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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


2 G. Ritter, Studien zur Spätscholastik 1: Marsilius von Inghen und die okkamistische 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 ewidencji rekopisów’, Studia Medioevisticzne, 25 (1988), 39–132.
methods, as was the case with the logico-semantic approach earlier. 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. 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 duplci logica* (1402) distinguished between the logic of faith and ethics on the one hand and that of traditional logic and metaphysics on the other. 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

---


study will provide and discuss the textual tradition.

The authenticity of the commentaries is beyond doubt. It is secured by the fact that the manuscripts mention the author’s commentary to Marsilius of Inghen. Out of three out of four manuscripts that contain citations of the manuscripts a

J. fol. 345: “Quaestiones disputatae de ordinibus, etc. This attribution is the scribe of the text. Berg in 1411.” The manuscript also attribute from that of the scribe.

K. fol. 10: “Quaestio disputata a venerabilis ma

The ascription to Marsilius is written at the top of the scribe who wrote the text as that in the other manuscripts. There is no reason to refer only to the

L. fol. 1: “Marcilius. Written at the right hand of the scribe; this is the.

The evidence of Marsilius’s work is corroborated by other manuscripts that Marsilius bequeathed in 1396 the following description.

Item (433) questiones ma
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7. On Gerald of Castricum (*Universität Heidelberg*, vol. 1, 115, and
8. *Die Rektorbücher der Universität J. Miethke, Heidelberg 1990, IV*. The list was made in 1396.
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 Castricum, the scribe of the text, who matriculated at the University of Heidelberg in 1411. 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: “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: “Marsilius 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.

---

7 On Gerald of Castricum (Diocese of Utrecht), see Töpke, *Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg*, vol. 1, 115, and vol. 2, Heidelberg 1886, 372 and 373.

8 *Die Rektorbücher der Universität Heidelberg, Band 1: 1396–1410*, 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 Art Faculty* in 1489.9

Secondly, in a number of places the author refers 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quaestiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum, Lib. 1, qu. 1, ed. Santos, 38</th>
<th>Quaestiones super libros Physicorum, Lib. 1, Wien, ONB, CVP 5437, fol. 83r</th>
<th>Quaestiones super Metaphysicam, Lib. 7, qu. 4, Wien, ONB, CVP 5297, fol. 90a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nam esse rei est ipsa res, ita intelligere eiusdem rei est cadem rei. Istud consuevit probari in 1 Physicorum, ubi probavi, et 7 Metaphysicæ etiam idem probavi.</td>
<td>Ultima conclusio: quod hominem generare est homo generans et generare est generans.</td>
<td>Tertia conclusio: Ipsum et esse ipsum sunt omnino idem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviationes super octo libros Physicorum, Lib. 1, ed. Venice 1521, fol. 5a

Quinti dicunt quod hominem generare est homo generans et creare est crans et ita in alius. Et videtur mihi quod haec est probabilior opinio.

---

as follows, *Die Rektorbücher*, ibid., 475: “Registrum librorum in theologâ, quos venerabilis vir magister Marsilius de Inghen bone memorie saecularis professor egregius primum in theologica facultate promovitus in hoc studio universitatis eiusdem cœrelliquit.” See also Töpke, ibid., 678.

9 Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Heid. Hs. 47, fol 49: “Quaestiones magistri
that the lectures given by Marsilius proper were written down and again with the attribution to him. It is not clear whether the text was written by Marsilius in 1466 and copied by him in 1489.9

The author refers the reader to his work 'ubi probavi' or 'ubi solvi'. He does this as well as in the others. The author states that Marsilius is the author of the commentary on the *Sententiarum*. The first and the second book, *Physics* and *Metaphysics*. In the case of the *Physica* quotations from the commentary are added at the places in the works of Aristotle where the commentaries are written.

Quaestiones super *Metaphysicam*, Lib. 7, qu. 4, Wien, ÖNB, CVP 5297, fol. 90°

Tertia conclusio: Ipsum et esse ipsum sunt omnino idem.

---

*Abbreviationes super octo libros Physicorum*, Lib. 8, ed. Venice 1521, fol. 34⁴ and fol. 37⁴

Quarto: Utrum a motore immutabilis et acerno posit provident actio nova. (...) Ex his inferunt seinta conclusione 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

Marsilius proprii manu ipsius conscriptae super tertio et quarto Sententiarum in papiro. Quaestiones magistri Marsili propria manu ipsius conscriptae super primo et secundo Sententiarum in papiro" and Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Annales Universitatis III, fol. 309°: "(...) Quaestiones Magistri Marsili de ingheym super quattor libros Sententiarum manu ipsius conscriptas (...)".


12 *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam*, Lib. 1, Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, CVP 5297, fol. 1°.⁴
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. 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. 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 Collectio 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, Biblioteca Jagiellońska, 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 (1433/4). 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 médievale, 56 (1989), 117-163, esp. 122-128.
Francisco de Vitoria, Domingo Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Notizen über die Handschriften Marsilius von Inghen’, Recherches de 122-123.
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Gabriel Biel, Collectarium circa quattuor libros Sententiarum, Lib. 1 dist. 35, qu. 5, ed. Werbeck, 647

Inter istos sic opinantes magis conformitatis principii prioribus loquitur Marsilius.

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

Sed contra hanc opinionem (sic. ipsius Ockham) volo probare hanc conclusionem, quod creatura producta vel productibilis 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 productibles non est propriis formalis ratio rem productibilum vel productam cognoscendi vel etiam producendi, prout notum est,igitur.

