



Title	The Exegetical Tradition of Medieval Neoplatonism. Considerations on a Recently Discovered Corpus of Texts
Authors(s)	Calma, Dragos
Publication date	2016
Publication information	Calma, Dragos. "The Exegetical Tradition of Medieval Neoplatonism. Considerations on a Recently Discovered Corpus of Texts." Brepols, 2016. https://doi.org/10.1484/M.SA-EB.5.111557 .
Publisher	Brepols
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/10128
Publisher's version (DOI)	10.1484/M.SA-EB.5.111557

Downloaded 2025-12-04 22:51:47

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)



© Some rights reserved. For more information

The Exegetical Tradition of Medieval Neoplatonism. Considerations on a Recently Discovered *Corpus* of Texts

Dragos Calma

(Universitatea “Babeş-Bolyai”, Cluj-Napoca / École pratique des hautes études, Paris)

The texts, first of all. More precisely, the unpublished commentaries on the *Book of Causes* and on the *Elements of Theology*, which are only partially uncovered in the two volumes of *Neoplatonism in the Middle Ages* (= *NeMA*). These volumes principally report philological and historical findings, though without neglecting — but also without privileging — philosophical analyses, treating those aspects most in need of describing when confronted with a *corpus* largely unknown or ignored until now. At the outset of the project, still underway, priority was given to the substantive groundwork: consulting catalogues, locating manuscripts, identifying the commentaries and providing detailed analysis (diffusion of manuscripts, edition, contextual and doctrinal studies). Together these elements constitute a kind of identity card for each of the commentaries studied in these pages; at times precise information can be given, while at others it was necessary to advance only hypotheses which now await further research in order to be verified.

1. Medieval Neoplatonism: the State of the Question

1.1. *Proclus and the Elements of Theology*

The Latin legacy of the *Elements of Theology* is bound up with Thomas Aquinas’s commentary on the *Book of Causes*¹. Aquinas considerably modified the medieval understanding of Greek Neoplatonism in two ways: firstly, by

1. A broader and still valuable overview, despite more recent developments in certain fields, was made by R. IMBACH, “Le (néo-)platonisme médiéval, Proclus latin et l’école dominicaine allemande”, in *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 110 (1978), p. 427-448; reprinted in *Id.*,

demonstrating that the *Book of Causes* depends on the *Elements of Theology* of Proclus; secondly, by offering a detailed comparison of the hierarchical structure of the cosmos in the *Book of Causes* with the writings of Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite (especially the *Celestial Hierarchy*). Thomas thereby situated the anonymous treatise between Proclus, its philosophical source, and Dionysius, one of the major authorities of Christian theology².

The Latin reception of Proclus has been the object of significant scholarly attention, to mention only the studies of R. Klibansky³, P.O. Kristeller⁴, H.-D. Saffrey⁵, W. Beierwaltes⁶, S. Gersh⁷, C. Steel⁸. Some remarkable progress

Quodlibeta. Ausgewählte Artikel, Fribourg, Universitätsverlag, 1996, p. 129-152. I do not take into consideration the later translations of the *Elements of Theology*; on this topic see the latest state of the question presented by D. ROBICHAUD, "Fragments of Marsilio Ficino's Translations and Use of Proclus' *Elements of Theology* and *Elements of Physics*: Evidence and Study", in *Vivarium* 54 (2016), p. 46-107. See also G. BOSS, G. SEEL (eds.), *Proclus et son influence*, Zürich, Edition du Grand Midi, 1987; E.P. BOS, P.A. MEIJER (eds.), *On Proclus and his Influence in Medieval Philosophy*, Leiden / New York / Köln, Brill, 1992.

2. Cf. A. DE LIBERA, "Albert le Grand et Thomas d'Aquin interprètes du *Liber de causis*", in *Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 74 (1990), p. 349.
3. R. KLIBANSKY, *Ein Proklos-Fund und seine Bedeutung*, Heidelberg, C. Winter, 1929; ID., *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition during the Middle Ages*, London, The Warburg Institute, 1939; ID. (ed.), *Corpus Platonicum Medii Aevii*, vol. III (*Parmenides - Proclus*), London, The Warburg Institute, 1953.
4. P.O. KRISTELLER, *Renaissance Thought and Its Sources*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1979; ID., "Proclus as a Reader of Plato and Plotinus, and his Influence in the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance", in J. PÉPIN, H.-D. SAFFREY (eds.), *Proclus lecteur et interprète des anciens*, Paris, Editions du CNRS, 1987, p. 191-211; ID., "Neoplatonismo e Rinascimento", in P. PRINI (ed.), *Il neoplatonismo nel Rinascimento*, Roma, Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, 1993, p. 9-28.
5. H.-D. SAFFREY, "L'état actuel des recherches sur le *Liber de causis* comme source de la métaphysique au Moyen Âge", in *Die Metaphysik im Mittelalter*, Berlin, W. De Gruyter, 1963, p. 267-281; ID., *Recherches sur la tradition platonicienne au Moyen-Âge et à la Renaissance*, Paris, Vrin, 1987; ID., *L'héritage des anciens au Moyen Âge et à la Renaissance*, Paris, Vrin, 2003.
6. W. BEIERWALTES, "Das seiende Eine. Zur neuplatonischen Interpretation der zweiten Hypothese des platonischen *Parmenides* : das Beispiel Cusanus", in BOSS, SEEL (eds.), *Proclus et son influence*, p. 287-298; ID., *Platonisme et idéalisme*, Paris, Vrin, 2000, p. 11-87; *Procliana: spätantikes Denken und seine Spuren*, Frankfurt a. M., Vittorio Klostermann, 2007.
7. S. GERSH, *Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism: the Latin Tradition*, 2 vols, Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1986; ID., *Reading Plato, Tracing Plato: From Ancient Commentary to Medieval Reception*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005; ID. (ed.), *Interpreting Proclus*, 2014; S. GERSH, M.J.F.M. HOENEN (eds.), *The Platonic Tradition in the Middle Ages: a Doxographic Approach*, Berlin, W. de Gruyter, 2002.
8. C. STEEL, *Proclus: Commentaire sur le 'Parménide' de Platon. Traduction de Guillaume de Moerbeke. Tome 1: Livre I à IV*, Leuven, Leuven University Press, 1982; ID., *Proclus: Commentaire sur le 'Parménide' de Platon. Traduction de Guillaume de Moerbeke. Tome 2: Livre V à VII et notes marginales de Nicolas de Cues. Edition critique suivie de l'édition des*

in the field of medieval Neoplatonism is due to the works of L. Sturlese who both has provided pioneering studies on the reception of Proclus among the German Dominicans and, over many years, has overseen the complete edition of Berthold of Moosburg's commentary on the *Elements of Theology*⁹.

1.2. The Liber de causis

Being the result of a translation-adaptation of Proclus's *Elements of Theology*, as well as displaying the influence of the Arabic Plotinus, the *Book of Causes* which influenced the Latin tradition studied in these two volumes¹⁰ was written in Arabic in 9th-century Baghdad. It was translated into Latin at the end of the 12th-century, and was subsequently translated into Hebrew (three times from Latin between 1260 and 1477, once from Arabic in 1280)¹¹ and into Armenian¹².

extraits du Commentaire sur le 'Timée', traduits par Moerbeke, Leuven, Leuven University Press, 1985; ID., "Plato Latinus", in J. HAMESSE, M. FATTORI (eds.), Rencontres de cultures dans la philosophie médiévale: traductions et traducteurs de l'antiquité tardive au XV^e siècle, Louvain-la-Neuve / Cassino, Publications de l'Institut d'Études médiévales, p. 301-316.

9. BERTHOLD DE MOOSBURG, *Expositio super Elementationem theologicam Procli*, unter der Leitung von L. STURLESE, Hamburg, Felix Meiner, 1984-2014; he started this edition in 1974: *Bertoldo di Moosburg, Expositio super Elementationem theologicam Procli, 184-211, De animabus*, presentazione di E. MASSA, Roma, Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1974.
10. Historians unanimously accept the hypothesis that there were two Arabic versions of the *Book of Causes*; the only point of discussion now concerns their dates of composition and the relations between them. See especially P. THILLET, S. OUDAIMAH, "Proclus Arabe. Un nouveau *Liber de causis* ?", in *Bulletin d'Études Orientales*, 53-54(2001-2002), p. 293-368; E. WAKELNIG, *Feder, Tafel, Mensch. Al-'Āmiri's Kitāb al-Fuṣūl fī l-Ma'ālim al-ilāhiya und die arabische Proklos-Rezeption im 10. Jh.*, Leiden / Boston, Brill, 2006; EAD., "Proclus in Aristotelian disguise. Notes on the Arabic transmission of Proclus' *Elements of Theology*", in A. MUSCO, R. GAMBINO, L. PEPI, P. SPALLINO, M. VASSALLO (eds.), *Universalità della Ragione. Pluralità delle Filosofie nel Medioevo, XII Congresso Internazionale di Filosofia Medievale Palermo, 17-22 settembre 2007*, Palermo, Officina di Studi Medievali, 2012, p. 165-176.
11. On this matter, see especially J.-P. ROTHSCHILD, *Les traductions hébraïques du Liber de causis latin*, thèse dactyl., 2 vol. (Paris, Université de Paris-III, 1985); ID., "Les traductions du *Livre des causes* et leurs copies", in *Revue d'histoire des textes* 24 (1994), p. 393-484; ID., "Le *Livre des causes* du latin à l'hébreu: textes, problèmes, réception", in A. FIDORA, H.J. HAMEZ, Y. SCHWARTZ (eds.), *Latin-into-Hebrew: Texts and Studies*, Leiden / Boston, Brill, 2013, p. 47-84; ID., "Quelques philosophes juifs du Moyen Age tardif, traducteurs ou lecteurs de saint Thomas d'Aquin", in E.H. FÜLLENBACH, G. MILETTO (eds.), *Dominikaner und Juden. Personen, Konflikte und Perspektiven vom 13. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2015, p. 25-63. I thank J.-P. Rothschild for his valuable collaboration.
12. M. Rapava is currently preparing the edition of the Armenian translation of the *Liber de causis*, completed in the second half of the 17th century. On the reception of Neoplatonism in the Caucasus, see T. NUTSUBIDZE, C.B. HORN, B. LOURIÉ (eds.), *Georgian Christian Thought and Its Cultural Context. Memorial Volume for the 125th Anniversary of Shalva*

Studies concerning the Arabic tradition of the *Book of Causes* (mentioning the Latin tradition as well) began in the 19th century with D.B. Haneberg¹³ and O. Bardenhewer¹⁴, and were continued and deepened by G. Endress¹⁵, Richard Taylor¹⁶, Cristina d'Ancona¹⁷ and E. Wakelnig¹⁸. Few studies on the Hebraic tradition have been made; these also began at the end of the 19th century, by M. Steinschneider, and have been carried on by I. Schreiber and J.-P. Rothschild¹⁹.

Of all these traditions, the Latin reception is the most extensive, judging

Nutsbidze (1888-1969), Leiden / Boston, Brill, 2014; T. IREMADZE, *Konzeptionen des Denkens im Neuplatonismus. Zur Rezeption der Proklichen Philosophie im deutschen und georgischen Mittelalter: Dietrich von Freiberg — Berthold von Moosburg — Joane Petrizi*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2004; JOANE PETRIZI, *Kommentar zur 'Elementatio theologica' des Proclus*, Übersetzung aus dem Altgeorgischen, Anmerkungen, Indices und Einleitung von L. ALEXIDZE und L. BERGEMANN, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2009; L. ALEXIDZE, "Ioane Petritsi", in S. GERSH (ed.), *Interpreting Proclus. From Antiquity to the Renaissance*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2014, p. 229-244.

13. D.B. HANEBERG, "Über die neuplatonische Schrift von den Ursachen (*Liber de causis*)", in *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, I (1863), p. 261-288.
14. O. BARDENHEWER, *Die pseudo-aristotelische Schrift über die reine Gute, bekannt unter dem Namen 'Liber de Causis'*, Freiburg i.B., Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1882.
15. G. ENDRESS, *Proclus Arabus. Zwanzig Abschnitte aus der Institutio theologica in arabischer Übersetzung*, Wiesbaden / Beirut, Imprimerie Catholique, 1973.
16. For a complete bibliography of R. Taylor's work on *Liber de causis*, see his "Primary and Secondary Causality", in R.C. TAYLOR, L.X. LOPEZ-FARJEAT (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Islamic Philosophy*, New York, Routledge, 2016, p. 225-235; R. TAYLOR, C. D'ANCONA, "Le *Liber de causis*", in R. GOULET (ed.), *Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques*, Supplément au vol. I, Paris, Editions du CNRS, 2003, p. 599-647.
17. C. D'ANCONA, *Recherches sur le 'Liber de Causis'*, Vrin, Paris 1995; EAD., "La notion de cause dans les textes néoplatoniciens arabes", in C. CHIESA, L. FREULER (eds.), *Métaphysiques médiévales. Études en l'honneur d'André de Muralt*, Cahiers de la Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, 20 (1999), p. 47-68; EAD., "L'influence du vocabulaire arabe: *Causa Prima est esse tantum*", J. HAMESSE, C. STEEL (eds.), *L'élaboration du vocabulaire philosophique au Moyen Age. Actes du Colloque International de Louvain-la-Neuve et Leuven, 12-14 septembre 1998* organisé par la S.I.E.P.M., Turnhout, Brepols, 2000, p. 51-97; EAD., "Avicenna and the *Liber de Causis*: A Contribution to the Dossier", in *Revista Española de Filosofía Medieval* 7 (2000), p. 95-114; EAD., "*Causa prima superior est omni narratione*. Il tema delle *sifat Allah* nel primo neoplatonismo arabo", in *Oriente Moderno*, 19(80), n.s., (2000), p. 519-555; EAD., "Proclus, Denys, le *Liber de Causis* et la science divine", in O. BOULNOIS, J. SCHMUTZ, J.-L. SOLÈRE (eds.), *Le contemplateur et les idées. Modèles de la science divine du néoplatonisme au XVIII^e siècle*, Vrin, Paris, 2002, p. 19-44; EAD., "The *Liber de causis*", in GERSH (ed.), *Interpreting Proclus*, p. 137-165. EAD., "Nota sulla traduzione latina del *Libro di Aristotele sull'esposizione del bene puro* e sul titolo *Liber de Causis*", in S. PERFETTI (ed.), *Scientia, Fides, Theologia. Studi di filosofia medievale in onore di Gianfranco Fioravanti*, Firenze, Edizioni ETS, 2011, p. 89-102.
18. See *supra*, n. 10.
19. See *supra*, n. 11.

by the number of manuscripts transmitting the text and the number of commentaries concerning it. In fact, the *Liber de causis* was cited already in the 12th century, shortly after being translated, by Alan of Lille²⁰ and, as was recently demonstrated, it was taught and commented upon up to the first half of the 16th century. Scholars to date had eight printed commentaries at their disposal: those of Roger Bacon²¹, Albert the Grand²², Thomas Aquinas²³, Siger of Brabant²⁴, Ps.-Henry of Ghent²⁵, Giles of Rome²⁶, Jacob of Gostynin²⁷ and Chrysostom Javelli Canapicius²⁸.

