RAMON LLULL, LOGICA BREVIS

Among the works of Ramon Llull constituting complete treatises on logic the Electorium catalogue --the oldest (1311) and most authentic inventory of Llull's works-- lists only two works: *Logica nova* and *Logica brevis*[1]. The first of these treatises is well known. The *Logica nova* was composed in Genoa in May of the year 1303, and begins with the words: Deus, cum tua benedictione novum et compendiosum incipimus opus, ubi novam logicam compilamus. Considerantes veterem logicam et antiquam. This important work is found in a great number of manuscripts and two printed editions[2].

The identification of the *Logica brevis*, however, presents more difficulty. Two works have come into consideration: (1) *Logica brevis* (otherwise: *Logica brevis et nova; Logica abbreviata*) (= *LBN*) with the incipit: Deus, cum tua summa perfectione incipit Logica brevis et nova. Logica est ars, qua verum et falsum ratiocinando cognoscuntur et argumentative discernuntur. In logica considerantur tria inter alia, scilicet terminus, propositio et argumentum. Terminus est ... / ... contrarietas quam habent circa hoc de quo disputant. This work is found in five manuscripts: *Kobenhavn* Kgl. Bibl. Ny kgl. S. 640. 8º (XV) f. 1^r–12^V (fragm.); *München* Staatsbibl. Clm. 4381 (A.D. 1497) f. 34^V–45^V; *Palma de Mallorca* Bibl. pública 1026 (XVIII) 19 fols. (fragm.; *expl:* per me Bernardum Lavinhetam); *Vaticana* Vat. lat. 986 (XV) f. 200^r–219^r; Vat. lat. 3069 (XV) f. 4^V–12^r. It is also found in the folloving

---

[1] E. W. Platzeck, *Raimund Lull* II (Düsseldorf 1964) 115* no. 26–27. In this article the following abbreviations will be used: *CLA* = *Compendium Logicae Algazelis*; *LBN* = *Logica brevis et nova*; *LDG* = *Logica del Gatzel*; *LN* = *Logica nova*; *LP* = *Logica parva*; *RD* = E. Rogent and E. Duràn, *Bibliografía de les impressions lul.lianes* (Barcelona 1927). References will be made by page or by folio to the following editions: *CLA* = C. H. Lohr. *Raimundus Lullus' Compendium logicae Algazelis: Quellen, Lehre und Stellung in der Geschichte der Logik* (Freiburg i. Br. 1967) 94–123; *LBN* = Venezia 1480 (RD 2); *LN* = Palma 1744 (RD 327); Bernhardi de Lavinheta *Opera omnia* (ed. J. H. Alsted; Cologne 1612).

[2] Platzeck, *op. cit.* 41* no. 112.

printed editions: Venezia 1480 (RD 2), Barcelona 1489 (RD 11), Valladolid 1497 (RD add. 2), Sevilla s. XVIin. (RD add. 6), Barcelona 1512 (RD 47), Paris 1516 (RD 60), Paris 1518 (RD 68), Palma 1584 (RD 129), Strasbourg 1598 (RD 144), Strasbourg 1609 (RD 162), Strasbourg 1617 (RD 180), Strasbourg 1651 (RD 233). A French translation by M. de Vassy appeared under the title: *Logique brieve et nouvelle* in Paris in the year 1632 *(RD 206)*. *(2) Logica parva* (otherwise: *Dialecticae introductiones*) *(=LP)* with the incipit: Gratia summi radii fontalis (Gratia et illustratione divina) pullulat arbor scientiae logicalis in arboribus quinque inserta, cuius fructum est verum et falsum ... – Logica est ars et scientia cum qua verum et falsum ratiocinando cognoscuntur et unum ab altero discernitur, verum eligendo et falsum dimittendo. Cuius principia specifica sunt tria, scilicet terminus ... / ... haec fallacia proveniat secundum multa. This work is known in six manuscripts: *München* Staatsbibliothek Clm. 10542 (XIV/XV) f. 42^r–64^r; *Palma de Mallorca* Biblioteca Provincial L. 95 Int. III; Biblioteca Pública 1044 (XVI) 31 fols. *(Expl:* Vincentius Valeriis discipulus Nicolai Pachis); 1061 (XV/XVI) II f. 25^r–56^v; 1082 (XVI) f. 1^r–44^r; Causa pia Lulliana 1 (XVIII) f. 59 -93. It is also found in two printed editions: Alcalá 1518 (RD 69), Palma 1744 (RD 327). This second work formed the basis for Prantl's analysis of Lullian Logic.[3]