Tertia conclusio: In Deo non sunt plures et distinctae ideae rerum creatarum vel creandarum formaliter et intrinsec; licet plures dici possint obiectaliter et extrinsec. Pro huius conclusionis intellectu est praemittendum quod plures esse in Deo potest intelligi dupliciter: Uno modo formaliter et intrinsec; ita quod quodammodo ideae non sint inter se idem, sed una realitat distinguatur ab alia. Quo modo in intellectu, humano cognitio distincta Petri est realitat alia a cognitione distincta Pauli. —Alio modo obiectaliter et extrinsec. Tale autem est aliquid in se penitus iadistantum. Est tamen plurium objectorum et cuisiulibet distincte.

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

(\ldots)
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 explici of the first book: (fol. 200r) “Primum scriptum libri Sententiarum venerabilis Marsillii finit feliciet”. This addition is not found in the manuscripts. Also at the end of the second and third book the term ‘scriptum’ is used: (fol. 347vb) “Finit secundum scriptum libri Sententiarum clarissimi Marsillii Inguen” and (fol. 472vb) “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 explici 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 Inghan”.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 saper 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. Gäl, St. Bonaventure, New York, 1990 (Franciscan Institute Publications). 94
16 In addition, the outside front cover has in a handwriting of the fifteenth century, “Quaestiones venerabilis magistri Marsilii saper 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. Also, the library inventory of 1466 and the *Annals of the Arts Faculty* of 1489 mention the same title. 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. *Quaestiones* primi sentenciarum Marsili quas una cum questionibus 2 et 3 et 4. fecit emi facultas arcium et apportari de Studio Heidelbergensi pro 16. florensis.
12. *Quaestiones* secundi sentenciarum Marsili.
13. *Quaestiones* tertii sentenciarum Marsili cum una questione Petri de Canidia circa primum.
14. *Quaestiones* quarti sentenciarum Marsili et breviloquium Bonaventure.

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 Soltan, who was among the first theologians at the newly founded University of Heidelberg, has the same format and bears the same title of ‘Quaestiones’.

The sources differ as to the words added to ‘Quaestiones’. Some just annex the books concerned in the genitive case: ‘Quaestiones
3. Reportatio, lectura, or ordinatio?

The information given in the title that the work consists of ‘quaesiones’ 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. 10r 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. 1va 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 (editae) and the act of writing by the scribe (scribere): “Explicit qvestiones Porphirii et

21 The same goes for the third and fourth book of Ockham’s commentary, which were also reportiones. 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. Brawn, (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).

THE COMSERT

Predicamentorum Aristotelium super librum De generibus et sortibus per manus Nicolai de Alesio magistro Marsilio de Alemania. Coloniae. 22

More important are the several smaller passages in the manuscripts and in the texts that mainly concern the rationem. The versions do not differ, one seems to be a text that has been redrafted.

Quaestiones super quin

(a. a. 000)

J, fol. 60r–61r (collated with K, 4)

Ad septimum dicatur secum: 

tam magis quam minus, quod prie 

causa terminatur, quia parte post, facit appropinquationem. (. . .)

Ad nonam ( . . .). Quaestiones 

ante non fuit tempus verendi 

ante fuit aeternitas, quam modo et digniori praebetur, ante 

quam aeternitas tempore

Quaestiones super quin

(a. a. 000)

J, fol. 67r–68r (collated with K, 4)

Quinto, si different gressae spiratio, vel hoc est sepia

22 Quoted according to Marsilius de Alemania (Erlfart, Bibliotheca Amaeliana).
The Commentary of Marsilius of Inghen

In the introduction to William of Ockham’s Commentary on the Sentences, Ockham’s commentary is an ordinatio, or an examination of the text, and the introduction to William of Ockham’s Commentary on the Sentences, Ordinatio et Distinctio Propria, ed. 11-17*). Occasionally, the first is referred to as ‘Quaestiones’ as well.

Use the preposition ‘super’ in the ablative case: ‘Quaestiones super librum De generatione’ for the accusative case: ‘Quaestiones super librum De sententiarum’ (J). The last work consists of ‘quaestiones’ entered in the manuscript or the lectures (lectura), or on the title page. The final publication (ordinatio), however, was used for different purposes. The first book is the first book of the Sentences under the Commentary of Conrad of Megenburg’s quaestiones.

It is almost certain that his work consists of ‘quaestiones’ in the editorial nature of the text, but the lectures given by Marsilius are different in structure and differ in the other sections of the manuscript as well.

The note on fol. 1ra of the first publication of Ockham’s commentary does not mean ‘publication by the author’. The first book of the manuscripts also distinguishes between Marsilius (edere) and the act of writing quaestiones Porphirii et

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

J. fol. 60b–61a
(collated with K, W, L)

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

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

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

(collated with K, W, L)

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

Qunto, si differant generatio et spiratio, vel ergo seipsis vel alius.

21 Quoted according to Markowski, ‘Catalog dzie? M?rsylusza z? Inghen’, 45 (Erfurt, Bibliotheca Amplioriana, 4° 246, fol. 90b) and 99 (Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Z VI 121a (2557), fol. 96b).
non, quia emanationes non distinguuntur seipsis, sicut nec sunt seipsis. Vel aliis, et hoc vel essentia, quod non potest dici, e quod est unica; vel personis, et hoc non, quia earum videtur esse distinguere non distinguere; vel notionibus, et sic notionis esset alia noio et 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. 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. 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 the time in which Marsilius was working on the original text, while the text was copy.

occurrence, in the first and second principia are absent. In the manuscripts of the first columns and pages, which is the case in the manuscript. Presumably, the passages at a later occasion to empty columns at these pointing that because of his handwriting and definitely formula, a part of which he had crossed out. When one asks to question the correctness which may go back to notes made by Marsilius.

