

SECUNDUM INTENTIONEM DOCTORIS SUBTILIS:
THE COMMENTARIES ON PORPHYRY'S ISAGOGÉ
AND ARISTOTLE'S DE ANIMA BY WALTER OF WERVIA
(CA. 1425-1497)

I. Introduction

The influence of John Duns Scotus (and of the Catalan Scotist Antonius Andreae) on Parisian Masters of Arts in the late fifteenth century is well documented. Scotus was the principal source of inspiration for such relatively well-known masters as Nicolaus de Orbellis and Petrus Tartareti, whose works were printed many times between the end of the fifteenth and the first decades of the seventeenth century, as well as for less renowned masters such as Johannes Hennon, Johannes le Damoisiau and Johannes de Caulaincourt. These masters, active in the period between 1470 and 1495, all produced *compendia* and manuals of Aristotelian philosophy that depended to a large extent on Scotus' writings. Hennon, Damoisiau and Caulaincourt followed Scotus in their commentaries on the *Metaphysics*, while in their questions on Aristotle's *libri naturales* they generally preferred to use the works of John Buridan and Albert of Saxony. Scotus' influence was even stronger in the case of Orbellis and Tartareti, who used the Subtle Doctor as a model not only in their treatises on metaphysics but also in their writings on logic, natural philosophy and ethics.¹

In this contribution, our aim is to present the works of another late fif-

We would like to thank Chiara Beneduce, Tricia M. Ross and Sander W. de Boer for their bibliographical help.

¹ See P.J.J.M. BAKKER, "Natural Philosophy and Metaphysics in Late Fifteenth-Century Paris. I: The Commentaries on Aristotle by Johannes Hennon", in *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 47 (2005), 125-55; IDEM, "Natural Philosophy and Metaphysics in Late Fifteenth-Century Paris. II: The Commentaries on Aristotle by Johannes le Damoisiau", in *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 48 (2006), 209-28; IDEM, "Natural Philosophy and Metaphysics in Late Fifteenth-Century Paris. III: The Commentaries on Aristotle by Johannes de Caulaincourt (*alias* Johannes de Magistris)", in *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 49 (2007), 195-37; IDEM, "Fifteenth-Century Parisian Commentaries on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*", in *A Companion to the Latin Medieval Commentaries on Aristotle's Metaphysics*, ed. F. AMERINI and G. GALLUZZO (Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 43), Leiden 2014, 575-629. On the natural philosophy of Nicholas de Orbellis, Johannes Hennon, Petrus Tartareti and Johannes de Caulaincourt (also known as Johannes de Magistris), see P. DUHEM, *Le système du monde. Histoire des doctrines cosmologiques de Platon à Copernic* 10, Paris 1959, 46-71 and 97-111.

teenth-century Scotist: Walter of Wervia.² After his initial studies in Cologne in the early 1440s, Walter was active in Paris for approximately three decades. He spent the last years of his life in Heidelberg and Tübingen. In contrast with the authors mentioned above, Walter did not produce *compendia* or manuals of Aristotelian philosophy, but authored more traditional commentaries on individual philosophical works. Two commentaries can be ascribed with certainty to him, one on Porphyry's *Isagoge* and another on Aristotle's *De anima*.³ In what follows, we shall present the contents of these two works. But before doing so, let us first give a brief overview of the most important data of Walter's biography.

II. Walter of Wervia

Walter of Wervia was born in Rijswij(c)k (Duchy of Guelders), in the diocese of Utrecht.⁴ His exact date of birth is unknown. However, from the

² See C.H. LOHR, "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries. Authors G-I", in *Traditio* 24 (1968), 149-245, at 188-89 ('Gualterus de Wervia [Wernia, Warnia, Vernia]'); A.L. GABRIEL, "*Via antiqua* and *via moderna* and the Migration of Paris Students and Masters to the German Universities in the Fifteenth Century", in *Antiqui und Moderni: Traditionsbewußtsein und Fortschrittsbewußtsein im späten Mittelalter*, hrsg. v. A. ZIMMERMANN (Miscellanea mediaevalia 9), Berlin 1974, 439-83, at 479-80 (and n. 218); R. MACKEN, *Medieval Philosophers of the Former Low Countries. Bio-Bibliography and Catalogue 1*, Leuven 1997, 199-200; O. WEIJERS, *Le travail intellectuel à la Faculté des arts de Paris: textes et maîtres (ca. 1200-1500) 3: Répertoire des noms commençant par G* (Studia artistarum 6), Turnhout 1998, 64-65 ('G[u]alterus de Wervia [Wernia, Warnia, Vernia, Merula]').

³ It seems plausible that Walter of Wervia is also the author of a commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics* (books I-VI) preserved in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Ms. lat. 6691, ff. 1r-215v (*inc.*: "Omnis ars et omnis doctrina. Circa primum librum *Ethicorum* Aristotelis movetur talis quaestio: utrum de virtutibus moralibus scientia...") and attributed to G(u)alterus de Walma; see LOHR, "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries", 188, and WEIJERS, *Le travail intellectuel*, 63-64. According to the colophon, the commentary was written in 1463 by Claudius Verneti (diocese of Besançon) studying under Master Walter of Walma at the Collège de Bourgogne: "Et sic est finis sexti *Ethicorum* finit<us> per me Claudium Verneti dyocesis Bisuntiensis studentem sub venerabili viro magistro Galthero de Walma (?) actu Parisius regente in collegio Burgundie... anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo sexagesimo tercio" (cited according to G. OUY, "Un catalogue d'un type nouveau", in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 122 [1964], 272-91, at 288). Given that our Walter of Wervia was affiliated to the Collège de Bourgogne (see below) and that we know many different forms of the name 'Wervia', Walma may very well be the same person as Wervia. In this essay, we will leave this commentary on the *Ethics* aside.

⁴ There are many variant forms of his name: Galterus de Wervia, Galtherus de Varnia, Galtherus de Vernia, Galtherus de Werfia, Galtherus de Weruia, Gualtherus de Veruia, Walter de Wervia, Walter van Werven, Walterus de Rijswijk, Walterus de Wernea and Woltero de Wervia. See <http://www.rag-online.org/gelehrter/id/205164079> (last accessed on 5 February 2015).

date of his inception as a Master of Arts at the University of Paris in 1445, one can infer that he was born around 1425.

