

# Contributions to a Codicological History of the *Logica Vetus* in Medieval France

**Abstract:** In this paper, I provide a brief outline of shifts in the teaching of the texts of the Old Logic, or *Logica Vetus*, in France and its surrounding regions from the 10<sup>th</sup> to the mid-14<sup>th</sup> century, primarily relying on codicological evidence. The following shows: 1a) that prior to the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the teaching of the old logic was dominated by the reading of commentaries, primarily those of Boethius, and 1b) that during this same period, there are no clear signs of a systematic approach to teaching logic; 2) that during the 13<sup>th</sup> century, Boethius' commentaries cease to be widely read, and the beginnings of a curriculum in logic develop; and 3) that the major development from the 13<sup>th</sup> to the 14<sup>th</sup> century in the organization of the *Logica Vetus* is the decreased presence of the Latin *auctores*, and a corresponding Hellenization of the study of logic more generally.

Keywords: Aristoteles Latinus; Logic in Medieval France, history of; *Ars Antiqua*; *Logica Vetus*; Aristotle; Boethius; Medieval education, history of.

## Introduction

This paper aims to outline the general features of the shift in the study of the Aristotelian logical corpus in the Gallican region from the 10<sup>th</sup> to the mid-14<sup>th</sup> century. The reason for this undertaking is in part a need to supplement more standard attempts at tracing the history of Medieval logic. Such accounts tend to be guided by, it seems to me, at least one of following two tendencies. The first is to focus heavily on the contributions of singular individuals, prodigies like Abelard or Ockham, who often attracted a number of followers.<sup>1</sup> Though there certainly were major thinkers of this kind, the tendency to focus almost exclusively on them – trying, for instance, to determine whether one thinker is or is not directly acquainted with the thought of another – has arisen not so much because of the evidence itself as because of a certain romantic ideal governing much of our historiography of the middle ages, viz., that of the solitary genius. Apart from treating different phases of literary production – e.g. early monastic and late

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, Copleston 1962.

scholastic – as essentially the same, this also approach fails to capture the communal and collaborative nature of the work of those figures the model is supposed to fit best.<sup>2</sup>

A second tendency arises not so much from romanticizing *the* self as *ourselves*. By this, I mean the tendency to organize the study of Medieval thought along contemporary interests, and to accordingly devote more space to those areas of medieval thought that either are most similar to our own or interest us the most.<sup>3</sup> In the historiography of Medieval Logic more specifically, this arises in the tendency to devote far more attention to post 14<sup>th</sup> century developments – foreshadowing, as they seem to be, the development of modern advancements like the propositional calculus – while dismissing much of the tradition prior to it.<sup>4</sup>

The net effect of these tendencies has been the neglect of the canonical texts of the Latin tradition prior to the developments that came to fruition in the first half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century among the terminist logicians at Oxford and Paris.

Positively, the scope of this study is restricted to the circulation of the codices of the *Logica Vetus* in the Gallican region from the 9<sup>th</sup> to the 14<sup>th</sup> century. For precision's sake, I have defined a *logica vetus* codex as one containing any of the following three works, in whole or in part: Porphyry's *Isagoge*, Aristotle's *Categories*, or Aristotle's *Periermenias*, all in their Boethian translations. Though, as we shall

---

<sup>2</sup> For an interesting treatment of this problem in the historiography of the Dominican Hugh of St. Cher, See Smith 2010

<sup>3</sup> For all the virtues of its entries, *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy* provides a fairly blatant example of this. In its introduction, it states:

Because the areas of concentration in contemporary philosophical scholarship on medieval thought naturally reflect the emphases in contemporary philosophy, our editorial strategy has led to a concentration on those parts of later medieval philosophy that are most readily recognizable as philosophical to a student of twentieth-century philosophy.