When Marsilius was working on his book. This means that the composition reportatio or lectura of the printed in 1592–1594, but an ongoing and preparing for publications initiatively. The existence of these notes may then be explained by the manuscript after, but already during

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 quasiones determinandae of the principia, the lectures with which the sententiarist 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 uninformated about the views of his fellow sententiarist. 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.
27 In the principia, the socii discussed their opinions. See the oath the sententiarist 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 corum, qui mecum concurrerint legendo, instare.” An interesting example of such a discussion is given by Peter of Cundia, 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 Cundia. The relevant passage is edited in F. Ehrle, Der Sentenzenkommentar Peter von Cundia des Pisaner Papstes Alexanders V. Ein Beitrag zur Scheidung der Schulen in der Scholastik des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts und zur Geschichte des Wegstreits, Münster 1925 (Franziskanische Studien, Beiheft 9), 45: “(…) secundum dubium pro propositione contra ad argumentum meum primum factura contra decimam propositionem declarativam quarte conclusionem sui principii (…)” The discussion among the socii is also documented in François de Meyronne-Pierrre 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 sententiarus 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 Winkelman, Urkundenbuch der Universität Heidelberg, 21: “Item ordinatum et statutum est quod faciens principium ordinate in tertium sententiarum sit et reputatur baccalarius in theologiam pro magistro formatus.”
30 Ibid., 21: “Postquam quis cursum sc. in theologica finierit, vacabit per unum annum, in quo ad legendum sententias se diligenter preparat, nichilominus tamen tenetur tunc visitare scolas et actus publicos et semel respondat ac predict ad minus anno eodem.”
31 In Heidelberg, reading the Sentences took two years (see Winkelman, 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 suis’ in theology in 1387, see Die Rektorbücher der Universität Heidelberg, Band 1: 1386-1410, Heft 1, ed. by J. Miehke, 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: “(…) idee prolix e scripsi, ut reverendis magistris meis praebem materiam me informind a 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 is, therefore, that these queries are principia he held, but that they were abandoned in the process of rewriting Marsilius dropped the principia that were unclear.34 Since the exact date and place is impossible to determine.

4. Problems of the date

Since Marsilius kept on reading the Sentences, it is difficult to determine the exact date of the principia. The points are the reading of the Sentences, the year of the principia, and the year of his death.

It is not unlikely that the principia were already during the beginning of the principia tenus in Heidelberg. Also, it is possible that he even earlier, perhaps in 1390, discussed some of the principalia, or if not, he may have had some discussions with Peter of Candia, Gerard of Capua, etc. Whether Marsilius takes issue with the principia of Ripa, not with those of Ripa himself.

34 However, he did not succeed in getting a faculty position. (cf. note 32 above).
35 The original principia of Marsilius, however, has been lost. See Die Rektorbücher der Universität Heidelberg, Band 1: 1386-1410, Anhang IV.
36 It was usual for the sententiarus to complete his work within ten to fifteen years. See V. Marcolino, ‘Der Augsburger Universitätswesen, Werk und Wirkung bis zur Reformation’, Augsburger Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Volkskunde, 20, 1917, 113.
37 Courtenay, Marsilius of Italy, 136-137.
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. Since the original principia of Marsilius are lost, it is impossible to determine what exactly he omitted and altered.

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 sententiaris 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 disputations in Paris. 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. Especially striking are his principia, which in the existent version discuss the same problems as treated in the principia of Parisian theologians such as Hugo Golofo of Orvieto, John of Ripa, Stephen Gaudet, Peter of Candi, Gerard of Kalkar, and Bonsenbiante Badoer. Marsilius takes issue with the views of Hugo of Orvieto and John of Ripa, not with those of his socii. This seems to suggest that in
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 Tubingen, Wilhelmstift, Cb 336b, which in addition to the fourth book also has the commentary on the Decalogue by Henricus de Primaria.41 In what follows, only the manuscripts of the first book are described.

---

39 On this issue, see Courtenay, 'Marlius of Inghen as Theologian', 48–52.
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 (...)"

---

62 On these absent *rationes principiorum* see above.
The used materials collected in this first part of the Parisian theologian by Marsilius of Inghen is attributed to Marsilius himself in the Prior analytics and in the time Marsilius's opinions among the Parisian theologians. Angelus Dobelin is quoted in Prior analytics or from (a quotation from Sentences, since the same passages that Marsilius put forward in Sentences which he had used.

Although Marsilius used materials of his career. However, it seems early materials and began in Sentences commentary. The edition therefore be left open

The edition of 1501

has been preserved in four of 1501. Although this is not one book has so many witness manuscripts known to date.40

Marsilius's commentary, with the additions 336b, which in addition is necessary on the Decalogue by not only the manuscripts of the

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

Incept of the first book, pag. 1: “Primis itaque duobus, videlicet
divini nominis invocatione et brevi sacrae scripturae commendatione (!..).”

Explicit of the first book, pag. 345b: “Aliae dueae rationes argument
pro dictis in septima conclusione. Hoc de quae'estione. Et sic est
impeditus. Explicitum quaestiones prii libri Sententiarium reverentis
magistri Mercelli de Inghen sacrae theologiae professoris
eximii. Scriptae per magistrum Gerhardum Casterkem propria
manu.” The same addition to the explicit “Parcant (!..) impeditus” can be found in manuscript K.

