

TWO NEW HEURISTIC INSTRUMENTS AND THE IDEAL ORDER OF RESEARCH IN MEDIEVAL PHILOSOPHY

There is an anomaly—or rather a paradox—at the heart of the modern recovery of medieval philosophy and theology. At a pivotal moment in Western intellectual history, at the end of the Middle Ages and for a century or two thereafter, the humanistic, philological and Scholastic, dialectical modes of knowledge and learning were opposed to each other, and this opposition became reified in institutions. There were, as always, individual thinkers who argued—and by their own examples proved—that the two modes of learning are not necessarily opposed and are in fact complementary, but most ‘humanist’ or ‘Scholastic’ practitioners lined up on one side of the divide or the other. Echoes of these late-medieval and early-modern “battles of the arts” reverberate in today’s disputes between “historical” and “analytic” schools of interpreting medieval philosophy and theology.

Because, however, the overwhelming majority of texts and records concerning medieval philosophy and theology were never printed and existed only in manuscripts and had not been read by anyone for centuries, and because those texts that were printed often existed only in faulty or unreliable editions, and because, finally, as a result there existed an enormous confusion about the most basic features of intellectual history (e.g., about names, dates, places, etc.), those who wished to study medieval philosophy had little choice but to pursue vigorously the recovery of the records and sources of medieval philosophical thought by ‘humanistic’ philological means. That effort has been underway now for nearly two centuries and, as the pages of this journal testify, continues unabated to this day. Indeed, I would claim that in no other particular field of scholarship has the ancient ideal of the marriage between philology and philosophy been realized more fully than in the study of medieval philosophy and theology, notably (and ironically) in the study of Scholastic philosophy and theology. From the particular, historical exigencies of the modern study of medieval philosophy has emerged, in an especially pronounced way, an ideal order of research, which in many instances has been actualized step-by-step. Frequently, medieval research must begin from “ground-zero.” In order to put in context the significance of two new research-tools that have recently been published, I shall first briefly outline that ideal order. I refer to the study of medieval Latin philosophy and theology, the subject of my own research and of the two heuristic works that I review in this essay, but the same order would hold in the study of medieval Arabic, Byzantine and Hebrew philosophy.

(1) *Inventories, repertories, catalogues and other instruments of primary research.* First of all, the authors and texts of medieval philosophy, and the manuscripts in which they survive or once existed, must be discovered and identified, and all of the information garnered put into a rational order. At the foundation of textual research is the *incipit*, the beginning words of a text, which in respect of medieval manuscript culture provides the only reliable means for identifying writings. For decades medieval scholars have benefited from global incipit-indices that have increasingly expanded and become increasingly accessible. The huge card-catalogue of incipits compiled at the Institut de Recherches et d'Histoire des Textes, which scholars who were in Paris could consult, serves as the foundation of the database *In principio*, which was first electrified in CD-Rom form and then mounted on-line by the publisher Brepols. The original core of the IRHT incipit-index was prepared by the early Director of the department of manuscripts at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (1848-1851) and pioneer historian of medieval Scholastic philosophy, Barthélemy Hauréau.¹ The *In principio* database also incorporates the incipit register compiled over many years by librarians at the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library at St. John's University in Minnesota, mainly from the indices in manuscript catalogues but also from microfilms of "uncatalogued" manuscripts owned by the Library.² A similar history pertains to an index of authors, texts and incipits in manuscripts preserved in German libraries compiled over decades under the sponsorship of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, first stored in a card-catalogue at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in München, then put on microfiche, and now posted and searchable on the Web-site *Manuscripta Mediaevalia*;³ this global index is compiled from the indices in manuscript catalogues of German libraries, and is added to as each new catalogue appears. I need not mention other incipit-registers prepared by individual scholars except perhaps, because of their scope and interest to students of medieval philosophy and theology, the register of incipits of works on the vices and the virtues by

¹ Hauréau's histories of Scholastic philosophy are of special interest to those who would "historicize" the study of medieval philosophy; see B. HAURÉAU, *De la philosophie scolastique*, 2 vols., Paris 1850, and *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique*, 3 vols., Paris 1872-1880. A photographic copy of Hauréau's card-index of incipits was published in book form by Brepols a long time ago, supplemented with the index of incipits prepared by the German scholar, Johann Andreas Schmeller (1785-1852); see B. HAURÉAU, *Initia operum scriptorum Latinorum Medii potissimum Aevi ex codicibus manuscriptis et libris impressis alphabetice digessit. Accredi Schedarium initia amplectans ab A.G. SCHMELLER et G. MEYER, praesertim ex codicibus Monacensibus, Gotingensibus, Bruxellensibus collecta*, 8 vols. Turnhout 1973-1974.

² The Library has altered its name to Hill Museum & Manuscript Library.