Walter started his studies in 1442 at the University of Cologne. His name ('Walt. de Rijswijk') is mentioned in the immatriculation register on 15 October of that year.⁵ Only a few years later, he continued his studies at the University of Paris. University records allow us to reconstruct the most important dates of Walter's career as a student and a master in Paris in some detail: (1) In 1445 he is first mentioned as a *baccalaureus artium* in a financial record of the English-German nation, to which he belonged;⁶ (2) in the same year, he incepted as a *magister artium* under Master Albertus Scriptoris (diocese of Utrecht);⁷ (3) in 1447, Walter is mentioned as a student of Theology;⁸ (4) in 1451 he is referred to as a *baccalaureus in theologia* and again in 1457 as a *baccalaureus in Sacra Pagina*;⁹ (5) in 1459, he started lecturing on Peter Lombard's *Sentences* in the Collège de Sorbonne, even though he was not a *socius* of that college.¹⁰ From the colophons of

⁵ See H. KEUSSEN, *Die Matrikeln der Universität Köln 1: 1389-1475*, Bonn 1928 (repr. Düsseldorf 1979, originally published in 1892), 455 n. 13. The register further mentions that Walter determined on 11 November 1443 under Master Johannes Kuyck (*ibid.*): "Semidives, 1443 21/11 det. sub m. Joh. Kuyk."

⁶ See *Auctarium chartularii Universitatis Parisiensis II: Liber procuratorum Nationis Anglicanae (Alemanniae) in Universitate Parisiensi ab anno MCCCCVI usque ad annum MCCCCLXVI*, ed. H. DENIFLE et A. CHATELAIN, Paris 1937 (henceforth: *AUP II*), 615.33. Between 1445 and 1472, Walter held a number of administrative offices (*procurator, receptor, deputatus*) in the English-German nation at the Parisian Faculty of Arts. In 1457 he was Rector of the University (*AUP II*, 918 n. 5). His name appears many times in the *Liber procuratorum* and in the *Liber receptorum* of the English-German nation.

⁷ *AUP II*, 616.17, and 617.11. See also *Auctarium chartularii Universitatis Parisiensis VI: Liber receptorum nationis Anglicanae (Alemanniae) in Universitate Parisiensi*, ed. A.L. GABRIEL et G.C. BOYCE, Paris 1964 (henceforth: *AUP VI*), 125.1. On Albertus Scriptoris (Albert Sriver), see H. DE RIDDER-SYMOENS, D. ILLMER et C.M. RIDDERIKHOFF, *Premier livre des procureurs de la Nation germanique de l'ancienne Université d'Orléans, 1444-1546 II: Biographies des étudiants 1*, Leiden 1978, 40 n. 69.

⁸ *AUP VI*, 721 n. 2 ("Magister Walterus de Wernia natus de Riiswiick in terra ducis Gelrie prope Tielam, studens in theol.").

⁹ *AUP VI*, 205.20 ("per magistrum Walterum de Wervia in Artibus magistrum et in Theologia baccalarium"); *AUP II*, 917.1-8 ("Receptorium magistri Galteri de Wernia in artibus magistri et in sacra pagina baccalarii, pro secunda vice, nati in ducatu Gelrie in inferiori Almania"). See also *AUP II*, 793.7.

¹⁰ See R. MARICHAL, *Le livre des prieurs de Sorbonne (1431-1485)* (Collection de textes et de documents sur l'histoire des universités 1), Paris 1987, 124 n° 444: "In eodem prandio placuit singulis sociis concedere parvas scholas collegii pro lectura *Sententiarum* magistro Galtero de Wernia, extra collegium commoranti, qui hoc requirebat, salvis tamen iuribus et laudabilibus consuetudinibus collegii, videlicet quod pro dicta supplicatione solveret duas

his commentaries on the *Isagoge* and *De anima* (see below) we know that he was affiliated with the Collège de Bourgogne. Finally (6), in 1466, he is referred to as a *baccalaureus formatus in sacra theologia*.¹¹ Walter's name was last mentioned in Parisian records in 1472.¹²

We do not know when exactly Walter received his licence in Theology but it must have been in Paris before 1475. In that year, his name is mentioned in the register of the University of Heidelberg, where he matriculated as a theologian under rector Martinus Rencz de Wisensteig. According to the register, he had previously received his license in Theology in Paris.¹³ After his stay in Heidelberg, Walter moved to the University of Tübingen, where he registered in the Faculty of Theology in 1480 as a *licentiatus sacrae theologiae* of the University of Paris.¹⁴ The University of Tübingen had been founded in 1477, and Walter was one of its first theologians. While he registered as a *licentiatus theologiae* in 1480, he became a Doctor of Theology in the same year. Walter's predecessor at the Faculty of Theology in Tübingen was Jean Heynlin (Johannes de Lapide, ca. 1425-1496), a well-known Parisian Doctor of Theology and a humanist, who established the first printing press in Paris in 1470 (with Guillaume Fichet).¹⁵ A printed Bible that once belonged to Walter is currently in the

quartas vini de meliori et extra et pro primo principio et pro tertio totidem, pro quolibet scilicet duas quartas." The document was written under the priory of Lucas de Molendinis [Molins]. According to MACKEN, *Medieval Philosophers*, 199, and WEIJERS, *Le travail intellectuel*, 64, Walter started lecturing on the *Summae* in 1459. The word *Summae* is probably a misreading of *Sententiae*.

¹¹ AUP II, 971.18 ("Quantum ad primum articulum electi fuerunt concorditer, nemine reclamante, quatuor magistri temptaturi baccalariandos, videlicet magne scientie et honestatis vir magister Galterus de Wernia, de ducatu Ghelrie Traiectensis dyocesis, artium magister et in sacra theologia baccalarius formatus").

¹² AUP III, 195.7-11; AUP VI, 502.27 n. 10.

¹³ See G. TOEPKE, *Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg von 1386 bis 1662* 1: 1386-1553, Heidelberg 1884, 346 ("Magister G(u)altherus de Veruia, s. Theologie licentiatus [Paris.]). Walter's name appears in the Heidelberg register only once.

¹⁴ H. HERMELINK, *Die Matrikeln der Universität Tübingen 1: Die Matrikeln von 1477-1600*, Stuttgart 1906, reprt. Nendeln 1976, 29 n. 5 ("Dom. Galtherus de Weruia M.a. et s. theol. Lic. studii Parisiensis die s. Lucie" [= 3 Dec.]).