The large majority of research has concerned a very limited corpus of six edited commentaries (Roger Bacon, Ps.-Henry of Ghent, Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Siger of Brabant, Giles of Rome); almost nothing has been done on the commentaries of Jacob of Gostynin and Javelli. Of these, the commentaries of Roger Bacon, Ps.-Henry of Ghent and Giles of Rome are the least studied²⁹. Albert the Great's commentary has benefitted from a relatively

20. M.Th. D'ALVERNY, "Les pérégrinations de l'âme dans l'autre monde d'après un anonyme de la fin du XII^e siècle", in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 13 (1940), p. 239-299; Ch. LOHR, "The Pseudo-Aristotelian *Liber de causis* and Latin Theories of Science in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries", in J. KRAYE, W.F. RYAN, C.B. SCHMITT (eds.), *Pseudo-Aristotle in the Middle Ages. The Theology and Other Texts*, London, The Warburg Institute, 1986, p. 53-62; Th. RICKLIN, *Die 'Physica' und der 'Liber de causis' im 12. Jahrhundert*, Fribourg, Universitätsverlag, 1995.
21. ROGERUS BACON, *Quaestiones supra Librum de causis*, ed. R STEELE, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1935.
22. ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De causis et processu universitatis a prima causa*, ed. W. FAUSER, Münster, Aschendorff, 1993.
23. THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Super Librum de causis expositio*, ed. H.-D. SAFFREY, Paris, Vrin, 2002.
24. SIGERUS DE BRABANTIA, *Quaestiones super Librum de causis*, ed. A. MARLASCA, Louvain / Paris, Publications universitaires / Béatrice-Nauwelaerts, 1972.
25. Ps. HENRICUS GANDAVENSIS, *Les Quaestiones in Librum de causis attribuées à Henri de Gand*, ed. J.P. ZWAENEPOEL, Louvain / Paris, Publications Universitaires / Béatrice-Nauwelaerts, 1974.
26. EGIDIUS ROMANUS, *Super Librum de Causis*, Venezia, apud Iacobum Zoppinum, 1550, repr. Frankfurt a.M., 1968.
27. IACOBUS DE GOSTYNIN, *Super Librum de causis*, ed. W.P. GÓRA, in *Materiały i Studia Zakładu Historii filozofii Starożytnej i Średniowiecznej* 11 (1969).
28. The work has had numerous printings: JAVELLI CHRYSOSTOMOS, *Epitoma super totam naturalem philosophiam & metaphysicam Aristotelis; necnon subtilissima enucleatio propositionum omnium in librum De causis*, Francesco I Bindoni et Maffeo Pasini, Venetiis 1531; H. Scotum, Venetiis 1547, 1552, 1567; Joannem Mariani Bonellum, 1555.
29. P.A. ANTOLIC, "Kausalität und Schöpfung in Roger Bacons Kommentar zum *Liber de causis*", in U. KÖPF, D.R. BAUER (eds.), *Kulturkontakte und Rezeptionsvorgänge in der Theologie des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, Münster, Aschendorff, 2011, p. 127-155; J.-L. SOLÈRE, "Néoplatonisme et rhétorique: Gilles de Rome et la première proposition du *De causis*", in L. BENAKIS (ed.), *Néoplatonisme et Philosophie médiévale*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1997, p. 163-196; C. D'ANCONA, "L'uso della *sententia Dionysii* nel commento di s. Tommaso e Egidio Romano alle proposizioni 3, 4, 6 del *Liber de Causis*", in *Medioevo* 8 (1982), p. 1-42;

recent edition which, however, is often unreliable because of its editorial methods; it has been partially translated into German and French (Treatise I) and only a few specific studies have been devoted to it³⁰. Thomas Aquinas's commentary, as is often the case, holds a privileged position; his commentary has been edited, entirely translated into several languages and has given rise to numerous studies³¹. The commentary of Siger of Brabant is untranslated and has been the object of a few contributions³². Even less studied, but equally profound and significant, is the influence of Neoplatonism on the universities of Central Europe³³.

P. PORRO, "Prima rerum creatarum est esse: Henri de Gand, Gilles de Rome et la quatrième proposition du *De causis*", in V. CORDONNIER, T. SUAREZ-NANI (eds.), *L'aristotélisme exposé. Aspects du débat philosophique entre Henri de Gand et Gilles de Rome*, Fribourg, Academic Press Fribourg, 2014, p. 55-81; Id., "The University of Paris in the thirteenth century", in GERSH (ed.), *Interpreting Proclus*, p. 264-299.

30. For the German translation, see ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *Buch über die Ursachen und den Hervorgang von allem aus der ersten Ursache. Liber primus*, übersetzt und herausgegeben von H. ANZULEWICZ, M. BURGER, S. DONATI, R. MEYER, H. MÖHLE, Hamburg, Felix Meiner, 2006; for the French translation, see ALBERT LE GRAND, *Le traité du flux. Tractatus de fluxu causatorum a causa prima et causarum ordine*, introduit, traduit et commenté par S. MILAZZO, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2013. Cf. M.R. PAGNONI-STURLESE, "A propos du néoplatonisme d'Albert le Grand. Aventures et mésaventures de quelques textes d'Albert dans le Commentaire sur Proclus de Berthold de Moosburg", in *Archives de Philosophie* 13 (1980), p. 635-654; L. SWEENEY, "Esse primum creatum in Albert the Great's *Liber de causis et processu universitatis*", in *The Thomist* 44 (1980), p. 549-646; ID., "A Controversial Text on *esse primum creatum* in Albert the Great's *Liber de causis et processu universitatis*", in *Proceedings of the Patristics, Medieval, and Renaissance Conference* 5 (1982), p. 137-150; DE LIBERA, "Albert le Grand et Thomas d'Aquin", p. 347-377; ID., "Albert le Grand et le platonisme. De la doctrine des idées à la théorie des trois états de l'universel", in BOS, MEIJER (eds.), *On Proclus and his Influence*, p. 89-119; H. ANZULEWICZ, "Plato and Platonic / Neoplatonic Sources in Albert", in I.M. RESNICK (ed.), *A Companion to Albert the Great. Theology, Philosophy, and the Sciences*, Leiden, Brill, 2013, p. 595-600; Th. BONIN, *Creation as Emanation. The Origin of Diversity in Albert the Great's 'On the Causes and the Procession of the Universe'*, Notre Dame, Notre Dame Press, 2001; EAD., "Albert's *De causis* and the Creation of Being", in RESNICK (ed.), *A Companion to Albert the Great*, p. 688-693; D. TWETTEN, "Albert's Arguments for the Existence of God and the Primary Causes", in RESNICK (ed.), *A Companion to Albert the Great*, p. 658-687.
31. For a recent bibliography, see P. PORRO, *Tommaso d'Aquino. Un profilo storico-filosofico*, Carocci editore, Roma, 2012, p. 403-408.
32. R. IMBACH, "Le traité de l'eucharistie de Thomas d'Aquin et les averroïstes", in *Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 77(1993), p. 175-194; "Notule sur le commentaire du *Liber de causis* de Siger de Brabant et ses rapports avec Thomas d'Aquin", in *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 43 (1996), p. 304-323; D. CALMA, "Siger de Brabant et Thomas d'Aquin: l'histoire d'un plagiat", in *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie*, 50 (2003), p. 118-135; ID., "D'Averroès au *Liber de causis*: la noétique", in ID., *Études sur le premier siècle de l'averroïsme latin. Approches et textes inédits*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2011, p. 265-309.
33. Several studies have been published on the reception of Plato (especially on *Timaeus*)

The study of the influence of the *Book of Causes* in the history of Western rationality, though not unacknowledged, has not benefitted from many innovative scholarly efforts. With the exception of the work of Cristina d'Ancona, the commentaries in manuscripts remained untouched. Still, thanks to Richard Taylor, the scholarly community has had two important lists at its disposal since 1984: a list of 237 manuscripts transmitting the text of the *Liber de causis* and a list of 31 manuscripts containing Latin commentaries on the work. Surprisingly, medievalists have never mined these two lists to any great depth. Thus a brief discussion concerning these manuscripts is in order.

2. Latin Manuscripts of the *Liber de causis*

Richard Taylor's list of 237³⁴ manuscripts containing the *Liber de causis* displays a richness to which the "edition" of A. Pattin cannot do justice. Pattin's work, published in 1966, has nevertheless been helpful to scholars by offering a more or less reliable text of the *Liber de causis*³⁵. In 1989, in

in Eastern Europe, but very few on Neoplatonism. E. JEAUNEAU, "Plato apud Bohemos", in *Mediaeval Studies* 41 (1979), p. 161-214; Z. KALUZA, "Jérôme de Prague et le *Timée* de Platon", in *Archives d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du Moyen Age*, 61 (1994), p. 57-104, reprinted in ID., *Études doctrinales sur le XIV^e siècle. Théologie, logique, philosophie*, Paris, Vrin, p. 253-300; ID., *Les querelles doctrinales à Paris: Nominalistes et réalistes aux confins du XIV^e et du XV^e siècles*, Bergamo, 1988. Cf. D.E. LUSCOMBE, "Denis the Pseudo-Areopagite and Central Europe in the Later Middle Ages", in S. WŁODEK (ed.), *Société et Eglise. Textes et discussions dans les universités d'Europe Centrale pendant le Moyen Age tardif*. Actes du Colloque international de Cracovie 14-16 juin 1993, Turnhout, Brepols, 1995, p. 45-64; ID., "Some Examples of the Use Made of the Works of the Pseudo-Dionysius by University Teachers in the Later Middle Ages", in J. IJSEWIJN, J. PAQUET (eds.), *The Universities in the Late Middle Ages*, Louvain, 1978, 228-41; V. HEROLD, "Wyclifs Polemik gegen Ockhams Auffassung der platonischen Ideen und ihr Nachklang in der tschechischen hussitischen Philosophie", in A. HUDSON, M. WILKS (eds.), *From Ockham to Wyclif*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1987, p. 185-211; ID., "Platonic Ideas and 'Hussite' Philosophy", in D.R. HOLETON (ed.), *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*, Praha, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, 1994, p. 13-17 (on-line: <http://www.brrp.org/proceedings/brrp1/herold.pdf>); ID., "Neuplatonismus in der Ideenlehre bei Johann Wyclif an der Prager Universität", in BENAKIS (ed.), *Néoplatonisme et philosophie médiévale*, p. 253-271. On the teaching of the *Liber de causis* in Central Europe, see D. CALMA, "Du néoplatonisme au réalisme et retour. Notes préliminaires sur la fortune latine du *Liber de causis* du XIII^e au XVI^e siècle", in *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale*, 54 (2012), p. 217-276, here p. 244-273.

34. I have identified other manuscripts by searching through library collections.

35. A. PATTIN, "Le *Liber de causis*. Édition établie à l'aide de 90 manuscrits", in *Tijdschrift voor Philosophie*, 28 (1966), p. 90—203; repr. in A. PATTIN, *Miscellanea. I. Liber de causis*, Leuven, Bibliotheek van de Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid, 2000.

an important article, Richard Taylor³⁶ called attention to the fact that the text published by Pattin differs from that of Aosta, Seminario Maggiore, 71 (f. 30ra-33ra), one of the oldest witnesses to the text. His remarks principally concern the fact that the Aosta manuscript transmits a text closer to the oldest Arabic manuscript (preserved in Leiden); Taylor has thus proposed a series of corrections, 60 of which are of particular doctrinal import. These corrections are certainly justified from the standpoint of the approach adopted by Taylor: to find the Latin text closest to the Arabic original. However, there exists no study on the entire tradition of manuscripts which would determine whether the Aosta witness has had any influence on the Latin tradition. Pattin has not taken it into consideration in his collation of the manuscripts, and the meagre apparatus of variants which accompanies his text does not allow one fully to compare the Aosta manuscript with the other witnesses.

Pattin, in fact, fully collated only 10 manuscripts, while leaving unexplained his rationale for choosing these witnesses rather than others; he “consulted”, in addition, 35 manuscripts (among which was the Aosta MS)³⁷. Glancing through the apparatus of variants, one finds that Pattin mentions one or another of these “consulted” manuscripts in order to note their variants, but only sporadically and without philological rigour. He very briefly describes 90 manuscripts, usually by giving an approximate date, the *incipit*, the *explicit* and occasionally some remarks on formal aspects of the manuscript which caught his attention (the owner of the manuscript, its provenance, the division of the text, etc.). Yet for establishing the Latin text, he only made use of half of them: he collated 10 manuscripts and consulted 35. His is therefore not an “édition établie à l’aide de 90 manuscrits” but an “édition établie à l’aide de 45 manuscrits”³⁸.

The very limited selection of texts and the meagre apparatus of variants do not enable one to measure the fluctuations undergone by the *Liber de causis* in the West. Indeed, Thomas Aquinas already observes here and there that his text is corrupt or seems corrupt, and he investigates the state of the text across several manuscripts, for example regarding the text of proposition XV(XVI), 129: “in omnibus libris videtur esse corrupta” (ed. Saffrey, p. 93, l. 20 - 94, l. 2). Against all the witnesses which he consulted, Thomas chooses the reading: “ipsa [virtus] fixa, stans in rebus”. Giles of Rome gives precedence to the manuscript tradition and rejects Thomas’s explanation, arguing instead for the plural:

Notandum est quod hanc secundam propositionis partem ut ‘non

36. TAYLOR, “Remarks on the Latin Text”, p. 75-102.

37. PATTIN, “Le *Liber de causis*”, p. 44-45.

38. Some would consider the term “édition” too generous when lacking any stemmatic discussion and clear criteria in the selection of variants.

quia ipsae sunt fixe stantes in rebus entibus, immo sunt' etc., quidam legunt singulariter, et dicunt communiter textus hos esse corruptos, referunt autem hoc ad ipsum Deum. (...) Sed cum omnes textus habeant hoc dictum pluraliter, et non singulariter, et cum habeant bonum intellectum, referendum est hoc pluraliter ad ipsas intelligentias vel ad ipsas virtutes quibus non est finis, et non sunt fixae, stantes etc. Immo meliorem intellectum habet referendo hoc ad intelligentias quam ad Deum. (Egidius Romanus, *Super Librum de causis*, f. 52rB)

Pattin notes in the apparatus that 9 of the 10 collated manuscripts have the plural: "ipsae sint/sunt acquisitae fixae stantes". However, he follows the variant suggested by Aquinas and, like him, ignores the manuscript tradition as well as the reading of Giles of Rome.