Incept of the second book: pag. 354b: “Circa secundum librum
Sententiarum movendo et disputando quaestionem primam et conti-
tuendo materiae de perfectionibus in primo principe meo tectam
formo quaestionem talem (!..).”

Explicit of the second book: pag. 595b: “Ad rationes pro quae'sto
dictitur quod auctoritas Apostoli Ad Romano 13 vult primas duas
quaestiones secundi articuli. Hoc de quaestione. Explicitum quaes-
tiones secundi libri Sententiarum magistri Mercelli de Inghen sacrae
theologiae professoris eximii scriptae per magistrum Gerardum
Casterkem propria manu. Deus dare vitam omnibus nobis sacra
deliquantibus. Deo gratias.”

Outside front cover, by a hand of the fifteenth century: “Quaestiones
venerabilis magistri Marsilli super primum et secundum Senten-
tiarum”.

Inside front cover, again by a contemporary hand: “Quaestiones
primi et secundi Sententiarum Marslli”.

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): 294b (partially) through
296, 309 (partially) through 312, 345b (after the explicit), 346 through

40 On these absent rationes principales, see section 3 and the reference in note 23 above.
Explicit of the second book, fol. 316: "Allenius de non potest probari omnem."


In the margin of book I, fol. 316: "Quia e contrario sublimis non potest probari omnem."

On the top of the second fly leaf, fol. 317: "Quod est itaque duobus, divini nominis invocatione et brevi sacrae scripturae commendatione (..)."


Incept of the second book, fol. 316: "[..] Circa secundum librum sententiarum. Disputando quaestionem primam et continuando materiam de perfectionibus in primo principio meo tactam formos quaestionem (..)."

This manuscript contains no section of book I, and very little of book II. The second part of the second book on fol. 321 with the words '..' and '..' catch words at the bottom of the page, but the next fol. 322 is blank. It is possible that the continuation got lost or was never written.

There are two more manuscripts of Marsilio in the Bibliothèque Nationale, one is the second book and Cod. 15774. Both contain marginal notes and annotations, and have been identified as having been written by a student. This, however, does not affect the quality of the manuscript. Only his comments are lost. The manuscript is an undoubted terminal.

---

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 Nikolaikirche in Isny (typescript 1936), 49: "Hs. n. 49, Albertus Magnus, De laudibus Marie, fol. 187. (..) Explicit una b. Virg. Marie et finite sunt per me Johannem Frantz de Leyphain in studio Heydelbergensi anno etc. (14)47 in vigilia Pasca."
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Explicit of the second book: fol. 321v: "(...) 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 Marsilius Ficino: "Marsilius Ficinus in primum Sententiarum."

On the top of the first text page (fol. 10) 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); 9r, 254v through 262v, 274 (partially) through 275v, 283 (partially) through 285 (partially), 322v. A table of questions is given on fol. 1r–9r.

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. 321v 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 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 Bibliotheca Jagellonska. 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 Dabrowa. 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 Biographical notes on John of Dabrowa are provided by R. Palacz, ‘Les manuscrits du Policraticon de Jean de Salisbury en Pologne’, Medioevalia 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.


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. 54v: “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 (it is not clear where they correspond to absent rationes principales): 1r-2v, 249v (partially) through 250v, 261r (partially) through 263r, 295v through 298r.

Summaries of the first six quaestiones on fol. 294v-295v. 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.

46 Tübingen, Wilhelmsstift, Gb 336b: “Monasterii Wiblingen”.


48 For further details, see nos 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. 2r (lower hand): “Monasterii Wiblingen”. Similar notes can be found on the first text page of the manuscripts Tübingen, Wilhelmstift, Gb 336a, and Tübingen, Wilhelmstift, Gb 336b, which contain the second and fourth book of Marsilius’s commentary respectively. 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, Wilhelmstift, Gb 336b, the scribe of the Decalogue commentary of Henricus de Primaria wrote: “scripta (...) per dominum Michaelam Slestim”. 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. 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.

The date of the manuscript is uncertain. The watermark makes plausible a date of sometime between 1436 and 1440. 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.

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

---

49 Tübingen, Wilhelmstift, Gb 336a. “Monasterii Wiblingen”, and Tübingen, Wilhelmstift, Gb 336b; “Monasterii Wiblingensis”. These manuscripts are not foliated.
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 Ochsenkopf–Sassenzzeichnen, Findbuch II/3, Stuttgart 1966, Abteilung XII. Piccard identified the watermark in the manuscript Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Cod. Theol. 2r 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.
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: "Marsiliu subtilis alemanus Quaestiones super I. sent. in fol. Lt. 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.

I. Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. 556, 310 x 215 mm, fifteenth century, written by several hands, paper, fol. 364.

Incipit of the first book, fol. 1: "Primi itaque duobus, videficit divini nominis invocatione et brevi sacrae scientiae commendatione (…)."


Inside front cover: "Iste liber comparatus est sub decanatu magistri Melchioris Lodivici de Freystadt anno saluti nostro txxviii."

On the top of the first folio (1): "Marcilii 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: The earlier list of 1687 Catalogus omnium librorum bibliothecae Wiblingensis, which has been preserved in Rottenburg (Diözesanbibliothek, F. 356), only mentions printed editions.

As is evident from the manuscript was purchased at the sale of Lodivicius of Freystadt (…). The winter semester of 1736 was written before that time. The Faculty bought the manuscript as Master of Arts induced.