¹⁵ HERMELINK, *Die Matrikeln*, 29 n. 44 ("Doct. theol. 1480: G. de Werfia, Traiectens. dico."). On Jean Heynlin, see P. MATHÉ, "Heynlin de Lapide, Johannes", in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 9 (1972), 98-100, online version (<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd119011700.html> [last accessed on 5 February 2015]), and J. VIELLIARD, *Le registre de prêt de la bibliothèque du Collège de Sorbonne (1402-1536)* (Histoire des bibliothèques médiévales 8), Paris 2000, 629.

library of the Eberhard Karls Universität in Tübingen.¹⁶ Walter's name is mentioned a last time in a document issued by the notary office of Eberhard I, Duke of Württemberg (1445-1496), related to the University of Tübingen and dated 2 December 1491. According to the editor of the document, Walter of Wervia died in 1497.¹⁷

III. Walter of Wervia's Commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge*

Walter of Wervia's commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge* has been preserved in two manuscripts:

- (1) New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Ms. 622, ff. 1ra-44vb (henceforth **N**);
- (2) Zwickau, Ratschulbibliothek, Ms. I.XIII.25, ff. 289ra-334va (henceforth **Z**).¹⁸

Manuscript N contains two works: a printed copy of Walter Burley's 1337 *Expositio super artem veterem*, published in Venice in 1481 by Johannes Herbort, and a (separately foliated) manuscript copy of Walter of Wervia's commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge*.¹⁹ Walter's commentary has the following *incipit*, *explicit* and colophon:

(N, f. 1ra) Utrum logica sit sciencia rationalis una ab aliis distincta. Arguitur quod non... (N, f. 44vb) ...hunc syllogismum non valere: omnis triangulus habet tres; modo ezocheles est huiusmodi; igitur habet tres.

Colophon: Sic finitur expositio textus Porphirii cum questionibus superordinatis secundum intencionem Doctoris Subtilis, editus per magistrum Galterum de Werula in collegio Burgundie, de cuius finicione laus et graciaram accio sit filio Virginis gloriose, qui est verus Deus, regnans cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto

¹⁶ The Bible was printed in 1479 by Johann Amerbach in Basel. See the catalogue of incunabula of the library of the Eberhard Karls Universität (<http://www.inka.uni-tuebingen.de/cgi-bin/inkunabel?sinkanum=48000530> [last accessed on 5 February 2015]).

¹⁷ R. ROTH, *Urkunden zur Geschichte der Universität Tübingen*, 1877, 82-93 (Zweite Ordnung Eberhards, Graf zu Wirtemberg), at 90 (and n. 2).

¹⁸ LOHR, "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries", 188, MACKEN, *Medieval Philosophers*, 200, and WEIJERS, *Le travail intellectuel*, 64, mention only MS Z.

¹⁹ A detailed description (by Albert DEROLEZ) of MS N is available online (<http://brbl-net.library.yale.edu/pre1600ms/docs/pre1600.ms622.htm> [last accessed on 5 February 2015]). A digital copy of the whole book (the printed *Expositio* by Burley and the manuscript commentary by Walter of Wervia) is also available online (http://brbl-dl.library.yale.edu/vufind/Record/3581422?image_id=1365612 [last accessed on 5 February 2015]). For Johannes Herbort's edition of Burley's *Expositio* on the *Ars vetus* (*inc.*: "Quia de dictis in logica quoddam compendium intendo compilare..."), see *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 5, Leipzig 1932, 671 n. 5767. See also LOHR, "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries", 174-76, and WEIJERS, *Le travail intellectuel*, 42-43.

per infinita secula seculorum. Amen. In Czwickaw. Conditus in alma universitate Parisiensi per magistrum Galterum in collegio Burgundie (N, f. 44vb).

Manuscript Z is a miscellany containing eight works by, among others, Francis of Meyronnes, Peter of Candia and John Duns Scotus.²⁰ The *incipit*, *explicit* and colophon of Walter's commentary on Porphyry (item 8) are virtually the same as in MS N:

(Z, f. 289ra) Utrum loyca sit sciencia rationalis una ab aliis distincta. Arguitur quod non... (Z, f. 334va) ...hunc syllogismum non valere: omnis triangulus habet tres; ezocheles est huiusmodi; ergo habet tres.

Colophon: Et sic finitur textus exposicionis Porphirii cum questionibus superordinatis secundum intencionem Doctoris Subtilis editus per magistrum Galterum de Fervia in collegio Borgundie de cuius finicione laus et graciaram accio sit filio Virginis gloriose qui est verus Deus regnans cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto per infinita secula seculorum amen (Z, f. 334va).

Some observations can be made concerning the text of the two colophons. First, the colophons give us no specific information about the date of composition of the commentary. Walter is mentioned as a Master (of Arts) at the Collège de Bourgogne (in Paris). Hence the work must have been written sometime between the year in which Walter received the degree of *magister artium* (1445) and the year he left Paris (shortly after 1472). There seem to be no elements that allow us to date the work with more precision. Second, both colophons explicitly mention the Scotist character of the commentary (*secundum intencionem Doctoris Subtilis*). Third, both colophons characterize the commentary as an *Expositio cum quaestionibus*. The commentary consists indeed of a (concise) literal commentary on Porphyry's text and a set of questions. The titles of the 23 questions are as follows:

	MS N	MS Z
(q.1)	Utrum logica sit sciencia rationalis una ab aliis distincta (1ra)	Utrum loyca sit sciencia rationalis una ab aliis distincta (289ra)
(q.2)	Utrum logica sit sciencia speculativa vel practica (3ra)	Utrum loyca sit sciencia speculativa vel practica (291ra)

²⁰ For a detailed description of MS Z, see R. SCHIPKE, *Die mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Ratschulbibliothek Zwickau: Bestandsverzeichnis aus dem Zentralinventar mittelalterlicher Handschriften (ZIH)* (Handschrifteninventare der Deutschen Staatsbibliothek 13), Berlin 1990, 68-70 (and the online version on *Manuscripta Mediaevalia*, <http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/hs/kataloge/HSK0487.htm> [last accessed on 5 February 2015]). According to WEIJERS, *Le travail intellectuel*, 64, this manuscript was sold in Southport (CT) in 1980 ("vendu à Southport, Connecticut, en 1980"). In reality, Z is still in the Ratschulbibliothek in Zwickau. The manuscript that was sold in Southport (and that was purchased by the Edwin J. Beinecke Fund) is N; see L. WITTEN, *Early Manuscripts & Illuminated Books* (Catalogue 12), Southport, CT 1980, 23-24 n. 18.

