In De anima* III, com. 36 (ed. Crawford, pp. 494–495, vv. 437–450). 42–45 Ea Averrois verba de homine aequivoce dicto ab aliis magistris frequenter usitata sunt: Aubricus Remensis, *Philosophia* (ed. Gauthier, p. 29, vv. 12–17): “Nam, ut ait Averroes in prologo 8 *Physicorum*, esse hominis ex sui ultima perfectione vel completionem est ipsum esse perfectum per scientias speculativas; aestimatur enim, ut ibidem dicit, quod hoc nomen homo aequivoce dicitur de homine perfecto per scientias speculativas et de aliis, sicut animal dicitur aequivoce de animali homine et de picto”; Oliver Brito, *Philosophia* (ed. Lafleur & Carrier, p. 481): “Nunc ad scientiam speculativam revertamur. De qua dicit Averroes in libro quem composuit super librum *Physicorum* quod ‘homo dicitur aequivoce de homine habente scientiam speculativam et de non habente, sicut de homine vero et homine picto’”; Boethius Dacus, *Modi Significandi*, qu. 5 (ed. Pinborg & Roos, p. 23, vv. 70–75): “Parum enim est homini habere ea quae per naturam habet homo. Natura enim valde imperfecte dimittit hominem et videtur homo sine sapientia esse quasi brutum animal. Unde dicit Commentator quod ‘homo de sciente et ignorante dividitur aequivoce’. Sic ergo apparet quod quaedam scientiae sunt homini necessariae propter indigentias tollendas”; Anonymus, *Prologus in Isagogen* (ed. Marmo, p. 143): “Unde Commentator supra *Metaphysicam* vocat tales ‘dominos terrenos’, et <dicit> quod de talibus et de primis dicitur homo aequivoce”; Fernandus Hispanus, *Sententia cum quaestionibus super De substantia orbis*, prooemium (Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat.lat. 845, f. 272ra): “Ex quibus ostenditur philosophiam esse homini maxime necessariam quod attendens Commentator in prooemio 8 *Physicorum* ait quod ‘hoc nomine homo aequivoce dicitur de eo qui perfectus est scientiis speculativis et de aliis hominibus’. Inter quas scientias constat philosophiam esse homini maxime

43 per] nigrum (?) *add. sed cancell.*

Ex hoc fertur ratio secundi, quia vitiosus homo caret recta ratione qua dirigatur in operationibus suis.

Et ex hoc fertur ratio tertii, ex quo non potest operari, ideo est immobilis, et iterum ex quo ignorans non potest elevare intellectum suum ad intelligibilia est immobiliter inhaerens sensibilibus. Et ad illa tantum versatur natura secundum Lincolnensem super 1 *Posteriorum*: "Ubi aspectus, ibi est et affectus".

Ratio quarti est: Nam 8 *Ethicorum*: "Malus secum dissidet ipse et semper animus eius per diversas distrahitur concupiscentias", et sic corrumpitur. Unde

