

Lombardus electronicus: Careers in the Arts and Theology Faculties before 1500.

Commentators on Peter Lombard's *Sentences* and their University and Extra-University

Lives

Steven J. Livesey

For more than fifty years, laborers in the field of Sentential literature have relied on Friedrich Stegmüller's *Repertorium commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*¹ as a first source in the search for medieval (and post-medieval) commentaries. Over the past half century, research focused on the *Sentences* has tended to reflect two distinct but related interests. First, there has been a substantial continuation of individual studies drawing upon the commentaries known to us, and in fact, this research has helped augment the canon of commentaries beyond Stegmüller's original list.² In many, but not all cases, the study of the content of commentaries has been accompanied by additional research into the lives of the authors. At the same time, scholars looking more globally at institutions have increased our knowledge about the place of commentaries on the *Sentences* in university faculties of theology or in the studia of religious orders proximate to medieval universities.³ The result of both of these efforts has been a more complete picture of the texts themselves, often in the context of the institutions in which they were written.

While we now know a great deal more about individual commentators and their works, and about theological faculties or religious studia, these studies tend to focus either on the microhistories of single cases or the peculiar characteristics of local or regional educational institutions. What I should like to pursue in this paper is an analysis of the University and extramural lives of the entire known population of commentators on the *Sentences*, and to do so, I will draw upon a database that collects biographical and bibliographical information about medieval commentators on both Peter Lombard's *Sentences* and

¹ 2 vols. Würzburg: F. Schöningh 1947.

² For the first thirty years of this period, there is a convenient bibliography that surveys research based on *Sentences* commentaries: John Van Dyk, "Thirty Years since Stegmüller: A Bibliographical Guide to the Study of Medieval *Sentence* Commentaries since the Publication of Stegmüller's *Repertorium Commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi* (1947)," *Franciscan Studies* 39(1979) 255-315. For the subsequent period, serial bibliographies like the *International Medieval Bibliography*, and more recently, the *Bibliographie annuelle du moyen-âge tardif* survey most of these studies.

³ The list of such works is too long to reproduce here, but representative examples can be found in J. I. Catto, "Theology and Theologians 1220-1320," in *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. I, *The Early Oxford Schools*, ed. J. I. Catto. Oxford: Oxford UP 1984. pp. 471-517; W. J. Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England*. Princeton: Princeton UP 1987; Monika Asztalos, "The Faculty of Theology," in *A History of the University in Europe*, vol. I, *Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. Hilde de Ridder-Symoens. Cambridge: Cambridge UP 1992. pp. 409-441; and *Storia della teologia nel Medioevo*, ed. Giulio D'Onofrio. 3 vols. Casale Monferrato: Piemme 1996.

Aristotle's works. Although there is a good deal of overlap among these two populations, I will confine my remarks only to the former, with occasional references to the latter as a means of comparison.

Before proceeding, one needs to be very clear about the criteria for inclusion in the database. This is very important, because as is well known, 'reading' or lecturing on the *Sentences* was a requirement imposed on all candidates for degrees in theology. Because the database — like Stegmüller's original *Repertorium* and its subsequent supplements — focuses on the textual survival of commentaries, mere oral transmission of one's ideas will not suffice for inclusion in the database. By the same token, there are significant numbers of commentaries on the *Sentences* that cannot be attributed with precision to any particular author, and because the goal of the database is to collect biographical information about commentators, anonymous commentaries — however interesting or important — are not included.

In distinguishing between written and oral transmissions of commentaries, I have drawn upon a variety of sources. First, many of the commentators qualify for inclusion in the database because their commentaries are extant in manuscript copies or early printed editions. Here, of course, I have followed various repertoria, some of which have already been discussed, together with manuscript catalogues, serial bibliographies, and references in modern secondary sources. Historical catalogues — both medieval and more recent — indicating that a commentary once existed have also proved useful in identifying commentators. Finally, the internal evidence of authors themselves or their readers (not hearers) has also qualified some commentators for inclusion.

