

Gyula Klima
Peter G. Sobol
Peter Hartman
Jack Zupko

John Buridan's
Questions on Aristotle's
De Anima – Iohannis
Buridani Quaestiones
in Aristotelis De Anima

Historical-Analytical Studies on Nature, Mind and Action

Volume 9

Editor-in-Chief

Gyula Klima, Fordham University, New York, USA

Series Editors

Russell Wilcox, University of Navarra, Pamplona, Spain

Hendrik Lagerlund, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

Jonathan Jacobs, CUNY, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, New York, USA

Dan Bonevac, University of Texas, Austin, USA

Sarah Borden, Wheaton College, Wheaton, USA

Edward Feser, Pasadena College, Pasadena, USA

Jorge Garcia, University of Buffalo, New York, USA

William Jaworski, Fordham University, New York, USA

Joseph E. Davis, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

Stephan Meier-Oeser, Academy of Sciences of Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany

Jose Ignacio Murillo, University of Navarra, Pamplona, Spain

Calvin Normore, UCLA, Los Angeles, USA

Penelope Rush, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

Jack Zupko, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada

Historical-Analytical Studies on Nature, Mind and Action provides a forum for integrative, multidisciplinary, analytic studies in the areas of philosophy of nature, philosophical anthropology, and the philosophy of mind and action in their social setting. Tackling these subject areas from both a historical and contemporary systematic perspective, this approach allows for various “paradigm-straddlers” to come together under a common umbrella. Digging down to the conceptual-historical roots of contemporary problems, one will inevitably find common strands which have since branched out into isolated disciplines. This series seeks to fill the void for studies that reach beyond their own strictly defined boundaries not only synchronically (reaching out to contemporary disciplines), but also diachronically, by investigating the unquestioned contemporary presumptions of their own discipline by taking a look at the historical development of those presumptions and the key concepts they involve. This series, providing a common forum for this sort of research in a wide range of disciplines, is designed to work against the well-known phenomenon of disciplinary isolation by seeking answers to our fundamental questions of the human condition: What is there? – What can we know about it? – What should we do about it? – indicated by the three key-words in the series title: Nature, Mind and Action. This series will publish monographs, edited volumes, and commented translations.

Gyula Klima • Peter G. Sobol • Peter Hartman •
Jack Zupko

John Buridan's Questions on
Aristotle's De Anima –
Iohannis Buridani
Quaestiones in Aristotelis De
Anima

Gyula Klima
Department of Philosophy
Fordham University
New York, NY, USA

Peter G. Sobol
McFarland
WI, USA

Peter Hartman
Department of Philosophy
Loyola University Chicago
Chicago, IL, USA

Jack Zupko
Department of Philosophy
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB, Canada

This work was supported by National Endowment for the Humanities

ISSN 2509-4793 ISSN 2509-4807 (electronic)
Historical-Analytical Studies on Nature, Mind and Action
ISBN 978-3-030-94432-2 ISBN 978-3-030-94433-9 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-94433-9>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2023

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Acknowledgments

We have benefited greatly from the assistance of others since embarking on this project over a decade ago.

To organize the project and coordinate our efforts during the initial phase, the editors and translators held meetings at the Radboud University Nijmegen, the University of Western Ontario, Université du Québec à Montréal, the University of Wisconsin (Madison), the University of Winnipeg, and Fordham University. We are grateful to those institutions for hosting us, and in particular to Hans Thijssen, Paul Bakker, Henrik Lagerlund, and Claude Panaccio, for inviting us and providing welcome surroundings in which to work.

Sharon Alford spent many hours on the microfilm reader at Emory University library preparing digital copies of our manuscripts from microfilms for all of us to use. Peter King offered technical advice on editing medieval texts and assistance to the project in its early stages.

We were able to rely on outside readers to spot errors and infelicities in the draft text of our Latin edition, and in this capacity, we are happy to acknowledge the expert eyes of Robert Andrews, Joël Biard, and Claude Panaccio. We have not adopted their thoughtful suggestions in all cases, however, and we are of course responsible for any errors that remain.

Portions of the translation were tested in a number of venues, such as Gyula Klima's graduate seminar at Fordham University, Jack Zupko's philosophical Latin reading group at the University of Alberta, and the students in Peter Hartman's philosophy graduate seminar at Loyola University Chicago. Again, with the translation, Claude Panaccio's keen understanding of fourteenth-century philosophical discourse helped us in many places where the manuscripts did not.

Finally, we thank the National Endowment of the Humanities, whose financial support in the form of a Grant for Editions and Translations (RZ-50988-09) made the edition and translation possible, as well as a grant for a supporting conference co-sponsored by Fordham University in 2012 (RZ-51468-12), which yielded a volume of accompanying interpretive essays edited by Gyula Klima, *Questions on the Soul by John Buridan and Others: A Companion to John Buridan's Philosophy of Mind* (Springer 2017).

Introduction

Life and Works

John Buridan was born around 1300, probably in the diocese of Arras, Picardy. He attended the Collège Lemoine in Paris on a scholarship and then the University of Paris, where he was a member of the Picard Nation. He was formally licensed as a teaching master in the Faculty of Arts by the mid-1320s. His earliest works were polemical in nature — short treatises criticizing contemporary views on the nature of relations, points, and universals — but he soon became known for his lectures on logic, which were eventually revised as his logical masterwork, the *Summulae de dialectica*. This work, ostensibly written as a commentary on a popular logic text by Peter of Spain, moved far beyond Peter's work in scope, method, and philosophical insight, to become one of the most widely used logic texts in the later Middle Ages. Buridan also lectured extensively on the works of Aristotle that formed the basis of the arts curriculum in Paris, writing commentaries on virtually the entire Aristotelian corpus, including *De anima* or *On the Soul*, the work edited here; indeed, the textual tradition indicates that he lectured on particular Aristotelian texts more than once, presumably polishing and further elaborating his ideas in the process. He is a careful and for the most part sympathetic expositor of Aristotle, but never afraid to reject the philosopher's views when there is good reason to do so. Like the *Summulae de dialectica* itself, his Aristotle commentaries were copied and widely circulated at universities in Central and Eastern Europe, where they served as textbooks and reference sources for scholars and students of Aristotle well into the

sixteenth century.¹ Buridan continued lecturing, writing, and being active in the scholarly community in Paris until the late 1350s. We do not know his exact death date, but it is likely to have been before 1361, when there is a record of one of his sources of scholarly support being awarded to another person.²

Versions of the Text

The text we edit here is the third and final version of Buridan's *Questions on Aristotle's De Anima* (*Quaestiones in Aristotelis De anima*). It is clearly identified as Buridan's third or final set of lectures ("tertia sive ultima lectura") on *De anima* in the catalogue tradition as well as in several of the manuscripts.³ From this we can infer that Buridan lectured on *De anima* on two previous occasions, although we have yet to find manuscripts we can definitively identify as originating from his first or second lectures.

