UNIVERSITATEA „BABEȘ-BOLYAI"
CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTATEA DE ISTORIE ȘI FILOSOFIE
ȘCOALA DOCTORALĂ DE FILOSOFIE

Anselm of Canterbury. His influence and reception in Medieval Logic and Theology with a case study on the commentaries on the Sentences in the second half of the 14th century

PhD THESIS ABSTRACT

Dissertation Director: Ph.D.:

Prof. univ. dr. Baumgarten Alexander   **Coman Daniel**

Cluj
2021

Cuprins

Keywords

Abstract

The current work rests upon the premise that in the Latin medieval world there was an increasing interest for the opus and the thinking of Anselm of Canterbury, which reached its highest point with his reception in the commentaries on the *Sentences* from the second half of the 14th century. The phrase „Latin medieval world" might come as a surprise to those who are not familiar with the broad influence of the Anselmian writings, which have exceeded the borders of Latin-speaking Europe. Demetrius Kydones (c. 1324-c. 1397) is a well-known figure to the historians engaged in the political relations and culture transfer between Byzantium and the West, in the 14th century. His brother, Prochoros, however, does not enjoy the same privilege. Nevertheless, they are both part of a small group of translators that have facilitated the pervasion of the Catholic conceptions of the late 13th and early 14th centuries in the Byzantine culture. Texts that are essential to Thomism, (including *Summa contra gentiles* and *Summa Theologiae),* texts specific to Augustinianism (namely *De Trinitate* or *De libero arbitrio*), and the texts about Dialectics pertaining to Boethius (*De differentiis topicis* and *De hypotheticis syllogismis*), were translated by the two brothers in Greek. In addition to these, Demetrius has also translated the opuscule and the little Anselmian epistle directly related to the disagreement between the Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church: *De processione Spiritus Sancti* and *De sacrificio azymi et fermentati ad Walerrannum episcopum*[1].

The main objectives in this approach were, first, to show that the influence of Anselmian semantology was felt in the configuration of certain theses in terminist logic and, second, to show that the theologians who commented, in the second half of the 14th century, on the Book of *Sentences* by Peter Lombard rediscoverd the writings of Anselm of Canterbury, which led to a new interest in certain aspects of his theological doctrine. The first objective is justified, as recent interpretations in the literature dimmed the ties of filiation between the logical theories of the two centuries, evaluating Anselmian semantics by the anachronistic use of the two distinctions employed by analytic philosophy ever since the early 20th century, meaning and reference. The

---

[1] See RYDER (2010), pp. 15-28, especially p. 26.

Anselmian notion *significatio* was identified with meaning, and *appellatio* with reference. Thus, the reconsideration of the semantic theory in *De grammatico* was needed in order to avoid such an inappropriate dichotomy for the Anselmian logical discourse. The second objective is legitimate because of the lack of studies dedicated to the 14th century reception of the Anselmian opus. We have tried to demonstrate that the aforesaid phenomenon occurred because of a doctrinal and semantic common ground, proper to both the 11th and 14th centuries. One of the most important factors in the revival of Anselmian studies among medieval theologians of this era was the need to justify the scientific status of theology. This was a good opportunity for them to dispute over the demonstrable or self-evident nature of the first theological principle, i.e. the existence of God, which has become a mandatory *locus communis* for any theology student who commented on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*.

In order to achieve these two major objectives, we have divided the thesis into four chapters, each chapter having its own goal. The first aim was to provide a brief analysis of Anselm's work in order to establish Anselm's place in the history of scholastic philosophy, to detect the Anselmian method of approaching issues in the field of sacred science, and to highlight some concepts that proved to be extremely important for the philosophical theology of the 14th century. A second aim was to demonstrate the importance of Anselmian logical texts and passages (especially the semantological theory elaborated in *De grammatico*; the theory of the propositional meaning, and the hierarchy of truths in *De veritate*) for those theologians who commented on Lombard's book at the end of the 13th century and the beginning of the 14th century. This is the reason why Anselm should be given an important place in a future history of medieval logic. The third aim was to show the usefulness, topicality and instrumentalization of Anselmian theology in the commentaries on the *Sentences*, and in this regard we have restricted our analysis to the most remarkable Anselmian contribution in the field of theology, i.e. the argument for the existence of God in *Proslogion*, cc. 2-4. A final goal was to argue that in the 14th century there was a formal element inherent to the commentary on the *Sentences*, which, conjoined with other historical factors, may be an easy criterion in classifying the approaches to the Anselmian texts of this period. The element is the technique of composing the commentaries by *copying verbatim* from other sources, especially from previous *Sentences* commentaries. The historical factors were: a) the rise of nominalism among 14th century theologians, b) the *ad fontes* movement generated by the

Augustinian hermits, and c) the imposition of Anselmian writings as a canon of orthodoxy to be followed in schools and faculties of theology all over Europe.

Chapter 1. The intellectual portrait and work of Anselm of Canterbury.

The task of the first chapter was to present the intellectual portrait of Anselm of Canterbury and to give a brief presentation of his work, emphasizing those concepts that were of interest to the philosophical theology of the 14th century. The outcome of this chapter is the image of a skillful theologian and logician, who, under the influence of the Aristotelian dialectics learned from Boethius's commentaries and logical writings, lays the rational foundations for a future science of theology. Thus, along with Augustine, Anselm is seen by 14th century theologians as the most appropriate authority that can compete in logic and argumentation with Greek and Arab philosophers. His logico-theological doctrines were perceived as the main sources that can generate solutions to the stalemate in which Christian theology found itself when it encountered the influence of the Greek and Arabic philosophy and science.

Chapter 2. Anselm the logician: the reinterpretation, reception and influence of the semantological theory of *De grammatico*.