Omnes virtutes quibus non est finis pendentes sunt per infinitum primum quod est virtus virtutum, non quia ipsa sit acquisita, fixa, stans in rebus entibus, immo est virtus rebus entibus habentibus fixionem. (*Liber de causis*, Pattin, p. 80, l. 70-74)

This is not the only instance where Pattin opts for a Thomistic text of the *Liber de causis* against all consulted manuscripts³⁹.

Giles of Rome checks the text of the *Liber de causis* even when he is not questioning Aquinas. When reading the proposition XV(XVI), 134⁴⁰, Giles notices the following:

Notandum autem, quod in hac littera multum diversificantur libri. Nam quidem antiqui libri habent litteram quam exposuimus, videlicet quod intelligentia 'non est non infinitum' (...). Aliqui vero alii textus habent, quod intelligentia 'non est infinitum' (...) et utrumque verum est. (Egidius Romanus, *Super Librum de causis*, f. 55vV)

One finds variations within the same manuscript tradition. Two important cases may be noted here: William of Leus and John Wenck(?). (1) The commentary of William of Leus twice transmits the text of the *Liber de causis*, once integrally before the commentary and once in the *lemmata* which he comments upon; but the text copied first differs from the one in the *lemmata*⁴¹. (2) The commentary attributed to John Wenck is transmitted together with a text of the *Liber de causis* which, however, contains important variations

39. PATTIN, "Le *Liber de causis*", p. 76, n. h and p. 43.

40. *Ibid.*, p. 82, l. 93-94: "ens autem creatum primum, scilicet intelligentia, non est finitum".

41. D. CARRON, "A Theological Reading of the *Liber de causis* at the Turn of the Fourteenth Century: The Example of William of Leus", in *NeMA I*, p. 467-549.

which could be grouped within two distinct branches of the commentary tradition⁴².

The commentaries published in these volumes preserve the text of the *Liber de causis* as it appears in the manuscripts of the commentaries themselves in order to present to the reader the words and phrases which each author comments upon. This is especially important in the case of commentaries which proceed by *lemmata* and which offer very detailed analyses of expressions from the *De causis*.

In light of these differences in transmission, a stemmatic analysis and critical edition of the work⁴³ would adequately determine whether there exist one or many traditions of the Latin text of the *Liber de causis*.

3. Latin Commentaries on the *Liber de causis*

Taylor's second list of 31 manuscripts containing Latin commentaries on *De causis* was the point of departure for these two volumes. Some clarifications, however, must be given. Of the 31⁴⁴ entries in Taylor's list, only 21 concern unique commentaries. Some commentaries transmitted by several manuscripts are mentioned separately each time, whilst others probably either were never written or have not come down to us⁴⁵. Of the 21 unique entries, 7 have already been printed (those mentioned above, to which Javelli must be added) and 14 are extant but unpublished⁴⁶. This list, with

42. M. MELIADÒ, "Le *Questiones super Librum de causis* attribuite a Johannes Wenck. Concezione, fonti e tradizione manoscritta del commento", in *NeMA II*, p. 225-270.

43. Studies on this topic are envisaged in the diverse projects on the *Liber de causis*.

44. The list contains 29 different entries, but the MS Wrocław, Ossolineum 734 (n° 14, p. 82) contains two distinct commentaries, while the commentary of Ps.-Adam of Bocfeld is named alongside two witnesses under the same entry. Here I correct the information given in "Du néoplatonisme au réalisme et retour" (p. 218) where the distinction between the individual commentaries and the number of manuscripts was not entirely clear.

45. The commentary of Johannes Krosbein, which I examine in *NeMA II*, is mentioned in the manuscripts conserved at Aberystwyth (n° 4 in the list, p. 81) and Venice (n° 21 in the list, p. 83), respectively; the commentary studied by A. Baumgarten is mentioned in the manuscript conserved at Kraków, BJ 2088 (n° 6, p. 81) and in the manuscript of Wrocław, Ossolineum 734. The commentary attributed to Peter of Auvergne, studied by M. Maga, is mentioned with Paris, BnF, 15819 (n° 7, p. 82) and Wien, Vindob. lat. 2330 (n° 24, p. 83). The commentary attributed to Johannes Wenck, studied by M. Meliadò, is mentioned with the manuscripts Mainz, Wissenschaftliche Stadtbibliothek, I 610 (n° 22, p. 83); Praha, Knihovna Metropolitani Kapituly, M 55 (n° 8, p. 82); Praha, Národní knihovna České Republiky, I F. 25; Vodňany, Městské muzeum a galerie Vodňany, G 11 R (n° 12, p. 82). The commentaries attributed to Walter Burley (n° 15, p. 82), Ludovicus de Ferrara (n° 23, p. 83) and Robert Kilwardby (n° 25, p. 83) are not confirmed in the manuscript tradition.

46. Commentaries n. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14.2 (= Wrocław, Ossolineum 734, f. 31-60), 16, 19, 20, 28.

imperfections such as usually accompany all pioneering research, has served as the foundation of a collective project⁴⁷ which has led to the discovery of more than 60 new Latin commentaries in addition to those 14 mentioned by Taylor. They have been written within nearly every kind of intellectual milieu (universities, *studia* of religious orders, cathedral schools) in the present day regions of France, Italy, the United Kingdom, Germany, Poland, the Czech Republic, Sweden etc. between the 13th and 16th century. It is now clear that there is no gap between the reception of Greek and Islamic Neoplatonism in the West with the Latin translation of *Liber de causis* by Gerard of Cremona († 1187) and the commentary of Ambrogio Fiandino († 1532), one of the last authors whose commentary is still extant.

3.1. *The Unpublished Corpus*

We discovered the majority of these commentaries gradually — and I expect that more will be discovered — while we were already engaged in the transcription of some of the commentaries identified by Taylor, which, in the beginning, was our only source of information. Our choice of texts for these two volumes proceeded not from a deliberate rationale but from a particular set of circumstances: certain digitalised copies of the manuscripts became available to the team more rapidly than others, and they constituted the first objects of research (for Alexandra Baneu, Alexander Baumgarten, Dragos Calma, Mihai Maga and Iulia Székely). The circumstances vary for each of our external collaborators (Marta Borgo, Iacopo Costa, Delphine Carron, Mario Meliador and Fiorella Retucci). In any case, 7 of the 14 unpublished commentaries on Taylor's list of 1984⁴⁸ are studied and edited (partially or completely) in *NeMA I* and *II*. If there is a deliberate editorial plan in the publication of these texts, it rests on the decision to publish a collection of prologues and commentaries on proposition I⁴⁹, in order to facilitate a comparison of the same problematics and the same part of the *Liber de causis*. The reader can therefore allow the many possible meanings of the commented text to emerge by playing these similarities and differences off one another.

While it would seem appropriate to ask whether these commentaries are representative of the entire corpus of commentaries on *Liber de causis*, as

47. On this research project developed at “Babeş-Bolyai” University (Cluj-Napoca), see CALMA, “Du néoplatonisme au réalisme et retour”, p. 219.

48. That is, the commentaries of Ps.-Peter of Auvergne, John of Mallinges, the Anonymous of Erfurt, William of Leus, John Krosbein (on *De causis*), John Wenck(?), the Anonymous “Sapiencie V”.

49. In some cases it was possible to publish entire editions of shorter texts, or those which were easier to read in the manuscripts.

it stands this would be premature, given the editorial contingencies just described, the progressive stages in the ongoing constitution of this corpus and the present state of our knowledge — most texts are still unpublished (and some likely still undiscovered). Nor is the question of the philosophical originality of one or another of the commentaries a priority, since it is difficult to determine which of these works deserves the highest level of research until the commentaries of the same period and the same milieu can be compared to one another. At this stage, all the commentaries are important. Some can be of interest to scholars studying the transmission of doctrines, while others may capture the attention of scholars, interested in conceptual innovation. At this time, it is important to study them and edit them as far as possible, so as to place a previously inaccessible collection of texts at the disposal of the academic community. In these volumes, the study of the connections between the commentaries has been emphasised and it proves that this *corpus* must be considered as one of the exegetical networks of the Western philosophical tradition. Indeed, it seems possible to demonstrate that these texts are not a mass of commentaries disconnected from one another, but rather an exegetical tradition constituted primarily around the *Liber de causis* (the *Elements of Theology* is commented on much less often). Therefore, all the commentaries are noteworthy and important when they are primarily studied as witnesses of the legacy of Greek and Arabic Neoplatonism in the Latin West. I will show that they are also of interest for the implicit and explicit references, reprisals and critiques, as indicative of deliberate choice to report what others (contemporary or not) have thought and written on the same work and the same problematics. The commentators of the *De causis* give an account of the work of their predecessors, discussing, copying and critiquing it. In doing so they contribute to the constitution of a philosophical tradition which they transmit as an inheritance. In all its imperfections, the collection of texts from the two volumes of *NeMA* witnesses to a thematic unity in a chronological and geographical diversity:

	Author	Title	Provenance ⁵⁰	Location of conservation	Date
1.	Ps. Petrus de Alvernia	<i>Questiones super Librum de causis</i> ⁵¹	Paris	Wien, Paris	<i>post</i> 1272 - <i>ante</i> 1278

50. By “provenance” one should understand the location or institution where the commentary was most likely written; when this is unsure or difficult to determine, I use an asterisk* to indicate the work’s doctrinal kinship with commentaries whose provenance is known.

51. M. MAGA, “Remarques sur le commentaire au *Liber de causis* attribué à Pierre d’Auvergne”, in *NeMA I*, p. 53-135.

2.	Anonymus <i>Sectator philosophie</i>	<i>Questiones super Librum de causis</i> ⁵²	Paris*	Paris	1274/1276 - 1277(?)
3.	Iohannes de Mallingys	<i>Reportationes De causis</i> ⁵³	Paris*	Worcester	<i>post</i> 1274/1276 - <i>ante</i> (?) 1289/1291
4.	Radulfus Brito(?)	<i>Questiones super Librum de causis</i> ⁵⁴	Paris	Firenze	<i>ca.</i> 1290 (<i>post</i> 1289/1291, <i>ante</i> 1298/1299)
5.	Anonymus “Super Libellum”	<i>Super Libellum de causis</i> ⁵⁵	Paris*	Worcester	second half of the 13 th c. ?
6.	Anonymus Erffordensis	<i>Questiones super Librum de causis</i> ⁵⁶	Paris	Erfurt	<i>post</i> 1289/1291; <i>inc.</i> 14 th c.
7.	Anonymus Augsburgensis	<i>Glose super Librum de causis</i> ⁵⁷	Paris*	Augsburg	<i>post</i> 1289/1291; <i>inc.</i> 14 th c.
8.	Guillelmus de Lieus (de Levibus)	<i>Expositio Libri de causis</i> ⁵⁸	Toulouse / Paris	Città del Vaticano	<i>post</i> 1289/1291 - <i>ante</i> 1308
9.	Iohannes Krosbein	<i>Super Librum de causis</i> ⁵⁹	Holy Roman Empire (?) / (Paris*)	Aberystwyth, Halle(Salle), København, Warszawa	<i>post</i> 1335/1340 - <i>ante</i> (?) 1400

52. See the Appendix, p. 42-52.

53. A. BANEU, D. CALMA, “Le commentaire sur le *Liber de causis* de Jean de Mallinges”, in *NeMA I*, p. 153-286.

54. I. COSTA, M. BORGIO, “The Questions of Radulphus Brito(?) on the *Liber de causis*”, in *NeMA I*, p. 287-358; for the date, see also I. COSTA, *Le questiones di Radulfo Brito sull’ ‘Ethica Nicomachea’*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2008, p. 155.

55. BANEU, CALMA, “Le commentaire sur le *Liber de causis* de Jean de Mallinges”.

56. I. SZÉKELY, D. CALMA, “Le commentaire d’un maître parisien conservé à Erfurt”, in *NeMA I*, p. 359-466.

57. A. BANEU, D. CALMA, “The *Glose super Librum de causis* and the Exegetical Tradition”, in *NeMA I*, p. 137-152.

58. CARRON, “A Theological Reading”, p. 467-549.

59. D. CALMA, “A Medieval Companion to Aristotle: John Krosbein’s Paraphrase on *Liber de causis*”, in *NeMA II*, p. 11-98.