Kretzmann et. al., 1982, 3.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Henry 1974, 7:

There are indications in recent works on medieval logic that there still exists a lack of familiarity with what are, after all, the roots of the terminological and conceptual nerve-fibres which animate medieval logic throughout its existence, and which issue to a large extent from the logical output of Boethius.

see, there were other works studied alongside these, these three represent the ‘stable core’ of logical studies throughout the medieval period. My aim has been throughout to allow the manuscript evidence to shed light on the circulation of a body of texts that remained available throughout the middle ages, and to contribute to an understanding of the common patrimony of Latin logic, to which the terminists themselves would have been indebted.

## Introduction to the Texts

In his *Dialectica*, Peter Abelard numbers the works studied under dialectic as follows:

The Latin treatment of this art [i.e. dialectic] is furnished by seven books, the work of three authors. For so far in the Latin world there are just two of them by Aristotle, the *Categories* and *On Interpretation*, and one by Porphyry... We generally use four by Boethius: *On Division*, the *Topics* and his *Categorical* and *Hypothetical Syllogisms*<sup>5</sup>

To Abelard’s list we should also add the *Liber Sex Principiorum*, a supplement to Aristotle’s categories forming an important part of the logical curriculum through the 13<sup>th</sup> century.

The *Isagoge* is an introduction to the Aristotelian organon composed by the Neo-Platonist Porphyry, though from fairly early on it was regarded as an introduction to Aristotle’s *Categories* more specifically. The text’s main concern is to explain the *five Porphyrian predicables* – genus, species, difference, property, accident – which are five basic ways in which things predicated of a subject relate to that subject. Though Porphyry himself deliberately refrains from attempting to solve it, discussions of this text often centered on the *problem of universals*, a series of problems revolving around that of the relationship things predicable of many subjects bear to the numerically singular particulars they are predicated of. Prior to the 13<sup>th</sup> century, this text was often accompanied by one or both Boethian commentaries on it. The first, called the *lesser commentary* or occasionally the *dialogus*, was written in a dialogue form, and is not so much a commentary on the *Isagoge* as an introduction to it. The second,

---

<sup>5</sup> Peter Abelard 1970, 146; quoted in Marenbon 2008, 65

called the *greater commentary*, is considerably longer, providing a section by section exposition of Porphyry's text.

The *Categories* and *Periermenias* were the only works of Aristotle available throughout the Middle Ages. The *Categories* treats the most general genera under which anything spoken about must belong, while the *Periermenias* gives Aristotle's account of the proposition, explaining the different kinds of propositions as well as the constitutive parts belonging to them. Each of these treatises has a standard commentary attributed to Boethius. While Boethius' *Categories* commentary has a less complicated manuscript tradition, the *Periermenias* has two distinct editions – presumably because Boethius himself edited and expanded his original commentary after it had already begun to circulate – as well as manuscripts representing a mix of the two.

The *Categories* only provides in-depth discussions of four categories: substance, quality, quantity and relation. The treatise only briefly mentions the remaining – habit, place, position, time, action, passion – in chapter 9. The *Liber Sex Principiorum* is a 12<sup>th</sup> century Latin treatise intended to fill the gap left by Aristotle here, and provides detailed treatments of each of these, as well as discussion of materials relevant to the categories from the *Metaphysics* and excerpts from the *De generatione et corruptione*.

The four works by Boethius Abelard mentions – the *de divisione*, *de differentiis topicis*, *de syllogismis hypotheticis* and the *de syllogismis categoricis* – are broadly concerned with deduction and argumentation. The latter two treat hypothetical and demonstrative syllogisms, respectively. Hypothetical syllogisms are formally valid syllogisms whose premises may or may not hold; while categorical syllogisms are *demonstrative* – that is, they are valid, sound, their premises are known to be true, and they are better known than the conclusion they lead to. The *de differentiis topicis* attempts to reconcile two different ways of understanding what a topic is: one deriving from Aristotle's, the other deriving from Cicero's *Topics*, both of which are treatises providing methods for discovering arguments in

a context of a formal disputation. The *de divisione* is concerned with the different ways in which certain concepts, names, and relations may be divided.