The database is a set of eleven tables linked together by the prescribed name of the commentator. One is a look-up table that provides aliases useful in identifying commentators. Basic biographical information, including the commentator's birth and death dates and places, social status, parental names, and family profession, is stored in an initial name table, which is in turn linked to the remaining nine subordinate tables that collect information about the individual's educational history, ecclesiastical positions, geographical movements, personal relationships to students, masters, patrons, and the like, professional careers, writings and other intellectual products, membership in religious orders, and teaching and lecturing. A final table stores bibliographical information for each commentator. While the data are entered under a unique program written in Visual Basic, they are stored and indexed in a standard Microsoft Access database format, and hence retrievable under MS Access or virtually any other commercial database software. As a result, one can devise and modify queries of the data that suit individual purposes.

At present, there are approximately 46,000 records in the database describing the lives of nearly 1600 commentators. The greatest number of these (nearly 20,000) comprises the table that stores information about texts composed by commentators. In addition, there are more than 8,000 records pertaining to the educational careers of commentators, approximately 3,100 ecclesiastical positions, and

4,700 records indicating relationships to masters, students, patrons, and the like. But as in any population, about some commentators we know a great deal; of others, there is virtually no information. For example, of Arnold Woestefeldes, the long-time master of arts and student of theology at Leipzig, we have nearly 80 educational records. But for nearly a third of the commentators, there are no records or only one record.

Of the 1584 commentators in the database, 893 produced commentaries on the *Sentences*.⁴ Of these, we know the birth countries for 503, or 56%. In descending order, 113 (22.5%) were French; 110 (21.9%) were English; 95 (18.9%) were Italian; 76 (15.1%) were German; and the remaining 109 (21.7%) were from an array of other locations across Europe and the Mediterranean.⁵ For 362, we know the city of birth or its environs, and as one might expect, none recurs with considerable frequency.⁶ We know the death places for 392 commentators, which in descending order of frequency are Avignon (25), Paris (25), Rome (22), Vienna (17), and Cologne (15), while the remaining 288 range over 193 locations. Clearly, while commentators hailed from all regions of Europe, they gravitated to ecclesiastical and educational centers.

We know the social origins of 114, or slightly more than one in eight commentators. Of these, only sixteen were of peasant, illegitimate or otherwise low birth; at the other end of the spectrum, only nine were of middle to upper aristocratic birth. The vast majority sprang from the local domini and knights (54) or urban bourgeoisie (35). Town scholars rose from a variety of occupational backgrounds, the most prominent being a variety of manual trades and notaries.⁷ For 205 commentators on the *Sentences*, we have reasonably reliable data about birth and death dates. They suggest that as a whole, the population lived a somewhat long life, 64.4 years, with the longest being 101 and the shortest 29.⁸

⁴ By comparison, 855 commentators produced commentaries on Aristotle; 216 commentators on the *Sentences* also produced commentaries on Aristotle.

⁵ For the universal data set, there are some notable shifts: of the 780 commentators for whom nationality is known, 183 (23.5%) were Italian, 160 (20.5%) were French, 144 (18.5%) were English, and 109 (14%) were German. The remaining 184 (23.6%) were drawn from a variety of countries.

⁶ The most frequent cities, in descending order, are Florence (8), Toulouse (7), Siena and Bologna (5 each), and Naples (4).

⁷ For the universal data set, we know the social origins of 185 (or fewer than one in eight) commentators. An equal number (21) derived from aristocratic and very low birth. Again, the vast majority came from local domini and knightly class (78) or urban bourgeoisie (65). Among this population, nine were from manual trades and six notaries, and the remainder from a variety of professions.

⁸ Every record in the database contains the provision for recording ranges of dates, corresponding to the incomplete historical record. That is, every date field is actually a sequence of four fields, two permitting the codes “p” (post), “a” (ante), and “c” (circa), and two others corresponding to the four-place date. As a result, one can enter the date range “p 1210 a 1215” to signify the historical evidence for an event that took place within this five-year period. These average lifespans have been calculated for those commentators whose birthdates and deathdates are either exact, or in which the birth and death dates were earlier or later respectively than the given numeric year. Thus, the calculated lifespan is a conservative one, and commentators could be assumed to have lived, on average, at least to this age. If one adopts a stricter standard, that of insisting upon exact birth and death years, the number of commentators on the *Sentences* satisfying this criterion falls to 40, with an average lifespan of 63.18 years, and a maximum and minimum of 84 and 33 years. Within the universal population of all commentators in the database,

