

## Scotus's Legacy

GIORGIO PINI (New York)

Scotus died in Cologne on November 8<sup>th</sup>, 1308, according to the now lost register of deaths of the Cologne Franciscan convent<sup>1</sup>. Since he is usually thought to have left Paris and reached Cologne in time to start classes in the fall of 1307, at the moment of his death he had served as the principal lector of the Franciscan *studium* for scarcely more than one year<sup>2</sup>. There is a tradition according to which Scotus left for Cologne at a short notice from the Franciscan general minister<sup>3</sup>. This tradition is not confirmed, but for some reason scholars have been willing to find an explanation for Scotus's move from Paris to Cologne. It has been hypothesized that he was sent to Cologne in order to fight

---

<sup>1</sup> The usually reliable Istrian Scotist, Matthew Ferlic (Matthaeus Ferchius), states that in 1619 he saw that document still in the archive of the Franciscan convent in Cologne. Cf. Matthaeus Ferchius, *Apologiae pro Ioanne Duns Scoto, Bononiae 1620*, *Apologia I*, 6; *Apologia II*, 13; cf. also R. Zavalloni, *Giovanni Duns Scoto. Maestro di vita e pensiero*, Santa Maria degli Angeli 1993, 25 sq. On Scotus's life, cf. in general A. B. Wolter, *Reflections on the Life and Works of Scotus*, in: *The American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 1993 (47), 1–36; T. Williams, *The Life and Works of John Duns Scotus*, in: id. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Duns Scotus*, Cambridge 2003, 1–14.

<sup>2</sup> It is usually thought that Scotus must have left Paris by the time Alexander of Alessandria succeeded him as the Franciscan regent master. Since Alexander is mentioned as a regent master in a document dated October 25<sup>th</sup>, 1307, he must have occupied his new position since the beginning of the academic year, i.e. September 14<sup>th</sup>, 1307. Cf. A. Callebaut, *La maîtrise du Bx. Jean Duns Scot en 1305: son départ de Paris en 1307 durant la préparation du procès contre les Templiers*, in: *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 21 (1928), 206–239, especially 215. As a matter of fact, it was not at all uncommon for masters to stay in Paris some time after their regency. But the fact that Scotus is mentioned as *lector* in Cologne on February 20<sup>th</sup>, 1307 (cf. nt. 4) makes it likely that he must have left Paris in time to start the new academic year in Cologne. Classes in the Franciscan *studia* started on St. Francis feast day, i.e. October 4<sup>th</sup>. Cf. M. Brlek, *De evolutione iuridica studiorum in ordine minorum. Ab initio ordinis usque ad an. 1517*, Dubrovnik 1942, 27.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Guillelmus de Vorillong, *Super IV libros Sententiarum, Venetis 1496*, l. 2, d. 44, q. 1, fol. 161<sup>va</sup>: „*Narratur de Doctore Subtili qui in Prato clericorum, visa Generali Ministri obedientia, dum actu Regens esset in scholis Parisiensibus, aut pauca aut nulla de rebus habita dispositione, Parisiis exivit ut Coloniam iret, secundum Ministri sententiam.*“ This tradition is quite late, as Vorillong's commentary dates from 1430. Cf. Callebaut, *La maîtrise* (nt. 2), 231. The *lector* of a *studium generale* was nominated by the minister general in a General Chapter with the advice of the masters who were present or, outside a General Chapter, with the help of a committee of ten friars chosen by the minister himself and the custodes of the Province and Custody to which the *lector* should be assigned, cf. Brlek, *De evolutione* (nt. 2), 85.

against the Beghards<sup>4</sup>. Alternatively, it has been argued that Scotus was hastily removed from Paris because of the dangers to which his alleged opposition to Philip the Fair and his clan exposed him during the Templar affair<sup>5</sup>. As a matter of fact, there is no evidence in support of either hypothesis. The truth is that there is probably nothing to explain about Scotus's departure for Cologne. It was common practice in the mendicant orders to move teachers from one *studium* to another<sup>6</sup>. Scotus's Paris regency as a theology master lasted two years – from the fall of 1305 to the spring of 1307. Regencies tended to be short in an order crowded with good candidates and eager to have as many people as possible to obtain the title of theology master. After two years as master in the Paris theology faculty, Scotus was now ready to take over another task. What could not have been expected was that Scotus would die merely one year after going to Cologne.

In this paper, I will consider what Scotus left behind in 1308 – what I call his 'legacy'. This legacy is both intellectual and material. From the intellectual point of view, we are faced with the philosophical and theological achievement of an exceptional mind. From the material point of view, we have to cope with the disordered mass of his writings. In what follows, I will take into account both aspects of this legacy. My intention is to stress the role that several members of the Franciscan order played in the transformation of this controversial and problematic legacy into one of the most successful schools of thought of the later Middle Ages – one that was destined to last well into the modern era.

How did this spectacular result take place? In order to provide at least a preliminary answer to this question, we should distinguish four aspects. First, we should consider Scotus's legacy – the works and ideas he left behind at the moment of his death. Second, we should consider what was done with this legacy, more specifically we should focus on the work of copying and editing to which Scotus's works were subjected in the years following his death. Third, we should consider the role that Scotus's own students played in the process of making their master's teachings accepted in the Franciscan *studia*. Fourth, we should consider what became of Scotus's legacy after this work of revision. Accordingly, this paper is divided into four parts. First, I consider Scotus's philosophical and theological output, i. e. what he left behind at the moment of his death. Second, I turn to the fate of his works and manuscripts. Third, I focus on Scotus's direct students and on their role in the diffusion of their master's writings and doctrines in the Franciscan *studia*. Fourth and finally, I illustrate the process of transition from Scotus to Scotism by contrasting, on the one hand, Scotus's treatment of the doctrines of the subject matter of metaphysics and of the univocity of being and, on the other hand, the treatments that his student, Antonius Andreae, gave of the same issues.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. W. Lampen, B. Johannes Duns Scotus, lector coloniensis, in: *Collectanea franciscana neerlandica* 2 (1931), 291–305, especially 298 sq.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Callebaut, *La maîtrise* (nt. 2), 217–239.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Wolter, *Reflections on the Life* (nt. 1), 13.

## I.

Scotus's career may be divided into three stages: Oxford (until 1302), Paris (from 1302 to 1307, with an interruption between 1303 and 1304), and Cologne (from 1307 to 1308). The hypothesis that Scotus may have stayed in Paris for four years from 1293 to 1297 is now usually rejected<sup>7</sup>. At some point he may have stayed at Cambridge, but there seems to be no conclusive evidence about it.

We can be virtually sure about what Scotus did at Oxford, where he stayed until 1302<sup>8</sup>. After completing his philosophical training and probably while still studying theology, in the early 1290s Scotus must have played the role of *lector logicae* in the Oxford convent. In that capacity, he probably commented on Porphyry's *Isagoge* as well as on Aristotle's *Categories*, *De interpretatione* (on which he lectured twice) and *Sophistical Refutations*<sup>9</sup>. In those same years, Scotus may also have commented on the *Topics*, if the *notabilia* on this work attributed to him are to be considered as an authentic work, as it seems to be the case<sup>10</sup>. These *notabilia* also offer evidence of some lectures on the *Prior Analytics*, now lost<sup>11</sup>. Some years afterward, Scotus must have acted as *lector philosophiae* and lectured a first time on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. The first draft of his *Questions on the Metaphysics*, which can be reconstructed from the composite version we currently have, as well as his *Notabilia super Metaphysicam* give us a fairly accurate idea of Scotus's teaching at this time<sup>12</sup>. Some time

<sup>7</sup> This hypothesis was put forward in Callebaut, Le bx. Jean Duns Scot (nt. 2). It was rejected in C. K. Brampton, Duns Scotus at Oxford, 1299–1301, in: *Franciscan Studies* 24 (1964), 5–20. Cf. also Wolter, *Reflections on the Life* (nt. 1), 9; W. J. Courtenay, Scotus at Paris, in: *Via Scoti. Methodologica ad mentem Joannis Duns Scoti. Atti del Congresso Internazionale*, Roma 9–11 marzo 1993, Rome 1995, 149–163. In a paper given at the Scotistic conference in Oxford in July 2008, William Courtenay has re-considered the possibility that Scotus may have stayed at Paris in the 1290s. If this were the case, Scotus may have commented on Aristotle during his first staying in Paris, while he was following the lectorate program in theology. In what follows, I do not develop on this hypothesis. Also, I do not take a position about Dumont's hypothesis that Scotus may have been back in Oxford some time in 1305. Cf. S. D. Dumont, William of Ware, Richard of Conington and the *Collationes Oxonienses* of John Duns Scotus, in: L. Honnefelder/R. Wood/M. Dreyer (eds.), *John Duns Scotus. Metaphysics and Ethics*, Leiden–New York–Cologne 1996, 59–85, especially 84 sq.

<sup>8</sup> For a list of Scotus's works, cf. C. Balić, *De Ordinatione I. Duns Scoti disquisitio historico-critica* (from now on: *Disquisitio*), in: *Ioannis Duns Scoti Opera omnia*, vol. 1, Vatican City 1950, 141\*–154\*.

<sup>9</sup> These commentaries are published in Scotus's *Opera philosophica*, vols. 1–2, St. Bonaventure (NY) 1999 and 2004.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. R. Andrews, *The Notabilia Scoti in Libros Topicorum: An Assessment of Authenticity*, in: *Franciscan Studies* 56 (1998), 65–75; G. Pini, *Duns Scotus' Commentary on the Topics: New Light on His Philosophical Teaching*, in: *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 66 (1999), 225–243.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Pini, *Duns Scotus' Commentary* (nt. 10), 243.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. the *Introduction* to Scotus's *Opera philosophica*, vol. 3, St. Bonaventure (NY) 1997, xxviii–xxxvii. On the different drafts of the *Questions on the Metaphysics*, see S. D. Dumont,

after commenting on Aristotle's ‚Metaphysics‘ (or possibly roughly at the same time), Scotus commented on Peter Lombard's ‚Sentences‘ for the first time<sup>13</sup>. The result of this first set of lectures on the ‚Sentences‘, known as ‚Lectura‘, would constitute the basis for a long process of revision, which was started at Oxford and would accompany Scotus all along his career to become his famous unfinished masterpiece, the ‚Ordinatio‘<sup>14</sup>.

Some time afterwards, probably in 1302, Scotus was sent to Paris with the prospect of being eventually promoted to the position of master of theology – which would actually happen in 1305<sup>15</sup>. He stayed there until his final move to Cologne in 1307, with a short interruption in 1303–04, when he had to leave Paris because of his refusal to sign an appeal in support of Philip the Fair's call for a council against the pope, Boniface VIII<sup>16</sup>. We are relatively well-informed concerning Scotus's activity in Paris, both before and after his promotion. Before the short interruption in his Paris career and his promotion to master, he must have been busy most of his time with lecturing another time on the ‚Sen-

---

The Question on Individuation in Scotus's *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam*, in: *Via Scoti* (nt. 7), 193–227; G. Pini, Univocity in Scotus's Questions on the *Metaphysics*: The Solution to a Riddle, in: *Medioevo* 30 (2005), 69–110. On the ‚*Notabilia super Metaphysicam*‘, cf. id., *Notabilia Scoti super Metaphysicam: una testimonianza ritrovata dell'insegnamento di Duns Scoto sulla Metafisica*, in: *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 89 (1996), 137–180.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Scotus's *Opera omnia*, vols. 16–21, Vatican City 1960–2003. Scotus's first commentary on the ‚Sentences‘, the so-called ‚Lectura‘, is dated by its editors at 1300/01 (*Editio Vaticana*, vol. 19, 33\*), but it is likely to have been carried out before that date, between 1297 and 1300. We only have Scotus's commentary on the first three books. A ‚Lectura‘ on the fourth book seems to have never existed, cf. A. B. Wolter, *Reflections about Scotus's Early Works*, in: L. Honnefelder/R. Wood/M. Dreyer (eds.), *John Duns Scotus. Metaphysics and Ethics*, Leiden–New York–Cologne 1993, 37–57, especially 45. On the close link between several passages in the ‚Lectura‘ and the ‚Questions on the *Metaphysics*‘, cf. Prolegomena, in: *Ioannis Duns Scoti Lectura in librum secundum Sententiarum* (*Opera omnia* 9), Vatican City 1993, 41\*–46\*; L. Modrić, *Rapporto tra la Lectura II e la Metafisica di G. Duns Scoto*, in: *Antoniana* 42 (1987), 504–509; Wolter, *Reflections about Scotus's Early Works*, 38 sq.