10.	Iohannes Krosbein	<i>Sententia Procli alti philosophi</i> ⁶⁰	Holy Roman Empire (?)	Halle(Salle), København, Warszawa	<i>post</i> 1335/1340 - <i>ante</i> (?) 1400
12.	Henricus de Geysmaria	<i>Questio: 'Utrum causa primaria'</i> ⁶¹	Erfurt	Erfurt	1414
13.	Iohannes Wenck(?)	<i>Questiones super Librum de causis</i> ⁶²	Paris*	Erlangen, Mainz, Praha (x 2), Tübingen, Vodňany	<i>ca.</i> 1417
14.	Anonymus "Sapientie V"	<i>Commentarium super Librum de causis</i> ⁶³	Holy Roman Empire	Kraków, Praha, Wrocław (x2)	<i>post</i> 1407 - <i>ante</i> 1455

The distribution of the commentaries into the two volumes of *NeMA* should not distort our understanding of the legacy of Proclus and of the *Book of Causes* in the long Middle Ages. This caveat is necessary in order to avoid a confusion which might find its support in certain prevalent historiographical hypotheses⁶⁴. The interest in Neoplatonism in the 13th century was not attested

60. F. RETUCCI, "Sententia Procli alti philosophi. Notes on an Anonymous Commentary on Proclus' *Elementatio theologica*", in *NeMA II*, p. 99-180; for dating, provenance and doctrinal kinship, see D. CALMA, "A Medieval Companion", p. 16-20 and 46-66.
61. D. CALMA, I. SZÉKELY, "Cause and Causality in Henry of Geismar's *Questio de quolibet*", in *NeMA II*, p. 181-224.
62. MELIADÒ, "Le *Questiones super Librum de causis*", p. 225-270.
63. A. BAUMGARTEN, "*Theologia philosophorum parcimonialis*. Un commentaire sur le *Liber de causis*", in *NeMA II*, p. 271-336.
64. Cf. L. STURLESE, "Il dibattito sul procolo latino nel medioevo fra l'università di Parigi et lo studium di Colonia", in BOSS, SEEL (eds.), *Proclus et son influence*, p. 261: "accolti in un primo momento a Parigi con interesse ed entusiasmo (Tommaso d'Aquino, Sigieri di Brabante), questi testi (i.e. of Proclus) furono presto neutralizzati. La stilizzazione delle tesi dell'*Elementatio theologica* a pochi luoghi comuni ed il fallimento editoriale degli *Opuscoli* sembrano indicare che già alla fine del settimo decennio del XIII secolo il neoplatonismo di Proclo fu espulso dal novero dei problemi di attualità filosofica. A questa specie di censura (*sic* !) fa riscontro, in aree culturali periferiche, una apertura a Proclo del tutto particolare. (...) Ma fu soprattutto nella scuola dei domenicani di Colonia (Teodorico di Freiberg, Eckhart, Bertoldo di Moosburg e Tauler) che si sviluppò un vero e proprio confronto con le tesi neoplatoniche." *Ibid.*, p. 275: "verso il principio degli anni Ottanta il problema del neoplatonismo era già del tutto neutralizzato e rimosso. Almeno a Parigi." *Ibid.*, p. 281: "Sul rifiuto di Proclo regnava, nel centro culturale più importante d'Europa (i.e. Paris), un consenso pressoché assoluto. Non è dunque azzardato pensare che sotto la straordinaria apertura di credito offerta a questi testi in Germania stessero volontà e disegni precisi,

exclusively at the University of Paris (as the texts of *NeMA I* would lead one to believe). After the 1280s, Neoplatonism had not been forgotten in Paris while it was being taken up in Germany by the Albertist Dominican school as a philosophical alternative to Parisian teaching (as the texts of *NeMA II* would also seem to indicate). The division in two volumes responds only to an editorial necessity. As already mentioned, the number and the texts studied here do not adequately reflect the complexity of medieval Neoplatonism: other commentaries, produced in other contexts, during the same period, await publication or even identification. The table above is, nevertheless, an incontestable proof of the fact that Neoplatonism continued to interest the Parisian masters in the last decades of the 13th century, and even later (with John Krosbein, John Wenck(?), Giles Charlier⁶⁵ etc.). In this regard, Laure Miolo's work⁶⁶ is particularly valuable because she shows, through a study of the library loan registers of the Parisian colleges, that the manuscripts containing the *Liber de causis* and/or the commentaries which became standard (by Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great, Giles of Rome) continue to circulate and to be read in Paris from the 13th to the 15th century (the latest information indicates borrowings in 1481).

The claim that the medievals avoided confrontation with Proclus is true if one considers only the commentaries on the *Elements of Theology* or on his other works. Miolo's results seem also to support this hypothesis⁶⁷: according to the library loan register of the college of Sorbonne from 1402 to 1536 (the only one which has come down to us), the ms. Paris BnF, Lat. 16097 (which has a Parisian provenance, contains a copy of the *Elements of Theology*, and which belonged to the library of the college since the 14th century⁶⁸), was never

e che l'*Elementatio* sia diventata in un certo modo un simbolo di un progetto e di un movimento filosofico intenzionalmente alternativi alla scolastica parigina etc." The idea of the "German philosophy" as an alternative philosophy is also developed in L. STURLESE, "Proclo ed Ermete in Germania da Alberto Magno a Bertoldo di Moosburg. Per una prospettiva di ricerca sulla cultura filosofica tedesca nel secolo delle sue origini (1250-1350)", in K. FLASCH (ed.), *Von Meister Dietrich zu Meister Eckhart*, Hamburg, Felix Meiner, 1984, p. 23.

65. Results presented by Z. Kaluza in his talk "Les *Éléments de théologie* dans le *Commentaire des Sentences* de Gilles Charlier," delivered on November 14th, 2015, at the conference *Les 'Éléments de théologie' et le 'Livre des causes' du V^e au XVII^e siècle. Volet 1. Formes littéraires, traditions scolaires et modalités du discours philosophique*, organised by D. Calma and M. Geoffroy, at the École pratique des hautes études. The Proceedings of this conference are in preparation.
66. Cf. L. MIOLO, "Liber de causis in libreria. Pour une mise en perspective du *Liber de causis* dans la bibliothèque du collège de Sorbonne", in *NeMA II*.
67. *Ibid.*
68. Cf. H. BOESE, "Einleitung", in *Proclus, Elementatio theologica translata a Guillelmo de Morbecca*, Leuven, Leuven University Press, 1987, p. XIV

borrowed in the 15th century. Nevertheless, one has to note that Giles Charlier abundantly cites the *Elements of Theology* in his *Commentary on the Sentences* held at the Faculty of theology of the University of Paris in 1416-1417⁶⁹. One must also take account of the fact that the commentary on *De causis* attributed to Wenck could have been composed in the Parisian milieu of John of Nova Domo, also around 1417. The very same year, Petrus Steinbeck disputed a *quolibet* in Erfurt on the topic of proposition XII(XIII), 114 of the *Liber de causis*.

Taking all these aspects into consideration, I would suggest the following hypothesis: the Neoplatonism of Proclus and of the *Liber de causis* was intentionally transferred from Paris to Germany, Toulouse, Central Europe (perhaps through Cologne). This *translatio studiorum* was not a function or consequence either of a supposed lack of interest in the Neoplatonism, or a quest for an intellectual alternative to the Parisian norms. It would have been more typical for Europe's new centres of learning, whether universities, monasteries or city schools, to have imported this Parisian tradition as they had done with others, whether philosophical (Aristotelian, for example) or theological, by copying works and their commentaries, by mild references or acerbic critiques, by implicit citations or explicit dismissals.

At the present stage of our research on this *corpus* of commentaries from the 13th to the 16th century, within the Parisian milieu and other centres, a new question arises, which will receive further consideration elsewhere: does the attempt to read and comment on the *Book of Causes* and on the *Elements of Theology* lead to a progressive and conscious constitution of an autonomous medieval Neoplatonic tradition, independent of yet parallel to the Aristotelian tradition? It is well-known that certain medievals considered the *Book of Causes* as complementary to Aristotle's *Metaphysics*; one should therefore ask whether the interpretative tradition formed around this treatise is itself also a complement or appendix to the Aristotelian hermeneutical tradition. In these pages, I will limit myself to singling out three directive features capable of defining an exegetical tradition, including that studied here. These features reflect deliberate choices made by medieval commentators and represent the various ways one might situate oneself relative to a philosophical inheritance, even if the act of commenting on a treatise, in whole or in part, according to the scholastic method, implies a certain formalism and concomitant institutional customs: (1) the explicit references to other commentaries on the same work; (2) the implicit repetition of fragments or arguments of other commentaries on the same work; (3) the continuation of a hermeneutical model through the repetition of the same questions on the same problematics.

69. Cf. *supra*, n. 65.

3.2. The Exegetical Tradition

i) Thomas Aquinas

The *Super Librum de causis expositio* of Thomas Aquinas is clearly well-known by all later commentators, even those who allowed themselves to be more deeply influenced by Albert. Usually Aquinas also serves as the primary source for citations of the *Elements of Theology*, though some authors cite and interpret propositions from Proclus' work which are not cited by Thomas (e.g., John of Mallinges and the Anonymous of Augsburg)⁷⁰.

The assimilation of Thomas's commentary (1272) into the exegetical tradition of the *Liber de causis* probably began with Siger of Brabant, who composed his commentary around 1274-1276. Several common passages have been identified already, while others are noted for the first time in the following table which, however, does not presume to be exhaustive⁷¹:

Thomas de Aquino, <i>Expositio super Librum de causis</i> , ed. Saffrey	Sigerus de Brabantia, <i>Quaestiones super Librum de causis</i> , ed. Marlasca
prop. 1, p. 9, l. 26 - 10, l. 15	q. 1, p. 38, l. 77-91
prop. 3, p. 18, l. 8 - 19, l. 13	q. 13, p. 71, l. 4-17 (IS/DC ⁷²)
prop. 4, p. 31, l. 18 - 32, l. 4	q. 13, p. 69, l. 75 - 70, l. 86

70. L. Sturlese has made a similar remark regarding Siger of Brabant: "In confronto a Tommaso, l'utilizzazione di Proclo fatta da Sigieri è meno sistematica e quantitativamente più limitata, ma il ventaglio dei teoremi toccati mostra una riflessione sul nuovo testo non meno attenta di quella dell'Aquinate". Cf. STURLESE, "Il dibattito", p. 265.
71. Aquinas's presence in Siger's commentary is not limited to the *Expositio super Librum de causis*. Siger takes many substantial passages from the *Summa theologiae*, the *Commentaries on the Physics*, on the *Metaphysics* and on the *De unitate intellectus*. Cf. A. MARLASCA, "Introduction", in SIGERUS DE BRABANTIA, *Les Quaestiones super Librum de causis*, p. 22, 26, 30; F.-X. PUTALLAZ, R. IMBACH, *Profession: philosophe. Siger de Brabant*, Paris, Cerf, 1997, p. 135-142 et 162-168; R. IMBACH, "Notule sur le commentaire du *Liber de causis* de Siger de Brabant et ses rapports avec Thomas d'Aquin", in *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 43 (1996), p. 304-323; D. CALMA, "Siger de Brabant et Thomas d'Aquin: note sur l'histoire d'un plagiat", in *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 50 (2003), p. 118-135; C. KÖNIG-PRALONG, *Avènement de l'aristotélisme en terre chrétienne. L'essence et la matière: entre Thomas d'Aquin et Guillaume d'Ockham*, Paris, Vrin, 2005, p. 37; SIGIERI DI BRABANTE, *Questio de creatione ex nihilo*, ed. A. AIELLO, Firenze, SISMEL / Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2015, p. 145-151; SZÉKELY, CALMA, "Le commentaire d'un maître", p. 367-381.
72. Parallels which have been noted already are accompanied by initials indicating their discoverer: RI = R. Imbach, "Notule sur le commentaire du *Liber de causis*"; AM = A. Marlasca, "Introduction"; IS/DC = I. Székely, D. Calma, "Le commentaire d'un maître parisien". The absence of initials indicates that, unless I am mistaken, these borrowings have not been noticed before.

prop. 3, p. 18, l. 8-23; prop. 32, p. 145	q. 16, p. 76, l. 16-25 (AM ⁷³)
prop. 4, p. 27, l. 14 - 28, l. 3	q. 21, p. 89, l. 4-12 et 90, l. 31-33 (AM)
prop. 4, p. 30, l. 10-14	q. 21, p. 91, l. 44-50 (AM)
prop. 5, p. 39, l. 23-31	q. 27, p. 114, l. 216-223
prop. 6, p. 45, l. 5 - p. 48, l. 2	q. 28, p. 118, l. 11-22 (IS/DC)
prop. 10, p. 68, l. 24 - 69, l. 8	q. 30, p. 122, l. 9-20 q. 45, p. 161, l. 16 - p. 162, l. 32
prop. 9, p. 65, l. 16 - 66, l. 7	q. 32, p. 126, l. 50-61
prop. 12, p. 78, l. 14-18	q. 36, p. 138, l. 81-87
prop. 8, p. 56, 11-21	q. 36, p. 142, l. 5-15 (IS/DC)
prop. 12, p. 81, l. 7-12	q. 36, p. 143, l. 59 - 144, l. 65
prop. 10, p. 70, l. 20 - 71, 2	q. 46, p. 164, l. 41-56 (AM)
prop. 8, p. 55, l. 15 - 56, l. 31	q. 47, p. 168, l. 63 - 82

Each of these cases requires a detailed examination to ascertain which changes were made by Siger; for although his debt to Thomas is undeniable, it is not unusual for Siger to depart from his source, often in order to criticise him tacitly⁷⁴. This is also the case with other commentaries, like the Anonymous of Augsburg, who both copies and criticises Thomas⁷⁵.

ii) Albert the Great

At present, the first known explicit reference to Albert's paraphrase in another *De causis* commentary is found in the *Questiones* attributed to Peter of Auvergne (1270-1277, q. 26, *in fine*). Other 13th-century writers use his paraphrase as well, either explicitly or tacitly, such as the Anonymous of Augsburg, the Anonymous *Sectator philosophie*, Ps.-Peter of Auvergne, John of Mallinges and William of Leus. Thomas Aquinas, Siger of Brabant⁷⁶ and Radulphus Brito(?), however, seem not to have used it for their commentaries.

73. A. Marlasca also points to similarities between Thomas's *Expositio* and Siger's commentary which, however, are not literal (p. 27, n. 5 and p. 139, 172, 174). These are certainly more extensive than what is indicated in the brief list which follows: Thomas, *Expositio* (ed. Saffrey), prop. 3, p. 18, l. 8 - 24 / Siger, *Quaestiones* (ed. Marlasca), q. 36, p. 139, l. 107 - 140, l. 146; Thomas, *Expositio* (ed. Saffrey), prop. 14, p. 85-87 / Siger, *Quaestiones* (ed. Marlasca), q. 48, p. 172, l. 3 - 173, l. 26; Thomas, *Expositio* (ed. Saffrey), prop. 15, p. 88, l. 7 - 91, l. 10 / Siger, *Quaestiones* (ed. Marlasca), q. 50, p. 174, l. 7 - p. 175, l. 34.
74. CALMA, "Siger de Brabant et Thomas d'Aquin", p. 118-135.
75. A. BANEU, D. CALMA, "Notes sur un commentaire inédit au *Liber de causis* (Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, 4° Cod. 68)", in *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale*, 54 (2012), p. 286-293.
76. Without any in-depth study on this matter, I have drawn quick comparisons between the commentaries of Thomas and Albert and between those of Siger and Albert using the

It is worth mentioning that John of Mallinges, when commenting on proposition 32⁷⁷, has recourse both to the *De causis et processu universitatis* of Albert the Great and to the *Expositio super Librum de causis* of Thomas Aquinas. He remarks there that Albert cites and comments upon the curious term *adlahic*, which Thomas does not mention:

Et dicit Albertus quod antiqui *sapientes vocaverunt circulum celestem 'adlahic'*. Sed Thomas non facit mentionem de isto 'adlahic'. Alio modo exponit ipse et sic: quia causa prima licet intellectuali lumine causat intelligentiam et animam nobilem, tamen illud lumen est magis purum in intelligentia quam in anima nobili. Frater Thomas dicit quod *anima nobilis est sic creata* <non> eo quod recipiat esse per intelligentiam, sed quod operationes alias recipit *mediante intelligentia*. (ed. Baneu / Calma, *NeMA I*, p. 242, l. 20-27.)