The marginal notes show that although not all questions were asked. A table of questions are found in manuscript W. Ritter a separate table of questions served in Leipzig, University.

The manuscript has a large number of misreadings and omissions. As in manuscript L, without f, Strasbourg, Martin columns per page.

The Commentary of Marsilius of Inghen

Strasbourg, Martinus Flach Junior 1501, fol. a1-b10, fol. 593, two columns per page, 2r.

Incipit of the first book, fol. 1v: “Clarissimi viri domini Marsillii Inguen super libros Sententiarium edita in studio Heidelbergensi incipit feliciter ordine optimo quasi mathematici certissimo. In nomine tuo, Jesu Christe, etc. Primis itaque duobus, videlicet divini nominis invocatione et brevi sacrae scientiae commendatione (...)”


The manuscript was purchased and came to Leipzig in 1488. Melchior Lodovicus of Freynstadt (Freystadt) was dean of the Arts Faculty in the winter semester of 1487/88. 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.

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

As is evident from the note on the inside front cover, the manuscript was purchased and came to Leipzig in 1488. Melchior Lodovicus of Freynstadt (Freystadt) was dean of the Arts Faculty in the winter semester of 1487/88. 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.

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

Incipit of the first book, fol. 1v: “Clarissimi viri domini Marsillii Inguen super libros Sententiarium edita in studio Heidelbergensi incipit feliciter ordine optimo quasi mathematici certissimo. In nomine tuo, Jesu Christe, etc. Primis itaque duobus, videlicet divini nominis invocatione et brevi sacrae scientiae commendatione (...).”


55 ‘Comparatus’ here means ‘purchased’ and not ‘completed’ or ‘finished’.
57 Ritter, Studien zur Spätscholastik, 192.

Inespit of the second book, fol. 347<sup>ta</sup>: "Cicco secundum librum Sententiarum disputando quaestione praevam et continuando materiam de perfectionibus in primo principio neo talem quaestionem (...).


Inespit of the third book, fol. 349<sup>ta</sup>: "Clarisissmi viri domini Marsilii Inguen super tertio Sententiarum profunissima clarissimaque disputata in studio Heidelbergensi edita incipiant feliciter, Jesu Christe, in nomine tuo. Circa tertium continuando materiam de perfectionibus semper in principiis tractatam sit prima quaestio talis: Utrum regnum increatum (...).


Inespit of the fourth book, fol. 473<sup>qa</sup>: "In nomine tuo, dulcis Jesu. Circa quartum librum continuando materiam cum dictis in quaes- tione initiali primo quaeritur: Utrum sicut sacramenta (...).

Explicit of the fourth book, fol. 593<sup>rb</sup>: "Ad auctorem Magistrum post oppositum patet quod sit pro prinis duabus conclusionibus. Hoc de quaestione."


Epigrammata on the second page (fol. a<sup>2</sup>b): "In laudem Marsilii poema (...). Dicite, Marsilio pellit error ingenii."

Tabula alphabetica on fol. a<sup>3</sup><sup>ra</sup>-b<sup>8</sup>b. Inespit (fol. a<sup>3</sup>q): "Reptorium alphabeticum in quaestiones librorum quattuor Sententiarum Marsilii Inghen clarissimi doctoris incipit studii Heidelbergensis institutoris (...)." Explicit (b<sup>8</sup>b): "Finit repertorium alphabeticum in quaes- tiones librorum quattuor Sententiarum Marsilii Inghen doctoris clarissimi."

Tabula quaestionum on fol. b<sup>9</sup><sup>ra</sup>-b<sup>9</sup>q. Inespit (fol. b<sup>9</sup>p): "Tabula generalis omnium quaestionum in hoc opere contenatur. Quaes- tiones primi Sententiarum (...)." Explicit (b<sup>9</sup>q): "Finit tabula generalis totius operis."

The edition was published in quarto; in 1501, one folio, the quarto edition was re-released. The number of libraries only the colophon or other indications of confusion, as to the date and place, etc. The literature to edition. The text of the edition of the manuscripts. Firstly, the Latin of classical Latin. Where the text is "indicatius perfecti" in indirect to emendations by a cor- rector at the workshop of the printer of classical and the medieval Latin of Marsilii.

Secondly, in a number of the version of the text which is known to have been made.

58 For further details, see M. 133–157.
scriptum libri Sententiarum

Sed ad rationem pro quae-
Ad Romanos 13 velit primas
quando materiam de perfe-
sit prima quæstio talis:

"Ad omnes auctoritates post
in nomine tuo, dulcis Jesu.

Ad auctoritatem Magistri

ad laudem Marsiliii super quattuor

incipit (fol. a²r): "Repertorium

incipit (fol. b9v): "Tabula

explicit (b9v): "Finit tabula

et de quaestionibus. Ex officina Martini
Flach junioris civis Argentinensis 4 Kal.
Septembris Anno Domini 1501.

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

The edition was published in two volumes. The first volume con-
tained the first and second book, the second volume the third and
fourth. The numbering of the folia, however, was continuous. The

58 For further details, see my 'Einige Notizen über die Handschriften und Drucke',

59 On Matthias Schürer, see J. Benzing, Die Buchbrücker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts
im deutschen Sprachgebiet, 2nd edition, Wiesbaden 1852 (Beiträge zum Buch- und
Bibliothekswesen, 12), 440. The editions printed by Schürer are listed in J. Muller,
in the manuscripts. 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 Magenta). They were unsuccessful, however. The commentary of Marsilius was never printed in Mainz. 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 Duce Philippi Roman Comitem Rhini Palatinum et ad nobilissimos filius epistola, a defense of nominalism issued by masters of the University of Heidelberg, which was printed by Peter of Friedberg in Mainz in 1499.

