

THE PROBLEM OF THE AUTHORSHIP

Osmund Lewry, O.P. Blackfriars Oxford

Robert Kilwardby is known as the author of a well attested commentary on Priscianus minor, the only grammatical exposition listed in the early 14th century catalogue, the Stams-tabula. S. Harrison Thomson¹ argued for the authenticity of commentaries on the Barbarismus Donati and De Accentu Prisciani found with the Priscianus minor in MS Vaticana Chigi L.V. 159. Another version of the Barbarismus with a different introduction exists in MS Cambridge Peterhouse 191, with the same De Accentu commentary, in the third section of a MS which has the unascribed commentary on Priscianus maior as its first section and the Priscianus minor, with an ascription to Kilwardby in the colophon of the first book, as its second section.

The Priscianus maior commentary also occurs incomplete as the final work in MS Cambridge Peterhouse 206, where it is found together with a series of commentaries on the Logica vetus, De Accentu and Barbarismus, a second series which only covers the Isagoge, Praedicamenta and the greater part of the Perihermeneias, followed by two incomplete works on the Analytica priora, a commentary on the Elenchi, an incomplete work on the Analytica posteriora and a commentary on the Ethica nova and Ethica vetus (Ethica nicomachea books 1-3, editio longior). M.R. James' description of this MS leaves out the De accentu and Barbarismus and the second Analytica priora². All these works are ascribed to Kilwardby in a later list of contents, but the present author has argued elsewhere that of the works on the Logica vetus only those of the second series are consistent with the style and teaching of Kilwardby³. They are found together with a Liber sex prin-

1. S. Harrison Thomson, Robert Kilwardby's Commentaries In Priscianum and In Barbarismum Donati. The New Scholasticism XII (1938), pp. 52-65.

2. M.R. James, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Library of Peterhouse. Cambridge 1899.

3. As noted by C.H. Lohr, Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries - Addenda et Corrigenda. Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale XIV (1972), p.126. The present author has been engaged in research since 1971 for a doctoral thesis on Kilwardby's writings on Logica vetus.

cipiorum in MS Madrid B. Univ. 73, where they are ascribed to "Robertus". The Perihermeneias and Liber sex principiorum also occur without ascription with a fragment of a commentary on the Liber Divisionum Boethii in MS Venezia B. Marc. L.VI.66⁴. The Elenchi is ascribed to "Robertus de Aucumpno" in MS Barcelona, Archivo de la Corona de Aragon, Ripoll 109, and to "magister Robertus", identified by a later hand as Kilwardby, in MS Paris B. Mazarine 3489⁵. The conclusion of this work is used to supply an ending to the commentary in MS Oxford Bodleian, Canonici Misc. 403, in a similar way to the use of the conclusion of Kilwardby's *Analytica priora* to supply an ending to the corresponding work there, but the late table of contents attributes all the works on the *Organon* in this MS to "Robertus Anglicus", though study of their formal features and doctrine has thrown doubt on the proposed identification with Kilwardby⁶. Another commentary on the Elenchi in MS Cambridge Peterhouse 205, which contains the *Analytica priora* and *posteriora* with ascriptions to Kilwardby, has some features consistent with his authorship⁷. This work appears with an ascription to "magister Robertus" in MS Paris B.N. lat. 16619. The *Ethica*, which precedes the *Priscianus maior* in MS Peterhouse 206, and is also found incomplete in MS Praha Univ. III.F.10, seems to have a truncated introduction without the usual causal scheme, but there are some other features which would support the attribution to Kilwardby⁸.

Both the early Peterhouse MSS, 191 and 206, have thus transmitted the *Priscianus maior* commentary with authentic Kilwardby material, though much of the content of 206 can be rejected, including the *De accentu* and *Barba-*

4. Cf. C.H. Lohr, *Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries. Traditio XXIX* (1973), pp. 93-197. Robertus, pp. 95-6.

5. *Ibid.* Robertus de Aucumpno (? Hautecombe), pp. 97-8.

6. As noted by C.H. Lohr, *Problems of authorship concerning some Medieval Aristotle Commentaries. Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale XV* (1973), pp. 131-6. 6. Robertus Kilwardby *Super logicam Aristotelis* pp. 134-35. Against the hypothesis that all the works in MS Oxford Bodl. Canon. Misc. 403 are by another Robertus Anglicus is the patching on of conclusions which may have occurred not only with the *Analytica priora* and *Elenchi* but also with the *Isagoge* and *Praedicamenta* and differences of style between the works on the *Logica vetus* and *Logica nova*.