In John's reference, one finds a fragment of Albert's commentary where he speaks of the circular motion of the heavenly sphere as described by the wisemen of antiquity and the Arabic sages. The term *adlahic* mentioned by John does not appear in the modern edition of Albert's commentary, where we find the form *alatyr*⁷⁸. Elsewhere, John confesses that he does not grasp Albert's reasoning which he considers obscure: "Albertus dicit quod ipsum primum ens habet rationem efficientis et finalis et etiam formalis, ut ipse dicit. Sed hoc est magis obscurum" (ed. Baneu / Calma, *NeMA I*, p. 216, l. 2-4).

Albert's influence lasts for centuries. For John Krosbein in the second half of the 14th century, Albert is one of the major sources of inspiration not only for commenting on the *Liber de causis* but for commenting on the works of Aristotle in general. This is well before the period of the revival of Albertism which, until now, was situated in Paris at the beginning of the 15th century

DRAMON software, designed for internal use. No phrase of at least 6 common words seems to have been taken by Thomas or by Siger from Albert's commentary (not, of course, including those similarities arising from citations of the *Liber de causis*).

77. PATTIN, "Le *Liber de causis*", III, 32, p. 52, l. 13-15: "Quod est quia causa prima creavit esse animae mediante intelligentia, et propter illud facta est anima efficiens operationem divinam".
78. ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De causis et processu universitatis a prima causa*, ed. FAUSER, p. 76, l. 18-26: "Caelestis autem circulus apud sapientes arabum *alatyr* vocatur. Esse igitur animae est intellectualitate formatum et ad *alatyr* determinatum. Hoc igitur modo anima nobilis a causa prima procedit, ut in esse nobilis animae constituatur. Et hoc est, quod quidam antiquorum dixerunt, quod *prima causa creat animam mediante intelligentia et alatyr*, non quod intelligentia pro medio prima causa utatur, sed quod forma intelligentiae media sit in esse diffinitionis animae, sicut sensibile medium est in esse diffinitionis hominis, cum dicitur vivum sensibile rationale".

with John of Nova Domo⁷⁹. We find thereafter the development of a what one can call an “alluvial tradition” of Albertism, with authors citing Albert’s works (in this case *De causis et processu universitatis a prima causa*) along with the later authors who make use of them. For example, in his paraphrase on the *Elements of Theology*, John Krosbein uses both Albert’s works and Berthold of Moosburg’s commentary on Proclus’s *Elementatio*, which is also deeply inspired by Albert. John Wenck(?) uses Albert in his commentary, probably composed in Paris in the first decades of the 15th century⁸⁰; Jacob of Gostynin, in Krakow in the 1490s, explicitly cites and extensively copies both Albert and Wenck(?)⁸¹. Gostynin works with both texts on the table before him, using one here and the other there, and rearranges their arguments to suit his own purposes⁸². Here is a brief example:

Albertus Magnus, <i>De causis et processu universitatis a prima causa</i> , lib. 2, c. 1, p. 59, l. 7 - 60, l. 10	Iohannes Wenck(?), <i>Super Librum de causis</i> , ed. Meliàdò, p. 259, l. 1-9	Iacobus de Gostynin, <i>Super Librum de causis expositio</i> , ed. Gora, p. 13
Cum in superioribus habitum sit de proprietatibus eius quod est necesse esse, et de his quae sunt ab ipso, restat nunc de causis primariis determinare.	Quantum ad secundum dicitur quod liber iste a philosophis diuersis rationabiliter quinque titulis inscriptus est.	Quantum ad secundum quod est de titulo huius libri est ista secunda conclusio: liber iste a philosophis diversis rationabiliter quinque titulis inscriptum est.

79. KALUZA, “Les débuts de l’Albertisme tardif (Paris et Cologne)”, in M.J.F.M. HOENEN, A. DE LIBERA (eds.), *Albertus Magnus und de Albertismus. Deutsche philosophische Kultur des Mittelalters*, Leiden / New York / Köln, Brill, 1995, p. 207-295; G. MEERSSEMAN, *Geschichte des Albertismus I, Die Pariser Anfänge des Kölner Albertismus*, Paris, Lutetiae Parisiorum apud R. Haloua, 1933.

80. Cf. MELIADÒ, “Le Questiones super Librum de causis”, in *NeMA II*, p. 228.

81. M. MELIADÒ has shown the similarities between Gostynin and Wenck(?), without emphasising the similarities and differences of the latter’s commentary to Albert’s text. M. MELIADÒ, “Axiomatic Wisdom: Boethius’ *De hebdomadibus* and the *Liber de causis* in Late-Medieval Albertism”, in *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale*, 55 (2013), p. 127-130.

82. The passages copied by Gostynin from Albert are in italics; the passages copied by Gostynin from Wenck(?) are in boldface. The expressions inspired by Albert’s text are in boldface and italics. I have briefly discussed this table on June 5th, 2013 during a *journée d’études*, *Autour du Liber de causis*, organized by O. Boulnois, D. Calma, A. de Libera, D. Poirel, at the Sorbonne. A more detailed analysis, taking into account the whole of Gostynin’s commentary, would enable one to determine with more exactitude the profile of Albertism at the University of Krakow, in relation to the Parisian Albertism of the beginning of the 15th century. M. Meliàdò suggests that the commentary attributed to Wenck was composed in Paris in the first decades of the 15th century.

<p>Accipiemus igitur ab antiquis, quaecumque bene dicta sunt ab ipsis, quae ante nos Davis Iudaeus quidam ex dictis Aristotelis, Avicennae, Algazelis et Alfarabii congregavit, per modum theorematum ordinans ea quorum commentum ipsemet adhibuit, sicut et Euclides in Geometricis fecisse videtur. Sicut enim in Euclidis commento probatur theorema quodcumque ponitur, ita et David commentum adhibuit, quod nihil aliud est nisi theorematis propositi probatio.</p> <p>Pervenit autem ad nos et physica per eundem modum ab eodem Philosopho perfecta, ubi istum librum 'Metaphysicam' nominavit, <i>tituli</i> eiusdem <i>quattuor</i> subiungens <i>rationes</i>.</p> <p>Quarum <i>prima</i> est, <i>quia agit hic de talibus quorum ratio diffinitiva nec cum materia nec cum continuo nec cum motu concepta est. Haec autem sunt ultra physicam et mathesim, sicut in primae philosophiae probatum est. Secunda est, quia agitur hic de</i></p>	<p>Patet quia, si ea que hic considerantur considerantur ea parte qua nec secundum esse nec secundum rationem materiam concipiunt, tunc inscribitur a Daud Iudeo, commentatore propositionum et etiam collectore earundem, liber <i>Metaphysice</i> quasi de transcendentibus materiam.</p>	<p>Patet, quia si ea, quae hic considerantur, considerantur ea parte, qua nec secundum rem nec secundum rationem materiam concipiunt, tunc ascribitur a David Iudaeo commentatore propositionum et etiam collectore earundem liber <i>Metaphysice</i>.</p> <p>Huius <i>tituli quattuor</i> dedit <i>rationes</i>, ut narat dominus Albertus.</p> <p><i>Prima</i> quia hic agitur de talibus quorum ratio definitiva nec cum materia nec cum continuo nec cum motu concepta est. Haec autem sunt ultra physicam et mathesim sicut in sexto 'Prime philosophie' probatum est. Secunda ratio, quia hic agitur de</p>
---	---	---

<p><i>principiis entis simpliciter, quod non secundum partem aliquam entis in genere vel specie determinatum est. Et hoc metaphysici est, ut in IV Primae Philosophiae probatum est. (...)</i></p>	<p>Si uero considerantur ea parte qua stant sub influencia finali, qua reducuntur in finale omnium principium, tunc rationabiliter</p>	<p><i>principiis entis simpliciter et non secundum partem aliquam in genere vel in specie determinatum est. Et hoc metaphysica est, ut in tertio ‘Primae philosophiae’. (...)</i></p>
<p>Talem autem tractatum ALFARABIUS ‘DE PURA BONITATE’ INSCRIPSIT <i>quinque rationibus. Prima est, quia cum bonitas dicatur, quod ad naturam pertinet fluens a bono primo, haec bonitas pura non est, prout in materia recepta est.</i></p>	<p>INSCRIBITUR liber iste ab ALPHORABIO liber DE PURA BONITATE, cum bonum dicat super ens habitudinem ad finem.</p>	<p>Si vero considerantur ea, quae hic considerantur ex parte, qua sub influencia finali sunt, quae reducuntur in finalem omnium principium, ratio- nabiliter INSCRIBITUR iste liber ab ALPHARABIO ‘DE PURA BONITATE’. Huius tituli assignat <i>quinque rationes. Prima ratio, quia cum bonitas dicatur quod ad naturam pertinet fluens ab uno primo bono. Haec bonitas pura non dicitur prout in materia recepta est.</i></p>

There remain many promising fields of research for further study on the relationship between Albertism and Neoplatonism, one of which is this Albertist tradition of interpreting the *Liber de causis*. Heymeric de Campo’s use of the treatise in his own writings has received but little attention, while its significance for the œuvre of John of Nova Domo (mostly unedited) is even less understood. So far, attention has been drawn only to his citations of proposition VIII(IX) of the *Liber de causis*, as well as to his projected commentary on the *De causis* which he may never have brought to fruition⁸³.

83. Cf. also M. MELIADÒ, “*Scientia peripateticorum*. Heymericus de Campo, the *Book of Causes* and the Debate over Universals in the 15th Century”, in *Recherches de Philosophie et Théologie Médiévales* 79 (2012), 195-230; ID., “Axiomatic Wisdom”, p. 96-97. A. SPEER, “*Yliathin quod est principium individuandi*. Zur Diskussion um das Individuationsprinzip

iii) Giles of Rome⁸⁴

One might also examine the relationship between Giles of Rome's commentary on the *De causis* and Albertism, especially regarding the question of existence and essence. For example, the following definition: "essentia dicitur a quo fluit esse" arises often, in similar doctrinal contexts, in a work attributed by Meersseman⁸⁵ to John of Nova Domus, the *Tractatus universalium*: "essentia enim est quo est illud quod est, vel essentia est illud, a quo fluit esse" (p. 160). In another work, *De esse et essentia*, John of Nova Domo quotes the same definition, and attributes it to "some philosophers" ("apud quosdam philosophos"); a reference which has not been identified by Meersseman, who edited the *De esse et essentia*, nor by the scholars who have since referred to this definition in John's treatise⁸⁶. This formulation, insofar as it appears in the context of the real distinction between existence and essence, is only found, unless I am mistaken, in Giles of Rome, particularly in his commentary on the *Liber de causis* and in his *Theoremata de esse et essentia*.

Egidius Romanus	Iohannes de Nova Domo, <i>De esse et essentia</i> , ed. Meersseman
Nam essentia dicta est ab esse, vel quia est in potentia ad esse, vel quia est illud a quo fluit esse . (...) Et quia (ut dictum est) principaliter forma pertinet ad essentiam; quia ab ea principaliter fuit esse. (<i>Super Librum de causis</i> , f. 88rD)	Notandum primo quod nomen essentiae aequivocum est apud philosophos: apud quosdam enim essentia dicitur a quo fluit esse , est isto modo loquimur de essentia, quando quaerimus utrum in eodem esse essentiae distinguatur ab esse actualis existentiae, et ista acceptio est propriissima, et omnes antiqui sic

im Anschluß an prop. 8(9) des *Liber de causis* bei Johannes de Nova Domo, Albertus Magnus und Thomas von Aquin", in J.A. AERTSEN, A. SPEER (eds.), *Individuum und Individualität im Mittelalter*, Berlin / New York, De Gruyter, 1996, 266-86; CALMA, "Du néoplatonisme au réalisme et retour", p. 240-244.

84. Giulia Battagliero at the Università degli Studi del Piemonte Orientale "Amedeo Avogadro", Vercelli, is preparing a doctoral thesis on the sources and the influence of Giles of Rome's commentary on the *Liber de causis*.
85. G. MEERSSEMAN, "Eine Schrift des Kölner Universitätsprofessors Heymericus de Campo oder des Pariser Prof. Johannes de Nova Domo?", in *Jahrbuch des Kölnischen Geschichtsvereins*, 18 (1936), p. 144-168.
86. Cf. MEERSSEMAN, *Geschichte des Albertismus*, I, p. 72; S. WŁODEK, "Albert le Grand et les albertistes du xv^e siècle. Le problème des universaux", in A. ZIMMERMANN (ed.), *Albert der Grosse: seine Zeit, sein Werk, seine Wirkung*, Berlin / New York, W. de Gruyter, 1981, p. 200; SPEER, "Yliathin quod est principium individuandi", p. 269; MELIADÒ, "Axiomatic Wisdom", p. 105-107; BAUMGARTEN, "Theologia philosophorum parcimonialis", p. 305-306.

