

<b>Zeitschrift:</b>	Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie = Revue philosophique et théologique de Fribourg = Rivista filosofica e teologica di Friburgo = Review of philosophy and theology of Fribourg
<b>Band:</b>	31 (1984)
<b>Heft:</b>	1-2
<b>Artikel:</b>	A neglected gloss on the "Isagoge" by Peter Abelard
<b>Autor:</b>	Mews, Constant
<b>DOI:</b>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-760859">https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-760859</a>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 13.02.2026

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

CONSTANT MEWS

## A neglected gloss on the «*Isagoge*» by Peter Abelard

Within a small article published in 1911 Martin Grabmann drew attention to an anonymous gloss on the *Isagoge*, titled *Glossae super librum Porphyrii secundum vocales*, found in the Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS. M. 63 sup., ff. 73ra–81vb, alongside glosses of Abelard on the *Isagoge*, the *Categories* and the *De interpretatione* on ff. 1ra–72va of the same manuscript<sup>1</sup>. He showed that these anonymous *Glossae*, as they may be referred to for convenience, contained passages very similar both to parts of Abelard's gloss on the *Isagoge* as found on ff. 1ra–15vb of the same manuscript and to parts of quite different *glossulae* of Abelard, found in the Lunel, Bibliothèque municipale MS. 6, ff. 8r–41r<sup>2</sup>. Because none of these glosses had been edited in full, Grabmann could not undertake a detailed comparison of the three works, but he did point out their close textual interrelationship. He commented that the discussion of universals in the anonymous *Glossae* was of particular interest<sup>3</sup>. Grabmann assumed that the anonymous author of these *Glossae* must have been influenced by the glosses of Abelard on the *Isagoge* of Porphyry as found in both the Ambrosian and Lunel manuscripts, while developing Abelard's ideas further. He justified his claim that the work was written by a disciple of Abelard by quoting the phrase on f. 76ra of the *Glossae*, *Dicebat enim olim magister noster*, which he assumed without explanation was a reference to Abelard himself<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> ‘Mitteilungen über scholastische Funde in der Biblioteca Ambrosiana zu Mailand’, *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 93 (1911), pp. 538–44.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 540–544.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 540.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 544.

Grabmann's ideas about the anonymous *Glossae* were developed in more detail by Bernhard Geyer, who, between 1919 and 1933, published critical editions of various glosses of Abelard, as found in the Ambrosian library manuscript under the title of *Logica «Ingredientibus»* (hereafter cited as *LI*) and in the Lunel manuscript under the title of *Logica «Nostrorum petitioni sociorum»* (hereafter cited as *LNP*)<sup>5</sup>. He promised to edit the anonymous *Glossae* because they were so closely related to the glosses of Abelard on the *Isagoge* in *LI* and *LNP*, but he eventually edited only two small fragments of the work<sup>6</sup>. Because there were many passages in the *Glossae* identical to parts of both *LI* and *LNP*, Geyer used the text of these *Glossae* (*A<sub>2</sub>* in his terminology) to correct sections of the text of both *LI* and *LNP* (*A* and *L* respectively in his terminology)<sup>7</sup>. Although he acknowledged that the *Glossae* sometimes contained a text superior to that of both *LI* and *LNP*, Geyer followed Grabmann in thinking that they were written by a disciple of Abelard. He postulated that the work was a compilation of various authentic glosses of Abelard, namely *LI*, *LNP* and another intermediary gloss which has not survived<sup>8</sup>.

In the same year as Geyer produced his edition of *LNP* and two fragments of the *Glossae*, Carmelo Ottaviano published a complete edition of the latter work and argued that they were written by Abelard himself<sup>9</sup>. Ottaviano based his argument on the close similarity both of the ideas and the text itself of the *Glossae* to those of *LI*; he did not, however, take into account the fact that there were other parallels between the *Glossae* and *LNP*. The intention of this study is to investigate the conflicting claims of Ottaviano and Geyer about the authorship of these *Glossae secundum vocales* and to establish their textual relationship to the known writings of Peter Abelard.

<sup>5</sup> Peter Abaelards *Philosophische Schriften*, I. *Die Logica 'Ingredientibus'*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters (hereafter cited as BGPTMA), 21. 1–3, Münster i. W. 1919–27; II. *Die Logica 'Nostrorum petitioni sociorum'*, BPTMA, 21. 4, Münster i. W. 1933 (2nd revised edition 1973).

<sup>6</sup> *Philosophische Schriften*, p. ix: «... die ich ebenfalls edieren werde, weil sie in engster Beziehung zu den Glossen Abaelards stehen und in textkritischer und literaturgeschichtlicher Beziehung für diese von Bedeutung sind.» Geyer edited two fragments alongside *LNP*, pp. 583–8. The manuscript is mistakenly cited as M. 64 sup. instead of as M. 63 sup.

<sup>7</sup> *Philosophische Schriften*, pp. ix–x.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 610–612.

<sup>9</sup> 'Un opusculo inedito di Abelardo', *Fontes Ambrosiani*, 3 (Florence 1933), pp. 95–207.

### *The manuscript*

As the manuscript, Biblioteca Ambrosiana M. 63 sup., has been described in some detail by Minio-Paluello, only a few features need be noted here<sup>10</sup>. These glosses on the *Isagoge* (ff. 1ra–15vb), the *Categories* (ff. 16ra–43vb) and the *De interpretatione* (ff. 44ra–71rb) are written in the same hand, while a short text about modal propositions, added in a different hand on ff. 71ra–72va, is not part of Abelard's gloss on the *De interpretatione*, as mistakenly thought by Geyer<sup>11</sup>. Minio-Paluello has shown that the complete text of Abelard's gloss on this work is found only in the Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek MS. lat. fol. 624, ff. 97r–146r. He has also argued that the short text on modal propositions is not by Abelard, but emanated from the circle of his teaching<sup>12</sup>. The *Glossae secundum vocales*, found on ff. 73ra–81vb, are written on a separate quaternion (with the addition of an extra leaf) from the rest of the manuscript in a hand apparently different from, though very similar to the hand which wrote the preceding glosses. The manuscript as a whole seems to date from the late twelfth century, although there is no indication as to where it may have been written<sup>13</sup>. Nothing is known of its whereabouts before it was given to Cardinal Federigo Borromeo, founder of the Ambrosian library, by Camillo Bossi of Modena in 1605<sup>14</sup>.

