

Andrew of Cornwall and the Reception of Modism in England

ROBERT ANDREWS

Summary: A set of questions on Porphyry by one Andrew of Cornwall is preserved in ms Clm 14383. Comparison of Andrew's questions with the Porphyry questions of Simon of Faversham and John Duns Scotus suggests the following scenario. Simon introduced Parisian modism into England, and Andrew used and criticized Simon; further, Andrew's critical account of Simon's modism influenced the young Scotus, who developed a critical stand towards modism.

In the course of preparing the critical edition of the philosophical works of John Duns Scotus, the research team at the Franciscan Institute of St. Bonaventure University has sought to identify as many of the works which influenced Scotus as possible. Towards that end, certain working hypotheses have come to be adopted concerning the composition of Scotus' logical works. One such hypothesis, generally conceded by scholars, is that the logical works are early compositions. Another theory, more controversial,¹ is that Scotus wrote his logical works in England, and that his influences were primarily British. In documenting the evidence, the editors have had much benefit from the critical editions of medieval British philosophical works available. At the same time, it has become painfully clear that much relevant material remains unedited.²

Presented in this article will be a little-known author hitherto unassociated with Scotus: Andrew of Cornwall. I shall argue that

1 Fr. Gedeon Gál thinks that Scotus wrote his logical works in Paris, where Antonius Andreas could have audited them, and thus around 1295-1298. Cf. Antonius Andreas *Quaestiones super librum Porphyrii* f. 71ra: "Haec de dictis magistri fratris Ioannis Duns, natione Scoti, sedentis supra cathedram magistralem, ut potui, colligens, in unum compilavi." In support of this hypothesis, see Balić 1965: 10-11 and Callebaut 1929: 355. Dr. Timothy Noone and I consider the logical works to have been written in England around 1281-87. In support of this hypothesis, see Brampton 1964: 18 and Wolter 1993: 9.

2 Some of the British logicians we have examined in editing Scotus include William of Sherwood, Robert Kilwardby, John of Secheville, Thomas Sutton, Simon of Faversham, William Bonkeys, and John Stycborn.

Andrew's commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge* influenced Scotus, and that Andrew was one of the first to receive critically the modistic theory arriving in England from the continent, thereby helping to shape Scotus' assessment of modism. However, such claims must be offered tentatively, because of the following difficulties: (1) there reigns almost total ignorance about Andrew's life and works; (2) the dates and location of his activity are uncertain; (3) there is no certainty about the direction of influence among Andrew, Scotus, and Simon of Faversham.

All that is known about Andrew of Cornwall derives from the record of his work surviving in ms München, BSB clm. 14383, ff. 81ra-86ra of which contain *Quaestiones super librum Sex principiorum*, and ff. 86rb-92va *Quaestiones super librum Porphyrii*. Martin Grabmann provides the only published discussion of this author and these works.³ Grabmann dates the script to the beginning of the 14th century. This judgement can be corroborated by comparing the script to plate 95 in Thomson's *Latin Bookhands*,⁴ dated 1291 in England. The split ascender on the 'l' and other paleographical evidence indicates this to be an English hand.

Works contained in the ms are:

- ff. 1r-11v pseudo-Aristoteles *Secretum secretorum*
- ff. 12r-39v Hervaeus Natalis *Quodlibet* I
- ff. 40r-63v Jacob of Metz *In Sententiarum* I dist. 1-37
- ff. 64ra-72vb Thomas Aquinas *Quodlibet* III (*des. mutil.*)
- ff. 73ra-80vb *Miscellanea medica*
- ff. 81ra-86ra *Quaestiones super librum Sex principiorum*
- ff. 86rb-92va *Quaestiones super librum Porphyrii*
- ff. 93ra-102r Arwei (Hervaei) *Tractatus de articulis Durandi*
(Colophon: "*Explicit de articulis pertinentibus ad primum librum Durandi reprobatis ab Aruueo.*")

But since the codex is compiled out of several fragments,⁵ the dating of any of these works is not of much significance. There is no date or localizing reference given in Andrew's section of the manuscript.

³ Grabmann 1936: 237-8.

⁴ Thomson 1969.

⁵ Shoener 1973: 393-4: "Codex memb., 280 X 196, ff. 102, e multis libellis consarcinatus."