6. The tabulae quaecestionum and the summaries preserved in the manuscripts

The different tabulae quaecestionum, 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, II, fol. 300: “Ultima mensis septembris in sacristia ecclesiae Sancti Spiritus concepit universitas ex inferiori liberaria ad Magnatiam honorabilibus magistris Florentii Diel de Spyra et Hermanno quaeciones magistri Marsili de Inghien super quartos libros Sententiarum manuscrips ad rescribendum et impamnendum, sic tamen quod libri manerant integri et infra anni spatium sine macula et absque unlo damno remittantur. (…) Addixerunt dicti magistri sponte quod vellent loqui impressori in Maguntia quod universi postquam imprimeret dari 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.
64 See Marsilius, Quaestiones, ending of the second article has ‘Quantum ad secundum articulum notitia asseasiva capitur duplici
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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 assensiis alicuius 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 assensiis alicuius studiorum”. A transcription of the first part of the tabula is given below.

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

Utrum ex diversitate idearum existentium in regno increato sumatur diversitas perfectionum productorum entium in regno creato.
De ideis.

Utrum res dependentes different inter se et sua essentia perfectione.
Utrum materia sit perfectioria entity quam formae qualitativae.
Utrum in composito forma sit perfectior materia, cum materia sit perpetua et forma in multis sit corruptibilis.
Utrum compositum sit perfectius sua materia et forma.
Utrum ex diversitate idearum existentium in Deo sumenda sit diversitas perfectionum rerum dependentium.
Utrum theologia sit scientia uma de Deo tamquam de subiecto proprio.

[qu. 1]
[art. 1]
[art. 2]
[a. 2, p. 6, du. 1]
[a. 2, p. 6, du. 2]
[a. 2, p. 6, du. 3]
[art. 3]
[qu. 2]

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

Summary of the origin of the tradition, which preserved a manuscript of Marsilius’s autograph was sent to Florentius in 1489. These two manuscripts of the text copied and printed by Strasbour and Mainz are now lost. It is not in the summaries preserved in books that went to Rome.

The summaries, and the marginal notes, reveal how the
Quis modus generationis notitiarum in nobis et
divisio communis notitiae.
Quid sit theologia et quomodo distinguatur ab
habitibus assensivos aliorum studiorum.
Utrum theologia sit scientia.
[art. 3]
Utrum theologia sit una scientia.
[art. 4]
Utrum Deus sit subjectum 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 ar-
ticle, the second 'secundo' is superfluous: "Articulus secundus est de
secundo supposito, quia supponit [sc. quastio] secundo rebus dependen-
tibus varias perfectiones inesse." The addition of the second 'secundo'
becomes clear, however, if the text is compared with the _divisio tex-
tus_ Marsilius had given at the beginning of the first question: "[...]
Primo enim supponit diversas ideas in Deo esse. Secundo rebus depen-
dentibus varias perfectiones inesse." The compiler of the summary took
the text from there, without dropping the 'secundo'.

The summary in manuscript W shows that the compiler was selec-
tive 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.
244v:

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

Primus est de primo supposito, scilicet de diversis ideis in Deo.
Quid sit idea, de modis loquenti 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 intrinsec se et realiter. Secunda: In Deo sunt infinitae ideae extrinsec se et obiectionaliter.

Articulus secundus est de secundo supposito, quia supponit [sc. quas tio] secundo rebus dependentibus varias perfectiones inesse.
Præmissuntur primo suppositiones.
Secundo, quae sunt rerum perfectiones. Quid ia re. Quod duplex sit perfectio. Et est quaedam accidentalis, quaedam essentialis. Dictum ponitur conclusiones et bona corollarìa.
Tertio, quod perfectiones sunt inaequales.
Quinto penes quid attendendae sunt perfectiones.
Sexto de perfectionibus variis comparationes.
Dubitatio prima: An materia prima sit perfectioris entitatis quam formas qualitativa. Dicitur inter cetera quod animae beatiorum habent tendentiam ad sua corpora, ideo magis formas accidentalas.
Tertia dubitatio: An compositum sit perfectius sua forma et materia. Et dicitur quod non saltet copulatim.
Quarta dubitatio: Quanto essentiale compositum est perfectius suam forma. Et dicitur quod precise in tanto quanta est perfectio suae materiae.

Articulus tertius est de quasitio, scilicet utrnum 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 commentators (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 Boaaventure 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. 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 Widehan, *An Introduction to his Life and Writings*, Leiden 1978 (Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, 21), 183–214 (Appendices 1–5). Robert Holot selects as well. He also transpose 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 Prologomena to Peter Lombard, *Sententiae in IV libros distinctae*, vol. 1/1, Rome 1971 (Spicilegium Bonaventurarium, 4), 143⁵–145⁵.

68 An interesting example of the clustering of distinctions is provided by the twelfth question of the second book. There Marsilius gives the reason for his putting together the distinctions their thematic unity. See *Quaestiones*, ed. 1501, fol. 25¹: "Tote quattuor decemdecimo circa distinctionem decimum seprarnam secundih libri et tres sequentes, quae sunt de statu naturae integrae."