The *Glossae secundum vocales* are incomplete in that they break off in mid-column on f. 81 vb *sed e converso verum omni est...*, presumably due to a deficient exemplar. The final section *de communitatibus* is thus missing as is the last part of the section *de accidente*. Ottaviano thought that the

<sup>10</sup> Minio-Paluello, *Twelfth Century Logic. Texts and Studies II. Abaelardiana Inedita* (Rome 1958), pp. xvi–xvii, extending the description of Geyer, *Philosophische Schriften*, pp. viii–x. The manuscript had been noted by B. Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum MSS. Nova* (Paris 1739), col. 521D; the editors of *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 12 (Paris 1769), p. 130 (reprinted *PL* 178, 38); A. Rosmini-Serbati, who cited extracts in *Aristotele esposito ed esaminato, 1. Opere edite e inedite*, ed. E. Turolla, vol. 29 (Padua 1963), p. 15n (first published in Turin, 1857).

<sup>11</sup> *Twelfth Century Logic*, p. xvii. The short text which does not belong to Abelard's gloss on the *De interpretatione* is edited by Geyer, *LI*, pp. 497. 20–503. 28.

<sup>12</sup> *Twelfth Century Logic*, pp. xvii–xxi. Minio-Paluello completed and corrected Geyer's edition of Abelard's gloss on the *De interpretatione* on pp. 1–108, 125–8.

<sup>13</sup> *Twelfth Century Logic*, p. xvi.

<sup>14</sup> According to the *Inventario Ceruti: Hic codex fuit ad ill. mum card. Federicum a Camillo Bossio mutina dono missus anno 1605. Olgatius scripsit*, cited by D. E. Luscombe, *The School of Peter Abelard* (Cambridge 1969), p. 89 n. 2.

*Glossae* also lacked a beginning, although the incipit *Quod antiquitus logicam dicebant, modo logicam sive dialecticam appellant* does serve as an adequate introduction to the work as a whole<sup>15</sup>. The *Glossae* are written in a fine school hand, highly abbreviated and not free from a number of scribal errors. Ottaviano's edition cannot always be trusted to give an accurate rendering of the text and some of his readings have to be treated with caution<sup>16</sup>.

### *The authorship of the Glossae secundum vocales*

Ottaviano argued that the *Glossae* were written by Abelard because not only did they express his major ideas, but they contained many passages very similar or sometimes identical to parts of the *Logica (Ingredientibus)*<sup>17</sup>. He also argued that criticisms expressed in the *Glossae* corresponded to Abelard's own criticisms of the teaching of William of Champeaux and Roscelin of Compiègne<sup>18</sup>. One particularly important passage which Ottaviano cited deserves to be quoted in full, because it was also used by Grabmann and Geyer as evidence that the work was written by a disciple of Abelard:

Dicebat enim olim magister noster quod Boethius de rebus agebat per genus et species in illa propositione «Genera et species non sunt», postea in solutione transferre se ad vocabula, quod non multum valet. Potest etiam fortasse intelligi ita illa propositio «Genus et species non sunt», hoc est generalia et specialia vocabula non significant aliquam de rebus existentibus, determinando scilicet eam et discrete agendo de ea, igitur verum est iuxta illud Boethii. Nam cum dico «omnis homo», intellectus audientis quid rationabiliter intelligat non habet. Et secundum hoc etiam non bona prima pars argumentationis, ubi probat genus et speciem non esse, id est non significare aliquid, id est intellectum facere aliquem de rebus concipientem<sup>19</sup>.

<sup>15</sup> Ottaviano, 'Un opusculo inedito', p. 97.

<sup>16</sup> Minio-Paluello commented that Ottaviano's edition was 'very unsatisfactory', *Twelfth Century Logic*, p. xvi n. 13. Some idea of its inadequacy can be gained by comparing it with Geyer's edition of two fragments of the *Glossae*. All extracts cited here have been checked against a microfilm of the manuscript provided by the Biblioteca Ambrosiana. The writer is working on a new edition of the *Glossae*.

<sup>17</sup> 'Un opusculo inedito', pp. 102–105.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 102–103.

<sup>19</sup> *Glossae* IV. 1, ed. Ottaviano, p. 145.

Grabmann's hypothesis, followed by Geyer, that *magister noster* referred to Abelard makes little sense in the context of the passage, in which the ideas of Abelard, far from being criticised, are reproduced with remarkable fidelity to his thought. The commentary in the *Glossae* on the interpretation of Boethius of the proposition *Genera et species non sunt* immediately preceding the criticism of the teaching of *magister noster* is in part identical to that given by Abelard in *LNP*<sup>20</sup>. The doctrine imputed to this teacher – that *genera* and *species* did not exist as *res*, but were simply *vocabula* – is much closer to the opinion of Roscelin, whom Abelard criticised in a not dissimilar fashion in the *Dialectica*, than to that of Abelard himself<sup>21</sup>. The much more subtle interpretation advanced in the *Glossae* that general or particular words did not signify anything about existing *res* was precisely that of Abelard, who taught in *LNP* that «man» did not signify any particular man:

Non est itaque necesse, ut si hominem intelligam, ideo hunc vel illum intelligam, cum multi alii innumerabiles conceptus sint, in quibus humana excogitatur natura, sed indifferenter, absque ulla scilicet certitudine personae, sicut haec ipsa conceptio simplex huius hominis «homo» vel huius nominis «album» simpliciter... Sicut est intellectus «omnis» qui ad omnes homines pertinet, quia unumquemque secundum intellectum illius sane possumus deliberare et aliquid esse illius significare<sup>22</sup>.