Andrew of Cornwall is expressly identified as the author of the *Quaestiones super librum Sex principiorum* in its colophon (f. 86ra): “*Expliciunt quaestiones super librum Sex principiorum datae a domino Andrea de Cornubia.*” The subsequent work, by the same scribe, has the names at the titulus (f. 86rb) and colophon (f. 92va) erased (perhaps an examination under ultraviolet light would reveal more). Grabmann, on the basis of similarities between the works, attributes them to the same author. Indeed, the author of the *Quaestiones super librum Porphyrii* has certain peculiarities of expression which are echoed in the preceding commentary: “*patet per ea quae dicta sunt in positione*” (f. 85vb; cf. ff. 86va, 87va, 91vb, 93va); and the formulaic response to arguments is the same: “*Ad primam rationem*” etc.

While concurring with Grabmann regarding authorship and dating, I must disagree with him regarding location. Grabmann says that the commentary on the *Sex principia* has some similarities with the commentary by Robert of Paris in ms München, BSB clm 14246, and thus suggests that Andrew of Cornwall might have been a master of the Arts faculty in Paris. I would argue that the scribe and the author’s patronym are both English – the name ‘Cornubia’, of course, means the county Cornwall in England – and thus I suggest that the place of composition is there also. But of course there is little evidence upon which to confirm any such conclusion.

So, leaving aside the problems about the localization of Andrew’s work, I would like to state the evidence for a connection among the commentaries on Porphyry’s *Isagoge* of Andrew, Scotus,⁶ and Simon of Faversham.⁷ Plainly, they are all question-commentaries, without interposed literal commentary or inserted dubia. And this genre of commentary is a rather new phenomenon for logical commentaries, originating perhaps no earlier than the 1260’s, with Martin of Dacia and Peter of Auvergne. Furthermore, commentaries at the close of the thirteenth century exhibit an increasing complexity. The most elementary type of question consists of preliminary arguments, an argument *ad oppositum* (often from authority), the determination of the question, and replies to the preliminary arguments. Most of Simon of Faversham’s ques-

6 Johannes Duns Scotus, *Quaestiones in Isagogen Porphyrii*.

7 Simon de Faversham, *Quaestiones super libro Porphyrii*.

tions on Porphyry fit this pattern. However, certain questions receive a more complex treatment; they may contain sub-arguments and reports of alternative positions. A number of Andrew's questions exhibit this sort of complexity, as do Scotus'. I submit that this sort of complexity grows out of a tradition of successive treatments of an issue. I think that it is generally previous authors and their opinions who are responsible for alternative opinions inserted into the ordinary progression of argument, rather than merely the creativity of the author – although of course straw-man arguments are not uncommon. The increased complexity of Andrew's and Scotus' arguments arise from their being further along in the chain of development of tradition.

An obvious mark of a continuous tradition is similarity of questions. And the lists of questions of Simon, Andrew, and Scotus overlap to a remarkable extent. This is of course completely expected for such typical questions as whether a genus requires several species; but it is more remarkable when the questions are only loosely prompted by the original text – such as the question of whether 'mortal' is a differentia (motivated by a single aside from Porphyry),⁸ or the question of whether being is predicated univocally of diverse genera, an interesting question only tenuously motivated by Porphyry's text.⁹ Our three authors share these questions, and more.

Preliminary arguments, also, were regarded as common intellectual property among medieval commentators, and freely repeated and echoed without attribution. Similarity in preliminary arguments does not argue direction of influence, but it does indicate a shared tradition. Many of the same preliminary arguments to the same questions are to be found in Simon, Andrew, and Scotus. Following are a couple of examples common to Andrew and Scotus:

IA Andreas de Cornubia *Qq. super librum Porphyrii* q. 4, f. 86vb: Praeterea omne accidens quod est in re ut in subiecto vel est proprium vel commune; sed universale est neutrum horum, quia tunc esset in individuo; igitur etc.

⁸ Cf. Simon de Faversham *Quaestiones super libro Porphyrii* q. 30; Andreas de Cornubia *Quaestiones super librum Porphyrii* q. 21; Johannes Duns Scotus *Quaestiones super librum Porphyrii* q. 29.

⁹ Cf. Simon de Faversham *Quaestiones super libro Porphyrii* q. 27; Andreas de Cornubia *Quaestiones super librum Porphyrii* q. 12; in Scotus, the treatment is found in his *Quaestiones super librum Praedicamentorum* q. 34.

IB Johannes Duns Scotus *Qq. super librum Porphyrii* q. 9-11 n. 1: Omne accidens, quod est in re, est proprium vel commune. Si proprium, inest individuus, licet non primo, quia proprium per se inest speciei, et 'per se' praesupponit 'de omni'. Si commune, primo inest individuus. Si igitur esset accidens in re, esset primo in individuus. Hoc est falsum, quia tunc individuum esset universale; igitur etc.

