The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/18623 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Helm, Alfred Charles van der  
**Title:** A token of individuality : Questiones libri porphirii by Thomas Manlevelt  
**Issue Date:** 2012-03-22
CHAPTER TWO

Thomas Manlevelt, life and works

The proper way to get acquainted with a philosopher is through his writings. Unfortunately, the present state of investigation does not allow us to draw up anything remotely like a definite bibliography of Thomas Manlevelt. For a tentative bibliography of Thomas Manlevelt however, just as for his biography, we should best turn to Lorenz’s 1996 paper on life and work of our author.1

2.1. Bibliography

As undoubtedly written by Thomas Manlevelt, Lorenz classifies the small tracts on terminist logic, the *parva logicalia*;2 that have earned him a place in modern handbooks on medieval logic.3 In the many manuscripts through which they are preserved they usually come as a trio: *De suppositionibus*, *De confusionibus* and *De consequentiae*.4 The authenticity of the first two of these has never been questioned; the authenticity of the third, *De consequentiae*, has to Lorenz’s mind been established by Brands.5

2 ‘Parva logicalia’ is here used in the sense of ‘short treatises on logical subjects in a terminist vein’; for two other shades of meaning of ‘parva logicalia’, see Braakhuis 1997, 135f.
4 This famous trio of tracts, widely used in the later medievals, is shortly to be presented in a critical edition by Lorenz, Kann and Grass. That these three tracts may have formed part of a logical *summa* by Manlevelt is suggested by Maierù 1972, 32, n. 93.
5 Lorenz 1996, 153, with reference to Brands 1996, 184f. The same work has also been ascribed to William of Sutton, but on the ground of doctrinal considerations,
With these three logical tracts comes a set of rules that can also safely be attributed to Manlevelt: *De ampliationibus*, *De restrictionibus*, *De appel-lationibus*, *De alienationibus* and *De remotionibus*. Furthermore, Lorenz shows no doubt about the ascription to Manlevelt of a *Tractatus de fallaciis*. Manlevelt must also have been the author of a tract on *Insolubilia*, that has however not been recovered yet. A work of a more polemical character, the anti-modist *Tractatus de improbatione modorum signifi-candi*, edited as an anonymous text by Kaczmarek, is also to be attributed to Thomas Manlevelt, says Lorenz, as long as it not proven otherwise. A *De incipit et desinit* that in half of its known manuscripts is ascribed to Thomas Manlevelt is reckoned by Lorenz to be more justly ascribed to Thomas Bradwardine (c. 1290–1349). Until it is seriously researched, Lorenz refrains from making a definitive statement on Manlevelt’s supposed authorship of the commentary in the form of *questiones* on the *Ars vetus*, known from the Amplonian Library, the first part of which, *Ques-

Brands shows that this tract *De consequentiis* is quite in line with Manlevelt’s *De suppositionibus*, and therefore is to be ascribed to Manlevelt as well.

6 There are other such tracts sometimes ascribed to Thomas Manlevelt, but not considered by Lorenz. For example there are two manuscripts of a tract on *Fallaciae breves*, mentioned by De Rijk 1982, 13, 29. In De Rijk’s as yet unpublished handwritten card-index in Leiden, mention is made of a tract *De inventione medii*. A work somewhat out of style with all these, to be found in Lehmann 1928, but also left unmentioned by Lorenz, was catalogued by the founder of the Bibliotheca Amplonian as *glosa egregii poete Maulevelt super Persium cum textu*. Piltz 1977, by the way, mentions quite some manuscripts ascribed to Manlevelt, but does not come up with titles not taken into account by Lorenz.