<sup>14</sup> With regard to the so-called ‚*Collationes Oxonienses*‘, which have been thought to date from Scotus's Oxford period, there are some doubts concerning their dating. Dumont has recently argued for a late date, i.e. between 1305 and Scotus's death in 1308; he has also ventilated the possibility that Scotus may have been back in Oxford in 1305. As an alternative, Dumont suggests that these *collationes* may date from Scotus's exile from Paris in 1303–04, cf. Dumont, *William of Ware* (nt. 7), 84 sq. On the Oxford *collationes*, cf. also C. Balić, *De collationibus Ioannis Duns Scoti, doctoris subtilis ac mariani*, in: *Bogoslovni Vestnik* 9 (1929), 185–219; F. Pelster, *Handschriftliches zur Überlieferung der Quaestiones super libros Metaphysicorum und der Collationes des Duns Scotus. 2. Die Collationes Parisienses und Oxonienses*, in: *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 44 (1931), 79–92; G. Alliney, *The Treatise on the Human Will in the Collationes oxonienses Attributed to John Duns Scotus*, in: *Medioevo* 30 (2005), 209–269.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Callebaut, *La maîtrise* (nt. 2).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. E. Longpré, *Le B. Jean Duns Scot. Pour le Saint Siège et contre le gallicanisme* (25–28 juin 1303), in: *La France Franciscaine* 11 (1928), 137–162; W. J. Courtenay, *The Parisian Franciscan Community in 1303*, in: *Franciscan Studies* 53 (1993), 155–173. On the historical context, cf. id., *Between Pope and King. The Parisian Letters of Adhesion of 1303*, in: *Speculum* 71 (1996), 577–605.

tences'. There are several *reportationes* of his teaching in those years<sup>17</sup>. There is also the possibility that at some point during his Parisian stay he acted again as a philosophy *lector*. In that capacity, he must have commented again on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, but possibly also on his logic, if we give credit to what his student, Antonius Andreae, claimed<sup>18</sup>. Admittedly, the statutes established that the same person could not play the roles of both theology and philosophy *lector* in the same convent and at the same time<sup>19</sup>. But Scotus may have acted in these two capacities at different times. Also, his function as bachelor in the theology faculty may have been separated from his function as *lector* in the Franciscan convent<sup>20</sup>. In any case, it is very likely that the Franciscans did not miss a single opportunity to keep him as busy as possible. After his promotion to master of theology in 1305 (in one of the Quodlibetal sessions between Lent 1305 and Lent 1307), Scotus produced his great Parisian masterpiece, his *Quodlibet*<sup>21</sup>. If we have to judge from its extension and complexity, we may confidently conclude that the edited version – the one we have – must have been heavily revised and currently bears only a slight resemblance to what must have been the oral disputation. It is consequently very likely that Scotus spent a long time working on its revision. In addition to these works, Scotus also carried out another series of *collationes* in the Paris convent<sup>22</sup>. And of course, Scotus must

<sup>17</sup> Cf. C. Balić, *Les commentaries de Jean Duns Scot sur les quatre livres des Sentences. Étude historique et critique*, Leuven 1924; *Disquisitio* (nt. 8), 149\*. Cf. also K. Rodler, *Die Prologe der Reportata Parisiensia des Johannes Duns Scotus: Untersuchungen zur Textüberlieferung und kritische Edition*, Innsbruck 2005; John Duns Scotus, *The Examined Report of the Paris Lectures. Reportatio 1-A*, edd./trans. A. B. Wolter/O. Bychkov, vols. 1 and 2, St. Bonaventure 2004 and 2008.

<sup>18</sup> At the end of his commentary on Aristotle's *Categories*, Antonius Andreae states that he is reporting the words of Scotus when he was teaching as a master (should we rather interpret, as a *lector*?), cf. Pamplona, Biblioteca de la Catedral, ms. 6, fol. 87<sup>rb</sup>, quoted in P. Sagüés Azcona, *Apuntes para la historia del escotismo en España en el siglo XIV*, in: *De doctrina I. Duns Scoti*, vol. 4, Rome 1968, 3–19, especially 4: „*Haec de dictis magistri fratris Ioannis Duns, natione Scoti, sedentis super cathedram magistralem, ut potui, colligens, in unum compilavi.*“ Cf. also I. Vázquez Janeiro, *Rutas e hitos del escotismo primitivo en España*, in: *Homo et Mundus. Acta Quinti Congressus Scotisiti Internationalis. Salamanticae, 21–26 septembris 1981, Rome 1984*, 419–436, especially 434. But notice that Antonius Andreae may just be saying that he redacted his commentary on the *Categories* when Duns Scotus was a regent master, whereas the material Antonius Andreae used for his redaction may have originated from what Scotus taught previously.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. the Strasbourg General Constitutions (1282), in: C. Cenci/R. G. Mailleux (eds.), *Constitutiones Generales Ordinis Fratrum Minorum I (Seculum XIII)*, Grottaferrata 2007, 181: „*Iura vero et philosophica in scolis theologie ab eodem lectore et eodem tempore non legantur, sed alibi et alias, ubi fuerit oportuum.*“

<sup>20</sup> On the distinction and relationships between the university and the *studia* system, cf. Courtenay, *The Parisian Franciscan Community* (nt. 16), 157–165; B. Roest, *A History of Franciscan Education* (c. 1210–1517), Leiden–Boston–Cologne 2000, 87–97 as well as 11–20 (on the Paris *studium*).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. T. B. Noone/H. F. Roberts, *John Duns Scotus' Quodlibet*, in: C. Schabel (ed.), *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages: The Fourteenth Century*, vol. 2, Leiden–Boston–Cologne 2007, 131–198.

<sup>22</sup> These are the so-called *Collationes Parisienses*. Cf. Balić, *De collationibus* (nt. 14); Alliney, *The Treatise* (nt. 14), 209–216.

have spent considerable time on the preparation of his ‚*Ordinatio*‘ on the ‚*Sentences*‘.

Towards the end of 1307, Scotus was sent to Cologne as the principal *lector* of the Franciscan *studium*. He was at the peak of his intellectual powers. He had just produced a great masterpiece of scholastic thought – his ‚*Quodlibet*‘. And from the many additions and revisions to his ‚*Ordinatio*‘ and ‚*Questions on the Metaphysics*‘ we are able to get a glimpse of the new and sometimes strange directions that his restless mind was taking. At Cologne, Scotus must have found a stimulating if possibly little group of students coming from different provinces<sup>23</sup>. What did Scotus do during that year?

We must admit that we do not have any positive information about Scotus's activity in the last year of his life. Apart from the fact that he died there, the only piece of evidence that we have concerning his stay in Cologne is a document where he is listed among those who gathered there on February 20<sup>th</sup>, 1308, to give advice to the provincial minister, Gerardus de Pomerio, concerning the acquisition of a house to be destined to the Franciscans in the town of Roermond, currently in the Southeastern part of the Netherlands. The original document, kept by the Landes- und Stadtbibliothek of Düsseldorf, was destroyed during World War II, but in 1931 Willibrord Lampen edited it. In that document, Scotus appears as ‚*lector*‘. As his name is followed by that of a certain Walter (*Gualterus*), who is described as ‚*lector sententiarum*‘, we may infer that Scotus's role was, not surprisingly, that of principal *lector* in the Cologne convent. As such, his functions were different from those of the secondary *lector*, who was charged with lecturing on the ‚*Sentences*‘<sup>24</sup>. Concerning Scotus's activity in Cologne, we should distinguish between, on the one hand, his actual teaching and, on the other hand, his work of revision of writings started elsewhere. As far as his teaching is concerned, we should notice that the main task of the principal *lector* was to comment on the Bible, but there is no extant commentary on the Bible by Scotus. Scotus may also have been carrying out other sorts of academic exercises for his students. Since some of his works are difficult to date, we may try to attribute them to the Cologne period. The ‚*De primo principio*‘ may be a candidate<sup>25</sup>. We do not know much about the dating of the

<sup>23</sup> On the Franciscan *studium* at Cologne as a *studium generale*, cf. W. Lampen, *De fratribus minoribus in universitate Coloniensi*, in: *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 23 (1930), 467–487; Brlek, *De evolutione* (nt. 2), 27; Roest, *A History* (nt. 20), 29. According to Lampen, the average number of friars in the Cologne convent was 60, even though on special occasions it seems that as many as 300 friars could occasionally be accommodated, cf. Lampen, *op. cit.*, 470. As a consequence, the size of the Franciscan Cologne community was more or less one third of the Franciscan Paris community, which counted 173 residents in 1303, cf. Courtenay, *The Parisian Franciscan Community* (nt. 16), 163. Only some of these residents would be lecturer students.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Roest, *A History* (nt. 20), 123–137. Accordingly, we should rule out Balić's hypothesis that Scotus gave a new commentary on the ‚*Sentences*‘ in Cologne, cf. Balić, *Les commentaires* (nt. 17), 32.

<sup>25</sup> Johannes Duns Scotus, *Tractatus de Primo Principio*, ed. W. Kluxen, Darmstadt 31994. This treatise is usually thought to have been written after 1301–02.

,Theoremata'<sup>26</sup>. We must admit, however, that we lack any positive information about what Scotus taught at Cologne.

As far as Scotus's work of revision is concerned, we do not know whether Scotus took along his personal manuscripts or whether he left them in Paris (as the tradition of his hasty departure for Cologne may make us suppose)<sup>27</sup>. If that was the case, Scotus may have been working on the definitive edition of his ',Ordinatio' and of his ',Questions on the Metaphysics'. Both works, however, were never finished – either because of Scotus's death or because of his move to Cologne (if he did not take his manuscripts with him).

Now that we have quickly gone through Scotus's career and production, we should ask: what remained of this activity at the moment of his death? We should distinguish two aspects of Scotus's legacy in 1308. I will call the first aspect the intellectual legacy. By contrast, I will call the second aspect the material legacy.

Let us briefly consider Scotus's intellectual legacy. Scotus left behind controversial doctrines. The issues I am referring to are well-known to scholars. In metaphysics and the theory of cognition, we may recall the doctrine of the univocity of being and of the proper object of human understanding; the doctrine of essence and universals; the doctrine of individuation; the doctrine of the formal and modal distinction; the defense of the role of the intelligible species in abstractive cognition; the notion of objective being and its role in the mechanisms of cognition; and the doctrine of intuitive cognition. Most of these doctrines were elaborated in theological contexts, but they may be regarded as philosophical because of the important consequences they had from a philosophical point of view and because they were often discussed in philosophical contexts after Scotus's death. If we move to the specific field of theology, Scotus left an original treatment of the Trinity as well as of the Hypostatic Union. We may add Scotus's controversial treatment of the Immaculate Conception. And we should also mention his emphasis on the Anselmian distinction between the two affections of the will as well as his doctrine of natural law and divine commandments. Other theological issues that have been singled out as having a lasting influence on successive thought are the theory of divine acceptation and covenantal theology, his view of justification and the sacraments as well as his doctrine of predestination before foreseen merits or demerits<sup>28</sup>.

Most of these issues emerged as developments and corrections of other theologians' views. Notably, Henry of Ghent played a major role in shaping Scotus's doctrines, as both a source and a polemical target. In this respect, Scotus may indeed be described as a philosophers' philosopher and a theologians' theologian. It must be said of Scotus even more than of other later medieval thinkers

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Scotus's *Opera philosophica*, vol. 2, St. Bonaventure (NY) 2004.

<sup>27</sup> Wolter suggests that Scotus left his autograph manuscript of the ',Ordinatio' in Paris, cf. Wolter, *Reflections about Scotus's Early Works* (nt. 13), 39.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. W. J. Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England*, Princeton 1987, 186.

that his teachings can be fully appreciated as a reaction to or a correction of the positions of those who preceded him.

If we consider these issues – to which undoubtedly several others may be added –, we can confidently claim that things would never be the same after Scotus. But this does not mean that Scotus's own ideas won over a large number of supporters, even among the Franciscans. At least in the first years after his death, his insights did attract attention but not always real sympathy. Even those who in the 1320s and 1330s adopted some of Scotus's important doctrines spent considerable efforts to correct and improve on them. They also differed as to their precise interpretations<sup>29</sup>.