## The study of Logic prior to the 13<sup>th</sup> Century

In the manuscripts available to us from the 9<sup>th</sup> to the 12<sup>th</sup> century, we can see the following. St. Germain de Pres in Paris, St. Mary's of Chartres, St. Willibrode's at Epternach, St. Peter's at Corbie, and St. Benedict's at Fleury-sur-Loire provide us with the earliest texts. In the 11<sup>th</sup> century, we begin to see texts from Saint-Michel, Arras, and St. Victor's near Paris as well. During this period, those works of Aristotle known in the west almost always circulate with the accompaniment of a Boethian commentary. And often, the commentary along with the text itself will fill its codex. In those cases where the Aristotelian texts are accompanied by others, the overall unity of the codex varies. In some cases, there is clear evidence of a plan of study,<sup>6</sup> while others place logical commentaries side by side with epistles or patristic works.<sup>7</sup> Typically, if a codex contains the *Isagoge*, *Categories*, or *Periermenias*, then the other works in that codex will be of a broadly logical nature – though occasionally one finds works of grammar as well.<sup>8</sup> But even when works are from a single monastery, there is little standardization concerning the order of works in a given codex, or even concerning *which* works should be studied. The only schools with enough of a manuscript footprint for us to discern any patterns are St. Mary's of Chartres and St. Benedict's at Fleury-sur-Loire.

The Chartrian School is notable for the sheer variety of texts it possessed.<sup>9</sup> It had multiple copies of the *Isagoge*, *Categories*, and *Periermenias* with commentaries by Boethius, as well as Apuleius' *Periermenias* compendium. It has an early specimen of Cicero's *Topics* with Boethius' commentary on it, the Pseudo-Augustinian *Categoriae Decem*, and one of the earliest copies of the newly rediscovered

---

<sup>6</sup> E.g. Chartres, Bib. Mun. 100.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. Paris, Bib. Nat. Lat. 1954; Paris, Bib. Nat. Lat. 2858.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. Paris, Bib. Nat. Lat. 7545; Rouen, Bib. Mun. 932.

<sup>9</sup> See Chartres, Bib. Mun. 71, 72, 100, 497, and 498.

*Sophistici Elenchi*. Lastly, one of its manuscripts<sup>10</sup> contains a surprising number of works presumably original to the school itself.

St. Benedict's at Fleury-sur-Loire<sup>11</sup> doesn't evince either the breadth or the originality one finds at Chartres, but there is still evidence of ample interest in logic there: several copies of the *Isagoge*, *Categories*, and *Periermenias* survive, along with multiple copies of Boethian commentaries on these works. The library also contains a copy of Apuleius' *Periermenias*, as well as the *de topicis differentiis* and Boethius' works on hypothetical and categorical syllogisms.

What is important to notice here, though, is that there is little evidence either for a unified curriculum at either locale, nor even for the more basic recognition of the codex as an occasion for gathering several works together with the aim of unified, programmatic instruction. For instance, one finds, the *Periermenias* prior to the *Isagoge* and *Categories*, and even the unified works themselves are cut up into various sections *ad placitum*.<sup>12</sup>

In sum, prior to the start of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the interest in logic, though keen in some places, does not appear to have manifested itself in the form of a progressive study of the various works of the logical canon according to a hierarchical ordering of its various sub-disciplines. As we shall see, this means that the recovery of the remainder of the Aristotelian Organon was itself accompanied by a new approach even to the old texts: they begin to be viewed in accordance with the aims of a progressive, step-wise, goal-centered notion of education, in contrast with the more meditative and repetitive, less systematic and programmatic character of a monastic one.

---

<sup>10</sup> Chartres, Bib. Mun. 100.

<sup>11</sup> See Orleans, Bib. Mun. 80, 265, 269, 277; Paris, Bib. Nat. Lat. 2788, 6400B, and 7193.

<sup>12</sup> See, for instance, the treatment of the *De differentiis topicis* in Orleans, Bib. Mun. 265.