IIA Andreas de Cornubia *Qq. super librum Porphyrii* q. 5, f. 87ra: Praeterea ad principale, si locus esset principium generationis quia est mensura rei, eadem ratione et tempus similiter, sicut omne quod est in loco sit et in tempore; igitur sicut locus est principium generationis, ideo et tempus.

IIB Johannes Duns Scotus *Qq. super librum Porphyrii* q. 13 n. 2: Item, tempus est principium generationis, quia est mensura extrinseca sicut locus.

The question-commentary format, lists of questions, and shared preliminary arguments perhaps argue only a common tradition, and not direct influence. In authors where one has read the other, we should expect common arguments and turns of phrases. And that is just what we find in our three authors:

IIIA Simon de Faversham *Qq. super libro Porphyrii* q. 29, 56: Contra. Sicut animal est aliquid concretum respectu huius quod est animalitas, ita lignum est aliquid concretum respectu huius quod est lignitas; sed lignum ut concretum non praedicatur de eo cuius est pars, dicendo 'arca est lignum'; ergo si animal dicat partem, non poterit vere praedicari de specie, quamvis sic sit concretum. Pars enim nullo modo habet rationem essentialem totius, et ideo non praedicatur in quid de specie.

IIIB Andreas de Cornubia *Qq. super librum Porphyrii* q. 6, f. 87rb: Dicendum quod principium vere potest praedicari de principiatis denominative, ut hic 'arca est lignea', sed non in abstracto, quia male dicitur 'arca est lignitas'. Similiter in proposito, non obstante quod animalitas vere de specie non potest praedicari, tamen animal quod per modum concreti accipitur vere de specie potest praedicari.

IIIC Johannes Duns Scotus *Qq. super librum Porphyrii* q. 16 n. 42: Contra responsum quae concedit quod materia in concreto praedicatur, arguitur aliter. Nam sicut animal significat materiam hominis in concreto, sic lignum materiam arcae in concreto. Igitur sicut haec est falsa 'arca est lignum', non obstante concrezione illa, sic et haec 'homo est animal'. Prima propositio patet, nam sicut animal est concretum respectu animalitatis, sic lignum respectu lignitatis.

Simon's discussion is his opinion, presented in response to an objection. In Andrew, it is presented as someone else's view arguing against a preliminary argument, and is subsequently rejected. In Scotus, the view is presented as an alternative response ("argui-

tur aliter”), which is then also rejected. The unusual technical term ‘ligneitas’ appears in all three, and Scotus’ turn of phrase (“*non obstante*”) matches Andrew’s.

In what follows, I shall argue that there is a specific direction of influence among the three: from Simon, who studied in Paris and learned of modism there, to Scotus, who read Simon and learned of modism by means of him; with Andrew as a conduit, providing criticisms of Simon which helped to shape Scotus’ view. I believe that Scotus knew Simon’s work directly, for there are quotations from Simon in Scotus that were not mediated by Andrew. But likewise, I can argue, Scotus must have known Andrew, for there are passages common to Andrew and Scotus which are not found in Simon. For example, the following passages, which are responses to the preliminary arguments IIA and B, above.

IVA Andreas de Cornubia *Qq. super librum Porphyrii* q. 5, f. 87ra-b: Ad ultimum dicendum est quod tempus non est principium generationis, sed potius corruptionis. Quia tempus est numerus motus; motus facit distare; ideo dicit Aristoteles quod omnia tabescunt et corrumpuntur. Locus autem principium conservativum est, quod patet quia plantae remotae ab uno loco ad alium corrumpuntur; et hoc non esset nisi primus locus esset principium conservativum.

IVB Johannes Duns Scotus *Qq. super librum Porphyrii* q. 13 n. 8-9: Ad secundum dico quod tempus non per se coadiuvat ad generationem nec salvat generatum, sed magis est causa corruptionis per se, ut ostenditur IV Physicorum. Nota, IV Physicorum: omnia tabefiunt et corrumpuntur in tempore. Facit enim distare rem a dispositione in qua fuit prius. Tempus enim est numerus motus; et in numero, motus est successiva corruptio partium. Igitur tempus non adiuvat ad generationem per se. (Cf. Scotus *Qq. super librum Porphyrii* q. 13 n. 4: Similiter, quaedam plantae fructificant in aliqua parte terrae, sed si plantarentur in alia parte terrae non fructificarent.)

