

Boehner's Text of Walter Burley's *De puritate artis logicae*: Some Corrections and Queries

Paul Vincent Spade
Indiana University

I am preparing an English translation of both the *Tractatus longior* and the *Tractatus brevior* of Walter Burley's *De puritate artis logicae* for the "Yale Library of Medieval Philosophy." My translation is based of course on the 1955 critical edition by Philotheus Boehner, the only reasonably reliable text available.¹ Nevertheless, in preparing my translation, I have had several occasions to question or correct readings in Boehner's edition. In some instances the corrections are merely obvious typographical errors, but in others there was something more substantive at stake. The text of the *Tractatus brevior* is particularly problematic in places, since there are fewer extant manuscripts on which to base an edition.

Through the courtesy of Leonard E. Boyle OP, the director of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, I have obtained a microfilm copy of the relevant portion of MS Vat. lat. 3066, which contains copies of both the longer and the shorter treatise. In the case of the shorter treatise, this is one of only two extant manuscript copies, and is therefore especially valuable.

In the following pages, I list a number of corrections to and queries for Boehner's text of both the longer and the shorter treatises. It must be emphasized that these corrections and queries are by no means based on a systematic collation of all the available manuscripts, but only on the single Vatican copy I have seen. Boehner's text is reliable enough in most instances that a new edition is surely not needed. Nevertheless, I am reasonably confident of the

¹ Walter Burleigh [= Burley] *De puritate artis logicae Tractatus longior*, *With a Revised Edition of the Tractatus brevior*, Philotheus Boehner, ed., ("Franciscan Institute Publications," Text Series No. 9; St. Bonaventure, NY: The Franciscan Institute, 1955). As this title suggests, the *Tractatus brevior* had already been published in a preliminary edition. See Walter Burleigh [= Burley] *De puritate artis logicae*, Philotheus Boehner, ed., ("Franciscan Institute Publications," Text Series No. 1; St. Bonaventure, NY: The Franciscan Institute 1951).



"Boehner's Text of Walter Burley's *De puritate artis logicae*: Some Corrections and Queries" by Paul Vincent Spade is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

points I list below. I also include further information about, and in some cases corrections to, some of the *fontes* identified by Boehner.

References to Boehner's edition are given below by page and lines numbers, separated by a period. I use the siglum 'Y', as Boehner does, for Vat. lat. 3066. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, Y agrees with the text as published in Boehner's edition for the words discussed below. The words of Boehner's edition are underlined; my correction or query follows.

The Tractatus longior

p. 5.7 Homo currit: Read 'Omnis homo currit' with Y 34rb41. The 'omnis' is needed, since it is "proposition A" that is being referred to, and that was 'Omnis homo currit', as stipulated at pp. 4.36–5.1.

p. 5.35–36 syncategorematicae (second occurrence): Read 'categorematicae' with Y 34va7. This sentence discusses the first alternative of the disjunction 'categorematicae vel syncategorematicae' (p. 5.35). The second alternative, *syncategorematicae*, is discussed in the next sentence (pp. 37–6.3).

p. 8.14 Boethius qui dicit: Rebus quas vidit nomina imponit: Boehner gives a reference to Boethius' second commentary on the *De interpretatione*, PL 64.301c. But PL 64.301c is in the *first* commentary, not the second, and moreover does not say what Burley attributes to him. I have been unable to find the quotation, or any close approximation of it, in any other passage in Boethius. The closest I have come is his *In Categorias Aristotelis*, I, PL 64.159b: "Prima igitur illa fuit nominum positio, per quam vel intellectui subiecta vel sensibus designaret."

p. 9.32 termino simplici: I conjecture 'singulari'. The edition's 'termino simplici' makes no sense here. Compare the corresponding passage at p. 3.7, which has 'singulari'.

p. 10.9 pro modo familiari: The 'pro' seems awkward in the context. One would have expected 'in' or the simple ablative.

p. 12.30 dignissima creatura creaturam: I conjecture 'creaturarum' for 'creaturam'. Compare pp. 11.17, 19, 27–28; 12.26, 32, 36; 13.34. Y 35ra27 has simply 'dignissima creaturarum'.

p. 18.7 verificantur: Read 'verificatur' with Y 35va14. The subject is 'esse corruptibile' in p. 18.6.

p. 18.13 corruptibili: Read 'corruptibile' with Y 35va17. The nominative is needed.