## The development of a Standard Curriculum

The 13<sup>th</sup> century gives us the first glimpse at the systematic study of logic in the medieval period.

Compared to the prior period, we can see several important shifts. First, as is well known, those logical works of Aristotle's that had been lost for part of the medieval period – the *logica nova* – once again become widely available. Second, the logical works begin to be grouped in a codex in much more systematic manner: differences in ordering of the texts, therefore, begin to reflect differences in the pedagogical order of reading. Third, the Greek texts of the *logica vetus* begin to circulate more often than not *sans* commentary, and those systematic treatments of a subject originally written in Latin – for instance, Cicero's *Topics*, Boethius' *De Syllogismis Hypotheticis* – circulate less widely as Greek texts on the subject become more widely available.

Patterns of orderings of texts throughout our period are illustrated in the following table. Each  $n^{\text{th}}$  row represents the  $n^{\text{th}}$  work in a given codex, with the number to the right of the work being the number of codices following that pattern for all rows prior to that cell. Because of this, the splits in a column are capable of representing divergent traditions regarding the ordering of the texts, and so the table can be read as depicting branches of an upside-down tree. The following records the data for every case where two or more manuscripts follow the same pattern in the ordering of works. In determining the number of a work in a codex, works taking up less than a folium – for instance, logical schemata or improvised verses of French poetry – have been ignored. Names and details for the manuscripts following a given pattern to its end are footnoted at the entry for the final node of a branch.

<i>Isagoge</i> , 49	
<i>Categories</i> , 48	
<i>Periermenias</i> , 41	<i>Liber Sex Principiorum</i> , 6

<i>Liber Sex Principiorum</i> , 28			<i>De Divisione</i> , 4	<i>De Topicis Differentiis</i> , <sup>13</sup> 3	Aristotle's <i>Topics</i> , 2	<i>Periermenias</i> , 5
<i>De Divisione</i> , 22			<i>De Topicis Differentiis</i> , 4		<i>On Sophistical Refutations</i> , 2	<i>De Divisione</i> , 3
<i>De Topicis Differentiis</i> , 21			<i>Liber Sex Principiorum</i> , 3		<i>Prior Analytics</i> , 2	<i>De Topicis differentiis</i> , <sup>14</sup> 2
<i>On Sophistical Refutations</i> , 7	<i>Prior Analytics</i> , 6	Aristotle's <i>Topics</i> , 5	<i>Prior Analytics</i> , <sup>15</sup> 2		<i>Posterior Analytics</i> , <sup>16</sup> 2	
Aristotle's <i>Topics</i> , 6	<i>Posterior Analytics</i> , 6	<i>On Sophistical Refutations</i> , 5				
<i>Prior Analytics</i> , 5	Aristotle's <i>Topics</i> , 5	<i>Prior Analytics</i> , 5				
<i>Posterior Analytics</i> , <sup>17</sup> 5	<i>On Sophistical Refutations</i> , <sup>18</sup> 5	<i>Posterior Analytics</i> , <sup>19</sup> 5				

<sup>13</sup> Orleans, Bib. Mun. 265 (S. 12<sup>ex</sup>-13<sup>in</sup>); Paris, Bib. Nat. Lat. 18423 (S. 13); Paris, Bib. Nat. Lat. 6291 (S. 13<sup>ex</sup>). The first splits Boethius' *Topics* in two parts, with the later coming first, followed by the *de syllogismis categoricis*, then the earlier part of Boethius' *Topics*, followed by fragments from the *de syllogismis hypotheticis*. The second follows Boethius' topics with the *de divisione*, which concludes the codex. The third follows the *De Topicis* with the *Liber Sex Principiorum*, the *de divisione*, both *Analytics*, and then the *Topics* and *On Sophistical Refutations*.

<sup>14</sup> Paris, Bib. Nat. Lat. 16597 (S. 13-14); Rheims, Bib. Mun. 870 (S. 13<sup>ex</sup>). The former is followed by the *Topics*, *On Sophistical Refutations*, *Prior* and *Posterior* analytics; the latter, written in 1279, ends with the *De Topicis differentiis*.