7 Lorenz 1996, 154, esp. n. 39.

8 Kaczmarek 1994.

9 By lack of investigation into Manlevelt’s works, Kaczmarek 1994, xxvi refrains from attributing this anti-modist tract to our author. Lorenz, who devotes a long footnote (Lorenz 1996, 155, n. 42) to a critical examination of Kaczmarek’s opinion on this matter, is more confident on Manlevelt’s authorship. As long as a critical textual investigation of the tract does not show that it is not by Manlevelt, says Lorenz, we may safely ascribe it to him. And such a critical investigation has not taken place yet, let alone that it has thrown serious doubts on Manlevelt’s authorship. Pinborg (1967, 196 n.) had been of the opinion that in this case the name of a better-known author (Thomas Manlevelt) was substituted for the name of a lesser-known author (John Aurifaber, fl. 1330). Another serious candidate for the authorship of the *Destructiones modorum significandi*, favoured by Pinborg but dismissed by Kaczmarek, is Peter of Ailly (1350–1420). That Thomas Manlevelt tends to be confused with authors chronologically so widely separated from one another, says enough about his own obscurity: Lorenz, by the way, dismisses Pierre d’Ailly’s possible authorship as a ‘Pseudo-Kontroverse’.

For more about this tract, and about the relationship of our author to Thomas Bradwardine in general, see below, subsection 4.6.1.
tiones libri Porphirii is edited here in full, and the second questio of the second part of which, Questiones supra Predicamenta, is edited here as an appendix.\textsuperscript{11} After giving the text its hitherto wanting research, I feel warranted to indeed ascribe these commentaries on the old logic to Thomas Manlevelt.

None of the manuscripts containing these texts are older than the later part of the fourteenth century. As will be seen, the earliest known manuscript of any of Manlevelt’s works which has a precise date attached to it stems from 1364.

Possible additions to the list of works ascribed to Thomas Manlevelt by Lorenz: commentaries, to wit, on the Physics and De anima, will be discussed below,\textsuperscript{12} as the authenticity of these works is dependent on the authenticity of the text presented here.

2.2. Biography

The problematic state of the bibliographical information on Thomas Manlevelt is more than matched by the almost total lack of biographical information. For ‘next to nothing is known about Thomas Maufelt.’ This lamentation by Brands in his 1996 paper on Manlevelt’s theory of supposition\textsuperscript{13} is echoed some years later by Grass in his study on the theory of consequentiae in pre-university Erfurt,\textsuperscript{14} in which Thomas Manlevelt plays a not unimportant role. In his 2008 paper on Manlevelt’s denial of substance, Andrews too cannot but concede that indeed little is known about our author’s life.\textsuperscript{15} No great advance seems to have been made, then, since 1974, when N.W. Gilbert presented ‘the mysterious “Thomas Maulefelt”’ as ‘a writer about whom we are almost completely uninformed’: ‘This logician leads a fugitive existence even by fourteenth century standards.’\textsuperscript{16}

As it is, hardly any fact can be accepted with a safe degree of certainty about the life and times and whereabouts of the fourteenth-century philosopher Thomas Anglicus dictus Maufelt.\textsuperscript{17} Indeed, if I want to

\textsuperscript{11} Lorenz 1996, 154: ‘Ob diese Kommentare tatsächlich von Maufelt stammen, bleibt einer eingehenden Untersuchung vorbehalten.’
\textsuperscript{12} Section 3.2.
\textsuperscript{13} Brands 1996, 185.
\textsuperscript{14} Grass 1998, 56.
\textsuperscript{15} Andrews 2008, 347.
\textsuperscript{16} Gilbert 1974, 113.
\textsuperscript{17} Maierù 1972, 31 holds that Manlevelt being an Englishman is about the only thing
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compile some sort of biography of this logician, I will have to confine myself to a sketchy outline as the highest attainable goal for the moment, without upholding any pretence that the sketchy results attained so far will never stand in need of correction. But I do not have to start from scratch, either.

The most extensive discussion of Manlevelt’s life is in Lorenz’s aforementioned 1996 paper, “Thomas Manlefelt (Maulefelt), Zu Leben und Werk” and this is the paper that provides us with the framework of Manlevelt’s biography – a framework heartily accepted by Andrews as well in his 2008 paper.

2.2.1. Biographical framework

Following Lorenz, Manlevelt’s tentative biography then runs as follows. He was born in England, but spent most of his active academic life in Paris in the 1320s and 1330s as a magister artium. He was a dedicated propagator of the logica modernorum and took it as his task to make away with the older logico-semantic theory of the modi significandi.