- p. 23.39 'Aliquis homo semper fuit': Add 'Aliquis homo semper erit', following Y 35va37. (Y goes on to add another 'aliquis homo' after 'erit', but these words seem out of place.) The future-tensed sentence is needed to complete the example.
- p. 24.38 distributive: The point of the example would seem to require that 'et mobiliter' be added.
- p. 30.10 animali: I conjecture 'risibili'. We are talking about the *second* conjunct of the example at p. 30.8.
- p. 32.6 aut relativa non habent suppositiones: I conjecture that these words should be omitted. They appear to make no sense in the context, and do not occur in the closely parallel passage of Burley's *De suppositionibus*. See Stephen F. Brown, "Walter Burleigh's Treatise *De suppositionibus* and Its Influence on William of Ockham." *Franciscan Studies* 32 (1972), pp. 15-64, at § (2.64).
- p. 34.4 sequeretur: Reading 'sequitur' with the variant recorded in the apparatus.
- p. 36.16 in conclusione. Cum: Repunctuate by moving the period to before the 'in conclusione'.
- p. 39.5–9 Et cum ... falsum est: I conjecture that these words can simply be deleted. They merely repeat the exact sense of pp. 38.39–39.2.
- p. 45.30 singulares: Read 'singularem' with Y 38ra18. What follows is only *one* singular.
- p. 51.11 homo: Read 'nigrum'. The 'homo' makes no sense in the context of the example. Y 38va26 has 'homo vel nigrum' here, apparently reflecting some awareness of the problem and probably recognizing a variant reading.
- p. 56.6 secundum adiacens vel tertium: Read simply 'tertium adiacens'. The reference of the 'cum ergo dicitur' in line 5 is back to p. 55.3–6, where 'est' is definitely *not* said to be taken *secundum adiacens*. I suspect the disjunctive 'secundum adiacens vel tertium' in Boehner's text (and in Y 39ra2) reflects variant readings in the manuscript tradition.
- p. 57.1–4 sed haec est de inesse: 'Aliquod possibile est hominem currere', ergo propositio, in quam convertitur, erit de inesse; ergo haec est de inesse: 'Hominem currere est possibile', secundum quod possibile est praedicatum: Something has gone wrong in these lines. The argument is part of an attempt to show that the minor premise of the syllogism 'Omne contingens est possibile, omnem hominem currere est contingens, ergo omnem hominem currere est possibile' (p. 56.34–35) is assertoric (see p. 56.37), and not about the contingent, as it would be if the modes in modal propositions were predi-

cates (see p. 56.36). But the minor of the latter syllogism has ‘contingens’, not ‘possibile’, as its predicate, and ‘omnem hominem currere’, not simply ‘hominem currere’, as its subject. Y 39ra21–22 agrees with Boehner, p.57.1–4 (except for trivial variants). On the other hand, for the original syllogism at p. 56.34–35, Y 39ra18 has: “Omne possibile est contingens; omnem hominem currere est possibile; igitur, omnem hominem currere est contingens.” In this version, the minor premise does have ‘possibile’ instead of ‘contingens’ as its predicate. But the subject is still ‘omnem hominem currere’ and not merely ‘hominem currere’. Moreover, the words ‘minor de contingenti’ at p. 56.36 (= Y 39ra19) require that the predicate of the minor in the original syllogism be ‘contingens’, as Boehner has it, not ‘possibile’ with Y. The remainder of the paragraph (p. 57.4–9 = Y 39ra23–25) presupposes that p. 57.1–4 reads as it stands in Boehner’s edition and in Y. In light of all this, it is not clear what should be done, except to recognize the problems. Fortunately, the overall sense of the passage is clear enough. It may be that Burley simply lost track of his example.

p. 59.1–2 et ad suum oppositum ad determinabile: Y 39rb9 has “et ad suum oppositum et ad determinabile.” Neither reading makes sense in the context. I conjecture “et ad oppositum determinabilis.”

p. 66.18: hypotheticae: I conjecture ‘categoricae’. Y 39vb28 agrees with the edition.

p. 69.1 consequens: Read ‘consequens’ (a simple typographical error).

p. 77.5 differentiae: Read ‘differentia’ with Y 40vb37. We need the singular.

p. 81.6 nulla: Add ‘sua’ following the variant recorded in Boehner’s apparatus, interpreting that variant not as a *correction*, as Boehner does, but as an *addition*. For confirmation, see p. 87.3, where Burley is replying to the argument given here.

p. 82.1 quod: This word should be omitted in reading the passage for sense. The proposition in question does not denote that such-and-such or *that* so-and-so — with the result that is denotes in one or another of *alternative* ways. Rather it denotes in one *disjunctive* way, that such-and-such-or-so-and-so. I do not suggest that the word was not present in the original of the *Tractatus longior* (and so that it should be deleted in the edition), although strictly speaking it is out of place. We are often just as careless about inserting an extra ‘that’ in English.

p. 82.28 Sortem: Read ‘hominem’ with Y 41rb30.

p. 84.15 risibilis (both occurrences): Read ‘rudibilis’ with the variant recorded in Boehner’s apparatus, and in agreement with Y 41va5.

p. 85.23 termino: Omit this word, following Y 41va31.