Let us now turn to Scotus's material legacy. What about the works and the manuscripts in which Scotus's ideas were preserved? Here we are faced with a peculiar situation. Among Scotus's writings, the only great work that was almost ready for publication at the moment of his death was his ‚Quodlibet‘. Scotus had managed to revise his ‚Quodlibet‘ except for the last question (q. 21), which is only partially revised and preserved in its entirety only in a reported form<sup>30</sup>. To the ‚Quodlibet‘, we can possibly add the ‚De primo principio‘ which however concerns only one specific aspect of theology, no matter how important, i. e. the demonstration of God's existence. Apart from these works, there are Scotus's youthful – and comparatively less remarkable – logical commentaries and his ‚Theoremata‘, which is a work whose significance is very difficult to assess.

Scotus's other great theological masterpiece, the definitive version of his commentary on the ‚Sentences‘, his famous ‚Ordinatio‘, is just an unfinished torso. It contains many corrections, annotations and additions. As a result, it is full of inconsistencies, sometimes concerning very important issues. Many tensions are not solved.

Similarly, Scotus's great philosophical masterpiece, his ‚Questions on the Metaphysics‘, was left unfinished. Scotus's first draft – dating probably from the early 1290s – had been superseded by many additions and corrections. But the definitive version is nowhere to be found. The result is a very confused mixture of the old and the new. Some passages that reflect Scotus's early ideas and are parallel to what we read in his logical commentaries are juxtaposed to

<sup>29</sup> See notably the controversy about how to interpret the univocal concept of being between William Alnwick and Petrus Thomae, cf. S. D. Dumont, *The Univocity of the Concept of Being in the Fourteenth Century: I. John Duns Scotus and William Alnwick*, in: *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987), 1–75; id., *The Univocity of the Concept of Being in the Fourteenth Century: II. The De ente of Peter Thomae*, in: *Mediaeval Studies* 50 (1988), 186–256. The first generation of Scotists took some effort to clarify several other notions, such as that of *esse intelligibile*, to which both William of Alnwick and Peter Thomae devoted specific sets of questions. Other topics that were being largely discussed were the notion of formality and distinction.

<sup>30</sup> This fact is reflected in the complicated manuscript tradition of the ‚Quodlibet‘, cf. Noone/Roberts, *John Duns Scotus's Quodlibet* (nt. 21), 140–143; Wolter, *Remarks on the Life* (nt. 1), 13. Both Noone/Roberts and Wolter quote from a marginal annotation relative to the words „Tertium membrum“ (Vivès, vol. 26, 337a, par. 6) in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, ms. Clm 8717, fol. 85<sup>vb</sup>: „Finis. Quodlibet repertum in sui quaternis. Quod sequitur est de reportatione.“



novel insights that are parallel to the latest developments that we can find in the additions to the ‚Ordinatio‘ and in the ‚Reportatio‘. This chaotic situation is reflected in the complicated textual history of the ‚Questions on the Metaphysics‘. Several manuscripts contain some questions in a peculiar order. The very same question is sometimes organized in different ways in different manuscripts. From a doctrinal point of view, we should also notice that, within the very same question, Scotus sometimes defends contradictory views<sup>31</sup>. Very often it is not at all easy to identify Scotus’s final opinion about the topic discussed. And this is true not just of minor points. Even Scotus’s treatment of topics as fundamental as the subject matter of metaphysics and the univocity of the concept of being is very problematic, to say the least<sup>32</sup>. Scotus’s position on these issues appears to be in contradiction with what he said elsewhere, notably in his theological writings. All this is not the sign of a confused mind, but of a confused textual history, which in turn must be explained as the result of the existence of different drafts of the same work, from which different traditions probably stemmed.

To the ‚Questions on the Metaphysics‘, we should add Scotus’s own remarks on the text of Aristotle’s ‚Metaphysics‘ – the so-called ‚Notabilia super Metaphysicam‘, which are what remains of his *expositio*. These remarks are a precious document of Scotus’s teaching on Aristotle. But they are often so close to what Scotus actually said in the classroom that it is at times almost impossible to adapt them for a larger audience. Their extemporaneous character may have played some role in the fact that these *notabilia* were completely neglected by Scotus’s followers. Their fate may have been closely linked to the destiny of Scotus’s own library, of which we know almost nothing. Apart from one very partial fourteenth-century manuscript and another witness dating from the fifteenth century, the ‚Notabilia super Metaphysicam‘ virtually disappeared and they were thought to be lost. Accordingly, they played no role in the history of Scotism<sup>33</sup>.

Accordingly, Scotus’s legacy can be described as little short of a failure. His doctrines – already quite complicated in themselves – were contained in works that are textually chaotic, where several drafts are added to one another and any coherent plan seems at times to be completely absent. If we compare Scotus’s legacy with that of other great masters of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, such as Thomas Aquinas, Henry of Ghent, Giles of Rome and Godfrey of Fontaines, the contrast cannot be stronger. If in 1308 a forecast had to be made, Scotus, for all his brilliance, would have looked as the least likely candidate for the role of the founder of a school with a large number of followers. His philosophical and theological output just seemed to be unfit for the *studia* system that the Franciscans had developed.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. the ‚Introduction‘ to Scotus’s Opera philosophica, vol. 3.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Pini, Univocity (nt. 12).

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Pini, Una testimonianza (nt. 12).

As we know, things went very differently. What happened? There is, of course, an easy answer to this question. Scotus's genius was immediately apparent to his contemporaries. No matter what people thought of his arguments and teachings, it was clear that they were something to be reckoned with.

Here, however, I would like to focus on a different aspect of this story. It is not surprising that Scotus attracted the attention of his peers in the theology faculty at both Oxford and Paris. What is more surprising is that he managed to penetrate the educational system of the Franciscans not just at the university level but also or rather especially in the numerically much more important lectorate program<sup>34</sup>. It is here that we notice the beginning of the posthumous success of Scotus. Scotus had the singular fate of being what his order missed – a great master acquainted with the latest developments in theology and philosophy. Some adjustments had to be made in order to make Scotus into a suitable candidate for the role of intellectual guide of the order, but Scotus's students seemed to have taken on themselves the task of carrying out these adjustments and of providing a suitable version of their master's teachings. What Scotus did not personally achieve, his students did. It is all the more remarkable that this adjustment of Scotus to the needs of Franciscan education was carried out in the absence of any official decision coming from the order. Scotus is officially mentioned in the Franciscan statutes for the first time as the author to be followed when commenting the ‚Sentences‘ only in 1500. Even then, the adoption of his teachings was not compulsory and other options were explicitly mentioned – notably, Alexander of Hales, Bonaventure, Francis of Meyronnes and Richard of Middleton. For it was acknowledged that Scotus was not good for everybody („*non enim omnis ad acumina Scoti idoneus est*“)<sup>35</sup>. Well before that date, however, Scotus had already been recognized as the main intellectual guide of the Franciscans. In order to shed light on this aspect of Scotus's posthumous success, we will have to take into account a specific aspect of his material legacy, i. e. the fate of his manuscripts.

<sup>34</sup> The lectorate program was a four-year program (shortened to three years in 1316 and to two years in 1325) which prepared the future teachers in custodial, provincial and non-degree general *studia*. It seems that at least two years in this program should have been spent in the *studium generale* of Paris. Only a few of the Franciscans who had completed the lectorate course and had spent some time as lectors (usually in their province of origin) may be selected to go back to Paris to pursue an academic career as bachelors and eventually masters in the theology faculty. After obtaining the bachelor and master degrees, these friars could be sent back as principal lectors to a *studium generale*. The lectorate and the university system should be kept separated, even though there were obviously many connections between them. Only the university granted the degrees of bachelor and master. Cf. Courtenay, *The Parisian Franciscan Community* (nt. 16), 157–163; Roest, *A History* (nt. 20), 87–97.

<sup>35</sup> *Constitutiones Alexandrinae* V, 163s, quoted in Brlek, *De evolutione* (nt. 2), 92: „*Et in studiis generalibus in quibus Sententiae leguntur, in toto triennio teneatur legisse [...] quatuor libros Sententiarum, cum quaestionibus Doctoris subtilis aut alterius: puta Alexandri de Ales, Bonaventurae, Francisci Mayronis aut Richardi, prout cum auditoribus convenerint. Non enim omnis ad acumina Scoti idoneus est.*“

## II.

So let us now turn to the posthumous fate of Scotus's own writings in the years immediately following his death. We have some evidence of a certain diffusion of Scotus's writings in Paris<sup>36</sup>. But it is not on the debates in the Parisian theology faculty that I would like to focus my attention. I think that a key factor to understand the success of Scotus's teachings is the fate met by his manuscripts and works within the Franciscan order.

When we consider the fate of Scotus's manuscripts, we face another gap in our knowledge. We do not know what happened to Scotus's autograph manuscripts after his death. Did he take them along when he moved to Cologne? Or did they stay back in Oxford and in Paris? We do not have any evidence concerning this important point, but it is not unlikely that Scotus left his autograph manuscripts in Paris when he moved to Cologne. The tradition of his hasty moving to his new destination would corroborate this possibility. What we do know is that, at the moment of Scotus's death, his autograph manuscripts were not dispersed or neglected. Some of his students had access to them – notably, William of Alnwick and Peter Thomae<sup>37</sup>. A possible scenario is that Scotus's autograph manuscripts were kept in the library of the Franciscan convent in Paris, where Alnwick and Peter Thomae could consult them. Specifically, Alnwick played an important role in the first diffusion of Scotus's works. He prepared the so-called ‚Additiones magnaë‘, which should be regarded as a compilation from various Parisian *reportationes* intended as a supplement to Scotus's unfinished revision of his ‚Ordinatio‘<sup>38</sup>. William of Alnwick may also have pos-

<sup>36</sup> Already in 1308, only a few months after Scotus had left Paris, Jean de Pouilly referred in a very hostile way to his teachings on the Immaculate Conception, cf. Callebaut, *La maîtrise* (nt. 2), 230. But since Jean of Pouilly carefully revised his ‚Quodlibeta‘ for publication, there is the possibility that this reference was added after the actual disputation. On Jean de Pouilly's ‚Quodlibeta‘, cf. L. Hödl, *The Quodlibeta of John of Pouilly* (d. ca. 1328) and the Philosophical and Theological Debates at Paris 1307–1312, in: Schabel (ed.), *Theological Quodlibeta*, vol. 2 (nt. 21), 199–229.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. nt. 56 on Peter Thomae; on William of Alnwick, cf. Ledoux's introduction to *Guillelmi de Alnwick Quaestiones disputatae de esse intelligibili et de quodlibet*, ed. A. Ledoux, Quaracchi 1937, ix–xlvi. On Alnwick's role in the history of the manuscript tradition of the ‚Ordinatio‘ and on the possibility that some manuscripts derive from his own copy of the ‚Ordinatio‘, cf. *Adnotationes ad nonnullas quaestiones circa Ordinationem I. Duns Scoti*, in: *I. Duns Scoti Opera omnia*, vol. 6, Vatican City 1956, 44\*, nt. 1; Dumont, *The Univocity* (nt. 29), 2, nt. 3. In what follows, I use the expression „Scotus's autograph manuscripts“ to refer to Scotus's own *originalia* of his works. According to the practice common among later medieval masters, these manuscripts were probably for the most part not written but dictated by Scotus to his secretary or secretaries. Scotus, however, must have added some passages by his own hand („*de manu sua*“) to the dictated version, according to what we know from several marginal notes to his works as well as from the testimony of those who actually saw those manuscripts (e.g., Peter Thomae).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. *Prolegomena*, in: *I. Duns Scoti Opera omnia*, vol. 10, Vatican City 2007, 77\* sqq.

essed a copy of Scotus's autograph manuscript of the unfinished ,*Ordinatio*‘, the so-called ,*liber Duns*‘.

The story of the manuscript diffusion of Scotus's works must still be written. Here I would like to mention only a famous case, that of Scotus's ,*Ordinatio*‘. The most successful part of this work was the first book, which had an extraordinary diffusion (103 manuscripts)<sup>39</sup>. Even though its diffusion is quite inferior to that of Thomas Aquinas's ,*Summa theologiae*‘ (213 manuscripts) and ,*Summa contra gentiles*‘ (182 manuscripts in addition to Aquinas's autograph manuscript)<sup>40</sup>, we should notice that one of the masterpieces of scholastic thought, Henry of Ghent's ,*Summa quaestionum ordinariarum*‘, is now preserved in 18 manuscripts – and this should be considered as a very remarkable success<sup>41</sup>.