³ <http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de>

Morton Bloomfield et al. and its recent supplement by Richard Newhauser and István Bejczy,⁴ and the massive repertory of authors and incipits of Latin sermons in the Middle Ages compiled by Johannes Baptist Schneyer, which is now also published and searchable on CD-Rom.⁵ For many decades scholars in medieval philosophy and theology have been assisted by Friedrich Stegmüller's repertories, embracing authors, texts, incipits and manuscripts, of commentaries on the Bible and on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard;⁶ the latter repertory is now being revised and augmented through an official Project of the SIEPM.⁷ Stegmüller's repertories have served as the models of several others like them, which are focused on material of more limited scope. Likewise scholars in medieval philosophy and theology have been served for decades by the repertories of masters in theology and of quodlibetal disputes, identifying works by incipit and citing manuscripts, by Palémon Glorieux;⁸ these have been joined by the magnificent repertories of authors and texts in the faculty of Arts at Paris by Olga Weijers.⁹ Finally, I cannot fail to mention the research-tools for the discovery and study of texts in manuscripts prepared by Paul Oskar Kristeller.¹⁰ Kristeller's *Latin Manuscript Books* opens up the world of manuscript catalogues and invento-

⁴ M.W. BLOOMFIELD et al., *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices, 1100-1500 A.D., including a section of Incipits of Works on the Pater Noster* (Publication: Mediaeval Academy of America 88), Cambridge, MA 1979; R. NEWHAUSER and I. BEJCZY, *A Supplement to Morton W. Bloomfield et al. Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices, 1100-1500 A.D.* (Instrumenta patristica et mediaevalia 50), Turnhout 2008.

⁵ J.B. SCHNEYER, *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters*, 11 vols. (BGPTHMA 43.1-11), Münster i.W. 1969-; *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters*, nach den Vorarbeiten von J.B. SCHNEYER, hrsg. v. L. HÖDL und W. KNOCH (CD-Rom) Münster i.W. 2001.

⁶ F. STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium Biblicum medii aevi*, 11 vols., Madrid 1940-; IDEM, *Repertorium commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, 2 vols., Würzburg 1947.

⁷ See W.J. COURTENAY and P.J.J.M. BAKKER, "SIEPM Project: Repertory of Commentaries on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*", in *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 51 (2009), 29-31.

⁸ P. GLORIEUX, *La littérature quodlibétique*, 2 vols., Le Sauchoir (Kain) 1925-1935; IDEM, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIII^e siècle*, 2 vols., Paris 1933-1934.

⁹ O. WEIJERS, *Le travail intellectuel à la faculté des arts de Paris : textes et maîtres (ca. 1200-1500)*, 8 vols. to date (Studia artistarum 1-3, 9, 11, 13, 15, 25), Turnhout 1994-.

¹⁰ P.O. KRISTELLER, *Latin Manuscript Books before 1600: A List of the Printed Catalogues and Unpublished Inventories*, 4th revised edition by S. KRÄMER, München 1993; the work has now been supplemented and up-dated by S. KRÄMER, unter Mitarbeit von B.C. ARENSMANN, *Latin Manuscript Books before 1600: Ergänzungsband 2006*, Hannover 2007. See also P.O. KRISTELLER, *Iter Italicum: A finding List of Uncatalogued or Incompletely Catalogued Humanistic Manuscripts of the Renaissance in Italian and Other Libraries*, 6 vols. in 8, London-Leiden 1963-1993; this work was cast into a computerized database by E.J. Brill in 1995.

ries, which are indispensable resources for all medieval studies. Indeed, all of the research-tools that we have mentioned themselves are wholly dependent on scholarly catalogues that offer complete historical, codicological and textual descriptions of manuscripts in library-collections. In sum, as perhaps may be surprising to some, students of medieval philosophy and theology have been unsurpassed in conceiving and producing research-tools for the recovery of the life and thought of the Middle Ages.

(2) *Critical editions.* All of the research-instruments that I have mentioned are preparatory to the critical editions of texts; those critical editions, in turn, are the foundation of all interpretive study of the thought of the Middle Ages. The historical critical edition, which considers and analyzes every surviving manuscript of a text and thus not only its origin and production but its subsequent transmission and reception until at least the printed *Editio princeps*, represents the most complete hermeneutical act that can be exercised on any text. That hermeneutical act will not be duplicated for centuries, if ever. The introductions of such historical critical editions, ideally, present the complete archeology of a text, opening correct and fruitful new lines of interpretation and preventing (one hopes) historically impossible and false lines of interpretation, and casting unexpected light on an hundred other matters of intellectual history. In short, the historical critical edition is the lynch-pin of all study of medieval thought.

(3) *Interpretive studies.* Monographic and articular interpretive studies of every kind follow upon the appearance of editions of texts; these serve, remotely and proximately, the teaching of medieval philosophy and theology. It is interesting to note that the status of authors is often the direct result of critical editions of their works. William of Ockham emerged from obscurity to become a 'major figure' in the history of philosophy as a result of the edition of his works produced at the Franciscan Institute at St. Bonaventure University in New York; likewise, in tandem with the appearance of volumes of his *Opera omnia* (produced at Leuven), Henry of Ghent has been the subject of an ever-increasing volume of scholarly literature, to the point that he is now recognized, along with Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus, as one of the greatest metaphysicians and speculative theologians of the Middle Ages.