- p. 91.19 Boethius: The reference given in the apparatus is incorrect. It is to Boethius, *De syllogismo hypophetico* I, PL 64, cols. 85 ff. But those columns do not contain the *De syllogismo hypothetico*. The correct reference is col. 845a to at least col. 848c. (The end of the relevant passage is hard to pinpoint.) A more recent edition may be found in Boethius, *De hypotheticis syllogismis*, Luca Obertello, ed., (“Istituto di filosofia dell’università di Parma, ‘Logicalia’: Testi classici di logica,” vol. 1; Brescia: Paideia editrice, 1969), II.I.7.60–II.III.8.94, pp. 258–274.
- p. 92.17 sculicet: Read ‘scilicet’. A simple typographical error.
- p. 94.22 consequentis: Read ‘antecedentis’ with Y 42rb46.
- p. 100.39 minore: Read ‘maiore’ with Y 43ra2.
- p. 101.34 si: Read ‘scilicet’ with Y 43ra21. ‘Si’ makes no syntactical sense here.
- p. 103.7 scientia: Read ‘scientia’. A simple typographical error.
- p. 104.13 de subiecto conditionalis: I conjecture ‘de subiecto antecedentis conditionalis’. Conditionals don’t have subjects, although their antecedents and consequents do, if they are categoricals. The addition of ‘antecedentis’ is required by the example given at p. 104.13–16.
- p. 107.4 intentia: Read ‘intentio’ with Y 43rb56. A simple typographical error.
- p. 114.3 imponere: Read ‘praeponere’ with Y 44ra19. For confirmation, see p. 114.4.
- p. 118.11 enim: Read ‘etiam’ with Y 44rb50. The sentence does not in any way *explain* what went before, so that the edition’s ‘enim’ is out of place.
- p. 119.20 hujus: I conjecture ‘hujusmodi’. Y 44va17 has ‘illa’, which is also possible. In any case, the genitive ‘hujus’ is out of place.
- p. 12.34 infertur: I conjecture a homoeoteleuton after this word. Add: “alia pars. Sed his ex disiunctiva cum contradictorio alterius partis infertur.” Some such emendation is required by the sense of the argument at p. 120.34–35. Y 44va44 agrees with Boehner’s edition.
- p. 126.6–7 si tamen non sit idem antecedens in maiore et consequens in minore: Although Y 45ra16–17 agrees with the edition here, these words make nonsense of the argument. I suggest either omitting them entirely, or else deleting the ‘non’ and changing the ‘si tamen’ to ‘quamvis’ or ‘etiam si’, yielding: “quamvis [*or etiam si*] sit idem antecedens in maiore et consequens in minore.”

p. 129.3–4 fuerunt verae pro eodem tempore, scilicet pro tempore praesenti: Follow the variant reading in Vat. lat. 2146 (Boehner’s MS V), as recorded in the apparatus. (Note that the apparatus suggests that the entire variant recorded there is a substitute for the *one word* ‘fuerunt’ in the edition. Without having seen Vat. lat. 2146, I nevertheless suspect this is an error, and that the variant recorded is a substitute for the entire remainder of the sentence.) Y 45rb11–12 agrees with Boehner’s edition.

p. 131.27 tantus: Read ‘tantum’ with Y 45rb56.

p. 136.31 hominem esse animal: Read ‘animal esse hominem’ with Y 45vb27.

p. 139.10 probationem: The sense requires ‘improbationem’. (See also the following two entries.)