Nicolás Antonio seems to have been the first to have included these two treatises in the list of Llull's authentic works; earlier inventories mention various complete treatises on logic, but give little help toward identification. The list in Cod. Cusanus 85 f. 48^v which dates from about 1430 cites a *Logica brevis* and the *Logica nova.*[4] The inventory of the Escuela Luliana of Barcelona of the year 1466 mentions the *Logica nova*, a *Logica Algazelis* which is without doubt Llull's early *Compendium logicae Algazelis (=CLA)*,[5] and a *Logica*[6]. In the sixteenth century Alonso de Proaza mentioned the *Logica nova*, a *Logica brevis*, and a *Logica de quinque arboribus*, which may possibly be the *LP* mentioned above[7]. The inventory of the Biblioteca Vileta

---

[3] C. Plantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendland* III (Leipzig 1867) 146–55.

[4] M. Honecker, "Lullus–Handschriften aus dem Besitz des Kardinals Nikolaus von Cues", *Spanische Forschungen der Görresgesellschaft* 1. Reihe 6 (1937) 252–309 at 279–81.

[5] Platzeck, *op. cit.* 11* no. 33. Cf. also J. Rubió Balaguer, "La Lògica del Gazzali, posada en rims per En Ramon Llull", *Anuari de l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans* 5 (1913–14) 311–54; C. H. Lohr, *op. cit.* 2f.

[6] F. de Bofarull y Sans, *El testamento de Ramón Lull y la Escuela Luliana en Barcelona* (Barcelona 1896) 35; P. Blanco Soto, *Estudios de bibliografía luliana* (Madrid 1916) 68–72.

[7] Alphonsus de Proaza, "Index librorum", in: *Raymundi Lulli Ars inventiva veritatis, Tabula generalis, Commentum in easdem ipsius Raymundi* (Valencia 1515) f. 220^v–222^v.

includes the *Logica nova*, a *Logica parva*, and a *Tractatus parvus de logica*[8].
In the following century Luke Wadding lists the *Logica nova*, a *Liber qui
vocatur Logica de Grozell*, in vulg., which is no doubt the Catalan adaptation
of *CLA* published by Llull under the title *Logica de Gatzel* (=*LDG*), and the
Logica parva, certainly the work cited above, since he gives the incipit:
Logica est ars et scientia, and lists two editions: Alcalá 1518 and Palma
1584.[9] It should be noted, however, that whereas the edition of Alcalá
1518 actually contains the *LP*, the edition of Palma·1584 contains the *LBN*,
and not the *LP* (RD 129). This confusion was eliminated by Nicolás Anto-
nio, whose inventory of Llull's libri logicales includes the following titles:
No. LXVI *Liber qui vocatur Logica del Grozell* (probably *LDG* and not
CLA); No. LXVII *Logica parva, inc:* Logica est ars et scientia (with the note
that this work appeared in Alcalá in 1518 and was commented on by Anto-
nio Belver); No. LXVIII *Logica nova, inc:* Considerantes veterem; No. LXIX
Dialectica seu logica nova, inc: Logica est ars qua verum (with the note:
quam in editione Argentoratensi toties laudata exstantem Bernardus La-
vinheta emendasse restitutis iis quae olim fuerant sublata dicitur)[10]. His Nos.
LXVII and LXIX correspond respectively to the *LP* and *LBN* described abo-
ve. Criticism of this inventory begins in the eighteenth century. Whereas Sal-
zinger mentions the *Logica nova*, and the *Compendium logicae Algazelis*, but
not the *Logica brevis*[11], Pasqual under the heading De artibus liberalibus in
his Catalogus librorum lists the *Logica nova*, the *Compendium logicae Alga-
zelis*, and a *Logica (rithmicé)*, which is no doubt to be identified with the
LDG[12]. In this chronological account of Llull's works Pasqual mentions the
Logica nova under the year 1303, but makes no reference to a *Logica bre-
vis*[13]. The more recent bibliographers agree in including *LN, CLA, LDG* in
the inventory of Llull's works, but differ in their treatment of *LBN* and *LP*.
The editors of the article on Llull in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*
(1885) seem to be the first to have identified the *Logica brevis* of the Elec-
torium catalogue with the work cited by Antonio with the incipit: Logica est
ars qua verum et falsum ratiocinando cognoscuntur[14]. They also includethe
Logica parva, although this work is not mentioned in the Electorium catalo-

---

8   [8] R. de Alós, *Los Catálogos lulianos* (Barcelona 1918) 67–83.

