

Boni libri or *scartafacia*?

An Inventory of the Commentaries on the ‘Sentences’ as a Mirror of Theological Education at the Dominican *Studium* at Bologna (14th c.)

ANDREA COLLI (Cologne/Vercelli)

I. Introduction*

Three stages characterize the development of the Italian Dominican libraries between the late Middle Ages and Modernity. The *armarium* was not initially a real *libraria* as the collection of books was very limited. At the end of the 13th century, however, the libraries flourished and expanded: several volumes were acquired and located in a specific room (*domus pro libraria*). Finally, in early Modernity, new libraries were built, as the number of manuscripts and documents preserved in the Dominican convents was enormous¹.

The library of the Dominicans’ *Studium* at Bologna typifies this evolutionary process. A philological study conducted on a number of manuscripts appears to reveal at least four different processes of cataloging². However, only a late medieval and a humanistic inventory are now available³.

A broad overview of these catalogues shows that, alongside a considerable number of *boni libri* (ancient and patristic sources, *libri naturales* from the Aristotelian and Arabic tradition, Albert the Great’s and Thomas Aquinas’ writings),

* The present paper was written in the context of the research project “The Lectura Thomasina and the theological education at the Dominicans’ Studium at Bologna (14th-15th century)” funded by the Fritz Thyssen Foundation (Travel Subsidies 2017).

¹ Cf. L. Pellegrini, *La biblioteca e i codici di san Domenico* (secc. XIII–XV), in: R. Lambertini (ed.), *Prædicatores/Doctores. Lo Studium generale dei frati Predicatori nella cultura bolognese tra il ’200 e il ’300* (Memorie domenicane 39), Firenze 2008, 143–159, here 146–147.

² Cf. Pellegrini, *La biblioteca* (nt. 1), 150–151.

³ M.-H. Laurent, *Fabio Vigili et les bibliothèques de Bologne au début du XVI^e siècle d’après le ms. Barb. lat. 3185* (Studi e Testi 106), Vatican City 1943, 203–235, 11–107. For the analysis of Vigili’s inventories and, in particular, of the comparison between these inventories and the manuscripts actually preserved in Bologna (University Library and Archiginnasio Library), see G. Zaccagnini, *Le scuole e la libreria del convento di S. Domenico in Bologna. Dalle origini al secolo XVI*, in: *Atti e memorie della r. Deputazione di storia patria per le province di Romagna*, s. IV, 17 (1927), 228–327; V. Alce/A. D’Amato, *La biblioteca di S. Domenico in Bologna*, Firenze 1961; G. Murano, *I libri di uno Studium generale: l’antica libreria del convento di San Domenico di Bologna*, in: *Annali di Storia delle Università italiane* 13 (2009), 287–304.

several *scartafacia* (partial transcriptions of commentaries on the ‘Sentences’, anonymous theological questions or *catenae aureae*) were preserved in the late medieval Dominican library. However, these kinds of texts – which, in most cases, have not been systematically studied – are no less remarkable than the *boni libri*. Indeed, they reflect the daily educational activities of the Dominican friars at Bologna, by making it possible to sketch the contours of what Martin Grabmann defines as the major center of Dominican cultural activity at the end of the Middle Ages, together with St. Jacques in Paris⁴.

After drawing a map of the commentaries on the ‘Sentences’, preserved in the monumental *domus pro libraria* of St. Dominic’s Convent in the 14th century, the present paper will focus on two particular case studies: the manuscripts A 913 (Bologna, Archiginnasio Library) and A 986 (Bologna, Archiginnasio Library). The analysis provides an explanatory illustration of how the convent of St. Dominic in Bologna is actively and directly involved in several theological and philosophical discussions characterizing the Parisian milieu in the first decades of the 14th century.

II. A catalogue of the commentaries on the ‘Sentences’ in St. Dominic’s late medieval library

The first inventory⁵, dated approximately 1380⁶, includes 472 short items⁷ that do not provide sufficient information for establishing exactly which books stood on the shelf in the library of St. Dominics’ convent at the end of the 14th century. By contrast, the catalogue published by Fabio Vigili at the beginning of the 16th century presents more significant details⁸. Therefore, a complete collection of the commentaries on the ‘Sentences’ preserved in the Dominicans’ libra-

⁴ M. Grabmann, *La scuola tomistica italiana nel XIII e principio del XIV secolo. Ricerche sui manoscritti*, in: *Rivista di filosofia neoscolastica* 15 (1923), 97–155, here 99. On the central role played by the Dominican studium in Bologna in late medieval theological studies see, among others, G. Mazzanti, *Lo Studium nel XIV secolo*, in: O. Capitani, *Bologna nel Medioevo*, Bologna 2007 (*Storia di Bologna* 2), 951–975; M. Mulchahey, *The Dominicans’ Studium at Bologna and its relationship with the university in the thirteenth century*, in: Lambertini (ed.), *Praedicatorum/Doctores* (nt. 1), 17–30.

⁵ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 203–235. The manuscript of this inventory is preserved in Bologna, Archivio di Stato, Archivio di S. Domenico 240/7574, Campione II, *Liber Possessionum conventus Praedicatorum de Bononia*, foll. 94r–97v. A partial edition of the text is published in L. Frati, *La Biblioteca del Convento dei Domenicani in Bologna*, in: *L’Archiginnasio* 5 (1910), 217–223 and in C. Lucchesi, *L’antica libreria dei padri domenicani di Bologna alla luce del suo inventario*, in: *Atti e memorie della Deputazione di storia patria per le province di Romagna* 5 (1939/1940), 205–252.

⁶ Cf. Alce/D’Amato, *La biblioteca* (nt. 3), 126–127; Murano, *I libri di uno Studium* (nt. 3), 288.

⁷ Twelve further items are included in the list of *Registrum librorum refectorii*. Cf. Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 4), 235.

⁸ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 11–107. The manuscript of Fabio Vigili’s inventory is preserved in Vaticano, Barb. lat. 3185.

ry in the Late Middle Ages certainly requires a comparison between these two different inventories⁹.

Thomas Aquinas' 'Super Sententiarum libros' were obviously preserved in several copies. Manuscripts of all four books were contained in the first and in the second *bancha*¹⁰ on the right side¹¹. Then, further copies of individual books (in particular the second and the third book) were placed in the fourth¹², ninth¹³, eleventh¹⁴ *bancha*. The only copy of the second and third book of Albert the Great's 'Super quattuor libros Sententiarum' was located in the ninth *bancha*¹⁵.

Further, a significant number of other commentaries on the 'Sentences' was located from the seventh to tenth *bancha*. The table below presents this collection of texts in the style of a modern bibliographical catalogue:

Autor	Title	Late medieval location		Actual location
Aegidius Romanus	Commentarium in librum I Sententiarum ¹⁶	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In decima bancha</i>	lost

⁹ The comparison between the two available inventories is generally adopted as a starting point by several studies on the library of St. Dominic. See, among the others, Lucchesi, *L'antica libreria* (nt. 5); Murano, *I libri di uno Studium generale* (nt. 3).

¹⁰ The late medieval *domus pro libraria* of St. Dominic comprised 52 *banchae* (26 on the right side and 26 on the left side).

¹¹ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 203–204: "*In prima bancha a latere dextro in introitu librerie [...] Item primus sententiarum. Item secundus. Item tertius. Item quartus: omnes eiusdem doctoris. [...] In secunda bancha [...] Item primus sententiarum. Item secundus. Item quartus. Item tertius.*"

¹² *Ibid.*, 205: "*In quarta bancha [...] Item secundus sententiarum eiusdem.*"

¹³ *Ibid.*, 209–210: "*In nona bancha [...] Item tertius sententiarum sancti Thome.*"

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 210–211: "*In XI bancha [...] Item tertius sententiarum sancti Thome; et sunt numero IX.*" The manuscripts of Aquinas' 'Commentary on the Sentences', originally preserved in St. Dominic's Library, are now presumably in the Bologna University Library: 'Super lib. I–II Sententiarum' (1505, foll. 1ra–188ra); 'Super lib. II Sententiarum' (1655¹⁰, foll. 1ra–120rb); 'Super lib. III Sententiarum' (1655¹¹, foll. 1ra–122va); 'Super lib. IV Sententiarum' (1655¹², foll. 1ra–224vb). Cf. L. Frati, *Indice dei codici latini conservati nella R. Biblioteca Universitaria di Bologna*, in: *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 16 (1908), 343, 372–373; *Codices manuscripti operum Thomae de Aquino (Editores operum sancti Thomae de Aquino 2)*, vol. 1: *Autographa et Bibliothecae A–F*, ed. H. V. Shooner, Roma 1973, here 106–117.

¹⁵ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 209–210: "*In nona bancha [...] Item tertius sententiarum fratris Alberti Theotonici. [...] Item secundus sententiarum magistri Alberti Theotonici.*" These manuscripts were lost. Cf. W. Fauser, *Die Werke des Albertus Magnus in ihrer handschriftlichen Überlieferung. Teil I: Die echten Werke (Alberti Magni Opera omnia, tomus subsidiarius I)*, Münster 1982, 278–284.