- | | | |
|--------|--|--|
| (q.3) | Utrum logica sit de argumentacione tanquam de obiecto proprio (6ra) | Utrum loyca sit de argumentacione tanquam de obiecto primo (294ra) |
| (q.4) | Utrum universale sit subiectum huius libri (8rb) | Utrum universale sit subiectum huius libri (296vb) |
| (q.5) | Utrum sint quinque universalialia (10vb) | Utrum sint quinque universalialia ²¹ (299rb) |
| (q.6) | Utrum universale sit aliquid in rebus (11vb) | Utrum universale sit aliquid in rebus (300va) |
| (q.7) | Utrum locus sit principium generacionis sicut pater (13ra) | Utrum locus sit principium generacionis sicut pater (301vb) |
| (q.8) | Utrum hic diffiniatur intencio vel fundamentum intencionis (13va) | Utrum hic diffiniatur intencio vel fundamentum intencionis (302va) |
| (q.9) | Utrum diffinico generis sit convenienter assignata in qua dicitur 'genus est quod predicatur de pluribus differentibus specie et in eo quod quid est' (14rb) | Utrum diffinico generis sit... (303ra) |
| (q.10) | Utrum genus predicatur de speciebus loquendo de predicatione exercita in fundamentis illarum intencionum, ut utrum hec sit vera 'homo est animal' et consimiles (15ra) | Utrum genus predicatur de speciebus loquendo de predicatione exercita(?) in fundamentis illarum intencionum, ut utrum hec sit vera 'homo est animal' et consimiles (303va) |
| (q.11) | Utrum diffinico speciei in qua dicitur 'species est quod predicatur' etc. sit convenienter assignata (17rb) | Utrum diffinico(?) speciei in qua dicitur 'species est quod predicatur de pluribus' etc. sit convenienter assignata (305vb) |
| (q.12) | Utrum ens sit univocum substantie et accidentibus (19vb) | Utrum ens sit univocum substantie et accidenti (accidente Z) (308va) |
| (q.13) | Utrum diffiniciones speciei specialissime, speciei subalterne, generis generalissimi, generis subalterne sint convenienter assignate (21va) | Utrum diffiniciones(?) speciei specialissime, speciei sub<alterne>, generis generalissimi et generis subalterne sint bene assignate (310ra) |
| (q.14) | Utrum genus necessario requirit plures species (23rb) | Utrum genus necessario requirit plures partes (312ra) |
| (q.15) | Utrum materia in substantiis materialibus sit principium et causa individuacionis (24va) | Utrum materia in substantiis materialibus sit principium et causa individuacionis (313rb) |
| (q.16) | Utrum divisio differentie in differentiam proprie et magis proprie dictam sit convenienter assignata a Porphyrio (30va) | Utrum divisio(?) differentie in differentiam communiter, proprie et magis proprie <dictam> sit convenienter <a> Porphyrio assignata (319va) |
| (q.17) | Utrum predictae diffiniciones differentie convenienter sint assignate (32ra) | Utrum predictae diffiniciones(?) differentie sint convenienter assignate (321ra) |
| (q.18) | Utrum diffinico proprii quarto modo sumpti, scilicet quod proprium est quod | <Utrum> diffinico(?) proprii quarto modo sumpti, scilicet quod accidit omni (homini |

²¹ This question seems to be incomplete. There is a blank space of approximately 16 lines on f. 299vb.

	accidit omni, soli et semper, sit convenienter assignata (34va)	Z), soli et semper, sit convenienter assignata (323va)
(q.19)	Utrum ista diffinicio accidentis in qua dicitur quod accidens est quod adest et abest preter subiecti corrupcionem sit convenienter assignata (36va)	Utrum illa diffinicio(?) accidentis sit convenienter possita in qua dicitur quod accidens est quod adest et abest preter subiecti corrupcionem (325vb)
(q.20)	Utrum predicari de pluribus differentibus specie convenienter sit data in diffinicione generis (39ra)	Utrum predicari (predicare Z) de pluribus differentibus specie convenienter datur(?) in diffinicione(?) generis (328va)
(q.21)	Utrum genus sit univocum suis speciebus (40vb)	Utrum genus sit univocum suis speciebus (330va)
(q.22)	Utrum predicari in quid convenienter ponatur in diffinicione generis (42vb)	Utrum predicari (predicare Z) in quid convenienter datur(?) in diffinicione generis (332va)
(q.23)	Utrum genus et differencia dicunt aliquas realitates distinctas (44ra)	Utrum genus et differencia dicunt aliquas realitates distinctas (333vb)

IV. Walter of Wervia's Commentary on Aristotle's *De anima*

Walter of Wervia's commentary on Aristotle's *De anima* has been conserved in the following three manuscripts:

- (1) Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms 1351, ff. 71ra-141vb (f. 142r *Tabula quaestionum*) (henceforth **A**);
- (2) Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms 1525, ff. 301ra-358vb (f. 359ra-rb *Tabula quaestionum*) (henceforth **B**);
- (3) Roma, Biblioteca Angelica, Ms. 127, ff. 252r-341r (ff. 341v-342r *Tabula quaestionum*) (henceforth **R**).²²

Manuscript A is a miscellany composed of two parts. The first part contains Porphyry's *Isagoge*, Aristotle's *Categories*, the *Liber sex principiorum* and William of Moerbeke's translation of Aristotle's *De anima*. The second part contains, besides Walter of Wervia's commentary on *De anima*, John Duns Scotus' commentaries on Aristotle's *Categories* and Porphyry's *Isagoge*, and Antonius Andreae's commentary on the *Liber sex principiorum*.²³ The colophon of Walter's commentary has an explanatory

²² LOHR, "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries", 188-89, and MACKEN, *Medieval Philosophers*, 200, mention all three manuscripts; WEIJERS, *Le travail intellectuel*, 65, only mentions A and R.

²³ For information about this manuscript, see M. MARKOWSKI, *Repertorium commentariorum medii aevi in Aristotelem Latinorum, qui in Bibliotheca Universitatis Lipsiensis asservantur*, Kraków 2012, 218-19; the introduction in IOANNES DUNS SCOTUS, *Quaestiones in librum Porphyrii Isagoge et Quaestiones super Praedicamenta Aristotelis*, ed. R. ANDREWS, G. ETZKORN, G. GÁL, R. GREEN, T. NOONE and R. WOOD (Opera philosophica

note in which the Scotist character of the work is extensively advertised. The *incipit*, *explicit* and colophon of the commentary run as follows:

Inscr. Liber primus *De anima* (A, f. 71r)

(A, f. 71ra) Circa primum librum *De anima* queritur primo utrum de anima sit sciencia naturalis tanquam de subiecto primo. Et arguitur quod de anima non sit sciencia: cuius non est diffinico... (A, f. 141vb) ...nec possunt ita faciliter corrumpi ab excellenciis qualitatum. Ad secundum patet solucio. Et hec de questione et per consequens de toto libro *De anima*.