Six hundred thirty six, or more than two-thirds, were members of religious orders. Of these, 181 were Franciscans, 175 Dominicans, 139 Carmelites, 86 Augustinians, 25 Cistercians, 22 Benedictines, and the remaining 14 spread among six other orders.⁹ While some (particularly those clustered near the early period of this population) entered the order at an early age, the average age of entry was about 23.8 years.¹⁰

Among the population that had previously passed through a Faculty of Arts, the average age at matriculation was 20.96 years, and at attainment of the M.A. 25.43 years.¹¹ Commentators on the *Sentences* matriculated in theology on average at just under age 33,¹² and completed their course of study at age 40.62 years.¹³ Their reading of the *Sentences* came on average at slightly more than 35 years of age, but for seculars in theological faculties, this was delayed about a year, while for students in orders, it occurred at about 32-1/2 years of age, probably reflecting the tendency — captured in the database tables — of such students to read the *Sentences* preliminarily at provincial schools.¹⁴

Once they had completed their degrees, commentators on the *Sentences* seem to have played an active role in the life and governance of their faculties or universities. They are recorded as having served on average five times as examiner in their faculty, in some cases much more frequently, as for example, Arnold Woestefeldes at Leipzig, who performed this duty on 39 occasions in the first third of the sixteenth century, or Johannes Kleine at Leipzig and Greifswald, who is recorded to have served 15 times in the second half of the fifteenth century. Among the population of *Sentences* commentators, seventy

the averages are fairly consistent: 64.26 years [335 commentators (extended criteria)] and 63.18 years [72 commentators (strict criteria)]. However, in all cases, the standard deviations are quite high (ranging from 12.59 to 12.81), so the averages may tell us less than we would wish.

⁹ The discrepancy in the totals arises because six commentators changed affiliation during their lifetimes: Nicolaus de Orbellis (OFM Obs. to OFM Conv.), Jacobus de Jutirboc (O.Cist. to O.Carth.), Narcissus Pfister de Augusta (OP to OSB), Johannes Tongrensis (O.Praem. to OFM), Johannes Briselotus (O.Carm. to OSB), and Antonius Niger (OFM Conv. to OFM Obs.).

¹⁰ These data derived from the fifty commentators on the *Sentences* for whom we have both an exact or approximate birthdate and date of entry in the order. One commentator (Jacobus de Jutirboc) was about 19 at entry into the Cistercian Order; his transference to the Carthusians came at about age 61. Not surprisingly, the standard deviation for these data is 13.67, in part because of the small pool, but also because commentators could and did enter orders at any time of their lives.

¹¹ These averages are based on a fairly small population of twenty five, for whom there are accurate dates of both birth and matriculation. Among the universal population in the database, there are fifty eight such commentators, and the average age of matriculation was rather similar, 20.57 years. Standard deviations for these two groups were 6.21 and 4.97, respectively. There were forty commentators on the *Sentences* for whom we have accurate dates of birth and attainment of the M.A.. Among the commentators at large, there are 76 such individuals, with an average age of 25.88 years at the attainment of the M.A.. Standard deviations for these groups were 6.04 and 6.48, respectively.

¹² Average age 32.95, derived from the forty commentators with accurate dates of birth and matriculation; the standard deviation was 8.18.

¹³ Derived from the sixty-three commentators with accurate dates of birth and attainment of the doctorate; the standard deviation for this population was 8.74.

¹⁴ Twenty-five students in studia of religious orders: average age 32.48 years, standard deviation 9.40; seventy-eight students in university theological faculties: average age 36.17 years, standard deviation 7.34; and the combined data: average age 35.22 years, standard deviation 8.00.

nine were deans of Arts, forty nine were deans of theology, and eighty five were rectors — often on multiple occasions during their careers.¹⁵

We know the identities of 1223 students of 128 of these commentators. While in most cases, we know only a small number of students taught by masters — generally one or two — in a handful, we know the identities and origins of several dozens.¹⁶ Perhaps more interesting than the numbers of students is the correspondence between the origins of students and their masters. At Leipzig, for example, the great majority of Magnus Hund's students hailed from Germany north of Leipzig, while only slightly earlier Conrad Wimpina's students came from Germany south of Coburg. A century earlier at Paris and then Prague, Henry of Embecke's students were largely from northern Germany. Of course, a good deal of this can be explained by the division of the universities into nations, since Magnus Hund matriculated in 1482 in the Saxon nation, while Conrad Wimpina matriculated in 1479 in the Bavarian nation, and thus would be expected to teach students from their own nation.¹⁷ Nevertheless, there does seem to be a tendency to select masters from the region close to home: Henry, from Einbecke midway between Hildesheim and Göttingen, selected as his own masters Arnoldus from Einbecke and Albert of Saxony from Helmstedt, and among his own students nearly 30% were from locations within 100 miles of his hometown.¹⁸ At Paris, of the 30 students of Marsilius of Inghen whose origins are identifiable, 26