(4) *Translations.* Wholly dependent on critical editions and reliant also on interpretive studies, translations of medieval Latin (or Arabic, Greek or Hebrew) philosophical texts into modern vernacular languages represent the final step in their divulgation. The primary purpose of translations of medieval Latin texts would seem to be to secure them a place on the undergraduate curriculum, with the hope, one supposes, that students might become so

enthusiastic about what they read in translation that they will resolve to learn languages so that they can read the works in the “original.” Moreover, certain kinds of theological texts (e.g. by Bonaventure or Thomas Aquinas or ‘mystics’) might be translated in order to provide pious readers with spiritual edification that otherwise would be inaccessible to them (the *raison d’être* of series of ‘Classics of Spirituality’). Furthermore, some argue that medieval Latin texts should be translated in order to make them accessible to ‘contemporary philosophers’ who otherwise do not know, and cannot take the time to learn, ancient languages. The intention would seem to be to gain entrance for medieval thought into the discussions of modern philosophy. The value of translations is neither self-evident nor unequivocal, however. At the world-famous booksellers’ exhibition at the recent International Congress on Medieval Studies at Kalamazoo, I was astonished to see the huge number of English translations of medieval texts of every kind offered for sale. Translations, needless to say, outnumbered editions of texts in their original languages by a wide margin. Does this fact signify an “advance in scholarship” or something else? Paul Kristeller wondered, justly, whether the practice of mass translation would in the end be a major cause of the decline of the study and knowledge of Greek and Latin. Recently, some publishers of text-series have come to require that critically edited texts be accompanied by vernacular (notably English) translations. Now, producing critical editions of medieval texts is arduous enough—and little enough rewarded—that we should burden scholars even further with the production or supervision of translations of the texts that they edit. Finally, how many medieval philosophical texts, however important knowledge of them might be for advanced research in the history of medieval thought (in which case they must be studied in their original language), merit translation for a ‘general audience’ or actually would be competitive for space on the undergraduate curriculum?

I have sketched this ideal order of research in order to highlight, within its framework, the significance and importance of two new contributions at the first, foundational level of all scholarly investigation.

* * *

Jacqueline HAMESSE, auxiliante Slawomir SZYLLER. *Repertorium initiorum mancriptorum latinorum medii aevi*. Vol. I:A-C, XXIV-658 pp.; Vol. II: D-O, 802 pp.; Vol. III:P-Z, 792 pp.; Vol. IV: *Supplementum, Indices*, 597 pp. (FIDEM Textes et Études du Moyen Âge 42.1-42.4). Louvain-la-Neuve, publié avec la concours de la Foundation Universitaire de Belgique, 2007-2010.

As stated, the incipit is the essential element for identifying medieval texts

that circulated in manuscript, for a great many texts are anonymous or they are attributed to two or more different authors; likewise, titles vary from manuscript-to-manuscript, assigned by individual scribes and readers as often as by authors. As Mme Hamesse says in her introduction (published in French and in English) to the *Repertorium initiorum*, although students of medieval philosophy and theology have been able to avail themselves of the incipit registers cited above for some time, such scholars as Auguste Pelzer and Gilbert Ouy have called for a published, global repertory of incipits of specifically philosophical and theological works in manuscripts. To satisfy this need, the project *Repertorium Initiorum Manuscriptorum* was founded in 1987 to prepare a computerized database for all medieval Latin manuscripts, which would collaborate with other projects already completed and published or underway (I: V-VI, XIII-XIV; cf. nn. 18, 21). Over the years, specialists in medieval philosophy and theology in various places had compiled large card indices of incipits of texts and manuscripts. Resourceful scholars in medieval philosophy and theology came to know about these rich resources, which, however, needed to be consulted on-site, or sometimes were completely inaccessible except to a few authorized persons. It is from these rich sources that Hamesse gathered the materials presented in these volumes:

Put together in the course of time by scholars or research teams who had worked on philosophical and theological manuscripts, they are the result of long and patient research in the libraries of Europe and the United States—truly a primary source. It was, therefore, indispensable to give priority to these unedited card indexes in order to make them accessible to all. Their registration constitutes the contents of these four volumes.... (I: XIV).

