

THE COMMENTARY ON THE *SENTENCES* OF MARSILIUS OF INGHEN

Maarten J. F. M. Hoenen

Marsilius read his commentary on the *Sentences* at the University of Heidelberg toward the end of his career in 1392–1394. He was the first theologian to be admitted to the degree of doctor of theology at this University, founded only shortly before in 1386: “primus in theologica facultate promotus in hoc studio”.¹ Although he finished his theological studies in Heidelberg, he began them in Paris, about 1366, four years after his inception as a Master of Arts.²

His commentary is his most extensive and probably his final work; many items on which he had touched in his treatises on logic, natural philosophy and metaphysics are treated again and integrated into his theology.³ The large number of themes discussed and the many different sources used make the commentary a useful epitome of late medieval thinking and an important document of intellectual history.

Compared to the first part of the fourteenth century, light still needs to be shed on various aspects of the second part. Many theologians no longer seemed to be concerned with the publication of their writings (far fewer commentaries on the *Sentences* from the second part of the century have come down to us) and in the writings that have survived the authors pursued a synthesis of traditional knowledge rather than the application of newly discovered theological

¹ He earned his degree between June 17, 1395, and June 23, 1396, and died on August 20, 1396. See G. Töpke, *Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg von 1386 bis 1662*, Heidelberg 1884, vol. 1, 3 (note 6). The quotation is taken from *registrum librorum* recorded in the *matricula*, *ibid.*, 678. On the date of his reading the *Sentences*, see W. J. Courtenay, ‘Marsilius of Inghen as Theologian’, *Marsilius of Inghen. Acts of the international Marsilius of Inghen Symposium*, ed. by H. A. G. Braakhuis and M. J. F. M. Hoenen, Nijmegen 1992 (Artistarium Supplementa, 7), 39–57, esp. 39 note 1.

² G. Ritter, *Studien zur Spätscholastik 1: Marsilius von Inghen und die okkamtistische Schule in Deutschland*, Heidelberg 1921 (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1921, 4. Abh.), 11.

³ The most recent catalogue of his writings is provided by M. Markowski, ‘Katalog dzieł Marsyliusza z Inghen z ewidencją rękopisów’, *Studia Mediewistyczne*, 25 (1988), 39–132.

methods, as was the case with the logico-semantic approach earlier.⁴ To be sure, the semantic analysis of propositions still played a role in theological writings. But increasingly its application became restricted. The limits of its use in theology were felt. There was a growing sense that theology and logic pursue different aims with different methods and that theology as *scientia pietatis* should follow tradition as approved by the doctors of the church and not human logic, since that may lead to superstition and errors. In the wake of this view, there was a tendency toward traditionalism. The use of logic in theology as developed in the first half of the fourteenth century became the target of criticism.

Marsilius belonged to the diminishing group of theologians who published their commentaries on the *Sentences*. In his commentary he entered into the discussion of the relationship between philosophy and theology and the use of philosophical methods in theology on many occasions, especially in his treatment of the trinity and divine knowledge.⁵ There he used logical tools which he borrowed from Adam Wodeham, Robert Holcot, and Gregory of Rimini. But he was anxiously concerned not to go against tradition. He thought that Adam Wodeham and Robert Holcot had pushed the matter too far in their use of logic in theology. What they maintained might be true according to the rules of logic, but was opposed to tradition and therefore should not have been put forward without further explanation, since it might offend those outside the university.

A similar point was maintained by John Gerson, who in his *De duplici logica* (1402) distinguished between the logic of faith and ethics on the one hand and that of traditional logic and metaphysics on the other.⁶ Marsilius's commentary allows modern research to study further this view on the nature of theology, which soon culminated in the Reformation. This, however, presupposes a reliable textual basis and a discussion of the work's authenticity, the nature of the text, the manuscript tradition, and the sources used. The following

⁴ This development is studied in *Philosophie und Theologie des ausgehenden Mittelalters. Marsilius von Inghen und das Denken seiner Zeit*, ed. by M. J. F. M. Hoenen and P. J. J. M. Bakker, Leiden 2000.

⁵ See my *Marsilius of Inghen. Divine Knowledge in Late Medieval Thought*, Leiden 1993 (Studies in the History of Christian Thought, 50).

⁶ John Gerson, *De duplici logica*, ed. P. Glorieux, Paris 1962 (Oeuvres complètes, 3), 57–63, esp. 58.

study will provide and discuss the materials necessary for securing the textual tradition.

1. *Authenticity*

The authenticity of the commentary has never been a matter of doubt. It is secured by the manuscripts. Unfortunately, not all manuscripts mention the author. But those that do, attribute the commentary to Marsilius of Inghen. As far as the first book is concerned, three out of four manuscripts refer to him as the author (For descriptions of the manuscripts and sigla, see below section 5):

- J fol. 345: "Quaestiones primi libri Sententiarum venerabilis magistri Mercilii de Inghen".

This attribution is given in the *explicit* by Gerald of Castrikum, the scribe of the text, who matriculated at the University of Heidelberg in 1411.⁷ The outside and inside front cover of the manuscript also attribute the text to Marsilius, but the hand is different from that of the scribe.

- K fol. 10^r: "Quaestio circa principium primi libri Sententiarum ordinata a venerabili magistro Marsilio".

The ascription to Marsilius concerns only the first question and is written at the top of the page in a hand different from that of the scribe who wrote the question. Since this question is the same as that in the other manuscripts and is also followed by the same questions, there is no reason to assume that this attribution is meant to refer only to the first question, to the exclusion of the others.

- L fol. 1^r: "Marcilius Heydelbergensis universitatis".

Written at the right top of the page in a hand different from that of the scribe; this is perhaps the hand that corrected the manuscript.

The evidence of Marsilius's authorship as given in the manuscripts is corroborated by other contemporary data. Firstly, in the list of books that Marsilius bequeathed to the University of Heidelberg in 1396 the following description is found:

Item (433) questiones magistri Marsilii super sentencias in duobus voluminibus.⁸

⁷ On Gerald of Castrikum (Diocese of Utrecht), see Töpke, *Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg*, vol. 1, 115, and vol. 2, Heidelberg 1886, 371 and 373.

⁸ *Die Rektorbücher der Universität Heidelberg, Band 1: 1386–1410, Heft 2*, ed. by J. Miethke, Heidelberg 1990, 478, and Töpke, *Die Matrikel*, vol. 1, 680 (Anhang IV). The list was made in 1396 under the rectorship of Johannes de Noet. It begins

This reference is the earliest evidence that the lectures given by Marsilius on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard were written down and preserved as *Quaestiones*. The same title, again with the attribution to Marsilius but now with the addition that the text was written by Marsilius himself, was listed in the library inventory of 1466 and mentioned in the *Annals of the Arts Faculty* in 1489.⁹

Secondly, in a number of places the author refers the reader to his earlier writings, using expressions such as 'ubi probavi' or 'ubi solvi'. Such expressions occur in the first book, as well as in the others. They refer to treatises of which we know Marsilius to be the author and thus confirm the authenticity of the commentary on the *Sentences*. The following examples, taken from the first and the second book, mention his commentaries on Aristotle's *Physics* and *Metaphysics*. In the first column of the table the relevant quotations from the commentary on the *Sentences* are given, next to it the places in the works referred to by Marsilius:

<i>Quaestiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum</i> , Lib. 1, qu. 1, ed. Santos, 38	<i>Quaestiones super libros Physicorum</i> , Lib. 1, Wien, ÖNB, CVP 5437, fol. 83 ^{vb}	<i>Quaestiones super Metaphysicam</i> , Lib. 7, qu. 4, Wien, ÖNB, CVP 5297, fol. 90 ^{ra}
Nam esse rei est ipsa res, ita intelligere eiusdem rei est eadem res. Istud consuevit probari in 1 <i>Physicorum</i> , ubi probavi, et 7 <i>Metaphysicae</i> etiam idem probavi.	Ultima conclusio: quod hominem generare est homo generans et generare est generans.	Tertia conclusio: Ipsum et esse ipsum sunt omnimode idem.
	<i>Abbreviationes super octo libros Physicorum</i> , Lib. 1, ed. Venice 1521, fol. 5 ^{ra}	
	Quinti dicunt quod hominem generare est homo generans et creare est creans et ita in aliis. Et videtur mihi quod haec est probabilior opinio.	

as follows, *Die Rektorbücher*, *ibid.*, 475: "Registrum librorum in theologia, quos venerabilis vir magister Marsilius de Inghen bone memorie sacre pagine professor egregius primus in theologica facultate promotus in hoc studio universitati eiusdem dereliquit." See also Töpke, *ibid.*, 678.

⁹ Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Heid. Hs. 47, fol 43^r: "Quaestiones magistri

*Quaestiones super quattuor libros
Sententiarum*, Lib. 2, qu. 1, ed.
Strasbourg 1501, fol. 204^{vb}

*Abbreviationes super octo libros
Physicorum*, Lib. 8, ed. Venice 1521,
fol. 34^{rb} and fol. 37^{ra}

Septimo, quia implicare videtur mutationem Dei quod mundus sit productus, ergo non est productus. (...) Ad hoc possunt adduci rationes Philosophi 8 Physicorum. Sed quia in *Physica* solvi consueverint et in *Abbreviatis eiusdem octavi eas solvi*, ideo de eis supersedeo (...).

Quarto: Utrum a motore immutabili et aeterno possit provenire actio nova. (...) Ex his infertur sexta conclusio quod primum movens est simpliciter immobile.

The authorship of the *Abbreviationes libri Physicorum* is certain. The authenticity of the other commentaries on the *Physics* ascribed to Marsilius still remains doubtful.¹⁰ We therefore used the *Abbreviationes* also to ascertain the reference to the commentary on the first book of the *Physics*. Most probably, the *Abbreviationes* were compiled when Marsilius was in Paris, as can be concluded from the many references to Paris.¹¹ The *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam* were composed at a later date, when he was in Heidelberg, as is clear from the introduction, in which he says that he is writing “ad honorem (...) studii universitatis Heydelbergensis”.¹²

Marsilii propria manu ipsius conscriptae super tertio et quarto Sententiarum in papiro. Quaestiones magistri Marsilii propria manu ipsius conscriptae super primo et secundo Sententiarum in papiro” and Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, *Annales Universitatis* III, fol. 300^r: “(...) Quaestiones Magistri Marsilii de Ingheym super quattuor libros Sententiarum manu ipsius conscriptas (...).”

¹⁰ Th. Dewender, ‘Einige Bemerkungen zur Authentizität der Physikkommentare, die Marsilius von Inghen zugeschrieben werden’, *Marsilius von Inghen. Werk und Wirkung. Akten des zweiten internationalen Marsilius-von-Inghen-Kongresses*, ed. by S. Wielgus, Lublin 1993, 245–269. For the manuscripts and early printed editions of the *Abbreviationes*, see Ch. Lohr, ‘Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries. Authors: Johannes de Kanthi—Myngodus’, *Traditio*, 27 (1971), 251–351, esp. 328f. For the *Quaestiones super libros Physicorum* I have used the manuscript Wien, ÖNB, CVP 5437. This manuscript attributes the first book, which is the book to which Marsilius refers in his *Sentences* commentary, to Marsilius, fol. 89rb: “(...) et hoc de quaestionibus libri primi reverendi magistri Marsilii de Inghen.”

¹¹ G. Ritter, *Studien zur Spätscholastik*, 71.

¹² *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam*, Lib. 1, Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, CVP 5297, fol. 1^{ra-b}.

Finally, some passages from the commentary of Marsilius appear in the work of other authors. The majority of these quotations date from the Early Modern period and go back to the printed edition of 1501.¹³ They are therefore only of limited use here. More interesting for our purpose are the quotations from the Middle Ages. Thomas of Strampino adopted large parts of the first question of Marsilius's *Sentences* commentary in his first *Principium*, which he held in Cracow in 1441. In the second (1441) and third *Principium* (1442) he used Marsilius's work extensively, too.¹⁴ Unfortunately, however, he did not mention Marsilius as his immediate source. Some years later, Gabriel Biel quoted from the same first question of Marsilius in his *Collectorium circa quattuor libros Sententiarum*, as part of his treatment of the divine ideas. He mentioned Marsilius as a defender of the view that the divine ideas are really (*realiter*) the same as the divine essence and cited his commentary on the *Sentences* almost *verbatim*, yet with some adaptation and changing of the order of arguments. In the table below the passages by Gabriel Biel and Marsilius are juxtaposed. Especially the second piece shows how Gabriel changed the structure of the *praemittenda* and *conclusiones*, so that they would better fit his own reasoning. The conformity of both passages and the attribution of the text to Marsilius support the claim of the authorship of Marsilius based on the other sources discussed. There can be no doubt that Gabriel Biel had a manuscript copy of the *Sentences* commentary of Marsilius on his desk.

¹³ Important in this respect are the writings of Francisco de Vitoria, Domingo de Soto, Luis de Molina, and Francisco Suárez.

