of using a good manuscript as the basis for the third and the fourth disputations have been rather restricted. The difficulties grow apparent especially towards the end of the third series, as the best manuscript (Bologna, Bibl. Comunale dell'Archiginnasio A 971) of the text contains only the questions I–XIV from the beginning. In some cases both of the complete manuscripts may give a false reading.

Since the quodlibetal disputes were conducted at Paris twice a year on any subject proposed by anyone present, they often dealt with current problems and revealed the determining master’s reaction to the contemporary doctrines. According to the nature of the dispute, the subjects and the extent of the questions varied greatly. The questions in which James of Viterbo developed his position to the central themes of his time, concerning, e.g., the real distinction of essence and existence (Quodl. I, q. IV), the nature of the agent intellect (Quodl. I, q. XII), the seminal reasons (Quodl. II, q. V; Quodl. III, q. X), and the problem of the quantity of matter (Quodl. III, q. XVII) have been given an elaborate discussion in comparison with the questions of lesser importance. What James of Viterbo thought about the relation of his own position to the theories of his immediate predecessors and contemporaries, can often be traced on account of his practice to make excellent surveys of the previous doctrines before entering into his own solution. Along with the good medieval tradition the contemporary authors are always referred to anonymously. Even if the editor has deliberately left the identifying of these references for the future research, some examples from the works of Thomas Aquinas, Giles of Rome and Henry of Ghent have been put forth in the introduction for the first volume and in the apparatus of the fourth. With respect to the earlier authorities Dr. Ypma has done an excellent work. He has also registered some references that James of Viterbo has made to his own, now perished or still undiscovered works, such as a commentary on the Metaphysics (Quodl. III, q. XV, 1. 112–113, p. 199, not p. 119 as given in the introduction) and a question called De animatione Coelorum (Quodl. IV, q. XXIV, 1. 222, p. 90). As the long marginal notes that occur in many manuscripts reflect the readers’ reactions from the turn of the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries, the editor’s practice of giving their exact locus is to be recommended. Each volume has been provided with accurate indexes. The misprints are rather few and as such to be noted (Quodl. II, q. X, 1. 97, p. 125; Quodl. IV, q. I, 1. 91, p. 4; Quodl. IV, q. XV, 1. 55, p. 93; Quodl. IV, Index totalis nominum et rerum, 1. 5, p. 122).

Anja Inkeri Lehtinen


It was a good idea to give a second edition of this excellent book, as some of the ”serious backwards” of the first edition, to use the wording of a reviewer, could be removed. The addition of important footnotes to the revised edition is one of the most notable improvements. The new chapter on the scholarship of the post-Renaissance period up to the modern times is welcomed, too.

Heikki Solin