<sup>15</sup> Lyon, Bib. Mun. 244 (176) (S. 13); Grenoble, Bib. Mun. 707 (S. 14). The former, written in a French hand, follows the *Prior Analytics* with the *Posterior*, then the *Topics* and *On Sophistical Refutations*. The latter, written in an English hand, follows the *Prior Analytics* with the *Topics* and *On Sophistical Refutations* before concluding with the *Posterior Analytics*.

<sup>16</sup> Arras, Bib. Mun. 224 (S. 13-14); Avranches, Bib. Mun. 227 (S. 13<sup>ex</sup> and 14). The latter has a folium of excerpts from Albert of Saxony's *questions on the Posterior Analytics* between the *Prior* and *Posterior Analytics*.

<sup>17</sup> Paris, Bib. Maz. 3470 (S. 13), Bib. Ars. 727 (S. 13<sup>ex</sup>), Bib. 6289 (S. 13-14); Toulouse, Bib. Mun. 735 (S. 13<sup>ex</sup>); Tours, Bib. Mun. 677 (S. 14<sup>in</sup>). Bib. Maz. 3470 adds parts of the *Ethics* to the end of the codex, while Charleville, Bib. Mun. 39 (S. 13) inserts the same between the *Topics* and the *Analytics*. For the remaining codices, the list of texts given on the branch is exhaustive.

<sup>18</sup> Laon, Bib. Mun. 433 (S. 13); Paris, Bib. Nat. Lat. 16596 (S. 13), 16595 (S. 13<sup>ex</sup>) and 6291A (13<sup>ex</sup>); Charleville, Bib. Mun. 250. The Laon manuscript originates from Laon. This is also the only manuscript to add content after the *Sophistici Elenchi*: it has parts of the *Nicomachean Ethics* following it. Tours, Bib. Mun. 678 (S. 14) follows the same pattern as the others listed, but excludes the *Topics*.

<sup>19</sup> Paris, Bib. Nat. Lat. 10202 (S. 13), 12956 (S. 13<sup>ex</sup>), 14697 (S. 13<sup>ex</sup>), 16092 (S. 13<sup>ex</sup>), and Bib. Ars. 728 (S. 14<sup>in</sup>). All but the second, which is written in an English hand, are written in a Gallican hand. All but the third, which includes the *De Anima* and *De Memoria*, end with the *Posterior Analytics*.



Forty-nine of the total ninety-one manuscripts begin with the *Isagoge*, and all but one of these<sup>20</sup> are immediately followed by the *Categories*. Of these, one<sup>21</sup> is followed by the Pseudo-Augustinian *Categoriae Decem*, six are followed by the *Liber Sex Principiorum*, and the remainder are followed by the *Periermenias*.<sup>22</sup>

Of those that have the *Liber* following the *Categories*, one is in a 15<sup>th</sup> century humanist hand,<sup>23</sup> one is from Saint-Omer in the north,<sup>24</sup> one is an earlier 13<sup>th</sup> century Victorine codex, and the remaining three can be traced to Italy or southern France.<sup>25</sup> All but one of these codices has the *Periermenias* following the *Liber*.<sup>26</sup>

The most widely followed ordering of texts among the manuscripts, followed by twenty-one of them, is as follows: 1) Porphyry's *Isagoge*; 2) Aristotle's *Categories*; 3) Aristotle's *Periermenias*; 4) the *Liber Sex Principiorum*; 5) Boethius' *De Divisione*, 6) Boethius' *De Topicis Differentiis*. All but two<sup>27</sup> of those that follow the pattern this far split into three groups from here: the greater part transition to Ia) Aristotle's *Topics* and *On Sophistical Refutations*, Ib) sometimes in reversed order, before moving on to the *Analytics*; II) while the minority report treats the *Analytics* first, and then moves on to Aristotle's *Topica* and

---

<sup>20</sup> Paris, Bib. Nat. Lat. 6636.