¹⁴ These *Principia* are preserved in the manuscript Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellonska, Cod. 1199. Thomas of Strampino earned the degree of *magister artium* in 1427 and became Master of theology in 1443, both at the University of Cracow, of which he was also rector (1443/4). He died in 1460. For further details and quotations of the relevant passages, see M. J. F. M. Hoenen, 'Einige Notizen über die Handschriften und Drucke des Sentenzenkommentars von Marsilius von Inghen', *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 56 (1989), 117–163, esp. 122–128.

Gabriel Biel, *Collectorium circa quattuor libros Sententiarum*, Lib. 1 dist. 35, qu. 5, ed. Werbeck, 647

Inter istos sic opinantes magis conformiter principiis prioribus loquitur Marsilius.

Ideo secundum opinionem istius est prima conclusio '*Creatura producta vel producibilis non est idea.*' Probatur: Quia *idea est ratio cognoscendi rem vel exemplar producendi*, prout sonant auctoritates; sed *res productae vel producibiles non sunt ratio cognoscendi vel producendi divinae essentiae*, cum ipsa producendo ad nihil extra se respicit.

Ibid., 648

Tertia conclusio: *In Deo non sunt plures et distinctae ideae rerum creaturarum vel creandarum formaliter et intrinsece*, licet plures dici possint *obiectaliter et extrinsece*. Pro huius conclusionis intellectu est praemittendum quod *plures ideas esse in Deo potest intelligi dupliciter: Uno modo formaliter et intrinsece*, ita quod huiusmodi ideae *non sint inter se idem*, sed una realiter distinguitur ab alia. Quo modo in intellectu humano cognitio distincta Petri est realiter alia a cognitione distincta Pauli.—*Alio modo obiectaliter et extrinsece*. Tale autem est aliquid in se penitus indistinctum. Est tamen plurium obiectorum et cuiuslibet distincte.

Marsilius of Inghen, *Quaestiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum*, Lib. 1, qu. 1, ed. Santos, 15

Sed contra hanc opinionem (sc. ipsius Ockham) volo probare hanc conclusionem, quod creatura producta vel producibilis proprie non est idea. Probatur sic: Hoc est idea quod est formalis ratio cognoscendi rem vel exemplar producendi, ut sonant omnes auctoritates beati Dionysii De divinis nominibus, quas ponit de ideis, et beati Augustini 5 De civitate Dei et 6 et in libro 83 Quaestionum quaestione De ideis; sed res producta vel producibilis non est proprie formalis ratio rem producibilem vel productam cognoscendi vel etiam producendi, prout notum est, igitur.

Ibid., 20–23

Quinto praemitto quod plures esse ideas in Deo sumi potest dupliciter: Uno modo formaliter et intrinsece, alio modo obiectaliter et extrinsece. Formaliter autem et intrinsece voco plura quae non sunt idem inter se, scilicet quorum unum non est aliud vel quorum unum est alia res in essentia sua quam aliud, ut in intellectu humano formaliter et intrinsece alia est idea parietis et alia domus, vel alia capucii et alia vestis. Extrinsece autem et obiectaliter plura dico, quod licet in se sit penitus idem, tamen plura et penitus distincta est obiecta extra. His praemissis sit prima conclusio haec: Nullae ideae sunt in Deo distinctae intrinsece et realiter sive formaliter.

(. . .)

Secunda conclusio: In Deo sunt infinitae ideae extrinsece et obiectionaliter.

2. *The Title of the Commentary*

There is no disagreement among the sources about the title of the commentary. They all refer to the work as 'Quaestiones'. None of them use terms such as 'Commentum', 'Commentaria', 'Lectura', or 'Scriptum'. The only exception is the printed edition of 1501, which added to the *explicit* of the first book: (fol. 200^{va}) "Primum *scriptum* libri Sententiarum venerabilis Marsilii finit feliciter". This addition is not found in the manuscripts. Also at the end of the second and third book the term 'scriptum' is used: (fol. 347^{vb}) "Finit secundum *scriptum* libri Sententiarum clarissimi Marsilii Ingenui" and (fol. 472^{vb}) "Finis tertii *scripti*", but again without a parallel in the manuscripts or in any other known sources. It is a unique case and therefore should not be taken into consideration any further here.¹⁵

The earliest manuscript which has an indication of the title is J. The *explicit* in which the term 'Quaestiones' occurs has been quoted above. Also at other places in the manuscript the term 'Quaestiones' is used. The *explicit* of the second book has:

J fol. 595: "*Quaestiones* secundi libri Sententiarum magistri Mercilii de Inghen".¹⁶

The same title comes up on the inside front cover of manuscript Ansbach, Regierungsbibliothek, Ms. lat. 62, which contains the commentary on the second (partially) and third book: "*quaestiones* Marsilii super secundo et tertio Sententiarum". The other manuscripts give no information on the title of the work. Yet, we can be sure that

¹⁵ Generally, the term 'scriptum' is used to indicate that the text is not a collection of students' notes or a report of the lectures given in the classroom, but composed by the author himself. Compare Rega Wood's introduction to Adam Wodeham, *Lectura secunda in librum primum Sententiarum, prologus et distinctio prima*, ed. by R. Wood, ass. by G. Gál, St. Bonaventure, New York, 1990 (Franciscan Institute Publications), 9*.

¹⁶ In addition, the outside front cover has in a handwriting of the fifteenth century, "*Quaestiones* venerabilis magistri Marsilii super primum et secundum Sententiarum". Again in a handwriting of the fifteenth century, the title is repeated on the inside front cover: "*Quaestiones* primi et secundi Sententiarum Marsilii".

Marsilius's *Sentences* commentary was known under the title of 'Quaestiones' from the very moment of its publication, since the book catalogue of 1396 gives that title as well.¹⁷ Also, the library inventory of 1466 and the *Annals of the Arts Faculty* of 1489 mention the same title.¹⁸ Furthermore, the register of the library of the University of Erfurt, which in the late fifteenth century had manuscript copies of all four books of the commentary originating from Heidelberg, used the title of 'Quaestiones':

11. *Questiones* primi sentenciarum Marsilii quas una cum questionibus
2. et 3. et 4. fecit emi facultas arcium et apportari de Studio Heidelbergensi pro 16. florentis.
12. *Questiones* secundi sentenciarum Marsilii.
13. *Questiones* tertii sentenciarum Marsilii cum una questione Petri de Candia circa primum.
14. *Questiones* quarti sentenciarum Marsilii et breuiloquium Bonaventure.¹⁹

These later sources make evident that Marsilius's commentary continued to be known as 'Quaestiones'.

The title 'Quaestiones' is perfectly in agreement with the character of the commentary. Marsilius shaped his discussion of all four books of Peter Lombard's *Sentences* in separate questions, without adding any 'divisio textus' or partial 'lectura textualis'. This format with the corresponding title was also used in other contemporary commentaries on Lombard. In the manuscripts, the *Sentences* commentary of Conrad of Soltau, who was among the first theologians at the newly founded University of Heidelberg, has the same format and bears the same title of 'Quaestiones'.²⁰

The sources differ as to the words added to 'Quaestiones'. Some just annex the books concerned in the genitive case: 'Quaestiones

¹⁷ See above.

¹⁸ See above.

¹⁹ *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, vol. 2, ed. by P. Lehmann, München 1928, 143 and 189. That the fourth book appears together with Bonaventure's *Breviloquium* is not surprising. In the fourth book, as in the others, Marsilius quotes Bonaventure often.

²⁰ Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Cod. Theol. Fol. 118, fol. 172^{vb}. "Expliciunt quaestiones compilatae et compositae per venerabilem magistrum Cunradum Soltanem". On Conrad of Soltau, who came from Prague and arrived in Heidelberg early in 1387, see J. Miethke, 'Marsilius von Inghen als Rektor der Universität Heidelberg', *Marsilius of Inghen. Acts of the international Marsilius of Inghen Symposium*, ed. by H. A. G. Braakhuis and M. J. F. M. Hoenen, Nijmegen 1992 (Artistarium Supplementa, 7), 13–37, esp. 22.

primi et secundi Sententiarum' (J). Others use the preposition 'super' with the books concerned either in the ablative case: 'Quaestiones super secundo et tertio Sententiarum' (A), or in the accusative case: 'Quaestiones super primum et secundum Sententiarum' (J). The last form is used in the facsimile reprint of the 1501 edition and has been adopted in modern research. It finds its roots in the manuscript tradition and has been used for the modern edition.

3. Reportatio, lectura, or ordinatio?

The information given in the title that the work consists of 'quaestiones' does not say anything about the editorial nature of the text, whether it is a transcript based on the lectures given by Marsilius in the classroom (*reportatio*), the text used for the lectures (*lectura*), or a revised version which he prepared for final publication (*ordinatio*). In the Middle Ages, the title of 'Quaestiones' was used for different texts alike. Ockham's commentary on the second book of the *Sentences* has come down to us as a *reportatio*. The commentary of Conrad of Soltau is an *ordinatio*. Both were called 'Quaestiones'.²¹

In the case of Marsilius, however, it is almost certain that his 'Quaestiones' were an *ordinatio*. Firstly, there is the note on the top of fol. 10^r in manuscript K that the first question was revised (*ordinata*) by Marsilius. This first question is not different in structure and style from the other questions. Therefore the other questions of the first book might be considered as 'ordinatae' as well.

Secondly, the printed edition of 1501 says on fol. 1^{ra} of the first book that the text is 'edita'. The word 'edita' does not mean 'published by making a copy', but 'prepared for publication by the author'. This meaning can be inferred from its use in the manuscripts, also those with works by Marsilius. In these manuscripts a distinction is made between the act of publishing by Marsilius (*edere*) and the act of writing by the scribe (*scribere*): "Expliciunt questiones Porphyrii et

²¹ The same goes for the third and fourth book of Ockham's commentary, which were also *reportationes*. Only the first book of Ockham's commentary is an *ordinatio*. It is indicated in the manuscripts as 'scriptum'. See the introduction to William of Ockham, *Scriptum in librum primum Sententiarum. Ordinatio. Prologus et distinctio prima*, ed. by G. Gál and S. Brown, (*Opera theologica*, 1), 11*–17*. Occasionally, the first book of Ockham's commentary (the *ordinatio*) is referred to as 'Quaestiones' as well. See Ockham, *ibid.*, 14* (Codex F).

Predicamentorum Aristotelis, *edite* a magistro Marcilio de Inghen, *scripte* per manus Nicolai de Moguncia partim” and “Expliciunt questiones super librum De generatione et corruptione Aristotelis, *edite* a magistro Marsilio de Almania, *scripte* sunt per fratrem Johannem de Colonia”.²²

More important are the following observations. In the first book several smaller passages have been preserved slightly differently in the manuscripts and in the printed edition of 1501. These sections mainly concern the *rationes principales* and the answers to these *rationes*. The versions do not differ so much as regards content. Rather, the one seems to be a textual revision of the other. Apparently, the text has been redrafted. The following passages may serve as examples:

Quaestiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum, Lib. 1, qu. 13.
(ad rationes principales)

J, fol. 60^{vb}–61^{ra}
(collated with K, W, L)

Ed. Strasbourg 1501, fol. 65^{va}

Ad septimam dicitur secundum rectam logicam, quod ‘principium’ et ‘causa’ terminum, quem regunt a parte post, faciunt appellare suam rationem. (. . .)

Ad septimam respondetur secundum rectam logicam, quod ly ‘principium’ et ‘causa’ sunt termini causativi appellationis rationis in terminum quem post se gerunt. Faciunt enim talem se sequentem appellare suam rationem. (. . .)

Ad nonam (. . .). Quamvis enim ante non fuit tempus verum, tamen ante fuit aeternitas, quae nobiliori modo et digniori praecedit Filium quam aeternitas temporis.

Ad nonam (. . .). Quamvis enim antea non fuerit tempus verum, fuit tamen aeternitas, qua nobiliori et digniori modo fuit quam si aeternitate temporis, quae etiam modo nobiliori et digniori praecedit Filium quam aeternitas temporis, etc.

Quaestiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum, Lib. 1, qu. 16.
(rationes principales)

J, fol. 67^{vb}–68^{ra}
(collated with K, W, L)

Ed. Strasbourg 1501, fol. 72^{vb}–73^{ra}

Quinto, si differunt generatio et spiratio, vel hoc est seipsis, et hoc

Quinto, si differant generatio et spiratio, vel ergo seipsis vel alii.

²² Quoted according to Markowski, ‘Katalog dzieł Marsyliusza z Inghen’, 45 (Erfurt, Bibliotheca Amploniana, 4° 246, fol. 90^{rb}) and 99 (Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Z VI 121a (2557), fol. 96^{rb}).

non, quia emanationes non distinguuntur seipsis, sicut nec sunt a seipsis. Vel aliis, et hoc vel essentia, quod non potest dici, eo quod est unica; vel personis, et hoc non, quia earum videtur esse distinguere non distinguere; vel notionibus, et sic notionis esset alia notio et esset processus in infinitum.

Non seipsis, quia emanationes non seipsis distinguuntur, sicut nec a seipsis sunt. Nec aliis, eo quod nec essentia, nec personis, nec notionibus. Non primum, quia unica est essentia. Neque secundum, quia earum esse distinguere non videtur. Neque tertium, quia sic notionis esset alia notio, et sic esset processus in infinitum.