The second chapter focuses on the re-examination of the semantic doctrine in *De grammatico* by resorting to the most recent interpretations. A significant number of studies, that have as their main object of research the philosophy of language in the work of Anselm of Canterbury, have explained the semantic distinctions exposed in *De grammatico – significatio* and *appellatio –* by using the logico-semantical distinctions of meaning and reference. Besides the fact that this terminological couple has a sinuous history even within the analytic philosophy, where it was sometimes replaced by the denotation/connotation couple, and other times by the intension/extension binomial, thus causing a harmful confusion for philosophical debates, we also consider it responsible for the following issues that obscure the correct understanding of the Anselmian dialogue:

1) The application of this distinction to Anselmian semantics outlines a dichotomy that is not the product of Anselmian thought (and probably not of medieval logic, at least not the one that precedes it, i.e. Boethius's logic);

2) The equivalences between *significatio* and meaning and between *appellatio* and reference did not take into account the career of the term *significatio* in the medieval logical tradition, where it was used as a tool to account for both meaning and reference;

3) And for this reason it missed the meaning of *appellatio* and the purpose for which this semantical distinction was made.

Anselm does not actually define the semantic notions in this dialogue, but the way he used them, the examples given to explain them and the cited sources are cues that they must be connected to the Aristotelian tradition mediated by Boethius's translation of *Categories* and *On interpretation*. From this approach, we could draw the following conclusion: the semantical dichotomy produced by the anachronistic use of logical positivism in interpreting the Anselmian text is avoided by what Boethius meant by *similitudo*. For him, concepts are similitudes of things, and the former abstractly contain the latter, just as objects are *in* the mirror due to the mirrors's ability to receive and transform them into a similarity. In the Boethian use, *significatio* does not strictly coincide with the property of terms to indicate the meaning, but it also covers the area left to the reference by the philosophy of language. Anselm worked with a Boethian model of meaning. But if *significatio* is the means by which Anselmian semantics expresses the unitary relation of words to meaning *and* reference (as hendiadys, i.e. conceptualized things), what would be the reason for a new semantic distinction, *appellatio*? This property of terms is proposed by Anselm in order to build a theory of syntactico-semantic disambiguation or a propositional hermeneutics to solve the problems presented in the first part of the dialogue, raised by the use of a single property of terms, *significatio*. This perspective is favorable to the integration of Anselmian semantology in the history of the theory of supposition, a logical device for the disambiguation of propositional meaning, pleading for its original role. We have also shown that the nominalist theory of connotation, represented by Ockham, found in the theory of paronymy in *De grammatico* and in the theory of predicaments in *Monologion* arguments of authority to certify its nominalist semantics.

Chaptere 3. Anselm the theologian: the reexamination of the "ontological argument" and its medieval reception.

The third chapter considers the reception of the Anselmian argument from P2-P3 in the theological debates of the 13th and 14th centuries and its use in these debates. The Anselmian argument was introduced to the Parisian university by English students who studied and later became masters in the Faculty of Theology in Paris. Its influence ruled the discussions around the scientific status of theology, almost each of the renowned scholastics feeling the need to quote, interpret, and even adapt it to his own scientific model. This chapter establishes the existence of a plural hermeneutical tradition, i.e. of a varieties of readings, due in the first instance to the nature of the argument, then to intermediate readings through secondary (non-source) texts, such as the *Sumptum* or the *Sentences* commentaries of the foregoers. Noteworthy is that these traditions emphasize one aspect of the argument to the detriment of others, so that the end product is a new morphology of the argument, sometimes contrary to the original argument. Following the re-evaluation of the argument in the light of the semantics from *De grammatico*, we resorted to the analysis of medieval traditions of interpretation of the argument, to conclude with the identification of four such traditions: physical, metaphysical, logical, and semantological, of which the semantic tradition is the most faithful to the Anselmian intention. The tradition that comes closest to the Anselmian view is the one that applied to it the semantological analysis. It can be found in the *Sentences* commentary of Robert Holcot and reached its apogee in the second half of the 14th century in the texts of Gregory of Rimini and Hugolino of Orvieto, despite the fact that in the first two cases the attitude is critical, and both Holcot and Rimini rejected the validity of the argument.

Chapter 4. Anselm's reception in post-1344 *Sentences* commentaries.

In the fourth chapter we turned our attention to the actual reception of the Anselmian writings in the commentaries on the *Sentences* of the second half of the 14th century. A first step in this direction is the statistical analysis of the sources specific to the post-1344 *Sentences* commentaries compared to those favored by the commentaries from the previous period. This allowed us to see a tendency of the theologians of the era toward the theological texts before 1200, especially Augustine and Anselm, and a decline of philosophical texts in their preferences. This

observation was reinforced by a historical analysis of the events that favored the reversion to the sources considered standards of doctrinal orthodoxy. Following these steps, we were equipped with the necessary tools to offer a theoretical frame and a historical approach to the ways in which authors related to their sources. Finally, we concluded the research by exemplifying these methods by resorting to the cases of James of Eltville and Conrad of Ebrach.

Bibliography

1. Editions and translations

ANSELM., *De casu diab.* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS, *De casu diaboli* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 1, Edinburgh, 1946, pp. 227-276.

ANSELM., *De conc. virg.* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS, *De conceptu virginali et de originali peccato* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Canturiensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 2, Roma, 1940, pp. 135-174.

ANSELM., *De concordia* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS, *De concordia praescientiae et praedestinationis et gratiae Dei cum libero arbitrio* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 2, Roma, 1940, pp. 243-288.

ANSELM., *De Gramm.* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS, *De grammatico* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Canturiensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 1, Edinburgh, 1946, pp. 141-168.

ANSELM., *De inc.* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS, *Epistola de incarnatione verbi* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Canturiensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 2, Roma, 1940, pp. 1-36.

ANSELM., *De inc. I* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS, *Epistola de incarnatione verbi prior recensio* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Canturiensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 1, Edinburgh, 1946, pp. 277-290.

ANSELM., *De lib. arbit.* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS, *De libertate arbitrii* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 1, Edinburgh, 1946, pp. 201-226.

ANSELM., *De proc. Sp. Sanct.* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENIS, *De processione Spiritus Sancti* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Canturiensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 2, Roma, 1940, pp. 175-220.

ANSELM., *De veritate* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS, *De veritate* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 1, Edinburgh, 1946, pp. 169-200.