Buridan's third and final set of lectures on *De anima* is also a compiled [*compilatus*] text, meaning that it was probably revised by Buridan himself from original classroom notes taken down by a student or secretary.⁴ The text we present here shows every sign of having been

¹See, for example, the extensive analysis provided by Andrews 2016 of the "supercommentary" on *De anima* — i.e., a commentary on Buridan's commentary on Aristotle's *De anima* — by Bero Magni de Ludosia, a Swedish master active at the University of Vienna between 1429 and 1465. Indeed, Buridan's commentaries were evidently so useful that they sometimes *replaced* the texts of Aristotle in the classroom; as Flüeler 2008 writes in connection with Buridan's commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics*, "In fact, I am able to verify that the masters of the Faculty of Arts in Vienna did not read Aristotle at all! Aristotle was not the subject of the lectures; instead, the masters read Buridan's questions on the Aristotelian *Ethics*" (265).

²For Buridan's career and comprehensive discussion of his philosophy, see Zupko 2003 and Klima 2008, as well as Zupko's 2018 entry on Buridan in the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

³For example, the *explicit*s of manuscripts S and U below both refer to their texts as the "tertia lectura" of Buridan's *Quaestiones on Aristotle's De anima*.

⁴This is attested to in the colophons of four manuscripts (AOR and V below). Two of these manuscripts (O and R) even go so far as to describe the questions as "edited [*editae*]" by Buridan. For the significance of compilation in manuscript copies of Buridan's commentaries, see Flüeler 1999, 513–15.

well established in Buridan's lifetime, despite occasional and minor differences in wording among the three main families or groups of manuscripts (labeled α , β , and γ) described below.

Buridan's commentary provides a comprehensive philosophical treatment of Aristotle's *De anima*, both in terms of the number (51) and length of the questions raised as well as the complexity of their argumentative structure. The text of the *tertia sive ultima lectura* survives in some 24 manuscripts in varying conditions and states of completeness. Again, because no manuscript has been identified as containing one of the earlier versions, we cannot tell how Buridan's psychology might have evolved between the *prima* and *ultima lectura*. We know that such a manuscript once existed because there is a medieval record of a bequest to the library of Heidelberg University of a volume containing "certain questions by Buridan on the book, *De anima*, but not from the final set of lectures [*quedam questiones circa librum De anima a Buridano, sed non de ultima lectura*]." ⁵ Unfortunately, this volume has been lost. We do have 15 manuscripts of a somewhat abbreviated text with fewer questions, ⁶ which may be the remains of one or both earlier lectures, or later abridgements by Arts Masters who used Buridan's commentary as the basis for their own lectures on *De anima* at one of the newly founded universities in Eastern Europe, ⁷ or both. In 1991 Benoît Patar produced an edition of a commentary or commentaries on *De anima* based on three anonymous manuscripts, which he claimed to be Buridan's *prima lectura*, or a hitherto unidentified first set of lectures on the text. ⁸ But doubts have been raised about the validity of Patar's claim, ⁹ and a more recent study of these same manuscripts by Paul Bakker and Sander de

⁵Michael 1985, 705.

⁶Descriptions of each manuscript along with titles of individual questions are provided in Michael 1985, 684–89.

⁷For these abridgements, which Markowski 1984 terms "rédactions pragoise," see Markowski 1971, 1984, and 1988.

⁸Patar 1991.

⁹See the reviews of Patar's edition by Sten Ebbesen (1994, 758–62), Zénon Kaluza (1995, 136–39), and Christoph Flüeler (1995, 218–24). It should be pointed out that the authorship of the text found in the main manuscript (Bruges 477) from which Patar constructed his edition has been a matter of dispute for some time, and that no scholarly consensus has formed around the question.

Boer concludes that, despite some surface similarities, there is no conclusive reason to attribute the text to Buridan because the contents also exhibit similarities to the *De anima* commentary of Buridan's younger contemporary, Nicole Oresme.¹⁰ Accordingly, Bakker and de Boer conclude that the manuscripts should be catalogued as anonymous commentaries produced around the same time and in the same context as those of Buridan and Oresme.¹¹ There is also an early printed edition of a set of *Quaestiones* on *De anima* edited by George Lokert (Paris 1516) and attributed to Buridan,¹² but the text corresponds to none of the surviving manuscripts. For a time it was thought that Lokert might have abridged the text of the edition from a lost manuscript of one of the earlier redactions.¹³ But a recent article concludes that Buridan is unlikely to have been the sole source of this text.¹⁴

It is possible that further study of these 15 manuscripts will reveal that they contain earlier versions of Buridan's *De anima* commentary. Until that happens, no picture can be given of the development of Buridan's teachings in psychology. Thankfully, that task can be set aside for now because the text edited here, the *tertia sive ultima lectura*, is an independent work and clearly intended as such by its author. In it, Buridan refers numerous times to his commentaries on other works of Aristotle, but never to his earlier lectures on *De anima*; nor does he ever suggest that an argument or conclusion expressed in the final version represents a change from, or an elaboration of, a position taken previously.¹⁵ This makes it more likely that the relation between earlier and later versions of a commentary was in Buridan's

¹⁰For example, the work contained in the Bruges 477 manuscript makes extensive use of the perspectivist tradition in its discussion of the propagation and reception of sensible *species*, which is something we find in Oresme's psychology but not Buridan's.

¹¹Bakker and de Boer 2012.

¹²Georgius Lokert Scotus 1516. The volume contains a collection of texts, including editions of Buridan's *Quaestiones* on Aristotle's *De anima* as well as on the books of the *Parva Naturalia*.

¹³See Michael 1985, 716–17.

¹⁴de Boer 2014.