The same idea is repeated in very similar terms later in the *Glossae*:

Licet omne quod est discretum sit, *genera* et *species* non significant aliquid ut discretum, et tamen aliquid significant; ut «homo» haec vox, licet non significet hunc vel hunc, – quia non facit intelligi hanc discrete vel illum, et sic de singulis, – tamen significat hominem, et tamen omnis homo est hic vel ille. Sed non omne significans hominem est significans hunc vel illum, quia non facit intelligi hunc discrete vel illum, et sic de aliis; et modo facit intelligi hominem hunc et talem, acceptum facit quod animal rationale mortale concipio, sed non talem quod hunc vel illum<sup>23</sup>.

<sup>20</sup> *Dialectica*, ed. L. M. De Rijk (Assen 1956), V. I, pp. 554–555: *Fuit autem, memini, magistri nostri Roscellini tam insana sententia ut nullam rem partibus constare vellet, sed sicut solis vocibus species, ita et partes adscribebat.*

<sup>21</sup> *LNP*, ed. Geyer, p. 531. 14–23.

<sup>22</sup> *Glossae* III. 9, ed. Ottaviano, p. 134.

<sup>23</sup> *Philosophische Schriften*, p. 612.

There is no criticism of Abelard's doctrine implied in the *Glossae* whatsoever. Abelard did not believe that *genera* and *species* were simply *vocabula* in the manner of his former teacher, Roscelin of Compiègne. If this were an inaccurate criticism of Abelard, it would be completely at odds with the whole tenor of the *Glossae*. The reference to *magister noster* makes much more sense as applied to Roscelin by Abelard himself.

Geyer explained the intellectual affinity between the ideas of the *Glossae* with those of Abelard as the result of a disciple drawing on ideas of his master. He based his argument that the work was a compilation of a number of genuine writings of Abelard on a few small irregularities in the text of its opening section<sup>24</sup>. The first was what Geyer believed to be the unnecessary repetition of a reference to the logical writings of Aristotle: the passage of the *Glossae* (ed. Ottaviano, I. 4, p. 112; ed. Geyer, p. 586. 11–27) *Ad naturam itaque simplicium vocum... scripta sunt*, followed by the passage (ed. Ottaviano, I. 5, pp. 113–14; ed. Geyer, p. 587. 10–18) *In scribendo autem logicam hic ordo servatur... Topica et Analetica*. Geyer argued that such a repetition was uncharacteristic of Abelard, but could be explained as the result of a compiler drawing first from *LNP* (ed. Geyer, pp. 508. 32–509. 8) and then from *LI* (ed. Geyer, p. 2. 8–15)<sup>25</sup>. The repetition of ideas is, however, slight as the first passage is about the contents of Aristotle's writings, the second about their logical order. Geyer's claim to detect literary clumsiness, alien to Abelard's literary style, is not backed up by any other examples of awkward repetition of ideas found in both *LI* and *LNP*. It is too subjective an interpretation of one text on which to build a theory of the authorship of the work.

The second example which Geyer cited as evidence that the work was a compilation was the repetition of a passage in the *Glossae* (ed. Ottaviano, I. 5, p. 114; ed. Geyer, pp. 587. 34 – 588. 5): *Vis argumentorum... per impossible*, found earlier in the *Glossae* (ed. Ottaviano, I. 4, p. 112; ed. Geyer, p. 586. 6–22). He claimed that the two passages must have been taken from different sources. The repeated version of the passage simply provides, however, a more comprehensible text than occurs in the first version, in which is found the nonsensical syllogism: *bic non est flos, ergo est niger* (ed. Geyer, p. 586. 9). This should read:

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 610–611.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 611. Geyer's reference in the first paragraph to *A<sub>1</sub>* (= *LI*) p. 3. 8–15 should read p. 2. 8–15.

... aliquando secundum significationem intellectus, ut: homo non est flos; ergo non est rosa; aliquando ex significatione rerum, ut: hic [MS *add.* homo] est corvus; ergo est niger.

The second version is not without textual error, but it is better than the first<sup>26</sup>. Abelard repeats the same syllogism in *LNP*<sup>27</sup>. Whether the scribe repeated the passage by accident or design, it is clear that the *Glossae* should not be treated as a compilation from different sources, but as a work very similar to the other glosses of Abelard, the single manuscript of which is not always free from fault.

The most important feature of Geyer's analysis was his recognition that some parts of the *Glossae* were based on an authentic gloss of Abelard on the *Isagoge*, different from both *LI* and *LNP*. Part of the repeated passage in the *Glossae* is too different from either known of Abelard to have been copied from one or other. Geyer postulated that this authentic gloss of Abelard on the *Isagoge*, which he presumed to be no longer extant, was the common source behind the striking textual parallels between the section of the *Glossae* on identity and difference and the section of the *Tractatus de Unitate divina* or *Theologia «Summi boni»* on this subject<sup>28</sup>. In fact, the manuscript of the *Glossae*, although imperfect, provides a text of these intermediate glosses of Abelard of the same value as do the manuscripts of *LI* and *LNP*.

By careful comparison of the relevant passages on identity and difference with those in the *Theologia Christiana*, Geyer observed that the *Glossae* and *TSum* equated identity of essence with identity of predication, but that Abelard explicitly rejected the idea in *LNP* and omitted any mention of it in *TChr*<sup>29</sup>. This meant that *LNP* had to have been

<sup>26</sup> Geyer's reference in the third paragraph to his edition of a fragment of the *Glossae* on p. 587. 34, *vis argumentationum*, should read: *vis argumentorum*. The homoioteleuton begins in fact in the preceding sentence: *alias per alias ... I am indebted to A. de Libera for suggesting that the repeated passage might be a correction.*

<sup>27</sup> *LNP*, p. 508. 15–28 (incorrectly cited by Geyer on p. 611 as p. 4. 15–28).

<sup>28</sup> *Philosophische Schriften*, p. 611–612. Geyer edited this section of the *Glossae*, p. 588. 6–39, equivalent in Ottaviano's edition to VI. 1, pp. 177–179. This parallels the section of the *Theologia 'Summi boni'* II, ed. Ostlender, BGPTMA, 35. 2–3, Münster i. W. 1939, pp. 54. 22–61. 13 (hereafter cited as *TSum*).