One of his pupils in Paris was John Aurifaber, who around 1330 spread Manlevelt’s teachings to Erfurt. By the end of 1330 Thomas Manlevelt was elected procurator of the English nation at the Paris faculty of arts. He probably was still teaching in Paris in 1337, but by 1339 had surely left Paris. Later he found employment as a teacher in pre-university Louvain, probably at the convent school of St. Peter. It is unknown if after that he worked anywhere else.

we know about him. In n. 9 Maierù refers to line of text above the manuscript edited here (‘Hec quesiones fuerunt compilate per Thom. Manvel Anglicum doctorem solemnem’), and to the Erfurt manuscripts Ampl. q 255 ‘Explicit tractatus fallacia-rum lectus Lovanii per mag. Thomam Anglicum dictum Manvel’. As I will presently make clear, the mentioning of Louvain, although passed over by Maierù, is not without meaning, either.

18 Lorenz 1996.
19 See Lorenz 1996, 164.
20 This assumption, based on Thomas being called Anglicus, is somewhat unsettled by the circumstance that Lorenz nor anyone else has thus far been able to find a trace of him in England. See Lorenz 1996, 157.
21 This anti-modal logician is not to be confused with the 16th century John Aurifaber (Goldschmidt), friend and disciple of Martin Luther, and editor of the latter’s table talks. On the 14th century Aurifaber, see Pinborg 1967, among others.
22 Lorenz 1996, 158.
24 This tentative biographical framework by Lorenz is more or less canonized by the mini-biography of Thomas Manlevelt in The Cambridge History of Medieval
2. THOMAS MANLEVELT, LIFE AND WORKS

His fame rests chiefly on his already mentioned works in the *parva logicalia*, which seem to have been spread mainly as a trio, comprising *De suppositionibus*, *De confusionibus* and *De consequentiis*. Widely popular in the fourteen hundreds, they were in use as textbooks and commented upon at universities in Germany and beyond: Leipzig, Erfurt, Prague, Vienna, Krakow, Uppsala. Manuscripts of his work remain in Edinburgh, Erfurt, Klagenfurt, Munich, Prague, Vienna, Uppsala.

2.2.2. Career in Paris

There are marginal notes to be made to this proposed *vita* of Thomas Manlevelt, for sure. Let us just take a closer look at Lorenz’s reasons for situating the key period of our author’s career in Paris in the 1320s and 30s.

Historical investigations have resulted in pinpointing not more than one single official document in which our author is supposed to be mentioned. In his book about the university of Erfurt in the thirteenth and fourteenth century, Lorenz not only links Thomas Manlevelt to the Erfurt curriculum, but grants him a place in Parisian history too, by identifying him as the ‘Thomas Anglicus, attorney on behalf of the Natio anglicorum’ who in the Chartularium of the University of Paris is twice mentioned for the year of 1331 as a Magister actu regens.

Of course, the twice mentioning of a certain ‘Thomas Anglicus’ in the Parisian charters is rather poor when taken as hard evidence for Manlevelt having stayed in Paris, as Lorenz seems to do. Thus, the identification of our ‘Thomas with the 1330 English master at Paris


26 The reference in Lorenz 1996, 158 n. 53 is to charters dated January 12 and 21, 1331. Reproduced in Deniile and Châtelain (eds.), 1891, pages 363 and 365, respectively.

27 Lorenz’s identification of the Parisian ‘Thomas Anglicus’ with Thomas Manlevelt begs to be questioned, and has in fact been questioned by Courtenay, among others. Stephen Read, in a conversation with the present author on 6 November 2006, stated that the mentioning of this ‘Thomas Anglicus’ ‘does not prove anything at all.’
has already been estimated as 'extremely tenuous' by Fitzgerald, who points out that the Parisian master of Arts, 'Thomas of England' is only identified as 'Thomas Maulfelt' in a single Melk manuscript and that most of the manuscripts of this 'Manlevelt' date from the 1360s at the earliest. The dating of our author's manuscripts may be right, but forms no conclusive counterproof to his presence at Paris in 1330. Moreover, Fitzgerald definitely did miss at least two other manuscripts identifying 'Thomas Anglicus' as 'Thomas Manlevelt' or any of its variant spellings.