¹⁵Elsewhere, Buridan does not hesitate to tell us when he changes his mind about something, as in his treatment of self-referential paradoxes in the *Sophismata* (*Summulae de dialectica* IX, Chapter 8, Seventh Sophism: "Every proposition is false"; tr. Klima 2001, 967–68).

mind one of supersession rather than continuous development and refinement; in other words, Buridan delivered his *tertia lectura* on *De anima* with the idea that it would be his “official” treatment of the subject, replacing earlier commentaries.¹⁶

Genre

Like other texts in the medieval genre of *quaestiones*, Buridan’s commentary is divided into particular problems or issues (the *quaestiones*) he takes to be raised by the authoritative text under discussion: in this case the three books of Aristotle’s *De anima*. He devotes 6 questions to Book I, 25 to Book II, and 20 to Book III. In keeping with the standard form of such commentaries, each question is headed by the Latin verb “*quaeritur*” (“it is asked”) followed by the interrogative pronoun “*utrum*” (“whether”) and the question under consideration (e.g., in q. 9 of Book III, “*quaeritur utrum intellectus humanus possit se intelligere*” [“it is asked whether the human intellect is able to understand itself”]).¹⁷ Typically, the topic question is based on a lemma from the Latin version of Aristotle’s text; we have identified where this is so in our edition. But just as often, and not unlike readers of Aristotle in our own time, Buridan is interested in pursuing issues that are tangential to Aristotle’s discussion. For example, in q. 14 of Book III, he uses Aristotle’s *De anima* III.6 (430^b21) remark about points being understood as privations as an opportunity to present his own divisibilist solution to the problem of analyzing continuous magnitudes — a solution also discussed at length in other works, where the topic seems more germane.¹⁸ But this is not surprising. In fact, the medieval genre of *quaestiones* was more freewheeling than

¹⁶This characterization also seems borne out by the manuscript tradition. The *tertia sive ultima lectura* was evidently the version of choice for copying and further propagation, as its surviving copies far outnumber any other *Quaestiones* on *De anima* attributed to Buridan.

¹⁷In the translation, we actually rendered these as direct “yes/no” questions (“Is the human intellect able to understand itself?”) to indicate more clearly the disputational character of the discussion.

¹⁸For example, in Book VI, qq. 1–4 of his *Quaestiones* on Aristotle’s *Physics* (Paris 1509, 93^{vb}–98^{va}).

its origins as a commentary on a prescribed text might suggest, to the point where Arts Masters such as Buridan felt no compunction about reusing materials they had presented on other occasions and in other contexts, much in the way university lecturers do today.¹⁹

Although there is no evidence to suggest Arts Masters were required or even expected to treat of certain topics in their commentaries, a loose but identifiable tradition of questions developed around the text of the *De anima*,²⁰ usually keyed to specific passages, such as Aristotle's remark in Book II, chapter 5 (418^a13) that no error is possible regarding proper sensibles (discussed by Buridan in q. 11 of Book II of his commentary), or in Book III, chapter 10 (433^b5–6), about the contrariety of appetites (which Buridan treats in q. 18 of Book III). But the genre offered plenty of room for an author to pose his own questions and to explore the implications of Aristotle's teachings via passages in other texts, in this case the psychological treatises of Aristotle's *Parva Naturalia* (qq. 24–25 of Book II), as well as the controversial interpretations of other authorities, such as Averroës and Alexander of Aphrodisias (qq. 3–6 of Book III).

There were other medieval genres of commentary, such as the *expositio*, or literal commentary, which, as the name suggests, involved closer explication of the actual wording of an authoritative text, divided lemmatically into sections and arguments.²¹ Five manuscripts have been identified as containing Buridan's *expositio* on Aristotle's *De anima*;²² these appear to represent three different redactions of

¹⁹Likewise, Buridan explicitly connects q. 8 of Book III of his *De anima* commentary, "*Utrum intellectus prius intelligit universale quam singulare, quam e converso*" (see III.8, par. 43 below), with q. 7 of Book I of his *Physics* commentary, "*Utrum universalia sunt nobis notiora singularibus*", which covers much of the same material (ed. Streijger and Bakker, 76–77)

²⁰See the comprehensive study in Christensen 2018.

²¹The division of the text of the three books of *De anima* is due to its commentators, beginning in late antiquity, most likely for purposes of teaching and study. The most influential medieval division was that of Averroës (1126–1198), whose *Long Commentary on De anima* appeared in the West in a Latin translation by Michael Scot around 1225. From then on, medieval commentators on *De anima*, including both Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas, were able to read and study Averroës' commentary, or at least excerpts thereof. Buridan sometimes quotes from it verbatim, e.g., in III.2, par. 6 and III.3, par. 7 below.

²²Michael 1985, 677–83.

the same commentary, which would correspond to the three versions of the question commentary that probably would have accompanied them.²³ As indicated above, the *expositio* and the *quaestiones* both originated as classroom lectures on a text that students were required to “read” for their bachelor’s degree.

We do not know precisely how Buridan gave his lecture courses, but there is some evidence to suggest that his practice was to deliver the *expositio* or literal commentary on a given passage and then any *quaestiones* he took to be raised by it in close proximity, perhaps even on the same day.²⁴ If this is correct, the pedagogical benefit would be to bring the philosophical discussion into alignment with the letter of the text. Be that as it may, the practice was usually not followed when the lectures were transcribed and revised for publication and copying because the two works were almost always bound separately. None of the surviving manuscripts of the *Quaestiones* edited here is bound with its corresponding *expositio*.

Authenticity

John Buridan is clearly the author of our text. In addition to it being ascribed to him by name in many manuscripts,²⁵ there are numerous references in it to other commentaries we know were written by Buridan, i.e., his *Questions* on Aristotle’s *Physics*, *Meteorology*, *De caelo*, *Metaphysics*, and *Nicomachean Ethics*, as well as to Buridan’s own logical masterwork, the *Summulae de dialectica*. As can be seen

²³Michael 1985, 718. On Buridan’s *expositiones* (or “*dicta*” in some manuscripts), see Flüeler 1999, 502–506.

²⁴By studying the watermarks on a copy of Buridan’s *expositio* and *quaestiones* on Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* written during Buridan’s lifetime (Paris BN lat. 16131), Christoph Flüeler discovered that the scribe used sheets of paper from the same ream to write first the literal commentary and then the question(s) corresponding to it, before proceeding to the next passage from Aristotle, showing that “the commentaries were written down in an alternating fashion, but at the same time period, and in two different fascicles” (Flüeler 1999, 509).