The card indices entered into the project's database and incorporated in Hamesse's *Repertorium* are these: (1) the unedited personal card index of Fr. L.J. BATAILLON, OP; (2) the card index of the Centre De Wulf-Mansion, Université Catholique de Louvain(-la-Neuve); (3) the index, in manuscript, at the De Wulf-Mansioncentrum, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (now posted on the Web-site of the DWMC); (4) the personal card index of Girard J. ETZKORN, until now inaccessible to the public; (5) the 'KAEPPELI card index' at the Istituto Storico Domenicano in Rome;¹¹ (6) G.E. MOHAN, *Initia operum Franciscanorum of the 13th-15th Centuries*, available on-site in some

¹¹ Thomas KAEPPELI, OP created this card index while preparing (with later help of E. PAN-ELLA) the monumental *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum medii aevi*, 4 vols., Roma 1970-1993. The index contains the incipits of many works not by Dominican authors. Hamesse says that this index was generally inaccessible to researchers when the project of the *Repertorium* began, and seemingly it is once more inaccessible to scholars. For that reason we are especially fortunate that its contents were ultimately able to be incorporated in the *Repertorium*.

libraries;¹² (7) the card index at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto; (8) A.J. SMET, *Initia commentariorum, quaestionum et tractatuum latinorum in Aristoteles libros De anima XIII, XIV, XV editorum*, by manuscript, Leuven 1963.

All entries in the four volumes of the catalogue are numbered and arranged alphabetically by incipit text, and include the name of the author of the text, when it is known, or the names of the various authors to which the text has been attributed (resolving authorship must be the work of further scholarship, and cannot be a hindrance to the recording of the existence of a work in manuscript identified by incipit); the title of the work as recorded in the index from which the entry was gathered (which means the title of the work in the particular manuscript in which the scholar discovered it); the location of the work in one or more manuscripts. Incipits, authors and titles have been recorded in a uniform orthography: “This was the only way to allow a useful search, in the case of words whose spelling varies in the manuscripts... Only by standardizing these elements could one find in the database all the manuscripts of the same work” (I: XVII). The entries in the repertory, moreover, are sensitive to genre:

The literary genre of the works also affected the approach taken: one does not deal in the same way with commentaries, questions and *sophismata*. The presence of a prologue had to be signalled and necessitated a double incipit: that of the prologue and that of the work itself... For sermons, there was need for the field ‘pericope’ to mention the biblical citation before the actual incipit of the sermon (I: XV).

One will note that in the repertory itself, sermons are entered alphabetically according to the actual incipit of the sermon, but preceded by the biblical citation of the pericope (in italics); there is a different treatment in the indices (see below). For commentaries, *lemmata* are followed by the actual beginning words of the text; so also the incipits of prologues are followed by (...) the incipit of the work itself.

¹² Hamesse mentions that copies of this typescript inventory can be consulted on-site at the Franciscan Institute at St. Bonaventure University (NY) and at the Vatican Library; a copy also exists in the Bodleian Library in Oxford. Earlier MOHAN published a separate register titled “Incipits of Logical Writings of the XIIIth-XVth Centuries”, in *Franciscan Studies* 12 (1952), 349-489. After his death, the Editors of *Franciscan Studies* published a series of articles titled “*Initia Operum Franciscalium (XIII-XV S.)*”, in *Franciscan Studies* 35 (1975), 36 (1976), 37 (1977), 38 (1978), which were then published by the Franciscan Institute in separate off-print booklets (1975-1978) paginated sequentially 1*-498*. It is not clear whether this is the same register which is incorporated in the *Repertorium*. Mohan seems to have compiled yet another “1,000 page incipit collection of logical and philosophical writings (commentaries, tracts, questions)” which the Franciscan Institute intended to publish but seems not to have done; cf. “Editor’s Preface”, in *Initia Operum Franciscalium: A-C* (1975).

The indices to the *Repertorium*, published in volume IV, are especially good and enable efficient use of the volumes.¹³ The ample *Index auctorum* (151-217) in itself can serve students of medieval philosophy and theology as a guide to the proper Latin orthography of the names of medieval authors. The ubiquitous ‘Anonymus’ (see below) is handled deftly, giving some adjectival specificity when it is found in the manuscripts themselves, or at least in the original note-card entry (e.g., ‘Anonymus Graeculus’, ‘Anonymus Graeculus OFM’, ‘Anonymus Graeculus OP’). Especially helpful is the *Index sermonum* (219-359); here the actual incipits of sermons are entered under their alphabetically-ordered pericopes, so that all of the sermons preaching the same gospel or scriptural text are visible at once. The huge *Index codicum* (361-596), in turn, in itself will serve scholars as a guide to libraries preserving manuscripts and to their official names, as well as the form of library shelf-marks. Finally, the volume contains an *Index linguarum vernacularum* (597).

The quantitative dimensions of the *Repertorium* are impressive. In the first three volumes, the repertory contains a total of 50,999 different references for 35,388 incipits (there are 37,432 recorded incipits, including the *Supplementum* in volume IV). Of these, 31,940 references are unique, that is, references to one manuscript for one incipit; the remaining incipits are attested in two or more manuscripts. Nearly half of the incipits (18,296) pertain to anonymous works; the other incipits refer to works by 3,587 authors or translators. The *Index codicum* refers to 20,861 manuscripts conserved in 567 different libraries.¹⁴ These figures give one a good idea of the size of the documentary base and geographical scope of medieval Latin philosophy and theology.