7. Cf. Lohr (note 4) Robertus de Kilwardby O.P., p. 113.

8. Cf. R.A. Gauthier, *Arnoul de Provence et la doctrine de la Fronesis, vertu mystique suprême. Rev. du Moyen Age Latin XIX* (1963), 129-70, p.155.

rismus of the first series of commentaries, and some works have still to be authenticated. The third MS of the Priscianus maior is the 15th century MS Cambridge Univ. Kk.III.20. This has a contemporary headline "Kilwardby in Magno", but no other material by him. The absence of this important work from the early catalogues such as the Stams tabula and its preservation in just these three Cambridge MSS makes one doubtful whether Kilwardby wrote it, or may suggest that if he did, it does not derive from his Parisian teaching, which may be roughly dated in the decade between 1235 and 1245, though his later Oxford career, before becoming Provincial of the English Dominicans in 1261, has generally been associated with theological rather than philosophical teaching on the authority of the chronicler, Nicholas Trivet.

Some reserves must be expressed first about the form of the work. Although it was Kilwardby's practice to introduce questions into the introductions to his commentaries, this work is remarkable both for the length of the introduction and the structuring of the problematic, which serves as a general introduction to the *scientiae sermocinales* and to grammar in particular. His other grammatical works have much briefer introductions, and the points of inquiry are not so well summarized in advance. In form, then, the introduction is more like that of the *Ethica*, once thought to be by John Peckham, found in MS Oxford Bodleian Lat. misc. c. 71 and other MSS⁹. Like that work too it employs the Augustinian distinction of "*scientia de rebus*" and "*scientia de signis*", which Kilwardby alludes to in his *De ortu scientiarum* c. 62, composed around 1250, without giving it prominence in his classification of the sciences. Despite the developed form of the introduction, the heads used in the *accessus* to Priscian's work, after the first lemma of the text, are in an archaic form closely modelled on Petrus Helias' *Summa* (pp. 46-48). The only traces of the causal scheme, which Kilwardby regularly uses in the introductions of his other commentaries, are in the statements of the *modus procedendi*, though "*probativus et improbativus*" is uncharacteristic, and in that of the three-fold *finis*, where the specification of the "*finis remotissimus*" as "*beatificatio animae rationalis*" would be consistent with his usage. The refer-

9. Cf. O. Lottin, A propos du Commentaire sur l'Éthique attribué à Jean Peckham. *Rech. de théol. Anc. et Méd.* X (1938), pp. 79-83. Id. *Psychologie et Morale aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles* VI, Gembloux 1960, pp. 230-35. R.W. Hunt, *Bodleian Library Record* V (1955), pp. 166-67.

ence to "forma tractatus" before the division of the text, though common in writings associated with Nicholas of Paris and a feature of the first series of commentaries in MS Peterhouse 206, is also uncharacteristic of Kilwardby, nor is it usual for him to mark the end of the textual division with the formula "Haec est divisio et sententia in generali", common in other authors (cf. above p.4+).

The author of the Priscianus maior found his classification of the sciences on the triad, "natura communiter dicta", "voluntas cum eligentia", "ratio" (p. 2), while Kilwardby is known from his De ortu to have adhered to the Aristotelian division, physics, mathematics and metaphysics. The distinction of "nota" and "signum" used here (p. 4) differs from that in the Perihermeneias: "... nota est in quantum est in ore proferentis, sed signum in quantum est in aure audientis..." (Peterhouse 206, f. 67rb). The treatment of a knowledge of signs has some resemblance to that in De ortu c. 47, but the latter insists more forcefully on the possibility of knowledge of the "sensibile". The arguments for the possibility of a "scientia de sermone" in the Barbarismus introduction more closely match those in the same chapter of the De ortu than those here. The status of "scientia de sermone" is described "secundum quosdam" as "... nec speculativa nec practica, sed ut speculativa et ut practica. Est enim quasi adminiculativa ad has" (p. 13), agreeing with the description of rational science as "adminiculans" in De ortu c. 48 and the distinction of the "scientiae sermocinales" from the other sciences, speculative and practical, in c. 62, though "... grammatica famulatur omnibus doctrinis, sed maxime speculativis...", and an active aspect is admitted in correct speech and writing.