<sup>29</sup> *Philosophische Schriften*, pp. 600–602. The two modes are identified in the *Glossae* VI. 1, ed. Ottaviano, p. 178; ed. Geyer, p. 588. 10–11: *Qui etiam modus idem est ille qui est idem praedicatione*, and in *TSum* II, ed. Ostlender, p. 55. 4–5: *ac si diceremus idem praedicatione*. They are distinguished in *LNP*, p. 558. 17–19: *Quae identitas idem videtur esse cum identitate praedicationis quibusdam, quod falsum est.*

written after *TSum*, while the *Glossae*, or rather the source (*x*) on which Geyer believed they were in part based, had to have been written before *LNP*. Geyer did not try to investigate how far the passages in the *Glossae* parallel to passages in *LNP* were dependent on the missing source *x* rather than on *LNP*. In the absence of this gloss, Geyer argued that evidence for the sources of the compilation had to be looked for within *LNP*. He justified his decision not to edit the *Glossae* in their entirety on the grounds that the passages which were significant in that work were not extensive and did not contribute anything essentially new<sup>30</sup>.

### *A compilation or an evolving gloss?*

In a brief, but important comment, Geyer observed that the relationship between *LI* and *LNP* was similar to that between different versions of the *Theologia* in that *LNP* was a revised version of *LI*<sup>31</sup>. He also postulated that Abelard wrote another gloss on the *Isagoge* intermediary between *LI* and *LNP*, which provided a source for at least part of the *Glossae*. The issue which still needs to be examined is how far these *Glossae* reproduce the text of this intermediary gloss and what light they throw on Abelard's method of working.

If a table is drawn up of those passages in the *Glossae* which are parallel to sections of *LI* and *LNP*, the full extent of the intricate relationship between these three works can be studied in detail. These parallels are not always exact, as words or whole phrases are often found in one gloss which are not found in the same place or are expressed differently in another. Nonetheless, the number of these parallels is too great to be ignored.

<sup>30</sup> *Philosophische Schriften*, p. 612.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 599.

Table I. *Parallels between LI, the Glossae and LNP*

<i>LI</i> (ed. Geyer, cited by page and line)	<i>Glossae</i> (ed. Ottaviano, cited by chapter and page)	<i>LNP</i> (ed. Geyer, cited by page and line)
1. 5–7	I. 1, 106 106–7	505. 13–22, 506. 1–3
	107	506. 13–17
1. 7–11	107	
2. 2–7	108	507. 27–508. 3
1. 11–25	I. 3, 110 I. 4, 112	508. 33–509. 8
2. 8–15	I. 5, 113–14	508. 4–9
2. 21–26	II. 1, 115	509. 9–14
2. 26–38	II. 2, 116	
3. 1–6	II. 3, 116–17	509. 29–37, 510. 1–22
4. 14–34, 5. 12–19, 4. 34–5. 11	II. 4, 118–19	510. 23–511. 12 16–29
5. 23–6. 16	II. 5, 120–1	
6. 17–24	II. 6, 121	
6. 25–7. 9	II. 7, 121–2	
7. 9–19	II. 8, 122–3	
7. 21–24	III. 1, 123 124–5 III. 2, 125–6 III. 3, 126–7 III. 4, 128 128–9 III. 5, 129 III. 6, 130 III. 7, 130–1 III. 8, 131–2 132	511. 31–512. 5 524. 32–525. 14 525. 15–22 525. 23–36, 526. 3–4, 11–13 526. 14–21 526. 27–34 526. 35–527. 19 527. 20–29 527. 30–528. 8 528. 10–16 528. 16–19

<i>LI</i> (ed. Geyer, cited by page and line)	<i>Glossae</i> (ed. Ottaviano, cited by chapter and page)	<i>LNP</i> (ed. Geyer, cited by page and line)
	III. 9,	134 531. 33–532. 3
		135 531. 9–12
	III. 9,	135–6 532. 3–7
		136–7 531. 19–29
		137–8 532. 18–533. 9
8. 26–41		139–40
9. 1–11		140–1
30. 34–9	IV. 1,	141–2 528. 28–529. 11
31. 6–21		142 529. 12–21
31. 28–31, 23–27		143
		144–5 529. 28–37
		146 530. 3–19
	IV. 2,	147 534. 6–16
		147–8 534. 23–30
		149 535. 19–30
		149–50 535. 33–536. 6,
		11–16
		150 536. 40–537. 6
	V. 1,	152 541. 5–7, 10–11,
		19–28
	V. 4,	156 543. 8–19
	V. 5,	157 544. 13–19
		157–8 545. 5–20
	V. 7,	160 546. 5–9
		161 546. 15–17
		164 547. 6–11
50. 7–14		165 550. 37–551. 7
	V. 8,	165–6 551. 8–10, 14–19
	V. 9,	168–9 552. 8–28, 31–36
57. 14–17	V. 10,	170 553. 1–15
57. 23–35		171–2 553. 16–36
	V. 11,	173 554. 7–15
		173–4 554. 18–24
		174 554. 30–34

<i>LI</i> (ed. Geyer, cited by page and line)	<i>Glossae</i> (ed. Ottaviano, cited by chapter and page)	<i>LNP</i> (ed. Geyer, cited by page and line)
63. 4–10	175	555. 23–28
63. 10–30	175–6	555. 28–30, 31
		556. 16
65. 12–30	176–7	556. 17–32
65. 31–37	VI. 1, 177–8	558. 1–6
	VI. 2, 179–80	560. 16–40
67. 39–68. 3	VI. 3, 180–1	
69. 30–38		181
71. 27–35, 72. 1–13		182–3
73. 36–39	VI. 4, 184	
		184 561. 5–10, 14–16
76. 1–31	VI. 5, 185–6	561. 20–562. 9
76. 32–77. 3	VI. 6, 186	562. 10–16
	VI. 7, 186–7	562. 37–563. 17
	VI. 8, 187–8	562. 16–36
77. 6–14	188–9	563. 18–23
77. 15–41	189–90	563. 24–37
78. 24–26, 31–80. 4	VI. 9, 190–3	564. 1–565. 22
80. 5–81. 2	VI. 10, 194–5	565. 23–566. 25
81. 5–22		195–6
81. 23–38		196–7 568. 13–37
		197–8 567. 10–17, 19–21,
		568. 1–6
81. 39–82. 34	198–9	568. 9–12, 38–
		569. 31
88. 1–89. 19	VII. 201–2	574. 1–5, 9–12, 25–
		27, 13–21, 28–35
93. 5–11	VIII. 1, 202	576. 1–5
	VIII. 2, 202–3	576. 5–6, 577. 1–4