¹⁶ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 210: "*Item primum fratris Egidii.*" The manuscript was not comprised in Vigili's inventory. In fact, a copy of the first book of Giles of Rome's 'Commentary on the Sentences' is actually preserved in Bologna, University Library, 2049. This manuscript was, however, copied in the 15th century and was not originally maintained in St. Dominic's Library (*prov. Iacopo da Pesaro*). Cf. Frati, *Indice* (nt. 15), 423.

Autor	Title	Late medieval location		Actual location
Alexander Halensis	Glossa in quattuor libros Sententiarum (I–III) ¹⁷	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In octava banca</i>	Bologna, Archiginnasio Library, A 920.
Bombolognus de Bononia	Commentaria in quattuor libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi ¹⁸	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In decima banca</i>	Bologna, University Library: (I) 1506, foll. 1ra–98va, 99vb–114ra; (II) lost; (III) 1508, foll. 3ra–116vb; (IV) lost ¹⁹ .
Bonaventura de Balneoregio	Commentaria in tertium librum Sententiarum ²⁰	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In decima banca</i>	lost
Gregorius Ariminensis	Lectura super primum et secundum Sententiarum ²¹	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In decima banca</i>	lost
Guillelmus de Ware	Super Sententias (II) ²²	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In nona banca</i> (*)	Bologna, Archiginnasio, A 913, foll. 67ra–96vb

¹⁷ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 209: “*Item opus fratris Alexandri super primum et secundum sententiarum. Item eiusdem super tertium sententiarum.*” Cf. Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 28: “*Alexandri de Ales, ordinis Minorum, summa in tribus codicibus.*” Cf. Lucchesi, Inventari (nt. 5), 90–91.

¹⁸ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 210: “*Item primus fratris Bombologni Bononiensis. Item secundus eiusdem. Item tertius eiusdem. Item quartus eiusdem.*” Cf. *ibid.*, 28: “*Bonbologni, sive Bombolognini de Gabiano Bononiensis, ordinis Praedicatorum, scriptum super primo sententiarum, et super 2°, 3° et 4°, in quatuor divisio codicibus.*” Cf. Frati, Indice (nt. 14), 343–344; F. Pelster, Les Manuscrits de Bombolognus de Bologne, in: *Recherches de théologie anc. et médiévale* 9 (1937), 404–412; F. Stegmüller, Repertorium Commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi, vol. 1: textus, Würzburg 1947, 54–56; T. Kaepfeli, Bombolognus de Bononia, in: *id.*, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, vol. 1: A–F, Rome 1970, 246–247.

¹⁹ Laurent identified the fourth book of Bombolognus’ ‘Commentary on the Sentences’ in an anonymous commentary preserved in Bologna, Archiginnasio, B 1420. In fact, nothing indicates that this text was written by Bombolognus. Cf. A. Oliva, I codici autografi di fra Bombologno da Bologna, O.P. e la datazione del suo commento al I libro delle Sentenze (1268–1279 c.), in: Lambertini (ed.), *Praedicatorum/Doctores* (nt. 1), 87–103, here 88.

²⁰ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 210: “*Item tertius fratris Bonaventure.*” The manuscript is not comprised in Vigili’s inventory.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 210: “*Item primus magistri Gregorii. Item secundus eiusdem.*” Cf. *ibid.*, 28: “*Gregorii de Arimino, Augustinensis, primus et 2° sententiarum.*” Cf. V. Marcolino, Einleitung, in: *Gregorii Ariminensis OESA Lectura super primum et secundum Sententiarum*, ed. A. Trapp/V. Marcolino, vol. I, Berlin–New York 1981, XLVI–XLVII.

²² Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 210: “*Item quedam quaestiones disputatae.*” Cf. Lucchesi, Inventari (nt. 5), 84–95. Stegmüller, Repertorium (nt. 18), 142–143. An in-depth analysis of this *item* will be the subject of the next paragraph.

Autor	Title	Late medieval location		Actual location
Guillelmus Petrus de Godino	Lectura Thomasina ²³	<i>A latere sinistro</i>	<i>In XX bancha</i> (*)	Bologna, Archiginnasio, A 986.
Henricus de Cervo Coloniensis	Super quattuor libros Sententiarum ²⁴	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In octava bancha</i>	Bologna, Archiginnasio, A 1029.
Iohannes de Ripa	Lectura super primum librum Sententiarum ²⁵	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In decima bancha</i>	lost
Iohannes Duns Scotus	Super Sententias (I) ²⁶	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In nona bancha</i>	lost
Iohannes Went	Quaestiones super Sententiarum libros ²⁷	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In nona bancha</i>	Bologna, Archiginnasio, A 939.
Osbertus Anglicus	Lectura Sententiarum ²⁸	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In octava bancha</i>	Bologna, Archiginnasio, A 1024, foll. 1ra–25vb.

²³ T. Kaeppli, Guillelmus Petri de Godino Baionensis, in: id., *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*, vol. 2: G–I, Roma 1975, 152–155; W. Goris/M. Pickavé, Die Lectura Thomasina des Guillelmus Petri de Godino (ca. 1260–1336). Ein Beitrag zur Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte, in: J. Hamesse (ed.), *Roma, magistra mundi. Itineraria culturae medievalis. Mélanges offerts au Père L. E. Boyle à l'occasion de son 75e anniversaire (Textes et Études du Moyen Âge 10/1)*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1998, 83–109. Further consideration on this manuscript will be made in the next paragraph.

²⁴ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 209: “*Item lectura fratris Iohannis Theotonici super quattuor libros sententiarum.*” Cf. *ibid.*, 28: “*Ioannis de Cervo Teutonici ordinis Praedicatorum, scriptum super IIII libros sententiarum.*” Cf. Lucchesi, *Inventari* (nt. 5), 138, in particular nt. 1; M. Grabmann, *Der Sentenzenkommentar des Magister Henricus de Cervo und die Kölner Dominikanertheologie des 14. Jahrhunderts*, in: *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 12 (1942), 98–117; Stegmüller, *Repertorium* (nt. 18), 148. T. Kaeppli, Henricus de Cervo Coloniensis, in: id., *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum* (nt. 23), 189.

²⁵ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 4), 210: “*Item primus magistri Iohannis de Ripis.*” Cf. *ibid.*, 27: “*Ioannis de Ripis de Marchia, ordinis Minorum, scriptum super primum sententiarum.*” Cf. Stegmüller, *Repertorium* (nt. 18), 237–239.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 209: “*Item primus Scoti super sententias.*” The manuscript was not comprised in Vigili’s inventory.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 209: “*Item lectura fratris Iohannis Menbenth.*” Cf. *ibid.*, 27: “*Ioannis Went Anglici scriptum super primo et II sententiarum.*” Cf. Lucchesi, *Inventari* (nt. 28), 102; Stegmüller, *Repertorium* (nt. 18), 248; J. Lechner, *Kleine Beiträge zur Geschichte des englischen Franziskaner-Schrifttums im Mittelalter*, in: *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 53 (1940), 374–385, here 376–379; R. Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540* (Publications of the Journal of Medieval Latin 1), Turnhout 1997, 344.

²⁸ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 4), 209: “*Item lectura fratris Osberti, ordinis Carmilitarum, super sententias.*” Cf. *ibid.*, 29: “*Osberti sive Oysberti, carmelite, scriptum super sententias.*” Cf. Lucchesi, *Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d’Italia*, vol. 32, Firenze 1925, 136; Stegmüller, *Repertorium* (nt. 18),

Autor	Title	Late medieval location		Actual location
Petrus de Tarentasia (Innocentius V)	In quattuor libros Sententiarum ²⁹	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In decima bancha</i>	Bologna, University Library, 1629.
Ricardus Fischacre	In quattuor libros Sententiarum (I–II) ³⁰	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In septima bancha</i>	Bologna, University Library, 1546, foll. 1ra–258vb.
Robertus Halifax	Lectura super I et II librum sententiarum	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In nona bancha</i>	Bologna, Archiginnasio, A 974.
Robertus Holcot	Opus quaestionum ac determinationum super libros Sententiarum ³¹	<i>A latere dextro</i>	<i>In decima bancha</i>	lost

The library presented a diverse collection of commentaries on the ‘Sentences’. There were not only texts published in the Dominican environment, but also texts written by Franciscan and Augustinian theologians. If we compare this with the number of manuscripts of *quaestiones* or *quodlibeta* edited by other notorious masters – such as Henry of Ghent, Peter of Auvergne, John of Neaple, or Harvey of Nedellec –, and preserved in Bologna, it is clear that the *domus libraria* in St. Dominic reflected the philosophical and theological debates that were on the agenda in Paris (and also in Oxford) in those years. A master or a scholar that pursued his studies in Bologna was effectively immersed into the most animated discussions of his time. Moreover, the strong presence of writings by the Franciscan milieu is particularly noteworthy in this regard: the Domi-

296–297; R. Copsey, *The Carmelites in England 1242–1540: Surviving Writings*, in: *Carmel in Britain* 3, Faversham – Rome 2004; *Bibliotheca Carmelitana, notis criticis et dissertationibus illustrata: cura et labore unius e Carmelitis provinciae Turoniae collecta / opus P. Cosmae de Villiers*, Rome 1927, vol. II, coll. 520–521.