As I have mentioned, Scotus left his theological masterpiece unfinished. So, at the moment of his death, his fellow friars were probably faced with an autograph manuscript (the so-called ,*liber Duns*‘) to which Scotus himself had attached several additions in the form of disconnected folios or scraps of parchment (the so-called *cedulae*) containing passages to be added in the relevant points of the original manuscript or to be substituted for other passages in the original manuscript. In the ,*liber Duns*‘, there were also several gaps. The most important ones are probably the entire d. 39 on the first book<sup>42</sup>, dd. 15–25 on the second book<sup>43</sup> as well as dd. 18–25 on the third book<sup>44</sup>, which were all missing from the ,*liber Duns*‘.

What did the first Franciscans who were faced with this material do? According to the *Commissio Scotistica*, they copied everything together without paying attention to what was part of a first draft, what was added, what was cancelled and what was corrected. These first scribes also filled the gaps that they found in Scotus's autograph manuscript using material coming from Scotus's other sets of lectures<sup>45</sup>. In a word, the first attempt was to complete what Scotus had left unfinished.

But things did not stop there. For several manuscripts also testify to the attempt to register what was and what was not in Scotus's autograph manuscript. The scribes of those manuscripts must have had direct or indirect access to

<sup>39</sup> There are extant 72 manuscripts of the second book, 60 of the third book and 79 of the fourth book. I take these data from *Disquisitio* (nt. 8), 9\*–12\*, 149\*.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Saint Thomas d'Aquin, *Somme contre les Gentils*, introduction par René-Antoine Gauthier, s. l. 1993, 23.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Henrici de Gandavo *Summa* (*Quaestiones ordinariae*). Art. XXXI–XXXIV (*Opera omnia* 27), ed. R. Macken, Leuven 1991, XVI.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. *Disquisitio* (nt. 8), 177\* sq.; *Adnotationes*, *Opera omnia*, vol. 6 (nt. 37), 26\*–30\*.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. *Prolegomena*, *Opera omnia*, vol. 8, Vatican City 2002, 89\*–92\*; for a list of all the major gaps in the second book of the ,*Ordinatio*‘, cf. *ibid.*, 84\*–93\*.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. *Prolegomena*, *Opera omnia*, vol. 10 (nt. 38), 42\* sq. For a list of other passages in book III missing from Scotus's autograph manuscript, cf. *ibid.*, 46\* sqq.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. *Disquisitio* (nt. 8), 177\* sq.; *Adnotationes*, *Opera omnia*, vol. 6 (nt. 37), 26\*–30\*; *Prolegomena*, *Opera omnia*, vol. 10 (nt. 38), 76\*.

Scotus's autograph manuscript, as they annotated in the margins what was marked as an addition, what was deleted, etc. in Scotus's autograph manuscript or in copies made after Scotus's autograph manuscript. For example, in the ms. Oxford, Merton College 66 there are many mentions of a „liber Alani“, which seems to have been a copy made after Scotus's autograph manuscript<sup>46</sup>. In the same Oxford manuscript there is also a mention of a passage found „in Reading's quires“ („*in quaterno Reding*“) <sup>47</sup>. Most probably, this is an allusion to a manuscript belonged to John of Reading, who read the ‚Sentences‘ at Oxford during Alnwick's regency in 1316<sup>48</sup>. So Reading may have had access to Scotus's autograph manuscript too, possibly through the copy belonging to Alnwick.

By far the most spectacular attempt to reconstruct the original version of the ‚Ordinatio‘ is the famous ms. Assisi, Biblioteca Comunale 137 (the so-called ‚A manuscript‘). Some time in the 1320s, a scribe (or possibly a team of scribes) came in possession of the ‚liber Duns‘ or of a faithful copy of it, and took it into account to carry out an impressive series of annotations and corrections to the ‚Ordinatio‘<sup>49</sup>. Thanks to this conscious effort to reproduce Scotus's autograph manuscript, we are now in a position to reconstruct large portions of the ‚liber Duns‘, as well as to single out the additions that Scotus himself or his students made to it. The task of the *Commissio Scotistica* has been to give us the closest possible approximation to the original ‚liber Duns‘. Unfortunately, the scribe did not always have the ‚liber Duns‘ (or its copy) at his disposal. Notably, it seems that he had to interrupt his careful work of reproduction of Scotus's autograph manuscript at ‚Ordinatio‘ II, d. 2 (par. 485). From that point to the end of book II, he could not correct his text against Scotus's autograph manuscript (or a copy of Scotus's autograph manuscript) anymore<sup>50</sup>. The situation is even more perplexing for the following parts of the ‚Ordinatio‘. For it seems that the scribe had the ‚liber Duns‘ again at his disposal when correcting ‚Ordinatio‘ III up to d. 7. But from ‚Ordinatio‘ III, d. 8 to the end of the third book (specifically, for ‚Ordinatio‘ III, dd. 8–17 and dd. 26–49, as dd. 18–25 seemed to have been lacking from the ‚liber Duns‘) he could not count on that exceptional source. Accordingly, he had to correct his text thanks to several other manuscripts<sup>51</sup>. We have to wait for the next volumes of the Vatican editions to

<sup>46</sup> Cf. *Disquisitio* (nt. 8), 33\* sq. Apart from the several mentions of a „liber Alani“, there is a remarkable reference to a quire copied from Scotus's own autograph manuscript („*in quaterno qui fuit scriptus post quaternum fratris Ioannis Duns*“).

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars* (nt. 28), 188.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. *Disquisitio* (nt. 8), 12\*–28\* as well as 259\*–270\* (for the work that the scribe of A actually carried out to produce his copy); for the annotations to the various versions of the ‚Ordinatio‘, cf. *ibid.*, 240\*–258\*; Wolter, *Reflections about the Life* (nt. 1), 26 sq. I wish to thank Loris Sturlese for discussing some of the material aspects of this tradition with me.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. *Adnotationes in I. Duns Scoti Opera omnia*, vol. 7, Vatican City 1973, 3\*; *Prolegomena*, in: *Opera omnia*, vol. 8 (nt. 43), 4\*, 5\*, 67\* sqq. Cf. also Wolter, *Reflections about Scotus's Early Works* (nt. 13), 42.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. *Prolegomena*, in: *Opera omnia X* (nt. 38), 3\*, 38\* sqq.

find out what happens in book IV. From Balić's description of ms. A, it seems that the scribe had again the ,liber Duns' at his disposal, at least for some portions of book IV<sup>52</sup>.

This attempt to reproduce Scotus's autograph manuscript was probably carried out in Italy. It is still unclear how Scotus's autograph manuscript (or a faithful copy of it) reached Italy and why this careful attempt to preserve Scotus's autograph manuscript with all Scotus's original additions and corrections was carried out. We should notice that in those very same years, William Alnwick was in Italy: he was certainly teaching in Bologna in 1321 and he participated in the General Chapter of Perugia in 1322<sup>53</sup>. He probably had with himself, if not Scotus's autograph manuscript, at least his copy of Scotus's ,*Ordinatio*' with his annotations about what was and what was not „*in libro Duns*“. So it may be tempting to think that the scribe of the A manuscript could correct his own text of the ,*Ordinatio*' against Alnwick's copy any time Alnwick's copy was made available to him. But we should also notice that there is no positive evidence in support of this possibility. Specifically, it has been suggested that Alnwick's copy of Scotus's ,*Ordinatio*' was different from the manuscript against which the A manuscript was corrected<sup>54</sup>. What is clear is that, at least for the first part of the A manuscript, this effort was remarkably successful. We can still distinguish the original draft from Scotus's additions and revisions.

Something very similar was carried out on Scotus's manuscript containing the ,*Questions on the Metaphysics*', even though in that case Scotus's autograph manuscript may have been copied several times in different moments and not just once. Scotus's own deletions, additions and corrections are indicated in several manuscripts with great precision. Again, we should imagine that the scribes were faced with Scotus's original manuscript as well as with the separated folios or scraps of parchment (*cedulae*) where Scotus had annotated his additions and corrections<sup>55</sup>. Again, the attention with which this work was carried out is remarkable. The scribes wanted to reproduce as faithfully as possible the state of Scotus's own original copy. Most of the manuscripts of the ,*Questions on the Metaphysics*' carrying indications of additions, corrections and deletions date

<sup>52</sup> Cf. *Disquisitio* (nt. 8), 24\*–28\*, and specifically the references to „*in libro Duns*“, „*in cedula*“, „*in libro Ioannis*“.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Ledoux, *Praefatio*, in: Guillelmi de Alnwick *Quaestiones disputatae* (nt. 37), XI–XII; C. Piana, *Gli inizi e lo sviluppo dello Scotismo a Bologna e nella regione Romagnolo-Flaminia*, in: *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 40 (1949), 49–80, especially 52 sq. For the suggestion that Alnwick played an important role in the diffusion of Scotus's teachings in Italy, cf. Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars* (nt. 28), 188, nt. 53.

<sup>54</sup> This suggestion is based mainly on the fact that Alnwick refers to portions of the ,*Ordinatio*' that are missing from the A manuscript. Specifically, this is true of ,*Ordinatio*' I, d. 39 and ,*Ordinatio*' II, dd. 15–25. Cf. *Prolegomena*, in: *Opera omnia*, vol. 8 (nt. 43), 76\*; Wolter, *Reflections about Scotus's Early Works* (nt. 13), 43.

<sup>55</sup> On the meaning of the word *cedula*, cf. *Disquisitio* (nt. 8), 243\* sq.

from the first half of the fourteenth century. It is in that period that we must posit the conscious attempt to preserve Scotus's legacy as faithfully as possible.

Such an extent of attention for the textual condition of Scotus's works is indeed remarkable, even though it is not at all unique in the history of manuscript tradition of scholastic writings. This attention for what Scotus actually wrote can also be noticed in several of his followers who wrote in the 1320s and 1330s. For example, Scotus's follower, Peter Thomae, had clearly access to Scotus's own writings. He did not hesitate to make reference to what Scotus wrote in his own hand („*de manu sua*“) and to Scotus's *cedulae*<sup>56</sup>. All these efforts seemed to have been part of a conscious attempt to make Scotus known in the Franciscan *studia*.

There is also another aspect that I would like to consider in order to appreciate the fate of Scotus's works in the Franciscan *studia*. In the years following Scotus's death, several tools were prepared to make the access to his writings easier. Specifically, we still have several tables and abbreviations of Scotus's works. A case in point is James of Ascoli's ‚*Tabula*‘ on Scotus's works. This ‚*Tabula*‘ is remarkably early, as James of Ascoli is usually thought to have been a student of Scotus in Paris<sup>57</sup>. I would also like to mention William of Missali's abbreviations of several of Scotus's works, including his ‚*Quodlibet*‘, his commentary on the ‚*Sentences*‘ and his ‚*Questions on the Metaphysics*‘<sup>58</sup>. These works were intended to help those who had to find their way in the confusing mass of Scotus's works. They should be compared to the tools of the same kind that the Dominicans had already prepared or were preparing in those same years on the works of Thomas Aquinas<sup>59</sup>.

These *tabulae* and abbreviations were prepared without any official prompting coming from the Franciscan order. But we should not be misled by the absence of official decisions. Behind these efforts of making Scotus approachable we can detect a spontaneous attempt to make Scotus into the intellectual leader of

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Sagüés Azcona, *Apuntes* (nt. 18), 14 sq. Cf. the quotation from Petrus Thomae's ‚*Quodlibet*‘ (pars 1, q. 3, ed. E. Buytaert, *St. Bonaventure* 1957, 52–53): „*Modus ponendi istud, videlicet rationes huiusmodi esse rationes obiectivae intellectus et voluntatis, est iste, innitendo dictis Scoti scriptis de manu sua.*“ Cf. also *ibid.*, 15 (from Petri Thomae *De modis distinctionis*, q. 8, Madrid, *Bibl. Nac.*, ms. 1016, fol. 71<sup>b</sup>): „*Tertium est quod dicit [Scotus] in quadam cedula ubi loquitur de ista materia.*“

<sup>57</sup> Cf. the ‚*Introduction*‘ to Scotus's *Opera philosophica*, vol. 3, xxvii. James of Ascoli's *tabula* is preserved in five manuscripts. On James of Ascoli, who was regent master in Paris in 1309 (or in 1310–11, according to Alliney), cf. Courtenay, *The Parisian Franciscan Community* (nt. 16), 172, nt. 44; G. Alliney, *La teoria scotiana della volontà*, in: *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 16 (2005), 339–404, especially 358. On his *tabula*, cf. the ‚*Introduction*‘ to Scotus's *Opera philosophica*, vol. 3, xxvii.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. the ‚*Introduction*‘ to Scotus's *Opera philosophica*, vol. 3, xxviii; G. Pini, *Sulla fortuna delle Quaestiones super Metaphysicam di Duns Scotus: le Quaestiones super Metaphysicam di Antonio Andrea*, in: *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 6 (1995), 281–361, especially 288 sq.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. M. Grabmann, *Hilfsmittel des Thomasstudiums aus alter Zeit (Abbreviationes, Concordantiae, Tabulae)*, in: *id.*, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, vol. 2, Munich 1936, 424–489.

the Franciscan order. For these *tabulae* and *abbreviationes* had a very specific purpose. Thanks to these tools, the initially unapproachable corpus of Scotus's writings could penetrate the *studia* system of the Franciscans. It is the need of such a system that we should keep in mind when considering these tools.