Probably in close connection with this occurrence, in the first and second book a number of answers to *rationes principales* are absent. This goes for all textual witnesses. In the manuscripts of the first book these places are marked by blank columns and pages, which obviously had their origin in the original manuscript. Presumably, they were left empty to add the lacking passages at a later occasion.²³ The printed edition of 1501 has no empty columns at these places, but inserts two different notes indicating that because of his death Marsilius had not been able to rewrite and definitely formulate the answers to these questions, the draft of which he had crossed out in his manuscript.²⁴ There is no reason to question the correctness of the information in the edition, which may go back to notes added in the original manuscript possessed by Marsilius.

If this information is indeed correct, then Marsilius was working on his commentary until his death in 1396. This means that the commentary which has been preserved is no *reportatio* or *lectura* of the lectures on the *Sentences*, which he delivered in 1392–1394, but an *ordinatio*, the text of which he was amending and preparing for publication, without being able to finish it definitively. The existence of different text versions referred to above may then be explained by the fact that the text was copied not only after, but already during

²³ I discussed the problem of these empty columns and pages in my 'Einige Notizen', 148–153.

²⁴ *Quaestiones*, ed. 1501, Lib. 1, qu. 41, fol. 175^{rb}: "Marsilius hic dimisit fere totum folium contemplatione solutionum obiectionum contra quaesitum factorum. Nec tamen ab re. Quippe, qui optimi viri vestigiis inhaerens maluerit huiusmodi rationum ad tempus suspensam tenere sententiam qua(m) temerario ausu quicquam a sese positum iri, verum, proh dolor, invisa praeventus morte, id quod sibi certum erat, haud quaquam executus est." and *ibid.*, qu. 42, fol. 182^{vb}: "Marsilius noster itidem efflagitat expurgationem."

the time in which Marsilius made his revisions. The one copy preserved the original text, while the other represents the revised version.²⁵

Finally, there is still another indication that the text was redrafted. The opening questions of the first, second, and third book present themselves as the *quaestiones determinandae* of the *principia*, the lectures with which the *sententiarium* began his commentary on the respective books of the *Sentences*.²⁶ Compared to other contemporary *principia*, however, these three questions are significantly different. They contain no discussion with the fellow students, the *socii*, as is normally the case.²⁷

As to the first *principium*, the absence of the discussion with the *socii* might be explained by the fact that perhaps Marsilius inserted the text of his actual lecture when he was still uninformed about the views of his fellow *sententarii*. But that is unlikely. Marsilius must

²⁵ As to the question of the manuscript or manuscripts used for the edition of 1501, see p. 490 below.

²⁶ Marsilius mentions the three parts which were characteristic of the *principium* right at the beginning of the first question of the first book. See *Quaestiones*, ed. Santos, 1: "Primis itaque duobus, videlicet divini nominis invocatione et brevi sacrae scientiae commendatione, de Dei misericordiae expeditis, venio ad tertium, videlicet ad quaestionis seu dubii propositionem colloctionis gratia cum aliis patribus et magistris meis." For the first question of the second and third book, see *Quaestiones*, ed. 1501, fol. 201^{ra} and fol. 349^{ra}. On the characteristics of a *principium*, see B. C. Bazan in *Les questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les facultés de théologie, de droit et de médecine*, Turnhout 1985 (Typologie des sources du Moyen Age Occidental, 44/45), 103–105. I discussed the problem of the *principia* in the *Sentences* commentary of Marsilius in my 'Neuplatonismus am Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts. Die Prinzipien zum Sentenzenkommentar des Marsilius von Inghen', *Marsilius von Inghen. Werk und Wirkung*, ed. by S. Wielgus, Lublin 1993, 165–194.

²⁷ In the *principia*, the *socii* discussed their opinions. See the oath the *sententiarium* had to swear according to the statutes of the University of Heidelberg, edited in E. Winkelmann, *Urkundenbuch der Universität Heidelberg*, vol. 1, Heidelberg 1886, 21: "Ego N. iuro (. . .) in quolibet libro faciendo principium contra dicta et conclusiones eius vel eorum, qui mecum concurrerint legendo, instare." An interesting example of such a discussion is given by Peter of Candia, who in his *principium* reacts against the criticism of his *socius* Francis of Saint Michael, who for his part had reacted against the earlier criticism of Peter of Candia. The relevant passage is edited in F. Ehrle, *Der Sentenzenkommentar Peters von Candia des Pisaner Papstes Alexanders V. Ein Beitrag zur Scheidung der Schulen in der Scholastik des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts und zur Geschichte des Wegestretes*, Münster 1925 (Franziskanische Studien, Beiheft 9), 45: "(. . .) secuntur due propositiones correlative contradicentes propositionibus positus per venerabilem magistrum meum Franciscum de Sancto Mychaele in suo secundo principio pro responsione ad argumentum meum primum factum contra decimam propositionem declarativam quarte conclusionis sui principii (. . .)." The discussion among the *socii* is also documented in François de Meyronnes-Pierre Roger, *Disputatio (1320–1321)*, ed. by J. Barbet, Paris 1961 (Textes philosophiques du Moyen Age, 9).

have known the opinions of at least one of his *socii* by then, since he refers to Heilmannus Wunnenberger as *socius* and *baccalarius formatus huius almae universitatis*.²⁸ The addition *baccalarius formatus* indicates that Wunnenberger had already given his third *principium* and that therefore he was in the second year of reading the *Sentences*.²⁹ According to the Statutes, the coming *sententiarius* was allowed one year of preparation before delivering his lectures on the *Sentences*, but during that time he had to attend official lectures such as the *principia*.³⁰ Marsilius began reading the *Sentences* in 1392. He therefore must have known what Wunnenberger had put forward in the *principia* to the first and second book, which he had read in the preceding year (1391).³¹

But there is no discussion with Wunnenberger in the version of the *principia* which has been preserved in the *Sentences* commentary, neither in the opening question of the first book, nor in those of the second and third book, although by the time Marsilius started commenting on the second and third book, he surely must have been familiar with the reactions of his *socii* against the statements of his first *principium*.³² It is only in the fifth question of his first book that he mentions the views of Heilmannus Wunnenberger, but without any relation to the subject of the first *principium*.³³

²⁸ See *Quaestiones*, ed. Santos, qu. 1, 6.

²⁹ This is evident from the oldest Statutes of the Theological Faculty, edited in Winkermann, *Urkundenbuch der Universität Heidelberg*, 21: "Item ordinatum et statutum est quod faciens principium ordinate in terciū sententiarum sit et reputatur baccalarius in theologia pro magistro formatus."

³⁰ Ibid., 21: "Postquam quis cursum (sc. in theologia) finiverit, vacabit per unum annum, in quo ad legendum sententias se diligenter preparet, nichilominus tamen tenetur tunc visitare scholas et actus publicos et semel respondeat ac predicet ad minus anno eodem."

³¹ In Heidelberg, reading the *Sentences* took two years (see Winkermann, *Urkundenbuch der Universität Heidelberg*, 21). That Wunnenberger began reading the *Sentences* in 1391 can also be inferred from the fact that he was 'legens cursus suos' in theology in 1387, see *Die Rektorbücher der Universität Heidelberg, Band 1: 1386-1410, Heft 1*, ed. by J. Miethke, Heidelberg 1986, 161 n. 86. Reading the Scriptures took two years (1387-1389). He then had a year of preparation for his commentary on the *Sentences* (1390), which he began delivering in the following year.

³² That Marsilius expected reactions from his *socii* is documented by the following remark, see *Quaestiones*, ed. Santos, 52: "(...) ideo prolixè scripsi, ut reverendis magistris meis praeberem materiam me informandi subtilibus imaginationibus suis et rationibus in contrarium faciendis." See also, ibid., 6: "(...) quandoque corollarie arguam cum reverendis magistris meis et patribus (...)" and 24: "(...) expectans instantias magistrorum meorum (...)".

³³ See *Quaestiones*, ed. Santos, 127.

The only plausible explanation for the absence of the discussion is, therefore, that these questions do not represent the actual *principia* he held, but that they were rewritten and that during the process of rewriting Marsilius dropped the debate with his *socii*, for reasons that are unclear.³⁴ Since the original *principia* of Marsilius are lost, it is impossible to determine what exactly he omitted and altered.³⁵

4. Problems concerning the date of composition

Since Marsilius kept on redrafting his text up to his death, it is difficult to determine the exact date of composition. The only fixed points are the reading of the *Sentences* at Heidelberg in 1392–1394 and the year of his death (1396).

It is not unlikely that Marsilius wrote down parts of the commentary already during the preparatory year allowed to the *sententarius* in Heidelberg. Also, he may have started collecting material even earlier, perhaps in Paris where he began to study theology about 1366, or he may have used material put forward in other writings and disquisitions in Paris.³⁶ Some observations seem to point to these possibilities.

Firstly, Marsilius mentions no authors from the period after 1370. He only rarely enters into discussions with his contemporaries.³⁷ Especially striking are his *principia*, which in the existent version discuss the same problems as treated in the *principia* of Parisian theologians such as Hugolino of Orvieto, John of Ripa, Stephen Gaudet, Peter of Candia, Gerard of Kalkar, and Bonsembiante Badoer.³⁸ Marsilius takes issue with the views of Hugolino of Orvieto and John of Ripa, not with those of his *socii*. This seems to suggest that in

³⁴ However, he did not succeed in completely erasing the traces of the debate (cf. note 32 above).

³⁵ The original *principia* of Marsilius appear as a separate item on the book list of 1396. See *Die Rektorbücher der Universität Heidelberg*, 477: “(98) Item (420) principium suum super sentencias cum aliis sexternis”, and Töpke, *Die Matrikel*, vol. 1, 679 (Anhang IV).

³⁶ It was usual for the *sententarius* to do preparatory work in advance. See V. Marcolino, ‘Der Augustinertheologe an der Universität Paris’, *Gregor von Rimini. Werk und Wirkung bis zur Reformation*, ed. by H. A. Oberman, Berlin 1981 (Spätmittelalter und Reformation, 20), 127–194, 150f.

³⁷ Courtenay, ‘Marsilius of Inghen as Theologian’, 52.

³⁸ See my ‘Neuplatonismus am Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts’, 172f.

the final draft of his *principia* he may have used materials collected as a student in Paris.

Secondly, in the *Sentences* commentary of the Parisian theologian Angelus Dobelin composed about 1375 a view is attributed to Marsilius which can be found in his commentary on the *Prior analytics* and in his commentary on the *Sentences*. By that time Marsilius's opinions therefore must have been well-known among the Parisian theologians. And although it is not clear whether Angelus Dobelin is quoting from Marsilius's commentary on the *Prior analytics* or from (a draft version of) his commentary on the *Sentences*, since the same view is defended in both, at least it proves that Marsilius put forward opinions in the commentary on the *Sentences* which he had already defended in Paris about 1375.³⁹

These two observations seem to imply that Marsilius used materials which date back to an early stage of his career. However, it remains unclear when he started editing this early material and began writing the text, which was to become his *Sentences* commentary. The narrowing down of the *terminus a quo* must therefore be left open until new evidence is found.

5. *The manuscripts and the printed edition of 1501*

The first book of the *Sentences* commentary has been preserved in four manuscripts and in the printed edition of 1501. Although this is not a rich textual tradition, none of the other books has so many witnesses. Of the fourth book, only one manuscript is known to date.⁴⁰

The manuscripts contain only Marsilius's commentary, with the exception of Tübingen, Wilhelmsstift, Gb 336b, which in addition to the fourth book also has the commentary on the Decalogue by Henricus de Frimaria.⁴¹ In what follows, only the manuscripts of the first book are described.

³⁹ On this issue, see Courtenay, 'Marsilius of Inghen as Theologian', 48–52.

⁴⁰ On the the manuscripts and the printed edition, see M. J. F. M. Hoenen, 'Einige Notizen', 117–163.

⁴¹ *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices, 1100–1500 A.D.*, ed. by M. W. Bloomfield e.a., Cambridge, Mass., 1979 (The Mediaeval Academy of America Publication, 88), 59–60, no. 0526: "Audi, Israel, precepta Domini (. . .) In verbis propositis (. . .)."

- J Isny, Nikolaikirche, Hs. 48, fifteenth century, 310 x 220 mm, paper and parchment, two columns per page, written by one hand (Gerald of Castrikum), no foliation but modern pagination counting each side (except for the first page; only the even pages bear page numbers), pag. 611.

Incipit of the first book, pag. 1^a: "Primis itaque duobus, videlicet divini nominis invocatione et brevi sacrae scripturae commendatione (. . .)".

Explicit of the first book, pag. 345^b: "Aliae duae rationes arguunt pro dictis in septima conclusione. Hoc de quaestione. Et sic est finis primi. Benedictus Deus. Amen. Parcant mihi lectores et corrigant et emendent. Non plus potui brevitate temporis et alias impeditus. Expliciunt quaestiones primi libri Sententiarum reverendi magistri Mercilii de Inghen sacrae theologiae professoris eximii. Scriptae per magistrum Gheraerdum Casterkem propria manu." The same addition to the *explicit* "Parcant (. . .) impeditus" can be found in manuscript K.