²⁹ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 210: “*Item primus et secundus magistri Petri de Tarentasia. Item tertius et quartus eiusdem super sententias.*” Cf. *ibid.*, 22–23: “*Petri de Tarantasio, ordinis Praedicatorum, qui fuit postmodum Innocentius papa V; super 3° et 4° sententiarum expositio [...] Petrus de Tarantasio, ordinis Praedicatorum, super primo et 2° sententiarum.*” Cf. Frati, *Indice* (nt. 14), 369; Stegmüller, *Repertorium* (nt. 18), 336. This manuscript is not comprised in the list compiled by Kaeppli.

³⁰ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 208: “*Item primus et secundus sententiarum magistri Ricardi Anglici.*” Cf. *ibid.*, 26: “*Ricardi Anglici, ordinis Praedicatorum, scriptum in primos sententiarum.*” Cf. Frati, *Indice* (nt. 5), 350–351; F. Pelster, *Das Leben und die Schriften des Oxfordener Dominikanerlehrers Richard Fishacre (†1248)*, in: *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 54 (1930), 518–553, here 526; Stegmüller, *Repertorium* (nt. 18), 348; T. Kaeppli, Ricardus Fishacre, in: *id.*, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, vol. 3, Rome 1980, 304.

³¹ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 210: “*Item opus fratris Roberti super sententias.*” Cf. Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 4), 28: “*Roberti Anglici scriptum super II°, III° et 4° sententiarum.*” This lost manuscript is attributed to Robert Holcot by Laurent, but this is evidently a pure conjecture.

nican library provided a partial transcription³² of the commentaries of Alexander of Hales, Bonaventura, William of Ware, John Duns Scotus, John Went, John of Ripa and Robert Halifax. Two cases (marked with an asterisk in the above table) are worth a closer look, and the first one concerns exactly the presence of the transmission of Franciscan thought in Bologna.

III. The case of A 913

Codex A 913, preserved in the Archiginnasio Library, is an interesting patchwork of very different works. However, it reveals, once again, certain distinctive traits of the teaching activities in Bologna. There are at least three different descriptions of this codex: the first was provided by Carlo Lucchesi in 1925³³; a second partial survey was provided by Jean Paul Müller³⁴, the third, and more detailed, by Raymond Macken in 1979³⁵. The codex consists of a conflation of two manuscripts, copied in Italy at the beginning of the 14th century³⁶. Folia 1–22 comprise a very suggestive *catena aurea* of excerpts from the first book of the commentaries on the ‘Sentences’ written by some prominent theologians (mostly Dominicans) between the end of the 13th century and the first decades of the 14th century (John of Paris, John of Sterngassen, Durand of St. Pourçain, Peter of Auvergne, William Anglicus³⁷ and presumably Giles of Rome³⁸). This is a typical text aimed at presenting a brief overview of opinions expressed concerning certain topics. Of course, especially after his canonization, Dominican scholars read entire works of Thomas Aquinas³⁹. However, it is not plausible that they studied other commentaries on the ‘Sentences’ systematically. Therefore, this *catena aurea* served as a practical teaching *compendium*.

Folia 23–130 comprise other kinds of text. According to Lucchesi, an anonymous series of questions on the first book of Peter Lombard’s ‘Sentences’ are copied from foll. 23ra to 46vb⁴⁰. However, with reference to Stegmüller’s ‘Re-

³² As the first inventory is dated around 1380, we cannot completely exclude that these works were preserved in their entirety at the beginning of 14th century.

³³ Lucchesi, *Inventari* (nt. 28), 84–85.

³⁴ J.-P. Müller, Introduction, in: Jean de Paris (Quidort) O.P., *Commentaire sur les Sentences. Reportation I* (Studia Anselmiana 47), Roma 1961, 18–20.

³⁵ R. Macken, *Bibliotheca Manuscripta Henrici de Gandavo* (Ancient and Medieval Philosophy. De Wulf-Mansion Centre, serie 2), Leuven-Leiden 1979, 64–68. However, Macken did not consider the corrections made by Müller to Stegmüller’s description. Cf. nt. 44 infra.

³⁶ Cf. Macken, *Bibliotheca* (nt. 35), 64–68.

³⁷ This is the conjecture of Raymond Macken. Cf. Macken, *Bibliotheca* (nt. 35), 66.

³⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, 66.

³⁹ See, among the others, A. A. Robiglio, *La sopravvivenza e la gloria. Appunti sulla formazione della prima scuola tomista (sec. XIV)* (Sacra doctrina 53/1), Bologna 2008, 53–54; A. A. Robiglio, *Se un savio omo diventa santo. Un aspetto della reputazione di Tommaso d’Aquino per gli studenti del Trecento*, in: *Studia, studenti, religione. Quaderni di storia religiosa* 16 (2009), 159–173.

⁴⁰ Cf. Lucchesi, *Inventari* (nt. 28), 84.

pertorium'⁴¹, Macken considers the text a partial transcription of the first book of William of Ware's 'Commentarium in Sententias Petri Lombardi'⁴². Indeed, as was demonstrated by Müller⁴³, the text at issue is a copy of some questions of Quidort's 'Commentary on the Sentences'⁴⁴. A similar situation occurs with regard to foll. 67ra–96vb: Lucchesi considers the text copied in these folia a series of anonymous questions on the second book of the 'Sentences'; Macken – in this case appropriately – follows Stegmüller and considers this transcription an incomplete copy of the second book of Ware's 'Commentary'⁴⁵. The second part of the codex comprises also the fourth treatise of Harvey of Nedellec's 'De quattuor materiis (Tractatus de intellectu et voluntate fratris Hervei britonis ordinis praedicatorum contra henricum de gandavo)⁴⁶ (foll. 47ra–64vb) and the anonymous 'Correctorium corruptorii "Sciendum"⁴⁷ (foll. 97ra–130vb). The latter two further confirm the presence of books reproducing the liveliest discussions of the late Middle Ages in St. Dominic's library.

Returning to Ware's 'Commentary on the Sentences', there are certain aspects that are worth examining. In fact, Stegmüller identified a large number of codices preserving this text⁴⁸, which is an obvious sign of the central role played by this "shadowy but important figure in scholasticism at the turn of the thirteenth to the fourteenth century"⁴⁹. However, a complete critical edition of this text is not yet available. There are only transcriptions or editions of single *quaestiones*⁵⁰.

⁴¹ Cf. Stegmüller, Repertorium (nt. 18), 142.

⁴² Cf. Macken, Bibliotheca (nt. 35), 66.

⁴³ Müller, Introduction, in: Jean de Paris (Quidort) O.P. (nt. 34) 18–20.

⁴⁴ In detail, from dist. 17, q. 1: *Utrum caritas sit aliquid creatum in anima vel sit Spiritus Sanctus* (Bologna, Archiginnasio, A 913, fol. 23ra–23va) to distinction 39 (q. 1): *Utrum sit ponere fatum* (Bologna, Archiginnasio, A 913, foll. 41ra–42ra). From dist. 42, q. 1: *Utrum in Deo sit potentia* (Bologna, Archiginnasio, A 913, fol. 42ra–42rb) to dist. 48, q. 1: *Utrum homo possit vel teneatur conformare voluntatem voluntati divinae* (Bologna, Archiginnasio, A 913, foll. 45vb–46vb).

⁴⁵ Cf. Macken, Bibliotheca (nt. 35), 67.

⁴⁶ Cf. L. M. De Rijk, General Introduction, in: Hervaeus Natalis O. P. De quattuor materiis sive Determinationes contra magistrum Henricum de Gandavo. vol. I: De formis (together with his De unitate formae substantialis in eodem supposito) (Studia Artistarum 30), Turnhout 2011, XIII.

⁴⁷ Cf. P. Glorieux, Introduction, in: Les premières polémiques thomistes, vol. 2: Le Correctorium Corruptorii "Sciendum" (Bibliothèque thomiste 31), ed. P. Glorieux, Paris 1956, 24–25.

⁴⁸ Cf. Stegmüller, Repertorium (nt. 18), 142–143.

⁴⁹ R. L. Friedman, Trinitarian Theology and Philosophical Issues: Trinitarian Texts from the Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries, in: Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge grec et latin 72 (2001), 89–168, here 91.

⁵⁰ For an updated catalogue of the edited questions, see R. Schönberg e. a., Repertorium edierter Texte des Mittelalters aus dem Bereich der Philosophie und angrenzender Gebiete, vol. 2, Berlin 2011, 1766–1769. Cf. also F. X. Putallaz, Figure Francescane alla fine del XIII secolo (Eredità Medievale 96/3), Milan 1996, 115–117. Questions numbering follows the question list found in A. Daniels, Zu den Beziehungen zwischen Wilhelm von Ware und Johannes Duns Scotus, in: Franziskanische Studien 4 (1917), 221–238.