<p>Si ergo consideratur ipsum esse ratione, cuius dicta est essentia, quia ab ea fluit esse, patet immaterialia stare per essentiam suam, non autem materialia, sed si consideretur ipsa forma, non ut comparatur ad esse, sed ut comparatur ad ipsum suppositum (...) sic immaterialia dicuntur stare per seipsa (...). (<i>Super Librum de causis</i>, f. 88vE)</p> <p>Et quia ab essentia causatur esse et fluit ab ipsa, oportet quod totum illud ad essentiam pertineat a quo ipsum esse causatur et fluit (...). (<i>Theoremata de esse et essentia</i>, p. 44, l. 10-12)</p>	<p>usi sunt nomine essentiae⁸⁷. (p. 93, l. 5-10)</p> <p>Sequitur quod esse, quod est actus essentiae, relatum ad essentiam a qua fluit, vocatur esse essentiae; in quantum vero participatur ab eo quod est, quod esse capit in quantum causalitate causae efficientis tangitur, vocatur esse actualis existentiae. (p. 101, l. 7-10)⁸⁸</p> <p>(...) et prout essentia est illud a quo fluit esse, esse dico in genere ordinabile quod est esse essentiae, quod tamen est eiusdem naturae cum esse existentiae. (p. 142, l. 24-26)⁸⁹</p>
---	---

87. This passage from John's *De esse et essentia* is copied by the Anonymous "Sapiencie V^o", who attributes the definition to Albert the Great: "Sciendum igitur quod nomen essencie est equivocum apud philosophos. Quidam enim dicunt quod essencia dicitur illud a quo fluit esse, et hoc modo loquitur Albertus de essencia in presenti loco et ista acceptio est propriissima et omnis antiqui sunt sic usi nomen essencie" (Cf. BAUMGARTEN, "*Theologia philosophorum parcimonialis*", p. 305). The Anonymous was probably misled by the presence of the concept of *fluxus* and also by John's own statement at the beginning of the treatise: "Ad habendam aliqualem notitiam pariter et intellectum circa naturam de esse et essentia secundum sententiam peripatheticorum, quam tribuit eis venerabilis dominus Albertus Magnus, movebuntur aliquae quaestiones, pro quarum solutione ponentur propositiones extractae ex diversis locis suorum librorum (...)". (JOHANNIS DE NOVA DOMO, *De esse et essentia*, p. 91, l. 1-5). The expression does not appear in Albert's work; I thank Henryk Anzulewicz who confirmed this in a letter on October 28th, 2014.
88. See also IOHANNES DE NOVA DOMO, *De esse et essentia*, p. 95, l. 11 - 96, l. 1: "Hinc est quod omnis essentia influit ei quod est, quod diversum est ab eo quod est esse."
89. See also IOHANNES DE NOVA DOMO, *De esse et essentia*, p. 94, l. 1 - p. 95, l. 7: "Prima propositio: Sicut lucere est actus lucis a substantia lucis exercitus, ita esse est actus essentiae ab essentia exercitus. Essentia enim se exserit esse, et omne esse exercitum est ab essentia, sicut fluxus exseritur a fonte. (...) Ut ergo essentia rei, fluendo a primo, virtutem retineat fontis, sic exserit a se esse, quod est eius actus. Est autem essentia quo id quod est, habet esse, 'quo' dico formaliter, cum habitudine cause formalis". Johannes Rüdiger of Creußen, briefly commenting upon the principal propositions of Giles's *Theoremata*, makes often reference to the *De causis*; his commentary was published in Leipzig around 1495 (many manuscripts of the *Theoremata* were copied in Leipzig, as indicated by the colophons). The conclusion of Rüdiger's commentary on theorem 14 is strikingly similar to the above-mentioned passage from John's *De esse et essentia*: "Et quia semper esse respicit essentiam cuius est actus et a qua fluit sicut lucere a luce; sicut nullum est lucere quod non sit a luce, ita nullum esse quod non sit ab aliqua essentia. Sed cum ex forma accidentali et subiecto

<p>Nam semper esse respicit essentiam et nunquam fluit aliquod esse nisi ab aliqua essentia. Ita enim secundum Augustinum dicitur esse ab essentia sicut sapere a sapientia. Quare sicut nullum est sapere quod non sit ab aliqua sapientia, ita nullum est esse quod non sit ab aliqua essentia. (<i>Theoremata de esse et essentia</i>, p. 92, l. 6-11).</p>	
--	--

Equally noteworthy features appear when one considers these doctrinal borrowings in light of the diffusion of manuscripts. E. Hocedez, the editor of the *Theoremata* of Giles of Rome, was not aware of its entire manuscript tradition. He took into account only nine manuscripts: two in Erfurt and those in Paris, Vatican, Oxford, Venice, Vienna, Erlangen and Munich⁹⁰. Yet the *Theoremata de esse et essentia* was largely diffused in manuscripts conserved today in Central Europe, especially East Germany, the Czech Republic and Poland⁹¹. Here is a supplementary list: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Ms. theol. lat. fol. 606; Eichstätt, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. st 469; Erfurt, Universitäts- und Forschungsbibliothek Erfurt/Gotha, UB Erfurt, Dep. Erf. CA. 2° 006; Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen-Nürnberg, Ms. 532; Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Cod. 1252; Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms 1355; Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms 1686; München, Universitätsbibliothek, 2° Cod. ms. 49; Naumburg (Saale), Domstiftsbibliothek, Nr. 67; New Haven, Yale University: Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, MS 768; Olomouc, Vědecká knihovna v Olomouci, 48.757; Praha, Národní knihovna České Republiky, Cod. I F.25; Praha, Národní knihovna České Republiky, Cod. III.A.13; Praha, Národní knihovna České Republiky, Cod. IV.G.26; Sangerhausen, Kirchenbibliothek St. Ulrich, B 88; Vodňany, Městské muzeum a galerie Vodňany, inv. nro. 1206, sub sign. G 11 R (280 f.); Wolfenbüttel,

non fiat aliqua essentia ab ipso toto, ab ipsis nullum aliud esse fluit" (f. 7r).

90. EGIDIUS ROMANUS, *Theoremata de esse et essentia*, ed. E. HOCEDEZ, Louvain, Museum Lessianum, 1930, p. 117-127.
91. Looking through the published volumes of catalogues of manuscripts from Italy and France alone which transmit the works of Giles of Rome, it is obvious that the number of manuscripts of the *Theoremata de esse et essentia* conserved in those countries is much smaller than that of manuscripts conserved in Central Europe. Cf. B. FAES DE MOTTONI, C. LUNA, F. DEL PUNTA (eds.), *Catalogo dei manoscritti*, Firenze, Olschki, volumes 1/1 (1988), 1/2* (1989), 1/3** (1988).

Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. 90-7-theol-3⁹². Some of these manuscripts also transmit the *De causis* commentary of Wenck(?), others the authentic or attributed works of John of Nova Domo such as the *De esse et essentia* or the *De universali reali*, and still others the *Tractatus problematicus* of Heymeric de Campo⁹³. Unpublished commentaries on Giles's *Theoremata* are also transmitted in Central European manuscripts: Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Cod. 2524; Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich Biblioteka, Cod. 734; Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, IV.Q.20; Praha, Knihovna Metropolitni Kapituly, Cod. M. 55; Praha, Knihovna Metropolitni Kapituly, Cod. 1599 (O.15)⁹⁴; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. 90-7-theol-3. One should also note that Jacob of Gostynin, in his commentary on the *De causis*, makes use of Albert's paraphrase, Giles of Rome, John Wenck(?) and the *De esse et essentia* of John of Nova Domo⁹⁵.

This late reception of Giles of Rome's commentary on the *Book of Causes* indicates what is perhaps the uninterrupted continuation of an exegetical method adopted fairly early in this tradition, which consists in the constant reference to previous commentaries and the effort to compare or to synthesize some of their views. The commentary of Giles at several points integrates the interpretations of the *De causis* given by Albert and Aquinas, and thus functions as a good intermediary source of their work. Giles's commentary was quickly taken up and cited within the Parisian milieu (Radulphus Brito being one example), as well as in Toulouse with the commentary of William of Leus, and, again, in Central Europe. In terms of chronology, one might also note that the dating of many Parisian commentaries is made relative to the established date of Giles's text (1289/1291), considered either as a *terminus post quem* or as a *terminus ante quem*⁹⁶.

William of Leus's work is of interest in several ways: using Giles of Rome for the literal explication of the text and Thomas Aquinas for the *questiones*,

92. Some manuscripts are mentioned in MELIADÒ, "Axiomatic Wisdom", p. 120-127; ID., "Le *Questiones super Librum de causis*", p. 242-243.

93. Cf. MELIADÒ, "Axiomatic Wisdom", p. 119-127.

94. *Ibid.*, p. 121-124; BAUMGARTEN, "Theologia philosophorum parcimonialis", p. 282; CALMA, "Du néoplatonisme au réalisme et retour", p. 265, n. 180, and p. 261, 266.

95. Cf. CALMA, "Du néoplatonisme au réalisme et retour", p. 257.

96. In this instance, the *terminus ante quem* would be determined only a *silentio*, and thus could be contested. Yet, in particular cases, one can maintain it as a realistic option: when an author cites the commentaries of Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas and tacitly uses the arguments from Siger of Brabant's commentary, he is evidently familiar with the Parisian exegetical tradition from 1265-1275. One can therefore assume that if the commentary of Giles of Rome was already written or in circulation, an author intent on staking out a position relative to the views expressed by his contemporaries (and in some cases, perhaps even by his colleagues) would have taken it into account.

William of Leus uses the *Liber de causis* to explain Christian doctrines such as the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. With William's interpretation, a work which resulted from an adaptation of the Greek polytheism of Proclus to Islamic monotheism receives a new life in Christian circles where it can be taught, without danger, to novices in the Dominican convents⁹⁷.

Giles's commentary became a classic in the interpretative tradition of the *Liber de causis*, holding the same stature as the commentaries of Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. Some manuscripts contain copies of all three works, one after the other, while others contain only two; Cardinal Bessarion possessed such a codex⁹⁸. Giles's commentary was found also in the private library of Amplonius Rating of Berka, and afterwards it was bequeathed to the Porta Celi College of the University of Erfurt⁹⁹. It seems also to have been read by Giordano Bruno¹⁰⁰. Giles's commentary on *De causis* is also cited in marginal comments to other commentaries in manuscripts from Central Europe¹⁰¹. One should also note that in his *Commentary on the Sentences*, Giles of Rome abundantly cites the *Elements of Theology*¹⁰²; further studies on this issue would certainly be highly relevant for a more complete understanding of Proclus's heritage in the Middle Ages.

iv) Siger of Brabant

One of the most striking features emerging from the network of commentaries on the *Liber de causis* is the significance of Siger of Brabant's exegesis. He is not cited explicitly by the authors studied in *NeMA I* and *II*, though many passages from his work are found in the Anonymous of Erfurt and in John of Mallinges. The titles of Siger's questions are very similar to those given by the Anonymous of Erfurt. Above all, one can note the long tradition of using question 2 ("Utrum causa primaria naturaliter possit producere effectum causae secundariae sine causa secundaria") of Siger's commentary already in the Parisian milieu in the last decades of the 13th century (the Anonymous *Sectator philosophie*, the Anonymous of Erfurt, John of Mallinges, Radulphus

97. CARRON, "A Theological Reading", p. 509-519.

98. Cf. CALMA, "Du néoplatonisme au réalisme et retour", p. 273-274.

99. SZÉKELY, CALMA, "Le commentaire d'un maître parisien", p. 360.

100. Cf. L. CATANA, *The Concept of Contraction in Giordano Bruno's Philosophy*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005, p. 103-134.

101. BAUMGARTEN, "Theologia philosophorum parcimonialis", p. 282-283.

102. EGIDIUS ROMANUS, *Commentarium in I Librum Magistri Sententiarum*, Ex Officina Augustiniana apud Lazarum de Risquez & Antonium Rosellon, Cordoba, 1699, p. 53rB, 57rA, 84rB, 99rA, 120rB, 165rA, 168rA-rB, 170rA-B, 171rA-B, 173rA-B etc. See also SZÉKELY, CALMA, "Le commentaire d'un maître parisien", p. 393-397.

Brito(?)) up to the first decades of the 15th century at the University of Prague¹⁰³.

v) Unexpected Cross-References

The commentaries presented above belonged to authors (Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas and Giles of Rome) who enjoyed a certain renown among their contemporaries. The influence of Siger's commentary on *De causis* could surprise historians more accustomed to tracing his influence in the context of debates concerning his texts on the soul. Even more unexpected is Henry of Gheismar's use, at the University of Erfurt in 1414, of long sections of the still unpublished commentary wrongly attributed to Adam of Bocfeld and written in Paris around 1251¹⁰⁴. Little has been written on Ps. Adam's commentary, but the late reception of his work shows that he had some influence on the tradition of the *Liber de causis* — a tradition which was formed not only around the three standard commentaries of reference but also around commentaries which do not hold high rank on the lists of historians of philosophy.

vi) The Constitution of a Formal Tradition

Another constitutive element of an exegetical tradition, which merits further examination, is the set of questions and arguments *pro* and *contra* which are repeated across several different commentaries. These are formalities which arise from institutional customs during a certain period when the masters in an institution frequently employ the same authorities and present solutions by way of the same arguments. It is not always possible to determine which master copies the other, or whether both are using a common "stock of arguments"¹⁰⁵. The following table gives just one example of this¹⁰⁶:

103. A study of this tradition will be published in the near future. Iulia Székely has pointed to the reception of this tradition in Prague in her paper, "Le 'Liber de causis', sujet des disputes quodlibétiques au xv^e siècle en Europe Centrale", given on November 14th, 2015 at the conference, *Les 'Éléments de théologie' et le 'Livre des causes' du v^e au xvii^e siècle. Volet 1. Formes littéraires, traditions scolaires et modalités du discours philosophique*, organised by D. Calma and M. Geoffroy, at l'École pratique des hautes études. The Proceedings of this conference are currently in preparation.

104. CALMA, SZÉKELY, "Cause and Causality", p. 196-199.

105. The phrase is Luca Bianchi's, from his article "Boèce de Dacie et Averroès: essai d'un bilan", which will be published in D. CALMA, Z. KALUZA (eds.), *Les médiévaux face aux traditions philosophiques*, Leuven, Leuven University Press, forthcoming.

106. Mihai Maga is preparing a study on the relationships between the commentaries of Siger of Brabant, Ps.-Peter of Auvergne and the Anonymous of Erfurt.

<p>Ps. Petrus de Alvernia, <i>Questiones super Librum de causis</i> (Reportatio Vindobonensis), ed. Maga, in <i>NeMA I</i></p>	<p>Anonymus Erffordensis, <i>Questiones super Librum de causis</i>, ed. Szekely / Calma, in <i>NeMA I</i></p>
<p>Hic primo queritur utrum agens naturale agat influendo. Arguitur quod non. Influere est interius fluere, et fluere est interius localiter moveri, sed agens naturale non agit sic in passivum quod aliquid ab eo corporaliter defluat in passivum, secundum Aristotelem I De generatione, capitulo de activis et passivis, quare etc. Oppositum dicit littera. (q. 2, p. 74)</p>	<p>Queritur circa hanc primam propositionem utrum omne agens agat influendo. Et arguitur quod non. Influere est intus fluere, sed hoc non contingit sine motu locali. Et sic fieret decisio ab agente in passum, quod est contra Philosophum, I De generatione, capitulo de activis et passivis. (...) Oppositum arguitur. (q. 2, p. 405)</p>
<p>Deinde queritur utrum eternitas differat a tempore. Arguitur quod non. Nam diverse mesure quarum una non continet aliam non possunt esse simul. NON enim SIMUL SUNT DUO DIES. (q. 8, p. 82)</p>	<p>Queritur utrum eternitas differat a tempore. Et arguitur quod non. Due measure diverse quarum una non continet aliam non sunt simul; sed tempus et eternitas possunt simul esse; ergo sunt una mensura. (q. 8, p. 414)</p> <p>see also Radulfus Brito(?), <i>Questiones super Librum de causis</i>, ed. Costa / Borgo, in <i>NeMA I</i>: Item, ostenditur quod non sit nisi una mensura. Quia plures measure non possunt simul esse sic quod una non sit pars alterius. Set eternitas et tempus sunt simul measure. Ergo oportet quod una sit pars alterius. Maior patet quia DUO DIES SIMUL ESSE NON POSSUNT sic quod unus non sit pars alterius. (q. 7, p. 318)</p>
<p>Ad hoc est intelligendum quod eternitas immutabilitatem confertur, et sicut quedam est immutabilitas causata et participata, ita est eternitas causata et participata. De hac autem eternitate intelligendum est quod est</p>	<p>Ad minorem, dicendum quod eternitas, ut causatum est, non predicatur de causa prima, nec sic causa prima est eterna, sed supereterna. Eternitas est quid causatum prout importat</p>

<p>causata, non de eternitate que predicatur de primo eterno quod est causa prima. (q. 11, p. 82)</p>	<p>indeficientiam causatam ab aliquo primo immutabili; sed prout importat immutabilitatem non participatam, sic convenit cause prime et de ea predicatur. (q. 6, p. 412)</p>
<p>Ad primum istorum dicendum quod primum alia a se intelligit. Intelligitur enim unumquodque per speciem eius denudata<m> a materia. Essentia autem cause prime species est ipsarum rerum maxime denudata a materia; ergo ipsa est intellectus omnium entium et maxime perfectis. (q. 14, p. 115)</p>	<p>Ratio primi est, quia secundum Avicennam, VIII sue <i>Metaphisice</i>: quod prohibet rem intelligi est materia vel eius appendicie; et quod liberum est ab istis est maxime intelligibile. Cum igitur essentia cause prime est maxime liberata a materia, ideo est summe intelligibile. (q. 18, p. 432)</p>

It seems therefore that the reception of the *Liber de causis* in the Latin world led to a kind of shared intellectual enterprise of continuous discussion and exegesis. Arguments, authorities and problematics were relayed between authors participating actively in this interpretative tradition.