ANSELM., *Ep. de sacr.* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS, *Epistolae de sacrificio azimi et fermentati* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Canturiensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 2, Roma, 1940, pp. 221-242.

ANSELM., *Mono.* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS, *Monologion* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 1, Edinburgh, 1946, pp. 1-89.

ANSELM., *Prosl.* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS, *Proslogion* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 1, Edinburgh, 1946, pp. 89-122.

ANSELM., *Resp.* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS, *Quid ad haec respondeat editor ipsius libelli* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 1, Edinburgh, 1946, pp. 130-140.

ANSELM., *Sumptum* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS, *Sumptum ex eodem libello* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 1, Edinburgh, 1946, pp. 123-124.

GAUN., *Pro insip.* = ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS, *Quid ad haec respondeat quidam pro insipiente* – F.S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Canturiensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia*, 1, Edinburgh, 1946, pp. 125-129.

ANSELM (1969) = R.W. SOUTHERN, F.S. SCHMITT (eds.), *Memorials of St. Anselm*, London, 1969.

ANSELM (1996) = ANSELM DIN CANTERBURY, *Proslogion*, trad. A. Baumgarten, Cluj, 1996.

ANSELM (1998) = ANSELM DIN CANTERBURY, *Monologion*, trad. A. Baumgarten, Cluj, 1998.

CHARLESWORTH (1965) = CHARLESWORTH, M.J., *Saint Anselm's Proslogion: With a Reply on Behalf of the Fool by Gaunilo and the Author's Reply to Gaunilo. Translated with an introduction and philosophical commentary*, Oxford, 1965.

CORBIN (1986) = CORBIN, M. (ed.), *L 'oeuvre de* S. *Anselme de Cantorbery,* vols 1-5, Les editions du Cerf, Paris 1986-89.

HENRY (1967) = HENRY, D.P., *The Logic of St. Anselm*, Oxford, 1967.

LOGAN (2009) = LOGAN, I., *Reading Anselm's Proslogion. The History of Anselm's Argument and its Significance Today*, Farnham, 2009.

2. Catalogs, manuscripts and incunabula

ALLIACO (1728) = PETRUS DE ALLIACO, *Tractatus contra Johannem de Montesono,* in *Collectio iudiciorum*, ed. Charles Du Plessis d'Argentré, Paris 1728.

ALTAVILLA (Ms. E) = IACOBUS DE ALTAVILLA (O. Cist.), *Quaestiones super librum Sententiarum*, Ms. Erfurt, UB, CA 2º 118.

ALTISSIODOR. (1514) = GUILLELMUS ALTISSIODORENSIS, *Summa Aurea in quattuor libros Sententiarum perlucida explanatio*, ed. F. REGNAULT, Paris 1514.

BRADWARDINE (1618) = THOMAS BRADWARDINUS, *Summa de Causa Dei* – ed. Londini, 1618.

BEKKER (1885) = BEKKER, G.H., *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui*, Bonn, 1885.

BUCKINGHAM (1505) = THOMAS BUCKHINGAM, *Quaestiones super Sententias*, ed. Augustinus Perez de Oliviano, Paris, 1505.

BUCKINGHAM (Ms. 134) = THOMAS BUCKHINGAM, *Quaestiones Thoelogicae*, New College, Oxford, Ms. 134.

COXE (1852) = COXE, H.O., *Catalogus codicum MSS. qui in collegiis aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur*, vol. 1, Oxford, 1852.

CUP = DENIFLE, H., CHATELAIN, Æ., *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis,* sub auspiciis consilii generalis Facultatum Parisiensium, I-IV, Paris, 1889-1897.

DURANDUS (1571) = DURANDUS DE SAINT POURÇAIN, *In Sententias Theologicas Petri Lombardi Commentariorum Libri Quatuor*, ed. Venetiis, 1571.

EBENDORFER (Ms. W) = THOMAS EBENDORFER DE HASSELBACH, *Quaestiones super librum Sententiarum*, Ms. Wien, ÖNB 4369.

EBRACH (Ms. K) = CONRADUS DE EBRACH, (O. Cist.), *In primum librum Sententiarum*, Ms. Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska 1297.

GAND (1520) = HENRICUS A GANDAVO, *Summa quaestionum ordinariarum*, Paris, 1520, vol. 1.

HOLCOT (1518) = ROBERTUS HOLCOT (OP): *In quatuor libros Sententiarum questiones argutissime. Quedam (ut ipse auctor appella) conferentie. De imputabilitate peccati questio longa. Determinationes item quarumdam aliarum questionum*, Lyon, 1518.

JAMES (1903) = JAMES, M.R., *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, Cambridge, 1903.

SEEHAUSEN (Ms. M) = ARNOLD DE SEEHAUSEN, *Quaestiones super librum Sententiarum*, Ms. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 3548.

SIENA (1598) = GERARDUS DE SIENA, *In primum librum Sententiarum*, Padova, 1598.

3. Ancient and medieval sources

ALAIN DE LILLE (2009) = ALAIN DE LILLE, *Regulae Theologiae*, A. Niederberger M. Pahlsmeier (eds.), Freiburg i. Br., 2009.

ALBERTUS (1893) = ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *In I Sent.*, în *Opera Omnia* 26, ed. A. Borgnet, Paris, 1893.

ALCHER (PL 40) = ALCHER DE CLAIRVAUX (Ps.-Augustin), *De spiritu et Anima*, (PL 40) coll. 779-832.

ALTISSIODOR. (1980) = GUILLELMUS ALTISSIODORENSIS, *Magistri Guillelmi Altissiodorensis Summa Aurea, Liber Primus*, J. Ribaillier (ed.), t.1, Paris 1980.

ALVERNIA (1986) = PETRUS DE ALVERNIA, *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam, q. 5, 18*, în EBBESEN S., „Termini accidentals concreti: Texts from the Late Thirteenth Century", în *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-âge grec et latin* 53, 1986, pp. 79-84.

Anon. Aurel. (2015) = Anonymus Aurelianensis III, *In Aristotelis Analytica priora*, în THÖRNQVIST, C.T. (ed.), *Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters* 115, Leiden-Boston, 2015.