necessariam". De difformitate sicut de malitia animae, cf. Anonymus, *Quaestiones super librum Ethicorum*, prooemium (ed. Costa, p. 242, vv. 80–85): "Unde dicit Philosophus: si miserum est vivere sic, tunc maxime fugienda est malitia, quia malitia facit hoc quod appetitus non oboedit rationi; et sic patet quod difformitas est in malo, uniformitas vero partium animae in bono. Et ideo in quantum aliquid consequitur bonitatem, consequitur et unitatem". 46–47 De debilitate sicut impedimento cognitionis et scientiae acquirendae, cf. Anonymus, *Prologus "Ut ait Tullius"* (ed. Dahan, p. 47): "Tertio propter debilitatem et pusillanimitatem intellectus; unde quidam sunt qui non possunt nisi sensibilia cognoscere, quia intellectus eorum propter sui debilitatem non potest se elevare ad cogitandum formas universales"; Iohannes Dacus, *Divisio scientiae* (ed. Otto, p. 14, vv. 7–16): "Scientia primo modo, quantum scilicet ad suam acquisitionem, sex modis impeditur: Primo propter malitiam complexionis. Unde 2 *De anima* duos carne ineptos mente, molles autem carne bene aptos mente dicimus. Secundo ex impotentia seu debilitate intellectus, eo quod non possunt separata intelligere, de quibus est scientia. Unde Aristoteles 2 *Methaphysicae* dicit, quod quidam contristantur propter sermonem perscrutum et odiunt ipsum, et causa est impotentia intellectus, scilicet quia perscrutationes non possunt ratione comprehendere nec comprehensas retinere, eo quod subtiles sunt et ipsi rudes". De carentia rationis ad dirigendum operationes suas, cf. Anonymus, *Prologus in Isagogen* (ed. Marmo, pp. 143–144): "Oportuit ergo intellectum habere scientias quae ipsum dirigunt in suis operationibus exercendis et in hoc apparet necessitas scientiae". Haec enuntiatio sequitur post eam quae supra citata est in p. 372–373, apparatus ad vv. 42–45. 51 Cf. Robertus Grosseteste, *In Poster.* I, 14 (ed. Rossi, pp. 215–216, vv. 279–281) "Ratio enim in nobis sopita non agit nisi postquam per sensus operationem, cui admiscetur, fuerit expergefacta. Causa autem quare obnubilatur visus animae per molem corporis corrupti est quod affectus et aspectus animae non sunt divisi, nec attingit aspectus eius nisi quo attingit affectus sive amor eius". 52–53 Non inveni. Hoc dictum similiter in libro VII exprimere videtur: Arist., *Ethica Nicomachea* VII, 5, rec. recognita (1147a10–18): "Adhuc habere scientiam secundum secundum alium modum a nunc dictis, existit hominibus. In habere quidem enim non in uti autem differentem videmus habitum. Quare et habere aliquid non habere, puta dormientem et inaniam patientem et vinolentum. Sed tamen sic disponuntur, in passionibus existentes. Ire enim et concupiscentie venereorum et quedam talium, manifeste et corpus transmutant. Quibusdam autem et insanias faciunt. Manifestum igitur quoniam similiter habere dicendum incontinentes his". Cf. etiam Aspasius, *In Ethic. Nicomach.* VIII, 11 (ed. Mercken, p. 170, vv. 37–40): "Licet enim unus malus etiam sibi ipsi non conveniat sed secum dissidet, facilius tamen et frequentius contingens est unum sibi in aliquo malo perpetrando concordare quam plures, et paucos quam numerosiores". 53–57 Seneca, *Ep. ad Lucilium* 51, 8 (ed. Reynolds, p. 134, vv. 22–25): "Fortuna mecum bellum gerit: non sum imperata facturus; iugum non recipio, immo, quod maiore

46 secundi] *coni.* primi. 47 operationibus] *coni.* operibus. 51 aspectus] *coni.* affectus. 52 ethicorum] *physicorum praem. sed cancell.*

Seneca *ad Lucilium* scribit sic: “Non est emolliendus animus cuius si voluptatibus cesseris, cedendum est labori, cedendum est et dolori, cedendum est et paupertati, <cedendum> est et timori, nam in me inesse volunt ambitionem et iram. Et sicut inter tot affectus distrahitur et immo discrepare videtur”.

Apparet ergo quod vitia et ignorantia inducunt animae difformitatem, debilitatem, <im>mobilitatem, corruptionem. Sed medicina habet inducere oppositos effectus effectibus morbi. Cum ergo philosophia sit remedium adversus morbum animae, ideo philosophia ut verum remedium et remediorum excellentissimum sanatum debet a quolibet homine affectari.

Sed a philosophiae perceptione quidam retrahuntur et dicunt se laborare non posse. Istos increpat Seneca dicens “Imbecillae aegrae mentis est inexper-
tum formidare; cogenda est igitur mens, ut insistat operi philosophiae, non enim amara est medicina, quia statim cum sanat, delectat”.