p. 139.12 utrumque: Omit the word, in agreement with the variant recorded in the apparatus. The sense from the context seems to be that a proposition *p* that “includes opposites” implies *its* opposite (that is, it implies the opposite of *p*), not that it implies the *two* opposites it includes (although that is true too). Note that in the apparatus entry for this word, Boehner adds “*In altero tractatu (LPA) L add. ut patet.*” It is not clear what this refers to. There is a somewhat similar passage in the *Tractatus brevior* (p. 249.15–21), for which ‘L’ is the siglum for one of the MSS, but the apparatus there shows no ‘ut patet’. Moreover, ‘A’ does not refer to a MS of the *Tractatus brevior*, and ‘P’ is not one of Boehner’s MS sigla at all. (See Boehner’s edition, pp. xv–xvi.) I conjecture that ‘LPA’ simply means “*Logicae de puritate artis.*” (See also Boehner’s apparatus at pp. 141.7, 146.15.) It is worth mentioning in connection with the immediately preceding entry (about p. 139.10) that in the passage just cited from the *Tractatus brevior* (in particular, at p. 249.18), the two surviving MSS both have ‘probationem’ where ‘improbationem’ is required. (Boehner has emended there accordingly.) It is striking that this substitution of ‘probationem’ for ‘improbationem’ occurs in both treatises in the context of the rule “*omnis propositio includens opposita infert suum oppositum.*” (See also the following entry.)

p. 139.13–14 Ista enim propositio: ‘Tu es ubique’, includit opposita, et ideo infert suum oppositum.: This sentence seems entirely gratuitous, and interrupts the flow of the argument. But note that in the *Tractatus brevior*, the passage cited in the immediately preceding entry (p. 249.15–21) contains the same example, and that it is not at all out of place there. This and the facts discussed in the two immediately preceding entries, above, suggest that here, at p. 139.10–14, Burley is relying loosely on the *Tractatus brevior*, p. 249.15–21, and is being a little careless about what he is taking from it. In particular, it suggests that the ‘probationem’ for ‘improbationem’ at p. 249.19 was a mistake in Burley’s *own* copy of the *Tractatus brevior*, and that it was simply cop-

ied over intact into the *Tractatus longior* at p. 139.10. All this, of course, remains speculative.

p. 140.32 haec: Read ‘hoc’ with Y 46ra46, and in agreement with the variant recorded in the apparatus. The reference is *not* to “haec [propositio]” — i. e., it is not the *proposition* that is signified, but rather the *claim* (‘hoc’, in the neuter) that only the proposition ‘Deus est deus’ is necessary.

p. 141.6 Deum (second occurrence): I conjecture ‘deus’ — nominative instead of accusative. The accusative can be construed, but not with the sense that the sentence goes on to give.

p. 141.17 obliquum dictum: I conjecture ‘obliquum “deum”’. As the rest of the argument indicates, what is being claimed to be the subject here is *not* the whole “dictum” — i. e., not the whole *oratio obliqua* expression ‘Tantum deum esse deum’ or even ‘Deum esse deum’ — but only the *subject* term of that *oratio obliqua*.

p. 143.15 Tantum: I conjecture that the word should be omitted. I cannot make good sense of the sentence with the word; the exclusion is already conveyed by the ‘soli’ later in the line. Nevertheless, Y 46rb36 agrees with the edition.

p. 143.29 aliquid: Read ‘alicui’ with Y 46rb46. ‘Aliquid could only be construed as the subject of ‘addatur’. But the subject of that has to be an implicit ‘exclusio’. Compare also ‘aliqui speciei’ at p. 143.24.

p. 143.30 soli: I conjecture ‘solum’ here, to parallel the construction ‘solum individua’ at p. 143.28. Alternatively, the word could be omitted entirely, in agreement with Y 46rb46.

p. 143.34 animali: I conjecture ‘homine’, to conform to the rule at p. 143.28–29. The example is of an exclusion added to an *individual*-term (‘Socrates’), not to a *species*-term.

p. 147.33 opponitur: The apparatus lists variants here. But the variant listed for Y belongs instead to ‘opponitur’ in the following line, line 34. (I conjecture that the other variants also belong with ‘opponitur’ in line 34, but I have not seen copies of those MSS.)

p. 147.36 contrariantur: I conjecture ‘contradictuntur’, in order to conform to what is said at p. 147.33–34.

p. 153.2–3 ex illa universali posita loco maioris cum minore prioris syllogismi posita loco minoris: I conjecture ‘maiore’ for ‘minore’. The emendation seems required by the sense of the argument. For confirmation, see ‘maiore’ at p. 153.7. Y 47ra44–45 omits the words ‘maioris ... loco’ entirely.