Kaczmarek tends to support Lorenz's hypothesis, but comes up with a couple of other Thomases that might just as well have been the Thomas Anglicus mentioned in the Parisian charters.

One circumstantial fact we can be really certain of has no direct relation to the vita of Manlevelt, namely, that his writings were widely used and held in high esteem in the fifteenth century middle European universities of Leipzig, Erfurt, Prague and Vienna. To name but one example: in the early years of its existence, the University of Leipzig, founded in 1409, favoured nominalism; among the prescribed textbooks are those of William Heytesbury and Thomas Manlevelt. To realists, on the other hand, Manlevelt was a main target of sometimes vicious attacks, on a par with the most famous or infamous of nominalists. Thus, in 1406 in a dispute in Heidelberg, his name was included in a list of infamous masters accused of heresy by their realist opponent, that also included Ockham, Buridan and Marsilius of Inghen. Manlevelt being part of this

---

28 Fitzgerald 2002, 31. Fitzgerald's concern with this matter is provoked by the possibility that Albert of Saxony might have drawn insights from, or been influenced by, Thomas Manlevelt teaching in Paris. Somewhat beyond the scope of our study is Fitzgerald's other concern, about Albert maybe not being Buridan's pupil at all, otherwise than has hitherto been generally assumed.

29 Fitzgerald's reference is to Melk, ms. 1941.

30 Apart from the manuscript edited below, Erfurt, ms. CA.Q.288, also Erfurt, ms. CA.Q.253 is overlooked.

31 Kaczmarek 1994, xxxiv.

32 See for example Lorenz, 1996, 147.

33 On the 1406 disputation in Heidelberg, see Kaluza 1997. Jerome of Prague (1379–1416), follower and friend of John Hus, and ardent supporter of Wyclif's brand of realism, is reported to have launched the realists' attack in a ruthless manner: 'Magister Jeronimus asseruit et temerarie tenuit pocius et melius esse adherendum doctrine dicti Johannis Wicleph quam doctrine sancti Augustini, palam, publice et notorie. (…) Et propter hoc intulerit magistros Okkan, Maulveld, Buridanum, Marsilium et eorum sequaces non dialecticos, sed diabolice hereticos.' Cited after Kaluza 1997, 138, n. 27. The quotation is from L. Klicman's edition of the acts of the following doctrinal process against Jerome of Prague in Vienna, 1410–1412.
realist assault may serve as a perverse proof of his fame in those days. The spread of Manlevelt’s logical writings all over Europe could not have taken place if not from a centre of philosophical authority. Paris then is the only place that seems to come into account. Seen from this point of view, the spread of his logical tracts does throw some light on Manlevelt’s vita after all.

2.2.3. Bibliographical data from works and manuscripts

Let me examine the information indirectly pertaining to the life of Thomas Manlevelt that can be had from his works and the manuscripts containing these.

If there are doubts to be raised about Manlevelt’s supposed stay in Paris, his having taught in pre-university Louvain seems to be undisputed. There is at least one manuscript in which the name of Thomas is linked directly to Louvain. The text concerned is an exposé by Thomas on the fallacies, and the manuscript is to be found in Erfurt. The text ends: ‘Explicit tractatus fallaciarum lectus Lovanii per mag. Thomam Anglicum, dictum Manlovel.’

There is no doubt about Thomas’s authorship of this tract on the fallacies. So there seems to be no reason for doubt about his lecturing in Louvain, as reported in the manuscript of this tract, either.