AQUINO (1882) = THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Summa theologica* (*Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P.M. edita*, 4-12), Roma, 1882-1948.

AQUINO (1929) = THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum* – ed. P. Mandonnet, Paris, 1929.

ARIST. LAT. *Met.* = ARISTOTELES LATINUS, *Metaphysica, lib. I-XIV. Recensio et translatio Guillelmi de Moerbeka (AL XXV, 3)* - edidit G. Vuillemin-Diem (Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi. Aristoteles Latinus, 24, 1-3), Leiden-New York-Köln, 1995.

ARIST. LAT. *Phy.* = ARISTOTELES LATINUS, *Physica. Translatio vetus et translatio Vaticana* - ed. F. Bossier - J. Brams - A. Mansion (*Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi. Aristoteles Latinus*, 7, 1-2), Leiden - New York, 1990.

ARIST. LAT., *Anal. Post.* = ARISTOTELES LATINUS, *Analytica Posteriora. Translatio Iacobi, Anonymi sive 'Ioanis' Gerardi et Recensio Guillelmi de Moerbeka* – L. Minio-Paluello, D.G. Dod (eds.) (Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi. Aristoteles Latinus, 4, I), Bruges - Paris, 1968 (repr. Leiden - New York - Köln, 1995).

ARIST. LAT., *Anal. Prior.* = ARISTOTELES LATINUS, *Analytica Priora. Translatio Boethii (Recensione Duae), Translatio Anonyma, Pseudo-Philoponi Aliorumque Scholia, Specimena Translationum Recentiorum* – L. Minio-Paluello (ed.), (Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi. Aristoteles Latinus, 3, 1-4), Bruges - Paris, 1962, (repr. Leiden - New York - Köln, 1998).

ARIST. LAT., *Categ.* = ARISTOTELES LATINUS, *Categoriae vel Praedicamenta*, translatio Boethii - editio composita – L. MINIO-PALUELLO (ed.), (Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi. Aristoteles Latinus, 1, 1-5) Bruges-Paris, 1961.

ARIST. LAT., *De interpret.* = ARISTOTELES LATINUS, *De interpretatione vel Periermenias (translatio Boethii specimina translationum recentiorum)* – ed. L. Minio-Paluello (*Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi. Aristoteles Latinus*, 2, 1-2), Bruges - Paris, 1965.

AUG., *De mag.* = AUGUSTINUS, *De magistro* în *Contra academicos. De beata vita. De ordine. De magistro. De libero arbitrio*– eds. W.M. Green, K.D. Daur, (CCSL 29), Turnhout, 1970.

AUG., *De ordine* = AUGUSTINUS HIPPONENSIS, „De ordine libri duo" în *Contra academicos. De beata vita. De ordine. De magistro. De libero arbitrio*– eds. W.M. Green, K.D. Daur, (CCSL 29), Turnhout, 1970.

AUREOLUS (1956) = PETERUS AUREOLUS, *Scriptum super primum Sententiarum*, ed. E.M. Buytaert, New York York-Louvain-Paderborn, 1956.

A̲VERROES̲ (1562) = A̲VERROES̲, *Metaphisica*, 5, ed. Iunta 1562.

B̲AUMGARTEN̲ (2016) = B̲AUMGARTEN̲, A., *Godescalc de Nepomuk. Teologia ca dispoziţie ştiinţifică* (Biblioteca medievală), Iaşi, 2016.

B̲ERENGAR̲, *Resc. c. Lanf.* = B̲ERINGERIUS̲ T̲URONENSIS̲, *Rescriptum contra Lanfrannum*, ed. R. Huygens, (CC CM 84), Turnhout, 1988.

B̲ERNARD̲ (2018) = B̲ERNARD̲ DIN̲ C̲LAIRVAUX̲, *Despre considerare*, Florina Ion (trad.), Iaşi, 2018.

B̲OETHIUS̲ (PL64a) = A̲NICIUS̲ M̲ANLIUS̲ S̲EVERINUS̲ B̲OETHIUS̲, *In Topica Ciceronis Commentariorum Libri Sex,* PL64, coll. 1039-1174A.

B̲OETHIUS̲ (PL64b) = A̲NICIUS̲ M̲ANLIUS̲ S̲EVERINUS̲ B̲OETHIUS̲, *De Differentiis Topicis Libri Quatuor*, PL64, coll. 1173-1216D.

B̲ONAVENTURA̲ (1934) = B̲ONAVENTURA̲ DE̲ B̲AGNOREGIO̲, *Commentaria in IV libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi, Opera Theologica Selecta* - ed. P. Collegii S. Bonaventurae t. 1, Quaracchi, 1934.

B̲RABANT̲ (1911) = S̲IGER̲ DE̲ B̲RABANT̲, *Quaestiones logicales*, în *Siger de Brabant et L'averroïsme Latin au XIIIme Siècle*, IIe partie, ed. P. Mandonnet, Louvain, 1911.

B̲RABANT̲ (1974) = S̲IGER̲ DE̲ B̲RABANT̲, *Quaestiones logicales*, în ed. B.C Bazán, *Écrits de Logique, de Morale, Et de Physique*, Louvain, 1974.

B̲RITO̲ (2000) = R̲ADULPHUS̲ B̲RITO̲, *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam*, ediţie parţială în S. Ebbesen, „Words and signification in 13th-century Questions on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*", *CIMAGL* 71, 2000, pp. 107-114.

B̲URLEIGH̲ (1955) = W̲ALTER̲ B̲URLEIGH̲, *De puritate artis logicae. Tractatus longior*, ed. Ph. Böehner, New York, 1955.

C̲AMPSALL̲ (1968) = R̲ICHARD̲ DE̲ C̲AMPSALL̲, *Logica Campsale Anglici, valde utilis et realis contra Ockham*, în *The works of Richard of Campsall*, ed. E.A. Synan, Toronto, 1968, pp. 88-104.

C̲HATTON̲ (2008) = W̲ALTER̲ C̲HATTON̲, *Lectura super Sententias* – ed. J.C. Wey, G.J. Etzkorn, (*Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Studies and Texts*, 158), Toronto, 2008.