²⁵For example, among the manuscripts used for this edition, Buridan is identified as the author of the work in the *explicit* to Book I in mss. A and T (see I.6, par. 19 below) and again in the *explicit* to the entire text at the end of Book III, in mss. A and V (see III.20, par. 19 below).

from the *apparatus fontium* of our edition, these references are accurate and almost always relevant to the topic under discussion. Finally, the arguments and doctrines presented in our text are all recognizably Buridanian in the sense that they fit the characteristically nominalist positions he defends in other works, as well as employing the same kind of fine-grained logical and conceptual analysis to defend them.

Dating

We do not know precisely when Buridan delivered the lectures on *De anima* that became the commentary edited here. There is a reference in q. 11 of Book III to certain articles from the 1347 Parisian Condemnation of the views of the theologian, John of Mirecourt, who was Buridan's contemporary. Since this does not appear to be a later interpolation, it gives us a *terminus post quem*: our text must have been composed after 1347. As for a *terminus ante quem*, there are only two clear references to the *De anima* commentary in Buridan's other works, suggesting that it was written fairly late in his career. These are in Book X, q. 2 of his commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics*, and in Book I, q. 7 of his commentary on the *Meteorology*.²⁶ If Bernd Michael is right that the latter commentary dates from 1357/58,²⁷ then the *tertia lectura* of Buridan's *De anima* commentary must have been produced between 1347 and 1358. Buridan's probable death date gives us a *terminus ante quem* only slightly later. We know from his being mentioned in a 1358 jurisdictional dispute at the University of Paris that he was still alive in that year,²⁸ but probably not after 1361, when one of his benefices was reassigned, something that

²⁶Buridan briefly refers to Book II, q. 10 and Book III, q. 10 of his *Quaestiones in Aristotelis De anima* (the work edited here) in Book X, q. 2 of his *Quaestiones super decem libros Ethicorum Aristotelis ad Nicomachum* (Paris 1513, f. 205^{rb}; tr. Kilcullen 2001, 516). The reference in Book I, q. 7 of the *Quaestiones in libros Meteorologicorum Aristotelis* is to Book II, q. 18 of the *Quaestiones in Aristotelis De anima*. For further details, see Michael 1985, 673–74 and 706–8. As Michael demonstrates, the references can only be to the third and final version of Buridan's commentary.

²⁷Michael 1985, 659–75.

²⁸The available evidence is canvassed in Michael 1985, 399–404. Michael believes Buridan's actual death date to be October 11, 1360.

would typically be occasioned by the decease of its incumbent. So, our text was probably composed between 1347 and 1358, and almost certainly before 1361.

Bernd Michael speculates further that our text might have been written later in the 1350s because the Mirecourt reference in Book III, q. 11 includes a reference to another late work, the final version of Buridan's *Questions* on Aristotle's *Physics*. He concludes, "of all the works of Buridan which originated in the 1350s, the *tertia lectura* of the *De anima* is evidently one of the last."²⁹

Manuscripts

Twenty-three manuscripts have been identified containing the text of the *tertia sive ultima lectura* of Buridan's *Quaestiones in Aristotelis De anima*.³⁰ None of them appears to have been copied during Buridan's lifetime; the earliest that can be reliably dated (A = Berlin 566) was written in 1382, more than two decades after Buridan's death. This is not unusual in the case of Buridan. Christoph Flüeler has found that only seven of approximately 250 surviving copies of Buridan's works were definitively produced during his lifetime.³¹ Buridan's reputation meant that his works were copied often, and, as we shall see below, recopied at other places far from Paris, an activity that continued well into the fifteenth century.

²⁹Michael 1985, 708.

³⁰Full descriptions of most of the manuscripts in our list are available in the two most comprehensive manuscript studies to date: the 1985 doctoral dissertation of Bernd Michael, which gives the state of primary text research on Buridan up to about 1978, and the editor's introduction to Patar 1991. See also footnote 68 below.

³¹Flüeler 1999, 501. Flüeler also contends that the small number of manuscripts dating from Buridan's lifetime indicates "his fame was established only after his death" (ibid. 501–502). We tend to agree, if by "fame" is meant Buridan's fame outside Paris. Buridan was famous during his lifetime in Paris, as his career in the University (twice serving as its Rector, in 1328 and 1340) attests.

Based on the pioneering research of Edmond Faral,³² supplemented by more recent studies by Charles Lohr,³³ Zdzisław Kuksewicz,³⁴ Jozef de Raedemaeker,³⁵ Ryszard Palacz,³⁶ Peter C. Marshall,³⁷ Bernd Michael, Benoît Patar, Christoph Flüeler, Paul Bakker, and Sander de Boer,³⁸ the following manuscripts have been identified as containing the text of the *tertia sive ultima lectura* of Buridan's *Quaestiones De anima* (preceded by the letter designation used in this edition):

1. [A]: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek 566, ff. 1^{ra}–65^{ra}³⁹
2. [B]: Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conv. Soppr. A.5.1365, ff. 228^{ra}–267^{vb}⁴⁰
3. [C]: Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conv. Soppr. C.4.263, ff. 1^{ra}–68^{rb}⁴¹
4. [D]: Krakow, Biblioteka Jagiellonska 2083, ff. 70^r–117^v⁴²
5. [E]: Liège, Bibliothèque de l'Université 346 C, ff. 53^r–95^r⁴³

³²Faral 1946 and 1949.

³³Lohr 1970, 172–74.

³⁴Kuksewicz 1961.

³⁵de Raedemaeker 1963.

³⁶Palacz 1970.

³⁷Marshall 1983.

³⁸Bakker and de Boer 2012.

³⁹Michael 1985, 694; Patar 1991, 40*: northern Italian provenance; dated 1382 by the scribe.

⁴⁰Michael 1985, 695; Patar 1991, 46*–47*: incomplete (text ends in the middle of Book III, q. 4); northern Italian provenance; Michael dates to the fifteenth century.

⁴¹Michael 1985, 695; Patar 1991, 38*: northern Italian provenance (Augustinian friary of Padua, according to the *explicit*); Michael dates to the end of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century.

