



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Anonymous Commentary on Billingham, De probationibus terminorum
Bos, E.P.

Citation

Bos, E. P. (2009). Anonymous Commentary on Billingham, De probationibus terminorum. *Acta Medievalia*, 22. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14597>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14597>

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

E.P. Bos, Leiden
Anonymous Commentary on Billingham,
De probationibus terminorum

Introduction

In this contribution to the *Liber amicorum* dedicated to Prof. M. Markowski, I shall edit an anonymous fourteenth century commentary on Richard Billingham's logical handbook *De probationibus terminorum* ('On the analysis of terms'). Prof. Markowski greatly favoured editions, especially by finding manuscripts and by making manuscript collections accessible by his inventories. The commentary to be published here is found in MS Munich, *Bayerische Staatsbibliothek*, CLM 4385, ff. 107va-112rb.

The handbooks on logic by e.g. Peter of Spain,¹ William of Ockham² and John Buridan³ have been edited by modern scholars and studied in detail. It is less known that in the fourteenth century another handbook with a different logical approach became popular, especially in central and southern Europe, viz. Richard Billingham's *De probationibus terminorum*.⁴

Richard Billingham's *De probationibus terminorum*

Modern scholars have edited Billingham's handbook. In 1970 Maierù has presented a 'working edition', as he calls it, of the *Speculum puerorum* ('Mirror of Youngsters') or *Terminus est in quem* ('a term is that into which <a proposition is analysed>') by Billingham. In 1982 De Rijk made a fresh study of the manuscripts. He concludes that five different versions of the work have been handed down to us, viz. an earlier version, called *De probationibus terminorum*, a second version, called *Terminus est in quem*, a version preserved in manuscripts in Italy, also called *Terminus est in quem*, a version called *Speculum puerorum* (preserved in a Vatican manuscript), and an

¹ Petrus Hispanus, *Tractatus*, ed. L.M. de Rijk, Assen (Van Gorcum), 1977.

² Guillelmi de Ockham *Summa logicae*, ed. G. Gál et S. Brown, St. Bonaventure (N.Y.), 1972.

³ Johannes Buridanus, *Summulae*, Nijmegen-Turnhout (Brepols), 1994 -

⁴ For an up to date survey of works by Billingham and of studies on his works, see O. Weyers, *Le travail intellectuel à la Faculté des arts de Paris: textes et maîtres (ca. 1200-1500)*. Répertoire des noms commençant par R. Turnhout (Brepols), forthcoming.

abbreviated version found in Prague.⁵

In how far was Billingham the author of all versions? We may assume, De Rijk says, that Richard's authorship of the first version is beyond any doubt. The other versions are also ascribed to Billingham in the texts. Apparently, his work was copied repeatedly, interpolations were added and glosses were adopted in the text.⁶

In all five versions the analysis of propositions is discussed. This analysis is accomplished by an analysis of one of the prominent analysable terms. After this analysis the supposition (or reference) and other properties of the terms in the proposition can be determined more easily. For an introduction to Richard's notions of those analysable terms, viz. resolvable, exponible and officiable terms and the analysis of the propositions containing those kinds of terms, I refer to studies by, especially, Maierù and Andrews.⁷

Richard's *De probationibus terminorum* has not been studied much. It deserves attention, not in the least because it was widely used in Europe, and because its logic was used in natural science of the fourteenth century, and had in that sense a wide impact.⁸

Commentaries on Billingham's *de probationibus terminorum*

Many commentaries have been written on Richard's *De probationibus terminorum*.⁹ Sometimes Billingham is an integral part of complete logic, e.g. by Paul of Venice,¹⁰ John Venator¹¹ and others. There are also many independent commentaries, e.g., by Henricus de Coesfeldia (Henry of Coesfeld).¹² The text of our anonymous is one of those independent commentaries.

⁵ L.M. de Rijk, *Some 14th Century Tracts on the Probationes Terminorum. Martin of Alnwick O.F.M., Richard Billingham, Edward Upton and Others. An Edition of Four Current Textbooks with an Introduction and Indexes*. Nijmegen (Ingenium Publishers), 1982.

⁶ L.M. de Rijk, *Some 14th Century Tracts on the Probationes Terminorum* (...), pp. -*24* -*25*.

⁷ A. Maierù, *Terminologia logica della tarda scolastica* (...). R. Andrews, 'Resolvable, Exponible and Officiable Terms in the *Sophistria* of Petrus Olai, MS Uppsala, *University Library*, C 599', in S. Read (ed.), *Sophisms in Medieval Logic and Grammar*, Acts of the Ninth European Symposium for Medieval Logic and Semantics, held at St. Andrews, June 1990, edited by S. Read, Dordrecht-Boston-London (Kluwer), pp. 3-33.

⁸ C. Wilson, *William Heytesbury. Medieval Logic and the Rise of Mathematical Physics*. Madison (University Press), 1956.

⁹ Cf. L.M. de Rijk / E.P. Bos, *Inventory of Medieval Manuscripts*, <http://www.mlh.huygensinstituut.nl>.