Incipit of the second book: pag. 354^a: "Circa secundum librum Sententiarum movendo et disputando quaestionem primam et continuando materiam de perfectionibus in primo principio meo tactam formo quaestionem talem (. . .)".

Explicit of the second book: pag. 595^b: "Ad rationes pro quaesito dicitur quod auctoritas Apostoli Ad Romanos 13 vult primas duas quaestiones secundi articuli. Hoc de quaestione. Expliciunt quaestiones secundi libri Sententiarum magistri Mercilii de Inghen sacrae theologiae professoris eximii scriptae per magistrum Gerardum Casterkem propria manu. Deus daret vitam omnibus nobis sacra eloquia delucidantibus. Deo gratias."

Outside front cover, by a hand of the fifteenth century: "Quaestiones venerabilis magistri Marsilii super primum et secundum Sententiarum".

Inside front cover, again by a contemporary hand: "Quaestiones primi et secundi Sententiarum Marsilii".

Initials. Occasionally initials are absent but room is left for their inclusion. Marginal notes indicating the structure of the text and marginal annotations. Quotations and the structure of the text are highlighted by underlining.

A number of columns and pages are blank (italics are used where they correspond to absent *rationes principales*):⁴² 294^b (partially) through 296^a, 309^b (partially) through 312, 345^b (after the *explicit*), 346 through

⁴² On these absent *rationes principales*, see section 3 and the reference in note 23 above.

353, 383^a (partially) through 383^b, 443^a (partially), 461^a (partially), 560^a (partially) through 561, 596 through 607, 610.

A complete table of the questions treated in the manuscript is given on pag. 608: "Sequuntur tituli quaestionum primi libri Sententiarum" and pag. 609: "Sequuntur tituli quaestionum secundi libri".

In all probability, J is the oldest manuscript of the first book and has its origin in Heidelberg. It was written by Gerald of Castrikum, who was in Heidelberg between 1411 and 1419.⁴³ It is not unlikely that he copied the commentary of Marsilius during his stay in Heidelberg. If this supposition is correct, J dates from the second decade of the fifteenth century. Marsilius of Inghen and Gerald of Castrikum, who originated from the diocese of Utrecht, were compatriots.

The manuscript is now part of the collection of the library of the Nikolaikirche at Isny. In the fifteenth century a fair number of students came from Isny to Heidelberg. On their way back to Isny they carried manuscripts copied in Heidelberg with them.⁴⁴ It is not known who carried the *Sentences* commentary of Marsilius to Isny.

The manuscript is clearly written and has a good textual quality, with a minimal number of omissions.

- K Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellonska, Cod. 1581, fifteenth century, 310 x 205 mm, paper, written by several hands, fol. 322.

Incipit of the first book, fol. 10^r: "Primis itaque duobus, videlicet divini nominis invocatione et brevi sacrae scripturae commendatione (. . .)".

Explicit of the first book, fol. 316^r: "(. . .) Aliae duae rationes arguunt pro dictis in septima conclusione. Hoc de quaestione. Et sic est finis primi. Benedictus Deus. Parcant mihi lectores et corrigant et emendent. Non plus potui brevitate temporis et alias impeditus etc."

Incipit of the second book, fol. 316^r: "[C]irca secundum librum sententiarum. Disputando quaestionem primam et continuando materiam de perfectionibus in primo principio meo tactam formo quaestionem (. . .)".

⁴³ He became Dean of the Arts Faculty in 1419. See Töpke, *Die Matrikel*, vol. 2, 373. When exactly he left Heidelberg is not known.

⁴⁴ One of the manuscripts (Isny, Nikolaikirche, Hs. 49) was copied in Heidelberg in 1447. See K. O. Müller, *Die Handschriften der Bibliothek der Nikolauskirche in Isny* (typescript 1936), 49: "Hs. n. 49, Albertus Magnus, De laudibus Marie, fol. 187. (. . .) Expliciunt laudes b. Virg. Marie et finite sunt per me Johannem Frantz de Leypphain in studio Heydelbergensi anno etc. (14)47 in vigilia Pasce."

Explicit of the second book: fol. 321^v: “(. . .) haec creatio non est possibilis sequitur ex principio philosophiae naturalis. Igitur haec non potest probari ex puro lumine.”

On the first fly leaf, a later hand attributes the text wrongly to Marsilio Ficino: “Marsilius Ficinus in primum Sententiarum.”

On the top of the first text page (fol. 10^r) a contemporary hand wrote: “Quaestio circa principium primi libri Sententiarum ordinata a venerabili magistro Marsilio sacrae theologiae professore in studio Heidelbergensi.”

Initials. Occasionally initials are absent but room is left for their inclusion. Marginal notes indicating the structure of the text and marginal annotations by several hands. Quotations and the structure of the text are highlighted by underlining.

Some pages are blank (italics are used where they correspond to absent *rationes principales*): 9^v, 254^v through 262^v, 274^r (partially) through 275^r, 283^r (partially) through 285^r (partially), 322^{r-v}.

A table of questions is given on fol. 1^{r-9f}.

This manuscript contains not only the text of the first book, but also a small part of the second. The text of the second book ends abruptly on fol. 321^v with the words “ex puro lumine” and continues in the catch words at the bottom of the page “26. naturali. Maior patet”, but the next fol. 322^r is blank. It is unclear, whether or not the continuation got lost or was never written.

There are two more manuscripts with books of the commentary of Marsilius in the Biblioteka Jagiellonska. Cod. 1268 contains the second book and Cod. 1580 the third book. All three manuscripts contain marginal notes and a table of questions written by the same hand, which has been identified as that of John of Dabrovka.⁴⁵ He earned his degree as a Master at the Theological Faculty of Cracow before 1437 and might have read the commentary of Marsilius as a student. This, however, is uncertain and cannot be used for dating the manuscript. Only his death in 1471 (Palacz) or 1472 (Stegmüller) is an undoubtable *terminus ad quem* here.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ M. Golaszewska, J. B. Korolec, A. Poltawski, Z. K. Siemiatkowska, I. Tarnowska, Z. Wlodek, ‘Commentaires sur les Sentences. Supplément au Répertoire de F. Stegmüller’, *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, 2 (1958), 22–27, esp. 25. The hand of John of Dabrovka also wrote marginal notes in Biblioteka Jagiellonska, Cod. 521, which contains the *Tractatus de contractibus* of Henry of Oyta. See A. Lang, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der ersten deutschen Universitäten und zur Problemgeschichte der Spätscholastik*, Münster 1937, 102 (n. 23).

⁴⁶ Biographical notes on John of Dabrovka are provided by R. Palacz, ‘Les manuscrits du Policraton de Jean de Salisbury en Pologne’, *Mediaevalia Philosophica*

In 1441 and 1442 Thomas of Strampino used the commentary of Marsilius for the preparation of his *principia*, which were held in Cracow. But it cannot be ascertained whether or not he used the manuscripts which are now in Cracow. If he did, their *terminus ad quem* is fixed by the date of these *principia*. Interestingly, Thomas extracted only passages from the first three books of Marsilius, not of the fourth, which is still absent in Cracow today.⁴⁷

Manuscript K has a good textual quality, almost comparable to that of manuscript J. Both J and K have far fewer omissions than manuscripts W and L. Also, they have the same scribal note "Parcant (. . .) impeditus" at the end of the first book. Obviously, they go back to a common source. Yet, there is no immediate connection between the two manuscripts.

- W Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Cod. Theol. 2° 113, fifteenth century, 320 x 215 mm, paper, two columns per page, written by several hands, modern foliation (eighteenth century?), fol. 298.

Incipit of the first book: fol. 2^{ra}: "Primis itaque duobus, videlicet divini nominis invocatione et brevi sacrae scientiae commendatione (. . .)".

Explicit of the first book: fol. 294^{vb}: "Aliae duae rationes arguunt pro dictis in septima conclusione. Hoc de quaestione."

Generally, initials of the *quaestiones* and the standard introductory phrasing of the *articuli* are missing, but room is left for their inclusion. At the beginning now and then marginal notes indicate the structure of the text. There are also smaller annotations (fol. 5^{ra}: "secunda pars articuli contra Okam"). Later on these are almost absent. The structure of the text is highlighted by rubrication.

Some columns and pages are blank (italics are used where they correspond to absent *rationes principales*): 1^{ra-vb}, 249^{va} (partially) through 250^{va}, 261^{va} (partially) through 263^{va}, 295^{va} through 298^{vb}.

Summaries of the first six *quaestiones* on fol. 294^{vb}–295^{rb}. The first and the second *quaestio* are summarized at some length.⁴⁸ Of the sixth *quaestio* only the title is given. These summaries are written in a hand of the fifteenth century.

Polonorum, 10 (1961), 55–58, esp. 57, and F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium Commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, vol. 1, Würzburg 1947, 200.

⁴⁷ For further details, see note 14 above.

⁴⁸ The summary of the first *quaestio* is given in section 6 below.

This manuscript belonged to the Benedictine Monastery of Wiblingen (Southern Germany), as is indicated at the top of fol. 2^r (later hand): "Monasterii Wiblingen". Similar notes can be found on the first text page of the manuscripts Tübingen, Wilhelmsstift, Gb 336a, and Tübingen, Wilhelmsstift, Gb 336b, which contain the second and fourth book of Marsilius's commentary respectively.⁴⁹ These three manuscripts belonged together, as can also be inferred from the summaries they contain, which are written in the same hand.

It is difficult to determine whether or not these manuscripts were written in the monastery. At the end of Tübingen, Wilhelmsstift, Gb 336b, the scribe of the Decalogue commentary of Henricus de Frimaria wrote: "scripta (...) per dominum Michaellem Slesitam". The hand of this scribe can be recognized in parts of the preceding *Sentences* commentary of Marsilius. Unfortunately, he is not on the list of the scribes of the monastery, who are known by other sources.⁵⁰ That he characterized himself as 'dominus' indicates that he probably was not a member of the monastery community itself, since the monks called themselves 'frater' in the colophon of the writings they copied. Yet, the manuscript bears the characteristic design and layout of the manuscripts that were produced in Wiblingen.⁵¹

The date of the manuscript is uncertain. The watermark makes plausible a date of sometime between 1436 and 1440.⁵² This would coincide with the flourishing of the writing activities in Wiblingen, which only really began after the Melk Reform in 1436. Already in 1450 the library probably possessed about 200 volumes.⁵³

The manuscripts are not on the book list composed in Wiblingen between 1432 and 1450. This does not mean, however, that they

⁴⁹ Tübingen, Wilhelmsstift, Gb 336a: "Monasterii Wiblingen", and Tübingen, Wilhelmsstift, Gb 336b: "Monasterii Wiblingensis". These manuscripts are not foliated.

⁵⁰ A list of scribes is given in *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, vol. 1, ed. by P. Lehmann, München 1918, 431–450, and H. Hummel, 'Bibliotheca Wiblingana. Aus Scriptorium und Bibliothek der ehemaligen Benediktinerabtei Wiblingen', *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-Ordens und seiner Zweige*, 89 (1978), 510–570, esp. 521.

⁵¹ Compare Hummel, 'Bibliotheca Wiblingana', 516–517 (description of the design and layout of the manuscripts copied in Wiblingen) and 520.

⁵² G. Piccard, *Die Ochsenkopfwasserzeichen*, Findbuch II/3, Stuttgart 1966, Abteilung XII. Piccard identified the watermark in the manuscript Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Cod. Theol. 2° 113, as Ochsenkopf XII 185/6, and dated the copying to between 1436 and 1440. His analysis of the manuscript can be consulted in the Württembergische Landesbibliothek.

⁵³ Hummel, 'Bibliotheca Wiblingana', 555.

were not already part of the library, since this list gives the accessions and loans only. Their first appearance is on the list of 1736: "Marsilii subtilis alemanni Quaestiones super 1. sent. in fol. Lit. M. n. 79. Eiusdem super 2. sent. in fol. Lit. M. n. 43. Eiusdem super 4. sent. in fol. Lit. M. n. 44."⁵⁴

After the disintegration of the library of Wiblingen in the beginning of the nineteenth century, the manuscripts of the collection went to several other libraries. The first book of Marsilius's *Sentences* commentary arrived in Stuttgart in 1808, the second and fourth book went to Tübingen. Why they were split up is not known. Interestingly, however, they were separated in the catalogue of 1736 as well, as is clear from the shelf marks. The first book is listed as M. n. 79, whereas the second and fourth are numbered successively M. n. 43 and M. n. 44. In 1757 the library was transferred to another room. Then all three books were numbered successively: I B 16, I B 17, and I B 18. These shelf marks are still to be seen on the inside front cover of the manuscripts.

The textual quality of the manuscript of the first book is rather poor. There are serious misreadings and omissions. Many of these omissions can also be found in manuscript L. But there is no direct connection between these manuscripts, since both contain omissions which are unique.