The dating of Manlevelt’s work is less straightforward. His treatise on supposition is dated by Courtenay somewhere before 1360. As his witness for this he takes Pinborg, who mentions that the earliest copy of Manlevelt’s Tractatus de suppositionibus appears in a manuscript from Erfurt, now at Göttingen. This manuscript, belonging to the Franciscan monastery in Göttingen, was written by one Nicolaus in Erfurt, 1364. Apart from the text by Manlevelt it contains mainly Franciscan tracts on theological, juridical, astronomical and philosophical matters.

This dating of the treatise on supposition may not seem to be too spectacular. It does at least offer a corroboration of the thesis that Manlevelt did indeed compose his logical treatises before 1360, but it does little to pinpoint the exact date, which should be around 1330, if he did indeed compose them in Paris, and if he is indeed to be identified with the Thomas Anglicus that Lorenz wants to identify him with.

34 Reference to this text is made by Lorenz 1996, 157 n. 48. Also by Maierù 1972, 31, n. 91.
35 Courtenay1987, 234.
36 Pinborg 1967, 145f.
Courtenay does not seem to have found a reason to advance a post quem dating of Manlevelt’s tract on supposition that is considerably earlier than its ante quem dating around 1360. However, as long as there is no hard evidence for a post quem dating of any of Manlevelt’s writings that would indisputably run against the otherwise feasible biographical framework laid out by Lorenz, it would seem unwise not to follow Andrews in his support of Lorenz’s hypothesis that Thomas Manlevelt did work in Paris around 1330.  

2.2.4. Anglicus?  

Another question is in how far Thomas Manlevelt dictus Anglicus is really an Englishman. I will not follow Courtenay where he takes Thomas Manlevelt to have been one of the logicians working in Oxford, even though Courtenay’s estimation does corroborate mine when it comes to Manlevelt’s Ockhamist frame of mind. 

The English treatises and textbooks in logic produced in the second and third quarters of the fourteenth century at Oxford, Courtenay explains, provided more than just so many introductions to the various areas of the logica moderna. They made continental students aware of different approaches and assumptions in late mediaeval logic. William Sutton, whose work became popular in German universities, compared the theories of Ockham and Burley on supposition, favouring the latter. Manlevelt, along with Heytesbury and Dumbleton, identified himself more closely with terminism, and within that, with Ockhamist presuppositions. Feribrigge and Hunter, on the other hand, show no traces of nominalism. Manlevelt’s influence seems to have been confined to the German universities, while Heytesbury, Billingham, Strode, Feribrigge, and Hunter were also influential south of the Alps.

One can only agree with Courtenay that Thomas Manlevelt may be labelled ‘English’ in as far as he took active part in the development of the then prevalent British way of philosophising. But was he really an Englishman?

---

37 More about the terminus post quem and the terminus ante quem of the present text in section 3.4 below.
38 Courtenay 1987, 236.
39 Courtenay 1987, 236f.
40 Courtenay 1987, 237.
True, he is called Thomas Anglicus in several manuscripts, but this may reflect nothing more than that he probably studied in England and was associated with English logicians (or with the English nation at the University of Paris, which had German and Dutch members as well) in the minds of continental scholars. Thus he may have been named ‘Thomas the Englishman’ because he approached logic and philosophy in general in an ‘English’, that is to say: non-modistic frame of mind, which was deemed an important characteristic in the modistic stronghold that Erfurt was.

If his being called Englishman is insufficient to establish his English descent, could we perhaps learn more of Manlevelt’s origin from his proper name?

2.2.5. The spelling of the name ‘Manlevelt’

Unluckily, even the way his name is to be spelled is subject of debate. Besides being called Thomas Anglicus, his proper name is spelled in many ways, ranging from Manlevelt to Maulfeld, and even Manlovel. We have already met with some different ways of spelling in the article by Andrews and in Schum’s presentation of the latter-day scribbling on the manuscript of our text.

Not laying any claim to completeness, Kaczmarek in the introduction to his 1994 edition of Destructiones modorum significandi proceeds to sum up twenty odd variations of Manlevelt’s surname, found scattered among the scientific publications in which more often than not passing mention is made of the fourteenth century logician. The list runs: Malvelt, Manfelt, Manlefelt, Manlevel, Manleveld(t), Manlevelt, Manlovel, Mansfeld(?), Maualfelt, Maulefelt, Maulevelt, Maulfeld(t), Maulfelt, Mauliwelt(h), Maulveld, Maulvelt, Mauwelvelt, Mawelfelt, Mawlfelt, Mawlphelt.