León Amorós edited the fourth question of the prologue⁵¹. Then, with regard to the first book, Augustine Daniels proposed editions of questions 14 (*Utrum Deus sit*), 19 (*Utrum quod videtur ab aliquo cognoscitive quocumque modo videatur in lumine alio quam sit intellectus agentis*) and 21 (*Utrum Deum esse per se sit notum*)⁵², while Peter Muscat transcribed question 15 (*Utrum Deus sit unus tantum sola fide teneatur*)⁵³. Russell Friedman and Chris Schabel edited questions 38 (*Utrum Pater producat Filium necessitate*), 39 (*Utrum Pater genuit Filium voluntate*), 53 (*Utrum Spiritus Sanctus procedat per modum voluntatis*), 54 (*Utrum Spiritus Sanctus procedat a Patre et Filio*), and 55 (*Utrum Pater posset producer Spiritum Sanctum supposito quod non haberet virtutem producendi Filium*)⁵⁴. Friedman also edited questions 56 (*Utrum Spiritus Sanctus distingueretur a Filio si non procederet ab eo*) and 61 (*Utrum generatio differat a spiratione*)⁵⁵. Another twelve questions were edited by Michael Schmaus, namely q. 78 (*Utrum in Deo sit ponenda aliqua relatio realis*), q. 79 (*Utrum relations in divinis constituent personas*), q. 83 (*Utrum Pater generet quia Pater aut quia generat ideo Pater*), q. 85 (*Utrum verbum secundum quod est pars imagines et perfecte repraesentat Verbum increatum sit terminus intellectionis vel principium*), q. 90 (*Utrum innascibilitas sit proprietas Patris*), and q. 92 (*Utrum generari sit proprietas constitutive Filii*)⁵⁶. Athanasius

⁵¹ Cf. L. Amorós, La teología como ciencia práctica en la escuela franciscana en los tiempos que preceden a Escoto, in: Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge 9 (1934), 291–303. Amorós used two manuscripts: Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, XXXIII and Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Conv. Soppr. A 4, 42.

⁵² Cf. A. Daniels, Quellenbeiträge und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Gottesbeweise im dreizehnten Jahrhundert (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters. Texte und Untersuchungen 8), Münster 1909, 89–104; id., Quaestio über das menschliche Erkennen, in: J. Geysler (ed.), Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie: Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag. Clemens Bäumker gewidmet von seinen Schülern und Freunden (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, Supplementband 1), Münster 1913, 311–318. Daniels used the following manuscripts: Vienna, Nationalbibliothek 1424, Vienna, Nationalbibliothek 1438, Oxford, Merton College 103, Leipzig Universitätsbibliothek, cod. lat. 527.

⁵³ Cf. P. Muscat, Guillelmi de Ware Quaestio inedita de unitate Dei, in: Antonianum 2 (1927), 335–350. Like Spettmann, Muscat transcribed Ware's text from Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, lat. Plut. 33 dext. 1.

⁵⁴ Cf. R. L. Friedman/C. Schabel, Trinitarian Theology and Philosophical Issues IV: English Theology ca. 1300: William of Ware and Richard of Bromwich, in: Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge grec et latin 75 (2004), 127–128; 128–133; 133–135; 135–141; 141–146. Friedman and Schabel referred to three main manuscripts: Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, lat. Plut. 33 dext. 1; Vatican City, Chigi lat., B VII 114; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 1424. In addition, readings have been checked occasionally, using Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 1438.

⁵⁵ Cf. Friedman/Schabel, Trinitarian Theology (nt. 54), 99–112. In preparing the edition of these questions, Friedman and Schabel used the following manuscripts: Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 1424; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 1438; Vatican City, Chigi lat., B VII 114; Vatican City, Chigi lat., B VII 135; Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, lat. Plut. 33 dext. 1.

⁵⁶ Cf. M. Schmaus, Der Liber Propugnatorius des Thomas Anglicus und die Lehrunterschiede zwischen Thomas von Aquin und Duns Scotus (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters. Texte und Untersuchungen 29/1), Münster 1930, 234*–285*; id., Augustinus und die Trinitätslehre Wilhelms von Ware, in: M. Grabmann/J. Mausbach (eds.), Aurelius Augustinus: Die Festschrift der Görres-Gesellschaft zum 1500. Todestage des Heiligen

Ledoux transcribed question 63 (*Utrum Spiritus Sanctus sit caritas qua homo diligit Deum et proximum*)⁵⁷

Regarding the second book, Ludwig Hödl edited question 107 (*Utrum aliqua creatura propria vel aliena virtute possit creare*)⁵⁸, while Hieronymus Spettmann transcribed question 129 (*Utrum species requiratur in intellectu propter defectum potentiae vel propter absentiam obiecti*)⁵⁹.

Concerning the third book, Jean-Marie Bissen published question 162 (*Utrum Filius Dei fuisset incarnatus, si homo non peccasset*)⁶⁰, while an edition of question 165 (*Utrum beata Virgo concept fuerit in originali peccato*) was provided in Quaracchi's edition⁶¹. A transcription of question 179 (*Utrum in Christo sint duae filiationes*) was presented by Éphrem Longpré⁶².

With regard to the fourth book, Willibrord Lampen transcribed question 192 (*Utrum sacramenta possint efficere aliquid absolutum positivum in anima*)⁶³, while Hermann Weber edited question 223 (*Utrum resurrectio sit possibilis*)⁶⁴.

Augustinus, Köln 1930, 315–352. Schmaus used seven manuscripts: Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, lat. Plut. 33 dext. 1; Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 527; Münster, Universitätsbibliothek, 92; Oxford, Merton College, 103; Vatican City, Vat. Lat. 1115; Vienna Nationalbibliothek, 1424; Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, 1438.

- ⁵⁷ Cf. A. Ledoux, *De gratia creata et increata iuxta quaestionem ineditam Guillelmi de Ware*, in: *Antonianum* 5 (1930), 148–156. Ledoux transcribed the text from Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, XXXIII.
- ⁵⁸ L. Hödl, *Literar- und problemgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Sentenzenkommentar des Wilhelm von Ware O.M. (nach 1305)*, in: *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 57 (1990), 122–141. Hödl's edition is based on six manuscripts: Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, 1438; Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 527; Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, lat. Plut. 33 dext. 1; Oxford, Merton College, 103; Münster, Universitätsbibliothek 527; Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, 1424.
- ⁵⁹ Cf. H. Spettmann, *Die Erkenntnislehre der mittelalterlichen Franziskanerschule von Bonaventura bis Scotus*, Paderborn 1925, 80–85. Spettmann transcribes Ware's text from Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, lat. Plut. 33 dext. 1.
- ⁶⁰ Cf. J.-M. Bissen, *Question inédite de Guillaume de Ware sur le motif de l'incarnation*, in: *Etudes Franciscaines* 46 (1934), 218–222.
- ⁶¹ Cf. Gulielmi Guarrae/Joannis Duns Scoti/Petri Aureoli, *Quaestiones disputatae de immaculata conceptione Beatae Mariae Virginis* (Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica Medii Aevi 3), Florence 1904, 1–11. The editors used the following manuscripts: Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, lat. Plut. 33 dext. 1, Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Conv. soppr. A 4 42 and Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, C 4 991.
- ⁶² Cf. E. Longpré, *De beata Virginis maternitate et relatione ad Christum*, in: *Antonianum* 7 (1932), 289–313. Longpré transcribed from the manuscript of Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, lat. Plut. 33 dext. 1.
- ⁶³ Cf. W. Lampen, *De causalitate sacramentorum iuxta scholam franciscanam*, in: *Florilegium Patristicum* 26 (1931), 37–45. Lampen transcribed the text of Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, XXXIII.
- ⁶⁴ Cf. H. Weber, *Die Lehre von der Auferstehung der Toten in den Haupttraktaten der scholastischen Theologie von Alexander von Hales zu Duns Scotus* (Freiburger theologische Studien 91), Freiburg e. a. 1973, 362–369. Weber used two manuscripts: Vatican City, Vat. Chigi, B VII 114; Münster, lat. 128 (92).

Finally, a selection of passages from all four books is contained in the comprehensive study of Gedeon Gal on Ware's philosophical doctrines⁶⁵.

The manuscripts preserved in the Biblioteca Laurenziana (F), in the Vienna Nationalbibliothek, 1438 (A) – 1424 (W), and in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Chigi B VIII 135 (C) – B VII 114 (V) are the most frequently used. Then, in his study, Friedman shapes an idea of manuscript groupings, by emphasizing a strong affinity between FV on the one hand and ACW on the other⁶⁶. Certainly, being incomplete and corrupted, the manuscript of Archiginnasio is not taken into account by any of these transcriptions or editions. In fact, after Stegmüller's inventory, no study effectively aimed at exploring the contents of this copy.

The exemplar begins *ex abrupto*: “*et volo quod raptim transeat, et accipio aliam immediate quae eodem modo potest stare et raptim transire. Istae duae cogitationes [...]*”⁶⁷. This is a part of question 117 (*Utrum operations angelorum mensurentur tempore vel aeo vel instanti temporis*). Then, the manuscript includes another thirty-five (complete) questions of the second book⁶⁸:

Daniels' table of contents	Bol
118. Utrum angelus sit in loco corporali	67rb: Utrum angelus sit in loco corporali
119. Utrum angelus possit esse in loco punctuali	68ra: Utrum angelus possit esse in puncto
120. Utrum angelus possit esse simul in diversis locis	-----
121. Utrum plures angeli possint esse simul in eodem loco	68vb: Utrum plures angeli sint simul in eodem loco
122. Utrum angelus possit moveri successive.	70rb: Utrum angelus possit moveri motu continuo
123. Utrum angelus possit ferre se ab uno loco in alium non transeundo per medium	-----
124. Utrum possit movere se continue vel semper necesse sit, quod moveatur discontinue et discrete.	-----
125. Utrum angelus possit moveri de loco in instanti	71ra: Utrum angelus possit moveri in instanti

⁶⁵ Cf. G. Gal, Gulielmi de Ware, O. F. M. Doctrina philosophica per summa capita proposita, in: *Franciscan Studies*, 14 (1954), 155–180; 265–292. Gal based his study on three manuscripts: Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, lat. Plut. 33 dext. 1, Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Conv. soppr. A.4.42 and C.4.991.