The skeptic might argue, however, that such similarities are not conclusive for the direction of influence, for Andrew provides us with no dates, and we might just as well be looking at someone influenced by Scotus.

I shall respond to this objection in several ways.

First of all, Andrew is no Scotist. That is, he does not agree with Scotus in all of the questions which he has in common with Scotus; nor does he follow the traditional doctrines assembled from Scotus’ works under the rubric Scotism.

In the second place, it would be remarkable to find anyone who read Scotus’ logical works at the beginning of the 14th century,

from when our manuscript dates. Scotus' reputation derived chiefly from his great theological works; it seems a later development that interested philosophers went back to Scotus' logical works. The earliest manuscript we have of any of Scotus' logical works dates from about twenty years after his death.¹⁰ Furthermore, Scotus' logical works are in such a rough shape, reflecting often a hasty and careless style, that later readers preferred to read his theories in Antonius Andreas, who organized and clarified the *Logica vetus* commentaries of Scotus; it was often Antonius, rather than Scotus, who was read in the later schools of Scotism.¹¹

And finally, the most important evidence is that Scotus quotes and rejects views which Andrew sets forth as his considered opinion, as the following examples show:

VA Andreas de Cornubia *Qq. super librum Porphyrii* q. 7, f. 87vb: Est intentio una, quae quidem unitas sumpta est ab unitate proportionis. Et tale unum potest diversis praedicamentis convenire secundum nomen et rationem. Quod sic patet, quia animal dicitur de homine et asino, qui differunt specie; similiter, color de albedine et nigredine praedicatur, quae differunt specie. Ideo propter unitatem huiusmodi proportionis attribuimus eis unam intentionem, quae dicitur genus, et eius definitionem.

VB Johannes Duns Scotus *Qq. super librum Porphyrii* q. 15 n. 26-7: Dicitur quod aliqua unitas in re sufficit <ad unitatem generis>, scilicet unitas proportionis a qua movetur intellectus attribuens hanc intentionem univocam huic et illi. Similiter enim se habet color ad albedinem sicut animal ad hominem.

Contra: unitas univocationis maior est unitate proportionis. Igitur haec ab illa non sumitur.

VIA Andreas de Cornubia *Qq. super librum Porphyrii* q. 6, f. 87ra: Ideo dicitur aliter quod duplex est <totum>, totum reale et totum rationis, et sic duplices sunt partes, scilicet partes reales et partes secundum rationem. Licet pars realis non praedicatur de toto, pars tamen secundum rationem de toto potest praedicari; animal est pars speciei secundum rationem, cum species sit totum secundum rationem; ideo non est inconveniens animal de homine praedicari.

VIB Johannes Duns Scotus *Qq. super librum Porphyrii* q. 16 n. 11-12: Aliter dicitur

¹⁰ Ms Bruxelles, Bibl. Royale 2908 is tentatively dated to around 1325.

¹¹ Cf. Leader 1988: 168: "The *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam* of the Scotist Antonius Andreas was the overwhelming favourite in this field. Organised for ready adaptation to disputations, it was virtually unchallenged in the later middle ages. Aquinas' commentary ran a poor second, followed by Averroës and Duns Scotus."

quod materia vel pars realis non praedicatur de toto; materia tamen vel pars rationis potest, cuiusmodi est genus.

Contra: VII *Metaphysicae* (VII,10 1034b20-24) dicit Aristoteles: "sicut ratio ad rem, sic partes rationis ad partes rei"; ergo permutatim 'sicut partes rei ad rem, sic partes rationis ad rationem'; sed partes rei, per te, non praedicantur de toto, igitur nec partes rationis.

I rule out the hypothesis that Andrew read Scotus, picked out theories which Scotus explicitly rejects, and presented them in an expanded version as his own. Thus Andrew was an influence on Scotus, and not the other way around.

The final excerpts I present, numbers VII A, B, and C, seem to me to show the way that Andrew stands between Simon and Scotus, serving as a mediator who helped to shape Scotus' views. The issue is the univocity of being, which arises here because of Porphyry's comment that that being cannot be a supreme genus to the ten categories (6.10-12). The solution that being should be applied analogously across different genera was perhaps first introduced by Avicenna,¹² but was given wide currency by Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas.

The first passage is Simon of Faversham's straightforward statement of this common position:

VIIA Simon de Faversham *Qq. super libro Porphyrii* q. 27, 51: Ergo ens non erit pure aequivocum ad substantiam et accidens; erit ergo analogum, dictum secundum prius et posterius, quia per prius dicitur de substantia, per posterius de accidente.