<sup>21</sup> The exception is the very early (S. 10-11) Chartres, Bib. Mun. 100, mentioned above.

<sup>22</sup> Chambery, Bib. Mun. 27 contains some French verse between the two texts; Avranches, Bib. Mun. 227, a book belonging to a bishop Michael of Paris, has the Aristotelian text interspersed with Boethius' commentary on it.

<sup>23</sup> Paris, Bib. Nat. Lat. 6292.

<sup>24</sup> Rheims, Bib. Mun. 870 (S. 13<sup>ex</sup>)

<sup>25</sup> Paris, Bib. Nat. 16597 (S. 13-14) and Auch, Bib. Mun. 11 (S. 13) are written in a Mediterranean hand, while Avignon, Bib. Mun. 228 belonged to the Dominicans at Avignon.

<sup>26</sup> The anomaly is Avignon, Bib. Mun. 1088, which has Aristotle's *Topics* between the *Liber* and the *Periermenias*, which ends the codex.

<sup>27</sup> Troyes, Bib. Mun. 1457 and Metz, Bib. Mun. 508. The former cuts off abruptly, and so the codex may have originally contained more than it does at present.

*Elenchi*.<sup>28</sup> There are no obvious geographic patterns correlating to the different orderings of the works of *Logica Nova*.

## Import of the Variants

The six manuscripts with the *Liber* following the *Categories* deserve to be singled out. The *Liber Sex Principiorum*, being a treatise meant to supplement the *Categories*, most naturally would come after it if the basic principle of the organization of the codex were the subject matter treated in the works themselves. What we find instead in all remaining manuscripts containing works of both the *logical vetus* and the *logica nova*, is that the texts are ordered according to an extrinsic principle: the assumed nationality of its author. This may even be the case with some, though not all, of the texts placing the *Liber* prior to the *Periermenias*, insofar as the *Liber* was sometimes taken to be a genuine work of Aristotle's. But the spuriousness of this work seems to have been widely-known even by the mid-13<sup>th</sup> century. Hence, Dodd writes that the *liber* "became a regular part of the logical corpus, and it was often commented on and accepted as containing genuine Aristotelian doctrine, although most medieval authors recognized that it was not by Aristotle;"<sup>29</sup> and, as Minio-Paluello tells us<sup>30</sup>, Iohannes Blundus, Nicolas of Paris, Roland of Cremona, Albert the Great, Roger Bacon, Bonaventure, Alexander of Hales, Thomas Aquinas, Lambert of Auxerre, Aegidius of Lessines, and Siger of Brabant all either explicitly or implicitly<sup>31</sup> acknowledge that the work was not written by Aristotle. The consideration of mistaken authenticity, then, would seem only at best applicable to the Auch, Bib. Mun. 11 and Paris, Bib. Nat. Lat. 15088 Victorine manuscripts.

---

<sup>28</sup> There is evidence that the last of these was the curriculum studied by Thomas Aquinas: see *PA* I. proemium.

<sup>29</sup>Dodd 1982, p. 48

<sup>30</sup>Aristoteles Latinus 1966, LXIV-XLVIII

<sup>31</sup>i.e. by ascribing quotes from the *liber* either to the book simply (e.g. "*ut dicit Liber sex principiorum*"), or to the author of the *liber* (e.g. "*dicit auctor Sex Principiorum*") but never to "Aristotle" or "the Philosopher." cf. *ibid*.