- p. 154.15 Si vero utraque praemissa sit exclusiva affirmativa: I conjecture ‘Si vero in utraque praemissa sit exclusio affirmata’. The text as it stands in the edition, together with the immediately following clause ‘et verbum principale negetur in utraque’ (lines 15–16), yields an impossible description. Y 47ra64 agrees with the edition.
- p. 154.20 non-homo: Read ‘tantum’ before this word, in agreement with Y 47rb1.
- p. 154.26 princidale: Read ‘principale’. A simple typographical error.
- p. 156.37 oppositis: Read ‘opposito’ with Y 47rb48.
- p. 170.6 excipitur: I conjecture that after this word something like “et Socrates excipitur in ista ‘Omnis homo praeter Sortem excipitur’” needs to be added. The addition is required by the argument. For confirmation, see p. 170.14–15. Y 48va3 agrees with Boehner’s edition.
- p. 170.33 praeter unum: Read ‘prolatum’ with Y 48va19. For confirmation, see p. 170.29 and the reference back to this passage at p. 171.17.
- p. 171.16 unum: I conjecture the words “est verum; ergo, quodlibet enuntiabile prolatum aliud” (or the equivalent) after this word. Plainly there is a break of sense in the text as Boehner has it.
- p. 171.23 Omnis: I conjecture ‘aliquis’ for this word, to conform to the example. The sentence ‘Aliquis homo videt omnem asinum’ is supposed to be the pre-jacent of the exceptive proposition quoted here, which means that the exceptive must begin with ‘aliquis’, not with ‘omnis’.
- p. 171.37 exceptis: Read ‘exceptivis’ with Y 48va41.
- p. 172.22–26 [Probatur ... sophisma verum]: Follow the text as given in the apparatus to Boehner’s edition for these lines. The reading in the apparatus conforms to Y 48va53–54. The text as it stands in Boehner’s edition appears only in an abbreviated Erfurt copy of the *Tractatus longior*, and makes no argumentative sense in the context.
- p. 173.5 si: I conjecture ‘nisi’. Otherwise, the sentence does not conform with the rest of the argument.
- p. 173.6 si: Ditto.
- p. 173.13 et: Omit the word, which makes no syntactical sense here.
- p. 174.1 executive: Read ‘consecutive’ with Y 48vb12.
- p. 174.11 immobilitatem: Read ‘immobilitat’ with Y 48vb18.
- p. 174.15 alium asinum praeter Brunellum: Read ‘asinum alium a Brunello’. The reading in Boehner’s text would expound an exceptive by an exceptive. Y

48vb20–21 has “asinum praeter Brunellum vel alium a Brunello,” apparently reflecting variant readings in the MS tradition.

p. 174.21 instanti: Add “igitur nihil est verum nisi in hoc instanti” after this word, following Y 48vb22. (The omission in the edition can be explained by a homoeoteleuton.) Without the words, there is no *argument* here at all, but only a single proposition, so that there can hardly be a “fallacy of the consequent,” as the text claims.

p. 176.17 et: I conjecture ‘id est’ for this word. Otherwise the sentence is merely a *repetition* of the preceding one, whereas the word ‘expositive’ in line 16 suggests that the sentence is to be an *analysis* of the preceding one.

p. 181.10 asinus (first occurrence): Follow the variant reading. The fourth alternative is required since the corresponding affirmative proposition has four exponents.

p. 183.4 vel (first occurrence): Omit this word, in agreement with Y 49rb50.

p. 184.9 est (first occurrence): Add ‘vera’ with the variant recorded in Boehner’s apparatus, and also in accordance with Y 49va2.

p. 185.27 reduplicativa: I conjecture ‘affirmativa’ after this word. For confirmation, see pp. 185.31–186.10.

p. 193.2 est: Add ‘et hanc “Hoc instans corrumpitur quando est,”’ or some equivalent. Such an addition is required by the sense of the context, which talks (*ibid.*) about expounding ‘utrumque’, so that *two* explicable propositions are needed. Y 50ra59 agrees with the edition.

p. 197.29 verbi: Add ‘de’ after this word, in agreement with Y 50rb37. The following word ‘futuro’ cannot be plausibly construed otherwise.

p. 195.13 de cetero: I conjecture ‘sine medio’ here, to conform to the previous expositions of ‘desinit’. See pp. 192.15, 17–18, 20, 22; 193.19, 21. Compare the note on p. 197.1, below.

p. 196.18 dum: Add ‘et “quia”’ after this word. We need the third alternative to conform to line 11.

p. 197.1 de cetero: I conjecture ‘sine medio’ here, to conform to the previous expositions of ‘desinit’. Compare the note on p. 195.13, above.