⁴²Michael 1985, 696; Patar 1991, 38*: incomplete (text ends in Book III, q. 4); probably produced in Krakow; Michael dates to the end of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century.

⁴³Not listed in Michael 1985; Patar 1991, 38*–39*; the manuscript is described in Streijger, Bakker, and Thijssen 2010, 17; provenance unknown; Patar dates to c. 1370 as the text is bound with a copy of a *Quaestiones De longitudine et brevitate vitae* with that date.

6. [F]: Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana P.120 sup., ff. 74^{ra}–135^{va}⁴⁴
7. [G]: München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 742, f. 2^r–52^{vb}⁴⁵
8. [H]: München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 18794, f. 93^r–195^v⁴⁶
9. [I]: Oxford, Bodleian Library Canon auct. class. lat. 278, f. 2^r–36^r⁴⁷
10. [J]: Oxford, Bodleian Library Canon misc. 393, 1^{ra}–75^{vb}⁴⁸
11. [K]: Perugia, Biblioteca Comunale Augusta N.43, ff. 3^{ra}–60^{ra}⁴⁹
12. [L]: Roma, Biblioteca Angelica 480 (D.7.6), ff. 6^{ra}–75^{vb}⁵⁰
13. [M]: Roma, Biblioteca Angelica 592 (F.6.4), ff. 113^{ra}–187^{vb}⁵¹
14. [N]: Roma, Biblioteca Angelica 593 (F.6.5), ff. 93^{ra}–148^{ra}⁵²

⁴⁴Michael 1985, 696; Patar 1991, 39*: provenance unknown; Michael dates to the fifteenth century.

⁴⁵Michael 1985, 696; Patar 1991, 41*: provenance unknown, but ms. was purchased from the collection of the Italian humanist Petrus Victorius (1499–1585); dated 1387 in the *explicit*, 1388 in the *tabula quaestionum*.

⁴⁶Not listed in Michael 1985; Patar 1991, 39*: provenance unknown; dated 1401 in the *explicit*.

⁴⁷Michael 1985, 696–97; Patar 1991, 41*–42*: northern Italian provenance, possibly Padua or Bologna (Michael); dated 1394 in the *explicit*.

⁴⁸Not listed in Michael 1985; Patar 1991, 39*: northern Italian provenance, probably Padua; dated 1401 in the *explicit* to Book I; author misidentified as Blasius of Parma in the content summary.

⁴⁹Michael 1985, 734; Patar 1991, 42*: provenance uncertain; dated 1394 in the *explicit*.

⁵⁰Michael 1985, 697–98; Patar 1991, 39*–40*: northern Italian provenance; scribe identifies himself as a master at Piacenza, on the basis of which Michael suggests the ms. was written c. 1398–1402.

⁵¹Michael 1985, 698; Patar 1991, 45*: northern Italian provenance; date uncertain, but probably fourteenth century (codex also contains a copy of Albert of Saxony's commentary on *De caelo* made in Bologna and dated 1368 in the *explicit*; another part of the codex [but not the one containing Buridan's *Quaestiones on De anima*] is dated 1382).

⁵²Michael 1985, 698–99; Patar 1991, 42*–43*: northern Italian provenance (written by a student in Perugia, according to the *explicit*); dated 1396 in the *explicit*.

15. [O]: Sarnano, Biblioteca Comunale E.14, ff. 1^{va}–46^{vb}⁵³
16. [P]: Sarnano, Biblioteca Comunale E.143, ff. 1^{ra}–66^{ra}⁵⁴
17. [Q]: Treviso, Biblioteche Comunali 420 A, ff. 48^{ra}–87^{vb}⁵⁵
18. [R]: Città del Vaticano, Reg. lat. 1959, ff. 1^{ra}–69^{vb}⁵⁶
19. [S]: Città del Vaticano, Vat. lat. 2164, ff. 122^{ra}–234^{rb}⁵⁷
20. [T]: Città del Vaticano, Vat. lat. 11575, ff. 22^{ra}–87^{rb}⁵⁸
21. [U]: Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek cod. 5437, ff. 176^{ra}–228^{vb}⁵⁹

⁵³Michael 1985, 699; Patar 1991, 45* (where the ms. is erroneously listed as ‘E.68’): incomplete (missing Book II, qq. 1 and 15–25, as well as Book III, qq. 1–2); provenance uncertain; fourteenth or fifteenth century, but precise date uncertain.

⁵⁴Michael 1985, 699–700; Patar 1991, 43*: incomplete (missing the last sections of each question in Book I, qq. 1–3 and most of Book II, q. 5); northern Italian provenance, possibly Padua; dated 1302 in the *explicit*, which is impossible (more likely 1402, with a missing ‘c’ in the scribe’s ‘*millesimo ccc^o secundo*’).

⁵⁵Michael 1985, 734; Patar 1991, 44*–45*: provenance unknown; dated 1419 in the *explicit* to Book II.

⁵⁶Michael 1985, 701–2; Patar 1991, 45*–46*: provenance unknown; dated 1404 in the *explicit*.

⁵⁷Michael 1985, 589–90, 700–1; Patar 1991, 38*: provenance unknown; precise date unknown, but another ms. in the same codex is dated 1398 in the *explicit* and appears to have been written around the same time. Michael notes that the codex for the most part contains works on natural philosophy and was written by two scribes: Petrus de Allamania, who wrote the first part between April and June 1398 (ff. 1–120, containing a copy of Buridan’s *Quaestiones* on Aristotle’s *Physics*), and Henricus de Westphalia, who wrote the second part (ff. 122–311, beginning with our text, the *tertia lectura* of Buridan’s *Quaestiones* on Aristotle’s *De anima*, on f. 122) probably around the same time. The colophon indicates that the codex was produced in Bologna in 1398–99 under the direction of Master Dinus de Florentia. It is unclear how the codex came to be in the possession of the Vatican Library.

⁵⁸Michael 1985, 701; Patar 1991, 46*: probably northern Italian, from Bologna, Padua, or Pavia (Michael notes that the paper on which it is written is from Ferrara); date uncertain, but probably late fourteenth or early fifteenth century.

⁵⁹Michael 1985, 702–3; Patar 1991, 43*–44*: central European provenance (Vienna); date uncertain, but codex contains works written between 1390 and 1416. Missing two folios from Book III.