---
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**First book**

| q. 1 = principium | q. 13 = *prologus* |
| q. 2 = *prologus* | q. 14 = *prologus* |
| q. 3 = *d. 1* | q. 15 = *d. 1* |
| q. 4 = *d. 2–3* | q. 16 = *d. 2–3* |
| q. 5 = *d. 4* | q. 17 = *d. 4* |
| q. 6 = *d. 5* | q. 18 = *d. 5* |
| q. 7 = *d. 6* | q. 19 = *d. 6* |
| q. 8 = *d. 7* | q. 20 = *d. 7* |
| q. 9 = *d. 8* | q. 21 = *d. 8* |
| q. 10 = *d. 9* | q. 22 = *d. 9* |
| q. 11 = *d. 10* | q. 23 = *d. 10* |
| q. 12 = *d. 11* | q. 24 = *d. 11* |

**Second book**

| q. 1 = principium | q. 7 = *prologus* |
| q. 2 = *prologus* | q. 8 = *prologus* |
| q. 3 = *d. 1–2* | q. 9 = *d. 1–2* |
| q. 4 = *d. 3–4* | q. 10 = *d. 3–4* |
| q. 5 = *d. 5* | q. 11 = *d. 5* |
| q. 6 = *d. 6* | q. 12 = *d. 6* |

**Third book**

| q. 1 = principium | q. 9 = *prologus* |
| q. 2 = *prologus* | q. 10 = *prologus* |
| q. 3 = *d. 1–2* | q. 11 = *d. 1–2* |
| q. 4 = *d. 3* | q. 12 = *d. 3* |

**Fourth book**

| q. 1 = *prologus* | q. 5 = *prologus* |
| q. 2 = *prologus* | q. 6 = *prologus* |
| q. 3 = *d. 1–2* | q. 7 = *d. 1–2* |
| q. 4 = *d. 5–6* | q. 8 = *d. 5–6* |

Marsilius considers his text
is clear from his mentioni
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 quasistitum 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. 17-26 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. 9-16 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 quasitum). 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 quasitum. One or more articuli discuss the suppositum, others discuss the quasitum. 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 propositions. The central statement is called conclusio responsalis or propositio responsalis. It provides the answer to the question posed in the suppositum or quasitum. 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. 372v: “Quarto tractatis dubius circa unionem quaeritur, accedendo ad litteram, circa distinctionem tertiam utrum (…)”.

70 See the reference in note 68 above and Quaestiones, ed. Sarzos, 205: “Circa distinctiones secundam et tertiam, in quibus declarat Magister unitatem essentiae et trinitatem personarum, quaeritur quinto locuto, 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 Constraining 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, Hugo of Orvieto, John of Ripa, Peter of Ailly), but also in natural philosophy and metaphysics (John Buridan, Marsilius of Ingher). Compare the oath of the sententiarus in Heidelberg (Winkelmann, Urkundenbuch der Universität Heidelberg, 21): “Ego N. iuro (…) legere sententias (…) et textum totaliter per conclusiones legendo et exponendo.”
The occasional use of phrases like 'he returns to the original question' and 'the conclusion of the discussion' 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".

8. Sources and authors discussed

Marsilius possessed a large library of over 230 volumes, some of which contained several items. He bequeathed this collection to the University of Heidelberg, as Conrad of Worms and Conrad Gelnhausen had done before him. 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*. 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.

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

---

73 *Quaestiones*, ed. Santos, 205: "Quarto tractatis dubiis ex qua distinguum tertiam utrum

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

75 On the library of Marsilius, see D. Walz, 'Marsilius von Inghen als Schreiber

76 See.* Die Rektorbücher*, 468.

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 mediae aevi. Die Handschriftensammlung
des Dominikaner Georg Schwarcz († nach 1484)*, Amsterdam 1994 (Bochumer Studien
zur Philosophie, 22), esp. 135–138.
metaphysica, moralis, 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 Auril, Durand of St Pourcain, 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 Heinrich Wunnenberger and Johannes Holzadell, 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 Pourcain, 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 only regarding his comments to his commentaries on Aristotle, and takes over many of his tables.

A study of which sources Marsilius used for textual composition. In the summa, which he silently borrowed, were put together. These tables summarize the questions: the ratio, and the objections or dubia, of each range of sources employed. He adopted passages from Robert Wodeham, and Thomas of Strasbourg.

8.1. Rationes principales

That Marsilius used the word principes is not exceptional of these rationes. Since the questions that go back to be put forward during the discussion are difficult to determine. Disputant and opponent made an extract from the Summa which are borrowed from the summa. They have been put forward orally. They are also used as part of the rationes.

The rationes quoted below is that of the unity of the divine persons. In one of them that of Johannes Bremer follows the other. In Holcavy, the fourteenth and this fifth divine persons do not differ without any distinction.


80 See W. Möhler, Die Trinität der Theologie des Spätmittelalters, Limburg 1925, of Christian Thought, 50).
81 For an interesting example
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*.

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. 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.

---


81 For an interesting example, see my *Speculum philosophiae mediæ aevi*, 114–130.
Robert Holcot,  
*In quattuor libros Sententiarum quaestiones*, Lyon 1518, Reprint Frankfurt am Main 1967, Lib. 1, q. 5, fol. 51r, 88v:


---

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

Secundo sic: Si concepit catholicus in Deo trinitatem, tunc habet haec 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 est quaternarius. Quod non est concedendum.

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

---

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.

---

8.3. Conclusiones

The *conclusiones* are the heart of each theses. The author lays down the solution to the problem. Since they are so important they have often been taken over from other authors and have become part of the common stock of theological knowledge. At several places Marsilius borrows them from other authors. The *conclusiones* are in the works of Durandus, *Summa*, from the works of Bacon, *Summa* et al. The *conclusiones* are the heart of each thesis. The author lays down the solution to the problem. They have often been taken over from other authors and have become part of the common stock of theological knowledge. At several places Marsilius borrows them from other authors. The *conclusiones* are in the works of Durandus, *Summa* et al. The *conclusiones* are the heart of each thesis.