The *Tractatus brevior*

p. 202.26 immobiliter: The example in the immediately following lines (pp. 202.27–203.4) requires ‘mobiliter’. Y 25rb25 agrees with the edition.²

p. 202.30–31 igitur si Sortes (!) currit, Plato currit: ‘Sortes’ and ‘Plato’ should be reversed, to conform with the parallel passage at p. 67.36–37.

pp. 203.36–204.1: te esse animal ... est verum: Adopt the reading suggested by Gabriel Nuchelmans, “Walter Burleigh on the Conclusion that You Are An Ass,” *Vivarium* 32 (1994), pp. 93–101 at p. 96: “verum; igitur consequens est verum.”

p. 204.27–28 quia ... sequitur: Adopt the variant in the apparatus, following Y 25va15.

p. 204.28 esse (second occurrence): Read ‘est’ for ‘esse’, following Y 25va15.

p. 205.8 non: Delete the word, following Nuchelmans, p. 96.

p. 205.12–15 unus ... Latinum: Adopt the variant readings in accordance with Nuchelmans, p. 97: “bonus: quod ille sciat illam vocem: ‘Tu es homo’ et istud scit laicus ignorans Latinum; et quod iste sciat, quod realiter importatur per hanc propositionem: ‘Tu es homo’, et hoc nescit nisi clericus.”

p. 205.17 asinum: Read ‘animal’, in accordance with Nuchelmans’ suggestion, p. 99.

p. 205.20 asinum: Ditto.

p. 206.34 florenis: Boehner’s edition has this word in parentheses, but gives no reason for them. I conjecture he took the reading from the similar example in the *Tractatus longior*, p. 87.28. Read ‘libris’ with Y 25rb7 and in conformity with p. 207.1.

p. 207.8–11 ex ... antecedentis: Omit these words in accordance with Y 25vb12. The passage appears merely to repeat the preceding point by using a different formulation of contradictory opposites. Moreover, they interrupt the flow of the paragraph. If the words are omitted, the first part of the paragraph (p. 207.3–8) gives a *necessary* condition for a good non-syllogistic inference, while the sentence beginning ‘Et’ (line 8) and continuing from ‘si ex opposito’ (line 11) goes on to say that the condition is also a *sufficient* one. If the dubious words are *not* omitted, the sentence beginning ‘Et’ (lines 8–11)

² I am grateful to Norman Kretzmann for calling this correction to my attention. The passage is translated correctly in Norman Kretzmann and Eleonore Stump, trans. *The Cambridge Translations of Medieval Philosophical Texts*, Volume One: *Logic and the Philosophy of Language*, (New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 1988), at p. 288.

introduces a repetition of the necessity of the condition, and the observation that the condition is also a sufficient one is abruptly tacked onto the end of the paragraph with no transition word.

p. 209.14 conditionis: Read ‘conditionalis’ with Y 25vb51.

p. 213.7 enim: Read ‘tamen’ with Y 27rb23, as recorded in Boehner’s apparatus.

p. 214.19–21 Quia ... antecedens: Something is wrong here. If the inference does *not* follow, then one cannot argue (lines 20–21) “Consequens est falsum, ergo et antecedens.” Furthermore, the ‘asinus’ in line 20 seems irrelevant to the point the passage is trying to prove. I conjecture that these lines should be emended after the pattern of p. 215.19–21, which seems to reply to and accept the argument here. Thus delete the ‘non’ at p. 214.19, and change ‘asinus’ at p. 214.20 to ‘non-homo’.

p. 215.2 simplici negativa: Follow the variant recorded in Boehner’s apparatus, in accordance with Y 27vb55.

p. 215.3 quacumque: Read ‘quocumque’ with Y 27rb56.

p. 217.36 accipiatur: The plural ‘accipiantur’ is required. (Y 27vb12 has ‘accipitur’.)

p. 221.19 compositones: Read ‘compositionis’ with Y 28ra28.

p. 222.10 inclusionem: Read ‘exclusionem’ with Y 28ra41.

p. 225.11–12 Sed ... adverum: For ‘adverum’ (apparently a simple typographical error) read ‘ad verum’. Compare Y 31rb9. I suspect some textual corruption has occurred with these two lines. At first glance, they appear to be addressed most likely to the argument at p. 224.31–33. But, on a closer look, there is another, different response to that argument at p. 225.13–16, immediately following the present lines. Moreover, if p. 225.11–12 are directed to p. 224.31–33, they require a suspiciously abrupt transition in the sense. Note that Boehner’s edition shows an apparently nonsensical variant for line 12 ‘nam ... verum’. The textual difficulties may begin earlier than lines 11–12. For lines 8–11 ‘sensus ... consequentis’, Y 31rb7–8 has³: “sensus ‘Omnem hominem currere non est necessarium’. Et ideo non valet ‘Omnem hominem currere non est necessarium; igitur, nullum hominem currere est verum.’⁴ Sed est fallacia consequentis,” and then continues as in the edition. I am reasona-

³ Note that although Y follows the edition fairly closely from p. 224.25 to p. 224.37 (= Y 31ra57–b3), it then abruptly begins using forms of ‘currere’ regularly for the edition’s forms of ‘sedere’, and continues doing so until the end of the sophism (p. 225.16 = Y 31rb10).