Roughly, then, possibly excepting those texts that place the *Liber* prior to the *Periermenias*, every branch of the above tree exhibits the following pattern:

1) Greek works of the <i>Logica Vetus</i>	2) Latin works of the <i>Logica Vetus</i>	3) <i>Logica Nova</i>
---	---	-----------------------

This is surprising in part because there are at least two places where the theoretical unity of the codex would be *better* served by violating this linguistic partitioning. The first, already mentioned, involves placing the *Liber Sex Principiorum* immediately after the *Categories*. The second involves grouping the Aristotelian and Boethian works on topical arguments together. This is done in one of the above branches – the third from the left – but not at the expense of violating the linguistic criterion of ordering: Aristotle’s *Topics* is placed immediately after Boethius’, but in accordance with a shift from Latin back to Greek authors. And even so, this pattern is followed by fewer codices than those that begin the *Logica Nova* with either the *Sophistici Elenchi* or the *Analytics*.

## The Fate of the Latin Works of the *Logica Vetus* in the 14<sup>th</sup> Century

Instead, to the degree that there are variations in this general pattern after the 13<sup>th</sup> century, they mostly concern *whether* certain Latin works should make it into the Codex. Of our original ninety-one *logica vetus* manuscripts, only eight contain either of the Boethian works on syllogisms mentioned by Abelard, the latest of which date to the early 13<sup>th</sup> century, and only one of which contains any works of the *logica nova*.<sup>32</sup> While an analysis of the fate of the remaining Latin works is best served by the chronological breakdown given in the following table:

Work/Ratio of Codices containing it to total <i>Logica Vetus</i> codices from a given period	≤ s. 13 <sup>in</sup>	s. 13	s. 13 <sup>ex</sup>	s. 13-14	s. 14 <sup>in</sup>	s. 14
<i>Isagoge</i>	12:35 (34%)	16:19 (84%)	12:13 (92%)	9:10 (90%)	4:4 (100%)	7:7 (100%)
<i>Categories</i>	10:35 (28.5%)	18:19 (94.7%)	13:13 (100%)	10:10 (100%)	4:4 (100%)	7:7 (100%)

<sup>32</sup> Chartres, Bib. Mun. 498 (s. 12<sup>med</sup>) contains the *Elenchi*.

<i>Periermenias</i>	27:35 (77%)	17:19 (89.4%)	13:13 (100%)	10:10 (100%)	4:4 (100%)	7:7 (100%)
<i>Liber Sex Principiorum</i>	1:35 (2.8%)	14:19 (73.7%)	13:13 (100%)	7:10 (70%)	3:4 (75%)	6:7 (85.7%)
<i>De Divisione</i>	5:35 (14%)	13:19 (68.4%)	12:13 (92%)	7:10 (70%)	3:4 (75%)	4:7 (57%)
<i>De Topicis Differentiis</i>	4:35 (11.4%)	13:19 (68.4%)	11:13 (84.6%)	7:10 (70%)	2:4 (50%)	3:7 (42.9%)
<i>Topics</i>	1:35 (2.8%)	12:19 (63%)	10:13 (77%)	6:10 (60%)	2:4 (50%)	3:7 (42.9%)
<i>Sophistici Elenchi</i>	1:35 (2.8%)	14:19 (73.7%)	10:13 (77%)	6:10 (60%)	2:4 (50%)	3:7 (42.9%)
<i>Prior Analytics</i>	1:35 (2.8%)	13:19 (68.4%)	10:13 (77%)	6:10 (60%)	2:4 (50%)	3:7 (42.9%)
<i>Posterior Analytics</i>	0:35 (0%)	13:19 (68.4%)	10:13 (77%)	6:10 (60%)	2:4 (50%)	3:7 (42.9%)

What the data here suggests is the following. Over the course of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the *Isagoge*, *Categories*, and *Periermenias* become firmly established as the core materials for studying the old logic. This is partly because more codices contain the works when compared to prior centuries, but partially also because these works are now almost always gathered together in the same codex, whereas in prior centuries the works tended to circulate separately: sometimes with their commentaries, sometimes in codices with miscellaneous contents. The *Liber Sex Principiorum* reaches the height of its popularity in the late 13<sup>th</sup> century, after which point it circulates somewhat less widely. After peaking at about the same time as the *Liber*, the Boethian logical textbooks experience a stronger decline. Aristotle's *Topics* and *Elenchi*, part of the new logic, are less likely to circulate in codices with the old after the 13<sup>th</sup> century, but this is not, as it is with the Boethian works, mainly because of decreased interest:<sup>33</sup> rather, these works become more likely to circulate separately throughout the 14<sup>th</sup> century. This is even more often the case with the *Analytics*, though it is not the place of this essay to address the history of these works in their own right.