22. [V]: Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek cod. 5454, ff. 2^{ra}–56^{vb}⁶⁰
23. [W]: Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek cod. 5374, ff. 35^{ra}–91^{vb}⁶¹

This list does not include manuscripts containing either abbreviated summaries or short excerpts of the text, but only manuscripts that contain the full, or nearly the full, authentic text of the *tertia lectura*.

We have examined copies of all 23 manuscripts listed above, fully collating several questions and parts of other questions.

Here are fuller descriptions of each of the manuscripts we used (AETVW):⁶²

[A]: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek 566, ff. 1^{ra}–65^{ra}

Our oldest datable manuscript (1382) is written on paper and part of a codex containing 12 quires (originally 13), all written in the same hand and in a style suggesting Italian provenance. The scribe identifies himself as “Fredericus de Meyssena,” although the name is not attested elsewhere, as far as we know. Michael believes that the codex probably belonged to the library of the Franciscan custodial school in Barbarano. It was purchased before 1895 by the Berlin library from a dealer in Padua.

The text of Buridan’s *tertia lectura* is clearly written with relatively few grammatical and structural errors. The scribe sometimes offers disjunctive readings (e.g., “*restringitur vel refertur*” for “*restringitur*” in Book III, q. 1), as if he is unsure about the reading of his source manuscript, or he was copying from more than one manuscript and decided to note different readings.

⁶⁰Michael 1985, 703; Patar 1991, 44*: central European provenance (Vienna); dated 1397 in the *explicit*.

⁶¹New ms. recently discovered by Sander de Boer (and so not listed in Michael or Patar). The text was miscatalogued as an autograph copy of the *Quaestiones* on *De anima* of Henry Totting of Oyta (c. 1330–97) in Franz Unterkircher (1969, 79); central European provenance (Vienna); dated 1393 in the *explicit*.

⁶²Most of our codicological information here is from Michael 1985.

[E]: Liège, Bibliothèque de l'Université 346 C, ff. 53^r–95^r

This codex has both paper and parchment leaves. Streijger et al. 2010 note that it “contains Albert of Saxony’s *Quaestiones super libros De caelo* and several works by John Buridan, such as his *Quaestiones on De anima*, *Meteora*, and *Parva Naturalia*,” as well as an anonymous *Quaestiones on De generatione et corruptione*, which can be attributed to Buridan.⁶³ The provenance is unknown. As noted above, its copy of Buridan’s *Quaestiones De longitudine et breuitate vitae* is dated 1370. Patar 1991 describes the hand as “certainly fourteenth century,” concluding that “it is very probable that the *Quaestiones on De anima* [in E] are from the same era, which would mean that the Liège version [of the text] is very close in time to the last lecture given by the Picard master.”⁶⁴ But in the absence of further evidence, such as some indication that the two texts are in the same hand or written on paper with matching watermarks, this conclusion strikes us as premature.

The text of E is also clearly written with relatively few errors. The verso of some folios was difficult to read in our copy because the binding did not open flat when the manuscript was photographed.

[T]: Città del Vaticano, Vat. lat. 11575, ff. 22^{ra}–87^{rb}

This manuscript is written on paper, dating from the end of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century, and contains works on natural and moral philosophy by John Buridan and Ugo Benzi. Michael notes that T contains paper produced in Ferrara, suggesting that T might have been copied at Bologna, or perhaps at another northern Italian university such as Padua or Pavia.⁶⁵ It is not known when the codex entered the Vatican library, but there is evidence that it was already part of another Vatican collection in the fifteenth century.

⁶³Streijger, Bakker, and Thijssen 2010, 17.

⁶⁴Patar 1991, 38*–39*.

⁶⁵Michael 1985, 701

T appears to have been written by two scribes, with the second taking over from the first at folio 15^r, in the middle of Book II, q. 8. Patar suggests that the scribes might have been working from two different exemplars.⁶⁶ The manuscript shows signs of water damage beginning at folio 37^r (towards the end of Book II, q. 20) becoming progressively worse until the end. This makes the text difficult to read in places.

[V]: Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek cod. 5454, ff. 2^{ra}–56^{vb}

This manuscript is written on paper and bound in a codex containing works on natural philosophy. As noted above, the *explicit* indicates that the manuscript was produced in Vienna in 1397. The scribe even records his name, “Nicolaij de farchas hida(?)” As far as we know, he is not attested elsewhere. The manuscript seems from the beginning to have belonged to the Arts Faculty at the University of Vienna — hence the ownership mark, “*Liber facultatis arcium*,” in the lower margin of f. 1^{ra}.

[W]: Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek cod. 5374, ff. 35^{ra}–91^{vb}

This manuscript is written on paper and bound in a codex along with the gloss of an unidentified treatise on natural philosophy written in another hand and dated 1438, as well as a single anonymous question, “*Utrum appetitus vel fantasiae sunt causae*,” also written in another hand. The scribe of our text tells us in the *explicit* (f. 91^{rb}) that it was produced in the *studium generale* in Vienna in 1393; his name is “Henricus Oltinghi de Oytha,” which led to the misidentification of this text in the catalogue of the Austrian National Library as an auto-

⁶⁶Patar 1991, 46*.

graph of Henry Totting of Oyta's *Quaestiones* on *De anima*. Henry (c. 1330–97) was a philosopher and theologian in his own right who would likely have been in Vienna when the manuscript was written. He was active in Prague, Paris, and Vienna, where he died in 1397. In addition to his own set of *Quaestiones* on Aristotle's *De anima* (as yet unedited), he also composed an abbreviation of Adam Wodeham's commentary on the *Sentences*. So Henry may very well have been our scribe in the case of W even though the commentary is not his.

Whoever he was, our Henry was a talented scribe with a very legible hand. His version of the text is the oldest datable (1393) from the α or central European family (see groupings below). As mentioned above, Sander de Boer recently discovered the true identity of the text contained in this manuscript but his work came to our attention only after we had finished a draft edition based on AETV.

Methodology

For our edition we decided to follow a “best-text strategy” of producing the philosophically most reliable and doctrinally most coherent text justifiable on the basis of available manuscript evidence, instead of a “critical edition” in the technical sense, where we would attempt to reproduce the — perhaps merely hypothetical — text at the root of a properly reconstructed stemma.