Quidam autem retrahuntur et dicunt se excusare paupertati quos Seneca in-
clamans ait “si vis vacare rationi mentis, oportet quod sis pauper vel pauperi si-
milis”. Et ad philosophiam multi tales perveniunt. Unde Philosophus 10 *Ethi-*
70 *corum* dicit “moderata possidentem oportet agere quae debet”. Et ibidem:

virtute faciendum est, excutio. Non est emolliendus animus: si voluptati cessero, cedendum est dolori, cedendum est labori, cedendum est paupertati; idem sibi in me iuris esse volet et ambitio et ira; inter tot affectus distrahar, immo discerpar”. 59–62 Cf. Arist., *Politica* II, 7, tr. prior (1267a8–12): “Si enim maiorem habent concupiscentiam necessariorum, propter huius medicinam iniuriabuntur; non igitur propter hanc solam, sed et si desiderent, ut gaudeant sine tristitiis delectationibus. Quod igitur remedium horum trium? His quidem substantia modica et operatio, his autem temperantia, tertium autem, si aliqui possint per ipsa gaudere, non utique quaerent apud philosophiam remedium, alia enim aliis opportuna sunt”. See also *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (ed. Hamesse, p. 254, n. 42). See a similar motive in Anonymus, *Prologus “Ut ait Tullius”* (ed. Dahan, p. 39): Huiusmodi autem scientiae appetitus multipliciter ratio a philosophis reperitur. Primo enim est appetenda scientia, quia salus est animae et animarum medela. Unde idem testatur: ‘Hoc efficit philosophia: medicamen est animis, sollicitudines abstrahit, a cupidinibus liberat, pellit timores’. Fragmentum ab illo Anonymo allatum ex libro Ciceronis est, *Disputationes Tusculanae*, II, IV, 11 (ed. Pohlenz, pp. 284–285). Cf. etiam aliud exemplum, ubi philosophia et virtus sicut medicamen animae ponuntur: Anonymus, *Lectura in Ethicam novam* (ed. Gauthier, p. 113): “Nullus debet dicere virtuosum felicem, nisi custodiens potionem: ille qui sumat potionem, hoc est aeger, credit sanitatem esse felicitatem; similiter illi qui non sunt virtuosus credunt virtutem esse felicitatem, cum ipsi sint aegrotantes aegritudine animae, quia, sicut sanitas est medicina corporis, sic virtus est medicina animae”. 64–66 Seneca, *Ep. ad Lucilium* 50, 9 (ed. Reynolds, pp. 132–133, vv. 25–2): “Sed quemadmodum virtutes receptae exire non possunt facilisque earum tutela est, ita initium ad illas eundi arduum, quia hoc proprium imbecillae mentis atque aegrae est, formidare inexperta; itaque cogenda est ut incipiat. Deinde non est acerba medicina; protinus enim delectat, dum sanat”. 67–69 Seneca, *Ep. ad Lucilium* 17, 5 (ed. Reynolds, p. 45, vv. 2–3). 69–70 Arist., *Ethica Nicomachea* X, 9 (1179a10–12). 70–71 Cf. Arist., *Ethica Nicomachea* X, 9, rec. recognita (1179a5): “Non tamen existimandum

56 ambitionem] *coni.* acrobationem. 64 imbecillae aegrae mentis est] *coni.* imbecilles equos mentis et. 69 perveniunt] *coni.* pervenire

“Philosophum non oportet esse dominum terrae et maris”. Et ratio huius est ex *De sensu et sensato*: “Motus maiores expellunt minores”; sed motus per quos aliquis bona exteriora inquirunt sunt maiores motibus per quos inquiruntur natura et cognitio. Ideo ut habeatur cognitio naturarum rei, oportet evitare motus per quos aliqui appetunt bona exteriora. Ideo paupertas non se excuset, sed magis habilem reddet.

Quidam autem retrahuntur propter voluptates quas deferre difficilliter possunt. De quibus ait Philosophus in 10 *Ethicorum* sic: “Hii bonum parvae delectationis peroptant pro bono magnae delectationis qui ad corruptibiles refugiant”.