G̲AND̲ (1991) = H̲ENRICUS̲ DE̲ G̲ANDAVO̲, *Summa (Quaestiones Ordinariae), art. XXXI–XXIV*, – ed. R. Macken (*Opera Omnia*, 27), Leuven, 1991.

H̲ALES̲ (1924) = A̲LEXANDER̲ DE̲ H̲ALES̲, *Summa theologica seu sic ab origine dicta 'Summa fratris Alexandri'* - ed. P. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, t. 1, Quaracchi, 1924.

H̲ALES̲ (1948) = A̲LEXANDER̲ DE̲ H̲ALES̲, *Summa theologica seu sic ab origine dicta 'Summa fratris Alexandri'* - ed. P. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, t. 4, Quaracchi, 1948.

L̲OMBARDUS̲ (1971) = P̲ETRUS̲ L̲OMBARDUS̲, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, tom. I, pars 1, Editiones Colegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, Grottaferrata, Romae, 1971.

O̲CKHAM̲ (1970) = G̲UILLELMUS̲ DE̲ O̲CKHAM̲, *Scriptum in librum primum Sententiarum Ordinatio, Distinctiones II-III*, în *Opera Theologica* 2, eds. S. Brown, G. Gál, New York, 1970.

O̲CKHAM̲ (1974) = G̲UILLELMUS̲ DE̲ O̲CKHAM̲, *Summa logicae*, în *Opera Philosophica* 1, eds. Ph. Böehner, G. Gál, S. Brown, New York, 1974.

O̲LIVI̲ (1986) = P̲ETER̲ J̲OHN̲ O̲LIVI̲, *Quaestiones Logicales*, ed. S.F. Brown, *Traditio* 42, 1986, pp. 349-352.

O̲RVIETO̲ (1980) = H̲UGOLINUS̲ DE̲ U̲RBE̲ V̲ETERI̲, *Commentarius in quattuor libros Sententiarum*, I, (Cassiciacum, 8) – ed. W. Eckermann, V. Marcolino, Würzburg, 1980.

P. DE̲ A̲UVERGNE̲ (1993) = P̲ETRUS̲ DE̲ A̲UVERGNE̲, *Quaestiones in Peri hermenias*, în S. E̲BBESEN̲, "*Animal est omnis homo*. Questions and Sophismata by Peter of Auvergne, Radulphus Brito, William Bonkes, and Others", în *CIMAGL* 63, 1993, pp. 150-181.

P<span/>ORETANUS, (1966) = G<span/>ILBERTUS P<span/>ORETANUS, *Commentaria in Boethii opuscula sacra*, ed. N. M. Häring, Pontifical Institute of mediaeval studies, Toronto, 1966.

R<span/>EADING (1981) = I<span/>OHANNS R<span/>EADING, *Scriptum in I Sent., D. 2, QQ. 2 and 3*, în G.J. Etzkorn (ed.) „John Reading on the Existence and Unicity of God, Efficient and Final Causality", în *Franciscan Studies*, 41 (1981) pp. 126-220.

R<span/>IMINI (1981) = G<span/>REGORIUS A<span/>RIMINENSIS, *Lectura super primum et secundum Sententiarum:* ed. D. Trapp - V. Marcolino - W. Eckermann - M. Santos-Noya - W. Schulze - W. Simon - W. Urban - V. Vendland (*Spätmittelalter und Reformation Texte und Untersuchungen*, 6), tom. I, Berlin-New York, 1981.

S<span/>COTUS (1639) = I<span/>OHANNES D<span/>UNS S<span/>COTUS, *Quaestiones in librum II Sententiarum*, în *Opera omnia*, VI.2, ed. L. Wadding, Lugduni-Durand, 1639.

S<span/>COTUS (1912-1914) = I<span/>OHANNES D<span/>UNS S<span/>COTUS, *Commentaria oxoniensia ad IV libros magistri Sententiarus*, ed. M.F. Garcia, Quaracchi, 1912-1914.

S<span/>COTUS (1999b) = I<span/>OHANNES D<span/>UNS S<span/>COTUS, *Quaestiones super Praedicamenta Aristotelis*, în *Opera philosophica* 1, R. Andrews et al. (eds.), New York, 1999, pp. 247-566.

S<span/>COTUS (2004) = I<span/>OHANNES D<span/>UNS S<span/>COTUS, *Reportatio I-A*, în A.B. Wolter, O.V. Bychkov (eds.), *John Duns Scotus. The examined report of the Paris Lecture*, Aashland, 2004.

S<span/>COTUS (2004a) = I<span/>OHANNES D<span/>UNS S<span/>COTUS, *Quaestiones in libros Perihermeneias Aristotelis*, în *Opera philosophica* 2, R. Andrews et al. (eds.), New York, 2004, pp. 43-132.

S<span/>COTUS (2004b) = I<span/>OHANNES D<span/>UNS S<span/>COTUS, *Quaestiones in duos libros Perihermeneias*, în *Opera philosophica* 2, R. Andrews et al. (eds.), New York, 2004, pp. 133-221.

4. Exegesis

A<span/>DAMS (1976) = A<span/>DAMS, M.M<span/>C., „Ockham on Identity and Distinction", în *Franciscan Studies* 36, 1976, pp. 5-74.

A<span/>DAMS (1987) = A<span/>DAMS, M.M<span/>C., *William Ockham*, vol. I, Notre Dame, 1987.

A<span/>DAMS (2000) = A<span/>DAMS, M.M<span/>C., "Re-reading *De grammatico* or Anselm's introduction to Aristotel's *Categories*", în *Documenti E Studi Sulla Tradizione Filosofica Medievale* 11, 2000, pp. 83-112.

A<span/>NSCOMBE (1985) = A<span/>NSCOMBE, G.E.M., „Why Anselm's Proof in the Proslogion Is Not an Ontological Argument", în *The Thoreau Quarterly* 17, 1985, pp. 32–40.