Colophon: Qui completus est per venerabilem virum magistrum Galterum de Weruia Parisius in collegio Burgundie. Volo autem scire omnes legentes hanc lecturam super libros *De anima* quod quantum valui aut intelligere potui vestigia ut plerumque illius subtilissimi et reverendi doctoris, qui inter subtiles nomen Doctoris Subtilis obtinere meruit, videlicet magistri Iohannis de Duns, qui fuit natione Scotus, relligione Minor, secutus sum. Verumtamen quia sunt numero plures, virtute et honore minores indocti, stolidi et derogare parati, qui huiusmodi doctoris viam insequentibus detrahentes predictas posiciones non esse de mente Doctoris Subtilis mendose proferre non verentur, quare secundum materiam non elacionis titulo tociens quociens necessarium fuit dicta prefati doctoris allegavi. Unde et sepius verba eius sicut ab ipso scripture posita reperiuntur invenies. Laus Deo (A, f. 141vb).

Manuscript B is a miscellany that contains a large number of (relatively short) logical and theological *quaestiones*, several series of *conclusiones* on the *Sentences*, disputed questions and various other theological texts (partly anonymous, partly by relatively unknown masters or students). A Franciscan friar named Johannes Roethaw copied most of the texts in the manuscript.²⁴ The colophon of Walter of Wervia's commentary on *De anima*, the last and most extensive work contained in the manuscript, has the same advertisement of the Scotist character of the work as the colophon in MS A. The *incipit*, *explicit* and colophon of Walter's commentary run as follows:

(B, f. 301ra) Utrum de anima sit sciencia naturalis tanquam de subiecto primo. Et arguitur quod de anima non sit sciencia sic: cuius non est diffinico... (B, f. 358vb) ...nec possunt ita faciliter corrumpi ab excellenciis qualitatum. Ad se-

1), St. Bonaventure, NY 1999, ix, and the relevant entry in *Manuscripta Mediaevalia* (<http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/?xdbcidn!%22obj%2031577673%22&dmode=doc#4> [last accessed on 5 February, 2015]).

²⁴ For a detailed description of this manuscript, see L. MEIER, "De scientifica fratris Ioannis Roethaw O.F.M. activitate", in *Studi Francescani* 32 (1935), 283-312, at 284-97. See also MARKOWSKI, *Repertorium*, 252, and the relevant entry (by A. MÄRKER) in *Manuscripta Mediaevalia* (<http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/?xdbcidn!%22obj%2031574098%22&dmode=doc#4> [last accessed on 5 February 2015]). The most famous text contained in this manuscript is the *Compendium logicae* by the Ockhamist logician PAUL OF PERGOLA (d. 1455).

cundum patet solucio. Et hec de questione ultima tercii libri et per consequens de toto *De anima*.

Colophon: Quod completum est per venerabilem magistrum Galterum de Vereña Parisius in collegio Burgundie. Volo autem scire omnes legentes hanc lecturam super libros *De anima* quod quantum volui aut intelligere potui vestigia ut plerumque illius subtilissimi et reverendi doctoris, qui inter subtiles nomen Doctoris Subtilis obtinere meruit, videlicet magistri Iohannis de Duns, qui fuit nacione Scotus, religione Minor, secutus sum. Verumtamen quia sunt numero plures, virtute et honore minores indocti, stolidi et derogare parati, qui huiusmodi doctoris omnia insequentibus detrahentes prescriptas posiciones non esse de mente Doctoris Subtilis mendose proferre non verentur, quare secundum materiam subiectam non elacionis titulo tociens quociens necessarium fuit dicta prefati doctoris allegavi. Unde et sepius verba eius sicut ab ipso scripture posita reperiuntur invenies. Laus Deo (B, f. 358vb).

Manuscript R contains, besides Walter's commentary on *De anima*, works by Euclides (*Elementa*), Robert Grosseteste (commentary on the *Physics*), Nicolaus de Orbellis (*Compendium in mathematica, physica et metaphysica*, *Expositio primi libri De anima* and *Expositio XII librorum Metaphysicæ*), Antonius Andreae (*De tribus principiis rerum naturalium*), Peter of Candia (*Libellus de terminis theologialibus*), and a set of *Auctoritates totius philosophiæ Aristotelis*.²⁵ The codex as a whole can be dated to the years 1473-1474, but some of the individual works were copied earlier (1458, 1462). The copy of Walter's commentary, which constitutes a separate codicological unity within the manuscript, neither mentions a date of composition nor a scribe. Contrary to the two Leipzig manuscripts, MS R does not contain the explanatory note concerning the Scotist character of the work, but the header of the commentary announces that the work is written *secundum mentem Doctoris Subtilis*. The *incipit*, *explicit* and *colophon* of Walter's commentary run as follows:

Inscr. Questiones libri *De anima* secundum mentem(?) Doctoris Subtilis incipiunt feliciter. Per magistrum Gualterium. Et primo circa primum librum (R, f. 252r).

(R, f. 252r) Circa librum *De anima* Aristotelis queritur primo utrum de anima sit sciencia naturalis tanquam de subiecto. Et arguitur quod de anima non sit sciencia sic: cuius non est diffinicio... (R, f. 341v) ...nec possunt uti(?) ita faci-

²⁵ For a detailed description of this manuscript, see E. NARDUCCI, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum praeter graecos et orientales in Bibliotheca Angelica olim Cenobi Sancti Augustini de Urbe* 1, Roma 1893, 67-68, and F. DI CESARE, *Catalogo dei manoscritti in scrittura latina datati o databili, per indicazione di anno, di luogo o di copista* 2: *Biblioteca Angelica di Roma*, Torino 1982, 30-34. See also the relevant entry (by M. FIDOMANZO) on *Manus Online* (http://manus.iccu.sbn.it/opac_SchedaScheda.php?ID=42711 [last accessed on 5 February 2015]).

liter corrumpi ab excellenciis qualitatum. Ad secundum patet solucio. Et hoc de questione ultima tercii libri *De anima*.

Colophon: Quod completum est per venerabilem magistrum Walterum de Veruia Parisius in collegio Burgundie de mente Scoti animo(?) etc. Finis libri. Sequitur tabula ipsius (R, f. 341r).