### III.

So we should now ask: who were those friars who devoted their time to spread and teach Scotus's writings in the Franciscan *studia*? It is at this point that we should focus our attention on Scotus's own students<sup>60</sup>.

So far, no attempt has been made to establish the list of those who can be counted as Scotus's direct students. In the light of the information in our possession, any attempt of this kind is probably premature. In recent years, however, much information has been acquired concerning the first followers of Scotus. Their names are well known. To limit ourselves to the Franciscans, we should mention John of Bassol, William of Alnwick, Peter Thomae, James of Ascoli, Alexander of Alessandria, Hugh of Novo Castro, Antonius Andreae, Peter of Navarre or de Atarrabía, Aufredo Gonteri Brito, Landulphus Caracciolo, Nicolas Bonet, William Rubio, Francis of Meyronnes and Peter of Aquila. Two less known Franciscans should be added to this list, i. e. Himbert of Garda (fl. ca. 1325) and Pastor of Serrescuderio (fl. 1333)<sup>61</sup>. Sometimes the name of Francis

<sup>60</sup> On the beginning of Scotism in general, cf. C. Bérubé, La première école scotiste, in: Z. Kaluza/P. Vignaux (eds.), *Preuves et raisons à l'université de Paris. Logique, ontologie et théologie au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris 1984, 9–24; L. Honnefelder, Scotus und der Scotismus. Ein Beitrag zur Bedeutung der Schulbildung in der mittelalterlichen Philosophie, in: M. J. F. M. Hoenen/J. H. J. Schneider/G. Wieland (eds.), *Philosophy and Learning. Universities in the Middle Ages*, Leiden–New York–Cologne 1995, 249–262.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. C. Schabel, Early Franciscan Attacks on Scotus's Doctrine of Divine Foreknowledge, in: M. Olszewski (ed.), *What is „Theology“ in the Middle Ages? Religious Cultures of Europe (11<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> Centuries) as Reflected in Their Self-Understanding*, Münster 2007, 301–328, especially 308, nt. 22. Schabel bases his list on these authors' position on the issue of divine foreknowledge and corrects and expands on the previous list by Schwamm in H. Schwamm, *Das göttliche Vorherwissen bei Duns Scotus und seinen ersten Anhängern*, Innsbruck 1934. Cf. also C. Schabel, *Theology at Paris, 1316–1345. Peter Auriol and the Problem of Divine Foreknowledge and Future Contingents*, Aldershot 2000, 135–179. For some interesting remarks on the textual dependence of some of these authors on one another, cf. id., *Haec Ille: Citation, Quotation, and Plagiarism in 14<sup>th</sup> Century Scholasticism*, in: I. Taifacos (ed.), *The Origins of European Scholarship. The Cyprus Millennium International Conference*, Stuttgart 2005, 163–175, especially 166–170. I have not included in this list John of Ripa, who became master at Paris in 1354, because he is too late to be regarded as one of Scotus's first followers. I take the opportunity for thanking Christopher Schabel for discussing with me the list of those who should be regarded as followers of Scotus and of those who should be regarded as possible direct students of him. I am happy to acknowledge that Dr. Schabel suggested several improvements on my tentative list. The responsibility for the errors that may still be present in my attempt to reconstruct the list of Scotus's first followers and students is of course entirely mine.



of Marchia is added, but in the light of recent research it seems that he should not be considered as one of Scotus's followers<sup>62</sup>. It is far from being clear whether all these Franciscans attended Scotus's classes, and if this is not the case, who actually did.

Let us start with a remark. At Oxford, Scotus does not seem to have had followers among the Franciscans until Alnwick's return to England in 1316<sup>63</sup>. This does not mean that his teachings went unnoticed. One of Scotus's first and most sympathetic followers is actually a secular, Henry of Harclay, who became master some time before 1312 (even though later in his career he moved away from several of Scotus's positions)<sup>64</sup>. Among the Oxford Dominicans, Thomas Sutton displayed some limited familiarity with Scotus's teachings already around 1300, and in his later ‚*Quaestiones ordinariae*‘ he took Scotus as the main target of his criticisms. Even though the ‚*Liber propugnatorius*‘ (which is nothing else than a detailed criticism of Scotus's commentary on the first book of the ‚*Sentences*‘) should not be ascribed to Sutton<sup>65</sup>, it seems that Sutton was indeed the author of a detailed criticism of the first half of Scotus's ‚*Quodlibet*‘<sup>66</sup>. Finally, among the Oxford Franciscans, there was awareness of Scotus's teachings but no real sympathy for them. We may mention Richard Conington (whose period as a student at Oxford must have „nearly coincided“ with that of Scotus and who was master at Oxford ca. 1305–06)<sup>67</sup> and Robert Cowton (who lectured on the ‚*Sentences*‘ at Oxford between 1303 and 1308)<sup>68</sup> as two Franciscans who knew and criticized Scotus before Alnwick's return to Oxford.

There is unfortunately no evidence about the identity of Scotus's students in Cologne. So we must turn to Scotus's stay in Paris to find the beginning of his success among the Franciscans. It was at Paris that the most talented Franciscans were supposed to spend four years in the lectorate program before being sent

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Schabel, *Theology at Paris* (nt. 61), 189–207.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars* (nt. 28), 186 sq.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, 187; M. G. Henninger, Henry of Harclay, in: J. J. E. Gracia/T. B. Noone (eds.), *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, London 2003, 305–313.

<sup>65</sup> The ‚*Liber propugnatorius*‘ was written between 1311 and 1323 by a ‚*Thomas Anglicus*‘. Its attribution to Thomas Sutton is now generally rejected. Schabel has recently suggested that it may be the work of Thomas Wylton, cf. Schabel, *Theology at Paris* (nt. 61), 52 sqq.; R. Friedman, *Domenican Quodlibetal Literature*, ca. 1260–1330, in: Schabel (ed.), *Theological Quodlibeta* (nt. 21), vol. 2, 401–491, especially 425.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Friedman, *Domenican Quodlibetal literature* (nt. 65), 425. This counter-*Quodlibet* has been edited: Thomas von Sutton, *Contra Quodlibet Iohannis Duns Scoti*, ed. J. Schneider, Munich 1978.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. S. Brown, Sources for Ockham's Prologue to the *Sentences*, in: *Franciscan Studies* 26 (1966), 36–65, especially 51; Dumont, *The Univocity II* (nt. 29), 4, nt. 9; Dumont, *William of Ware* (nt. 7), 68 sq. Dumont documents the debate between Scotus and Conington in their discussion of Henry of Ghent's doctrines on the Trinity.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. S. Brown, Robert Cowton, O.F.M. and the Analogy of the Concept of Being, in: *Franciscan Studies* 31 (1971), 5–40, especially 5 sq.; Dumont, *The Univocity II* (nt. 29).

back to some custodial or provincial *studium* as lectors<sup>69</sup>. They would probably start the lectorate program when they were about 21 to 23 years old<sup>70</sup>. At Paris, those friars would receive a university level education and attend the classes given by Franciscan bachelors and masters, even though they would not, properly speaking, be enrolled in the theology faculty and would not receive a university degree. After completing their lectorate, they would be sent back to their province or somewhere else in order to teach. Only a few of them would eventually go back to Paris as lectors in the *studium generale* and pursue their university career as bachelors and finally masters. This characteristic of the Franciscan (and more in general, mendicant) educational system accounts for the fact that there seems to be a gap of a few years between Scotus's activity as a teacher at Paris and the emergence of a generation of bachelors and masters directly influenced by his teachings (with the exception of James of Ascoli and Alexander of Alexandria, who seem to be older than the rest of Scotus's students). This gap may sometimes extend to last even twenty years. It is actually striking that so many of Scotus's direct students managed to be sent back to Paris and to lecture on the 'Sentences' there in the late 1310s, 1320s and 1330s<sup>71</sup>. This allowed them to have an exceptional influence on the formation of the next generation of lectors and to shape the intellectual identity of the Franciscans for the years to come.

An important document that we should take into account in order to reconstruct the list of Scotus's direct students between 1302 and 1307 is the list of the Franciscans at the Paris convent who were asked to sign a petition in favor of Philip the Fair's call for a council against the pope, Boniface VIII. This document is dated on June 24<sup>th</sup>/25<sup>th</sup>, 1303<sup>72</sup>. Scotus was among those who refused to support the King and accordingly had to leave Paris within a few days. The fact that he had an assistant (*socius*) testifies to his position as a theology bachelor<sup>73</sup>. In the same document, we also find the names of several friars who are usually taken to have been Scotus's students: Aufredus Gonteri (,fr. *Aufredus*“, indicated as *socius* of the master Alan)<sup>74</sup>, William Alnwick (,fr. *Guiller-*

<sup>69</sup> This is true at least around 1310. For the possibility that at some point the English Franciscans stopped sending their students to Paris, cf. Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars* (nt. 28), 148, 153. Notice, however, that Courtenay's remark concerns students sent to Paris to read the Sentences to become masters of theology. It is not clear whether the same remark could be extended to the lectorate program.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Roest, *A History* (nt. 20), 91.

<sup>71</sup> Schabel has given a tentative list of the Franciscans who lectured on the Sentences in the Paris convent after Peter Auriol (1316–18) in C. Schabel, Landulphus Caracciolo and a Sequax on Divine Foreknowledge, in: *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 66 (1999), 299–343, especially 302.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Longpré, *Le B. Jean Duns Scot* (nt. 16); Courtenay, *The Parisian Franciscan Community* (nt. 16).

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Courtenay, *The Parisian Franciscan Community* (nt. 16), 170, nt. 39.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, 166, nt. 26.

mus Anglicus“)<sup>75</sup>, James of Ascoli („fr. Jacobus“)<sup>76</sup>, and Alexander of Alessandria („fr. Alexandrinus“)<sup>77</sup>. In the same document, there is also a mention of „fr. Antonius“, who may be Antonius Andreae<sup>78</sup>, as well as of „fr. Petrus“, who might be Peter Thomae<sup>79</sup> (alternatively, we may think of Peter of Navarre or de Atarrabía). There is also a mention of „fr. Henricus Alamannus“, who could be the same friar who made a *reportatio* of Scotus's Parisian lectures<sup>80</sup>.

In the light of our current knowledge, I suggest the following tentative classification of Scotus's first followers into four groups: (1) those who certainly attended Scotus's classes at Paris; (2) those who are very likely to have attended Scotus's classes at Paris; (3) those who may have attended Scotus's classes at Paris, even though there is no conclusive evidence; (4) those who probably did not attend Scotus's classes at Paris.

The first group is constituted by the friars who certainly attended Scotus's lectures on the ‚Sentences‘ sometime between 1302 and 1304 (with an interruption of a few months in 1303–04). At least some of them may have also attended his classes as theology master between 1305 and 1307. In this group, I would put William of Alnwick, Antonius Andreae and Aufredo Gonteri. William of Alnwick, who played a key role in the first diffusion of his master's teachings, probably lectured on the ‚Sentences‘ at Paris ca. 1313–14. Afterwards, he was sent to Oxford, where he acted a regent master in 1315–16. He was back in Paris in 1316, and he may have taught there in 1316–17. He was then *lector* at Montpellier ca. 1318–20, then at Bologna in 1321. At some point he went to Naples, and was eventually made bishop of Giovinazzo in 1330. He died in 1333<sup>81</sup>. Antonius Andreae lectured on logic, metaphysics and natural philosophy in the custody of Lérida probably in the late 1310s and 1320s. He also lectured on the ‚Sentences‘, probably in his province and there is no evidence of his

<sup>75</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, nt. 28.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, 172, nt. 44.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, nt. 43.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, 171.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. *ibid.* Longpré suggested that Peter Thomae could be identified with Scotus's „*socius, fr. Thomas*“; but this is unlikely because, as Vázquez Janeiro remarked, all the friars in the 1303 list are mentioned by first name, but *Thomas* or *Thomae* is not Peter's first name, cf. Longpré, Le B. Jean Duns Scot (nt. 16), 150; Vázquez Janeiro, *Rutas e hitos* (nt. 18), 427. But there is a *Petrus* in the list.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Courtenay, *The Parisian Franciscan Community* (nt. 16), 171, nt. 40.