Cum philosophia inter alias delectationes habet firmitatem et puritatem, de qua Philosophus ait ibidem sic: “Philosophia admirabiles delectationes habet,

multis et magnis indigere futurum felicem, si non contingit sine exterioribus bonis beatum esse. Non enim in superhabundancia per se sufficiens neque iudicium neque actio; possibile autem et non principes terre et maris agere bona”. Cf. etiam *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (ed. Hamesse, p. 248, n. 216): “Homo felix, sive sapiens indiget aliquid rebus exterioribus, quia natura per se non est sufficiens speculari, sed oportet quod habeat corpus sanum, cibum bonum et reliquum famulatum; non tamen indiget multis ac magnis rebus quod non oportet felicem vel philosophum esse dominum terrae vel maris”. 71–72 Arist., *De sensu et sensato* 7 (447a13). Cf. etiam *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (ed. Hamesse, p. 198, n. 28). 71–76 Hic locus referens ad librum *De sensu* fere simile est alio apud Iohannem de Dacia, tametsi Dacus librum *De somno et vigilia* affert: *Divisio scientiae* (ed. Otto, p. 16, vv. 11–22): “Sextum impedimentum in acquisitione scientiae est sollicitudo et cura, quam habet homo circa mundana et delectabilia sensuality. Ista enim avertunt hominem a cognitione veritatis et tollunt sibi potentiam perveniendi ad scientiam, cuius causa est, quia anima occupata is circa aliqua intentionem suam avertit ab aliis. Unde Philosophus in *De somno et vigilia* dicit, quod motus maiores, qui fiunt in anima, depellunt minores, ita ut cogitantes multum non vident proprium sensibile sensui oblatum, et inde est, quod qui debet pervenire ad perfectionem, quae est in scientiis, debet esse abstractus a curis et sollicitudinibus, et totus intellectus scientiis debet adhaerere”. 78–80 Cf. Aristoteles, *Ethica Nicomachea* X, 7 (1176b20–21): “Neque si ingustabiles isti existentes delectationis sincere et liberalis ad corporales refugiant, propter hoc has existimandum eligibiliores esse”. 80–82 Cf. etiam similem usum illius auctoritatis: Aegidius Aurelianensis, *Quaestiones in Phys.*, ed. I, prooemium (Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 3493, f. 1ra–va): “Item, illi delectationi quae est secundum intellectum non est admixta tristitia sicut delectationi quae est secundum sensum, ut delectationi quae est in potu est admixta quae est in siti, unde si aliquis ultra sitim potest, indelectabiliter potest... (lacuna) electatio; ergo quae est secundum intellectum est prima. Et propter Philosophus in 10 *Ethicorum* dicit quod ‘scientia affert mirabiles delectationes sinceritate et puritate’ et in 2 *Politicae* quod dicit, ‘si quis velit delectari sine tristitia, recurat ad philosophiam’; Fernandus Hispanus, *Sententia libri Metaphysicae*, prooemium (Oxford, Merton College, 281, f. 1ra): Et ex hoc patet maxime inconueniens est suadere homini, ut uniat secundum operationem intellectus quae maxime sibi contingit quae vita est maxime delectabilis est cum enim operatio intellectus sit optima, quia secundum illud quod est optimum in homine sit etiam sibi maxime conueniens. Unumquodque autem maxime delectatur in bono sibi maxime conuenienti. Sequitur quod vita secundum intellectum quae homini maxime est propria sit ea delectissima, et ideo Philosophus eodem 10 *Ethicorum* dicit quod ‘philosophia habet admirabiles delectationes puritate et firmitate’.