The second passage is this common position being reported by Andrew, following Simon's words. But remarkably, what follows in Andrew is not found in Simon, but it is a quick summary of the modist position of an isomorphism among being, understanding, and signifying – the cornerstone of modist doctrine. And Andrew applies this theory to explain why someone might hold the analogy of being. This allusion to modist doctrine, while provided by Andrew, was clearly intended to point out Simon of Faversham to anyone familiar with his ideas.

VIIIB Andreas de Cornubia *Qq. super librum Porphyrii* q. 12, f. 89va: Ad quaestionem dicunt quidam quod ens dicitur de substantia et accidente analogice, et hoc secundum prius et posterius. Per prius dicitur de substantia, per posterius de accidente. Cuius ratio est quia significare et intelligere sequuntur esse secundum ordinem. Sicut igitur se habet ad esse, ita ad intelligere et significare. Sed substantia

¹² Avicenna, *Liber de philosophia prima* I, 5; I 40.

est primum ens et per se ens; accidens autem non est nisi quia substantia eius in qua est, cum esse accidentis sit inesse. Propter hoc dicitur accidentaliter ens, quia <a> substantia capit suum esse. Sic igitur est intelligere et significare quod primo significabit ens substantiam, et postea per reductionem accidens.

See what happens in the third passage, number VIIC, when Scotus takes up this debate.¹³ Scotus is familiar with several ways of understanding analogy; Simon's version is the second one he reports. But he cites Simon along with the specific association with the key modistic doctrine, as earlier linked together by Andrew.

VIIC Johannes Duns Scotus *Qq. super librum Praedicamentorum* q. 34 n. 28-29: Ponitur autem analogia in vocibus tripliciter: vel quia significant unam rationem primo, quae in existendo diversimode convenit duobus vel pluribus, quae dicuntur analogata. Sicut hoc nomen 'causa' et hoc nomen 'principium' et multa alia nomina, quae distinguuntur in V *Metaphysicae* (1012b35-1014a25) significant unam rationem primo, tamen illa est in diversis secundum ordinem.

Alio modo ponitur analogia in vocibus, quia unum significatur per prius per vocem, et reliquum per posterius. Cuius causa ponitur: quia significare sequitur intelligere. Quod igitur per prius intelligitur alio, si significetur per eandem vocem per quam et illud aliud, per prius significabitur.

And then Scotus goes on to reject this view of the analogy of being, while using language that suggests he has the doctrines of modism in mind:

Johannes Duns Scotus *Qq. super librum Praedicamentorum* q. 34 n. 34: Ratio posita (*sc.*, n. 29) ad hoc non videtur valere. Quia significare non sequitur intelligere necessaria consequentia, sicut effectus necessariam causam. Quia aliquid potest intelligi prius alio tempore et natura, nec tamen tunc significari. Non enim necesse est, ut intelligens, vocem imponat ei quod intelligit, sed adhuc est ad placitum ut imponat vel non. Sed ista propositio 'significare sequitur intelligere' intelligenda est ut illud 'sine quo non', quia non potest aliquid significari nisi intelligatur; sed nec sequitur necessario nec quoad similem ordinem in intelligendo et significando.

Scotus' argument, that signification does not necessarily follow upon understanding, is an attack on a rather simple-minded version of modism; for a modist need not claim that everything that is understood *eo ipso* becomes signified, but rather that any signification presupposes understanding. But Scotus' choice of words shows that he intended to oppose the modists.

I have argued earlier, in a paper submitted to the proceedings of the Tenth European Symposium for Logic and Semantics, that

13 Johannes Duns Scotus, *Quaestiones super librum Praedicamentorum* q. 34.

Scotus was not a modist.¹⁴ Here is another piece of evidence to add to the arguments there. Note also that, in this regard, Scotus is not a Scotist – for here he goes on to posit a complete equivocation among being in different categories. This is an uncomfortable position for the Scotists who were familiar with the later doctrine of Scotus claiming the univocity of being.¹⁵ The same position as here, when stated in Scotus' *Metaphysics* commentary,¹⁶ led to all sorts of scribal variants and annotations, and the question was revised when it appeared in Antonius Andreas.¹⁷ But the fact is that Scotus at the outset of his career was not a proponent of the univocity of being.