- L Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. 568, 310 x 215 mm, fifteenth century, written by several hands, paper, fol. 364.

Incipit of the first book, fol. 1^r: "Primis itaque duobus, videlicet divini nominis invocatione et brevi sacrae scientiae commendatione (. . .)".

Explicit of the first book, fol. 363^r: "Aliae duae rationes arguunt pro dictis in septima conclusione. Haec de quaestione etc."

Inside front cover: "Iste liber comparatus est sub decanatu magistri Melchioris Lodivici de Freynstadt anno salutis nostre lxxxviii." On the top of the first folio (1^r): "Marcilius Heydelbergensis Universitatis".

⁵⁴ See *Bibliotheca Wiblingana seu catalogus librorum in III tomos divisus*, tom. III: *Manuscripta*, Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, HB XV 109 c, fol. 24^r. The earlier list of 1687 *Catalogus omnium librorum bibliothecae Wiblingensis*, which has been preserved in Rottenburg (Diözesanbibliothek, F. 356), only mentions printed editions.

Initials. Occasionally initials are absent but room is left for their inclusion. Marginal notes indicating the structure of the text and marginal annotations. Quotations and the structure of the text are highlighted by underlining. On several folios underlinings and marginal notes are absent, especially towards the end of the manuscript. The text was corrected.

As in the other manuscripts, some folios are blank (italics are used where they correspond to absent *rationes principales*): 310^r (partially) through 310^v, 324^r (partially) through 326^v, 363^r (partially, after end of text).

There is a table of questions on fol. 363^v–364^v.

As is evident from the note on the inside front cover, the manuscript was purchased and came to Leipzig in 1488.⁵⁵ Melchior Lodivicus of Freynstadt (Freistadt) was dean of the Arts Faculty in the winter semester of 1487/88.⁵⁶ This means that the manuscript was written before that time. The Arts Faculty or a member of that Faculty bought the manuscript. Probably, the reputation of Marsilius as Master of Arts induced the acquisition of his *Sentences* commentary.

The marginal notes show that the manuscript was used intensively, although not all questions equally. Especially the first part was studied. A table of questions is added to the manuscript. According to Ritter a separate table of questions to the first book has been preserved in Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. 1090, fol. 47.⁵⁷

The manuscript has a poor textual quality, with many misreadings and omissions. As indicated above, some of these also appear in manuscript W, without a direct relationship.

- f Strasbourg, Martinus Flach Junior 1501, fol. a1–b10, fol. 593, two columns per page, 2^o.

Incipit of the first book, fol. 1^{ra}: “Clarissimi viri domini Marsilii Inguen super libros Sententiarum edita in studio Heidelbergensi incipiunt feliciter ordine optimo quasi mathematicali certissimo. In nomine tuo, Jesu Christe, etc. Primis itaque duobus, videlicet divini nominis invocatione et brevi sacrae scientiae commendatione (. . .)”.
Explicit of the first book, fol. 200^{va}: “Aliae duae rationes arguunt pro dictis in septima conclusione. Hoc de quaestione. Et sic est

⁵⁵ ‘Comparatus’ here means ‘purchased’ and not ‘completed’ or ‘finished’.

⁵⁶ See *Die Matrikel der Universität Leipzig*, vol 2, ed. by G. Erler, Leipzig 1897, reprint Nendeln, Liechtenstein 1976, 299.

⁵⁷ Ritter, *Studien zur Spätscholastik*, 192.

finis primi. Benedictus Deus. Primum scriptum libri Sententiarum venerabilis Marsilii finit feliciter."

Incipit of the second book, fol. 201^{ra}: "Circa secundum librum Sententiarum disputando quaestionem praeiviam et continuando materiam de perfectionibus in primo principio meo tactam formo talem quaestionem (. . .)".

Explicit of the second book, fol. 347^{vb}: "Sed ad rationem pro quaesito dicatur quod Apostoli auctoritas Ad Romanos 13 velit primas duas conclusiones secundi articuli. Hoc de quaestione. Et sic per Dei gratiam est finis secundi. Finit secundum scriptum libri Sententiarum clarissimi Marsilii Inghen."

Incipit of the third book, fol. 349^{ra}: "Clarissimi viri domini Marsilii Inghen super tertio Sententiarum profundissima clarissimaque disputata in studio Heidelbergensi edita incipiunt feliciter, Jesu Christe, in nomine tuo. Circa tertium continuando materiam de perfectionibus semper in principiis tractatam sit prima quaestio talis: Utrum regnum increatum (. . .)".

Explicit of the third book, fol. 472^{vb}: "Ad omnes auctoritates post oppositum patet quod sint pro dictis singulae pro suo articulo. Hoc de quaestione. Finis tertii scripti."

Incipit of the fourth book, fol. 473^{ra}: "In nomine tuo, dulcis Jesu. Circa quartum librum continuando materiam cum dictis in quaestione initiali primo quaeritur: Utrum sicut sacramenta (. . .)".

Explicit of the fourth book, fol. 593^{vb}: "Ad auctoritatem Magistri post oppositum patet quod sit pro primis duabus conclusionibus. Hoc de quaestione."

On the titlepage (fol. a1^v): "Quaestiones Marsilii super quattuor libros Sententiarum. In Marsilium Tetrastichon. Quam superat Phaebus (. . .) Heidelbergensis lux et origo scolae. In Marsilium distichon. Inspice Marsilium quid scripserit (. . .) quod fructu non vacat iste liber." (fol. a1^v): "Ad lectorem. Marsilius de Inghen (. . .) Vale in Christo candide lector."

Epigrammata on the second page (fol. a2^{r-b}): "In laudem Marsilii poema (. . .). (. . .) Dicite, Marsilio pellitur error ingens."

Tabula alphabetica on fol. a3^{ra}-b8^{vb}. *Incipit* (fol. a3^{ra}): "Repertorium alphabeticum in quaestiones librorum quattuor Sententiarum Marsilii Inghen clarissimi doctoris incliti studii Heidelbergensis institutoris (. . .)". *Explicit* (b8^{vb}): "Finit repertorium alphabeticum in quaestiones librorum quattuor Sententiarum Marsilii Inghen doctoris clarissimi."

Tabula quaestionum on fol. b9^{ra}-b9^{rb}. *Incipit* (fol. b9^{ra}): "Tabula generalis omnium quaestionum in hoc opere contentorum. Quaestiones primi Sententiarum (. . .)". *Explicit* (b9^{rb}): "Finit tabula generalis totius operis."

Colophon on fol. 593^{vb}: "Divi Marsilii Inghen doctoris clarissimi in quattuor Sententiarum libros opus praeclarum summi Dei munere gratioſo ſic reductum in lucem finit feliciter. Ex officina Martini Flach iunioris civis Argentinensis 4 Kal. Septembris Anno Domini 1501. Laus Deo caeli Dominoque terrae.

Throughout the edition marginal notes indicating the structure of the text.

Literature: Panzer, VI, 26, 1; Hain/Copinger 3885; L. Polain, *Catalogue Général des Incunables des Bibliothèques Publiques de France*, vol. 11, Liechtenstein 1970, 7569a–d.

The edition was published in two volumes. The first volume contained the first and second book, the second volume the third and fourth. The numbering of the folia, however, was continuous. The *tabula alphabetica* and the *tabula quaestionum* were printed in the first volume preceding the text of the commentary. They covered the text of both volumes with references to the folia. This means that both volumes were printed before the compilation of the index and that the whole must have been released about the same time. In a number of libraries only the first volume has survived, which has no colophon or other indication of the printer's identity. This caused confusion as to the date and the origin of the volume. References in the literature to editions printed in Strasbourg in 1490 or in Hagenau in 1497 have their roots in this confusion.⁵⁸

The text of the edition differs at two points from the text of the manuscripts. Firstly, the Latin is more in accordance with the rules of classical Latin. Where the manuscripts have *indicativus praesentis* or *indicativus perfecti* in indirect speech or final clauses after *ut*, the printed edition has *coniunctivus praesentis* or *coniunctivus perfecti*. This may be due to emendations by a corrector. In 1501 Matthias Schürer was corrector at the workshop of Martinus Flach Junior. In 1508 he became a printer of classical and humanist writings. He may have adapted the medieval Latin of Marsilius to standards of classical Latin.⁵⁹

Secondly, in a number of smaller passages the printed edition has a version of the text which diverges from that which has survived

⁵⁸ For further details, see my 'Einige Notizen über die Handschriften und Drucke', 153–157.

⁵⁹ On Matthias Schürer, see J. Benzing, *Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts im deutschen Sprachgebiet*, 2nd edition, Wiesbaden 1982 (Beiträge zum Buch- und Bibliothekswesen, 12), 440. The editions printed by Schürer are listed in J. Müller, *Bibliographie Strassbourgeoise*, vol. 2, Baden-Baden 1985, 174–206.

in the manuscripts.⁶⁰ This raises the question of the origin of the manuscript or manuscripts used for the edition, which preserved a different redaction of the text. Possibly, Marsilius's autograph was used. The University of Heidelberg lent the manuscript to Florentius Diel de Spyra and a certain Hermannus in 1489. These two masters had expressed their wish to have the text copied and printed with a printer in Mainz (*impressor in Maguntia*).⁶¹ They were unsuccessful, however. The commentary of Marsilius was never printed in Mainz.⁶² Perhaps the manuscript or a copy went to Strasbourg and eventually was printed by Martinus Flach Junior. But there is no positive evidence of this. The autograph is now lost. It is not in the list of the *Codices Palatini Latini* which was compiled in the late seventeenth century and which mentioned the books that went to Rome in 1623.

A number of poems printed in the edition of the *Sentences* commentary had appeared earlier in *Ad illustrissimum Bavariae Ducem Philippum Comitem Rheni Palatinum et ad nobilissimos filios epistola*, a defense of nominalism issued by masters of the University of Heidelberg, which was printed by Peter of Friedberg in Mainz in 1499.⁶³

6. *The tabulae quaestionum and the summaries preserved in the manuscripts*

The different *tabulae quaestionum*, the summaries, and the marginal notes which have been preserved in the manuscripts reveal how the

⁶⁰ See above p. 475f.

⁶¹ Heidelberg, Universitätsarchiv, *Annales Universitatis*, III, fol. 300: "Ultima mensis septembris in sacristia ecclesiae Sancti Spiritus concessit universitas ex inferiori liberaria ad Maguntiam honorabilibus magistris Florentio Diel de Spyra et Hermanno quaestiones magistri Marsilii de Ingheym super quattuor libros Sententiarum manu ipsius conscriptas ad rescribendum et imprimendum, sic tamen quod libri maneant integri et infra anni spatium sine macula et absque ullo damno remittantur. (...) Addixerunt dicti magistri sponte quod vellent loqui impressori in Maguntia quod universitati postquam imprimaverit daret unum librum pro remuneratione." The University Library has a copy of the *Sentences* commentary (Sign. Q 1601) printed by Flach in 1501. But this copy came to Heidelberg later. It is not the copy mentioned in the *Annales Universitatis*.

⁶² See my 'Einige Notizen über die Handschriften und Drucke', 143–144.

⁶³ Compare I. Hubay, *Incunabula der Staats- und Stadtbibliothek Augsburg*, Wiesbaden 1974, 314, n. 1367.

text of Marsilius was read and which parts were given attention to. Two examples may illustrate this here.

Manuscript K contains a *tabula quaestionum* compiled by John of Dabrovka. His indexing of the first question is not complete. He mentions the different articles, but omits five out of six parts of the second article, which is very extensive, and only gives the *dubia* of the sixth article, again omitting the fourth *dubium*. The indexing of the second article, however, is complete. Interestingly, the wording shows that he used the *divisio quaestionis* which Marsilius gave at the outset of the question. The addition to the second article “(. . .) *et quomodo distinguitur ab habitibus assensivis aliorum studiorum*” is quoted *verbatim*, not from the second article itself, but from the *divisio quaestionis* given by Marsilius: “Secundo, ut removeatur ignorantia negationis, videbitur, quid sit theologia *et quomodo distinguitur ab habitibus assensivis aliorum studiorum*”.⁶⁴ A transcription of the first part of the *tabula* is given below.

Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellonska, Cod. 1581, fol. 1^r (*tabula quaestionum*):

Utrum ex diversitate idearum existentium in regno increato sumatur diversitas perfectionum productorum entium in regno creato.	[qu. 1]
De ideis.	[art. 1]
Utrum res dependentes differant inter se et sua essentiali perfectione.	[art. 2]
Utrum materia sit perfectioris entitatis quam formae qualitativae.	[a. 2, p. 6, du. 1]
Utrum in composito forma sit perfectior materia, cum materia sit perpetua et forma in multis sit corruptibilis.	[a. 2, p. 6, du. 2]
Utrum compositum sit perfectius sua materia et forma.	[a. 2, p. 6, du. 3]
Utrum ex diversitate idearum existentium in Deo sumenda sit diversitas perfectionum rerum dependentium.	[art. 3]
Utrum theologia sit scientia una de Deo tamquam de subiecto proprio.	[qu. 2]

⁶⁴ See Marsilius, *Quaestiones*, ed. Santos, qu. 2, 64 (*divisio quaestionis*). The beginning of the second article has a different phrasing, *Quaestiones*, ed. Santos, 71: “Quantum ad secundum articulum, videndo quid sit theologia, sciendum est quod notitia assensiva capitur dupliciter (. . .).”