Especially significant, it seems to me, is the large number of anonymous texts uncovered in the *Repertorium*. Historical scholars must always strive to become conscious of unconscious, unexamined presuppositions of their own time and culture that might distort their comprehension of the perception and understanding of the past. Modern thought has a strong bias for individual accomplishment, so that, for example, among modern scholars there is a tendency to portray the history of philosophy as a long line of individual thinkers—some ‘major’, others ‘minor’—who are the more or less estimable to the degree that they have influenced later times and subsequent thinkers (especially us). The individualistic viewpoint of modern scholars is indicated

¹³ Volume IV contains a *Supplementum* of incipits, A-Z (7-139), *Addenda et Corrigenda* (141-47), followed by the various indices.

¹⁴ These figures, tallied from the computerized database, were given to me, upon request, by the editors.

by their uneasiness with the large body of anonymity in medieval thought, and their habitual desire to assign an author's name to any anonymous work that they might admire; this desire generates a considerable body of academic literature arguing *pro et contra*, not to mention errors that need to be corrected and recorrected. There are many historically accidental reasons for the anonymity of so much medieval philosophic literature, but that anonymity also bespeaks something else, namely the corporate and institutional aspect of the pursuit of truth in the Middle Ages, which in its Scholastic form embraces dialectical opposition as much as common 'schools of thought'. In any event, the *Repertorium initiorum* presents us with an huge material body of evidence for inquiry into the 'culture of anonymity' in medieval thought.

The individual entries in the *Repertorium* are only as accurate as the scholars who originally recorded the information, who in compiling their indices and inventories surveyed a large body of difficult materials. It is the nature of global works like the *Repertorium* that, once the massive core of information is established and published, specialist users can subsequently make necessary corrections of items one-by-one. Despite the inevitable necessity of correction, the value of a work bringing to order such an huge body of data and literature is ungainsayable. Eventually all of the information in the *Repertorium* will become accessible and searchable on-line. "At the same time the search for card indexes will continue and the database will be enriched as new discoveries are made." As Hamesse herself points out, a

printed work and an on-line database do not substitute for one another. The question of the researcher is different if he has the book in his hand than if he is consulting data on his computer. The two formats complement each other, and each allows a different kind of discovery (I: XVII).

Scholars take wholly for granted, I suppose, the extraordinary advantages and conveniences of the codex or 'book at hand' for thorough, ready reference; they will become more acutely aware of these advantages when they no longer are available. We are at a pivotal time in that respect; it is doubtful that in the near future reference works like the *Repertorium initiorum manusciporum medii aevi* any longer will be published in book form. Jacqueline Hamesse and her assistant Slawomir Szyller have produced a wonderful *instrument de travail* in the grand tradition of scholarship in medieval philosophy. We are especially fortunate that this research-tool has preserved unique scholarly resources the preservation of which might otherwise be perilous, and that it has done so, 'at the last minute', in a format that might well vanish but the ingenious convenience of which should never be underestimated.

* * *

Sten EBBESEN and Frédéric GOUBIER. *A Catalogue of 13th-Century Sophismata. Part I: Introduction and Indices*, 352 pp.; *Part II: Catalogue*, 665 pp. (Sic et Non). Paris: Libraire Philosophique J. Vrin, 2010.

“The purpose of this catalogue is to encourage research on the medieval genre of *sophismata* and to make it easier for anyone interested in medieval philosophy to see whether a given issue is discussed in the sophistic literature, and if so, where” (I: 5). In her repertory of incipits, Jacqueline Hamesse remarked that *sophismata* require their own special treatment; Sten Ebbesen’s and Frédéric Goubier’s catalogue make clear that this is so, and why this is so. For their catalogue, the authors devised an ingenious method of cross-referencing several indices that matches the complexities of the genre and its elements, and the way that *sophismata* are actually transmitted in manuscripts. In his introduction to the volumes, Ebbesen first establishes and codifies a typology of the literary forms that medieval *sophismata* take. The genre has its basis in the disputational practices of the Arts faculties in medieval universities. Fundamentally, a *sophisma* is a “a discussion of a proposition that raises some theoretical issue in logic or grammar because it seems possible to argue with equally good reasons that it is false and true or grammatical and ungrammatical” (I: 5). The basic structure of these sophistic disputes is that of the classical Scholastic question, including the presentation of the proposition, its proofs and then disproofs, the solution, sometimes followed by refutations of either the proofs or disproofs of the initial proposition (the authors label this basic type *C*, for *corpus sophisticis*). This basic type receives various elaborations, i.e., the initial solution given by a *respondens* is attacked by an *opponens*, and these engage in one or more rounds of argument until there is a determination by a *magister* (the authors label this type *CR*); or, once the stages of the *corpus sophisticis* have been enacted, a certain number of pertinent problems (*problemata*) are debated according to the rules of a classical *quaestio* (type *CP(R)*). Thus, as one can see, sophistic disputations can be quite brief or extended and can combine the basic elements in different ways (which the authors can indicate in various configurations of the letters of their typological code, *C,P,R*). Sophistic disputations, moreover, are incorporated into different kinds of logical and grammatical texts, i.e., in *Abstractiones*, or collections of *sophismata* generally lacking discussions of *distinctiones* used to resolve the ambiguities of the sophisms, and *problemata*, or questions arising from *sophismata* and their solution; *Syncategoremata*, or treatises in which a number of syncategemes or verbal operators (such as quantifiers or ‘distributive signs’ like *tantum* and *solus*, etc.) that cause the ambiguity of sophistic propositions are discussed; *Distinctiones*, i.e., “treatises on types of distinctions and rules relevant to propositions that contain a syncategematic word and hence