81–82 Aristoteles, *Ethica Nicomachea* X, 7, rec. recognita (1177a25–26): “Videtur enim puritatem] *coni.* principalitatem.

firmitatem et puritatem”. Ad tales ait Seneca sic: “Indurandus est animus et a blandimentis voluptatum procul abstrahendus”. Ex his etiam Philosophus 2 *Ethnicorum* dicit: “Quod enim plebis senes ab Elena oportet et nos pati ad delectationem et in omnibus illorum habere vocem, scilicet fugiamus et abiciamus ipsam, sic enim abicientes eam minus peccabimus”. Sic ergo delectationes debemus fugere, licet sit difficile. Et causam difficultatis tangit Philosophus in *eodem* 2 dicit: “Delectatio connutritur nobis a pueritia”, quia pueris primo natis datur lac, quod est dulce, sic deinceps homo sequitur delectationes. Unde idem 90 consulit Philosophus dicens: “Sicut se habet paedagogus ad puerum regnandum in regnando, sic se debet habere ratio ad appetitum sensitivum, ut non valeat nisi quidem recta ratio determinavit”.

Apparet ergo quod nec non paupertas nec labor nec voluptas a philosophia potest retrahere, si ardentem ipsae amplexatur ordo, autem philosophia inducat 95 praedictorum morborum oppositos effectus.

Patet nam <per> formositatem, quia per ipsam homo reordinatur in propriam speciem.

Et per ipsam <philosophiam> acquirit homo fortitudinem, ut patet per Commentatorem 8 *Physicorum* qui dicit inducens † in singulis eam de moralibus virtutibus †; dicit philosophum omnibus virtutibus esse perfectum, et similiter etiam fortitudine, nam fortitudo per philosophiam non est aliud nisi virtus per quam homo non timet pericula mortis; sed philosophus sciens se compositum <ex anima et corpore esse>, et per consequens moriturum, non timet pericula mortis; ideo est fortis.

philosophia admirabiles delectationes habere, puritate et firmitate”. See also *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (ed. Hamesse, p. 247, n. 206). 82–83 Seneca, *Ep. ad Lucilium* 51, 5 (ed. Reynolds, p. 134, vv. 3–4). 83–86 Arist., *Ethica Nicomachea* II, 9 (1109b9–11). 87–88 Cf. Arist., *Ethica Nicomachea* II, 2, rec. recognita (1104b34–35a2): “Maxime autem omnibus circa delectationem; communis enim haec animalibus, et omnibus quae sub electione assequuntur; et enim bonum et conferens delectabile videtur. Adhuc autem ex puero omnibus nobis connutritur”. 90–92 Cf. Arist., *Ethica Nicomachea* III, 15, rec. recognita (1119b12–17): “Tale autem bene persuasibile dicimus et punitum; quemadmodum enim puerum oportet secundum praeceptum paedagogi vivere, sic et concupiscibile consonare rationi. Intentio enim ambobus bonum; et concupiscit temperatus quae oportet, et ut oportet, et quando; ita et ut autem ordinat et ratio”. 98–104 Averroes, *In Phys.* VIII, prologus (ed. Schmieja, p. 186): “Cum hoc quod sequitur cognitionem scientiarum speculatarum de moribus bonis, necesse est, cum artifices istarum scientiarum fuerint secundum cursum naturalem, necesse est, ut sint virtuosi omnibus modis virtutum moralium ut iustitia et castitate et audacia et magnanimitate et liberalitate et veracitate et aliis virtutibus. [...] Et similiter cum sciverit quod mors est de necessitate materiae et maxime cum acquisiverit humanam perfectionem, tunc enim percipiet in aliqua hora quod melius est ei mors quam vita”. Quamvis Averroes non loquatur hic de fortitudine, haec virtus aliquando apud alias ab magistris enumeratur: Aegidius Aurelianensis, *Questiones in De generatione*, ed. I, prooemium (London, British Library, Arundel, 4, f. 17ra):

82 puritatem] *coni.* principalitatem. 84 plebis sense] *coni.* paris.

105 Similiter per philosophiam homo sit nobilis, nam per philosophiam homo spectatur caelestia, terrestria et inferna.

Similiter fit immortalis per philosophiam, unde Philosophus 10 *Ethnicorum*: “Vita talis, scilicet philosophica, non est per hominem, sed secundum optimum quod est in homine, quod quamvis quantitate parvum sit, est tamen
110 virtute praetiosissimum”.