   [9] L. Wadding, *Scriptores ordinis Minorum* (Rome 1650) 297.

   [10] N. Antonio, *Bibliotheca hispana vetus* II (Madrid 1788) 128.

   [11] I. Salzinger, *Raimundi Lulli opera* I (Mainz 1721; repr. Frankfurt a.M. 1965) 55,
61, 73.

   [12] A. R. Pasqual, *Vindiciae lullianae* I (Avignon 1778) Vita 376.

   [13] *op. cit.* I Vita 243.

   [14] M. P. E. Littré and B. Hauréau, *Histoire littéraire de la France* XXIX (Paris 1885)
242 f. no. 57.

gue[15]. Longpré (1926) lists both the *LBN* and the *LP* at the conclusion of his account of Llull's philosophical works[16], Ottaviano (1930) similarly among undated works[17]. Glorieux (1933) is the first to associate these two works with the *Logica nova* under the date of 1303[18]. Avinyó (1935) marks an important stage in the criticism of these attributions. Although maintaining the identification of *LBN* with the Electorium catalogue's *Logica brevis*, he excludes the *LP* from the authentic works with the note that the form of exposition used in the *LP* seems to be an amplification of *LBN*, and that the work is possibly to be ascribed to Nicolas de Pax who had it printed in Alcalá[19]. Carreras y Artau (1939), following Avinyó, exclude *LP*, but note with regard to *LBN* that, although date and place of composition are unknown, the work is probably to be situated immediately after *LN*[20]. Finally, Platzeck (1964) associates *LBN* with *LN* in the same way, but excludes *LP* from his inventory[21].

In the following pages I want to maintain that neither the *LBN* nor the *LP* is an authentic work of Llull. A comparison of both works with the certainly authentic *LN* and *CLA* will be the basis for this conclusion. Finally, a suggestion will be made as to the identification of the *Logica brevis* cited by the Electorium catalogue.

1. Logica brevis et nova

The *LBN* is certainly a work belonging to the Lullian tradition. It begins with a typically Lullian invocation: Deus, cum tua summa perfectione incipit Logica brevis et nova. Logica est ars . . . (f. 1^r). Moreover, the Lullian principles, bonitas, magnitudo, etc. are used in examples of terms (f. 1^r), propositions (f. 1^r etc.), and syllogisms (f. 4^r etc.). Again, Llull's demonstratio per aequiparantiam is added to the traditional demonstratio per quid and demonstratio per quia in the treatment of the methods of proof (f. 3$^{v)}$)[22].

However, when we compare the structure and contents of *LBN* with *LN*

[15] *loc. cit.* no. 58.

[16] E. Longpré, art. "Lulle", *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 9 (1926) at col. 1096, nos 52—53.

[17] C. Ottaviano, *L'Ars compendiosa de R. Lulle* (Paris 1930) 93 nos. 220—221.

[18] P. Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIIIe siècle* II (Paris 1933) 160 f. items ct, cv, cw.

[19] J. Avinyó, *Les Obres autèntiques del beat Ramon Llull* (Barcelona 1935) 178—81 no. 94.

[20] T. and J. Carreras y Artau, *Historia de la Filosofía española: Filosofía cristiana* I (Madrid 1939) 295 no. 46, 334, no. 37.

[21] Platzeck, *op. cit.* (supra note 1) 41* no. 114.

[22] Confer Platzeck, *Raimund Lull* I (Düsseldorf 1962) passim.

—a work of which it is supposed by many authors to be a shorter form—, significant differences appear.

First, the structure of the two works is basically different. *LBN* is divided into three major sections: 1. De termino, 2. De propositione, 3. De argumento (f. 1^r). *LN* is divided into seven distinctions: 1. De arbore, 2. De praedicabilibus, 3. De praedicamentis, 4. De centum formis, 5. De syllogismo, 6. De applicatione, 7. De quaestionibus (p. 2). To the distinction De arbore (p. 2–18), which concerns the Lullian nine subiecta and ten regulae or quaestiones, as well as to the distinctions De centum formis (p. 60–75), De applicatione (p. 113–127), De quaestionibus (p. 127–161) —a distinction with which Llull characteristically concluded his works— there is nothing comparable in *LBN* [23].