the solution of” *sophismata*; finally, collections formed by reports of oral sophistic disputations, recorded by students or compiled from a master’s notes, which follow the typology of forms presented above (I: 5-7).

The *13th-Century* of the work’s title is a long thirteenth century: the types of sophistic literature catalogued in these volumes, with a few later exceptions, cover the period 1200-1325. Besides sophistic propositions and arguments in collections of *Abstractiones*, *Syncategoremata* and *Distinctiones*, the authors include *sophismata* found in such handbooks as the *Tractatus* or *Summulae* of Peter of Spain, but they have not systematically searched such handbooks for inclusion in the catalogue. Omitted are occasional treatments of sophistic propositions in commentaries on Aristotle and in the specialized logical genre of *obligationes* (I: 9-10). Very little sophistic literature was printed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, “and nothing from the 13th century” (I: 7); thus most all of the sophistic literature from the Middle Ages exists only in manuscripts. Sophistic texts are not so easy to find in codices. Sophistic propositions and arguments are often written on spare leaves or sides, for example, at the end of gatherings, their introductory words are irregular and confusing, and most often they are not clearly labeled or rubricated; as a result, they are often overlooked or mislabeled or descriptively and generically titled (e.g., “Logical questions”) by manuscript cataloguers. In other words, it takes a specialist in the complex sophistic literature to rummage the manuscripts, track down and precisely locate the elusive quarry. Ebbesen, who was responsible for the manuscript work in the catalogue,¹⁵ has performed an inestimable service in assembling the core manuscript library of the sophistic literature of the Middle Ages.

Because of the various forms that arguments involving *sophismata* take, the different but intertwining genres of logical and grammatical texts in which *sophismata* appear, and because sophistic literature may be organized (and identified) by different argumentative elements and structural features—i.e., sophistic propositions themselves, the syncategoremes that create them, the *distinctiones* whereby they are resolved, and the *problemata* pertaining to them—the authors judge than an adequate guide to this litera-

¹⁵ Goubier was responsible for collecting data from printed sources, and compiled the indices of distinctions, sophistic propositions by syncategoreme, of manuscripts and the bibliography in volume I; he also was mainly responsible for transforming the material in the database into a printed catalogue. Ebbesen wrote the introduction and was responsible for the manuscript work in the list of collections and the Catalogue itself (in volume II), as well as the other sections in volume I (e.g., indices of *problemata*); see I: 8. It is good that the respective responsibilities of the editors are delineated so precisely.

ture requires multiple indices, cross-indexed to one another. The authors first present a list of collections, mainly in manuscript, containing *sophismata* (I: 21-61); the list embraces 134 collections (143 if one counts sub-collections within larger collections). The collections are arranged alphabetically according to author and title (see below). Each entry includes, in order, a list of the manuscripts containing the collection; the dates of the manuscripts; if possible, their origin and any information about a manuscript that seems pertinent; a general description of the collection, its structure and which type(s) of *sophismata* it contains, according to the codes (e.g., *CR(P)*) established by the authors (see I: 13); the probable date of composition, the origin of the collection, and discussions of any problems of authorship; a citation of any edition of the text or part of the text and of any scholarly literature concerning the collection.

