



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

**Review: Hubert Hubien, Iohannis Buridani
Tractatus de consequentiis. Edition
critique. Serie Philosophes Médiévaux**
Bos, E.P.

Citation

Bos, E. P. (1977). Review: Hubert Hubien, Iohannis Buridani Tractatus de consequentiis. Edition critique. Serie Philosophes Médiévaux. *Philosophes Médiévaux*, (15 (2)). Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/10620>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/10620>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Book Review

Hubert Hubien, *Iohannis Buridani Tractatus de consequentiis*. Édition critique. Série: Philosophes médiévaux, t. XVI, Louvain/Paris, (pp. 138) 1976 (300 FB).

Much work is still to be done in the field of medieval logic. In particular, critical editions of texts should be prepared, for which knowledge of paleography and codicology is required. These texts should be studied carefully, and for this study knowledge of modern logic is desirable: the interchange between modern and medieval logic can put the latter in the right perspective.

Prof. Hubien (Liège) has now provided us with a critical edition of an important medieval tract on logic. In the introduction to this edition, he discusses briefly, with reference to modern logic, the contents of the tract on consequences; but this is not the main object of his book.

His excellent edition of Buridan's tract on consequences meets the need of students of medieval logic. Buridan was an important and influential fourteenth century logician. His works were widely known, especially in France, Italy and the German speaking countries. Through his pupils, Marsilius of Inghen and Albert of Saxony, he also was influential in Middle Europe. The *Tractatus de consequentiis* itself (composed, as Professor Hubien convincingly argues, in 1335) is very important, because it is a first specimen of an axiomatic-deductive exposition of logic (on the basis of propositional calculus), as Professor Hubien expresses it.¹ The deductive treatment is of a wider range than Walter Burley's, even though one should not neglect the latter.² Buridan's tract, on the other hand, which includes a general theory of consequences, inferences between modal propositions, non-modal categorical syllogisms, and modal syllogisms, is permeated thoroughly by this deductive treatment. *Suppositiones* (the predecessors of our axioms) and *conclusiones* (theorems) are found throughout the whole tract.

In a paper published elsewhere, Professor Hubien has brought forward another interesting point about Buridan's tract on consequences: using the apparatus of modern logic, he shows that Buridan was the first European logician to recognise the existence of the fourth figure of the syllogism.³ He corrects Professor Resher's claims of this title for Peter Tartaret.⁴

¹ p. 14.

² *De Puritate Artis Logicae Tractatus Longior*, edited by Ph. Boehner, New York-Louvain-Paderborn, 1955, Tract II, ch. 1. See also Ph. Boehner, *Medieval Logic*, Chicago, 1952, p. 89.

³ *John Buridan on the fourth figure of the syllogism*, in: *Revue internationale de philosophie*, 113 (1975), pp. 271-285. This volume is dedicated to the centennial of the birth of Martin Grabmann. It contains contributions by J. Jolivet, D. P. Henry, H. Hubien, J. Pinborg and L. M. de Rijk. The editor was F. van Steenberghen.

The increasing interest in John Buridan's logic is attested to by a symposium on this subject held in Copenhagen, in 1975. At this symposium research on Buridan's logic was stimulated and coordinated. It is probable that critical editions of all the logical writings of Buridan will be available within a few years.⁵

For his edition, Professor Hubien uses one of the three *incunabula* (Parisius, about 1493) and the three manuscripts hitherto known. The two other *incunabula* seem to depend on the one used. Of the manuscripts, one (Liège, *Bibliothèque universitaire*, 114C) had been forgotten in the scholarly world (e.g. Faral and Boehner explicitly denied any knowledge of manuscripts of the tract in question), though it was mentioned in the catalogue of the Liège Library and in an article of Dom H. Bascour in the *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique* of 1938 (s.v. *Buridan*); the two other *codices* (viz. *Vat. lat. 3020* and *Pal. lat. 994*) had not been properly described in the handwritten catalogues. We still await a good description of these manuscripts, one that also pays attention to various paleographical and codicological aspects (Professor Hubien could inspect the Vatican *codices* only by microfilm).

In the *apparatus criticus* we find only the relevant alternative readings. The individual readings have been omitted, because their number would unnecessarily burden the *apparatus*, with the exception of those readings, of course, that are of some interest. This was inevitable, but, of course, it is always possible that further study will show the importance of a reading that has appeared irrelevant at first.

Concluding this review three remarks should be made. First, I regret the absence of an *index* of names etc. This would have given a better entry to the text. Secondly, Professor Hubien does not treat the information supplied by the *tabula* which precedes Buridan's *Quaestiones in physicam*, on f. 2^{ra} of the MS Liège, 114 C: '*Tabula quaestionum libri primi Physicorum magistri Iohannis Buridan in uico straminum Parisius anno domini M^o III^o 66^o pronuntiarum*'. On the basis of this information, it would seem attractive to conclude to a later *terminus post quem* of Buridan's death than the one usually accepted (viz. 1358). Thirdly, it is evident that the tract on consequences to be found in MS Florence, *Biblioteca nazionale*, Magl. cl. V, 43 (ff. 35^r - 38^r) and attributed to John Buridan, is not the tract on consequences as edited in Hubien's book; it was almost certainly not composed by Buridan. But as Mrs Graziella Federici Vescovini rightly remarked, it remains to be shown why this mistake was made in the title as well as in the *explicit*, and also who was in fact the author of this tract on consequences.⁶

E. P. Bos

⁴ N. Resher, *Galen and the syllogism*, Pittsburgh, 1966.

⁵ *The Logic of John Buridan*. Acts of the 3rd European Symposium on Medieval Logic and Semantics, Copenhagen 16.-21. November 1975, ed. by Jan Pinborg, Copenhagen 1976.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 23.