A<span/>RCHAMBAULT (în pregătire) = A<span/>RCHAMBAULT, J., „Anselm's De grammatico: structure, sources, pedagogical context", în S.L. Uckelman (ed.), *The Cambridge Critical Guide to Anselm's De grammatico and De veritate*, forthcoming.

A<span/>SIEDU (2012) = A<span/>SIEDU F.B.A., *From Augustine to Anselm: The influence of De Trinitate on the Monologion* (IPM 62), Turnhout, 2012.

B<span/>AKKER-S<span/>CHABEL (2002) = B<span/>AKKER, P.J.J.M., S<span/>CHABEL, C.D., „*Sentences* Commentaries of the Later Fourteenth Century", în G.R. Evans (ed.), *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, , Leiden-Boston-Köln, 2002, pp. 425-464.

B<span/>ARTH (1960) = B<span/>ARTH, K., Anselm, *Fides Quaerens lntellectum: Anselm'S Proof of the Existence of God in the Context of his Theological Scheme*, I.W. R<span/>OBERTSON (tran.), London, 1960.

B<span/>AUMGARTEN (2003) = B<span/>AUMGARTEN, A., *Sfântul Anselm şi conceptul ierarhiei*, Iaşi, 2003.

BAZÁN (1979) = BAZÁN, B.C., „La signification des termes communs et la doctrine de la supposition chez Maître Siger de Brabant", în *Revue Philosophique de Louvain* 77, 1979, pp. 345-372.

BERMON (2007) = BERMON, P., *L'assentiment et son objet chez Grégoire de Rimini* (Etudes de philosophie médiévale, 93), Paris, 2007.

BRÎNZEI (2019) = BRÎNZEI, M., „Theology *versus* Metaphysics: the case-study of Augustinus Favaroni of Roma'*principia* at the Faculty of Theology from Bologna", în M. Brînzei, W. Duba (eds.), *Les Principia sur les commentaires des Sentences: entre exercice institutionnel et débat philosophique* (Studia Sententiarum, 4), Turnhout, 2019.

BRÎNZEI-SCHABEL (2018) = BRÎNZEI, M., SCHABEL, C.D. (eds.), *The Cistercian James of Eltville (†1393). Author in Paris and authority in Vienna* (Studia Sententiarum 3), Turnhout, 2018.

BRÎNZEI-SCHABEL (2018) = BRÎNZEI, M., SCHABEL, C.D., „Les Cisterciens et l'Université: Le cas du Commentaire des Sentences de Conrad d'Ebrach (†1399)", în A.-M. Turcan et al (éd.), *Les Cisterciens et la transmission des textes (XIIe-XVIIIe siècles)* (Bibliothèque d'histoire culturelle du Moyen Âge 18), Turnhout, 2018, pp. 453-486.

BRÎNZEI-SCHABEL-MAGA (2015) = BRÎNZEI, M., SCHABEL, C.D., MAGA, M., „The Golden Age of Theology at Prague: Prague Sentences Commentaries, ca. 1375–1381, with a Redating of the Arrival of Wycliffism in Bohemia", în *Historia Universitatis carolinae Pragensis* 55, 2015, pp. 21-42.

BROWN (2004) = BROWN, M., „Faith and Reason in Anselm: Two Models", *The Saint Anselm Journal* 2, 2004, pp. 10-21.

BURR (1976) = BURR, D., „The Persecution of Peter Olivi", în *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 66, 1976, pp. 3-98.

CAMPBELL (1976) = CAMPBELL, R., *From Belief to Understanding*, Canberra, 1976.

CAMPBELL (2018) = CAMPBELL, R., *Rethinking Anselm's Arguments*, Leiden, 2018.

CEREZO (2015) = CEREZO, M., „Anselm of Canterbury's Theory of Meaning: Analysis of some semantic distinctions in *De grammatico*", în *Vivarium* 53, 2015, pp. 194-220.

CESALLI (2007) = CESALLI, L., *Le réalisme propositionnel: sémantique et ontologie des propositions chez Jean Duns Scot, Gauthier Burley, Richard Brinkley et Jean Wyclif*, Paris, 2007.

CHÂTTILLON (1985) = CHÂTILLON, J., „De Guillaume d'Auxerre à saint Thomas d'Aquin: l'Argument de saint Anselme chez les premiers scholastiques du XIIIe siècle" în J. Châtillon, *D'Isidore de Séville à saint Thomas d'Aquin*, London, 1985.

CHENU (1957) = CHENU, M.-D., *La théologie au douzième siècle*, Paris, 1957.

CIOCA (2018) = CIOCA L., „Knowing God's existence according to James of Eltville's *Sentences* Commentary I, q. 6", în M. Brînzei, C. Schabel (eds.), *The Cistercian James of Eltville (†1393). Author in Paris and authority in Vienna* (Studia Sententiarum 3), Turnhout, 2018, pp. 193-214.

COURTENAY (1987) = COURTENAY, W.J., *Schools and Scholars in the Fourteenth-Century England*, Princeton, 1987.

EBBESEN (1981) = EBBESEN, S., „Early supposition theory (12th-13th century)", în *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 3-1, 1981, pp. 45-48.

EBBESEN (1981) = EBBESEN, S., „The Paris Arts Faculty: Siger of Brabant, Boethius of Dacia, Radulphus Brito", în J. Marenbon (ed.), *Routledge History of Philosophy*, vol. 3, London-New York, 1998, pp. 269-290.

EBBESEN (1986) = EBBESEN S., „Termini accidentales concreti: Texts from the Late Thirteenth Century", în *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-âge grec et latin* 53, 1986, pp. 37-150

ECO (1987) = ECO, U., „Meaning and Denotation", în *Synthese* 73, pp. 549-568

ERISMANN (2005) = ERISMANN, C., „Un autre aristotélisme? La problématique métaphysique durant le haut Moyen Âge latin. À propos d'Anselme, *Monologion* 27", în *Quaestio* 5, 2005, pp. 145-162.

ERISMANN (2007) = ERISMANN, C., *Immanent realism. A reconstruction of an early medieval solution to the problem of universals*, în *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 18, 2007, pp. 211-230.