In his report on the SIEPM Commission on the Trivium published in this volume of the *Bulletin*, Ebbesen says that his favorite medieval author is *Mr. Anonymus* (p. 21). No wonder: 85 of the collections of *sophismata* (94 if one counts sub-collections) that are listed in this catalogue are anonymous. Upon reflection, this is not so surprising. First, sophistic disputations were collective enterprises, involving masters and (often many) students (collections are sometimes named for the master who supervised the disputes); moreover, strictly speaking, these disputes are mostly formal exercises, meant to hone reasoning skills. To master this *mare magnum* of anonymity, Ebbesen names the anonymous collections as a biological taxonomist names species or types of roses or butterflies. Anonymous collections are named for the current location of the manuscript in which they are contained, e.g., ANONYMUS, *Sophismata Harleiana* (from London, BL, Ms. Harley 3272) or ANONYMI, *Sophismata Parisina 16089* (from Paris, BNF, Ms. lat. 16089); or they are named for the place that the dispute or the manuscript originated, e.g., ANONYMUS, *Syncategoremata Lemovicensia* and ANONYMUS LEMOVICENSIS, *De distributionibus* (both in Paris, BNF, Ms. lat. 3454), or ANONYMUS VICTORINUS PRIMUS, *Sophismata* and ANONYMUS VICTORINUS ALTER, *Sophismata* (both in Paris, BNF, Ms. lat. 15170); or they are named after the sophistic ‘scientist’ who discovered the collection, e.g., ANONYMUS ALANI, *Sophismata* and ANONYMUS LIBERANUS, *Sophismata* (named after Alain de Libera); or they are named according to the number that they have in L.M. de Rijk’s authoritative list of Parisian treatises on *distinctiones*,¹⁶ e.g., ANONYMUS, *Distinctiones Sophismatum 2.24*. The status of Ebbesen’s favorite author is verified in this issue of the *Bulletin*: by

¹⁶ L.M. DE RIJK, *Some Earlier Parisian Tracts on Distinctiones* (Artistarium 7), Nijmegen 1988.

far, more even than Aristotle or Thomas Aquinas, *Mr. Anonymus* is the most-cited author in the *Table des noms d'auteurs anciens et médiévaux* (pp. 471-73).

The rest of volume I comprises a series of indices, geared to the Catalogue of *Sophismata*, which is printed in the second volume (the Catalogue must have an entire volume to itself). The authors do not explicitly state their rationale for disposing the indices before the Catalogue, but the reason seems to be (at least) twofold: The indices treat single elements or features of sophismatic literature that then are signified by abbreviation in the Catalogue, which comprehends all of the elements; according to the codex form of publication, it is actually 'handier' to have one volume opened to the indices and the other to the Catalogue to which they make cross-reference.

The Index of Distinctions (I: 63-172) of necessity is the most complex. A "distinction always regards one or more words.... In the prototypical case the relevant word is a plain syncategoreme, which belongs to a 'syncategorematic family'...", so that in the index entries are generally grouped under some syncategorematic type (e.g., *Conditio / Distributio, Dictiones modales [contingenter, necessario, possibile, impossibile]*) although sometimes a syncategoreme itself constitutes a type (e.g., *incipit-desinit*). Typically, under the term of the type an entry will present the text of the distinction or rule, followed by the *sophisma* to which it is applied in the literature, the author and title of the relevant collection and the number of the *sophisma* in the collection, often accompanied by a short text from the writing; any further distinctions which the author applies to the same *sophisma*, with the same appendages. Moreover, many entries record verbal variants of the distinctions, dubbed 'tokens', "which differ in formulation in ways that deserve attention but do not affect the basic nature of the two interpretations offered by the distinction" (I: 16); each of these tokens, numbered under the basic distinction (e.g., 73-73.1-73.2 etc.), is again accompanied by the *sophisma* to which it is applied and the author and title of the collection in which it occurs, its number within the collection and sometimes a text from the writing. There are further complexities to the index deriving from the complexity of the matter, concerning which readers will need to consult the reader's guide to the index (I: 16-18).

The Indices of Logical and Grammatical *Problemata* (I: 173-274, 275-312) are ordered under the key term involved in the question (e.g., *suppositio, suppositum* or *ablativus*), followed by the text of the *problema*, usually in the form of a question (e.g., "U[trum] adiectivam possit supponere," or "Cum haec propositio 'in' construitur cum accusative et ablativo quare non haec praepositio 'inter'"), and then by the *sophisma* to which the problem

pertains, and again the author and title of the collection in which it occurs. Another Index of Sophismatic Propositions by Syncategoreme (I: 311-32) “lists the sophismatic propositions according to the syncategoremes [e.g., *Aliquis... Contingit... Nihil... Omnis... Vel* etc.] that occur in them and that give rise to the discussion in the text” (I: 19). The multiple indices serve well the two main constituencies in the study of medieval philosophy: One will note that by reading across the various indices and by reference to the Catalogue, historical and textual scholars can enter the body of literature at any point and trace *loci*, and analytic philosophers can chase terms, propositions, problems, questions and solutions to their hearts’ content. The first volume closes with an Index of Manuscripts (333-44) and the Bibliography (345-52).