⁶⁶ Cf. Friedman, *Trinitarian Theology* (nt. 54), 92–93.

⁶⁷ Cf. Stegmüller, *Repertorium* (nt. 18), 142; cf. Macken, *Bibliotheca* (nt. 35), 66.

⁶⁸ The table below compares the incipits of the questions from W transcribed by Daniels (*Daniels, Zu den Beziehungen* (nt. 50), 230–239) with the excerpts of Bologna, Archiginnasio, A 913 (Bol). In the transcription from Bol, the spelling of the texts has been classicized: u and v have been distinguished and j is not used; the Latin classical diphthong has been used; punctuation and capitalization have been modernized and abbreviations spelled out.

Daniels' table of contents	Bol
126. An angelus et anima sint compositi ex materia et forma	71vb: Utrum in angelo sit compositio materiae et formae
127. Utrum angelus intelligat se per suam essentiam formaliter	73ra: Utrum angelus intelligat se per essentiam suam
128. Utrum angelus intelligat omnia alia a se per species vel habitus	74rb: Utrum illud per quod intelligit angelus debeat dici habitus vel species
129. Utrum species requiratur in intellectu propter defectum potentiae vel propter absentiam obiecti	75rb: Utrum in actu intelligendi hominis requiratur species propter defectum a parte potentiae, videlicet propter potentialitatem intellectus ut ad actum reducitur vel tantum propter absentiam obiecti vel per alia verba
130. Utrum angelus intelligat per species innatas vel acquisitas	76va: Utrum angelus intelligat per species innatas
131. Utrum angeli superiores intelligant per species magis universale, ita quod angelus superior intelligat per pauciores quam inferior	77va: Utrum angeli superiores intelligant per species universales
132. Utrum angelus naturali dilectione teneatur diligere Deum plus quam se ipsum	78rb: Utrum angelus naturali dilectione diligat Deum diligere prius quam se ut diligat ipsum super omnia
133. Utrum angeli sint creati in gratia	78va: Utrum angeli fuerit creati in gratia
134. Utrum angelus potuerit peccare	78vb: Utrum angelus possit peccare vel potuerit
135. Utrum angelus potuerit peccare in primo instanti	79rb: Utrum angelus potuerit peccare in primo instanti
136. Utrum natura assumpta a Christo in puris naturalibus sit nobilior omni natura angelica	80rb: Utrum natura humana in Christo sit nobilior natura angelica secundum quod consideratur in naturalibus principiis
137. Utrum Lucifer potuerit appetere Dei aequalitatem	81ra: Utrum malus angelus, scilicet Lucifer appetierit aequalitatem Dei vel potuerit appetere
138. Utrum angelus malus potuerit poenitere	81va: Utrum malus angelus possit poenitere
139. Utrum angelus malus continue sit sub actu malo elicito a potentia libera	82ra: Utrum malus angelus semper sit sub actu malo
140. Utrum angeli possint inducere in materiam veras formas reales	82va: Utrum angeli possint inducere veras formas
141. Utrum agens increatum et creatum concurrant in omni actione create	83ra: Utrum actiones quibus res producuntur in esse totaliter sunt a Deo vel totaliter a creatura vel partim sit a Deo et partim a creatura
142. Utrum angelus possit aliquando corpus movere	83va: Utrum angeli possit movere aliquod corpus
143. Utrum angelus bonus possit peccare	84rb: Utrum bonus angelus peccare possit

Daniels' table of contents	Bol
144. Utrum angeli recipiant gratiam et gloriam secundum capacitatem naturae	84vb: Utrum angeli recipiant gratiam et gloriam secundum capacitatem suorum naturalium
-----	85rb: Utrum Deus quocumque angelo dato semper possit facere nobiliorem, ita quod semper sic attenditur superius in infinitum imperfectionibus
145. Utrum omnes angeli sint eiusdem speciei	86va: Utrum angeli sunt eiusdem speciei
-----	87ra: Utrum Deus possit facere amorem sine amante et generaliter omne accidens sine subiecto ab eo realiter differente
146. Utrum unus angelus possit alteri loqui	90rb: Utrum unus angelus possit loqui alteri angelo
147. Utrum unus angelus possit illuminare alium	90vb: Utrum unus angelus illuminet alium
148. Utrum materia prima sit creata a Deo	92ra: Utrum materia prima sit creata a Deo
149. Utrum Deus possit inducere aliquam formam substantialem in materiam, ad quam materia non habet potentiam naturalem	92rb: Utrum Deus possit facere aliquam formam in materia ad quam materiam non est in potentia naturaliter
151. Utrum materia secundum se considerata dicat aliquam naturam positivam seu aliquem	93ra: Utrum materia habeat in se aliquem actum
152. Utrum materia possit fieri per se sine omni acut formali	93vb: Utrum Deus possit facere materiam sine forma
153. Utrum materia prima prout est in actu sub quantitate sit alia extensio realiter quam sit extensio quantitatis	95ra: Utrum materia existens sub quantitate habeat aliam extensionem ab extensione quantitatis
154. Utrum materia sub quantitate caeli et istorum inferiorum sit eiusdem rationis	95vb: Utrum materia ut est sub quantitate caeli et istorum inferiori

There is a substantial similarity between the two lists. However, some exceptions are worth mentioning: two questions, precisely *Utrum Deus quocumque angelo dato semper possit facere nobiliorem, ita quod semper sic attenditur superius in infinitum imperfectionibus* and *Utrum Deus possit facere amorem sine amante et generaliter omne accidens sine subiecto ab eo realiter differente*, are copied in the Archiginnasio exemplar, but they are not included in Daniels' inventory. Moreover, there is no trace of these questions in F either. Of course, only a complete collation of all manuscript witnesses would allow us to draw valid conclusions about these anomalies. However, a comparison of some passages of the text provides further elements to place A 913 in the manuscript tradition of Ware's 'Commentary on the Sentences':

(ex. 1)

Bol (67rb)	F (111v)	W (ff. 96rb)
<p>Quaeritur utrum angelus sit in loco corporali. Quod non videtur quod potest esse ante omnem locum corporeum. Ex natura sua non determinat sibi aliquod locum ex natura sua. Sed talis est angelus, ergo etc. Et tunc arguitur ulterius sic quod non determinat sibi aliquod locum, indifferenter se habet ad omnem locum. Si igitur angelus indifferenter se habet ad omnem locum, vel erit in omni loco vel in nullo. Sed non potest dici quod angelus sit in omni loco, ergo erit in nullo.</p>	<p>Circa locabilitatem angelorum quaeritur primo an angelus sit in corporali loco. Quod non, quod potest esse ante omnem locum, non determinat sibi aliquod locum. Sed angelus potuit secundum se ante omnem motum, igitur et ante omnem locum. Igitur nullum locum ex sua natura sibi determinat. Aut ergo erit in omni loco aut in nullo, cum sit indifferens ex natura sua ad omnem. Sed non potest esse in omni, quia hoc proprium Dei est, ergo in nullo.</p>	<p>Circa locabilitatem angelorum primo quaeritur an angelus sit in loco corporali. Quod non, quia quod potest esse ante omnem locum, non determinat sibi aliquod locum. Igitur nullum locum ex sua natura sibi determinat. Aut ergo erit in omni loco aut in nullo, cum indifferens sit ex natura sua ad omnem locum: non in omni quia hoc est proprium Dei, ergo in nullo.</p>

(ex. 2)

Bol (69rb)	F (114r)	W (98rb)
<p>Quaeritur utrum angelus possit moveri successive. Quod non secundum Philosophum in VI Physicorum: nihil movetur, nisi sit continuum; et secundum eundem in VIII: nullum continuum movet se active. Sed angelus non est aliquid continuum, quare etc.</p>	<p>Circa motum angelorum quaeritur primo an angelus possit moveri successive. Quod non. Omne quod movetur est continuum ex VI Physicorum. Sed angelus non est quod continuum. Similiter si esset continuum, non posset se ipsum movere, quia nullum continuum se ipsum movet ex VIII Physicorum.</p>	<p>Circa motum angelorum quaeritur primo an angelus possit moveri successive. Quod non, quia omne quod movetur est continuum ex VI Physicorum. Sed angelus non est quod continuum. Similiter si esset quod continuum, non posset se ipsum movere, quia nullum continuum se ipsum movet ex VI Physicorum.</p>

(ex. 3)

Bol (79rb)	F (127v)	W (109rb)
<p>Quaeritur utrum angelus potuit peccare in primo instanti. Quod sic videtur. Anima simul creatur et inficitur in actu alieno, ergo eadem ratione angelus potuit simul creari et infici actu proprio, quia etc.</p>	<p>Quaeritur utrum angelus potuit peccare in primo instanti. Quod sic. Anima in eodem instanti quo creatur inficitur a tactu carnis. Ergo et angelus potuit creari bonus a Deo et tamen esse malus in eodem instanti per actum proprium.</p>	<p>Quaeritur utrum angelus potuit peccare in primo instanti. Quod sic. Anima in eodem instanti quo creatur inficitur a tactu carnis. Ergo et angelus potuit creari a Deo bonus et tamen esse malus in eodem instanti per actum proprium.</p>