We can make some general observations with respect to the colophons in MSS A, B and R. First, just as in the case of the commentary on Porphyry, the colophons do not seem to make it possible to date the work with precision. As Walter is mentioned as a Master (of Arts) at the Collège de Bourgogne in Paris, we can date the commentary to the period between 1445 and 1472. Second, the Scotist character of the commentary is clearly advertized, even more emphatically than in the case of the commentary on Porphyry. Manuscripts A and B contain the same note explaining why the author of the commentary gives literal citations from Scotus' writings wherever necessary. Manuscript R omits this note, but announces that the commentary is written *secundum mentem Doctoris Subtilis*. Manuscripts A and R contain, besides Walter's commentary, works by Scotus himself and by such prominent Scotists as Antonius Andreae and Nicolaus de Orbellis. Third, MS R refers to Walter's work as a commentary *per modum quaestionis*. The work indeed differs from the commentary on Porphyry because it does not contain a literal commentary, but consists only of questions. In all three manuscripts, Walter's commentary contains the same number of questions (I: 5; II: 25; III: 14) in the same order. The titles of the questions are as follows:

Circa primum librum De anima

	MS A	MS B	MS R
(q.1)	Utrum de anima sit sciencia naturalis tamquam de subiecto primo (71ra)	Utrum de anima sit sciencia naturalis tamquam de subiecto primo (301ra)	Utrum de anima sit sciencia naturalis tanquam de subiecto (252r)
(q.2)	Utrum inter partes philosophie naturalis sciencia de anima sit dignior et nobilior et in primo loco ponenda (73ra)	Utrum inter partes philosophie naturalis sciencia de anima sit dignior et nobilior et in primo loco ponenda (302vb)	Utrum inter partes philosophie naturalis sciencia de anima sit dignior et nobilior et in primo loco ponenda (254v)
(q.3)	Utrum sciencia de anima utilis existens ad omnem veritatem et precipue ad scienciam naturalem sit de numero difficillimorum (74rb)	Utrum sciencia de anima utilis existens ad omnem veritatem(!) et precipue ad scienciam naturalem sit de numero difficillimorum (304rb)	Utrum sciencia de anima [sit] utilis existens ad omnem veritatem et precipue ad scienciam naturalem sit de numero difficillimorum (256r)
(q.4)	Utrum anima habeat aliquas	Utrum anima habeat aliquas	Utrum anima habeat aliquas

	operaciones sibi proprias in quibus non communicat corpus (75va)	operaciones sibi proprias in quibus non communicat corpus (305rb)	operaciones sibi proprias in quibus non communicat corpus (258r)
(q.5)	Utrum cognoscibile habeat esse reale in cognoscente (77vb)	Utrum cognoscibile habeat esse reale in cognoscente (307rb)	Utrum cognoscibile habeat esse reale in cognoscente (260v)

Circa secundum librum De anima

	MS A	MS B	MS R
(q.1)	Utrum anima sit substancia (79va)	Utrum anima sit substancia (308vb)	Utrum anima sit substancia (263r)
(q.2)	Utrum anima possit immediate uniri materie prime (81vb)	Utrum anima possit immediate uniri materie prime (311ra)	Utrum anima possit immediate uniri materie prime (266r)
(q.3)	Utrum in eodem homine anima vehitativa, sensitiva et intellectiva sint tres anime realiter et essentialiter distincte (87vb)	Utrum in eodem homine anima vehitativa, sensitiva et intellectiva sint tres anime realiter et essentialiter distincte (316ra)	Utrum in eodem homine anima vegetativa et sensitiva et intellectiva sint tres anime realiter et essentialiter distincte (273v)
(q.4)	Utrum due diffiniciones anime a Philosopho sint bene assignate. Quarum prima est: 'anima est actus corporis' etc.; secunda est: 'principium quo vivimus, sentimus, movemur secundum locum et intelligimus primum' (89b)	Utrum due diffiniciones anime sint a Philosopho convenienter assignate. Quarum prima est: 'anima est actus primus corporis phisici' etc.; secunda est: 'principium quo vivimus, sentimus, movemur secundum locum et intelligimus primum' (317va)	Utrum diffiniciones anime sint a Philosopho convenienter assignate. Quarum prima est: 'anima est actus corporis organici phisici'; secunda est: 'anima est principium quo vivimus, sentimus, movemur secundum locum et intelligimus primum' (275r)
(q.5)	Utrum potencie anime ab ipsa anima et a se invicem sint realiter distincte (91vb)	Utrum potencie anime ab ipsa anima et a se invicem sint realiter distincte (319vb)	Utrum potencie anime ab ipsa anima et a se invicem sint realiter distincte (278v)
(q.6)	Utrum anima sit tota in toto et in qualibet parte tota (95va)	Utrum anima sit tota in toto et in qualibet parte tota (322vb)	Utrum anima sit tota in toto et in qualibet parte tota (283v)
(q.7)	Utrum potencie anime secundum speciem distinguantur per actus, et actus per objecta (97vb)	Utrum anime potencie secundum speciem distinguantur per actus, et actus per objecta (324vb)	Utrum potencie anime secundum speciem distinguantur per actus, et actus per objecta (286v)
(q.8)	Utrum substancia aliqua potest esse per se et immediate alterius substancie productiva produccione naturali (100rb)	Utrum substancia aliqua possit esse per se et immediate alterius substancie productiva produccione naturali (327ra)	Utrum substancia aliqua possit esse per se et immediate alterius substancie productiva produccione naturali (290r)
(q.9)	Utrum sint tantum tres operationes anime vehitative,	Utrum sint tantum tres operationes anime vehitative,	Utrum sint tantum tres operationes anime vegetative,