We performed four soundings against the 23 manuscripts listed above: 21 lines from Book I, q. 1; 19 lines from Book II, q. 2; 117 lines from Book III, q. 1; and 29 lines from Book III, q. 13. These soundings allowed us to identify three groups based upon shared omissions, additions, and variations: DHUVW (α), BGMRT (β), and the rest (γ). Most of the members of α (and none of the members of β) have a central European provenance: UVW were copied in Vienna and D

in Krakow (although H is unknown).⁶⁷ However, we were not able to identify any further major groupings from these soundings.⁶⁸

Having made these initial divisions, we chose the best text(s) from each of these three groups, namely AETVW.

We initially selected V as containing the best text in the α family. We eliminated D and U on the grounds that these manuscripts were incomplete.⁶⁹ V and H both offered good readings. However, based on our soundings there were relatively few variants between them and further checks revealed omissions in other questions in both manuscripts, some unique and others shared.⁷⁰ In the absence of decisive evidence from soundings, we chose V because two of the editors

⁶⁷When our edition was in final copyediting, we became aware of another manuscript containing the *tertia lectura* of Buridan's *Quaestiones on De anima*: Lambach, Benediktinerstift, Col. 175, ff. 163^{va}–203^{rb}. We were unable to obtain a copy of this manuscript before going to press, but with the help of another scholar who had access to a copy we were able to test 53 lines from our edition of Book III, q. 1 against it. Based on this reading, the Lambach seemed not to belong to either our α or β groups, which would place it in γ . One interesting feature is that it appears to have been produced in Prague, which would make it the only β or γ manuscript with a central European provenance. Here is the *explicit*, on f. 203^{rb}: “Et patet satis per dicta quomodo procedant rationes que fiebant. Et sic est finis questionis et consequenter omnium aliarum. <illegible> Expliciuunt longe questiones De anima magistri Iohannis Byridani reportate Prage per Wernerum de Drisponscede (Drispenscede?) anno Domini millesimo tricentesimo LXXXVto in vigilia Sancti Iohannis Baptiste hora vicesima prima ante cenam.” We are grateful to Paul Bakker for his generous assistance with this manuscript.

⁶⁸S seems to be in a class by itself. We had initially included it in our draft *apparatus* until its unreliability became clear. S frequently gave variant readings found in no other manuscript, going far beyond the task of a copyist and often entering into the realm of speculation. It is almost as if the scribe had enough philosophical training to feel comfortable augmenting and correcting the argument as he went along. Hence, we removed S from our edition.

⁶⁹D ends at Book III, q. 4. U is missing an entire folio, from Book III, q. 14, par. 4, “*et si quis dicat ...*” to Book III, q. 15, par. 17, “*...maneret in organo corporeo phantasiae*”; and another, from Book III, q. 17, par. 25, “*post emissionem spermatis ...*” to Book III, q. 19, par. 15, “*...sibi convenientia*”. It also contains a blank space in Book III, q. 20, omitting text from par. 9 “*Item incontinens movetur secundum ...*” to par. 10 “*... agunt cum ratione et nihil contra.*”

⁷⁰For example, H has unique gaps of 12 words at II.15, par. 3, 3 words at III.10, par. 9, 8 words at III.15, par. 17, and 15 words at III.17, par. 19, as well as a 10-word gap shared with UV at III.5, par. 7. HVW share 5-word gaps at II.17, par. 24 and III.6, par. 14, although in the former case the missing text is added in the margin of W.

knew that it was reliable, having used it before to construct working editions of Books II and III in their dissertations.⁷¹

After W was brought to our attention, we added it to our sounding, but were unable to discern any major differences between it and V. Since we had already completed our initial edition, and since W (1393) is older than V (1397), we decided to read the entire text again against W, adding it to the core family of best texts alongside AETV.⁷²

We selected T as containing the best text from the β group (BGMRT). We eliminated B on the grounds that it was incomplete (ends in the middle of Book III, q. 4). T had fewer gaps than GMR.

We selected A and E from the γ group (ACEFIJKNOPQS). We eliminated OP because these were incomplete (O is missing Book II, qq. 1 and 15–25, as well as Book III, qq. 1–2; P omits the last sections of each question in Book I, qq. 1–3 and most of Book II, q. 5). We eliminated S because it was such an outlier, as mentioned above. AE shared similar homoioteleutonic gaps and had the fewest omissions in our soundings.⁷³ However, we were not able to determine if A or E was the better manuscript, so we decided to use both. A, as it turns out, was also the oldest datable copy (1382).

The Edition

The Latin text produced here is the work of three different editors: Peter Hartman (Book I), Peter G. Sobol (Book II), and Jack Zupko

⁷¹See n. 75 below.

⁷²After finishing the edition, we can now safely say that W is superior to V. For instance, there is a 78-word gap in UV that spans paragraphs 14 and 15 of Book II, q. 1, and a 24-word gap in UV in par. 30. However, W is not free of gaps, with a unique gap of 10 words at III.2, par. 20, as well as gaps of 8 words at I.4, par. 8, 6 words at III.8, par. 16, and 12 words at III.13, par. 9, the latter shared with AT (UV have the text).

⁷³E is also one of only two manuscripts (the other being W) to include a negative argument (though a different one in each case) missing from the beginning of III.16, par. 3, in all other manuscripts — all of which, oddly, include the reply to this argument at III.16, par. 20. The argument supplied by W (written beneath the column on f. 87^{vb} of W) looks more germane to the reply than the argument supplied by E, so we've given the reading of W in the main text of the edition, with the text of E in the *apparatus*.

(Book III).⁷⁴ Although each editor took primary responsibility for establishing and revising Buridan's text from our source manuscripts according to principles agreed upon at the start of the project, the entire draft text was thoroughly proofread multiple times and rechecked against the source manuscripts by members of the editorial team. Subsequently, the Latin text was reviewed on its own by several external proofreaders.