Having scrutinized these variations from a lexico-historical point of view, Kaczmarek points out the English Maulefelt, with its German
variation Maulfelt, as the most likely form of the logician's surname. Kaczmarek's amply elucidated surmise is that Maulfelt's is a farmers' descend, his roots laying somewhere in the West of East Anglia or thereabout.  

One does not have to be an expert on the subject matter treated so meticulously by Kaczmarek to raise an obvious objection. It is clear enough to even the layman's eye that Kaczmarek's reasoning is somewhat speculative, here and there. Seeing the maze of suppositions on which Kaczmarek's conclusions rest, they obviously cannot be taken as the last word on the matter either. That Manlevelt or Maulfelt must have a geographical connotation, if not to say denotation, seems to be quite sure. A manuscript of Manlevelt's Suppositiones, written in Prague in the second half of the fourteenth century, ends thus: 'Explicitunt suppositiones magistri Thome Malvelt' , to which the scribe added: 'de tali loco' as an explanation of the magister's name. All that can be said on basis of the foregoing is that neither the form of our philosopher's name nor its English origin can be established with certainty. In any event, he must have taught at Louvain, and at least some variations of his name (Maulveldt, Mauleveld, Manlevel, Manloval) suggest a Low Countries origin, rather than an English origin. All this does not go to say that Thomas Manlevelt himself must have come from the duchy of Brabant. Neither can this be taken as decisive disproof of his being of English birth. But why the real name of our Thomas Anglicus should not be in some way connected to the German hometown of Martin Luther, Mansfeld, to make but one wild guess in another geographical direction, is far beyond the scope of this study.

47 Kaczmarek 1994, xli. That Manlevelt's name does indeed have a geographical meaning is also indicated, as we will presently see, by the scribe of one of the mss. of his tract on supposition, who added 'de tali loco' as an explanation of the name spelled by him 'Malvel'. See De Rijk 1982, 11.

48 See De Rijk 1982, 11.

49 In a footnote to his list of variations of our philosopher's name, Kaczmarek explains why precisely this variant is provided with a question mark. The variant stems from the catalogue of the Erfurt Collegium Universitatis ca. 1472, and it is Kaczmarek's opinion that the writer has mistakenly read or written Mansfeld for Maulleld, an all too understandable mistake, precisely because of the nearness of Erfurt to the town and county Mansfeld. Indeed, there is a speculative tinge to Kaczmarek's line of reasoning.

50 It would have been nice if there was a town, village or cottage by the name of 'Manlevelt' or any of its variations to be found in the vicinity of present-day Louvain, but alas, scrutinizing maps and atlases did not yield any such result.
For the present edition, the choice for 'Thomas Manlevelt' as the spelling of our author's name is not entirely arbitrary. It stays close enough to the spelling used in the note jotted down above the very beginning of our text, 'Thom. Manlevel'. Also it is in accordance with the spelling used by Maiéru in his handbook on late scholastic logical terminology and the intended spelling used in the forthcoming edition of the parva logicalia by Kann, Lorenz and Grass.

Let me say a few more things on his English background and on the dating of his works.

2.2.6. Thomas's English background and the dating of his works

In his 1975 book The Medieval Liar, Spade cites a medieval text in which Manlevelt's Insolubilia is mentioned together with the Insolubilia by Thomas Bradwardine (c. 1295–1349), Roger Swineshead (fl. before 1335; d. ca. 1363) and William of Heytesbury (b. before 1313; d. 1372/3). The grouping of Thomas Manlevelt with three English thinkers seems to fit in well with Manlevelt himself being called Anglicus. But as I have already noted, there remains a shadow of doubt whether Thomas Manlevelt indeed was English, despite this namegiving. N.W. Gilbert remarked in 1974 that Manlevelt is not even listed in any British biographical register that he had been able to consult. To my knowledge no such listing has been discovered since then.