¹⁵ Among the 893 commentators on the *Sentences*, 79 served as Dean of Arts a total of 146 terms; among the remaining 691 individuals in the database, 82 served in this capacity for a total of 154 terms. The 49 deans of theology among the commentators on the *Sentences* served 120 terms; there were 19 deans of theology recorded in the database who are not included in this list, because no commentary has survived or was attributed in the past. The 85 commentators on the *Sentences* served as rector for 191 terms, significantly more frequently than the remaining 89 non-commentators who served 145 terms. For some, like Marsilius of Inghen, who took his degree rather late in life, all service as rector preceded his (short) theological career; others, like Johannes de Dabrowka (who served eight times as rector of Krakow), performed most or all of their service after completing their theological degrees. While the significantly higher service as rector may be tied to the prestige of the superior faculty, there are so many additional factors that it is difficult if not impossible to make such correlations.

¹⁶ By far, the leader of the group is Arnoldus Woestefeldes, who taught at Leipzig between 1498 and 1538, for whom we have recorded 131 students. Others in this group are Magnus Hund de Magdeburg (98), Conrad Wimpina (87), Conrad de Soltau (74), Nicolaus de Luthomyssl (56), Paul of Venice (52), and Johannes Ottonis de Munsterberg (51).

¹⁷ G. Erler, *Die Matrikel der Universität Leipzig*. 3 volumes. Leipzig: Giesecke u. Devrient 1896- . S 1482 S.21 (Magnus Hund); W 1479 B.31 (Conradus Wimpina). The database contains records for 98 of Magnus' students at Leipzig, for 90 of which we know places of origin. Of these, 74 were from towns within 90 miles of Magdeburg, Magnus' birthplace; 62 are located within 60 miles; and 20 are located within 30 miles. Eleven hailed from Magdeburg. For Conrad, from Bad Wimpfen, there are 87 students at Leipzig in the database. Thirty-four were from towns within 90 miles of Conrad's home; twenty-six were from towns within 60 miles. Even with the underlying affiliation in the nation, the significant numbers of proximate students suggest a selection based partly on geography.

¹⁸ We have data only for a relatively thin segment of Henry's career. He was apparently master of arts and proctor of the English Nation at Paris in 1356-57 and served as examiner in 1357-58 [ACUP 1.195, 203, 209, 211, 225]; in 1362 the University petitioned for a canonry and prebend in St. Mary's, Erfurt [Overmann 2(1929) 268 no. 552]. In 1367 he appears in Prague as Vice-Rector, then Rector in 1368, and Dean of Arts in 1369, at sometime before which he was also a bachelor of theology [*Liber Decanorum* 1.18, 133, 137; Josef Tůma, *Ěivotopisný slovník pražské Pražské Univerzity 1348-1409* (Repertorium biographicum Universitatis Pragensis praeussiticae 1348-1409). Prague: Universitas Carolina 1981. p. 150]. During this period he was also canon of St. Peter's, Mainz

were within 75 kilometers of Nijmegen, as was the home of his own master, Wilhelmus Buser de Huesden.¹⁹

For the most part, the commentators in the database enjoyed favorable positions within the Church. One hundred twenty eight are known to have received a canonry during their lifetimes. Of these, fourteen were men who subsequently entered religious orders and thereupon resigned their positions in the cathedral. Consequently, of the 257 commentators who remained seculars throughout their lifetime, 114 (44%) became canons, and several enjoyed multiple appointments over the course of their ecclesiastical careers.²⁰ One hundred seven commentators became bishops during their lifetimes, of which 83 were regular clergy.²¹ Thirty three became archbishops, of which 27 were regular clergy.²² There were 36 cardinals of all ranks among the cohort of commentators, of which 24 were regulars.²³ Five became pope.²⁴ Within their own orders, 121 are recorded as having served as prior conventualis or guardian, 171 as prior or minister provincialis, and 34 as prior or minister generalis.²⁵ While theologians may have complained about the lucrative prospects of their colleagues in law and medicine, there were similar rewards for the most accomplished within their own ranks.²⁶

(1367), subdeacon, Worms (1369), and canon, Worms (1369 until at least 1371). For these brief periods, he is known to have had 23 students, of which 21 are identifiable. Those from his home region included students from Arnstadt, Hildesheim, Mühlhusen, Nordhausen, Osnabrück, and Scheusingen.