Furthermore, the treatment of the predicables and predicaments is quite different in the two works. The treatment in *LBN* (f. 3^r) is extremely brief, and whereas the definitions for the predicables genus. species, and accident do resemble those of *LN*, the definitions for differentia and proprietas betray an entirely different understanding of the predicables than that developed by Llull in *LN*. *LN:* Differentia est id, ratione cuius bonitas, magnitudo etc. sunt rationes inconfusae (p. 26); *LBN:* Differentia est ens per quod quaedam ab aliis differunt (f. 3^r). *LN:* Proprietas est illa forma propter quam quodlibet ens consistit in suo proprio numero (p. 29); *LBN:* Proprium est id quod uni convenit, alteri non (f. 3^r)[24]. In *LN* these two distinctions (p. 18–60) constitute the heart of the work, but for the revolutionary understanding which Llull there proposes for the predicables and predicaments in terms of his own doctrine of correlatives of action[25] and the ascent of the intellect[26] *LBN* does not reflect the slightest comprehension.

The term is treated in *LBN* under the headings: communis–discreta, universal–particular, copulative–subject–predicate (f. 1^r). There is nothing corresponding to this in *LN*.

The treatment of the proposition in *LN* is quite different from that in *LBN*. *LBN* distinguishes vera–falsa, categorica–hypothetica, affirmativa–negativa (f. 1^{r-v}); *LN* distinguishes necessaria–contingens, in potentia–in–actu, brevis–longa, clara–obscura, convertibilis–non convertibilis, coniunctiva–disiunctiva, maior–minor, per se nota–dubitativa (p. 76–78, 80). In *LBN*

---

[23] Concerning the *Logica nova* see Platzeck, *op. cit.* 1 393–445.

[24] Concerning this definitions see Platzeck, *op. cit.* 1 211–14, 285–7.

[25] Concerning this doctrine see Platzeck, *op. cit.* 1 171 f. and passim.; R. Pring–Mill, *El Microcosmos Lul.lià* (Oxford 1962) 137–68; E. Colomer, *Nikolaus von Kues und Raimund Llull* (Berlin 1961) passim.

[26] Concerning this doctrine see Platzeck, *op. cit.* 1 379–83; Pring–Mill, *op. cit.* 51–8; Colomer, *op. cit.* 75–82; Lohr, *op. cit.* *(supra note 5) 68.

the conversion of propositions is handled in the usual Scholastic manner (f. 1^v–2^r); in *LN* the discussion is perfunctory and apparently without great interest for the author (p. 78–79). In *LBN* there is nothing matching the analysis of various types of propositions on which arguments may be based (p. 79–80) and the various classifications of seemingly contradictory propositions which Llull derived from Muslim sources and developed at great length not only in *LN* (p. 80–81), but also in *CLA* (cf. infra)[27]. In *LBN* the treatment of hypothetical propositions is, in accordance with late medieval interest in the theory of consequences, complete, though brief (f. 2^v); *LN* omits them entirely. On the other hand, *LBN* has nothing to the following section on definition in *LN* (p. 81–82).

Llull's understanding of the methods of argumentation represents a transformation of traditional doctrine, but in *LBN* the treatment is in the standard Scholastic manner: definition and terms of the syllogism, distinction of moods and figures, the three figures (f. 3^v–5^r). *LN*, on the contrary, discusses quomodo fit syllogismus, the comparison of the syllogism —its positive, comparative, and superlative degrees, in accordance with Llull's doctrine of the degrees of knowledge[28] —, the condition of the syllogism, and proof; the syllogism is then taken up under the ten Lullian questions, and examples are given for the three figures of the syllogism (p. 82–94).

The discussion of the topics is similar and traditional in both works (*LBN* f. 5^{r-v}; *LN* p. 84–85), but at the end of this discussion *LBN* adds a treatment of consequences (f. 5^v–6^r), to which there is nothing comparable in *LN*.