The main show of the work is the Catalogue of *Sophismata* (volume II), which under alphabetically-ordered sophismatic propositions incorporates all of the significant features of sophismatic literature. The entries include, in order, the sophismatic proposition; the author (often ‘Anonymus’) and title of the work or works in which the proposition occurs and is discussed; the number of the *sophisma* in the collection (amazingly, the authors themselves have numbered the *sophismata* in each unpublished collection); the type of argument pertaining to the *sophisma* in the collection (e.g., *C* or *CR* or *CR(P)* etc.); the syncategoreme that occurs in the *sophisma* and gives rise to discussion about it; the *casus* or “stipulation of the condition under which the proposition is supposed to be uttered” (cf. I: 12), if there is one; the *distinctio(nes)* applied to the *sophisma*, if there are any; *problemata* attached to the *sophisma* in the collection, if there are any; the incipit and explicit of the text (or textual unit) treating the *sophisma* (these are usually “omitted if the work belongs to one of the genres of *abstractiones*, *distinctiones*, *syncategoremata*”; see I: 14); a list of the manuscripts used by the authors giving the exact folios in which the *sophisma* is to be found; finally, citation of printed editions, if any exist, and references to scholarly literature concerning the relevant collection (see I: 12-15 for all this). Typographically, the information is neatly and economically laid out in each entry, so that one may surmise all in a single glance. The Catalogue contains entries for 1329 sophismatic propositions, and if one counts its sub-entries that refer to the works in which each proposition is treated, it contains over 3000 entries in all.

As the blurb on the back cover of the volumes says, the analysis of sophismatic propositions represented “cutting-edge research” in the study of logic and grammar in medieval universities; the mass of material that the authors present indicates that sophismatic exercises and disputes were regularly practiced by the students and masters in the faculty of Arts. This begs

the question: What was the larger purpose of training in sophistic techniques of linguistic analysis? Where did sophistic analysis go in the larger range of thirteenth-century philosophic and theological literature? Does the technique appear often in discourse about natural philosophy or metaphysics or ethics or in theological discourse? Scholars know instances, of course, but how extensive was such analysis, and does it appear explicitly or implicitly in writings pertaining to the various branches of philosophy? Now that Ebbesen's and Goubier's catalogue has appeared, it seems to me that students of Scholastic philosophy and theology will become more attuned to the nature of sophistic analysis and likely will detect it more often in the literature that they study. (For one thing, it seems evident that sophistic analysis would be especially useful in the interpretation and reconciliation of *authoritates*.)

The number of modern scholars who, since the early twentieth century, have penetrated the world of medieval *sophismata* is relatively few, though the roster is composed of master scholars (not least Ebbesen himself) whose names will be known to all serious students of medieval philosophy (see I: 7-9 and the Bibliography, 345-52). Based on these pioneering studies and scholarly probes into the body of literature, Sten Ebbesen and Frédéric Goubier have accomplished something more and rare: their *Catalogue of 13th-Century Sophismata* effectively constitutes and indexes a distinct body of literature for scholarly research.

* * *

The heuristic works mentioned in the first part of this review-essay have served to generate research in medieval philosophy and theology among several generations of scholars. One hopes that the new heuristic instruments directed by Jacqueline Hamesse and Sten Ebbesen, printed just under the wire before all such reference works vaporize into the Cloud, will be the impetus that accelerates original research among the manuscripts by several more generations of scholars. Will a new generation of students of medieval philosophy and theology take up the challenge implied by Hamesse's repertory of incipits and Ebbesen's catalogue of *sophismata*? Perhaps a more pointed question is: Will universities and other institutions of learning enable young scholars to take up the challenge?

The very contents of the *Repertorium* and *Catalogue*, moreover, have implications for the path of future research. In the archetypal movie of the Boomer generation (now passed into its "seniority" if not its dotage), *The Graduate* (1967), at his college graduation party Ben Braddock—played memorably by Dustin Hoffman—is accosted by two middle-aged women who ask him what he plans to do with his "future life." At that point, the

conversation is interrupted by a worldly-wise businessman, named McGuire, who sweeps young Ben aside for some private advice:

McGuire: "Ben, I just want to say one word to you. Just *one word*."

Ben: "Yes, sir."

McGuire: "Are you listening?"

Ben: "Yes, I am."

McGuire: "*Plastics*."

Ben: "Exactly how do you mean?"

McGuire: "There's a great future in *Plastics*. Think about it. Will you think about it?... Shush, enough said."

If the *Repertorium initiorum* and *A Catalogue of 13th-Century Sophismata* are any guides, the word to the wise in medieval philosophy would seem to be: *Anonymity*. There's a great future in *Anonymity*. Think about it.

Kent EMERY, Jr. (Notre Dame)

University of Notre Dame, bpm@nd.edu

Abstract: This essay proposes an ideal order of research in medieval philosophy and theology, historically exemplified, which progresses from heuristic works to critical editions to interpretive studies to, finally, translations of Latin texts into modern vernacular languages (the value of which is not unambiguous). Thereafter the essay offers reviews of two new heuristic instruments, the *Repertorium initiorum manuscritorum latinorum medii aevi*, 4 volumes, by Jacqueline Hamesse assisted by Slawomir Szyller, and *A Catalogue of 13th-Century Sophismata*, 2 volumes, by Sten Ebbesen and Frédéric Goubier.

Keywords: Anonymity-Anonymus, *distinctiones*, incipits-initia, philosophy, *problema(ta)*, *sophisma(ta)*, syncategoremes, theology.