---

82 For example in his discussion of the *Comm. de trinitate* 10.2, 56–61.
Marsilius of Inghen,  
*Questaiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum*, Lib. 1, qu. 2, ed. Santos, 72–73:

Tertio est notandum, quod theologiam 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 theologica dicitur habitus, quod per suavissimodii revelata nota et credita fides et ea, quae in Sacra Scriptura traduntur, defenduntur contra haereticos et declarantur apud simpliciores indigentem, quo modo capet eam beatissimam Augustinum.* (..)

*Tertio modo theologica dicitur habitus alcuinicus conclusionis vel propositionis deductae ex articulis fidei sive ex dictis Sacrae Scripturae, vel pro omnibus habitibus in mente alcuinicus existentibus hoc modo acquisitis, sicut habitus conclusionum in geometriia deductorum dicuntur scientia geometrica.* (..)

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. 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, q. 33, q. 1, fol. 73\*–74\*a

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

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

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

Concedo igitur absque haesitatione aliqua quod essentia et proprietatibus 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 ex ea distincta.

Marsilius of Inghen, *Quaestionis super quattuor libros Sententiarum*, Lib. 1, qu. 6, ed. Sarosi, 237–241:

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

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

Tertia conclusio: Quod essentia divina et proprietates personalis nullo modo sunt distinctae res in persona, cujus ipsa est proprietates, sive illae res distinctae voceuntur distinctae formatales, sive distinctae perfectiones, vel distinctae modi reales eiusdem rei, sive formatae rationes distinctae, vel distinctae quidditates vel qualibet alio modo, quod placet huiusmodi distincta quo modoliber appelare. (. . .)

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

Secundum: Quod cum proprietates 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, Bibliothèque Mazarine, Cod. 915, fol. 101\*b–102\*a.

84 Compare the *dubium* edited according to Marsilius of Inghen, *Quaest. de a. 2*, Marsilius of Inghen, *Academiae*, ed. by H. A. G. Brakhus and M. Schröder, Supplemenata, 7, 117–142, esp. 136–137; 149, esp. 149a, 178, esp. 178a, 189, esp. 189a, 224, esp. 224a, 254, esp. 254a, 266, esp. 266a, 267, esp. 267a. The final example concerns the debate between Thomas of Strasbourg and himself. It-deal with the distinction between subject and predicate, while the question of whether the subject is really distinct from the predicate is often employed to follow his views.84 The view that neither is mere is not unusual. Sometimes Marsilius of Inghen even argues that they are distinct. This should make the most convincing arguments about the nature of the relationship between the subject and the predicate. In contemporary debates, this view is still considered to be correct and is often used to support the view that the subject is not identical with the predicate.

Thomas of Strasbourg, *Commentaries in IIII libros Sentenciarum*. Venice 1564, Rep. 4, Ridgetwood, New Jersey, 1711, Lib. 1, qu. 1, fol. 68r

Et ex dictis eorum (sc. Thomas et operis mei) multiplicier potest similem virtutem controversiam: Primo sic: Tale potest esse praesupponit tale per exemplo de bonum et malum. Ergo si non est bonum et non est malum, non est bonum et malum. Sed quod est tale per exemplo est tale per hoc ipsi dicunt Deum.

Practerea, ubicumque est secundum, igitur etia debet esse primam, quia secundum est secundum secundam, nisi in ordine ad principium est secundum causatorum. Non est ad malum. Ergo etia debet esse primam.

Et hoc evert Deus malorum.
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. 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. 28r:

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 ipsis dictum Deum. Ergo etc.

Marsilius of Inghen,
*Quaestiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum*, Lib. 1, qu. 5, ed. Saatos, 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 secundum moventem ad malam. Quare ergo non primam? Quia omne secundum dicitur per respectum ad primam; modo primum in malis videtur esse primum principium malorum.

---
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Theology underwent a period of change in the thirteenth century. This development can be attributed to the gradual creation of an institutionalized and more regulated course of study in universities in the thirteenth century. The presence of theology as a discipline in the study of arts was a prerequisite for the formation of a theological textbook. To this end, in the thirteenth century, the city of Paris, which was the center of theological studies, would become the textbook of theology. In the thirteenth century, the work of John Scotus Eriugena had a vast spectrum of theological themes, which is evident in the four books (on respectively, the five senses, the virtues, and the sacraments) of the Sentences. The textbook's chapters focused on well-known theological texts.

Lombard's Sentences did not only serve as a textbook of theology but also as a commentary on the work of John Scotus Eriugena. On the contrary, several other theologians were influenced by the Sentences, and their figures—witness e.g. Poppe—used Lombard's interpretation of the theological texts.

* Thanks to Lauge Nielsen and the Danish Research Council for the Humanities.
1 This idea can be found in William of Ockham, Summa Logicae (Paris, 1597; partial English translation, Ockham’s Summa Logicae, William of Ockham Society, University of Chicago Press, 1997). The problem has been pursued by, e.g., M. Congar, "La Condition des Théologiens du XIIe Siècle: Les Théologiens de Paris", Journal des Savants, 1575–1576.
2 Peter Lombard, Sententiae in I Bernardi de Clairvaux, 1971–81; = Spicilegium Bonaventurae, Sentences, especially Marcia Colish and William of Ockham.