

Katowice, 15.06.2023 r.

Łukasz Tomanek

Student number: 8147

### **Abstract of PhD Thesis**

Fernand of Spain's Commentary on Averroes' *De substantia orbis*, hitherto ascribed to John of Jandun. A Critical Edition with Introduction and Historical-Philosophical Commentary

Supervisor: prof. dr hab. Hanna Wojtczak

Co-supervisor: dr Maciej Stanek

The subject of the present work is Fernand of Spain's commentary on Averroes' treatise *De substantia orbis*, which has hitherto been falsely attributed to John of Janduno. The work consists of three parts. The first is entitled "Historical and doctrinal introduction" and consists of three chapters.

The first chapter discusses the author and his philosophical works. All the known sources that bear witness to the Fernand's activity at the University of Paris are introduced here, as well as information on the manuscripts in which the works known today are preserved. The chapter goes on to discuss in detail the problems of attribution of the commentary and provides evidence that Fernand was its author. On the basis of an analysis of 12 manuscript transmissions with the commentary and its Renaissance editions, it was established that half of them are anonymous, while in 6 of them the commentary on *De substantia orbis* is attributed to three authors: Fernand of Spain, John of Jandun and Peter of Villach. To Fernand of Spain the commentary is attributed in two manuscripts, i.e. Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria di Bologna 1625 and Erfurt, Universitäts- und Forschungsbibliothek, Dep. Erf., CA 2° 346. Each of these transmissions and the attributions present there date from the 14th century. To John of Jandun the commentary is attributed in the manuscripts Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Lat. VI 102, Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Lat. VI 173 and Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. lat. 340 and in all Renaissance editions. The attributions in the Venice manuscripts are secondary, while the one in the Vatican manuscript dates from the 1st half of the 14th century. To Peter of Villach

the commentary on *De substantia orbis* is attributed only in the manuscript Zwettl, Zisterzienserstift, 292.

Given that only the first two authors can be considered as possible authors of the commentary on *De substantia orbis*, the present study undertakes to clarify which of these attributions is correct.

The manuscript Barb. lat. 340 is discussed as a particularly important testimony to the early attribution of the commentary on *De substantia orbis* to John of Jandun. As argued in this section of the book, the fact that the commentary was attributed to John of Jandun is most likely to be explained by the doctrinal proximity of Fernand's work and the works attributed to John. Furthermore, the attribution of the work to Jandun was influenced by the fact that works by lesser-known authors were often attributed later to him. John of Jandun himself, on the other hand, made use of commentaries by other authors during his lectures, a fact that is confirmed by the sources examined in the dissertation.

In the case of the attribution to Fernand of Spain, the decisive argument for his being the author of the published commentary is provided by testimony in other sources, i.e. Fernand's commentary on the *Metaphysics* and John Reading's commentary on the *Sentences*. In the first case, the author refers to his earlier work, i.e. the commentary on *De substantia orbis*, which made it possible to link the two works together. In the second case, Reading's commentary contains a long *in extenso* quotation from the commentary on the *De substantia orbis*, and the marginal note in the manuscript indicates that it comes from Fernando's commentary on *De substantia orbis*.

The second chapter of the historical and doctrinal introduction deals with Fernand of Spain's commentary in a historical perspective, i.e. the genre of the work, its sources and its date of composition.

The commentary on *De substantia orbis* from the formal point of view is a rare example of *sententia cum quaestionibus* whereby the two ways of discussing the source text, i.e. literal commentary and questions, were combined into an integral whole. This form of commentary made it possible to trace exactly how the author treated the work he was commenting on. Accordingly, it was established in the course of the research that Fernand does not use the traditional division of Averroes' treatise into 5 chapters, but divides it into

7 chapters, which probably influenced the entire later tradition of commentaries on *De substantia orbis*.

The analysis of the commentary's sources draws attention to the authorities quoted explicitly and implicitly by Fernando, of which, apart from Aristotle and Averroes, these are most often Avicenna, Alexander of Aphrodisias, John Philoponus and Themistius.

Of the 13th century authors, only Albert the Great is directly referred to in the commentary. Based on an analysis of other commentaries written in the second half of the 13th century, it has been established that the various philosophical problems taken up by Fernand of Spain in his commentary on *De substantia orbis* can be linked to the discussions then taking place in Paris on topics such as the matter of the heavens, the nature and essence of first matter, the indefinite dimensions of matter, the power and causality of the first mover. Among the authors whose positions Fernand knew and debated with are Thomas Aquinas, Siger of Brabant, Peter of Auvergne, Giles of Orléans, Giles of Rome and Godfrey of Fontaines.

The historical and doctrinal section of the introduction concludes with findings on the *terminus post quem* and *ante quem* of the commentary's composition. The research carried out into the doctrinal relationship between Fernand of Spain and Giles of Rome made it possible to establish the time of composition of the commentary on *De substantia orbis* as between 1288 and c. 1295. The determination of these dates was made possible by reference to the dates of composition of the quodlibets of Godfrey of Fontaines, who regularly criticised the position of Giles of Rome in his discussions. As shown in the paper, these discussions should be regarded as cut-off dates for the ways in which selected problems were addressed in Fernand of Spain's commentaries on *De substantia orbis* and the *Metaphysics*.

The second part of this work is an introduction to a critical edition, divided into 5 chapters. The first chapter provides a detailed description of all 11 manuscripts containing Fernand of Spain's commentary, focusing specifically on the context in which the manuscript was written and the intellectual environment in which it was used. The second chapter provides a comparative table of the contents of the transmissions. The third chapter presents the relationships between all the transmissions of the commentary. On this basis, the basis for the edition has been chosen, which is the manuscript of Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 845. The fourth and fifth chapters contain in turn the principles of the edition and the list of abbreviations used in it.

The third part of this book is a critical edition of Fernand of Spain's commentary on *De substantia orbis*.

The critical edition, together with the introduction, is the result of a National Science Centre grant I have been carrying out from 2018 to 2023 as part of the Preludium programme: Preparation of the critical edition of John of Jandun's commentary on Averroes' "De substantia orbis" (2017/27/N/HS1/02528).