	scilicet nutrire, augeri et generare (102rb)	scilicet nutrire, augeri et generare (328vb)	scilicet nutrire, augeri et generare (291v)
(q.10)	Utrum sensus sit potencia pure passiva (103vb)	Utrum sensus sit potencia pure passiva (330ra)	Utrum sensus sit potencia pure passiva (293r)
(q.11)	Utrum multiplicacio luminis in dyaphano fiat in instanti vel successive (105rb)	Utrum multiplicacio luminis in dyaphano fiat in instanti vel successive (331rb)	Utrum multiplicacio diaphoni fiat in instanti vel successive (295r)
(q.12)	Utrum ad videndum requiratur lumen propter medium vel propter colores (106vb)	Utrum ad videndum requiratur lumen propter medium vel propter colores (332va)	Utrum ad videndum requiritur lumen propter medium vel propter colores (297r)
(q.13)	Utrum color sit proprium obiectum visus (107vb)	Utrum color sit proprium obiectum visus (333rb)	Utrum color sit proprium obiectum visus (298r)
(q.14)	Utrum sonus fiat in aere tamquam in medio proprio (108vb)	Utrum sonus fiat in aere tamquam in medio proprio (334ra)	Utrum sonus fiat in aere tanquam in medio proprio (299v)
(q.15)	Utrum vox hoc modo bene diffiniatur: 'est repercussio aeris refracti ab anima que est in hiis partibus ubi sunt cor et pulmo ad arteriam vocalem' (109va)	Utrum vox hoc modo bene diffiniatur: 'vox est repercussio aeris refracti ab anima que est in hiis partibus ubi sunt cor et pulmo ad arteream vocalem' (334vb)	Utrum vox hoc modo bene dividatur: 'vox est percussio aeris refracti ab anima que <est> in hiis partibus ubi sunt cor et pulmo ad arteriam vocalem' (300v)
(q.16)	Utrum odor sit proprium obiectum olfactus (110ra)	Utrum odor sit proprium obiectum olfactus (335ra)	Utrum odor sit proprium obiectum olfactus (301v)
(q.17)	Utrum sapor sit proprium obiectum gustus (111ra)	Utrum sapor sit proprium obiectum gustus (335vb)	Utrum sapor sit proprium obiectum gustus (302v)
(q.18)	Utrum sensus tactus sit unus vel plures (111va)	Utrum sensus tactus sit unus sensus vel plures (336rb)	Utrum sensus tactus sit unus sensus vel plures (303r)
(q.19)	Utrum sensus tactus requirat medium extrinsicum ad percipiendum suum obiectum (113ra)	Utrum sensus tactus requirat medium extrinsicum ad percipiendum suum obiectum (337rb)	Utrum sensus tactus requirat medium extrinsicum ad percipiendum suum obiectum (305r)
(q.20)	Utrum sensibile positum supra sensum facit sensacionem (113vb)	Utrum sensibile positum supra sensum faciat sensacionem (338ra)	Utrum sensibile positum supra sensum faciat sensum (306r)
(q.21)	Utrum sensus sit receptivus specierum sine materia (114rb)	Utrum sensus sit receptivus specierum sine materia (338va)	Utrum sensus sit receptivus specierum sine materia (307r)
(q.22)	Utrum accio et passio sint unus actus (<i>corr. ex motus</i>) (115vb)	Utrum accio et passio sint unus actus (339vb)	Utrum accio et passio sint unus motus (309r)
(q.23)	Utrum sensus particularis possit simul contraria sentire (118rb)	Utrum sensus particularis possit simul contraria sentire (341vb)	Utrum sensus particularis possit simul contraria sentire (312v)
(q.24)	Utrum sit necesse ponere sensum communem preter	Utrum sit necesse ponere sensum communem propter	Utrum necesse sit ponere sensum communem preter

- | | | | |
|--------|--|--|---|
| | istos duos actus positos a Philosopho. Quorum unus est: cognoscere vel iudicare de actibus exteriorum sensuum. Et secundus est: ponere distinctionem inter obiecta diversorum sensuum propriorum (118vb-119ra) | istos duos actus positos a Philosopho. Quorum unus est: cognoscere vel iudicare de actibus exteriorum sensuum. Et secundus est: ponere distinctionem inter obiecta diversorum sensuum propriorum (342rb) | illos duos actus positos a Philosopho. Quorum unus est: cognoscere vel iudicare de actibus exteriorum sensuum. Et secundus est: ponere distinctionem inter obiecta diversorum sensuum propriorum (313v) |
| (q.25) | Utrum preter quinque sensus exteriores sint ponendi alii quinque sensus interiores, qui sunt: sensus communis, ymaginativa, fantasia, estimativa et memoria (120va) | Utrum preter quinque sensus exteriores sint ponendi alii quinque sensus interiores, qui sunt: sensus communis, ymaginativa, fantasia, estimativa et memoria (343va) | Utrum preter quinque sensus exteriores sint ponendi alii quinque interiores sensus, qui sunt: sensus communis, ymaginativa, fantastica, estimativa et memorativa (315v) |

Circa tertium librum De anima

- | | MS A | MS B | MS R |
|-------|--|--|--|
| (q.1) | Utrum corpora celestia possunt agere in intellectum nostrum et voluntatem (121va) | Utrum corpora celestia possunt agere in intellectum nostrum et voluntatem (344rb) | Utrum corpora celestia possunt agere in intellectum nostrum et voluntatem (317r) |
| (q.2) | Utrum intellectus noster possibilis sit potencia pure passiva (123vb) | Utrum intellectus noster possibilis sit potencia pure passiva (346ra) | Utrum intellectus noster possibilis sit pure potencia passiva (320r) |
| (q.3) | Utrum principalior causa noticiae genite sit obiectum in se vel in specie presens vel ipsa pars intellectiva (128rb) | Utrum principalior causa noticiae genite sit obiectum in se vel in specie presens vel ipsa pars intellectiva (349va) | Utrum principalior causa noticiae genite sit obiectum in se vel in specie presens vel ipsa pars intellectiva (325v) |
| (q.4) | Utrum intellectus possibilis secundum esse sit a corpore separatus ita quod sit in omnibus hominibus unus (129ra) | Utrum intellectus possibilis secundum esse sit a corpore separatus ita quod sit in omnibus hominibus unus (350ra) | Utrum intellectus sit possibilis secundum esse a corpore separatus ita quod sit in hominibus omnibus unus numero (326v) |
| (q.5) | Utrum de intencione Philosophi fuerit ponere intellectum agentem esse aliquid anime nostre vel substantiam separatam (131ra) | Utrum de intencione Philosophi fuerit ponere intellectum agentem esse aliquid anime nostre vel substantiam separatam (351ra) | Utrum de intencione Aristotelis fuerit ponere intellectum agentem esse aliquid anime nostre vel substantiam separatam (328r) |
| (q.6) | Utrum intellectus agens sit nobilior intellectu possibili (131va) | Utrum intellectus agens sit nobilior intellectu possibili (351va) | Utrum intellectus agens sit nobilior intellectu possibili (328v) |
| (q.7) | Utrum due potencie sint realiter distincte intellectus agens et possibilis (132vb) | Utrum intellectus agens et possibilis sint due potencie anime realiter distincte (352va) | Utrum intellectus agens et possibilis sint due potencie anime realiter distincte (330v) |