<sup>81</sup> On William of Alnwick, cf. Dumont, *The Univocity* (nt. 29), 2 sq., nt. 3; G. Alliney, *Time and Soul in Fourteenth-Century Theology*, Florence 2002, xi–xiii; W. O. Duba, *Continental Franciscan Quodlibeta*, in: Schabel, *Theological Quodlibeta*, vol. 2 (nt. 21), 569–649, especially 598. That William of Alnwick attended Scotus's classes in Paris is what results from his explicit statement in *Guillelmi de Alnwick Quaestiones disputatae* (nt. 37), xxvi: „*Ad primum istorum potest dici sicut respondet Scotus in Collatione illius quaestionis, An virtutes morales sint necessario connexae; ipse enim ore suo, me praesente et postea notante, sic respondebat [...]*.“ Alnwick is referring to Scotus's first *collatio parisiensis*: Dumont, *William of Ware* (nt. 7), 70, n. 27; Alliney, *The Treatise* (nt. 14), 210 sq., nt. 2.

going back to Paris<sup>82</sup>. Aufredo Gonteri, who lectured on the ‚Sentences‘ in Barcelona in 1322, lectured again on the ‚Sentences‘ in Paris in 1325<sup>83</sup>.

In the second group, i. e. those friars who are very likely to have attended Scotus's classes, I suggest we should put James of Ascoli, Alexander of Alessandria, John of Bassol, Hugo de Novo Castro and Peter of Navarre or Atarrabia. James of Ascoli and Alexander of Alessandria must have been quite advanced in their studies when they attended Scotus's lectures. Alexander of Alessandria was already bachelor in theology in November 1303 and he acted as regent master in Paris just after Scotus in 1307–08. He was eventually elected general minister of the Franciscans in June 1313 and died soon afterwards, in October 1314. James of Ascoli was probably regent master at Paris in 1309–11. These two Franciscans were probably only slightly younger than Scotus himself (Alexander of Alessandria was probably born around 1268, James of Ascoli was probably born around 1270). When Scotus was lecturing in the Paris convent, they must have been in their early- or mid-thirties. Consequently, they did not attend Scotus's classes as lectorate students. As a matter of fact, Alexander of Alessandria was already a theology bachelor, and the same may be true for James of Ascoli as well. Their relationship with Scotus should be assimilated to that between a young professor and two advanced graduate students almost ready to become professors in their turn. They should be distinguished from the rest of Scotus's students, who took Scotus's classes as part of their lectorate program and who were actually formed by Scotus<sup>84</sup>. John of Bassol, who prob-

<sup>82</sup> On Antonius Andreae, cf. Vázquez Janeiro, *Rutas e hitos* (nt. 18); Sagüés Azcona, *Apuntes* (nt. 18), 3–6; C. Bérubé, Antoine André, témoin et interprète de Scot, in: *Antonianum* 54 (1979), 386–446; M. Gensler, Antonius Andreae – The Faithful Pupil? Antonius Andreae's Doctrine of Individuation, in: *Mediaevalia philosophica Polonorum* 31 (1992), 23–38; id., Catalogue of Works by or Ascribed to Antonius Andreae, in: *Mediaevalia philosophica Polonorum* 31 (1992), 147–155; id., The Making of a ‚Doctor dulcifluus‘: Antonius Andreae and his Position in the Formation of Scotism, in: *Annuari de la Societat Catalana de Filosofia* 8 (1996), 57–67. Specifically on his *expositio* and *quaestiones* on Aristotle's ‚Metaphysics‘, cf. G. Pini, Una lettura scotista della ‚Metafisica“ di Aristotele: l'Expositio in libros Metaphysicorum di Antonio Andrea, in: *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 2 (1991), 529–586; id., *Sulla fortuna* (nt. 58). Cf. also above, nt. 18 and below, nt. 101, for Antonius Andreae's explicit claim that he attended Scotus's lectures.

<sup>83</sup> On Aufredo Gonteri, see L. Amorós, Anfredo Gontero, O.F.M. Discípulo de Escoto y lector en el estudio general de Barcelona, in: *Revista española de teología* 1 (1941), 545–572; Dumont, *The Univocity II* (nt. 29), 194, nt. 34; Schabel, *Theology at Paris* (nt. 61), 207–210; M. Rossini/C. Schabel, Time and Eternity among the Early Scotists. Texts on Future Contingents by Alexander of Alessandria, Radulphus Brito, and Hugh of Novocastro, in: *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 16 (2005), 237 sq., especially 282; Duba, *Continental Franciscan Quodlibeta* (nt. 81), 621. Cf. also below, nt. 100, for Aufredo Gonteri's explicit claim that he attended Scotus's lectures.

<sup>84</sup> On Alexander of Alessandria, cf. R. Manselli, Bonino, Alessandro (Alessandro d'Alessandria), in: *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 12, Rome 1970, 226–229; Duba, *Continental Franciscan Quodlibeta* (nt. 81), 579–580. On James of Ascoli, cf. P. Vian, Giacomo da Ascoli, in: *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 54, Rome 2000, 199–201; Alliney, *La teoria* (nt. 57), 358–360; Duba, *Continental Franciscan Quodlibeta* (nt. 81), 591.

ably lectured on the ‚Sentences‘ in the *studium* of Reims in 1313, does not seem to have ever gone back to Paris, or at least there is no evidence that he became a theology master<sup>85</sup>. Hugo de Novo Castro probably lectured on the ‚Sentences‘ at Paris in the early 1310s<sup>86</sup>. Peter of Navarre probably taught at the Barcelona *studium generale* both before and after he served as provincial minister in 1317–20 (he would serve as provincial minister of Aragon again in 1323–25). In 1325 he was mentioned as a „professor of theology“ and in 1328 he was again referred to as a „master of theology“<sup>87</sup>.

In the third group, i. e. those who may have attended Scotus’s classes even though there is no conclusive evidence, I would put Peter Thomae, Landulphus Caracciolo, Nicolas Bonet and Peter of Aquila. Peter Thomae, who was *lector* in Barcelona in 1316–17, became master of theology at Paris by 1325<sup>88</sup>. Landulphus Caracciolo lectured at Paris immediately after Auriol, in 1318–19 and started what Schabel called „a one-man crusade“ against Auriol<sup>89</sup>. Nicolas Bonet and Peter of Aquila may have been the youngest in this group. Nicolas Bonet probably lectured on the ‚Sentences‘ at Paris in the late 1320s and became a master of theology in 1333<sup>90</sup>. Peter of Aquila was probably *lector* in Todi and l’Aquila in the 1320s and 1330s. He probably lectured on the ‚Sentences‘ at Paris in 1337–38, after serving as provincial minister of Tuscany and before becoming inquisitor in Florence<sup>91</sup>.

<sup>85</sup> On John of Bassol, cf. M. Pasiecznik, John de Bassolis OFM, in: *Franciscan Studies* 13 (1953), 59–71; 14 (1954), 49–80; Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars* (nt. 28), 186; Alliney, *La teoria* (nt. 57), 372–380. John of Bassol may have gone back to Paris to become a master of medicine, for there is a mention of a John of Bassol master of medicine at Paris in a document of 1326. But it is far from being certain whether this was the same John of Bassol we are concerned with here.

<sup>86</sup> On Hugh of Novo Castro, cf. V. Heynck, Der Skotist Hugo de Novo Castro, OFM, in: *Franziskanische Studien* 43 (1961), 244–270; Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars* (nt. 28), 186; Rossini/Schabel, *Time and Eternity* (nt. 84), 279; Alliney, *La teoria* (nt. 57), 351–356.

<sup>87</sup> On Peter of Navarre (or Atarrabía), cf. Sagüés Azcona, *Apuntes* (nt. 18), 7–13; Petri de Atarrabía sive de Navarra In Primum Sententiarum Scriptum, ed. P. Sagüés Azcona, 2 vols., Madrid 1974, vol. 1, 15\* sq.; Vázquez Janeiro, *Rutas e hitos* (nt. 18), 431 sq.; Schabel, *Theology at Paris* (nt. 61), 172–175; Duba, *Continental Franciscan Quodlibeta* (nt. 81), 625. He seems to have had first-hand knowledge of Scotus’s teaching, even though Vázquez Janeiro thinks that this evidence is not conclusive.

<sup>88</sup> On Peter Thomae, cf. Petri Thomae Quodlibet, edd. M. R. Hooper/E. M. Buytaert, *St. Bonaventure* 1957; Sagüés Azcona, *Apuntes* (nt. 18), 13–19; Dumont, *The Univocity* II (nt. 29), 187, nt. 3; Schabel, *Theology at Paris* (nt. 61), 173 sq.; Duba, *Continental Franciscan Quodlibeta* (nt. 81), 626. It is sometimes thought that the evidence for his studying under Scotus is not conclusive.

<sup>89</sup> On Landulphus Caracciolo, cf. Schabel, *Theology at Paris* (nt. 61), 138–147; Schabel, *Landulphus Caracciolo* (nt. 71); id., *Landulphus Caracciolo*, in: Gracia/Noone (eds.), *A Companion to Philosophy* (nt. 64), 409 sq.

<sup>90</sup> On Nicolas Bonet, cf. Schabel, *Theology at Paris* (nt. 61), 162–170; I. Mandrella, *Metaphysik als Supertranszendental-Wissenschaft? Zum scotistischen Metaphysikentwurf des Nicolaus Bonetus*, in: *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 75 (2008), 161–193.

<sup>91</sup> On Peter of Aquila, cf. A. Chiappini, *Fra Pietro dell’Aquila „Scotello“ O. Min., celebre scolastico del Trecento* (m. 1361), in: *Miscellanea Francescana* 61 (1961), 283–310; Schabel, *Theology at*

The fourth group is constituted by Franciscans who, although usually associated with Scotus, almost certainly did not attend his classes in Paris. For one thing, these Franciscans were too young. As I have mentioned, a friar would be sent to Paris to start his lectorate studies when he was 21–23 years old. This should rule out the possibility of having been Scotus's students for both Francis of Meyronnes (who was probably born ca. 1288, lectured on the ‚Sentences‘ at Paris in 1320 and was promoted master in 1323<sup>92</sup>) and Francis of Marchia, who was born ca. 1290, studied at Paris around 1310, lectured on the ‚Sentences‘ there in 1319–20 and was promoted master of theology by 1325<sup>93</sup>. These two Franciscans probably did not attend Scotus's classes, but the classes of some of Scotus's students. As to William of Rubio, he certainly was not Scotus's student, as he studied at Paris acting as a *reportator* for Francis of Marchia<sup>94</sup>. The same is true for Himbert of Garda and Pastor of Serrescuderio, who were followers and possibly students of Meyronnes<sup>95</sup>.

It is to the group of Scotus's students in Paris that we owe the first diffusion of their teacher's doctrines and writings in the Franciscan *studia*. When those young Franciscans started teaching as lectors, they did not forget what they had learnt. Some of these Franciscans eventually went back to Paris to lecture on the ‚Sentences‘ and to obtain the title of theology master. The *studium* in the Paris convent probably played the major role in shaping the next generations of Franciscan intellectuals, as the students following the lectorate program at Paris would eventually go back to their province to teach other friars. In the 1310s, 1320s and 1330s, Scotus's students played a major role in this process of forming the lectors for the provincial *studia* in their qualities of bachelors and masters

---

Paris (nt. 61), 262 sqq. Again, the evidence in support of Peter of Aquila's being a direct student of Scotus is late and not conclusive. For the dating of his lecturing on the ‚Sentences‘, cf. Z. Kaluza, *Serbi un sasso il nome: une inscription de San Gimignano et la rencontre entre Bernard d'Arezzo et Nicolas d'Autrecourt*, in: B. Mojsisch/O. Pluta (eds.), *Historia Philosophiae Medii Aevi*, vol. 1, Amsterdam 1991, 437–466, especially 446, nt. 18.