Quis modus generationis notitiarum in nobis et divisio communis notitiae.	[art. 1]
Quid sit theologia et quomodo distinguatur ab habitibus assensivis aliorum studiorum.	[art. 2]
Utrum theologia sit scientia.	[art. 3]
Utrum theologia sit una scientia.	[art. 4]
Utrum Deus sit subiectum in theologia.	[art. 5]
(. . .)	

The same phenomenon of using the *divisio textus* for compiling the summary can be seen in the abstract of the first question which has been preserved in manuscript W. In the summary of the second article, the second ‘secundo’ is superfluous: “Articulus secundus est de secundo supposito, quia supponit [sc. quaestio] *secundo rebus dependentibus varias perfectiones inesse*.” The addition of the second ‘secundo’ becomes clear, however, if the text is compared with the *divisio textus* Marsilius had given at the beginning of the first question: “(. . .) Primo enim supponit diversas ideas in Deo esse. *Secundo rebus dependentibus varias perfectiones inesse*.”⁶⁵ The compiler of the summary took the text from there, without dropping the ‘secundo’.

The summary in manuscript W shows that the compiler was selective and had a specific interest. Of the many points which Marsilius discussed in dealing with the position of Ockham, he only quoted the view that according to the latter, there are two different ways of calling something eternal: “Item, aliquid dicitur aeternum dupliciter secundum Ockham”. The complete text of the summary is given below:

Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Cod. Theol. 2° 113, fol. 244^{vb}:

1. Utrum ex diversitate idearum existentium in regno increato sumatur diversitas perfectionum productorum entium in regno creato. Per regnum creatum intelliguntur creaturae. Per increatum Deus. Tres sunt articuli.

Primus est de primo supposito, scilicet de diversis ideis in Deo.
Quid sit idea, de modis loquendi idearum Platonis, Augustini et Ockham.
Item, aliquid dicitur aeternum dupliciter secundum Ockham.
Item, Plato tria attribuit Deo.
Item, prima pars Evangelii Iohannis primo est reperta in libris Platonis.

⁶⁵ See Marsilius, *Quaestiones*, ed. Santos, qu. 1, 1.

Item, duodecim conditiones quae attribuuntur ideis.

Item, inter conditiones illa est prima: Nullae ideae sunt in Deo distinctae intrinsece et realiter. Secunda: In Deo sunt infinitae ideae extrinsece et obiectivaliter.

Articulus secundus est de secundo supposito, quia supponit [sc. quaestio] secundo rebus dependentibus varias perfectiones inesse.

Praemittuntur primo suppositiones.

Secundo, quae sunt rerum perfectiones. Quid in re. Quod duplex sit perfectio. Et est quaedam accidentalis, quaedam essentialis. ~~Due~~ Ponuntur conclusiones et bona correlaria.

Tertio, quod perfectiones sunt inaequales.

Quarto, diversae considerationes de perfectione. Correlarium: Angelus est essentialiter perfectior homine. Requiris varias conclusiones. Et est septima: Sol, stellae, etiam seclusa intelligentia, quodlibet istorum quolibet animali irrationali est perfectius. Et ponitur probabiliter probaturque multipliciter.

Quinto penes quid attendendae sunt perfectiones.

Sexto de perfectionibus variis comparationes.

Dubitatio prima: An materia prima sit perfectioris entitatis quam formae qualitativae. Dicitur inter cetera quod animae beatorum habent tendentiam ad sua corpora, ideo magis formae accidentales.

Secunda dubitatio: An in composito forma sit perfectior materia. Et dicitur quod sic.

Tertia dubitatio: An compositum sit perfectius sua forma et materia. Et dicitur quod non saltem copulativum.

Quarta dubitatio: Quanto essentialiter compositum est perfectius sua forma. Et dicitur quod precise in tanto quanta est perfectio suae materiae.

Articulus tertius est de quaesito, scilicet utrum ex diversitate idearum existentium in Deo sumenda sit diversitas perfectionum rerum dependentium. De hoc multae ponuntur conclusiones. Videas ad rationes ante oppositum.

7. *Method and style*

Sentences commentaries of the fourteenth century vary in organization, in length, and in their division of Lombard's text. Some follow Lombard very closely and comment upon every distinction. Others make a selection or rearrange the topics, as is the case in a number of English commentaries (Wodeham, Robert Holcot).⁶⁶ The commentary

⁶⁶ Adam Wodeham does not discuss all the distinctions, but makes a selection. See the listing of the questions of his different commentaries on the *Sentences* in

of Marsilius is of the first type and is thus in line with the traditional form employed by Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century and by Durand of St Pourçain and Thomas of Strasbourg in the fourteenth century, to mention only a few examples.

Yet, there is no complete one-to-one correspondence between Lombard and Marsilius. The commentary of Marsilius is not divided into distinctions, which were introduced in the text of Lombard in the early thirteenth century, but into questions.⁶⁷ Generally, these questions deal each with a separate distinction. But there are a number of exceptions. Occasionally, distinctions are put together and discussed in one question. Sometimes, however, it is just the other way around and several questions are devoted to one distinction. This clustering of distinctions is not an isolated phenomenon. In the commentaries of Thomas of Strasbourg, Gregory of Rimini, and Hugolino of Orvieto the same procedure can be observed.⁶⁸

In the first book, all distinctions of Lombard are discussed by Marsilius. This can easily be determined, since Marsilius mentions the distinctions with which his questions are concerned. In the following three books, however, things are different. Distinctions are skipped or grouped together, especially in the fourth book devoted to the sacraments. The emphasis is clearly on the first book, which also is the most extensive. Marsilius carries forth the tradition of many commentaries of the first half of the fourteenth century, which reveal an equal preference for the first book. The shift towards the fourth book with its emphasis on matters of practical theology, as it has been observed for the fifteenth century, is not yet manifest in

W. J. Courtenay, *Adam Wodeham. An Introduction to his Life and Writings*, Leiden 1978 (Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, 21), 183–214 (Appendices 1–3). Robert Holcot selects as well. He also transposes problems that are traditionally dealt with in the first book to the second. This is the case with the question of divine foreknowledge, which is no longer discussed among the divine attributes (first book), but as part of the problem of creation (second book).

⁶⁷ As to the origin of the distinctions, which were not used by Lombard, see I. Brady, 'The Distinctions of Lombard's Book of Sentences and Alexander of Hales', *Franciscan Studies*, 25 (1965), 90–116, and the Prolegomena to Peter Lombard, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, vol. 1/1, Rome 1971 (Spicilegium Bonaventurianum, 4), 143*–144*.

⁶⁸ An interesting example of the clustering of distinctions is provided by the twelfth question of the second book. There Marsilius gives as the reason for his putting together the distinctions their thematic unity. See *Quaestiones*, ed. 1501, fol. 251^{vb}: "Inde quaeritur duodecimo circa distinctionem decimam septimam secundi libri et tres sequentes, quae sunt de statu naturae integrae."

the commentary of Marsilius. He omits the discussion of matrimony and holy orders, which are usually dealt with in the fourth book.

The following table shows which of Lombard's distinctions (d.) are dealt with in Marsilius's questions (q.). It provides insight into the theological concerns of Marsilius. In the seventh question of the third book, there is also the interesting phenomenon that two distinctions are discussed in one question in such a way that distinction seven is treated as the *suppositum* of question seven and distinction eight as *quaesitum* of the same question.

First book

q. 1 = principium	q. 13 = d. 9	q. 25 = d. 22	q. 37 = d. 34
q. 2 = prologus	q. 14 = d. 10	q. 26 = d. 23	q. 38 = d. 35-36
q. 3 = prologus	q. 15 = d. 11-12	q. 27 = d. 24	q. 39 = d. 37
q. 4 = d. 1	q. 16 = d. 13	q. 28 = d. 25	q. 40 = d. 38-39
q. 5 = d. 2-3	q. 17 = d. 14	q. 29 = d. 26	q. 41 = d. 40-41
q. 6 = d. 2-3	q. 18 = d. 15	q. 30 = d. 27-28	q. 42 = d. 42-43
q. 7 = d. 2-3	q. 19 = d. 16	q. 31 = d. 29	q. 43 = d. 44
q. 8 = d. 4	q. 20 = d. 17	q. 32 = d. 30	q. 44 = d. 45
q. 9 = d. 5	q. 21 = d. 18	q. 33 = d. 31	q. 45 = d. 46
q. 10 = d. 6	q. 22 = d. 19	q. 34 = d. 32	q. 46 = d. 47
q. 11 = d. 7	q. 23 = d. 19-20	q. 35 = d. 32	q. 47 = d. 48
q. 12 = d. 8	q. 24 = d. 21	q. 36 = d. 33	

Second book

q. 1 = principium	q. 7 = d. 9-11	q. 13 = d. 17-20	q. 19 = d. 30-33
q. 2 = d. 2	q. 8 = d. 12	q. 14 = d. 21	q. 20 = d. 34 (?)
q. 3 = d. 3-4	q. 9 = d. 13	q. 15 = d. 22	q. 21 = d. 35-37
q. 4 = d. 5-6	q. 10 = d. 14	q. 16 = d. 24-25	q. 22 = d. 38
q. 5 = d. 7	q. 11 = d. 15-16	q. 17 = d. 26-27	q. 23 = d. 43-44
q. 6 = d. 8	q. 12 = d. 17-20	q. 18 = d. 28-29	q. 24 = d. 44

Third book

q. 1 = principium	q. 5 = d. 4	q. 9 = d. 11-12	q. 13 = d. 21-22
q. 2 = d. 1-2	q. 6 = d. 5-7	q. 10 = d. 13-14	q. 14 = d. 23-25
q. 3 = d. 1-2	q. 7 = d. 7-8	q. 11 = d. 15-17	q. 15 = d. 26-34
q. 4 = d. 3	q. 8 = d. 9-10	q. 12 = d. 18-20	

Fourth book

q. 1 = ?	q. 5 = d. 7	q. 9 = d. 12-13	q. 13 = d. 43-44
q. 2 = d. 1-2	q. 6 = d. 8-9	q. 10 = d. 14	
q. 3 = d. 3-4	q. 7 = d. 10	q. 11 = d. 15-16	
q. 4 = d. 5-6	q. 8 = d. 11	q. 12 = d. 14-16	

Marsilius considers his text as a close commentary on Lombard. This is clear from his mentioning the relevant distinctions of Lombard at

the beginning of each question and his occasional use of phrases such as 'accedendo ad litteram', to indicate that he returns to the text of Lombard.⁶⁹ As is customary in commentaries that consist of questions, there is no summary or paraphrasing nor any division (*divisio textus*) of Lombard. Only seldom is the content of the distinctions referred to briefly.⁷⁰

The many questions of the commentary are structured uniformly. The original question is divided into at least two subquestions, one of which investigates the presuppositions of the original question (the *suppositum*), while the other is concerned with the subject itself (the *quaesitum*). The *rationes principales* and the *articuli* are distinguished according to the subquestions. A first set of *rationes principales* gives arguments for and against the *suppositum*, whereas a second set brings arguments for and against the *quaesitum*. One or more *articuli* discuss the *suppositum*, others discuss the *quaesitum*. Sometimes a separate article with *dubia* is added. The question ends by responding to the *rationes principales*.⁷¹

The articles are designed according to the distinction between *suppositiones*, *notabilia*, and *conclusiones*. The *suppositiones* and *notabilia* precede the *conclusiones* and are intended to support the *conclusiones* and to add materials for their proof. The *conclusiones* are no inferences or deductions, but statements which present the basic ideas and steps of the argument. They are also called *propositiones*. The central statement is called *conclusio responsalis* or *propositio responsalis*. It provides the answer to the question posed in the *suppositum* or *quaesitum*. Frequently, the *conclusiones* are followed by a set of *corollaria*, which develop the ideas put forward in the *conclusiones*.⁷²

⁶⁹ See, e.g., *Quaestiones*, ed. 1501, Lib. 3, q. 4, fol. 372^{vb}: "Quarto tractatis dubiis circa unionem quaeritur, accedendo ad litteram, circa distinctionem tertiam utrum (. . .)."

⁷⁰ See the reference in note 68 above and *Quaestiones*, ed. Santos, 205: "Circa distinctiones secundam et tertiam, in quibus declarat Magister unitatem essentiae et trinitatem personarum, quaeritur quinto loco, utrum sit tantum unus Deus."

⁷¹ In the modern edition (ed. Santos) the division of the questions is highlighted by the use of titles.

⁷² Constructing the argument by the use of *suppositiones*, *notabilia*, *conclusiones*, and *corollaria* is typical for commentaries since the second quarter of the fourteenth century, not only in theology (Gregory of Rimini, Hugolino of Orvieto, John of Ripa, Peter of Ailly), but also in natural philosophy and metaphysics (John Buridan, Marsilius of Inghen). Compare the oath of the *sententiaris* in Heidelberg (Winkelmann, *Urkundenbuch der Universität Heidelberg*, 21): "Ego N. iuro (. . .) legere sententias (. . .) et textum totaliter per conclusiones legendo et exponendo."