We classicize all spellings (in the main text as well as in the apparatus fontium) according to the Oxford Latin Dictionary, using the evolved spelling (e.g., *tamquam/numquam/eamdem* over *tanquam/nunquam/eandem*) and distinguishing "u" and "v." We do not note variations in word order, and we ignore certain common variants (e.g., *eo quod/quia; ergo/igitur; et sic etiam/et tunc; huius/listius; ille/iste; necl/neque; scilicet/videlicet; sive . . . sive/ seu . . . seu; vell/aut/seu; etc.*). We do not record variants involving sentence particles such as *etiam, enim, autem, tamen, etc.* unless the meaning is affected, or categorematic terms with equivalent meaning, e.g., *sint distinctae/distinguantur*. We silently correct obvious errors in the case endings of nouns and adjectives and the number/mood/voice of verbs. We write out all numerals in the text. As far as the structure of each question is concerned, we have supplied the numbered paragraph divisions in the edition/translation, which often align with paragraph markers supplied by the scribes of our main manuscripts (though we have not noted when they do not). We do not record variants in the first word of paragraphs (*Item; Deinde; Demum; Primo; Secundo; etc.*) or the ordinal numbering of arguments. We have standardized the opening of each question so that it contains a title question beginning with the interrogative pronoun "*Utrum*" in the Latin edition and so that it poses an actual question in the English translation, ending with a question mark. We do not record other *pro forma* verbiage connected with the opening or closing of a question (e.g., "*Quaer-*

⁷⁴Some years before the present project began, the editors of Books II and III produced preliminary working editions of those Books as part of their doctoral dissertations (see Sobol 1984 and Zupko 1989), both of which circulated informally for years in the absence of a proper critical edition of the *ultima lectura* of Buridan's *Quaestiones on De anima*. The present edition/translation is much improved because it contains the complete text and is based on better manuscripts.

itur consequenter nono . . .”) except at the beginning and ending of each Book. Finally, we use double quotation marks in the edition and translation for verbatim quotations, but italics in the edition and single quotes in the translation when a word or phrase is mentioned.

The apparatus is in two tiers. First, the *apparatus fontium* gives the source(s) of all identifiable references in the body of the text. We provide the Latin wording for all direct quotations but also for some paraphrases too, such as when it seemed to us that the wording of the source contributed to the way Buridan frames and/or discusses the question. We also give internal references: on the Latin side when the reference is to another Book or question of the work (BURIDANUS, *QQ. De an.*); on the English side if the reference is elsewhere in the same question.

Needless to say, for a work that is a commentary on Aristotle’s *De anima*, Buridan quotes often from the letter of the philosopher’s text, as well as from other relevant authorities, both ancient and medieval. At other times, he loosely paraphrases what Aristotle says, or else broadly alludes to an Aristotelian teaching in a certain work. We do not know which source(s) Buridan had at his elbow as he wrote, but in all cases, we have endeavored to provide a modern reference for the source or text in question, with Bekker numbers where appropriate. In the case of literal quotations, we provide an *apparatus fontium* reference to the *Aristoteles Latinus*, along with the wording of the passage from that edition.⁷⁵ In the vast majority of these cases, Buridan’s *De anima* quotations follow William of Moerbeke’s thirteenth-century Latin — or so-called “*nova* [new]” — translation of the *De anima* almost verbatim, though there are occasions where a quotation appears to have come from a *florilegium* or compilation of authorities such as the *Auctoritates Aristotelis*, in which case we have supplied a reference to the late thirteenth-century *florilegium* with that title edited by Jacqueline Hamesse. We record manuscript variants for quoted passages only where we could not find any witnesses with verbatim text of either the *Aristoteles Latinus* or the *Auctoritates*

⁷⁵In keeping with our policy of classicizing all spellings according to the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, we have changed the medieval spellings in quotations from the *Aristoteles Latinus* to their classical equivalents.

Aristotelis,⁷⁶ and we judged that the misquotation affected the way Buridan understood the passage in his subsequent remarks.

The second tier, the *apparatus criticus*, provides the variant readings we have recorded from AETVW.

Our apparatus uses the following abbreviations:

add. addidit

corr. correxit

del. delevit

exp. expunxit

hom. homoioteleuton

inf. infra

inv. invertit

lin. lineam

marg. margine

om. omisit

praem. praemisit

ras. rasura

rep. repetivit

sup. supra

The Translation

As with the Latin edition, our English translation is the work of three different translators: Peter Hartman (Book I), Gyula Klima (Book II), and Jack Zupko (Book III). This might seem a recipe for inconsistency given natural differences in the way English speakers express themselves, to say nothing of differing stylistic preferences in translating medieval philosophical texts. But in practice we found that even

⁷⁶Our manuscripts exhibited interesting variations in the precise wording of their Aristotle quotations, despite their having originated from the same source text(s), with A (= Berlin 566) usually offering the reading closest to the modern edited versions found in the *Aristoteles Latinus* and *Auctoritates Aristotelis*.

our initial drafts read well together, and were harmonious where it really mattered, which is to say, on points of doctrine. Stylistic niceties were discussed at length by the editors/translators in person at meetings during the first three years of the project, resulting in a basic equivalence lexicon of stock phrases and technical terms for use in revision. As the project moved along, particular translation issues were discussed and resolved by the translators via email. The translation of each Book was then carefully proofread by the other translators, as well as tested in other venues such as our graduate seminars and Latin reading groups.

On the handful of occasions where we could not agree about how to render a particular passage, the final decision was always left to the translator of the Book in question, just as its editor had final say over how the Latin text should read.

Tabula Contentorum

Agnitio	V
Introductio	VII
Liber Primus	2
I. 1 Utrum subiectum proprium in scientia libri De anima sit anima vel ille terminus <i>anima</i> vel corpus animatum vel quoddam aliud aut nihil.	4
I. 2 Utrum omnis notitia sit de numero bonorum, id est utrum omnis notitia sit bona.	16
I. 3 Utrum omnis scientia sit de numero honorabilium.	30
I. 4 Utrum scientia de anima sit de numero difficillimorum.	42
I. 5 Utrum universale nihil est aut posterius est.	52
I. 6 Utrum accidentia magnam partem conferant ad cognoscendum quod quid est.	68
Liber Secundus	84
II. 1 Circa secundum librum de anima quaeritur primo utrum omnis anima sit actus substantialis.	86
II. 2 Utrum omnis anima sit actus primus corporis organici.	104
II. 3 Utrum definitio animae sit bona qua dicitur anima est actus primus substantialis corporis physici organici habentis vitam in potentia.	124
II. 4 Utrum in eodem animali sit eadem anima vegetativa et sensitiva.	136
II. 5 Utrum potentiae animae sint distinctae ab ipsa anima.	156