¹⁹ ACUP 1.294-512. As Jacques Verger notes ["Patterns," in *A History of the University in Europe*, v. 1: *Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. H. De Ridder-Symoens. Cambridge: Cambridge UP 1992. pp. 35-74 at 40], universities tended to recruit students from distinct catchment areas. But the origins of the students discussed here also suggest that the catchment area was reduced further among individual masters. Such restricted recruitment, however, had limits. Although the vast majority of Marsilius' students was from the Low Countries and far western Germany, in 1369-71 he had students from Sweden, Kolobrzeg and Boisville-la-St.-Père.

²⁰ These 114 seculars were appointed to 216 canonries, and average of nearly two. Among the most prolific receivers were Conrad de Susato (10), Pierre d'Ailly (9), Conrad de Soltau (7), and Thomas de Strampino (6). As one might expect, both from the expansion of benefices and the increased survival in the historical record, the database records a significant increase in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries: from 41 recorded before 1300, the number increases to 103 in the fourteenth century and 119 in the fifteenth century.

²¹ Among these, Franciscans and Carmelites each numbered 21, Dominicans 19, and Augustinians 15. Within the population as a whole, several obtained successive sees during their lifetimes: Jacobus de Teramo (4), Benedictus Tancredi Perusinus (4), Angelus de Camerino (4), Durand de St. Pourçain (3), Pierre d'Ailly (3), Dominicus de Cremona (3), and Petrus de Candia (3).

²² Here the Franciscans maintained their lead with 11, followed by the Augustinians (7), and Dominicans (6); the Carmelites, so prominent among the regular bishops, achieved one. Among those translated from one archiepiscopal see to another were Robert de Waldby, Petrus Rogerii de Malomonte, and Jacobus Capocci de Viterbio.

²³ Including 10 Dominicans, 9 Franciscans, and 2 Augustinians.

²⁴ Hadrian VI, Alexander III, Alexander V, Innocent V, Clement VI. Innocent III, included by Stegmüller (397,1) for his *Summa sacramentorum*, is not included here because the work has been reclassified for the purpose of the database as a theological work, but not Sentential; Alexander III composed *Sententiae*, although obviously not a commentary on Lombard's text.

²⁵ Clearly, the relative numbers here reflect greater survival of records for positions of greater responsibility. While the database also records appointments to lower orders, in most cases the survival of such details is fragmentary.

²⁶ Peter Moraw, "Careers of Graduates," *A History of the University in Europe*, v. 1: *Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. H. De Ridder-Symoens. Cambridge: Cambridge UP 1992. pp. 257-258; James A Brundage, "From Classroom to Courtroom: Parisian Canonists and their Careers," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung* 114(1997) 342-361 at 345ff. While it is certainly true that jurists did

Of course, the central — indeed, defining — focus of the database is the table that collects information about the texts produced by this pool of authors. Because this table attempts to assemble and correct information from Stegmüller, the subsequent studies that augmented the *Repertorium*, and the many individual accounts of commentators and their texts before and since 1949, it may in one sense be a retrospective compilation of the Sentential tradition. However, it both falls short of a new *Repertorium* and goes beyond it. Unlike the *Repertorium*, it does not attempt to collect information about every manuscript copy of commentaries on the *Sentences*, nor does it give incipits for each book in the commentary, as Stegmüller frequently did. Aside from issues of scale and economy, the reason for this shift in focus was that the database was designed primarily as a biographical tool, and hence the table presents the commentator's Nachlass rather than an exhaustive list of manuscript and printed survivors of the text. On the other hand, it does attempt to distinguish versions or revisions of texts as separate records in this table; so, for example, Nicolaus de Dinkelspühl's *Quaestiones communes* are distinguished from the *Quaestiones magistrales* and the *Lectura Mellicensis*. And while no attempt has been made to provide a list of all manuscript witnesses, each record contains a bibliographical field in which the goal has been to provide references that lead the user to relevant sources where manuscript sources are collected. When texts have had little or no modern examination, this bibliographic field presents manuscript references.²⁷