The use of *suppositiones*, *notabilia*, *conclusiones*, and *corollaria* conveys the impression of a commentary, which in its rigor is comparable to a mathematical treatise. For this reason the editor of the printed edition of 1501 added that the commentary was designed according to an “ordo optimus quasi mathematicalis certissimus”.⁷³

8. Sources and authors discussed

Marsilius possessed a large library of over 230 volumes, some of which contained several items.⁷⁴ He bequeathed this collection to the University of Heidelberg, as Conrad of Worms and Conrad Gelnhausen had done before him.⁷⁵ In 1396, the titles of the books were listed in the first volume of the *matricula*, in which the property of the University was specified. This practice was started during the rectorship of Berthold of Dieburg (1395/96). The *matricula* have survived together with the property catalogue. A contemporary copy of this catalogue has come down to us in the *Acta Universitatis*.⁷⁶ This catalogue provides insights into the composition of Marsilius's library. Unfortunately, most of its books cannot be traced and are perhaps lost. In 1623, they moved to Rome as part of the Bibliotheca Palatina. Only 29 volumes of the Vatican Library have been recognized as belonging to the original collection of Marsilius of Inghen.⁷⁷

The 1396 catalogue shows the diversity of the books collected by Marsilius. All fields of late medieval intellectual culture are represented.⁷⁸ The rubrics of the catalogue distinguish between *theologia* (with a great number of commentaries on the *Sentences*), *ius*, *medicina*,

⁷³ *Quaestiones*, ed. 1501, Lib. 1, fol. 1^{ra}.

⁷⁴ See, e.g., *Die Rektorbücher*, 476: “Item (391) plures libros beati Bernhardi in eodem volumine” and *ibid.*, 477: “Item (407) multi tractatus et sermones beati Bernhardi, Amselmi (!), Richardi et aliorum in uno volumine.”

⁷⁵ On the library of Marsilius, see D. Walz, ‘Marsilius von Inghen als Schreiber und Büchersammler’, *Marsilius von Inghen. Werk und Wirkung. Akten des zweiten internationalen Marsilius-von-Inghen-Kongresses*, ed. by S. Wielgus, Lublin 1993, 31–70, esp. 32.

⁷⁶ See *Die Rektorbücher*, 466f.

⁷⁷ Walz, ‘Marsilius von Inghen’, 50–59.

⁷⁸ See Töpke, *Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg*, vol. 1, 678–685. Another example of a medieval scholarly library covering all fields of medieval learning is studied in M. J. F. M. Hoenen, *Speculum philosophiae mediæ ævi. Die Handschriftensammlung des Dominikaners Georg Schwartz († nach 1484)*, Amsterdam 1994 (Bochumer Studien zur Philosophie, 22), esp. 135–138.

metaphysica, moralia, philosophia naturalis, mathematica, logica, and *grammatica*. Also, the doctrinal scope of the collection is large. It contains writings of Plato, Cicero, Ovid, Seneca, Augustine, Bernard of Clairvaux, Richard of St Victor, Alan of Lille, Bonaventure, Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Henry of Ghent, John of Jandun, John Buridan, Adam Wodeham, Robert Holcot, Gregory of Rimini, Thomas of Strasbourg, and John of Ripa.

The diversity of the collection is mirrored in the commentary on the *Sentences*, where Marsilius quotes a great variety of sources. In addition to thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century thinkers such as Bonaventure, Thomas Aquinas, Henry of Ghent, Duns Scotus, Giles of Rome, Peter Auriol, Durand of St Pourçain, and William of Ockham, he also refers to theologians of later date such as Bradwardine, Thomas of Strasbourg, Adam Wodeham, Gregory of Rimini, Hugolino of Orvieto, and John of Ripa.

Remarkably, no theologians writing after 1370 are quoted by name, with the exception of Heilmannus Wunnenberger and Johannes Holszadel, who are mentioned as *socii* at the beginning of the first book. Even Conrad of Soltau, with whose work Marsilius was surely familiar, is not mentioned anywhere. The same pattern is found in the works of other theologians, especially at the beginning of the fifteenth century. In the commentary on the *Sentences* of John Capreolus (written 1409–1432), for instance, practically no theologians of the second half of the fourteenth century are mentioned, with the exception of John of Ripa. The same holds true of the commentary by John Bremer (1429), who mostly quoted Bonaventure and Scotus, and sometimes also later theologians such as Peter of Candia.⁷⁹

Although there are many places in which Marsilius mentions his sources, he also quotes them without attribution. In this case only a comparison of the texts involved can show which passages from the works of others he adopted. In particular he used the commentaries on the *Sentences* by Durand of St Pourçain, Thomas of Strasbourg, Adam Wodeham, and Gregory of Rimini without attribution. That he had the works of others at his desk while composing his writings has already been established by earlier research, not

⁷⁹ See John Capreolus, *Defensiones theologiae divi Thomae Aquinatis*, vol. 1–7, ed. C. Paban and Th. Phègues, Tours 1900–1908, and L. Meier, 'Der Sentenzenkommentar des Johannes Bremer', *Franziskanische Studien*, 15 (1928), 161–169, esp. 167 (with a list of authors cited by John Bremer).

only regarding his commentary on the *Sentences*, but also with respect to his commentaries on Aristotle, in which he follows Buridan closely and takes over many of his questions and *conclusiones*.⁸⁰

A study of which sources are used provides insight into the process of textual composition. In the following tables a number of cases in which Marsilius silently borrowed from the works of others has been put together. These tables show that he used these works in all parts of his questions: the *rationes principales*, the *notabilia*, the *conclusiones*, and the objections or *dubia*. Also they give an impression of the wide range of sources employed. In the cases collected here Marsilius adopted passages from Robert Holcot, Durand of St Pourçain, Adam Wodeham, and Thomas of Strasbourg.

8.1. *Rationes principales*

That Marsilius used the writings of others as a source for the *rationes principales* is not exceptional. Yet it raises the question of the nature of these *rationes*. Since they are taken over almost *verbatim*, it may seem that they go back to the written version only and were not put forward during the oral lectures on the *Sentences*. But this is difficult to determine. Disputations have survived in which the respondent and opponent made out their cases with arguments verbally extracted from the *Summa theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas.⁸¹ Arguments which are borrowed from the works of others may therefore have been put forward orally. They may have been collected in advance and afterwards used as part of the disputation.

The *rationes* quoted below relate to the discussion as to whether or not the unity of the divine essence is consistent with the trinity of the divine persons. In Marsilius, the one argument immediately follows the other. In Holcot, however, they are dispersed and serve as the fourteenth and third argument for the view that the three divine persons do not differ but are one with the divine essence without any distinction.

⁸⁰ See W. Möhler, *Die Trinitätslehre des Marsilius von Inghen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie des Spätmittelalters*, Limburg/Lahn 1949, and M. J. F. M. Hoenen, *Marsilius of Inghen. Divine Knowledge in Late Medieval Thought*, Leiden 1993 (Studies in the History of Christian Thought, 50).

⁸¹ For an interesting example, see my *Speculum philosophiae medii aevi*, 114–130.

Robert Holcot,
*In quatuor libros Sententiarum
 quaestiones*, Lyon 1518, Reprint
 Frankfurt am Main 1967, Lib. 1,
 q. 5, fol. fl^{rb}, e8^{va}:

Praeterea, haec est vera: trinitas
 est unus Deus. Ergo trinitas est
 unitas. Sed non est Pater, neque
 Filius, neque Spiritus Sanctus. Ergo
 est quarta res in divinis.

Praeterea, Deus et trinitas sunt
 omni modo idem quo simpliciter
 est melius esse idem quam non
 idem. Sed esse idem essentialiter
 et personaliter est simpliciter melius
 quam non esse sic idem. Igitur
 Deus et trinitas sunt idem essen-
 tialiter. Maior patet per Anselmum
 Proslogion 15: Tu es itaque ius-
 tus, verax et beatus et quidquid
 est melius esse quam non esse.
 Minor patet etiam, quia quicquid
 convenit Patri est melius simpliciter
 ipsum quam non ipsum, igitur etc.

Marsilius of Inghen,
*Quaestiones super quattuor libros
 Sententiarum*, Lib. 1, qu. 6,
 ed. Santos, 226:

Secundo sic: Si concedit catholi-
 cus in Deo trinitatem, tunc habet
 hanc concedere: *trinitas est unus Deus*.
 Consequentia nota est. Et ultra:
*ergo trinitas est unitas. Sed trinitas non
 est Pater, nec Filius, nec etiam Spiritus
 Sanctus; ergo est quarta res; ergo in
 Deo erit quaternarius. Quod non
 est concedendum.*

Tertio sic arguitur: *Deus* est illud
 quod *melius est esse quam non esse;*
sed esse idem personaliter et realiter est
melius quam tantummodo esse idem
essentialiter, igitur etc. Maior patet
 Proslogion capitulo 5: *Tu es itaque*
iustus, verax et bonus et quidquid est
melius esse quam non esse. Minor pro-
batur, quia quidquid convenit Patri est
melius ipsum quam non ipsum; modo
Pater est idem essentialiter et per-
sonaliter.

8.2. Notabilia

The *notabilia* are the tool for solving the questions posed. Because of their instrumental character it is obvious that they may have their origin in methodological distinctions which had proved to be useful in the writings of others and thus had become part of the common knowledge of how to deal with certain traditional questions. In the following example three forms of theology are distinguished. Marsilius borrows these distinctions from Durandus and adds a fourth one (not quoted here) of his own.

Durandus of St Pourçain,
In Sententias commentariorum libri III,
 Venice 1571, Reprint
 Ridgewood, New Jersey 1964,
 Lib 1, prol., qu. 1, fol. 2^{va}:

Quantum ad primum notandum est, quod theologia videtur posse accipi tripliciter:

Uno modo pro habitu, quo solum vel principaliter assentimus his, quae in Sacra Scriptura traduntur, et prout in ea traduntur. (. . .)

Secundo accipitur theologia pro habitu, quo fides et ea quae in Sacra Scriptura traduntur, defenduntur et declarantur, ex quibusdam principiis nobis notioribus. Et sic accipit eam Augustinus (. . .).

Tertio accipitur theologia communis (nescio si verius) pro habitu eorum, quae deducuntur ex articulis fidei, et ex dictis Sacrae Scripturae, sicut conclusiones ex principiis (. . .).

Marsilius of Inghen,
Quaestiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum, Lib. 1, qu. 2, ed. Santos, 72–73:

Tertio est notandum, quod theologia potest capi tripliciter vel quadrupliciter:

Uno modo pro habitu vel actu vel utrisque simul, *quo vel* quibus assentimus his, *quae in Sacra Scriptura traduntur, prout in ea traduntur.* (. . .)

Secundo modo theologia dicitur *habitus, quo* per huiusmodi revelata nota et credita *fides et ea, quae in Scriptura Sacra traduntur, defenduntur* contra haereticos et *declarantur* apud simpliciores indigentes, quo modo capit eam beatus Augustinus (. . .).

Tertio modo theologia dicitur *habitus* alicuius conclusionis vel propositionis *deductae ex articulis fidei* sive *ex dictis Sacrae Scripturae*, vel pro omnibus habitibus in mente alicuius existentibus hoc modo acquisitis, sicut *habitus conclusionum* in geometria deductarum dicuntur *scientia geometriae.* (. . .)

8.3. *Conclusiones*

The *conclusiones* are the heart of the late medieval question. Here the author lays down the solution to the problem, mostly in several steps. Since they are so important, it may seem unusual that they have been taken over from the works of others. But this would be a wrong impression. At several other occasions in his commentary Marsilius borrows them from others as well.⁸² The same goes for his commentaries on Aristotle, where many *conclusiones* are taken almost *verbatim* from the works of Buridan. This means that the *conclusiones* in the writings of Marsilius are not to be considered as strictly individual

⁸² For example in his discussion of the divine attributes; see my *Marsilius of Inghen*, 56–61.

expressions of the author's opinions. The emphasis is not on the author, but on the content or *sententia* of the conclusions. They give expression to the opinions to which the author adheres, also when they are not originally his own.

In the example given here, the *conclusiones* concern the discussion of the divine trinity and are taken from the same question as the *rationes principales* quoted above.⁸³

Adam Wodeham,
Ordinatio, Abbreviatio Henrici de Oyta,
Paris 1512, Lib. 1, d. 33, q. 1,
fol. 73^{va}–74^{ra}

Dico primo quod divina essentia non distinguitur realiter a persona, ita quod essentia non sit persona vel non sit res quae est persona vel econtra. (. . .)

Secunda conclusio essentia divina non realiter distinguitur a proprietate personali sive ista sit relatio sive aliquid aliud. (. . .)