The distinction of the "scientiae sermocinales" by their end, here attributed to "Isaac in libro de divisione" (p. 21), closely agrees with that in the introduction to the Barbarismus of Kilwardby and in the Priscianus minor ascribed to Jordanus in MS Leipzig Univ. Bibl. 1291, studied by M. Grabmann¹⁰. Kilwardby's Priscianus minor has a modified form of the same distinction. Only here is the puzzling attribution found, though the author shows a disposition to identify his sources even when this leads to confusion, as with his reference to "Remigius in commento super Donatum"

10. M. Grabmann, Der Kommentar des sel. Jordanus von Sachsen (+1237) zum Priscianus Minor. Mittelalterliches Geistesleben III (München 1956), 232-242. Citation from Jordanus p. 234.

in connection with the origins of the alphabet (Peterhouse 206, f. 318vb). It is also uncharacteristic of Kilwardby to refer to Aristotle as "Philosophus", as he does (p. 4,5,7 e.g.).

In regard to the subject of grammar an opinion is cited of those who talk of a twofold subject: "... quidam dicunt quod subiectum duplex, quoddam per reductionem tamquam ad principium et causam... alio modo dicitur subiectum in scientia commune per modum universalis vel totius integri..." (p. 36), which deserves comparison with the position adopted by Kilwardby in *De ortu* c. 52, where "... littera et syllaba sunt partes et principia sermonis". The statement of the subject as "vox litterata quantum ad litteratam primo modo et secundo et articulata primo modo et secundo articulatione" (p. 39) corresponds to that in the first of the two *De accentu* commentaries with writings of Nicholas of Paris in MS München clm. 14460 (f.188rb), and is suggested by the treatment of grammar in Nicholas' *Philosophia*, an introduction to the *Isagoge* in the same MS (f.151ra). This author's expressions are closer to the statements of the subject in Kilwardby's *Priscianus minor* as "vox litterata ordinabilis propter congruum sive ordinabilis ad significandum vel ad informandum" than to the "sermo significativus secundum quod huiusmodi" of the *De ortu* c. 52. The analogy with the twofold subject of the *Perihermeneias* which this author employs (p.35-36) is also used by Kilwardby in his *Priscianus minor* introduction.

The division of grammar into its parts (p.41) resembles that in the *Priscianus minor*, though the terms of the latter are more closely followed in the "*Quaestiones in Metaphysicam*" of Geoffrey of Aspill (MS Cambridge Gonville and Caius College 509, f. 53va), a work which was at one time thought to be by Kilwardby because of similarities to the *De ortu*, and may well depend on his writings¹¹. After a basic division into "sermo significativus in se" and "in altero", the *Priscianus maior* has subdivisions of "complexus/incomplexus" or "divisibilis/indivisibilis" corresponding to the "compositus" and "simplex" of Kilwardby's *Priscianus minor* and Geoffrey's *Quaestiones*. In the account of prosody the separate treatment of accentuation is justified by an opinion which turns on the dependence of knowledge of accents on that of the *dictio*:

11. Cf. G. Gal, Robert Kilwardby's Questions on the Metaphysics and Physics of Aristotle. *Franciscan Studies* XIII (1953), pp. 7-28. E. Macrae, Geoffrey of Aspill's Commentaries on Aristotle. *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* VI (1968), pp. 94-134, p. 126.

Alii dicunt quod est scientia separata de accentu; cuius ratio est quia ... dependet cognitio accentus a cognitione dictionis. Unde dicit Priscianus quod non potest discerni complete qualiter syllaba accentuanda sit donec videatur qualiter in dictione posita sit; et ideo quantum ad eius completam cognitionem dependet a dictione. Et ideo potest esse scientia separata de accentu a scientia de syllaba. (p. 44).

This is the position to which Kilwardby adheres without reference to others in his *De accentu* introduction: "Non enim cognoscitur complete qualis debeat esse accentus nisi per dictionem et significationem dictionis" (MS Vaticana Chigi L.V.159, f. 104vb; cf. Peterhouse 191, III f. 22ra). The arguments for a separate treatment of "dictio" and "oratio" with which the Priscianus maior introduction concludes (p.45) have little in common with the handling of the question of a separate treatment of "oratio constructa" in Kilwardby's Priscianus minor introduction.

These brief notes can hardly offer a determination of the authorship of the disputed commentary. For that a more extensive study of Kilwardby's grammatical work would be needed as well as that of his contemporaries, since here, as so often with works of this period, it is hard to judge what is common problematic, teaching and method and what is characteristic of one writer without a much wider knowledge of the unpublished literature.