One of the most noticeable features of this table is that all the passages which are found in both *LI* and *LNP* also occur in the *Glossae*. According to Geyer's theory, the compiler sometimes borrowed from *LI*, sometimes from *LNP* and sometimes from an intermediary gloss (*x*) written by Abelard after *LI*, but before *LNP*. Geyer did not explain why

the compiler should have drawn on so many different sources. A much simpler explanation is to see the text of the *Glossae* as a revision of that of *LI*, while the text of *LNP* as a revision of that of the *Glossae*. The text of the *Glossae* in the Ambrosian library manuscript may not be free from a number of scribal errors, but this does not imply that the original work should not be considered as genuine. Geyer dismissed the possibility that *LNP* might be a revision of the *Glossae* simply by stating that the *Glossae* were not authentic, «weil ebenso das Sondergut von *L* gegenüber *A*<sub>2</sub> als echt abaelardisch erwiesen werden kann»<sup>32</sup>. The arguments which he adduced to demonstrate this are, however, far from exclusive. The apparent repetition of a reference to Aristotle in the *Glossae* cannot in itself be used to distinguish the work of a disciple from that of Abelard, while scribal errors within the text of the single extant manuscript may stem only from copying of the work. The reference to *magister noster* within the *Glossae* makes more sense when applied to Roscelin of Compiègne than to Peter Abelard. The textual parallels evident within *Table I* are so numerous as to suggest that the *Glossae* do represent a work written by Abelard after the *Logica «Ingredientibus»*, but before the *Logica «Nostrorum petitioni sociorum»*.

Abelard may have written other glosses on the *Isagoge* of Porphyry, which may illuminate further the development of the *Glossae* and of *LNP* from the text of *LI*, but these have not survived. There are no clear textual parallels between Abelard's earliest known glosses on the *Isagoge*, found in the *Introductiones parvulorum*, and those of *LI*, although they contain the germ of the ideas developed in detail in later glosses<sup>33</sup>. If the four glosses are compared with each other, a picture emerges of a mind continually rethinking basic issues about language posed by Porphyry in the *Isagoge*. The *Glossae*, far from being a compilation from different sources, represent a stage in Abelard's intellectual development, always in a state of continuous movement.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 612.

<sup>33</sup> Pietro Abelardo. *Scritti filosofici*, ed. M. Dal Pra, Nuova Biblioteca Filosofica, II. 3 (Rome-Milan 1954), pp. 3–42. They are found in the Paris MS, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 13368, ff. 156r–162v.

*The evolution of the glosses on Porphyry*

Comparison of individual passages in *LI*, the *Glossae* and *LNP* throws light on the way in which Abelard continued to revise what he had written. To take just one of many examples, a sentence in the introduction of *LI* is found in slightly altered form in the *Glossae*, while it is extended further in *LNP*:

*LI* (ed. Geyer, p. 2. 1–5)

De qua etiam hac ratione conscriptam esse meminit atque eam ad certas argumentationum regulas reductam esse, ne nimium vagos falsis complexionibus in errorem pertrahat, cum id quod in rerum natura non invenitur, rationibus suis videatur astruere et saepe contraria in conditionibus suis colligere hoc modo: «Socrates est corpus... etc.»

*Glossae* (ed. Ottaviano, I. 1, p. 108; ed. Geyer, p. 584. 7–13)

Ad huiusmodi discretionem ergo philosophi laborantes conati sunt ad certas regulas omnes argumentationes reducere ne quis indiscretus in argumentis falsas eorum complexiones pro veris recipiat, atque id quod in natura rerum non invenitur [rerum] concedere compellatur [MS.: appellatur] ac plurimum perturbetur, cum saepe contraria in conclusionibus colligi viderit hoc modo: «Socrates est corpus... etc.»

*LNP* (ed. Geyer, pp. 507. 27–508. 1)

Ad huiusmodi discretionem [Geyer: discretiones] philosophi laborantes conati sunt ad certas regulas argumentationes reducere, ne quis indiscretus in argumentationibus falsas pro veris recipiat. Sicut enim ex similitudine rerum decipimur, ita et in complexionibus contingit. Sicut enim quam plurimos videri pulchros contingit, cum tamen faciat adornatio, ita et versipelles sophistae falsarum complexionum fallacias polientes sophisticis argumentationibus nobis alludunt, atque id quod [est] in natura rerum non invenitur, concedere compellunt, cum saepe contraria in conclusionibus colligi videantur hoc modo: «Socrates est corpus... etc.»

The subject of the sentence is changed from Boethius to philosophers in general and a few other phrases changed in the *Glossae*, while a passage highly critical of certain *versipelles sophistae* is added in *LNP*. This

may be a reference to Roscelin of Compiègne, whom Abelard criticised indirectly in the *Theologia (Summi boni)* as *versipellis sophista, qui auctoritate peripateticorum me arguere niteris*<sup>34</sup>.

One indication that Abelard may have deliberately been trying to disassociate himself from the teaching of his former teacher in *LNP* is the change in his description of a universal as a *sermo* rather than as a *vox*, as he had described it in *LI*<sup>35</sup>. John of Salisbury characterised the difference of opinion between Abelard and Roscelin about universals in terms of their definitions of it as a *sermo* and as a *vox* respectively<sup>36</sup>. For Roscelin, a universal was simply a physical sound of human imposition, whereas for Abelard a universal, although just a word, signified something about that which it predicated. Abelard had not always described a universal as a *sermo*. His adoption of the term in *LNP* may reflect his concern to distinguish his own approach more clearly from that of Roscelin.