Looking at the biographical data of the other two thinkers, the least one can say about this mentioning is that it is not incompatible with the tentative dating of Manlevelt's philosophical activity around the thirties or forties of the fourteenth century. This tentative dating of Manlevelt's works seems to be corroborated even further by a characteristic that is lacking in them, but that is to be found a little later on in the fourteenth century. A philosopher writing around the fifties and early sixties like Albert of Saxony (d. 1390), by way of traceable quotations makes implicit

---

51 Maiéru 1972, passim.
52 This spelling of our author's name has also been used by Brands 1996 and by Kann 1994, but strangely enough not by Lorenz, who is also involved in the forthcoming edition of the parva logicalia, in his 1996 tentative biography, whose title has 'Thomas Manlefelt (Maulefelt)', sticking to the letter l instead of v, and keeping open the possibility of the letter u replacing the letter n.
53 Spade 1975, 29f. The text cited by Spade is an anonymous, probably early 15th century Quaestiones libri insolubilibus Hollandrini.
54 Gilbert 1974, 99 n. 42. Lorenz 1996 does not come up with any such findings either.
mention of several early fourteenth century thinkers, while such quotations seem not to be found with Manlevé. Explicit mention is made by Thomas Manlevé of only a handful of more or less contemporary thinkers, all of whom had died years before he took to writing anyway: Robert Grosseteste (d. 1253), Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274), and Peter of Spain (d. 1277).

For curiosity’s sake, attention must be drawn to a remarkable if not coincidental similarity in a minor detail: in both Manlevé’s and Albert of Saxony’s commentary on the Isagoge reference is made to Plato’s eagle’s nose. It is unclear whether this must be looked upon as a sign of intellectual kinship between the two. On the other hand, Manlevé’s use of the adjective ‘aquilinus’ to designate Plato, might link him to Albert of Saxony after all, seeing that Albert makes use of the very same, rather uncommon epithet to designate Plato. A possible philosophic relationship between our author and Albert of Saxony is also taken into account by Fitzgerald, who draws attention to the remarkable affinity Manlevé’s writings on supposition show with Albert’s. The problem is, Fitzgerald says, that no one really knows what a connection between them would even be supposed to be. If Lorenz’s assumption that Thomas was teaching in Paris around 1330 is right, the connection can hardly have been other than a kind of teacher-pupil one, with Albert on the pupil-end. This conclusion would not be subscribed to by Fitzgerald, whose view of the matter is that our author’s treatments of material and simple supposition seem to be elaborations on Albert’s views rather than vice versa. Fitzgerald cannot but conclude, however, that at this stage of research into Thomas Manlevé, it is just too early to hazard even a guess about the interrelationship between him and Albert of Saxony, even though there are striking similarities. Research will greatly benefit by the critical

55 See, for example, Fitzgerald’s 2002 edition of Albert of Saxony’s Twenty-Five Disputed Questions On Logic.
56 q. 44: In Posteriorum analytiorum.
57 q. 14: Summa theologiae.
58 q. 14: Summulae logicales.
59 q. 30 concl. 3, 29⁵⁶, of our text; Albert of Saxony, In Porph., p. 260, § 268.
60 q. 30 concl. 3, 29³⁶: omnis sciturus vel omne scitum differt a Platone aquilino; Sortes est sciturus; igitur Sortes differt a Platone aquilino.
62 Just like John Aurifaber may well have been Manlevé’s pupil at the Parisian faculty of Arts around 1331.
edition of Thomas Manlevelt’s *parva logicalia*. More questions will then probably come somewhat closer to an answer. Chief among these will be the question concerning the relationship between Manlevelt’s theory of supposition and Ockham’s theory.