⁴ est verum] *in margine*.

bly confident something has gone wrong in this vicinity, but I am unable to provide a plausible reconstruction.

p. 227.8 substantia nihil est: Read ‘nihil est nulla substantia’ with Y 31rb36. See also the following entry.

p. 227.15 substantia nulla: Read ‘nihil est nulla substantia’ with Y 31rb40. These words are part of the reply to the argument in which the words in the preceding entry occur. I can make no sense of the argument and reply without these emendations.

p. 227.16 substantia aliqua est: Read ‘quodlibet est una substantia’ with the variant recorded in Boehner’s apparatus, in accordance with Y 31rb40.

p. 228.11 veram: I conjecture a ‘non’ after this word; the argument makes no sense without it. But the word does not occur in Boehner’s apparatus or in Y 31ra51.

p. 229.13 et (second occurrence): Omit this word, in accordance with Y 31va5.

p. 229.15 distributio et: Add another ‘distributio’ after these words, in accordance with Y 31va13.

p. 220.20 istorum: Read ‘probationem’ with Y 31va9. The reference is to the argument beginning at p. 228.29.

p. 229.26 primae propositiones: I conjecture ‘primae propositionis’. ‘Primae propositiones’ can be construed here, but seems to me very unlikely.

p. 231.8 probatione: Read ‘improbatione’. The reference is to p. 231.6–7. Y 31va38 agrees with the edition.

p. 232.18 ante: Read ‘ente’ with Y 31vb3. A simple typographical error.

p. 232.31 Homo (first occurrence): Read ‘hoc’ with Y 31vb10.

p. 233.7 Unde simul: Read ‘Similiter’, in accordance with Y 31vb11. The sentence is not in any way a consequence of what has gone before, as suggested by Boehner’s ‘Unde’.

p. 234.2 sint: I conjecture ‘sit’, in conformity with ‘sit’ at p. 234.1 and with the singular ‘est’ later in line 2. Y 31vb32 omits the passage, as Boehner observes in the apparatus to p. 233.35.

p. 234.24 veritas: Read ‘necessitas’ with Y 31vb42.

p. 236.17 de: Read ‘in’ with Y 32ra17.

p. 236.35 modus (first occurrence): I conjecture ‘sit modalis’ after this word. Then move the comma after ‘figura’ to after the added words ‘sit modalis’. I can make little sense of the sentence as it stands in the edition.

p. 237.2 Necessarium est B esse A: Add ‘omne’ after ‘est’. Otherwise the two propositions are not contradictories. Y 32ra29 has “De necessitate omne *B* est *A*,” as recorded in Boehner’s apparatus. This has basically the same sense as “Necessarium est omne *B* esse *A*,” but the argument requires that the modal word can at least plausibly be read as the predicate, which it cannot in ‘De necessitate omne *B* est *A*.’ (Burley, however, is arguing that the modal word is in fact *not* the predicate.)

p. 237.11 syncategorema: I conjecture ‘syncategorematicae’, following Y 32ra33 as recorded in Boehner’s apparatus. The words ‘aliquod syncategorema a parte praedicati mere syncategorema [*or syncategorematicae*]’ (lines 10–11) are awkward on either reading.

p. 237.20–22 esse ... est esse: Perhaps read ‘non omne quod est sit necesse esse, tamen omne quod est quando est, necesse est esse’ with Y 32ra38, as recorded in Boehner’s apparatus. I prefer the variant because of the awkward ‘sed’ in the edition at line 22.

p. 237.26–27: et ... movetur: Omit these words, which make no sense in context. They occur in Y at 32ra41, but make no sense in the context of the argument.

p. 237.34 aliam: Read ‘alteram’ with Y 32ra45.

p. 239.12–21: Item ... paucioribus: For this entire paragraph, Y 32rb14–18 has, in my view, the better text:

Item, sciendum quod ^{/15} ‘contingens’ accipitur dupliciter. Uno modo pro contingenti in communi secundum quod est commune ad omne possibile, sive necessarium sive non ^{/16} necessarium, sive contingens ad utrumlibet sive contingens natum. Alio modo accipitur contingens pro contingenti non communi ^{/17} sed in speciali, divisibile in contingens ad utrumlibet (sive contingens infinitum,⁵ quod idem est), et in contingens natum. ^{/18} Et contingens natum dividitur in contingens ut in pluribus et in contingens ut in paucioribus.