(ex 4)

Bol (84vb)	F (135v)	W (115ra)
Quaeritur utrum angeli recipient gratiam et gloriam secundum capacitatem suorum naturalium. Quod sic, Magister Sententiarum libro 2 ^a distinctione.	Quaeritur utrum angeli recipient gratiam et gloriam secundum totam capacitatem naturae. Quod sic, Magister II Sententiarum, d. 2 c. 2, quod enim natura magis subtiles et sapientia et sapientia amplius perspicaces creatae. Hii et maioribus gratiae muneribus praedicti sunt et dignitate aliis excellentiores constituti; qui vero natura minus subtiles et sapientia minus perspicaces conditi minora gratiae dona habuerunt inferioresque constituti sunt sapientia Dei, aequo moderamine cuncta ordinantis”.	Quaeritur utrum angeli recipient gratiam et gloriam secundum capacitatem naturae. Quod sic. Magister II Sententiarum d. 2 c. 2: “qui enim natura magis subtiles et sapientia amplius perspicaces creatae. Hii et gratiae maioribus muneribus praedicti sunt hii et dignitate aliis excellentiores constituti; qui vero natura minus subtiles et sapientia minus perspicaces conditi sunt minora gratiae dona habuerunt inferioresque constituti sunt sapientia Dei, aequo moderamine cuncta ordinantis”.

Although these four examples are limited, they reveal that the text preserved in St. Dominic’s library is presumably not a copy of the second book of Ware’s ‘Commentary on the Sentences’, but rather a *reportatio* of the text. Omissions, abbreviations, the use of certain expressions, such as *ergo etc.*, are in fact recurring. In example 4, for instance, the copyist omits the long quotation from Peter Lombard’s ‘Sentences’, while in example 2 there is a concise summary of the quotations from Aristotle’s ‘Physics’. Moreover, in example 1 there is a complete reworking of the text transmitted by the two other manuscript witnesses. It is hard to believe that these are isolated incidents of the Archinnasio exemplar. As has been stated, it is more plausible that the copy preserved in Bologna is a *compendium* or a *reportatio* of Ware’s work.

The problem is to determine whether this text was effectively maintained in the late medieval *libraria*, and providing a definitive answer to this question is in fact impossible. In the late medieval (the first) inventory, there is no explicit reference to this particular writing. On the other hand, as aforementioned, both parts of manuscript A 913 were copied in Italy at the beginning of the 14th century⁶⁹. Then, as observed by Lucchesi, the manuscript now preserved in the Archiginnasio library was originally in St. Dominic’s library (Prov. Domenicani)⁷⁰. After all, the fact that neither the late medieval catalogue nor Vigili’s inventory explicitly mentions this text appears odd. Indeed, it is more plausible that this *reportatio* of Ware’s ‘Commentary on the Sentences’ was catalogued under a generic title. For instance, as the text at issue appears to be a series of questions rather than a commentary on the ‘Sentences’, it is plausible that it was

⁶⁹ Cf. nt. 36.

⁷⁰ Cf. Lucchesi, *Inventari* (nt. 28), 85.

catalogued in the *nona bancha* with the generic title “disputed questions” (*Item quaedam quaestiones disputatae*)⁷¹ or in the “various questions of different theologians” (*Item varie quaestiones diversorum doctorum*)⁷². Finally, these are enough reasons – I submit – for supposing that this *compendium* was one of the books available in the late medieval library. In this regard, the most significant aspect is certainly that the Dominican scholars in Bologna had the opportunity not only to study complete (or partial) versions of ‘Commentary on the Sentences’, composed in the Franciscan environment, but also to consult texts aimed at resuming the teaching activity of a Franciscan theologian in Paris, such as a *reportatio*⁷³. This case, however problematic, reveals both the specialization of the Dominican theological education in Bologna and the liveliness of the discussions in St. Dominic’s convent.

IV. The case of A 986

Codex A 986 serves as another interesting case study. The manuscript preserves a copy of the ‘Lectura Thomasina’, a widespread teaching *compendium* of “Thomistic” theology (and philosophy)⁷⁴, composed by the Dominican theologian William of Peter of Godin († 1336) at the beginning of the 14th century⁷⁵.

⁷¹ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 210.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Cf. J. Hamesse, La méthode de travail des reportateurs, in: *Medioevo e Rinascimento* 3 (1989), 51–67; ead., Le vocabulaire de la transmission orale des textes, in: O. Weijers (ed.), *Vocabulaire du livre et de l’écriture au moyen âge*, Turnhout 1989, 168–194; O. Weijers, *A Scholar’s Paradise. Teaching and Debating in Medieval Paris* (Studies on the Faculty of Arts. History and Influence 2), Turnhout 2015, here 165–173.

⁷⁴ According to the vast majority of these contributions, it is only appropriate to talk about “Thomism” in the period following Aquinas’ canonization: A. A. Robiglio, La sopravvivenza e la gloria. Appunti sulla formazione della prima scuola tomista (sec. XIV) (*Sacra doctrina* 53/1), Bologna 2008, 53–54; A. A. Robiglio, Se un «savio omo» diventa santo. Un aspetto della reputazione di Tommaso d’Aquino per gli studenti del Trecento, in: *Studia, studenti, religione. Quaderni di storia religiosa* 16 (2009), 159–173. Pasquale Porro, however, argues: “The hypothesis that Thomism first emerged from this process is quite plausible, but, on the other hand, it cannot be denied that a certain ‘Thomist identity’ had already constituted itself before this, as an effect of William de La Mare’s ‘Correctorium’ and the responses to it, and, above all, around the fundamental doctrine of the unicity of the substantial form, as the interventions of Peckham and the condemnation of Knapwell show”, P. Porro, *Thomas Aquinas. A Historical and Philosophical Profile*, Washington 2016, 400.

⁷⁵ See J. Quetif/J. Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, vol. 1, Paris 1719, 591–593; C. Douais, *Les frères prêcheurs en Gascogne au XIII^{me} et au XIV^{me} siècle*. Chapitres, couvents et notices, Paris 1885, 421–422; P. Fournier, Le cardinal Guillaume de Peyre de Godin, in: *Bibliothèque de l’École des Chartes* 86 (1925), 100–121; id., Guillaume de Peyre de Godin, cardinal, in: *Histoire littéraire de la France* 37 (1938), 146–153; M. Grabmann, Kardinal Guilelmus Petri de Godino O.P. († 1336) und seine *Lectura Thomasina*, in: id., *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben. Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Scholastik und Mystik*, vol. 2, München 1936, 559–576; M.-H. Laurent, Le testament et la succession du cardinal dominicain Guillaume de Pierre Godin, in: *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 2 (1932), 84–231; B. Decker, Die Gotteslehre des Jakob von Metz. Untersuchungen zur Dominikanertheologie zu Beginn des 14. Jahrhunderts (Beiträge

The division into distinctions and the debated topics are typical for a commentary on the ‘Sentences’. Nevertheless, the manuscript tradition gives the work this title, emphasizing the large number of verbatim quotations from Thomas Aquinas’ writings included in the text⁷⁶. Some passages of the ‘Lectura Thomasina’ were transcribed as papers and essays⁷⁷, though a critical edition of the text is not yet available⁷⁸. Fifteen manuscripts that preserve this text, in its entirety or in part, are known to exist⁷⁹. The Archiginnasio manuscript (Bol) contains a complete version of the text: Prologue and Book I (foll. 1ra–40vb); foll. 40vb–50rb and 52ra–72rb: Lib. II; foll. 72va–100ra: Lib. III; foll. 100ra–125vb: Lib. IV⁸⁰. A broad overview of the manuscript tradition reveals a substantial similarity between Bol and the manuscripts usually considered the most reliable witnesses of Godin’s text (G: Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, ms. 475 and Pi: Pisa, Biblio-

zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters 42/1), Münster 1967, 24–31; Kaeppli, *Guillelmus Petri de Godino Baionensis*, in: id., *Scriptores*, vol. 2: G–I (nt. 23), 152–155; Goris/Pickavé, *Die Lectura Thomasina* (nt. 23), 83–109; A. Colli, *Tommaso prima del tomismo. Annotazioni per un’edizione critica della Lectura Thomasina* (II libro), in: *Divus Thomas 120* (2017), 163–194.

⁷⁶ A. Colli, *Transcriptions, paraphrases and abbreviations. Rewriting Thomas Aquinas in the Lectura Thomasina*, in: M. Meliàdo/S. Negri (eds.), *Praxis des Philosophen, Praktiken des Philosophiehistorikers. Perspektiven von der Spätantike bis zur Moderne* (Geist und Geisteswissenschaft 2), Freiburg-München 2018, 21–42.