FRIEDMAN (2013) = FRIEDMAN, R.L., *Intellectual Traditions at the Medieval University: The Use of Philosophical Psychology in Trinitarian Theology among the Franciscans and Dominicans, 1250–1350* (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 108/1–2), vol. 1, Boston, 2013.

GALONNIER (1986) = GALONNIER, A., „(Au sujet) de Grammarien", în A. Galonnier, M. Corbin and R. de Ravinel (eds.), *Le Grammarien; De la véritè; la liberté du choix; la chute du diable: Anselme de Cantorbéry*, Paris, 1986, pp. 25-49.

GALONNIER (1987) = GALONNIER, A., „Le *De grammatico* et l'origine de la théorie des propriétés des termes", în J. Jolivet, A. de Libera (eds.), *Gilbert de Poitiers et ses Contemporains: aux Origines de la logica Modernorum*, Naples, 1987, pp. 353-375.

GASKIN (2003) = GASKIN, R., „Complexe Significabilia and Aristotle's Categories", în J. Biard, I. Rosier-Catach (eds.), *La Tradition Medievale des Categories*, Louvain, 2003, pp. 187-205.

GASPER (2004) = GASPER G.E.M., *Anselm of Canterbury and His Theological Inheritance*, Burlington, 2004.

GEACH (1962) = GEACH, P., *Reference and Generality*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1962.

HARTSHORNE (1966) = HARTSHORNE, C., *Anselm's Discovery: a re-examination of the ontological proof for God's existence*, Illinois, 1966.

HENRY (1953) = HENRY, D. P., „St. Anselm on the Varieties of 'Doing'", în *Theoria*, 19, 1953, pp. 178-185;

HENRY (1960) = HENRY, D.P., „Saint Anselm's de 'Grammatico'", în *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 10/39, 1960, pp. 115-126.

HENRY (1963a) = HENRY, D.P., „The early history of 'suppositio'", în *Franciscan Studies* 23, 1963, pp. 205-212.

HENRY (1963b) = HENRY, D.P., „Saint Anselm's Nonsense", în *Mind*, vol. 72/285, 1963, pp. 51-61.

HOLOPAINEN (1996) = HOLOPAINEN, T.J., *Dialectic and Theology in the Eleventh Century* (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 54), Leiden, 1996.

HOLOPAINEN (1998) = HOLOPAINEN, T.J, „Augustine, Berengar and Anselm on the Role of Reason in Theology", în Jan A. Aertsen *et al.* (ed.), *What is Philosophy in the Middle Ages?*, Berlin-New York, 1998, pp. 553-559.

HOLOPAINEN (2007) = HOLOPAINEN, T.J., „Anselm's *Argumentum* and the Early Medieval Theory of Argument", în *Vivariu* 45, 2007, pp. 1-29.

KALUZA (1998) = KALUZA, Z., „*Auteur et plagiaire: quelques remarques*", în J.A. Aertsen et al. (ed.), *What is Philosophy in the Middle Ages?*, Berlin-New York, 1998, pp. 312-320.

KALUZA (2013) = KALUZA, Z., „Le problème du Deum non esse chez Étienne de Chaumont, Nicolas Aston et Thomas Bradwardin", în Z. Kaluza, *Études doctrinales sur le XIVᵉ siècle*, Paris, 2013, p. 37-51.

KLIMA (1993) = KLIMA, G., „'Debeo tibi equum': A Reconstruction of the Theoretical Framework of Buridan's Treatmen of the Sophisma", în S. Read (ed.), *Sophisms in Medieval Logic and Grammar*, Dordrecht, 1993, pp. 333-347.

KLIMA (1996) = KLIMA, G., „The Semantic Principles Underlying Saint Thomas Aquinas's Metaphysics of Being", în Medieval Philosophy and Theology 5,1996, pp. 87-141.

KLIMA (1999) = KLIMA, G. „Ockham's Semantics and Ontology of the Categories", în P. Spade (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ockham*, Cambridge, 1999, pp. 118-142.

LIBERA (1982) = LIBERA, A. DE, „The Oxford and Paris traditions of logic", în Kretzmann et al. (eds.), *Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge, 1982, pp. 174-187.

LIBERA (1998) = LIBERA, A. DE, *Cearta universaliilor. De la Platon la sfârşitul Evului Mediu*, (trad.) I. Gyurcsik şi M. Gyurcsik, Timişoara, 1998.

MARENBON (1996) = MARENBON, J., „Anselm and the early Medieval Aristotle", în J. MARENBON (ed.), *Aristotle in Britain during the Middle Ages*, Turnhout, 1996, pp. 1-19.

MARENBON (1997) = MARENBON J., "Glosses and Commentaries on the *Categories* and *De interpretatione* before Abelard", în *Dialektik und Rhetorik im früheren und hohen Mittelalter: Rezeption, Überlieferung und gesellschaftliche Wirkung antiker Gelehrsamkeit, vornehmlich im 9. und 12. Jh.*, ed. Johannes Fried, Schriften des Historichen Kollegs, Kolloquien, 27, Munich, 1997, pp. 21-49.

MARENBON (2000a) = MARENBON J., *Aristotelian Logic, Platonism, and the Context of Early Medieval Philosophy in the West* (Variorum Collected Studies Series, CS696), Aldershot-Burlington, 2000.

MARMO (1989) = MARMO, C., „Ontology and Semantics in the Logic of Duns Scotus", în U. Eco, C. Marmo (eds.), *On the Medieval Theory of Signs*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, 1989, pp. 143-193.

MURDOCH (1975) = MURDOCH, J.E., „From Social to Intellectual Factors: An Aspect of the Unitary Character of Late Medieval Learning", în J.E. Murdoch, E.D. Sylla (eds.), *The Cultural Context of Medieval Learning*, (*Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 26), Dordrecht-Boston, 1975, pp. 271-348.

NOVAES (2007) = NOVAES, C.D., *Formalizing Medieval Logical Theories* (Logic, Epistemology, and the Unity of Science, 7), Dordrecht, 2007.

NOVIKOFF (2011) = NOVIKOFF A.J, „Anselm, Dialogue, and the Rise of Scholastic Disputation", în *Speculum* 86, 2011, pp. 387-418.