Et sic philosophia inducens quattuor effectus bonos summe est appetenda, sed tamen specialiter una pars eius ut naturalis propter duo: primo propter hoc, quia per naturalem philosophiam cognoscit se homo, nam homo compositus ex anima et corpore habens notitiam libri *De anima* cognoscit animam
115 suam; similiter habens cognitionem <libri> *De caelo* habet cognitionem corporis et elementorum ex quibus fit corpus. Ideo per naturalem philosophiam homo scit se et naturam suam et ob hoc naturalis philosophia maxime dicitur

“Et propter hoc dicit Commentator supra prologum 8 *Physicorum* quod philosophi debent enim esse casti, liberales, iusti, fortes et mansueti et sic de aliis virtutibus ut probat inducendo et si philosophi non sunt tales, hoc est contra naturalem cursum”. 107–110 Arist., *Ethica Nicomachea* X, 2, rec. recognita (1177b34–1178a3): “Oportet autem non secundum suadentes humana sapere hominem entem, neque mortalia mortalem, set in quantum contingit immortale facere, et omnia facere ad vivere secundum optimum eorum que in ipso. Si enim et mole parvum est, potencia et preciositate multum magis omnibus superexcellit. Videbitur autem utique et unumquodque esse hoc, si quidquidem principale et melius”. Cf. etiam *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (ed. Hamesse, p. 248, nn. 213–214). Fernandus Hispanus ad hunc locum refert in sui *Sententia libri Metaphysicae*, prooemium (Oxford, Merton College, 281, f. 1ra): “In quibus verbis docet Philosophus secundum dignitatem humanae naturae hominem debere toto conatu omnia facere quaecumque cum fuerint ad vivere secundum intellectum qui est optimum et divinissimum eorum quae sunt in homine nec per haec attingens quantum valuerit excellentiam divinae munificentiae donum philosophiam, videlicet immortalibus et intelligibilibus substantiis asimilet et ut cumque potuerit se faciat immortalem, intellectus enim humanus est optimum et divinissimum eorum quae sunt in homine”. 111–119 Usque ad finem verba prologi valde similia sunt eis quae in commento Fernandi Hispani super *De substantia orbis* habentur. 112–114 Cf. Averroes, *In De anima* I, com. 2 (ed. Crawford, 4. 3, vv. 10–18): “Et intendit per hoc quod dixit: et maxime in Natura, idest, et maxime in scientia Naturali. Deinde dedit causam propter quam magis adiuvat Naturalem scientiam quam aliam, dicendo: Est enim quasi principium animalium. Idest, et causa in hoc est quia cognoscere de animalibus est maxima cognitio partium naturalium, et anima est principium animalium. Unde necessarium est ut scire de anima sit necessarium in cognitione animalium, non tantum utile”. 115–116 Cf. Averroes, *In De caelo* I, com. 1 (ed. Carmody, p. 4, vv. 57–63): “Deinde dixit Et quedam sunt principia habentium corpora et magnitudinem, intendendo quod causarum quaedam sunt causae simplicium, ut materia et forma, et quaedam causae compositorum ut elementa ex quibus componuntur res consimilium partium; et intendebat monstrare per hoc quod Naturalis considerat in duobus modis corporum naturalium scilicet simplicium et compositorum, et dat causas eorum et causas accidentium eorum”. Cf. etiam Arist., *De caelo* III, 1 (298b2–3).

113 philosophiam] s. l. 115 habet] con. scit.

philosophia, nam secundum Isaac “philosophia est cognitio sui ipsius ab homine”, ex quo tunc homo maxime cognoscit se per naturalem philosophiam.