⁷⁷ M. Grabmann, *Doctrina S. Thomae de distinctione reali inter essentiam et esse ex documentis ineditis saeculi XIII illustratur*, in *Acta hebdomadae thomisticae Romae celebratae 19–25 Novembris 1924 in laudem S. Thomae Aquinatis sexto labente saeculo ab honoribus sanctorum ei decretis*, Rome 1924, 131–190, esp. 181–182; R. M. Martin, *Les questions sur le péché originel dans la “Lectura Thomasina” de Guillaume Godin O.P.*, in: *Melanges Mandonnet: études d’histoire littéraire et doctrinale du Moyen Age*, vol. 1, Paris 1930, 411–421; D. T. Graf, *De subiecto psychico gratiae et virtutum secundum doctrinam scholasticorum usque ad medium saeculum XIV, Pars prima. De subiecto virtutum cardinalium II* (*Studia Anselmiana* 3,4), Rome 1935, 179–181; O. Lottin, *Psychologie et morale aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles*, vol. 3/2, Louvain 1949, 476–479; W. Goris/M. Pickavé, *Von der Erkenntnis der Engel. Der Streit um die species intelligibilis und eine quaestio aus dem anonymen Sentenzenkommentar in ms. Brügge*, Stadtsbibliothek 491, in: J. A. Aertsen/K. Emery jr./A. Speer, *Nach der Verurteilung von 1277* (*Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 28), Berlin–New York 2001, 125–177; T. Jeschke, *Deus ut tentus vel visus. Die Debatte um die Seligkeit im Reflexiven Akt* (ca. 1293–1320), Leiden–Boston 2011, 372–373.

⁷⁸ The critical edition of William Peter of Godin’s ‘Lectura Thomasina’ is recently in preparation: in the framework of her PhD thesis, Francesca Bonini is editing the first half of the first book (distinctiones 1–27). I am editing the first half of second book (dist. 1–22).

⁷⁹ For an updated catalogue of the manuscripts preserving the ‘Lectura Thomasina’, see Goris/Pickavé, *Die Lectura Thomasina* (nt. 23), 87–92. Moreover, a detailed description of the codex is provided by Francesca Bonini in her PhD thesis: *Edizione critica della Lectura Thomasina di Guglielmo di Pietro di Godino* (libro I, Prol.–dist. 27) / *Kritische Edition der Lectura Thomasina des Guillelmus Petri de Godino* (Buch I, Prol.–dist. 27), Università del Salento/Universität zu Köln, in preparation.

⁸⁰ Cf. Lucchesi, *Inventari* (nt. 28), 90–91; M. Grabmann, *Kardinal Guilelmus Petri de Godino († 1336) und seine Lectura Thomasina*, in: *Divus Thomas 4* (1926), 385–403, [repr.: id., *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, vol. 2, München 1936, 559–576]; G. Nenzioni, *Antonio Magnani e la sua donazione alla città di Bologna*, in: *Almanacco dei bibliotecari italiani*, Roma 1961, 123–127.

teca del Seminario Arcivescovile S. Caterina ms. 44)⁸¹. The table below provides some examples:

Bol	G	Pi
(1ra) Quaeritur utrum sacra theologia sit scientia. Et videtur, quod non, quia de particularibus non est scientia. Theologia est huiusmodi, ideo et cetera. Praeterea Primo Posteriorum dicitur, quod scientia procedit ex principiis per se notis. Sed principia theologiae non sunt omnibus nota, ideo et cetera.	(1ra) Quaeritur de sacra theologia utrum sit scientia. Et videtur, quod non, quia de particularibus non est scientia sed theologia est huiusmodi, ideo et cetera. Praeterea Primo Posteriorum dicitur, quod scientia procedit ex per se notis. Sed principia theologiae non sunt nota omnibus, ideo et cetera.	(1ra) Incipit opus super Sententias secundum fratrem Guillelmum Petri ordinis fratrum praedicatorum. Magistrum in theologia, qui fuit lector curiae et nunc est cardinalis. Et appellatur istud opus thomasina, quia in omnibus tenet cum Thoma. Liber primus. Quaeritur de sacra theologia utrum sit scientia. Et arguitur, quod non, quia de particularibus non est scientia. Theologia est huiusmodi, ergo et cetera. Praeterea Primo Posteriorum dicitur, quod scientia procedit ex principiis per se notis. Sed principia theologiae non sunt omnibus nota, ideo et cetera.
(10va) Quaeritur, utrum in divinis sit aliqua persona, quae procedat per modum amoris et voluntatis. Videtur, quod non. Natura enim non videtur communicari nisi per actum naturae, sed Spiritui sancto ex processione sua communicatur natura divina, ergo non procedit nisi per modum naturae. Sed talis modus est alius a modo amoris, vel voluntatis, ideo et cetera.	(7rb) Quaeritur, utrum in divinis sit aliqua persona, quae procedat per modum amoris vel voluntatis. Videtur, quod non. Natura enim non videtur communicari nisi per actum naturae, sed Spiritui sancto ex processione sua communicatur natura divina, ergo non procedit nisi per modum naturae. Sed talis modus est alius a modo amoris, vel voluntatis, ergo et cetera.	(11ra) Nunc post Filii aeternitatem et cetera. Quaeritur circa istam decimam quaestionem utrum in divinis sit aliqua persona, quae procedat per modum amoris et voluntatis et videtur, quod non quia natura enim non videtur communicari nisi per actum naturae, sed Spiritui sancto ex processione sua communicatur natura divina, ergo non procedit nisi per modum naturae. Sed talis modus est alius a modo amoris, vel amoris, ideo et cetera.
(41vb) Circa istam distinctionem secundi libri iterum quaeritur utrum creare sit solius Dei et videtur quod non, sed quod aliqua creatura possit creare, quia quanto aliquid magis resistit agenti, tanto difficilius est ipsum ab agente fieri. Sed contrarium magis resistit agenti quam non ens simpliciter, quia non ens nihil in se habet, unde possit resistere. Ergo si	(29rb) Circa distinctionem primam secundi libri quaeritur utrum creare sit solius Dei et videtur quod non, sed quod aliqua creatura possit creare, quia quanto aliquid magis resistit agenti, tanto difficilius est ipsum ab agente fieri. Sed contrarium magis resistit agenti quam non ens simpliciter, quia non ens nihil in se habet, unde resistere possit. Ergo si agens	(36rb) Circa istam distinctionem iterum quaeritur utrum creare sit solius Dei et videtur quod non, sed quod aliqua creatura possit creare, quia quanto aliquid magis resistit agenti, tanto difficilius est ipsum ab agente fieri. Sed contrarium magis resistit agenti quam non ens simpliciter, quia non ens nihil in se habet, unde possit resistere. Ergo si agens

⁸¹ Transcriptions are usually based on these two exemplars.

Bol	G	Pi
agens naturale aliquid potest generare ex contrario non obstante eius resistentia, multo magis poterit hoc ex non ente, quod est creare. Ergo creatura poterit creare.	naturale aliquid potest generare ex contrario non obstante eius resistentia, multo fortius poterit hoc ex non ente, quod est creare. Ergo creatura poterit creare.	naturale aliquid potest generare ex contrario non obstante eius resistentia, multo magis poterit hoc ex non ente, quod est creare. Ergo creatura poterit creare.
(59va) Circa distinctionem 20 quaeritur primo utrum mulier debuerit de costa viri formari. Videtur quod non, quia costa non potest separari ab homine sine dolore. Sed dolor non fuit ante peccatum. Ergo non debuit de ista costa corpus mulieris formari.	(43ra) Circa distinctionem 20 quaeritur primo utrum mulier debuerit de costa viri formari. Videtur quod non, quia costa non potest separari ab homine sine dolore. Sed dolor non fuit ante peccatum. Ergo non debuit de ista costa corpus mulieris formari.	(53ra) Circa distinctionem 20 quaeritur primo utrum mulier debuerit de costa viri formari. Videtur quod non, quia costa non potest separari ab homine sine dolore. Sed dolor non fuit ante peccatum. Ergo non debuit de ista costa corpus mulieris formari.
(72va) Quaeritur congruum fuerit Filium Dei incarnari. Videtur quod non quia quae sunt in infinitum distantia inconvenienter coniungitur sicut inconvenienter esset quod aliquis dipingeret imaginem in qua humano capiti <i>aequis</i> (<i>sed. corr.</i> cervix) coniunguntur equina. Sed Deus et caro in infinitum distant, cum Deus sit simplicissimus et caro compositum. Ergo inconueniens est unio unius ad alterum.	(53ra) Quaeritur utrum congruum fuit Filium Die incarnari. Videtur quod non, quia quae sunt in infinitum distantia inconvenienter coniunguntur, sicut inconueniens esset quo aliquis depingeret imaginem in qua humano capiti cervix coniungeretur equina. Sed Deus et caro in infinitum distant, cum Deus sit simplicissimus et caro compositum. Ergo unio unius ad alterum est inconueniens.	(66va) Incipit liber tertius. Utrum fuerit etc. Quaeritur utrum congruum fuerit Filium Die incarnari. Videtur quod non, quia quae sunt in infinitum distantia inconvenienter coniunguntur, sicut inconueniens esset quod imaginem aliquis depingeret in qua humano capiti cervix coniungeretur equina. Sed Deus et caro in infinitum distant, cum Deus sit simplicissimus et caro compositum. Ergo inconueniens est unio unius ad alterum.
(99ra) Circa distinctionem 39 quaeritur utrum iuramentum coactum sit obligatorium. Videtur quod non, quia nullus obligatur nisi per voluntatem suam. Sed iuramentum coactum excedit voluntarium. Non ergo est obligatorium.	(67rb) Circa distinctionem 39 quaeritur utrum iuramentum coactum sit obligatorium. Videtur quod non quia nullus obligatur nisi per voluntatem. Sed iuramentum coactum excedit voluntarium. Ergo non est obligatorium.	(94rb) De iuramento coacto. Utrum obliget. Circa distinctionem 39 quaeritur utrum iuramentum coactum sit obligatorium. Videtur quod non, quia nullus obligatur nisi per voluntatem suam. Sed iuramentum coactum excedit voluntarium. Ergo non est obligatorium.
(100ra) Quaeritur utrum post lapsum primi hominis fuerit necessarium institui sacramenta aliqua. Videtur quod non, quia superflue sit per plura quod fieri potest per pauciora. Sed homo poterat salvari per fidem artificiorum et opera praeceptorum, sicut Adam. Ergo superflue fuit instituire aliqua sacramenta.	(78ra) Utrum post lapsum primi hominis fuerit necessarium instituire aliqua sacramenta. Videtur quod non quia superflue sit per plura quod potest fieri per pauciora. Sed homo poterat salvari per fidem et opera praeceptorum sicut Adam. Ergo superfluum fuit instituire aliqua sacramenta.	(96ra) Incipit liber quartus. Quaeritur utrum post lapsum primi hominis fuerit necessarium institui sacramenta aliqua. Videtur quod non, quia superflue sit per plura quod potest fieri per pauciora. Sed homo poterat salvari per fidem artificiorum et opera praeceptorum, sicut Adam. Ergo superfluum fuit instituire aliqua sacramenta.