The cohort of commentators on the *Sentences* produced a total of 12,863 texts for which the attribution is incontestable or probable. Of these, sermons or sermon collections constituted the largest share (1829 or 14.2%), followed by commentaries on the Bible (1739 or 13.5%), and theological works beyond commentaries on the Bible and the *Sentences* (1628 or 12.7%), while the 1166 commentaries on the *Sentences* constituted only 9.1% of the total. Without doubt, these counts of texts must be only a gross and highly inaccurate assessment of medieval productivity, for a variety of reasons. Any such assessment is based on the contingencies of historical survival, for even though the texts recorded in the database reflect both what is extant and the historical reports of each author's production, both witnesses are certainly incomplete and vary in quality from one author to another. Furthermore, what counts as a unit of authorship varies in a culture like that of the middle ages, where parts of texts become detached from the original, only to become independent texts, on some occasions overstating an author's production, on others understating it.²⁸

quite well in the acquisition of benefices, the same appears to be true among graduates of theology, although their faculty tended to be considerably smaller.

²⁷ Among the nearly 20,000 records of texts at present, several thousands contain references to manuscript witnesses to the text in the record, including the major national libraries of most European countries, as well as prominent university, cathedral and other ecclesiastical libraries.

²⁸ For a more complete discussion of this problem and its application to the database, see my "Unique Manuscripts and Medieval Productivity: How Shall We Count?" in *Computing Techniques and the History of Universities*, ed. Peter Denley [Halbgraue Reihe zur historischen Fachinformatik A30]. St. Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae Verlag

Be that as it may, while aggregate numbers of texts are probably not good indicators of productivity because of the different ways texts have survived and are thus counted in the database, comparisons between the relative proportions may reduce these factors and produce some interesting results. We may look, for example, at three subsets of commentators: (1) 669 authors who commented on the *Sentences*, but not Aristotle's works; (2) 216 authors who commented on both the *Sentences* and at least one of Aristotle's works; and for comparison (3) 639 authors who commented on Aristotle, but not the *Sentences*. Each of the three groups composed approximately the same number of texts, suggesting at first glance that those whose interests spanned both Aristotle and the *Sentences* were more productive. Yet it appears that this too may be explained by discrepancies in historical survival. We know more about this middle group: we are nearly twice as likely to know something about the educational background or ecclesiastical positions of those who commented on both sets of texts as those whose authorship is limited to one.²⁹ The rather significant levels of membership in religious orders may have some bearing on this, because of the early and sustained interest among the orders in preserving the biographical details of their members. But as we have seen, membership in religious orders extended across all the commentators on the *Sentences*,³⁰ so that additional factors affecting historical preservation are clearly at work. In the final analysis, it may simply be that commentators whose production included both Aristotle and the *Sentences* were more likely to be active in a variety of areas.

Among the categories of texts preserved, it is perhaps not surprising to find that commentators on the *Sentences*, particularly those in the first, exclusive category, were significantly more inclined to have produced commentaries on the Bible, sermon literature, and other theological works as well. Once again, this very likely results from the heavy representation of members in religious orders, although those in the middle group who commented on both Aristotle and the *Sentences* seem to have produced disproportionately more spiritual or meditative works. The same is surely true for the disproportionate production of polemical works, either the result of the theological controversies of the late middle ages, or the internal controversies among the mendicants; in either case, they seem to have left their philosophical colleagues far behind in this category. Commentators on the *Sentences* also seem to have left significantly more *quaestiones disputatae* and *quaestiones de quolibet* than those who commented exclusively on Aristotle.³¹

1996. pp. 65-85, and "De viris illustribus et mediocribus: A Biographical Database of Franciscan Commentators on Aristotle and Peter Lombard's *Sentences*," *Franciscan Studies* 56(1998) 203-237, esp. 213-215.

²⁹ The three categories of commentators generates the following number of educational records: 3067, 1797, 3045; ecclesiastical records: 1396, 625, 941.