120 Secundo, quia est de sensatis a quibus incipit omnis naturalis cognitio.

Et licet tota naturalis philosophia sit specialiter appetenda, adhuc tamen quaedam eius pars magis, ut illa quae est de corporibus caelestibus. Et hoc vult Philosophus in 2 *Caeli et mundi*. Similiter in *De generatione animalium* ubi dicit “Aliquid topice scire de superioribus nobilius est quam naturalia scire cum
125 demonstratione de nobis propinquis”. Hoc idem vult in prooemio *De anima*, ubi dicit: “Scientia est nobilior alia propter duo, vel propter certiores demonstrationes vel propter subiecti nobilitatem”; sed constat virtute | quod corpora caelestia sunt nobiliora aliis corporibus; ergo et scientia de ipsis. 19v

Sed propter difficultatem quae est circa notitiam corporum caelestium et
130 motores caelorum Commentator fecit librum *De substantia orbis* in quod assumens multa principia philosophiae his notum deducit quae est de corpore caelesti, cum secunda pars naturalis philosophiae quae est de corporibus caelestibus sit specialiter appetenda, ergo et ille liber. Et ipse continuatur ad librum *De caelo et mundo* et tenet secundum ordinem inter naturales libros
135 cum libro *De caelo et mundo*. Et intentio Commentatoris est talis, ut ostendat ex quibus principiis componatur corpus caeleste, quia ex materia et forma.

118–119 Isaac Israeli, *De definitionibus* (ed. Muckle, p. 306, vv. 1–2). Cf. etiam alios prologos ubi hoc dictum Isaac usitatum est: Arnulfus Provincialis, *Divisio scientiarum* (ed. Laffeur, p. 310, vv. 138–142): “Sexta, in libro *De diffinitionibus* Ysaac : Philosophia est cognitio sui ipsius ab homine quia, si homo se ipsum perfecte cognosceret, cum sit compositus ex substantia spirituali et corporali sub quibus omnia continentur, omnia quodam modo cognosceret in se ipso”; Anonymus, *Philosophiae commendatio “Dicit Aristoteles”* (ed. Laffeur, pp. 377–378): “Quarto diffinitur philosophia sic: ‘Philosophia est cognitio sui ipsius ab homine’. Et istud potest intelligi et quantum ad partem practicam et quantum ad speculativam. Homo enim potest cognoscere se ipsum quantum ad substantiam, et tunc quantum ad speculativam, vel quantum ad operationem, et tunc quantum ad practicam”; Aubricus Remensis, *Philosophia* (ed. Gauthier, p. 38, vv. 207–212): “Philosophia est cognitio sui ipsius ab homine; si enim homo se ipsum complete cognosceret, quodam modo omnia cognosceret, eo quod convenientiam habet cum singulis creaturis: habet enim substantiam corpoream et incorpoream, omnis autem substantia est talis vel talis; praeterea ipse est susceptivus novem accidentium”. Cf. etiam alios auctores: Anonymus, *Philosophia “Ut ait Tullius”* (ed. Dahan, p. 44); Iohannes Dacus, *Divisio scientiae* (ed. Otto, p. 7, vv. 5–7). 121–123 Cf. Arist., *De caelo* II, 12 (292a30–b12); *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (ed. Hamesse, p. 164, nn. 66–67): “(66) Illud quod per paucas rationes acquiritur, facilius acquiritur, sed quod per plures rationes acquiritur, difficilius acquiritur; (67) Illud quod bonitatem per pauciores actiones participat nobiliter est quam quod per plures eam participat”. 123–125 Arist., *De part. animalium* I, 1 (644b24–25; 644b31–35). 125–127 Averroes, *In De anima* I, com. 1 (ed. Crawford, p. 3, ll. 13–19): “Artes enim non differunt ab invicem nisi altero horum duorum modorum, scilicet aut confirmatione demonstrationis aut nobilitate subiecti aut utroque”; Aristoteles, *De anima*, I, 1 (402a4). Cf. etiam *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (ed. Hamesse, p. 174, n. 2).

127 virtute | *infima pagina*.

Et hoc ostendit ex comparatione materiae caelestium corporum ad materiam corporum generabilium et formae ad formam. Similiter et ostendit omnes differentias et convenientias inter ea et tres <causas> inquit in eis, in se et in parte sumptis. Ex hoc patet materia huius libri, quia <est> corpus caeleste et motor eius similiter efficiens et finis, sicut in aliis libris patet. Prooemium super *De substantia orbis*.

Edidit Łukasz TOMANEK