4. In Lieu of a Conclusion

The documents identified, studied and (partially) edited in these volumes enable us, it seems, to expand Stephen Gersh's particular judgement about Germany to apply to medieval Europe as a whole: "we see the development of an entire tradition in which Platonism gradually increases in importance relative to Aristotelianism, and philosophy gains strength as an independent rational discipline, with Proclus being the primary catalyst in this process"¹⁰⁷. Aquinas's discovery that the *Liber de causis* is a false Aristotle did not stall the interpretative tradition. Medieval thinkers continued to interpret and teach this work *after* Aquinas because they read it as a condensation of metaphysical doctrines absent both in Aristotle and in the *Elements of Theology*. Indeed, there are at least three important differences between the *Liber de causis* and the *Elements of Theology*, as Cristina d'Ancona summarises:

(1) "instead of the opposition one-multiple (i.e. of the *Elements of Theology*), it is the primacy of the remote, transcendent First Cause that

107. S. GERSH, "One thousand years of Proclus: an introduction to his reception", in GERSH (ed.), *Interpreting Proclus*, p. 18.

sets the tone in the *Liber de causis*¹⁰⁸.

(2) “the First Cause turns out to be that pure and underived Being which is even above eternity”, while Proclus’s “first principle is located not only beyond Being, but also beyond the supra-essential henads”¹⁰⁹.

(3) “The *De causis* proceeds to state that the transcendent First Cause does not limit itself to being the first item of the causal chain: indeed, it *creates* the derivative levels of reality”¹¹⁰.

The transcendence of a single and unique cause, the pure being above eternity who creates all beings and levels of reality, are marks of a metaphysical turn, which emerged in the course of adapting the Greek polytheism of Proclus to Islamic monotheism. The medievals likely preferred the *Liber de causis* to the *Elements of Theology* precisely because of this metaphysical turn¹¹¹.

108. D’ANCONA, “The Liber de causis”, in GERSH (ed.), *Interpreting Proclus*, p. 143.

109. *Ibid.*, p. 144.

110. *Ibid.*, p. 145.

111. I wish to thank Elizabeth Curry and Evan King for the English translation of this text.

Appendix

The manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, latin 12951 contains these texts: the *Metaphysica*, f. 3ra-68va; the *Liber de causis*, f. 69ra-73va; at f. 73va-b one reads the text of the questions published below written in very small letters, by a hand from the end of the 13th century and beginning of the 14th century. It begins immediately after the copy of the *Liber de causis*, which is itself written by another hand (13th century) of French origin, in larger letters; the same hand has copied the previous text, the *Metaphysica*. The text of the *Liber de causis* is annotated only once, by a different hand (f. 70ra), but the same tiny writing of the *Questiones super Librum de causis* is found in numerous marginal notes of the *Metaphysica*; in both cases the words are much abbreviated. Certain corrections which are found within the text of the *Questiones* lead us to doubt that we are dealing with an autograph; the abbreviations of the correcting hand are quite similar to the principal hand, which suggests rather that these are erroneous readings which were afterwards revised: *maior* instead of *magis*, *illud autem* instead of *illa autem*, *inferiorum* instead of *inferioribus*, *perfectius* instead of *perfectam*.

This brief text, which might have been part of a larger commentary now lost or yet unidentified, consists of four questions on the first proposition of the *Liber de causis*. The implicit citations of Thomas Aquinas and Siger of Brabant prove that the Anonymous was familiar with the Parisian milieu, and it is even probable that he was a master of arts at the University of Paris.

The 2nd question, as in Siger's commentary, has the title: "Utrum causa prima possit producere suum effectum sine causa media". The solution begins:

Licet credamus secundum fidem rationes simpliciter verum concludere,
secundum philosophiam tamen, cuius sectatores summus, dicendum est
quod causa prima nihil possit producere sine causa secunda.

Although the arguments *pro*, which he has just given, agree with the truth of the faith, according to philosophy, which he follows, one must conclude otherwise. This standpoint recalls Siger's manner of opposing theology and philosophy. The Anonymous places himself in the sect of philosophers who do not see a concord between faith and reason regarding God's immediate intervention. He himself, for that matter, gives a clear statement of his profession, rare among the masters of arts¹¹², by including himself among

112. L. BIANCHI, "Viri philosophici. Nota sui prologhi dei commenti all'*Etica* e ai *Meteorologica* erroneamente attribuiti a Giacomo di Douai (ms. Paris, BnF, lat. 14698)", in S. PERFETTI (ed.), *Scientia, Fides, Theologia. Studi di filosofia medievale in onore di Gianfranco Fioravanti*, Firenze, Edizioni ETS, 2011, p. 253-288.

the *sectatores philosophiae*. From this position he is obliged to hold that the first cause can produce nothing without the second cause. He reflects on this question as a philosopher and articulates his view by providing both arguments from authority and a philosophical demonstration. Luca Bianchi has recently called into question the hypothesis previously put forward by Alain de Libera according to which “philosopher” is a theologian’s term “made for condemning, censuring, or impeding intellectual freedom” and that, consequently, the Faculty of arts was not a Faculty of philosophers¹¹³. The fact that the Anonymous considers himself, along with his students, as a follower of philosophy is another argument one may support Bianchi’s argument.

The Anonymous clearly knows Thomas Aquinas’s commentary on the *De causis*, which he draws upon regarding the question of essentially and accidentally ordered causes, as well as for the question of the validity of the first proposition for every genre of causality:

Thomas de Aquino, <i>Expositio super Librum de causis</i> , ed. Saffrey	Anonymus, <i>Questiones super Librum de causis</i>
<p><i>In causis etiam finalibus</i> manifestum est verificari omnia praedicta, nam propter ultimum finem, qui est universalis, alii fines appetuntur, quorum appetitus advenit post appetitum ultimi finis et ante ipsum cessat (...). Si autem quaeratur <i>in unoquoque causarum genere</i> utrum praedicta verificentur in omnibus causis quomodolibet ordinatis, manifestum est quod non. (...)</p> <p><i>In causis igitur per se ordinatis haec propositio habet veritatem</i>, in quibus causa prima movet omnes causas medias ad effectum; <i>in causis autem ordinatis per accidens est e converso</i>, nam effectus qui per se producitur a causa proxima, per accidens producitur a causa prima, praeter intentionem eius existens. Quod autem est per se potius est eo</p>	<p>Idem patet in omni genere cause, ut <i>in causa finali</i>. Si sint due cause finales respectu unius effectus ita quod una prima et alia secunda, certum est quod causa prima plus influit supra effectum quam secundaria. Et sic inducendo <i>in omni genere cause</i>, sciendum tamen quod quedam sunt cause <i>essentialiter ordinate</i>, et in istis <i>hoc est verum</i> quod dictum est. Alie sunt cause <i>accidentaliter ordinate</i>, et in istis <i>non est verum</i>. Et huiusmodi ordo accidentalis est in individuís. (q. 1, p. 48-49)</p>

113. Cf. L. BIANCHI, “Johannes de Malignes”, in C. ANGOTTI, M. BRÎNZEI, M. TEEUWEN (eds.), *Portraits de Maîtres offerts à Olga Weijers*, FIDEM, Porto, 2012, p. 304-307.

<p>quod est per accidens, et propter hoc signanter dicit: causa universalis, quae est causa per se. (p. 9, l. 18 – 10, l. 15)</p>	
<p>Proclus enim hanc propositionem inducit <i>secundum Platoniorum</i> suppositiones, qui, universalium abstractionem ponentes, quanto aliquid est abstractius et universalius <i>tanto prius</i> esse ponebant. (prop. 2, p. 13, l. 15-18)</p> <p>Cuius quidem ratio est, <i>secundum positiones Platonicas</i>, quia, sicut supra dictum est, quanto aliquid est <i>communius</i>, tanto ponebant illud esse magis separatum et quasi <i>prius</i> a posterioribus participatum, et sic esse posteriorum causam. (prop. 4, p. 27, l. 14-18)</p>	<p>Unde cum Actor dixit quod cause communiores sunt priores, similiter locutus fuit <i>secundum platonicos</i>. (q. 4)</p>

The Anonymous borrows passages from Siger of Brabant’s commentary, notably for arguments *pro* and *contra*, but his solution shows signs of an original philosophical inquiry:

<p>Sigerus de Brabantia, <i>Quaestiones super Librum de causis</i>, ed. Marlasca</p>	<p>Anonymus, <i>Questiones super Librum de causis</i></p>
<p>Quidam homines vulgares et populares opinati sunt, sicut recitat Averroes super nono Metaphysicae, quod causa prima omnia faceret immediate, quod esset agere causam primariam sine secundaria. Et hi, sicut dicit, non habentes cerebrum ad bonum naturale tollunt ab entibus proprias operationes; quare et essentias et virtutes. (q. 2, p. 40, l. 25-29)</p>	<p>Quod patet primo ex auctoritate, primo, Commentatoris IX Metaphysice qui dicit quod populares dicunt Deum immediate agere in omnibus; sed isti habent cerebrum ineptum ad omne bonum. Secundo, patet II <i>Celi et mundi</i> ubi dicit Philosophus quod celum est ligamentum illorum inferiorum cum superioribus, ita quod mediante celo superiora agunt in istis inferioribus; contra ergo immediate. (q. 2, p. 50)</p>
<p>Quod autem forma uniuscuiusque rei sit simplex in substantia sua et non</p>	<p>Arguo quod non, quia forma rei est diffinitio, tunc arguo quod non habet</p>

composita multipliciter arguitur. Primo sic, quia, sicut vult Aristoteles, **definitio** principaliter indicat **rei formam**. Sed **definitio** quae est in prima veritate definitionis, ut substantiarum, ipsa est in qua **non additur** ens enti, sicut vult Aristoteles *septimo Metaphysicae* et suus Commentator. Sed si in substantia rei esset forma addita formae, tunc definitio rei adderet ens enti.

Praeterea. Si **forma** rei in sua **substantia** esset composita ita quod esset forma formae addita, ens per formam in quo esset talis additio non esset unum ens nisi **per accidens**. Omnis enim forma **adveniens** alicui habenti formam quamcumque imperfectam est accidens non constituens ipsum in esse, sed in esse tali vel tanto et esse simpliciter praesupponens.

Praeterea. Si **forma** rei in sua substantia esse composita **ex formis diversis**, illae formae diversae essent entia **in actu diversa**, quae habens talem formam compositam **non esset unum** in actu **essentialiter**.

Praeterea. Si forma rei non esset simplex sed composita, illa eius compositio esse ex **forma** eius **generis** et **forma** **suae differentiae**, ita quod compositio formae speciei ex forma generis et forma differentiae esset compositio tertiae rei ex duabus rebus. Sed **hoc esse non potest**, quia secundum hoc **genus** esset **pars** speciei et pars **de suo toto** praedicatione in quid non **praedicatur**. Ergo genus de specie in quid non praedicaretur.

Oppositum huius vult **Auctor** in littera (...).

additamentum; in **diffinitione non habet additamentum**; in formis substantia non differtur per additamentum, VII *Metaphysicorum*. Ideo nec forme ita se habebunt quod una addatur alteri.

Item, iam **forma** **substantialis** esset **accidentalis** quia **adveniret** enti actuato per primam formam.

Item, **forma** idem est quod actus. Si ergo aliquid **haberet diversas formas**, iam aliquid haberet **diversos actus**; quod est impossibile quia illud **non esset unum** nisi forma **et non secundum essentiam**.

Item, si in aliquo sint plures forme ita quod una communior et alia magis specialis, tunc forma communior esset **forma generis** et forma specialis esset **forma differentie**; **sed hoc est impossibile** quia iam **genus** esset **pars** integralis. Et quia **genus predicatur**, tunc pars integralis **predicatur de toto**; quare etc.

In **oppositum** est **Actor** in commento. Dico quod non sunt plures forme tales

<p>Solutio. Dicendum est quod forma substantialis uniuscuiusque rei simplex est in sua substantia, non composita ex formis diversis, quarum una habeat rationem imperfecti, reliquae vero rationem perfectionis, sicut bene ostendunt rationes ad hoc adductae. (...) Immo Socrates per formam unam simplicem est substantia, corpus, animatum corpus et homo, sub alia et alia ratione. Nam a sua forma habet esse, vivere et ratiocinari, et sic de multis aliis; et sub istis diversis rationibus causa est ut sit substantia, corpus et sic de aliis. Unde in rebus diversis invenitur <i>gradus formarum ita quod completior continet in se</i>, virtute, minus completum, sicut numerus perfectior numerum imperfectiorem, ita quod cum vegetativum in plantis principium sit nutritionis, sensitivum in animalibus principium est nutritionis et adhuc sensus.</p>	<p>in eodem, differentes secundum rem, quia iam individuum vel species non esse una per essentiam, quod est impossibile; etiam secunda forma substantialis esset accidentalis. Dico tamen quod differunt ratione, ut Sor vivit <et> ratiocinatur.</p> <p>Inquantum ratiocinatur differt a seipso inquantum consideratur ut vivit, quia cum consideratur ut ratiocinatur consideratur sub ratione magis contracta quam si consideratur secundum quod vivit; quare etc. Sciendum tamen quod licet ibi non sit nisi una forma; si sit, tamen <i>forme speciosior includunt omnes precedentes virtute</i>, ut sensitivum includit vegetativum. Unde anima sensitiva includit in se potentiam nutritivam.</p>
--	--

Among the authorities cited by the Anonymous one finds a reference to Averroes’s *Commentary on the Metaphysics*, taken from Siger, as the adjective *populares* indicates (Averroes uses *moderni*). The Anonymous refers to a passage of the *De celo* not cited by Siger. His argumentation also differs from Siger’s: the Anonymous prefers to prove the impossibility of God’s direct intervention by emphasizing the heavens’ role as intermediary between separate substances and the sublunary world. The heavens are the cause of movement, and therefore of time; furthermore, material things are subjected to movement and time; therefore, all actions in this world are produced by the intermediary of the heavens. As a middle term between God and the material

world, the heavens are a medium of every divine intervention:

(...) dicendum est quod causa prima nihil possit producere sine causa secunda.