2.2.7. Thomas Manlevelt and Albert of Saxony

Meanwhile, the interconnection between Manlevelt and Albert of Saxony did receive some more probing attention on the occasion of both philosophers’ respective thoughts on a technical aspect of supposition theory, the so-called ‘descensus copulatim.’ This is a rather unusual mode of ‘descending to singulars’ for terms used in personal supposition in a proposition. Via this *descensus copulatim*, the descent to singulars for the term ‘man’ in the proposition ‘Socrates differs from every man’ will result in the conjunctive proposition ‘Socrates differs from this man and that man and …; and not ‘Socrates differs from this man or that man or …’ Read and Brands have written articles about this subject matter; Kann pays considerable attention to this matter in the introduction to his study on Albert of Saxony’s *Perutilis logica*. Without going into the technical details here, it is worthwhile to notice that all three adhere to the hypothesis that it was Thomas Manlevelt who influenced Albert of Saxony. They take Manlevelt’s tract *De suppositionibus* to have been written

---

63 See above, section 2.1, where reference is made to the forthcoming critical edition by Lorenz, Kann and Grass.

64 Recently, Dutilh Novaes has proposed an intensional interpretation of Ockham’s theory of supposition, contrary to the more common referential interpretation (Dutilh Novaes 2008). Rather than a theory of reference, she holds that Ockham’s theory of supposition is a theory of (propositional) meaning, providing a formal method for the semantic analysis of (certain) propositions, generating their possible meanings. An interesting matter of further study would be whether or not Manlevelt’s theory of supposition would lend itself to such an intensional interpretation as well.

65 For a general account of the descent to singulars one may consult Spade 2002, chapter 9: ‘The Ups and Downs of Personal Supposition.’ For a more specific account on the nominal conjunctive descent or *descensus copulatim* see Dutilh Novaes 2008a, 454 ff. Maierù, 1972, 232 ff. treats *descensus* in its relation to *confusio*. On *descensus copulatim* in the context of *suppositio confuse tautum* with Manlevelt, see Maierù 1972, 277 ff.


67 Brands 1996.

68 Kann 1994.

69 Thus Kann 1994, 19 holding that there are indications that Albert of Saxony ‘Positio- nen Manlevelts übernommen bzw. sich mit ihm auseinandergesetzt haben könnte.’
after William of Ockham’s 1324 *Summa logicae* and before 1344, that is to say, before the *Perutilis logica*, which should be dated between 1351 and 1355. Not only does Albert of Saxony tread in Manlevelt’s footsteps when it comes to the *descensus copulatim*, even using the same problematic proposition ‘Sortes differt ab omne homine’, but both thinkers’ main partition of the types of supposition show a highly remarkable likeness as well. They both accept an initial tripartition in simple, material and personal supposition, while limiting simple supposition to conventional terms: spoken and written terms do have simple supposition, but mental terms (having ‘natural supposition’) have not. The differences between Thomas Manlevelt’s and Albert of Saxony’s theories on the main division of supposition as well as on the *descensus copulatim* are not in the main lines, but in the details, suggesting that Albert of Saxony developed his own ideas while involved in a philosophical discussion with Manlevelt, whose ideas had crystallized into the tracts at Albert’s elbow. If so, this forms a further strengthening of my surmise that Thomas Manlevelt did his major work in the 1330s and 1340s.

---

70 1344 being the year of the earliest known commentary on a tract ascribed to Thomas Manlevelt, *De consequentiis*. Brands 1996, 185.

71 The 1350s are the period from which the most and the most important of Albert of Saxony’s writings stem, as well as those of John Buridan – which puts a considerable burden on those maintaining that Manlevelt may have been a Buridanist instead of an Ockhamist. That Buridan’s *De consequentiis* may be of the 1330s does not make this different, in as far as the 1350s still is the undisputed era of Buridan’s main writings.

72 Berger, 1991, 43 holds that to the best of his knowledge the terminology of *significare naturaliter propriiter* and *communiter* is due to Albert of Saxony. In a footnote he cites Brands, claiming however that this terminology was already employed by Manlevelt in the 1330s. For a more nuanced discussion on simple supposition, also in relation to ‘natural signification’ in distinction to ‘natural supposition’, see Panaccio’s forthcoming article on Ockham and Buridan on simple supposition.