NOVIKOFF (2013) = NOVIKOFF, A.J., *The Medieval Culture of Disputation: Pedagogy, Practice, and Performance*, Philadelphia, 2013.

NUCHELMANS (1973) = NUCHELMANS, G., *Theories of the Proposition. Ancient and Medieval Conception of the Bearers of Truth and Falsity* (Linguistic Series, 8), Amsterdam-London, 1973.

OBERMAN (1957) = OBERMAN, H.A., *Archbishop Thomas Bradwardine, a Fourteenth Century Augustinian: A Study of His Theology in Its Historical Context*, Utrecht, 1957.

PANACCIO (1990) = PANACCIO, C., „Connotative Terms in Ockham's Mental Language", în *Cahiers d'épistémologie* 9016, Montréal, 1990, pp. 1-22.

PINI (1999) = PINI, G., „Species, Concept, and Thing: Theories of Signification in the Second Half of the Thirteenth Century", în *Medieval Philosophy and Theology* 8, 1999, pp. 21-52.

PINI (2001) = PINI, G., „Signification of Names in Duns Scotus and Some of His Contemporaries", în *Vivarium* 39, 2001, pp. 20-51.

PINI (2003) = PINI, G., „Scotus on Deducing Aristotle's Categories" în J. Biard, I. Rosier-Catach (eds.), *La Tradition Médiévale des Catégories (XIIᵉ-XVᵉ siècles)*, Louvain-Paris-Dudley, 2003, pp. 23-35.

PRENTICE (1964) = PRENTICE, R., „The *De primo principio* of John Duns Scotus as a thirteenth century *Proslogion*", în *Antonianum* 39, 1964, pp. 77-109.

PRENTICE (1970) = PRENTICE, R., *The Basic Quidditative Metaphysics of Duns Scotus as seen in his De primo principio* (Spicilegium Pontificii Athenaei Antoniani, 16), Roma, 1970.

ROVIGHI (1965) = ROVIGHI, S.V., „Notes sur l'influence de saint Anselme au XIIe siècle", în *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 8, 1965, pp. 43-58.

SCHABEL (2000) = SCHABEL, C.D., *Theology at Paris, 1316–1345: Peter Auriol and the Problem of Divine Foreknowledge and Future Contingents*, Aldershot-Burlington-Sydney-Singaporen 2000, pp. 24-28.

SCHABEL (2006) = SCHABEL, C.D., „*Haec Ille*. Citation, Quotation, and Plagiarism in 14th-Century Scholasticism", în I. Taifacos (ed.), *The Origins of European Scholarship: The Cyprus Millennium International Conference*, Stuttgart, 2006, pp. 164-176.

SCHUMACHER (2015) = SCHUMACHER, L., *The Halensian 'Five Ways' to Prove God's Existence: A Neglected Landmark in the History of Natural Theology*, conference paper, 2015.

SLOTEMAKER (2012) = SLOTEMAKER, J.T., „The Development of Anselm's Trinitarian Theology", în *Anselm of Canterbury and His Legacy*, ed. G. Gasper, Toronto, 2012, pp. 203-219.

SMITH (2014) = SMITH, A.D., *Anselm's Other Argument*, Cambridge, 2014.

SOUTHERN (1990) = SOUTHERN, R.W., *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape*, Cambridge 1990.

SPADE (1975) = SPADE P.V., „Ockham's Distinctions between Absolute and Connotative Terms", în *Vivarium* 13/1, 1975, pp. 55-76.

SPADE (1988) = SPADE, P.V., „The logic of the categorical: the medieval theory of descent and ascent", în N. Kretzmann (ed.), *Meaning and Inference in Medieval Philosophy*, Dordrecht, 1988, pp. 187-224.

SPADE (2007) = SPADE P.V., *Thoughts, Words and Things: An introduction to Late Medieval logic and semantic theory*, curs introductiv, 2007.

STEIGER (1969) = STEIGER, L., „Contexte syllogismos: Über die Kunst und Bedeutung der Topik bei Anselm", în *Analecta Anselmiana*, ed. F.S. Schmitt, Frankfurt, 1969, pp. 107-143.

TRAPP (1956) = TRAPP, D., „Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century: Notes on Editions, Marginalia, Opinions and Book-lore", în *Augustiniana* 6, 1956, pp. 146-274.

UCKELMAN (2012) = UCKELMAN, S.L., „The reception of St. Anselm's logic in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries", în G. Gasper, I. Logan (eds.), *Saint Anselm of Canterbury and His Legacy*, Toronto, 2012, pp. 405-426.

VALENTE (2013) = VALENTE, L., „Supposition Theory and Porretan Theology: *Summa Zwettlensis* and *Dialogus Ratii et Everardi*", în *Vivarium*, 51(1-4), 2013, pp. 119-144.

VIGNAUX (1976) = VIGNAUX, P., *De Saint Anselme à Luther*, Paris, 1976.

VISSER-WILLIAMS (2009) = VISSER S., WILLIAMS T., *Anselm* (Great Medieval Thinkers), Oxford, 2009.

WEINBERG (1977) = WEINBERG, J.R., *Ockham, Descartes, and Hume*, Madison, 1977.

Medieval Philosophy and Theology 7, 1998, pp. 39-49.

WYLLIE (2011) = WYLLIE, G., „Signification et forme logique dans le *De grammatico* d'Anselme de Cantorbéry", în ed. R. H. Pich, *Anselm of Canterbury: Philosophical Theology and Ethics* (TEMA, 60) Turnhout, 2011, pp. 111-118.

XIBERTA (1931) = XIBERTA, B.M., *De scriptoribus scholasticis saeculi XIV ex ordine Carmelitarum*, Louvain, 1931.

ZAHND (2015) = ZAHND, U., „Easy-Going Scholars Lecturing *Secundum Alium*? Notes on Some French Franciscan *Sentences* Commentaries of the Fifteenth Century”, în P.W. Rosemann (ed.), *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. 3, Leiden-Boston, 2015, pp. 267-314.