<sup>92</sup> On Francis of Meyronnes, cf. Schabel, *Theology at Paris* (nt. 61), 149–155; R. Lambertini, *Francis of Meyronnes*, in: Gracia/Noone (eds.), *A Companion to Philosophy* (nt. 64), 256 sq.; Duba, *Continental Franciscan Quodlibeta* (nt. 81), 609. Francis of Meyronnes is usually presented as a direct student of Scotus, cf. B. Roth, *Franz von Mayronis O.F.M.: sein Leben, seine Werke, seine Lehre vom Formalunterschied in Gott*, Werl 1936, 25 sq., and more recently H. Möhle, *Formalitas und modus intrinsecus. Die Entwicklung der Scotischen Metaphysik bei Franciscus de Mayronis*, Münster 2007, 25 sq. The evidence brought in support of this claim, however, is not conclusive, as it is quite late and in general it may be interpreted as supporting the perfectly uncontroversial claim that Francis of Meyronnes was a follower of Scotus, not that he actually attended his classes.

<sup>93</sup> On Francis of Marchia's career, cf. Schabel, *Theology at Paris* (nt. 61), 189–207; R. Friedman/C. Schabel, *Francis of Marchia's Commentary on the Sentences: Question List and State of Research*, in: *Mediaeval Studies* 63 (2001), 31–106; R. Friedman, *Francis of Marchia*, in: Gracia/Noone (eds.), *A Companion to Philosophy* (nt. 64), 254 sq.; Duba, *Continental Franciscan Quodlibeta* (nt. 81), 600 sq.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Schabel, *Theology at Paris* (nt. 61), 210–214; Duba, *Continental Franciscan Quodlibeta* (nt. 81), 628.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Schabel, *Theology at Paris* (nt. 61), 155–158.

in Paris<sup>96</sup>. And the role of Scotus's students in the Paris *studium* should not make us neglect that after being in Paris as students and before (and sometimes even after) being there as bachelors and masters, these very same Franciscans sometimes spent a considerable time as lectors in provincial *studia*. It is thanks to these people that Scotus's doctrines left the university of Paris and penetrated the system of Franciscan education. In the Paris and Oxford theological faculties, philosophical and theological fashions were quick to be superseded. If we turn our attentions to the provincial *studia*, however, it seems that we can trace some continuity in the Scotistic tradition. This seems to be largely due to the groundbreaking role that Scotus's direct students at Paris played in the diffusion of the teachings of their master. Sometimes, the works of these students reflect the teaching activity in a typical provincial *studium*. Both Peter of Aquila's and Antonius Andreae's commentaries on the ‚Sentences‘ are basically abbreviations of Scotus's own ‚Ordinatio‘<sup>97</sup>. They are the sort of products that fit well with the needs of the lectorate program in a provincial *studium* (in the case of Peter of Aquila, it may have been Todi or l'Aquila; in the case of Antonius Andreae, it may have been Lérida in the Aragon province).

A prominent role among Scotus's direct students was played by William of Alnwick. As I have mentioned, he was sent to Oxford as a master and it is probably thanks to him that Scotus's teachings started being accepted and discussed among the English Franciscans. He may have also played an important role in the diffusion of Scotus's works and teachings in Italy<sup>98</sup>.

A special mention should be made of the Franciscan *studium* in Barcelona, where several of Scotus's students happened to be sent<sup>99</sup>. Among them we find Aufredus Gonteri, Peter of Navarre and Peter Thomae. What is remarkable is the explicit commitment of these people to follow their teacher's doctrine as far as possible in their activity as lectors. So for example, Aufredus Gonteri in 1322 read on the ‚Sentences‘ in the *studium* of Barcelona „*ad introductionem iuniorum*“. In that work, he claimed that he tried to follow Scotus's teachings as much as possible. He justified his decision by saying that he found Scotus's doctrines „catholic and reasonable and less open to criticism“, which we should

<sup>96</sup> Cf. the list of lectors in the Paris Franciscan convent reconstructed by Schabel, Landulphus Caracciolo (nt. 71), 302.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. F. Petri de Aquila *Comentaria in quatuor libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi*, ed. C. Paolini, 4 vols., Levanto 1907–1909. According to Chiappini, Peter of Aquila's commentary is preserved in a manuscript dated 1334, so it precedes Peter's teaching at Paris, which is dated at 1337–38. On Antonius Andreae's commentary on the ‚Sentences‘, cf. Sagüés Azcona, *Apuntes* (nt. 18), 5 sq.; Gensler, *Catalogue* (nt. 82).

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Ledoux, *Praefatio* in Guillelmi de Alnwick *Quaestiones disputatae* (nt. 37), XI–XII; Piana, *Gli inizi* (nt. 53), 52 sq.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. C. Schabel, *The Franciscan Studium in Barcelona in the Fourteenth Century*, paper read at the XV<sup>th</sup> Colloquium of the Société Internationale pour l'Étude de la Philosophie Médiévale: Philosophy and Theology in the Studia of the Religious Orders and at the Papal Court, Medieval Institute, University of Notre Dame, 8–11 October 2008.

interpret as less open to criticism than those of other Franciscans, specifically Peter Auriol, with whom Aufredus was comparing Scotus there. Aufredus specified that this is true „for those who understand [Scotus's doctrines] correctly“<sup>100</sup>. Similar statements can be found in the works of other lectors active in the same years. I have already mentioned Peter Thomae's careful attention to find out and report Scotus's precise opinions. Here I would like to add the name of Antonius Andreae. It is clear that Antonius Andreae had at his disposal several works of Scotus and that he intended to adapt them to the needs of the Franciscan students in the provincial schools. He repeatedly stated that in his works he merely intended to present Scotus's teachings. Again, such a conscious attempt to create a Scotistic school is remarkable<sup>101</sup>.

Sometimes, these Franciscans seem to take over the task of defending Scotus against other positions, specifically some possible Franciscan competitors. Peter Auriol is a frequent target. For example, Peter Thomae described Auriol as a friend (*amicus*) to be criticized in a sweet way (*dulciter*), as opposed to enemies (such as Thomas Aquinas) to be criticized harshly<sup>102</sup>. A more hostile attitude towards Auriol can be found in Landulphus Caracciolo, Aufredus Gonteri and Antonius Andreae<sup>103</sup>. These authors took Peter Auriol into consideration as an opponent of Scotus and rejected his positions in favor of those of their master.

<sup>100</sup> Amorós, Anfredo Gontero (nt. 83). Cf. the quotation from his commentary on the second book of the ‚Sentences‘, *ibid.*, 550 (from Bratislava, Univerzita knižnica, ms. I, fol. 309d): „*Ego Aufredus Gonteri de Britania, Corisopitensis dyocesis, de ordine Fratrum Minorum, de provincia Turonie, lector baccalarei anno Domini 1322, ex iussu superiorum meorum, ad instantiam scolarium, lecturam meam super secundum sententiarum, per modum cuiusdam reportationis et correctionis, ad introductionem iuniorum, volui communicare doctorum venerabilium, principaliter Iohannis Scoti, sacre theologie doctoris, vestigiis inherendo.*“ Cf. also *ibid.*, 551 (from Vatican City, Vat. Lat. 1113, fol. 7<sup>v</sup>): „*Modo 3<sup>o</sup> adduco contra hanc conclusionem argumenta cuiusdam doctoris (in mg: P. Aureoli primo i. Supra) qui ubique nititur reprobare venerabilem doctorem fratrem Iohannem Scotum, quem pro posse quasi ubique sequor, quia ipsum diu audivi, et dicta eius catholica et rationalia et minus calumpniabilia recte intelligentibus invenio.*“

<sup>101</sup> Cf. Antonius Andreae's statements at the end of his ‚Expositio super Metaphysicam‘, printed among Scotus's works in Wadding's and Vivès's editions of Scotus's Opera omnia (Vivès, vol. 6, 600): „*Volo autem scire omnes litteram istam legentes, quod tam sententiando quam notando sequutus sum doctrinam illius subtilissimi et excellentissimi Doctoris, cuius fama et memoria in benedictione est, utpote qui sua sacra et profunda doctrina totum orbem adimplevit et facit resonare, scilicet Magistri Iohannis Duns, qui fuit natione Scotus, religione Minor.*“ Cf. also Antonius Andreae's statement at the end of his ‚De tribus principiis‘, in: Sagüés Azcona, Apuntes (nt. 18), 4 (quoted from Pamplona, Bibl. de la Catedral, ms. 6, fol. 59<sup>rb</sup>): „*Attende, lector qui legis, quod si quid bene dictum est in quaestionibus supra dictis, ab arte doctrinae scoticae processit, cuius vestigia, quantum potui et quantum ipsum capio sum sequutus. Si autem aliquid male dictum vel doctrinae praedictae contrarium reperis vel repugnans, meae imperitiae ascribe; quod si vero ibi tale aliquid continetur, nunc pro tunc revoco, tamquam dictum fuerit ignoranter, puta quod ignoraverim mentem Scoti.*“

<sup>102</sup> Cf. Sagüés Azcona, Apuntes (nt. 18), 18 (from Petri Thomae Sent., prolog., q. 4, in: Vatican City, ms. Vat. Lat. 1106, fol. 344): „*Circa secundam partem quaestionis, quae est de rerum inquisitione, sic est procedendum: nam in principio quaestionis disputabitur acriter contra adversarios, secundo dulciter ad amicos.*“

<sup>103</sup> On Caracciolo's attitude towards Peter Auriol, cf. Schabel, Landulphus Caracciolo (nt. 71); on Gonteri's reference to Peter Auriol, cf. Amorós, Anfredo Gontero (nt. 83), 551; on Antonius Andreae's references to Peter Auriol, cf. Pini, Sulla fortuna (nt. 58), 281, nt. 1.



Scotus's role as the intellectual guide of the Franciscan order, even though not established by an official decision of the order, was clearly defended by his own students against the most formidable possible competitor.

#### IV.

In order to illustrate the way Scotus's works and teachings were transformed to satisfy the needs of the Franciscan *studia*, let me finally focus on the works of Antonius Andreae, who lectured in the custody of Lérida in the 1310s and 1320s and died some time before 1333<sup>104</sup>. His writings should be regarded as genuine editions of Scotus's writings. But these editions were carried out according to very special criteria. Here we find an attitude opposite to the respect for Scotus's own words and intentions that we have found in the scribe of manuscript A or in William of Alwrick and Peter Thomae. Antonius Andreae has no respect for what is found in Scotus's own *cedulae*. By contrast, he subjected his master's works to a complete re-elaboration. He wrote a complete Scotistic course in philosophy. He left commentaries on the *Logica vetus* and on the 'Metaphysics', to which we should add his 'Quaestiones de tribus principiis', which provided the basic elements of natural philosophy. He even wrote a commentary on the 'Sentences', which is just an *abbreviatio* of Scotus's own commentary.

Antonius Andreae's works are part of a unitary program. They are intended to provide his students with a philosophical and theological course with a specific identity: a Scotistic identity. These writings were conceived as genuine textbooks for the Franciscan *studia*. All the difficulties and contradictions present in Scotus's works are eliminated. All hints of an evolution or a change of mind on Scotus's part disappear. As textbooks, Antonius Andreae's works were extremely successful. They were so successful that they eventually replaced Scotus's original works as the source for the Scotistic movement<sup>105</sup>.

Of course, there was some price to be paid in order to make Scotus palatable to a larger audience. Much of Scotus's subtlety was lost. Scotus's original context was lost as well, both theologically and philosophically. Scotus's own doctrines were considered not as he developed them, i. e. in reaction to some specific positions of Henry of Ghent and other authors. Scotus's doctrines became the identifying marks of a school. As such, they had sometimes very little in common with what they originally were. I would like to mention only two examples of this phenomenon, i. e. what happened to Scotus's treatment of the subject

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Vázquez Janeiro, *Rutas e hitos* (nt. 18), 432–436.

<sup>105</sup> On Antonius Andreae's success in the fifteenth century, cf. Vázquez Janeiro, *Rutas e hitos* (nt. 18), 435; D. Riehl Leader, *Philosophy at Oxford and Cambridge in the Fifteenth Century*, in: *History of Universities* 4 (1984), 25–46.

matter of metaphysics and of the univocity of being as found in his questions on the ‚Metaphysics‘<sup>106</sup>.