An interesting aspect of the discovery of Andrew's work is that it helps to clarify the progression of ideas in the introduction of modism in England. According to the scenario sketched above, modistic ideas were first transmitted to England in the works of the Englishman Simon of Faversham, who had studied in Paris. As they arrived in England, these theories were criticized by Andrew of Cornwall, who then helped to shape Scotus' attitude towards modism.

It is worth re-emphasizing that my reconstruction of events is conjectural, and is based upon features of texts currently available. Researchers in the future should be able to supply editions which will either confirm or challenge my version of events. (I plan to publish the complete text of Andrew's *Isagoge* commentary.) My hope is that these investigations will help to illuminate the milieu of Scotus and the state of British logic at the end of the thirteenth century.

Bibliography

Primary Literature

Andreas de Cornubia, *Quaestiones super librum Porphyrii*, ms München SB, Clm. 14383.

Antonius Andreas, *Quaestiones super duodecim libros Metaphysicae*, Venetiis 1513.

Antonius Andreas, *Quaestiones super librum Porphyrii*, Pamplona, Bibl. de la Catedral cod. 6.

¹⁴ Andrews: forthcoming.

¹⁵ Cf. Johannes Duns Scotus, *Ordinatio* I d. 3 pars 1 q. 3; III 68-123.

¹⁶ Johannes Duns Scotus, *Quaestiones super libros Metaphysicorum* IV q. 1.

¹⁷ Antonius Andreas, *Quaestiones super duodecim libros Metaphysicae* IV q. 1, ff. 17ra-18ra.

- Avicenna, *Liber de philosophia prima sive Scientia divina I-X*, ed. S. Van Riet and E. Peeters, with an introduction by G. Verbeke, Éditions Orientalistes & Brill: Louvain & Leiden, 1977-1980.
- Johannes Duns Scotus, *Ordinatio*, Liber primus, distinctio tertia, *Opera omnia* III, ed. C. Balić *et al.*, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis: Vatican, 1954.
- Johannes Duns Scotus, *Quaestiones in Isagogen Porphyrii, Opera philosophica* vol. I, ed. R. Andrews, G. Etzkorn, G. Gál, R. Green, T. Noone, and R. Wood, The Franciscan Institute: St. Bonaventure, N.Y., in preparation.
- Johannes Duns Scotus, *Quaestiones super libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis, Opera philosophica* vols. III-IV, ed. G. Etzkorn, R. Andrews, G. Gál, R. Green, F. Kelley, T. Noone, and R. Wood, The Franciscan Institute: St. Bonaventure, N.Y., 1997-1998.
- Johannes Duns Scotus, *Quaestiones super librum Praedicamentorum Aristotelis, Opera philosophica* vol. I, ed. R. Andrews, G. Etzkorn, G. Gál, R. Green, T. Noone, and R. Wood, The Franciscan Institute: St. Bonaventure, N.Y., in preparation.
- Simon de Faversham, *Quaestiones super libro Porphyrii, Opera Omnia I, Opera logica*, to-mus prior, ed. P. Mazzarella, CEDAM: Padua, 1957.

Secondary Literature

- Andrews, Robert. Forthcoming. "The *Modistae* and John Duns Scotus's *Quaestiones super Perihermeneias*." The Proceedings of the Tenth European Symposium for Logic and Semantics. Brill: Leiden.
- Balić, Charles. 1965. "The Life and Works of John Duns Scotus." In *John Duns Scotus, 1265-1965*. Edited by John K. Ryan and Bernadine M. Bonansea. *Studies in Philosophy and the History of Philosophy* 3. Catholic University of America Press: Washington.
- Brampton, C. K. 1964. "Duns Scotus at Oxford, 1288-1301." *Franciscan Studies* 66: 5-20.
- Callebaut, A. 1929. "Le séjours du b. Jean Duns Scot à Paris. Son milieu universitaire." *La France Franciscaine* 12: 353-373.
- Grabmann, Martin. 1936. "Mitteilungen aus Münchener Handschriften über bisher unbekannte Philosophen der Artistenfakultät (cod. lat. 14246 und 14383)"; in *id.*, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben* II. Max Hueber: München.
- Leader, D. R. 1988. *A History of the University of Cambridge*, vol. I. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Shooner, H. (ed.) 1973. *Codices Manuscripti Operum Thomae de Aquino*, Tom. II. Editori di San Tommaso: Rome.
- Thomson, S. Harrison. 1969. *Latin Bookhands of the Later Middle Ages*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Wolter, Allan B. 1993. "Reflections on the Life and Works of Scotus." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 57: 1-36.