The major difference between *LI*, the *Glossae* and *LNP* lies in the different ways in which they discuss the problems of universals. While Abelard omitted any detailed discussion of the subject in the *Introductiones parvolorum*, he devoted a long section in *LI* to arguing that a universal was a *vox* rather than a *res*<sup>37</sup>. In the *Glossae*, while the introductory section on the nature of logic was maintained, the discussion of *LI* about universals was omitted and the idea put forward instead that the ques-

<sup>34</sup> *TSum* II, ed. Ostlender, p. 52. 10–11. Abelard stated that he wrote this treatise to refute the tritheistic heresy of Roscelin in a letter to the bishop of Paris, *Epist. 14: ... multas in me contumelias et mina evomuerit viso opusculo quodam nostro de fide sanctae Trinitatis, maxime aduersus haeresim praefatam, qua ipse infamis est, conscripto* (PL 178, 356D–357A).

<sup>35</sup> In *LI*, ed. Geyer, p. 16. 21–22 Abelard stated: *restat ut huiusmodi universalitatem solis vocibus adscribamus*; in *LNP*, ed. Geyer, p. 522. 28–31 he stated: *Sic ergo sermones universales esse dicimus, cum ex nativitate, id est ex hominum institutione, praedicari de pluribus habeant; voces vero sive res nullatenus universales esse, etsi omnes sermones voces esse constat*. On the development of Abelard's terminology about universals see J. Jolivet, *Arts de langage et théologie chez Abélard* (Paris 1969), pp. 69–71, and M. T. Beonio-Brocchieri Fumagalli, *La Logica di Abelardo* (2nd edn. Florence 1969), pp. 49–71. Abelard's approach to universals in general has been expounded in many studies, notably by M. Tweedale, *Peter Abailard and Universals* (Amsterdam-New York-Oxford 1976), L. M. De Rijk, 'The semantical impact of Abailard's Solution of the Problem of Universals, in *Petrus Abaelardus (1079–1142). Person, Werk und Wirkung*', ed. R. Thomas, Trierer Theologische Studien, Bd 38 (Trier 1980), pp. 139–151, and W. L. Gombocz 'Abaelards Bedeutungslehre als Schlüssel zum Universalienproblem' on pp. 153–164 of the same volume.

<sup>36</sup> *Metalogicon* II. 17, ed. C. C. J. Webb (Oxford 1929), p. 92; *Policraticus* VII. 12, ed. C. C. J. Webb (Oxford 1909), II, p. 142.

<sup>37</sup> *LI*, ed. Geyer, pp. 9. 12 – 32. 12; cf. *Scritti filosofici*, pp. 5–6.

tion whether *genera* or *species* existed *in solis et nudis et puris intellectibus* arose from misunderstanding philosophical statements about *genera*:

In hanc dubitationem inciderant ex locutionibus philosophorum huiusmodi: «Animal est genus; animal est universale; genus est in pluribus; animal est commune; homo est species; hoc praedicatur de pluribus etc.», in quibus haec nomina «animal», «homo» et similia in propria et usitata significatione accipientes, animal, id est res huius vocis, animal, quae res est substantia animata sensibilis, et personam hominis, id est animal rationale, genus esse, speciem vel universalem vel communem etc. proponi credebant, – non intelligentes huius praedicta vocabula «homo» et «animal» etc. de personis subiectis, quibus imposita fuerunt, ad se ipsa significanda philosophos transtulisse<sup>38</sup>.

Abelard included this argument as well as those which follow in the *Glossae* in very similar form in *LNP*, although occasionally rephrasing individual passages. The most important change which he made was to add a long new section in which he argued that a universal was not a *res* or an *intellectus*, but a *sermo*<sup>39</sup>. Abelard's intention was to make more explicit the difference between his own emphasis on what a universal signified and Roscelin's description of it simply as a *vox*<sup>40</sup>. Having defined a universal as a *sermo*, Abelard could then add a long passage in criticism of Roscelin's definition which he claimed was inadequate:

Vox vero illud non habet, in quo terminatur descriptio et quod per diffinitionem copulatur, scilicet praedicabilitatem de pluribus, sed est illud quod praedicatur, quia est sermo praedicabilis. ... Hic sermo «animal» est genus, hoc vocabulum «animal» est genus et universale, et similiter omnes in quibus subicitur vox innuens institutionem, non simpliciter essentiam vel prolationem, sed significationem et praedicans communitatem, sicut est: genus, universale, sermo, vocabulum, dictio, oratio. Vox autem simpliciter innuens essentiam est ut animal, homo, vox, sonus aeris etc.<sup>41</sup>.

The remaining discussion about universals in *LNP* appears to have been taken from the *Glossae*, as perusal of *Table I* would suggest. By

<sup>38</sup> *Glossae* III. 2, ed. Ottaviano, p. 126. This passage is found in almost identical form in *LNP*, ed. Geyer, p. 525. 16–22.

<sup>39</sup> *LNP*, ed. Geyer, pp. 512. 7 – 524. 31.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 522. 10–524. 24.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 523. 5–8, 524. 4–10.

comparing the text of the *Glossae* with that of *LNP*, it becomes apparent that Abelard was particularly concerned in the latter work to refute the ideas of Roscelin, while he also incorporated ideas which he had already developed in the *Glossae*.

Abelard took care to introduce his new description of a universal as a *sermo* throughout the text of *LNP* as comparison of individual passages, otherwise very similar, makes clear:

*Glossae* (ed. Ottaviano, III. 3, p. 127)

Eadem persona enim appellatur ab universali nomine et a singulari; et nota «subsistant» transferri de rebus ad *voces* pro «appellantur subsistentia» ex adiunctione horum vocabulorum «genus» et «species», quae *vocibus* data sunt ex significatione.

*LNP* (ed. Geyer, p. 525, 33–36)

Eadem namque res ab universali nomine et particulari continetur et hoc loco hoc verbum «subsistit» de rebus ad *sermonem* transfertur per adiunctionem horum nominum: genus et species, quae *sermonibus* data sunt.