³⁰ Among commentators on both Aristotle and the *Sentences*, 152 (70.4%) were members of religious orders; 480 (71.7%) of the commentators on the *Sentences* only were members of orders; while only 166 (26.0%) of the commentators on only Aristotle were members of orders.

³¹ The reasons for this discrepancy are not entirely clear. The database does not distinguish between *quaestiones* created in the arts or theological faculty, although the 'titles' or incipits often give an indication of their orientation. While both *disputationes ordinariae* and *de quolibet* were held at regular intervals in both faculties, quodlibets seem

If we look at the preferences for particular Aristotelian works by those who commented on the *Sentences* and those who did not, we find that the former seem to have preferred the *Physics*, *Metaphysics*, *Ethics*, and *Politics*, rather than several of Aristotle's logical works (especially the *Posterior Analytics*, the *Categories*, and the *Prior Analytics*) and Porphyry's *Isagoge*. Although this observation must be tempered by the relatively small number of texts and the fact that commentators continued to read across the spectrum of Aristotle's corpus, it may be an additional factor in the discussion of the philosophical or logical orientation of the use of analytical languages to pursue theological and philosophical issues.³²

This initial attempt at describing the population of commentators on the *Sentences* provides some surprising contrasts. While most sprang from rather ordinary backgrounds, they lived, on the whole, longer and more successful lives than the general population of the period. Within the elite institution of the university, they frequently came to assume positions of leadership and influence that continued to follow them when they left academic pursuits for careers in the Church or state. And while in pursuit of their careers they moved frequently between university and ecclesiastical centers of Europe, they often retained surprisingly local ties through their masters and students. In many respects, they are a remarkably diverse cohort.

This diversity extends to the defining criteria of the cohort, the writings they produced. Stegmüller's original *Repertorium*, like the many subsequent collective and individual studies, tended to focus on single products of medieval authors. In the final analysis, however, the distribution of categories of texts suggests that authors in these groups were remarkably diverse in their interests. None of the categories surveyed in the database came to dominate the field. Even when all of Aristotle's works are collapsed into a single category of texts, the collective picture remains that no category exceeded 30% of

to have developed later and occurred much less frequently, that is, consistent with the reduced position in the database. After 1334, written *quodlibeta* almost disappear from the faculty of theology, while they continue in use in arts. This seems to be almost opposite the data suggested here, and demands further investigation. See Brian Lawn, *Rise and decline of the scholastic Quaestio disputata : with special emphasis on its use in the teaching of medicine and science*. Leiden: E. J. Brill 1993. pp. 13-17; P. Glorieux, *La littérature quodlibetique*. 2 vols. Paris: Vrin 1925, 1935. 1.57.

³² See especially John Murdoch, "The Analytic Character of Late Medieval Learning: Natural Philosophy without Nature," *Approaches to Nature in the Middle Ages*, ed. Lawrence Roberts (Binghamton, NY 1984) 171-213, at 196-197. Murdoch himself notes that the *Physics* was more popular among Oxford readers than Paris commentators, by a proportion of two to one. By applying queries involving geographical place and time to related tables of texts, one could investigate similar preferences for other university sites and among other Aristotelian works. While I have not undertaken a precise count, a cursory look at indexes of *auctoritates* in commentaries on the *Sentences* suggests *modo grosso* a similar emphasis: with the exception of prologues (where issues of *scientia* were discussed via references to the *Posterior Analytics*), citations tended to reflect the *Physics*, *Metaphysics*, *Ethics*, and *De anima* more than the logical works.

the total.³³ While they may have expressed individual preferences for particular texts, they also read and wrote widely across the disciplines in which they were engaged. In retrospect, this is hardly surprising. Students who commented on the *Sentences* while pursuing a theological degree could hardly afford to specialize too narrowly in a single field. As Francesco del Punta has suggested recently, the medieval scholastic commentary was a genre that embraced a conception of knowledge that extended to all domains — theology, philosophy, law, literature, grammar — both in its form and its content.³⁴ The mental acuity that scholastic education sought to cultivate was enhanced by the exposure to this diverse literature. Judging from the success of the population surveyed by the database, diversity paid dividends in the late middle ages.

³³ See Table 1: among commentators on Aristotle but not the *Sentences* — that is, a pool of authors that self-selects this category of texts — it comprised only 28.12%. Among commentators on the *Sentences* (including those who commented on Aristotle) the figure drops to 6.78% [Table 3]. For virtually all categories and all pools of commentators, the maximum is under 15%.