Boehner’s text seems confused and appears to yield a common and a special sense of ‘contingent’ that apply to exactly the same range of cases, so that the point of the distinction is lost.

p. 240.27 ut est actu: I suspect that the variant ‘in suum actum’ as recorded in Boehner’s apparatus is the better reading, although either one will work.

⁵ Infinitum] finitum *sed in- add. in margine.*

- p. 241.6 minor, ergo maior: Read ‘maior, ergo minor’ with Y 32rb42–43. The minor is the sophism-proposition, and that is what is being disproved here.
- p. 241.14 ‘Impossibile est impossibile’: I conjecture ‘Impossibile est possibile’, in order to conform to the disproof at p. 241.5.
- p. 241.15 possibile est impossibile: I conjecture ‘impossibile est possibile’.
- p. 242.4 aliquam unam de praesenti: Read ‘aliquam de praesenti veram’ with Y 32va2. Boehner’s text can be construed in the context, but the reading is much smoother if the ‘veram’ is made explicit.
- p. 242.7 sunt: Read ‘fuerunt’ with Y 32va3. We need the perfect tense, not the present.
- p. 243.7 est: I conjecture ‘esse’. Otherwise, the passage makes no argumentative sense. Compare the entry for p. 243.10, below. Y 32va19 agrees with Boehner’s edition.
- p. 243.8–9 et ... innumera: Read ‘nec debet aliquid praedicari in minori’ with Y 32va20, as noted in Boehner’s apparatus.
- p. 243.10 est (first occurrence): I conjecture ‘esse’. Compare the entry for p. 243.7, above. Y 32va21 agrees with Boehner’s edition.
- p. 246.11 enim: Read ‘igitur’ with Y 32vb12.
- p. 248.4 Non: Read ‘Tamen non’ with Y 32vb47.
- p. 251.4 Solutio: Omit the word, which was supplied by Boehner. The emendation is unnecessary, although it does correctly mark the structure of the discussion.
- p. 251.32–33 subiectum nec pars subiecti: I conjecture ‘praedicatum nec pars praedicati’. The sense of the passage is obscure on either reading. Y 33ra51–52 agrees with Boehner’s edition.
- p. 252.29 Boethium: In addition to the reference supplied by Boehner to the first commentary on the *De interpretatione*, see also the second commentary, PL 64.628B–C. See also the critical edition in *Anicii Manlii Severini Boetii Commentarii in librum Aristotelis Peri Hermeneias*, C. Meiser, ed., 2 vols., (Leipzig: Teubner, 1877–1880), at vol. 1, II.14 (p. 215.18–22), and vol. 2, VI.14 (p. 480.7–9).
- p. 254.13 improbatione: Read ‘probatione’ with Y 33rb32.
- p. 254.19 vel: Read ‘et’ with Y 33rb35.
- p. 254.30 igitur: Read ‘omnis’ after this word, with Y 33rb40. For confirmation, see p. 255.6.

- p. 254.31 homo currit: I conjecture ‘et iste homo albus currit’, or the equivalent, after these words. For confirmation, see the reply at p. 255.3–6. Y 33rb40 has ‘ergo, omnis homo currit, et iste albus, et sic de’. (The ‘sic de’ is perhaps deleted.) See also the entries for p. 255.4, 255.5–6, below.
- p. 255.4 quia in probatione: I conjecture ‘in improbatione quia’. Y 33rb45–46 has ‘in probatione quia’. The ‘improbatio’ (p. 254.30–31) is what is needed here; the ‘probatio’ (p. 254.28–29) is irrelevant.
- p. 254.5–6 homo albus currit: Read ‘est albus’ with Y 33rb46.
- p. 258.7 distributivum: I conjecture ‘distributum’. Y 33va46 has an ambiguous abbreviation that can be read either way.
- p. 258.23 sint: I conjecture ‘sunt’. Y 33vb2 omits the ‘qui’-clause entirely.
- p. 258.23 ergo: Read ‘quilibet’ after this word, following Y 33vb2.
- p. 258.27 sit: Read ‘scit’ with Y 33vb5.
- p. 258.27: [se]lipsum: Read ‘ipsum’ with Y 33vb5. Boehner’s emendation is unnecessary.
- p. 260.13 finita sunt infinita: Read ‘infinita sunt finita’ with Y 33rb37.