The treatment of the fallacies in *LBN* is traditional and very schematic (f. 6^{r-v}), and gives no indication that the author was even acquainted with the so-called vicesima fallacia or fallacia contradictionis, which Llull began to elaborate for the first time in *LN* (p. 94–113). Llull's later thought on the subject of fallacies builds on the classification of seemingly contradictory propositions mentioned above, and leads by way of the fallacia contradictionis, first adumbrated in *LN* (p. 111–113) and completely developed in *De novis fallaciis* (1308) and *De refugio intellectus* (1308), to a radically new and important method of demonstration proposed in *Liber facilis scientiae* (1311) and *De novo modo demonstrandi* (1312)[29]; of these developments *LBN* is completely ignorant.

Finally, *LBN* gives no indication in the explicit of the place and date of composition, although this is the practice of Llull from the year 1290 on[30],

---

[27] Confer Lohr, *op. cit.* 46–50, 68 f.

[28] Confer Colomer, *op. cit.* 78.

[29] Concerning this development see Platzeck, *op. cit.* I 428–44; Lohr, *op. cit.* 72 f.

[30] This rule was first observed by M. Obrador y Bennassar, in the Prologue to *Obras de Ramon Lull* (ed. J. Rosselló; Palma de Mallorca 1901) xlv.

a fact which would provide either a terminus ante quem for the composition of the work, or an argument for its inauthenticity.

However, a date before 1290 for *LBN* would justify the conclusion that the work should resemble *CLA* which was completed in its final form about that time[31]. But on this hypothesis we would not be able to account for the litle *Logica brevis "et nova"*. And a comparison of the two works precludes the possibility of ascribing them to the same author, at least at the same time in his career.

Whereas *LBN* treats the term quite extensively and the predicables and predicaments very schematically, *CLA* omits any consideration of the term as such, but gives a complete discussion of the universals (Dist. I; p. 94–96), predicaments (Dist. VI; p. 112–115), and the Porphyrian tree (Dist. VII; p. 115).

Again, the respective sections De propositionibus are quite different. An indication of the treatment in *LBN* has been given above. *CLA* gives simply a brief division of types of propositions (p. 98) and then goes on —as in *LN*— to a discussion of the various types of propositions on which arguments may be based (p. 100–101) and of various classifications of seemingly contradictory propositions (p. 98–99)[32].*LBN*'s discussion of hypothetical propositions is not found in *CLA*.

The sections De argumentis also reflect the divergent interests of the authors. In *LBN* there is nothing to correspond to the various subjects which Llull takes up in *CLA:* De materia argumenti, De requisitis syllogismorum, De conditionibus syllogismi, De speciebus argumentationis, De obscuratione argumenti, De inquisitione syllogismi, De modis interrogandi, De oppositione (p. 101–104)[33].

After a discussion of the figures of the syllogism (*CLA* p. 110–112) and of the fallacies (*CLA* p. 104–108) which reveals the dependence of both works on a common tradition, *LBN* turns to a treatment of the consequences and concludes with some notes on the conduct of disputations. whereas *CLA* provides some cautions to be observed in avoiding fallacies (p. 108–109), a favorite subject of Llull, and at the end makes certain Additiones de theologia (p. 116–123).

Llull's thought on formal logic developed very rapidly from the early excerpts from the logic of al–Ghazāli's *Maqāsid al–falāsifa* to the revolutionary *LN* and the late treatises on the methods of demonstration. His early work is more indebted to Arabic sources than to the standard Scholastic authors. But even in the earliest period the interests are revealed which will

---

[31] See Lohr, *op. cit.* 37.
[32] Confer note 27 supra.
[33] Concerning these sections see Lohr, *op. cit.* 70 f.

develop in *LN* into an elaboration of the regulae or quaestiones, a radically
new understanding of the predicables and predicaments in terms of the corre-
latives of action and the ascent of the intellect, and in the latest works from
a fascination with fallacies and seemingly contradictory propositions into an
ultimate rejection of the Aristotelian syllogism and substitution of a new
form of demonstration[34]. *LBN* betrays not the slightest understanding of
these developments. *LBN* can not be regarded as a compendium either of
CLA or of *LN*; it is rather a typically Scholastic treatise on logic with some
Lullistic touches. The author does not even seem to have been acquainted
with *CLA* or *LN*. Since there are no manuscripts earlier than the fifteenth
century, the work may probably be assigned to this period. It was studied by
Bernard de Lavinheta, the well-known Lullist of the late fifteenth century
(+ after 1523)[35]. To judge by the explicit of MS Palma Bibl. Pública 1026,
it was copied by him. Moreover, he took up the entire work into the section
on logic in his *Explanatio compendiosaque applicatio artis Raymundi Lulli*
(Lyons 1523 [RD 78]; Cologne 1612 [RD 168]). The following table will
make clear the relation of the two works. To the sections enclosed for
Lavinheta's work there is nothing corresponding in *LBN*. It should be noted
that the sections on the predicables and predicaments are very different in
the two works.