³⁴ Francesco del Punta, “The Genre of Commentaries in the Middle Ages and its Relation to the Nature and Originality of Medieval Thought,” *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter. Akten des X. Internationalen Kongresses für mittelalterliche Philosophie der Société Internationale pour l’Etude de la Philosophie Médiévale 25. bis 30. August 1997 in Erfurt*, ed. Jan A. Aertsen and Andreas Speer. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 1998. pp. 138-151, esp. 144-145.

*Table 1: Selected Text Categories for Populations of Commentators*³⁵

Text Category	Commentators on the <i>Sentences</i> but not Aristotle (6190 Texts)		Commentators on both Aristotle and the <i>Sentences</i> (6283 Texts)		Commentators on Aristotle but not the <i>Sentences</i> (6280 Texts)	
	Number of Texts	Percent of Total	Number of Texts	Percent of Total	Number of Texts	Percent of Total
Commentaries on Aristotle	N/A	N/A	872	13.88	1766	28.12
Biblia Sacra	1070	17.29	619	9.95	318	5.06
Sermones	1030	16.64	771	12.27	350	5.57
Other Theological Works	872	14.09	686	10.92	326	5.19
Commentaries on <i>Sentences</i>	796	12.86	366	5.83	N/A	N/A
Quaestiones disputatae ³⁶	395	6.38	408	6.49	211	3.36
Ecclesiastical works	237	3.83	154	2.45	43	0.68
Spiritual Works	223	3.60	327	5.20	122	1.94
Epistolae	223	3.60	287	4.57	741	11.80
Polemical works	192	3.10	214	3.41	54	0.86
Quaestiones de quolibet	156	2.52	178	2.83	59	0.94
Misc. Philosophical Works	127	2.05	143	2.28	158	2.52
Other Text Categories	869	14.04	1258	20.02	2132	33.95

³⁵ Discrepancies in totals arise because of inclusion of non-authentic texts stored in database.

³⁶ Includes texts distinguished as *quaestiones ordinariae*.

Table 2: Selected Categories of Aristotle Commentaries for Populations of Commentators

Text Category	Commentators on both Aristotle and the <i>Sentences</i> (872 Texts)		Commentators on Aristotle but not the <i>Sentences</i> (1766 Texts)	
	Number of Texts	Percent of Total	Number of Texts	Percent of Total
Physics	105	12.04	162	9.17
De anima	83	9.52	152	8.61
Metaphysics	75	8.60	106	6.00
Ethica	67	7.68	86	4.87
Analytica Posteriora	42	4.82	110	6.23
Perihermenias	39	4.47	89	5.04
Categories	38	4.36	105	5.95
De generatione et corruptione	36	4.13	62	3.51
Porphyry, Isagoge	35	4.01	94	5.32
De caelo et mundo	30	3.44	60	3.40
Politica	25	2.87	27	1.53
Meteorologica	25	2.87	66	3.73
Analytica priora	24	2.75	79	4.47
De sophisticis elenchis	22	2.52	57	3.23
Topica	16	1.83	47	2.66
Other Texts	210	24.08	464	26.27

Table 3: Selected Text Categories for Combined Populations of Commentators on the Sentences and Aristotle's Works

Text Category	Commentators on the <i>Sentences</i> (12,863 Texts)		Commentators on Aristotle (12563 Texts)	
	Number of Texts	Percent of Total	Number of Texts	Percent of Total
Sermones	1829	14.22	1121	8.92
Biblia Sacra	1739	13.52	937	7.46
Other Theological Works	1628	12.66	1012	8.06
Commentaries on <i>Sentences</i>	1166	9.06	363	2.89
Commentaries on Aristotle	872	6.78	2638	21.00
Quaestiones disputatae ³⁷	812	6.31	619	4.93
Spiritual works	572	4.45	449	3.57
Epistolae	515	4.00	1028	8.18
Polemical works	416	3.23	268	2.13
Ecclesiastical Works	399	3.10	197	1.57
Quaestiones de quolibet	349	2.71	237	1.88
Misc. Philosophical Works	279	2.17	301	2.40
Other Text Categories	2287	17.78	3392	27.00

³⁷ Includes texts distinguished as *quaestiones ordinariae*.