¹⁰ Paul of Venice, *Logica Magna*, edited with an English Translation and Notes by N. Kretzmann, Oxford UP 1979, Part 1, fascicule 1, cap. 4: *De terminis mediatis et immediatis*

¹¹ Johannes Venator Anglicus, *Logica*. First critical edition from the manuscripts by L.M. de Rijk, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 1999, vol. I, tract 1, cap. 1: *De terminis mediatis et immediatis*.

¹² I intend to publish this commentary, preserved in, as far as I know, two manuscripts (MS Krakow, BJ 2105, ff. 43v-80v; MS Erfurt, Amplon. Q 243, ff. 1ra-51rb).

The commentaries are interesting in themselves, and are helpful to understand Billingham's book. They are interesting, I believe, because Richard's work is very concise and not very clear on important points, for instance on the notion of the *compositio nominum*. Commentaries on the *De probationibus terminorum* have not been edited so far.

The commentary

The text edited here is a commentary on Billingham's *De probationibus terminorum*, i.e. the first version. This is indicated by the fact that in the third part, he refers to three rules (in the later versions we find more rules). Still, our anonymous does not have exactly the version at his elbow like it is presented by De Rijk. He divides the commentary into 3 tracts. He subdivides the first tract into 3 parts, and again subdivides part 1 into 4 chapters. He subdivides the second tract into 5 chapters.

Our commentary corresponds to Billingham's text as presented by De Rijk as follows:

Anonymus, <i>Commentary on Billingham</i> , CLM 4385	Richard Billingham, <i>De probationibus terminorum</i> , ed. De Rijk
Tract 1, part 1, chapter 1L on the definition of terms	§ 1-6
chapter 2: on resolvable terms	§ 7-17
chapter 3: on exponible terms	§ 18-19
chapter 4: on functionalisable terms	§ 20
Tract 1, part 2: on componible terms	§ 21
Tract 1, part 3: on the same term being both resolvable, exponible and functionalisable	
Tract 2, part 2: chapter 1: on demonstrative propositions, on indefinite affirmative, particular affirmative and indefinite negative propositions.	§ 23-33
chapter 2 on universal affirmative propositions.	§ 34-43
chapter 3 on universal negative propositions, on 'first', 'last', 'most' and	

'least'.	§ 44-48
chapter 4: on comparatives.	§ 49-51
chapter 5: on superlatives, exclusives, exceptives, on 'differs', 'other', and 'not the same'.	§ 52-54
chapter 6: on 'begins' and 'ceases', on functionalisable propositions.	§ 56-61
Tract 3: three general rules and some notes	§ 71-79

The manuscript

M = MS Munich, *Bayerische Staatsbibliothek*, CLM 4385, ff. 107va-112rb.

Catalogue: *Catalogum codicum latinorum bibliothecae regiae Monacensis composuerunt C. Halm et G. Laubmann. Munich 1868-1881, p. 184.* The manuscript is rather superficially described in the catalogue. Halm and Laubmann note that in our manuscript on ff. 106 – 112 is found *Richardi Biligani de studio Oxoniensi logica*. In fact, ff. 107va-112rb contain our anonymous commentary. On ff. 102ra-107rb a commentary on William of Sutton's *Consequentiae* is found.¹³

The text itself is written in two columns and by a single hand in gothic cursive. The headings are written by a different hand than that wrote the main text. For a fuller description of the manuscript I refer to the 'De Rijk files'.¹⁴ In the manuscript one finds logical texts on the properties of terms, a.o. by the fourteenth century masters Hugo Kym, Johannes Lebendorfer, Thomas Manlevelt and Marsilius of Inghen, as well as commentaries on Manlevelt. Further one finds anonymous logical texts and commentaries on anonymous texts.

¹³ f. 102ra: Inc.: Text: *Quoniam in sophismatibus*. Hic magister pertractat de secunda parte nove logice, scilicet de passionibus propositionum. Et habet duas partes, scilicet prohemiale et executivam, scilicet ibi 'in aliis (?)'.

Circa initium consequentiarum. Circa initium libri consequentiarum primo videndum est quid sit subiectum scientie presentis libri. Unde illa questio tantum valet quid est subiectum in tali scientia (...)

Expl.: Et tunc magister subdit quomodo propositiones debent exponi ratione istarum dictionum 'differt', 'aliud', 'non-idem', hoc non pertinet ad presentem librum sed ad Biligam.

Et sic est finis huius libri.

¹⁴ See the website of the Huygens Institute, The Hague, Cf. L.M. de Rijk / E.P. Bos, *Inventory of Medieval Manuscripts*, <http://www.mlm.huygensinstituut.nl>.

According to Halm and Laubmann, the copy of our commentary dates XIV-XVth century. Our text cannot be dated exactly. In the manuscripts we find dates on f. 22rb: 1384, f. 119va: 1409, but these texts are written by different hands from the hand which wrote our text.