Later on in the *Glossae* (ed. Ottaviano, VI. 1, pp. 178–9; ed. Geyer, p. 588, 30–32) a similar change is made to the text:

Illud secundum effectum vel secundum pretium sunt quae idem valent ad efficiendum aliquid, sicut sunt *voces* eiusdem intellectus.

*LNP* (ed. Geyer, p. 560, 6–8)

Illud etiam secundum effectum vel secundum pretium dicimus quod idem valet ad efficiendum aliquid, sicut eosdem *sermones* dicimus, qui ad efficiendum intellectum valent.

A sentence in the *Theologia 'Summi boni'* is very similar to the version of this sentence in the *Glossae* in using *voces* rather than *sermones* as in *LNP*.

Idem secundum effectum aut secundum pretium dicuntur quae idem valent ad efficiendum aliquid, sicut easdem dicimus *voces* quae idem valent ad eumden manifestandum intellectum<sup>42</sup>.

<sup>42</sup> *TSum* II, ed. Ostlender, p. 57. 1–4.

This provides incidental confirmation of Geyer's hypothesis that *LNP* was written after *TSum*, while suggesting that Abelard may have been drawing from the text of the *Glossae* or a very similar work when he wrote his first treatise on the Trinity. Abelard was thus engaged in dispute with Roscelin on philosophical as well as theological matters at the time of writing the *Theologia 'Summi boni'*<sup>43</sup>. Comparison of *LNP* with the *Glossae* shows, however, that Abelard did not write a gloss on Porphyry quite different from that of *LI* only at this time, but that he revised a pre-existing gloss, itself a revision of *LI* in order to reflect his particular concerns at the time. The development of ideas is less dramatic if the *Glossae* are seen as an intermediary version between *LI* and *LNP*.

### *The glossae and the Theologia 'Summi boni'*

Besides throwing light on the development of Abelard's ideas about universals and the nature of language, the *Glossae* also illuminate his treatment of identity and difference in the *Theologia 'Summi boni'*. Geyer pointed out that this section of *TSum* was closer to the corresponding part of the *Glossae* than to that of *LI* or *LNP*, but he did not explore the significance of this in terms of the literary construction of *TSum* or *LNP*<sup>44</sup>. Comparison of the relevant texts reveals the close relationship between Abelard's writings on logic and those on theology and the continuity of his thought on these two subjects.

Whereas in *LI* Abelard simply stated that the three modes of difference identified by Porphyry – genus, species and number – could be interpreted in various ways, he disregarded this classification in the *Glossae* and spoke of identity and difference as possible in a number of ways: essence, number, definition, similitude, immutability or effect<sup>45</sup>. Abelard wanted to stress that *idem* or *diversum* could have many different meanings, depending on the context in which the terms were used. He enumerated these very same modes of identity and difference in the *Theologia 'Summi boni'* in order to discuss how there could be a diversity of

<sup>43</sup> *Philosophische Schriften*, pp. 599–600.

<sup>44</sup> *V. supra*, n. 28.

<sup>45</sup> *Glossae* VI. 1, ed. Ottaviano, pp. 178–9; ed. Geyer, p. 588. 6–39. Cf. *LI*, ed. Geyer, p. 66. 6–28.

persons within the Trinity<sup>46</sup>. The crux of the problem which confronted Abelard was that it did not seem possible to apply any distinct philosophical mode of difference to within God:

Summa, ut arbitror, omnium quaestionum haec est, quomodo scilicet in tanta unitate individuae ac penitus merae substantiae diversitatem personarum consideremus, cum nullus differentiae modus a philosophis distinctus videatur hic posse assignari secundum quem diversitas valeat ostendi<sup>47</sup>.

After a long passage about the transcendence of the divine nature from all human categories, Abelard then proceeded to answer criticism that none of the modes of difference defined by Porphyry applied to the three persons in God by claiming that Porphyry did not describe every mode of difference:

Quod autem nobis Porphyrium opponunt, qui de differentiis tractans modos differentiarum distinxit, sub quibus modus iste differentiae personarum, quae in Deo sunt, non cadit: nihil impedit. ... Multos etiam alios differentiae modos praeter hos quos Porphyrius distinguit, fateri cogimur, quos omnes ut plenius ac diligentius prosequamur, distinguendum est, quot et quibus modis idem accipiatur, sive etiam diversum, praesertim cum totius controversiae summa ex identitate divinae substantiae et diversitate personarum pendeat, nec aliter ipsa queat terminari controversia, nisi ostendamus hanc identitatem illi diversitati non esse contrariam<sup>48</sup>.

The description of the various modes of identity which followed in *TSum* is very similar to that which began the section on difference in the *Glossae*, although it contains more detail. The discussion of the subject in *LNP* is sometimes closer to that of *TSum* than that of the *Glossae*:

<sup>46</sup> *TSum* II, ed. Ostlender, pp. 54. 22 – 61. 13. There is some confusion within the text of *TSum* whether Abelard meant that there were six or more modes as stated at the end of the section in all three MSS of *TSum* II, p. 57. 5: Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek lat. 182, f. 50r; Oxford, Bodleian, Lyelle 49, f. 117r; Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, theol. lat. oct. 95, f. 31v. Ostlender emended the *quinq*ue to *sex* in his edition (p. 57. 5) to agree with the reference on p. 54. 22. The corresponding sentence in the *Glossae* VI. 1, ed. Ottaviano, p. 179, also has *quinq*ue *modis* (*V* on fo. 78rb of the Ambrosiana MS). With Roman numerals scribal errors are easily made.

<sup>47</sup> *TSum* II, ed. Ostlender, p. 47. 9–14.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 54. 2–17.

*Glossae* (ed. Ottaviano, *TSum* II (ed. Ostlender, *LNP* (ed. Geyer, p. 558. V. 1, p. 178; ed. Geyer, pp. 54. 28–55. 5) 15–21) p. 588. 6–7)

Dicimus enim idem secundum essentiam quorumcumque est eadem essentia, sicut idem est ensis quod mucro, vel substantia quod corpus, sive animal et homo vel Socrates, et album idem quod durum. Qui etiam modus idem est ille qui est idem praedicatione.