Scotus is famous for holding that the subject matter of metaphysics is being, which in turn is considered as a univocal concept. This means that the word ‚being‘ has just one sense when said of substances and accidents as well as when said of God and creatures. Admittedly, substances and accidents and God and creatures are different kinds of beings, which are related to one another by a relation of dependence. But this relation is not part of the content of the meaning of the word ‚being‘. When we say that Felix the cat is something or a being and that its ability to purr is also something or a being, we are admittedly speaking of two different kinds of things – a substance (Felix the cat) and an accident (its ability to purr). But we think of these two different kinds of things as beings in the same sense of the word ‚being‘.

This doctrine has sometimes been considered as the basis for a revolution in metaphysics. Thanks to his univocal concept of being, Scotus could finally get rid of the tension present in Aristotle and his followers between metaphysics as theology – i. e. as dealing with God and separate substances – and metaphysics as ontology – i. e. as dealing with being qua being. Scotus's solution is definitely in favor of ontology or *metaphysica generalis*, as it will be called. Philosophical theology, i. e. the treatment of God and of separate substances, will become just a part of metaphysics in this general sense – what will be called *metaphysica specialis*<sup>107</sup>.

Scotus gave all the elements of this doctrine in his theological writings. There are some important remarks about this issue both in his ‚Lectura‘ and ‚Ordinatio‘ as well as in his ‚Reportatio‘. But if we turn to his ‚Questions on the Metaphysics‘, our expectations are disappointed. Scotus did devote the first question of book I to the issue of the subject matter of metaphysics. But it is far from being clear that he favored the solution with which he is usually associated. In that question, Scotus presented Averroes's position in favor of metaphysics as theology as well as Avicenna's position in favor of metaphysics as ontology. But Scotus criticized both positions. As a matter of fact, Scotus ended up defending a third position, according to which the subject matter of metaphysics is neither God nor being, but substance<sup>108</sup>.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Scotus, *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam*, I, q. 1, in: Ioannis Duns Scoti *Quaestiones super libros Metaphysicorum*, libri I–V, edd. R. Andrews [e. a.] (*Opera philosophica* 3), St. Bonaventure (NY) 1997, 15–72.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. A. Zimmermann, *Ontologie oder Metaphysik? Die Diskussion über den Gegenstand der Metaphysik im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert*, Leuven <sup>2</sup>1998, 294–329; L. Honnefelder, *Ens in quantum ens. Der Begriff des Seienden als solchen als Gegenstand der Metaphysik nach der Lehre des Johannes Duns Scotus*, Münster 1979.

<sup>108</sup> Scotus, *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam* (nt. 106), parr. 13–29 (Averroes's position), parr. 30–67 (against Averroes's position), parr. 68–84 (Avicenna's position), parr. 85–90 (against Avicenna's position), parr. 91–96 (Scotus's solution that substance is the subject matter of metaphysics). In a long addition at parr. 97–163, Scotus introduces and defends another solution, in favor of Averroes's position that God is the subject matter of metaphysics. On this question,

How did Scotus's followers and students deal with this confusing situation? William Missali, in his abbreviation of the *Questions on the Metaphysics*, faithfully reported Scotus's treatment. And he faithfully concluded that Scotus's own position is that substance is the subject matter of metaphysics<sup>109</sup>.

By contrast, Antonius Andreae took a very different approach. In his re-elaboration of Scotus's question, any criticism of Avicenna's position disappears. Scotus's question is re-worked as an attack on Averroes. Large sections of Antonius Andreae's question are taken from Scotus's *Ordinatio* to make the point that being is the subject matter of metaphysics and that being is a univocal concept (in a sense of *univocal* peculiar to Antonius Andreae and quite different from what we find in Scotus himself, as we shall see). Substance is not even mentioned as a possible candidate for the role of subject matter of metaphysics<sup>110</sup>. In other words, Antonius Andreae presents us with the Scotus we would expect. This „edited Scotus“ can now be safely taught in the schools.

Another interesting and revealing example of the way Antonius Andreae dealt with his master's teachings and writings concerns the famous doctrine of the univocity of being. We can reconstruct two redactions of the question on the *Metaphysics* where Scotus discusses whether being is a univocal concept. In the first redaction, Scotus argued that being is equivocal according to a logical consideration, for the term *being* has many meanings; he also held, however, that the term *being* is analogical according to the natural or real philosopher, for in reality there are several kinds of beings linked by a relation of dependence on one another (e. g., accidents depend on substances). Later on, Scotus rejected this position and came to regard being as a univocal concept. Scotus's famous arguments for the univocity of the concept of being are found in the various versions of his commentary on the *Sentences*. Possibly after commenting on the *Sentences* for the first time, Scotus went back to his treatment of univocity in the *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam* with the intention to prepare a second version of the question where he would have rejected his previous position and he would have argued that being is actually univocal according to a logical consideration and analogical according to a metaphysical consideration. Scotus, however, was never able to finish the second redaction of his *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam*, as we know. So what we have right now – and what his first followers were confronted with at the moment of his death – is a confusing mixture of the first draft and the additions that were supposed to form the basis for a second, definitive redaction<sup>111</sup>. Even though Scotus changed his mind

---

cf. D. Demange, *Pourquoi Duns Scot a critiqué Avicenne*, in: Giovanni Duns Scotus. Studi e ricerche nel VII centenario della sua morte, vol. 1, Rome 2008, 195–232.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. Guillemi de Missali *Tabula super Quaestiones Metaphysice Scoti*, in: Vatican City, ms. Vat. Lat. 889, fol. 43<sup>va</sup>.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. Antonii Andreae *Quaestiones super duodecim libros Metaphysice*, Venetiis 1495, foll. 2<sup>ra</sup>–5<sup>va</sup>. Cf. Zimmermann, *Ontologie* (nt. 107), 329–339.

<sup>111</sup> Cf. Duns Scotus, *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam*, IV (nt. 106), q. 1, 295–320. On the reconstruction of the two drafts of this question, cf. Pini, *Univocity* (nt. 12).

about the univocity of the concept of being and this important change is reflected in the two drafts of the relevant question on the ‚Metaphysics‘, there is, however, a constant feature all along his different treatment of this issue. Both when he rejected and when he afterwards came to accept the view that being is univocal, Scotus remained faithful to what has been identified as an Oxford tradition about analogy. According to this tradition, whose exponents were active in Oxford towards the end of the thirteenth century (e.g. William of Chelvestun and William of Bonkes), the fact that different kinds of being (i. e., the categories) are really linked among themselves by a relation of dependence has no bearing on the way the term ‚being‘ signifies. Accordingly, the Oxford tradition rejected the semantic interpretation of the doctrine of the analogy of being, according to which the different meanings of the term ‚being‘ are related to one another just as the real kinds of being are related to one another in the world. By contrast, the view that the real relation holding among different kinds of being is embedded in the meaning of the term ‚being‘ was common at Paris towards the end of the thirteenth century. It is to this Parisian tradition that Thomas Aquinas gave his famous contribution. Scotus, however, came from a different tradition. So when Scotus spoke of analogy he did not refer to a semantic relation between the meanings of a term, for this semantic relation, according to Scotus, did not hold. By contrast, Scotus took ‚analogy‘ to mean a real relation holding among kinds of things – and this relation has no parallel at the semantic level<sup>112</sup>.

Soon, however, any awareness of the distinction between an English and a Parisian tradition concerning analogy seemed to have disappeared among Scotus's students at Paris. They were familiar with the Parisian tradition but knew probably nothing of the English tradition where Scotus had developed his ideas and to which he still belonged. Accordingly, Scotus's first students had difficulties to understand their master's claims that being is analogical from a real or metaphysical point of view but univocal (or, according to the young Scotus, equivocal) from a logical point of view.

Antonius Andreae's revision of Scotus's question is indicative of his attitude towards his master's writings and teachings. Faced with the juxtaposition of Scotus's first draft and his successive additions, he opted for a radical re-writing of the original question. Any trace of Scotus's original solution to the question favoring the equivocity of being disappeared. Instead, Antonius Andreae copies wholesale entire passages from Scotus's ‚Ordinatio‘ to present and defend the doctrine of the univocity of being. The result is a revised and strongly edited question, which has very little to do with Scotus's original treatment of this

---

<sup>112</sup> Cf. Duns Scotus, *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam* (nt. 106), IV, q. 1, n. 70, 315 sq. On the Oxford and Parisian tradition on univocity, cf. S. Donati, *La discussione sull'unità del concetto di ente nella tradizione di commento della „Fisica“: commenti parigini degli anni 1270–1325 ca.*, in: M. Pickavé (ed.), *Die Logik des Transzendentalen. Festschrift für Jan A. Aertsen zum 65. Geburtstag*, Berlin–New York 2003, 60–139; Pini, *Univocity* (nt. 12).

issue<sup>113</sup>. With regard to Scotus's reference to a real and a logical consideration, Antonius Andreae is not aware of the philosophical context of Scotus's distinction. He consequently tries to make sense of his master's statements by distinguishing three kinds of univocity: physical, logical and metaphysical. First, Antonius Andreae defines physical univocity as the unity pertaining to a certain essence independently of any operation of the intellect. Only specific essences such as ,humanity' or ,horseness' are univocal in this sense, because they possess a certain unity independently of our thinking about them. By contrast, genera such as ,animality' are equivocal according to this first kind of univocity, as their unity depends to some extent on our thinking about them. Second, Antonius Andreae defines logical univocity as the unity of a reality or a first intention as conceived under one and the same logical concept. For example, the essence ,human being' is logically univocal when considered as a species, and the species ,human being' and ,horse' are logically univocal when considered as belonging to the same genus. Accordingly, two items that are logically univocal do not have to (even if they may) share any common essence, since this kind of univocity is bestowed by the intellect on the things it thinks about. Third and finally, Antonius Andreae defines metaphysical univocity as the unity pertaining to a concept abstracted by the intellect from several things, but only insofar as that concept is conceived without any logical concept attached to it. So for example the concept of being and the other so-called transcendental concepts (e. g., one and true) are univocal in this way, because they have a certain unity as concepts abstracted by the intellect, even though this unity is not the unity pertaining to one and the same essence. Accordingly, Antonius Andreae can order the three kinds of univocity into degrees, from the strongest and most real (i. e., physical univocity) to the weakest and less real (i. e., logical univocity)<sup>114</sup>. Antonius Andreae's point is that being, even though it is not one essence, nevertheless has a degree of unity which is more real and less mind-dependent than the unity pertaining to logical concepts such as ,genus' and ,species'.

If we consider Scotus's sober distinction between a relation holding among kinds of things and a relation holding among meanings of a term we cannot help noticing that Antonius Andreae failed to render justice to his master's position. Antonius Andreae's hierarchy of degrees of univocity, if it makes any sense, does not have anything to do with Scotus's sound claim. What has happened? As I mentioned, I think that we can explain Antonius Andreae's curious distinction among types of univocity as a result of his being incapable of making sense of Scotus's original background. Once any familiarity with the Oxford

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Antonius Andreae, *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam* (nt. 110), IV, q. 1, foll. 16<sup>ra</sup>–17<sup>ra</sup>.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, fol. 16<sup>rb</sup>. Cf. S. D. Dumont, *Transcendental Being: Scotus and Scotists*, in: *Topoi* 11 (1992), 135–148, especially 140 sqq. Dumont also analyzes Peter of Navarre's and Peter of Aquila's position on univocity. Both these authors do not seem to be aware of the original context and correct interpretation of Scotus's distinction between real and logical approach to the question of univocity.

tradition concerning analogy was lost, Scotus's position must have become incomprehensible to his students, who only knew the Parisian tradition. The attempt to make some sense of what could not be understood anymore is what we find in Antonius Andreae's position on univocity.

Scotus's teachings, reworked in such a radical way, were now ready to enter the Franciscan *studia* and to form the basis for the philosophical and theological formation of the friars. This is what actually happened. Antonius Andreae's free rendition of his master's teachings in his own *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam* formed the basis of the Scotistic metaphysics taught for centuries as Scotus's own. But this success came at some cost. Not only did Antonius Andreae suppress any trace of the opinions that Scotus held but subsequently discarded. Any mention of Scotus's later developments is suppressed as well, if these developments were not in accordance with the standardized Scotus that Antonius Andreae was willing to propose. What we get is a version of Scotism that was good for the average Franciscan student but that was probably much less intellectually stimulating than the historical Scotus. At least until the late fifteenth century, and to a large extent even afterwards, however, it would be Antonius Andreae's version of Scotus's metaphysics that would triumph, first in the Franciscan *studia* and eventually in the universities of Europe.