---

[34] Confer Platzeck, *op. cit.* I 441–44

[35] Concerning Lavinheta see E. d'Alençon, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique IX*
(1926) 36 f; A. Renaudet, *Préréforme et humanisme à Paris pendant les premiers guerres*
d'Italie (Paris 1916) 671 f, 686; *RD* passim; T. and J. Carreras y Artau, *Historia de la*
filosofía española: Filosofía cristiana II (Madrid 1943) 209–14, 238–40; P. Rossi, *Clavis*
universalis (Milan–Naples 1960) 74–8 and passim; W. Risse, *Die Logik der Neuzeit* I
(Stuttgart 1964) 536 f.

2. Logica parva

The *LP* is a work more closely related to *LBN* and Lavinheta's *Logica* than to *CLA* and *LN*. It is divided into sections: I. De termino, II. De propositione, III. De suppositione etc., IV. De argumento, V. De fallaciis. The first three sections correspond roughly to the first fourteen chapters of Lavinheta's work, but the following sections appear to be completely independent. Since the attribution to Llull has generally been rejected, it is not necessary to consider the work any further, although it might be noted that the ascription to Nicolas de Pax might be supported by the explicit in MS Palma Bibl. Pública 1044, given above.

3. Logica brevis

At the conclusion of this dry inquiry I should like to suggest that the *Logica brevis* of the Electorium catalogue is simply the certainly authentic *CLA*. The intrusion of *LBN* and *LP* into the catalogues from the time of Wadding and Antonio has confused the question, and seems to have been the reason for the identification by the editors of the *Histoire littéraire of LBN* with the *Logica brevis* cited in the Electorium catalogue, their great discovery. Salzinger and Pasqual, both distinguished by an intimate knowledge of Llull's works and their tradition, were apparently aware of the problem and justified in including only *LN, CLA* (and *LDG*) in their listings.

The two works *LBN* and *LP* are valuable as showing the understanding of Llull's thought on formal logic which was current in certain circles in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. But the real depth and direction of his thought was appreciated not by the authors of these treatises, but by Nicholas of Cusa. It is probably not by accident that the list in Cod. Cusanus 85 mentions only a *Logica brevis* and a *Logica nova*.

<div align="right">

Raimundus–Lullus–Institut
Freiburg i. Br.
CHARLES H. LOHR

</div>

RESUMEN DEL PRECEDENTE ARTICULO
DEL PROF. CHARLES H. LOHR.

Se puede resumir el artículo con las mismas palabras del autor: "En las páginas siguientes quiero mantener que ni la *Logica Brevis et Nova* (LBN), como tampoco la *Logica Parva* (LP), son obras auténticas de Llull. La comparación de una y otra de estas obras con las ciertamente auténticas, *Logica Nova* (LN) y *Compendium Logicae Algazelis* (CLA), será el fundamento de esta afirmación. Finalmente voy a hacer una sugerencia para la identificación de la *Logica Brevis* citada en el *Electorium* Catalogue"

En la nota 1 pone las siglas de su trabajo, ciertamente necesarias, para seguir la confrontación de las obras y ediciones que coteja para llegar a la conclusión que se propone.

Demuestra la autenticidad de la LBN, no solo por su incipit, sino también por la estructura de la misma, básicamente diferente de la LN, que muchos autores creyeron que era su forma abreviada. Prosigue con el examen interno de los conceptos y deduce que son diferentes, por lo que no pueden ser atribuídos al mismo autor, por lo menos en la misma época de su vida.

En cuanto a la LP, afirmándose en el cuadro comparativo que lleva expuesto anteriormente, sostiene que está más íntimamente relacionada con LBN y con la Logica de Lavinheta que la CLA y la LN. Confirma seguidamente la opinión general de los autores, que no la tienen por auténtica, y la atribuye a Nicolás de Pax, tal como se consigna en el explicit del manuscrito 1044 de la Biblioteca Pública de Palma de Mallorca.

Sugiere finalmente que la *Logica Brevis* del Catalogue *Electorium* es seguramente la auténtica CLA.