Idem esse secundum essentiam dicimus quorumcumque eadem est essentia, ita scilicet ut hoc sit illud, sicut idem est ensis quod mucro, vel substantia quod corpus, sive etiam Socrates, et album idem quod durum; et omnia eadem essentialiter dicuntur quaecumque praedicatione coniungi possunt. Quod tale est ac si diceremus idem praedicatione.

Nam idem dicitur in essentia quorum unumquodque est eadem essentia, ita scilicet ut haec essentia non sit illa, sicut hic homo et Socrates. ... Quae identitas idem videtur esse cum identitate praedicationis quibusdam, quod falsum est, cum multa sint eadem essentialiter et non praedicatione, sicut nomen et verbum et cetera huiusmodi.

The same phenomenon of an argument being extended in *TSum* from its brief form in the *Glossae* and then transferred to *LNP* can be observed by comparing the discussions of identity by number, definition, similitude, immutability and effect in each work<sup>49</sup>. It could be argued that the text of this part of the *Glossae* was abridged from that of *TSum*, but this seems less likely because *TSum* appears to contain a version of the text intermediary between that of the *Glossae* and that of *LNP*.

The importance of this discussion of identity and difference in the *Theologia 'Summi boni'* was that it enabled Abelard to argue that there was a mode of difference, namely that of definition, which could legitimately be applied to the persons in the Trinity without compromising God's essential unity. The originality of Abelard's approach lay in the way in which he discussed a traditional problem of logic, going much further

<sup>49</sup> *Glossae* VI. 1, ed. Ottaviano, pp. 178–9; ed. Geyer, p. 588. 11–32; *TSum* II, ed. Ostlender, pp. 55. 6 – 57. 4; *LNP*, ed. Geyer, pp. 558. 21–27, 559. 5–17, 30–34, 560. 1–2, 6–8.

than Porphyry had done in describing various possible modes of difference. By comparing the corresponding sections in the *Glossae*, *TSum* and *LNP*, it becomes apparent that the ideas which Abelard expressed in *TSum* are an elaboration of those outlined in the *Glossae*. The discussions of difference by essence, number and definition, summarised only briefly in the *Glossae* were discussed in much more detail in *TSum* because they were particularly relevant to Abelard's argument about the difference between the persons of the Trinity<sup>50</sup>. The originality of Abelard's approach to the Trinity was founded on the novelty of his approach to a problem posed by Porphyry in the *Isagoge*.

If Abelard's argument in *TSum* was more developed than in the *Glossae*, his argument in *LNP* was more developed still<sup>51</sup>. As Geyer correctly pointed out, Abelard revised the idea which he had mentioned in the *Glossae* and in *TSum* that identity of predication was the same as identity of essence. He replaced a reference to *voces* with the term *sermones*<sup>52</sup>. Abelard also changed the order of his argument in *LNP* so as to discuss each mode of difference after the corresponding mode of identity rather than within a separate section as in *TSum* and the *Glossae*<sup>53</sup>. The text of this part of *LNP* would appear to be influenced both by the *Glossae* and by *TSum*.

Abelard revised his discussion of identity and difference further in the *Theologia Christiana* in order to omit mention of the mode of effect, while to add the mode of property because it was particularly relevant to his discussion of the difference between the three persons of the Trinity<sup>54</sup>. The basic idea which Abelard was putting forward in all his glosses on the *Isagoge* and in each version of the *Theologia* was the same – that identity and difference were not absolute concepts, but could be interpreted in a number of different ways, none of which were mutually exclusive. Things could be technically different and the same at the same time. Abelard developed this philosophical idea further in the *Theologia Christiana*, while in the *Theologia 'Scholarium'* he simplified his argument by reducing the modes of identity and difference to only three

<sup>50</sup> This is particularly true of the modes of number and definition, *TSum* II, ed. Ostlender, pp. 57. 27 – 60. 16.

<sup>51</sup> *LNP*, ed. Geyer, pp. 558. 15 – 560. 15.

<sup>52</sup> *V. supra*, n. 29; *LNP*, ed. Geyer, p. 560. 7.

<sup>53</sup> *LNP*, ed. Geyer, pp. 558. 28 – 559. 4, 18–29, 35–36, 560. 3–5, 8–10.

<sup>54</sup> *TChr* III. 138–60, ed. Buytaert, *Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis*, XII (Turnhout 1969), pp. 247–254.

– similitude, essence or number and property<sup>55</sup>. His intention here, as throughout the *Theologia 'Scholarium'*, was to eliminate philosophical discussion which did not apply directly to the Trinity. By studying the development of Abelard's approach to identity and difference in both his glosses on Porphyry and in different versions of the *Theologia*, some insight is gained into Abelard's intellectual development as a whole.

### *Conclusion*

This study has been concerned with the close relationships, both textual and thematic, between the anonymous *Glossae secundum vocales*, found in the Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS. M. 63 sup., ff. 73ra-81vb, and various known writings of Abelard on logic and theology. These anonymous glosses seem to represent a revision made by Abelard of his *Logica 'Ingredientibus'*, while they appear to have been themselves revised in the *Logica 'Nostrorum petitioni sociorum'*. Geyer's argument that they were compiled by a disciple of Abelard from various genuine glosses of his master is unnecessarily complicated and does not fit with the evidence. The text of the *Glossae* as found in the Ambrosian library manuscript may not be free from a number of scribal errors incurred in copying of the work, but this does not mean that the glosses themselves cannot be genuine. Detailed comparison of the work with other writings of Peter Abelard confirms Ottaviano's opinion that the *Glossae secundum vocales* were written by Abelard himself.

<sup>55</sup> *Theologia 'Scholarium' (Introductio ad theologiam)* II, ed. Duchesne, *PL* 178. 1065A–66B. The writer is completing a new edition of this work and of *TSum* for the series *Corpus Christianorum*. For study of the relationship between the different versions of *TCbr* and *TSch*, see C. Mews, 'The development of the Theologia of Peter Abelard' in *Petrus Abelardus*, ed. Thomas (v. supra n. 35), pp. 183–198, and 'Peter Abelard's *Theologia Christiana* and *Theologia 'Scholarium'* re-examined' to appear in *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 52 (1985).