Tertia conclusio quod essentia et proprietas non sunt in eadem persona distinctae formalitates eiusdem rei, ita scilicet quod fiat una res, non tamen eadem formalitas, sed multae formalitates ex parte rei vel perfectiones et formales rationes distinctae, vel modi reales eiusdem rei a parte rei distincti vel distinctae quidditates vel quovis alio nomine appellantur. (. . .)

Concedo igitur absque haesitatione aliqua quod essentia et proprietas personalis Patris non plus sunt formalitates inter se distinctae quam distinctae res. Cum igitur non sit concedendum quod proprietas personalis sit res distincta ab essentia divina, igitur nec est formalitas ab ea distincta.

Marsilius of Inghen,
Quaestiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum, Lib. 1, qu. 6,
ed. Santos, 237–241:

Hoc praemisso sit prima conclusio talis, *quod essentia divina non distinguitur realiter a persona*, sic scilicet *quod non sit persona seu quod non sit res quae est persona*. (. . .)

Secunda conclusio: Essentia divina non distinguitur realiter a proprietate personali, sive ista proprietas sit relatio vel aliqua alia res. (. . .)

Tertia conclusio, quod essentia divina et proprietas personalis nullo modo sunt distinctae res in persona, cuius ipsa est proprietas, sive illae res distinctae vocentur *distinctae formalitates*, sive *distinctae perfectiones*, vel *distincti modi reales eiusdem rei*, sive *formales rationes distinctae*, vel *distinctae quidditates vel quolibet alio modo*, quo placet huiusmodi distincta quomodolibet appellare. (. . .)

Corollarium: *Quod essentia et proprietas personalis Patris non plus sunt formalitates inter se distinctae quam distinctae res*. (. . .)

Secundum: *Quod cum proprietas personalis non sit distincta res ab essentia divina*, etiam *non formalitas ab ea distincta*. (. . .)

⁸³ Marsilius seems to have used the Oyta *Abbreviatio*, not Wodeham's *Ordinatio* itself, which has a slightly different text here. Compare Adam Wodeham, *Ordinatio*, Paris, Bibl. Mazarine, Cod. 915, fol. 101^{vb}–102^{ra}.

8.4. Dubia

The final example concerns a *dubium* which has been inserted in the text. It deals with the divine causality of evil and has been taken from Thomas of Strasbourg, an author whose commentary on the *Sentences* is often employed by Marsilius, although he does not always follow his views.⁸⁴ The use of a source for formulating a *dubium* is not unusual. Sometimes Marsilius takes them from Lombard's *Sentences*. This should make the modern reader aware of the fact that the problems put forward in the *dubia* do not always express contemporary debates, but may have been standardized.

Thomas of Strasbourg,
Commentaria in IIII libros Sententiarum,
Venice 1564, Reprint
Ridgewood, New Jersey 1965,
Lib. 1, dist. 2, qu. 1, fol. 28^{ra}:

Et ex dictis eorum (sc. haereticorum) multipliciter potest argui. Primo sic: Tale per participationem praesupponit tale per essentiam. Sed est dare bonum et malum per participationem. Ergo est dare bonum et malum per essentiam. Sed quod est tale per essentiam, hoc ipsi dicunt Deum. Ergo etc.

Praeterea, ubicumque est dare causam secundam, ibi est dare causam primam, quia secundum non dicitur, nisi in ordine ad primum. Sed est dare secundam causam moventem ad malum. Ergo et primam. Et hoc erit Deus malorum.

Marsilius of Inghen,
Quaestiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum, Lib. 1, qu. 5,
ed. Santos, 218:

Si dicatur: Est dare malum *per participationem*; ergo est dare malum *per essentiam*, quia videtur quod omne *per participationem* dictum reducatur ad aliquid *quod per essentiam est tale*.

Item, in malis est dare causam secundam moventem ad malum. Quare ergo non primam? Quia omne secundum dicitur per respectum ad primum; modo primum in malis videtur esse primum principium malorum.

⁸⁴ Compare the *dubium* edited in M. J. F. M. Hoenen, 'The eternity of the world according to Marsilius of Inghen. Study with an edition of the *dubium* in II *Sent.* q. 1 a. 2', *Marsilius of Inghen. Acts of the international Marsilius of Inghen Symposium*, ed. by H. A. G. Braakhuis and M. J. F. M. Hoenen, Nijmegen 1992 (Artistarium Supplementa, 7), 117–142, esp. 137. The *Sentences* commentary of Thomas was very influential and was used as a textbook at some universities. Conrad of Soltau followed it very closely in his own commentary on the *Sentences*. On Thomas of Strasbourg and his influence see A. Zumkeller, 'Die Augustinerschule des Mittelalters. Vertreter und philosophisch-theologische Lehre', *Analecta Augustiniana*, 27 (1964), 167–262, esp. 212–214.

Bibliography

Editions of the Commentary on the Sentences of Marsilius of Inghen

- Quaestiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum*, ed. by M. Flach, Strasbourg 1501, Reprint Frankfurt am Main 1966.
- , ed. by G. Wieland, M. Santos Noya, M. J. F. M. Hoenen, M. Schulze, vol. 1: *Super primum, Quaestiones 1–7*, ed. by M. Santos Noya, Leiden 2000 (Studies in the History of Christian Thought, 87).
- , ed. by G. Wieland, M. Santos Noya, M. J. F. M. Hoenen, M. Schulze, vol. 2: *Super primum, Quaestiones 8–21*, ed. by M. Santos Noya, Leiden 2000 (Studies in the History of Christian Thought, 88).

Reference works

- Benzing, J., *Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts im deutschen Sprachgebiet*, 2nd edition, Wiesbaden 1982 (Beiträge zum Buch- und Bibliothekswesen, 12).
- Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, 4 vols, ed. by H. Denifle and E. Chatelain, Paris 1998–1897, repr. Brussels 1964.
- Die Rektorbücher der Universität Heidelberg, Band 1: 1386–1410, Heft 1 and 2*, ed. by J. Miethke, Heidelberg 1986 and 1990 (Die Amtsbücher der Universität Heidelberg, A).
- Golaszewska, M., J. B. Korolec, A. Poltawaski, Z. K. Siemiatkowska, I. Tarnowska, Z. Włodek, 'Commentaires sur les Sentences. Supplément au Répertoire de F. Stegmüller', *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, 2 (1958), 22–27.
- Hoenen, M. J. F. M., 'Marsilius von Inghen Bibliographie. Appendix zu der geplanten Edition der wichtigsten Werke des Marsilius von Inghen († 1396)', *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale*, 31 (1989), 150–167.
- , 'Marsilius von Inghen Bibliographie II. Ergänzungen', *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale*, 32 (1990), 191–195.
- Markowski, M., 'Katalog dzieł Marsyliusza z Inghen z ewidencja rękopisów', *Studia Mediewistyczne*, 25 (1988), 39–132.
- Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, vol. 1 and 2, ed. by P. Lehmann, München 1918 and 1928.
- Muller, J., *Bibliographie Strasbourgeoise*, vol. 2, Baden-Baden 1985.
- Müller, K. O., *Die Handschriften der Bibliothek der Nikolauskirche in Isny* (typescript 1936).
- Stegmüller, F., *Repertorium Commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, 2 vols, Würzburg 1947.
- Töpke, G., *Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg von 1386 bis 1662*, 3 vols, Heidelberg 1884–1893.
- Winkelman, E., *Urkundenbuch der Universität Heidelberg*, 2 vols., Heidelberg 1886.

Secondary literature

- Bos, E. P., 'Marsilius of Inghen on Theology as Science', *Marsilius of Inghen. Acts of the international Marsilius of Inghen Symposium*, ed. by H. A. G. Braakhuis and M. J. F. M. Hoenen, Nijmegen 1992 (Artistarum Supplementa, 7), 81–96.
- Braakhuis, H. A. G., and M. J. F. M. Hoenen, 'Marsilius of Inghen: A Dutch Philosopher and Theologian', *Marsilius of Inghen. Acts of the international Marsilius of Inghen Symposium*, ed. by H. A. G. Braakhuis and M. J. F. M. Hoenen, Nijmegen 1992 (Artistarum Supplementa, 7), 1–11.
- Brady, I., 'The Distinctions of Lombard's Book of Sentences and Alexander of Hales', *Franciscan Studies*, 25 (1965), 90–116.

- Courtenay, W. J., *Adam Wodeham. An Introduction to his Life and Writings*, Leiden 1978 (Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, 21).
- , 'Marsilius of Inghen as Theologian', *Marsilius of Inghen. Acts of the international Marsilius of Inghen Symposium*, ed. by H. A. G. Braakhuis and M. J. F. M. Hoenen, Nijmegen 1992 (Artistarium Supplementa, 7), 39–57.
- , 'Marsilius von Inghen († 1396) als Heidelberger Theologe', *Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, 32 (1988), 25–42.
- Ehrle, F., *Der Sentenzenkommentar Peters von Candia des Pisaner Papstes Alexanders V. Ein Beitrag zur Scheidung der Schulen in der Scholastik des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts und zur Geschichte des Wegestreiches*, Münster 1925 (Franziskanische Studien, Beiheft 9).
- Heitmann, Ch., 'Der Glaube bei Marsilius von Inghen', *Marsilius of Inghen. Acts of the international Marsilius of Inghen Symposium*, ed. by H. A. G. Braakhuis and M. J. F. M. Hoenen, Nijmegen 1992 (Artistarium Supplementa, 7), 59–79.
- Hoenen, M. J. F. M., 'Der Sentenzenkommentar des Marsilius von Inghen († 1396). Aus dem Handschriftenbestand des Tübinger Wilhelmsstifts', *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 171 (1991), 114–129.
- , 'Einige Notizen über die Handschriften und Drucke des Sentenzenkommentars von Marsilius von Inghen', *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 56 (1989), 117–163.
- , *Marsilius of Inghen. Divine Knowledge in Late Medieval Thought*, Leiden 1993 (Studies in the History of Christian Thought, 50).
- , 'Neuplatonismus am Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts. Die Prinzipien zum Sentenzenkommentar des Marsilius von Inghen', *Marsilius von Inghen. Werk und Wirkung*, ed. by S. Wielgus, Lublin 1993, 165–194.
- , 'The eternity of the world according to Marsilius of Inghen. Study with an edition of the *dubium* in II *Sent.* q. 1 a. 2', *Marsilius of Inghen. Acts of the international Marsilius of Inghen Symposium*, ed. by H. A. G. Braakhuis and M. J. F. M. Hoenen, Nijmegen 1992 (Artistarium Supplementa, 7), 117–142.
- Hummel, H., 'Bibliotheca Wiblingana. Aus Scriptorium und Bibliothek der ehemaligen Benediktinerabtei Wiblingen', *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-Ordens und seiner Zweige*, 89 (1978), 510–570.
- Marsilius van Inghen. Kennis, wetenschap en theologie*, ed. and transl. by E. P. Bos, Baarn 1987 (Geschiedenis van de Wijsbegeerte in Nederland, 3).
- Marsilius von Inghen. Werk und Wirkung. Akten des zweiten internationalen Marsilius-von-Inghen-Kongresses*, ed. by S. Wielgus, Lublin 1993.
- Mietheke, J., 'Marsilius als Rektor der Universität Heidelberg', *Marsilius of Inghen. Acts of the international Marsilius of Inghen Symposium*, ed. by H. A. G. Braakhuis and M. J. F. M. Hoenen, Nijmegen 1992 (Artistarium Supplementa, 7), 13–37 [also in *Ruperto Carola*, 76 (1987), 110–119].
- Möhler, W., *Die Trinitätslehre des Marsilius von Inghen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie des Spätmittelalters*, Limburg/Lahn 1949.
- Pelster, F., 'Der Heidelberger Magister artium und Baccalarius theologiae Heilmann Wunnenberg als Lehrer des Marsilius von Inghen und Erklärer des Sentenzen', *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 125 (1944), 83–96.
- Philosophie und Theologie des ausgehenden Mittelalters. Marsilius von Inghen und das Denken seiner Zeit*, ed. by M. J. F. M. Hoenen and P. J. J. M. Bakker, Leiden 1999 (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters) (forthcoming).
- Ritter, G., *Studien zur Spätscholastik I: Marsilius von Inghen und die okkamistische Schule in Deutschland*, Heidelberg 1921 (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1921, 4. Abh.).
- Santos Noya, M., 'Schrift, Tradition und Theologie bei Marsilius von Inghen', *Marsilius von Inghen. Werk und Wirkung*, ed. by S. Wielgus, Lublin 1993, 73–91.
- Schulze, M., 'Die psychosomatische Theologie des Marsilius von Inghen', *Marsilius von Inghen. Werk und Wirkung*, ed. by S. Wielgus, Lublin 1993, 93–118.

- Vignaux, P., *Luther, commentateur des Sentences (Livre I, Distinction XVII)*, Paris 1935 (Études de philosophie médiévale, 21).
- Walz, D., 'Marsilius von Inghen als Schreiber und Büchersammler', *Marsilius von Inghen. Werk und Wirkung. Akten des zweiten internationalen Marsilius-von-Inghen-Kongresses*, ed. by S. Wielgus, Lublin 1993, 31–70.