Et probatur: quia actiones que sunt in istis inferioribus sunt temporales, et non essent temporales nisi hec esset per celum quia si celum non esset motus, non esset nec tempus; quare relinquitur quod actiones in istis inferioribus sint mediante celo.

Item, extremum non agit in extremum nisi per medium. Deus et ista inferiora sunt extrema. Celum est medium cum communicat cum inferioribus ratione corporeitatis, cum superioribus ratione eternitatis. Ergo Deus non agit in istis inferioribus nisi mediante celo.

These arguments recall several propositions censured by Etienne Tempier and his theological commission in 1277:

Quod primum principium non potest esse causa diversorum factorum hic inferius nisi mediantibus aliis causis. (prop. 43)

Quod primum principium non potest immediate producere generabilis, quia sunt effectus novi. (prop. 54)

Quod Deus non potest in effectum causae secundariae sine ipsa causa secundaria. (prop. 63)

Quod nichil est novum, nisi celum esset variatum respectu materie generabilium. (prop. 88)¹¹⁴

It is unlikely that the Anonymous took up this idea in the aftermath of Tempier's censure; rather, since the anonymous commentary on the *De causis* is written after Siger's text, which dates from 1274-1276, one can suppose that the commentary was composed in Paris shortly before March 7th, 1277. It is a commentary, slightly posterior to that of Siger of Brabant, which the members of Tempier's commission might have known and taken into account for the theses cited above.

114. Cf. D. PICHÉ, *La condamnation parisienne de 1277*, Paris, Vrin, 1999, p. 94, 96, 100, 88; see also R. HISSETTE, *Enquête sur les 219 articles condamnés à Paris le 7 mars 1277*, Louvain / Paris, Publications Universitaires / Vander-Oyez, 1977, p. 120-130 and p. 138-142. An Anonymous author, citing several times *Elementatio theologica* in a commentary on *De generatione et corruptione*, defends the same thesis: "Iste autem (scil. motor primus) per se non est causa sufficiens effectuum inferiorum sine causis mediis, quia novitas in effectu de necessitate exigit novitatem in causa"; cf. S. DONATI, "A New Witness to the Radical Aristotelianism Condemned by Étienne Tempier in 1277", in J.A. AERTSEN, A. SPEER (eds), *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter?*, Berlin / New York, W. De Gruyter, 1998, p. 371-382, here p. 374, n. 15.

<Anonymus Sectator philosophie>

<Questiones super *Librum de causis*>

<Questio 1. Utrum sit vera prima propositio que dicit:
omnis causa primaria etc.>

Circa primam propositionem queritur utrum sit vera que dicit: *omnis causa primaria* etc. Et arguitur quod prima causa non plus influit supra effectum quam secundaria, ymmo quod secundaria magis influat. Et probatur sic: causa magis assimilans sibi effectum plus influit supra effectum quam causa minus assimilans; sed causa secundaria magis assimilat sibi effectum suum quam causa prima; quare etc. Maior patet quia omne agens assimilat sibi passum quantum potest. Minor patet quod homo generat hominem et sol; et homo generans magis assimilat sibi hominem generatum quam sol; quare etc.

Item, causa determinata plus influit supra effectum determinatum quam causa non determinata. Sed causa secunda est causa determinata; determinare enim istum effectum sibi determinat producendo; quare etc.

Item, si causa prima plus influeret quam causa secunda supra effectum suum, iam abavus et proavus et avus plus facerent ad generationem alicuius filii quam pater immediatus illius filii, cum sint cause prime et pater immediatus sit causa secunda. Hoc est impossibile quia talis effectus potest produci et tamen avus, abavus <et> proavus erunt corrupti; quare etc.

Oppositum vult Alphorabius compositor istius artis.

Dicendum quod propositio vera est. Cuius probatio est quia quandoque aliqua duo faciunt ad aliquod tantum, et unum illorum nullam causalitatem habet supra effectum nisi ab alio quod presupponit, illud autem aliud illam causalitatem habet, et adhuc illud plus influit supra effectum quam illud alterum quod illam causalitatem habet ab altero. Sed causa prima et causa secunda faciunt ad effectum et quicquid causalitatis habet secunda causa, habet a prima. Prima autem illam habet et adhuc aliam. Ergo causa prima plus influit supra effectum quam causa secundaria. Idem patet in omni genere cause, ut in causa finali. Si sint due cause finales respectu unius effectus ita quod una prima et alia secunda, certum est quod causa prima plus influit supra effectum quam secundaria. Et sic inducendo in omni genere cause, sciendum tamen quod quedam sunt cause essentialiter ordinate, et in istis hoc

5 secundaria] *add. ill. sed del.* P 8 etc] magis *scr. sed del.* P 15 proavus] prothavus P
18 proavus] prothavus P 21 duo] *sup. lin.* P 22 presupponit] illa autem alia *add. sed del.* P
23 adhuc] plus *add.* P

est verum quod dictum est. Alie sunt cause accidentaliter ordinate, et in istis non est verum. Et huiusmodi ordo accidentalis est in individuis.

Per hec ad rationem.

Ad primam, 'causa magis assimilans' etc., nego. Et cum probatur: 'agens assimilat' etc., verum est de agente particulari qui agens particulare, ex eo quod particulare est, habet causalitatem determinatam et dependentem a causa universali.

Ad aliam, 'causa determinata' etc., ista ratio magis concludit oppositum quam propositum quia, ex eo quod determinata est, dependet ab universali.

Ad aliam, soluta est in fine quia ibi non arguitur de causis essentialiter ordinatis. Et si contra veritatem arguatur: quia causa prima nihil causat in effectum nisi quamdam potentiam, causa secunda causat in effectum actum, ita quod influit actum in effectum; et tale magis facit ad effectum, quare etc. Dico quod ista ratio ymaginatur quia causa secunda illam actualitatem habeat a se; quod falsum est, ymmo habet a causa prima. Ideo multo magis causa prima agit.

<Questio 2. Utrum causa prima possit producere suum effectum sine causa media>

Deinde queritur utrum causa prima possit producere suum effectum sine causa media. Videtur quod sic, quia quicquid causalitatis habet secunda, habet a prima. Ergo prima per se ipsam producere potest suum effectum.

Item, causa habens omnes perfectiones quicquid potest mediante secunda causa, potest per se. Deus est huiusmodi, per Philosophum et Commentatorem V *Metaphysice*, capitulo de perfectione; quare etc.

Item, causa omnipotens quicquid potest mediantibus causis secundis potest per se vel non esset omnipotens. Deus est causa omnipotens; quare etc. Minor etiam patet per Commentatorem XII *Metaphysice* qui dicit quod omnes forme que sunt in potentia passiva in prima materia sunt in potentia activa primi motoris.

Item, agens per cognitionem sicut intelligit sic potest facere; Deus agit per cognitionem quia suus intellectus est causa rerum, secundum Commentatorem XII *Metaphysice*; quare etc.

Oppositum patet I *Metaphysicorum*, VIII *Physicorum*, I *Celi et mundi*.

Licet credamus secundum fidem rationes simpliciter verum concludere, secundum philosophiam tamen, cuius sectatores summus, dicendum est quod causa prima nihil possit producere sine causa secunda.

10 de] in P 27 passiva] mediante *add. sed exp.* P

Quod patet primo ex auctoritate, primo, Commentatoris IX *Metaphysice* qui dicit quod populares dicunt Deum immediate agere in omnibus; sed isti habent cerebrum ineptum ad omne bonum. Secundo, patet II *Celi et mundi* ubi dicit Philosophus quod celum est ligamentum illorum inferiorum cum superioribus, ita quod mediante celo superiora agunt in istis inferioribus; contra ergo immediate.

Et probatur: quia actiones que sunt in istis inferioribus sunt temporales, et non essent temporales nisi hec esse<n>t per celum, quia si celum non esset motus, non esset nec tempus; quare relinquitur quod actiones in istis inferioribus sint mediante celo.

Item, extremum non agit in extremum nisi per medium. Deus et ista inferiora sunt extrema. Celum est medium cum communicat cum inferioribus ratione corporeitatis, cum superioribus ratione eternitatis. Ergo Deus non agit in istis inferioribus nisi mediante celo.

Ad rationem. Cum dicitur 'quicquid causalitatis' etc., verum est ex parte causarum et causalitatis. Bene dicitur. Sed respiciendo ad modum causandi, dico quod non sequitur quod in causa prima est causalitas alicui<us>; modo in secundo causante est causalitas magis organice, ideo secunda causa determinat causa<m> universalem primam in suis actionibus et sic est ordo in entibus, secundum Eustratium I *Ethicorum*; et I *Celi et mundi* ubi dicit quod Deus dat omnibus esse, hiis vero clarius hiis vero obscurius.

Ad aliam, 'causa habens omnes perfectiones' etc., concedo si ex parte causalitatis. Sed quia prima eminentius habet et universalius, ideo requiruntur secunde que determinant et specificant.

Ad aliam, 'causa omnipotens' etc., verum est nisi implicentur contradictoria. Sed ibi probatur, scilicet : si ageret immediate, quia tamquam causaret, sic proportionaretur, quia agens proportionaretur passo. Inquantum habet eminentius et universalius causalitatem non proportionatur. Et sic proportionatur et non propotionatur. Modo contradictoria, ut supra dictum, principio VI *Ethicorum*.

Ad aliam, 'agens per intellectionem' etc., dico secundum unam viam quod agere in ratione cause finalis et non in ratione immediati efficientis : vel maior concedatur, <et> minor posset negari, quia non declaravit ista fides, cum sint vitia; vel dicatur quod sive agat per intellectum sive non. Oportet quod inter agens et patiens sit proportio, tunc autem <inter> Deum et ista inferiora non est proportio.

1 primo] *sup. lin.* P 4 inferiorum] *sup. lin. post corr. ex inferioribus*

<Questio 3. Utrum in eodem effectu sit causa communior et minus
communis>

Ergo cuiusdem dicti in contrario quero utrum in eodem effectu sit causa communior et minus communis. Arguo quod non, quia forma rei est diffinitio, tunc arguo quod non habet additamentum; in diffinitione non habet additamentum; in formis substantia non differtur per additamentum, VII *Metaphysicorum*. Ideo nec forme ita se habebunt quod una addatur alteri. 5

Item, iam forma substantialis esset accidentalis quia adveniret enti actuato per primam formam.

Item, forma idem est quod actus. Si ergo aliquid haberet diversas formas, iam aliquid haberet diversos actus; quod est impossibile quia illud non esset unum nisi forma et non secundum essentiam. 10

Item, si in aliquo sint plures forme, ita quod una communior et alia magis specialis, tunc forma communior esset forma generis et forma specialis esset forma differentie; sed hoc est impossibile quia iam genus esset pars integralis. Et quia genus predicatur, tunc pars integralis predicatur de toto; quare etc. 15

[73vb] In oppositum est Actor in commento.

Dico quod non sunt plures forme tales in eodem, differentes secundum rem, quia iam individuum vel species non esse una per essentiam, quod est impossibile; etiam secunda forma substantialis esset accidentalis. Dico tamen quod differunt ratione, ut Sor vivit <et> ratiocinatur. Inquantum ratiocinatur differt a seipso inquantum consideratur ut vivit, quia cum consideratur ut ratiocinatur consideratur sub ratione magis contracta quam si consideratur secundum quod vivit; quare etc. Sciendum tamen quod licet ibi non sit nisi una forma ; si sit, tamen forme speciosior includunt omnes precedentes virtute, ut sensitivum includit vegetativum. Unde anima sensitiva includit in se potentiam nutritivam. 20 25

Rationes bene probant quod non sunt in eodem plures <forme> realiter et non secundum rationem. Et ideo quia sunt in plures secundum rationem, propter hoc dicuntur multe, et sic intelligit commentum.

<Questio 4. Utrum causa communior sit prior>

Deinde queritur, utrum causa communior sit prior. Arguitur quod non, quia quanto perfectius, tanto prius; causa magis propria est perfectior; quare etc.

Secundo probo quod causa propria sit magis causa: quia quod habet magis
 5 rationem forme est magis causa quam quod habet rationem materie; sed causa propria habet magis rationem forme cum sit magis determinata et actuans, quod competit forme; quare etc.

Oppositum vult Actor.

Dico quod esse, vivere et ratiocinari, de quibus exemplificat, non sunt
 10 proprie cause quia non sunt altera pars aggregati. Quod patet, quia quod constituit aliquid ut pars realis, non ponitur de constituto per se. Et dicente modo, esse, vivere etc. ponantur per se de constituto; quare etc. Sed sic non queritur, ymmo ponitur supponendo quod habent modum forme.

Et tunc queritur utrum illud quod habet modum cause, magis communis
 15 sit prius. Et tunc dico quod duplex est prioritas: quedam est prioritas imperfectionis et generationis, et quedam est prioritas simpliciter et via perfectionis. Tunc dico quod illa que habent modum cause magis communis sunt priora prioritate prima, quia confusiora et indeterminata. Sunt priora ista prioritate cum ista prioritas competat materie; sed iste cause sunt huiusmodi;
 20 quare etc. Secundo dico quod cause proprie sunt priores secunda prioritate, quia quanto perfectius tanto prius; iste sunt perfectiores; quare etc. Et loquor de prioritate secundo modo dicto.

Item, actus precedit potentiam; et iste sunt magis actuales et intimiores; quare etc. Unde cum Actor dixit quod cause communiores sunt priores,
 25 similiter locutus fuit secundum platonicos.

Ad rationem 'quanto perfectius' etc., verum est <de> ordine imperfectionis non <de> ordine perfectionis.

Per idem ad aliam etc.

21 quanto] perficiens et(?) *scrp. sed del. P* 22 dicto] dicta P 27 ordine] nature *scrp. sed del. P*