---

<sup>33</sup> Though interest in topical arguments *does* decrease. See Stump 1989, 157-175.

## Conclusion

What I have attempted to show in the preceding pages is that the development of the study of the texts of the *logica vetus* occurs in two stages. In the first, we find the first signs of a *progressivist* notion of education, marked most basically by the development of the very idea of a *cursus studii*. In the second, we witness the gradual *Hellenization* of that notion. The first of these shifts occurs at the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, while the second is ascendant at the turn of the 14<sup>th</sup>.

In contradistinction to more typical historiographies of the Medieval period generally, what this means is that 1) in logic, the question of the authority of an author of a text becomes *more* important, not less, as we move from the 13<sup>th</sup> to the 14<sup>th</sup> century; 2) the authority of the author is determined not wholly by their individual reputation, but partly on account of their ability to be grouped into a larger collective – in this case, “the Greeks”; and 3) that the authority attached to this collective was attributed to it in accordance with an easily distinguishable sign of the heteronomy of that same group (i.e. its language) vis-à-vis the collective that the reader of the text would identify him/herself with, i.e. the *Orbis Latina*. Rather than reason being established *against* authority, here we see the value of authority firmly established in logic, in the domain of reason itself – and even by an extrinsic sign rather than an internal criterion – precisely at that point where logic is thought to have made the most significant advances in the medieval period. Though the eclipse of earlier Latin logical texts after the recovery of Greek sources is well-known, the event itself has not been the subject of critical reflection. Hopefully, the more detailed analysis given in this study can be the ground for that, doubtless to be fruitful, encounter.

## References

- [Aristoteles Latinus] (1939). *Codices: Pars Prior*, ed. G. Lacombe *et al.*, (Rome: La Libreria dello Stato).
- \_\_\_\_\_(1966). *I: 6-7: Categoriarum Supplementa: Porphyrii Isagoge et Liber Sex Principiorum*. ed. L. Minio-Paluello (Bruges-Paris: Desclée de Brouwer).

Copleston, Frederick (1962). *A History of Philosophy Volume 2: Medieval Philosophy* (New York: Doubleday).

Dodd, Bernard G (1982). "Aristoteles Latinus," in Kretzmann et al., 1982, 45-79.

Gabbay, D. And J. Woods (2008). *Handbook of the History of Logic Volume Two: Medieval and Renaissance Logic* (Amsterdam: Elsevier).

Kretzmann, Norman, Anthony Kenny, Jan Pinborg and Eleonore Stump, eds. (1982). *The Cambridge Companion to Later Medieval Philosophy*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Marenbon, John (2008). "Logic at the Turn of the Twelfth Century," in Gabbay and Woods 2008, 65-81.

Henry, D. P. (1974). *Commentary on De Grammatico: The Historical-Logical Dimensions of a Dialogue of St. Anselm's* (Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel).

Peter Abelard (1970). *Dialectica*, ed. L. M. de Rijk (Assen: Van Gorcum).

Smith, Lesley (2010). "Hugh of St. Cher and Medieval Collaboration," in *Transforming Relations: Essays on Jews and Christians throughout history in honor of Michael A. Signer*, ed. Franklin T. Harkins (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press), pp. 241-64.

Shiel, J. (1990). "Boethius' Commentaries on Aristotle" in R. Sorabji, ed. *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and their Influence* (London: Duckworth), 349-72.

Stump, Eleonore (1989). *Dialectic and its Place in the Development of Medieval Logic* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Thomas Aquinas (1955). *In Aristotelis libros Posteriorum Analyticorum Expositio*. (Marietti) [PA]