An accurate collation of the manuscripts reveals that Bol and Pi presumably derive from the same exemplar⁸², but definitive remarks on this point may be made only after a complete critical edition of the text.

The case of A 986 is an enigma. According to Lucchesi's inventory, this manuscript was copied in the 15th century⁸³, and indeed there is no trace of this manuscript in the late medieval catalogue⁸⁴. For this reason, Pellegrini concludes that: "this manuscript was acquired by the Dominican library only in the Modern Ages"⁸⁵.

On the other hand, this conclusion is not so convincing for a number of reasons. First, Godin was a prominent figure in the Dominican Order and a cardinal of the Catholic Church⁸⁶. Moreover, the significant number of manuscript witnesses preserving the 'Lectura Thomasina' reveals that this atypical commentary on the 'Sentences', aimed at introducing Aquinas' theological thought, was largely diffused in the Dominican *studia* at the beginning of the 14th century. Although these are just general considerations, the assumption that A 986 was acquired by the Dominican library in Bologna that late appears quite implausible. Then, there are also some anomalies within both the late medieval catalogue and Vigili's inventory, which must be taken into account. As already mentioned, the 'Lectura Thomasina' is not included in the first catalogue. However, it should be stressed that also in the early modern inventory the text is not explicitly mentioned: Laurent identified item 98 of Vigili's catalogue as "Bologne, Archiginnasio A 986"⁸⁷, which is indeed Godin's 'Lectura Thomasina'. However, the inventory alludes to "*Ioannis Parisiensis, ordinis Praedicatorum, eius videlicet qui fecit correctorium corruptorii, scriptum super 4^{or} libros sententiarum*"⁸⁸. This is due to the fact that on the top of fol. 1 of A 986, a 16th-century hand wrote "*Super 4^{or} Li. Sententiarum Johannis Parisiensis ord. pred. hic fecit correctorium corruptorii?*". In other terms, Godin's 'Lectura Thomasina' effectively has never been mentioned in the list of books preserved in the Dominican library of Bologna, except by a wrong name. Therefore, it cannot be excluded that the text was preserved also in the 14th-century *libraria*, but catalogued incorrectly.

In fact, the late medieval inventory mentions in the XX *banca*: "*Item sermones de sanctis fratris petri gaudini*"⁸⁹ and in the XXV *banca*: "*Item sermones fratris petri gaudini de tempore, de aliquibus epistolis, de aliquibus feriis, de aliquibus solempnitatibus et plures in congregatione beate Virginis et de consecratione ecclesie*"⁹⁰. According to Lucchesi

⁸² Cf. F. Bonini, Edizione critica della Lectura Thomasina di Guglielmo di Pietro di Godino (nt. 79), esp. LXXV–CXXIX.

⁸³ Cf. Lucchesi, Inventari (nt. 28), 125.

⁸⁴ Cf. Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 203–235; Lucchesi, L'antica libreria (nt. 5), 21–35.

⁸⁵ Cf. Pellegrini, La biblioteca (nt. 1), 154.

⁸⁶ Cf. supra nt. 75.

⁸⁷ Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 27.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 231.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 234.

and Laurent, “Petrus Gaudinus” is unequivocally William of Peter of Godin (*Guillelmus Petrus de Godino*)⁹¹. But if that really was the case, the conclusion might be that the 14th-century library preserved a series of Godin’s sermons and not his more important and popular work. This appears very strange.

Additionally, in the XX *bancha*, together with the sermons composed by Godin, one can find also “*sermone de tempore et sanctis et diversis materiis fratris Iacobi de Losana*”⁹². And James of Lausanne, just like William of Peter of Godin, wrote a ‘Lectura Thomasina’⁹³.

Even if this might not be irrefutable evidence, all of this would be a remarkable coincidence. In fact, there are a number of factors which suggest that codex A 986 was already available in the Dominican *libraria* of Bologna in the 14th century. Furthermore, that the Dominican student had this atypical commentary on the ‘Sentences’ available is very plausible, particularly when taking the cultural activity of this *studium* and the close relationship with the Parisian theological debates into account.

V. Conclusion: The Library as a mirror of teaching activity

The late medieval Dominican librteary in Bologna preserved a considerable number of manuscripts compared to what was owned by other Italian libraries of the same years⁹⁴: not only theological works, but also philosophical and physical treatises were available to students and masters who studied in Bologna.

A mirror for determining the concrete cultural milieu of the 13th/14th *conventus Bononiensis* is, however, the catalogue of the commentaries on the ‘Sentences’, as this genre influenced the daily teaching activity and may also be considered the “educational guidelines” of the *studium*. This is presumably the reason why these texts were not considered *scartafacia*, but *boni pro libraria* and were preserved over the centuries⁹⁵.

The virtual catalogue that indexes all commentaries likely preserved in the late medieval library emphasizes an interesting point: together with the texts of notorious 13th century theologians (Bonaventure, Giles of Rome, Peter of Tarentasia, Thomas Aquinas) a number of commentaries composed by masters, who have not yet been adequately studied, was available to the scholars *Bononienses*, such as Fischacre’s ‘In quattuor libros Sententiarum’, Robert Holcot’s ‘Opus quaestionum ac determinationum super libros Sententiarum’ or Went’s ‘Quaestiones super Sententiarum libros’. Both examples that have been specifically ex-

⁹¹ Lucchesi, *L’antica libraria* (nt. 5), 46; Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 231.

⁹² Laurent, Fabio Vigili (nt. 3), 231.

⁹³ Stamser Katalog, ed. H. Denifle, in: G. Meerseman, *Laurentii Pignon Catalogi*, Roma 1936, 64: “*Fr. Iacobus Lausanensis scripsit super Sententias lecturam thomasinam*”.

⁹⁴ Murano, *I libri di uno Studium* (nt. 3), 291.

⁹⁵ On the distinction between *libri boni pro libraria* and *scartafacia* in the 15th century rearrangement of the Dominican library in Bologna, see Pellegrini, *La biblioteca* (nt. 1), 156.

amined in this paper belong to this second category: albeit not yet studied in detail, both William of Ware's 'Super Sententias (Reportationes)' and William of Peter Godin's 'Lectura Thomasina' play a crucial role in the late medieval theological debates, and the fact that their works were available in Bologna confirms this.

Finally, a number of critical studies focused on the theological and philosophical education at the university of Paris and, sometimes, at the English universities⁹⁶. By contrast, Bologna is usually an underestimated case study. From a particular angle, the present paper has, however, demonstrated how this cultural environment was favorable for the discussion of crucial questions on the agenda of late medieval theological and philosophical debates. By combining a study of the late medieval and modern catalogues of the *domus pro libraria Bononiensis* with an accurate analysis of the already available manuscripts, of which a couple of examples have been previously provided, it is possible to make the library a mirror that not only reflects the geographical diffusion of texts, but also the concrete influence of some doctrines on the late medieval educational activity.

⁹⁶ See, among the others, P. Glorieux, L'enseignement au moyen âge. Techniques et méthodes en usage à la Faculté de théologie de Paris au XIIIe siècle, in: Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge 35 (1968), 65–186; A. Maierù, University Training in Medieval Europe, Leiden–New York–Cologne 1994; O. Weijers, Le maniement du savoir. Pratiques intellectuelles à l'époque des premières universités (XIII^e-XIV^e), Turnhout 1996; N. Gorochov, Naissance de l'université. Les écoles de Paris d'Innocent III à Thomas d'Aquin (v. 1200-v.1245), Paris 2012; J. Verger/O. Weijers (eds.), Les débuts de l'enseignement universitaire à Paris (1200–1245 environ), Turnhout 2013.