(q.8)	Utrum quidditas rei materialis sit primum et adequatum obiectum intellectus nostri (133vb)	Utrum quidditas rei materialis sit primum et adequatum obiectum intellectus nostri (353ra)	Utrum quidditas rei materialis sit primum et adequatum obiectum intellectus nostri (331v)
(q.9)	Utrum Deus sit naturaliter intelligibilis ab intellectu viatoris (135ra)	Utrum Deus sit naturaliter intelligibilis ab intellectu viatoris (354ra)	Utrum Deus sit naturaliter intelligibilis ab intellectu viatoris (333r)
(q.10)	Utrum singulare sit a nobis per se cognoscibile (137rb)	Utrum singulare sit a nobis per se cognoscibile (355vb)	Utrum singulare sit a nobis cognoscibile (336r)
(q.11)	Utrum in parte intellectiva proprie sumpta sit memoria habens speciem intelligibilem (138va)	Utrum in parte intellectiva proprie sumpta sit memoria habens speciem <intelligibilem> (356va)	Utrum in parte intellectiva proprie sumpta sit memoria habens speciem intelligibilem (337r)
(q.12)	Utrum anima separata a corpore posset intelligere quidditates sicut ante separationem (139rb)	Utrum anima separata a corpore posset intelligere quidditates sicut ante separationem (357ra)	Utrum anima separata a corpore potest intelligere quidditates sicut ante separationem (338r)
(q.13)	Utrum appetitus sit principium motus processivi in animalibus (140rb)	Utrum appetitus sit principium motus processivi in animalibus (357vb)	Utrum appetitus sit principium motus progressivi in animalibus (339v)
(q.14)	Utrum necesse sit omne vivens habere sensum (141ra)	Utrum necesse sit vivens habere sensum (358rb)	Utrum necesse sit omne vivens habere sensum (340v)

V. Conclusion

Walter of Wervia's commentaries on Porphyry's *Isagoge* and Aristotle's *De anima* constitute yet another witness to the massive influence of Duns Scotus and Scotism at the University of Paris in the late fifteenth century. Yet his commentaries differ in some interesting respects from the works of contemporary Parisian masters such as Nicholas de Orbellis, Petrus Tartareti, Johannes Hennon, Johannes le Damoisiau and Johannes de Caulaincourt. First of all, Walter authored rather traditional commentaries on individual philosophical works instead of *compendia* and manuals of Aristotelian philosophy. Another difference between Walter and most of his contemporaries is that the former advertizes his adherence to Scotus more emphatically than the latter. Walter also gives explicit quotations from Scotus' works (with precise references to the relevant passages), especially in his commentary on *De anima*. A third observation that can be made from a first reading of Walter's commentaries is that his *quaestiones* (unlike the manuals of his contemporaries) seem to contain quite extensive discussions of earlier opinions. The authors mentioned most often, besides Scotus, are such late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century theologians as Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Giles of Rome, Henry of Ghent and Hervaeus

Natalis. Let us cite three short passages from the two commentaries to illustrate this point:

(1) In questione erunt quinque articuli. In primo ponitur opinio (distincio N) nominalium et eius reprobacio. In secundo opinio Henrici de Gandavo et eius reprobacio. In tercio opinio Egidii et beati Thome et eorum improbacio. In quarto opinio Alberti et eius improbacio. In quinto opinio Doctoris Subtilis et eius confirmacio (*In Porph.* q.15; N, f. 24vb).

(2) In questione erunt tres articuli. In primo articulo narrabitur opinio Henrici de Gandavo in parte concordantis cum Thoma et in parte discordantis. In secundo ponentur rationes probantes possibilitatem pluralitatum formarum in eodem composito. In tercio directe respondebitur ad quesitum et solventur rationes negancium pluralitatem formarum in eodem composito (*De an.* II q.2; R, f. 267r).

(3) In questione erunt duo articuli. In primo ponentur aliquae opiniones cum earum improbacionibus. In secundo respondebitur ad quesitum secundum intencionem Doctoris Subtilis. Quantum ad primum notandum est quod est una opinio beati Thome, parte prima, questione 77(?), quod potencie anime realiter distinguuntur ab anima et a se invicem, ita quod iste potencie sunt accidentia absoluta anime et reponuntur in secunda specie qualitatis. Sunt enim naturales potencie. Pro quo arguit duplici ratione. Prima est quod, cum potencia et actus dividunt ens et quodlibet genus entis, oportet quod ad idem genus pertinent; sed actus secundus qui est operacio non est in genere substancie; ergo potencia que elicitur ad illum actum non potest esse in genere substancie, sed in genere accidentis. Preterea: anima secundum suam essenciam est forma et actus; sed inquantum est actus non est ordinata ad ulteriorem actum; si ergo anima esset immediatum principium operacionis, semper operaretur, sicut habens animam semper est in actu vivum. Minor patet, quia nichil est in potencia ad actum inquantum est actus. Ergo anima inquantum forma et actus non est potencia ordinata ad actum. Unde quod sit in potencia ad actum non competit anime secundum essenciam inquantum est forma, sed secundum suam potenciam essencie superadditam. Et per illam substancia anime ordinatur ad actum secundum.

Quidam alius, scilicet Hervous (B Henricus R) nacione Brito, *Quolibeto* primo, questione nona, sic arguit: unum et idem simplex causatum non potest esse principium essenciale diversarum operacionum sive diversorum actuum, quia nec eadem materia potest esse proprium passivum sive receptivum diversarum formarum nisi per disposicionem propriam determinantem. Aliter enim quodlibet fieri posset ex quolibet. Si ergo non posset aliquid esse in potencia receptiva hoc modo, multo minus poterit aliquid esse in potencia operativa. Sed intellectus et voluntas sunt potencie operative. Ergo non sunt eadem simpliciter essencia anime.

Item Albertus sic arguit in secunda parte sue *Summe*: quecumque sunt eadem uni tercio simpliciter sunt eadem inter se. Si ergo intellectus et sensus sunt idem in essencia anime, sequitur quod sunt idem inter se. Et sic intellectus erit sensus.

Item ab Egidio arguitur sic, *Quolibeto* tercio: accidens variabile non est in subiecto nisi mediante accidente invariabili; sed actus est accidens <variabile>; ergo potencia mediante qua inest actus [actus] est accidens invariabile. Item agens per essenciam semper agit; sed anima non semper agit; ergo anima non est agens per essenciam. Ergo potencia per quam agit non est sua essencia (*De an.* II, q. 5; R, ff. 278v-279r).

It is our hope that our presentation of Walter's commentaries will lead to a more thorough investigation of these works (and their thirteenth- and fourteenth-century sources), and of their place in the history of late fifteenth-century philosophy.

Paul J.J.M. BAKKER (Nijmegen)

Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen
p.bakker@ftr.ru.nl

Femke J. KOK (Nijmegen)

Open Universiteit
femke.kok@ou.nl

Abstract: This contribution offers a detailed presentation of the commentaries on Porphyry's *Isagoge* and Aristotle's *De anima* by Walter of Wervia (ca. 1425-1497). Walter wrote his commentaries between 1445 and 1472 at the University of Paris. Both works bear witness to the influence of John Duns Scotus and Scotism on Parisian Masters of Arts.

Keywords: Commentaries on Aristotle, fifteenth-century philosophy, Scotism, University of Paris, Walter of Wervia.

