

Adam of Buckfield is known for the number of his commentaries on Aristotle as well as for the number of redactions of each commentary, authentic or not. However, the different versions of his *De anima* commentary¹ will not be discussed here, as this article has a different focus: the position of Adam's commentary in relation to other, contemporary commentaries, as shown by the treatment of the topic of the *sensus communis*, the common sense². Aristotle's account of the inner senses (as opposed to the five proper or exterior senses) starts with a paragraph on the common sensibles, followed by a discussion of the necessity to assume the existence of a 'common' sense (although the term itself is not used in the context of the *De anima*), especially to account for various perceptions that can not be caused by the proper senses: how, for instance, can we distinguish something white and something sweet, if not by a sense that combines the impressions of eye and taste? This discussion, which is rather short in Aristotle's *De anima* (III, 2, 425b10 – 427a15) has been much refined and completed later, especially by Avicenna in his *Liber sextus naturalium*³.

I will first address Adam's treatment of the topic and then compare it to some more or less contemporary commentaries, which seem representative of the period: the famous one called Pseudo-Petrus Hispanus by Gauthier and attributed to Richard Rufus of Cornwall by Rega Wood⁴, the anonymous commentary edited by Gauthier⁵ and the anonymous one edited by Bazán⁶. The comparison may tell us something about Adam's aim and public.

¹ There seems to be a consensus about the different redactions of Adam's Commentary on the *De anima*. Apart from the main redaction, preserved in twelve manuscripts, we may mention a Pseudo-Adam, 'second redaction': commentary in the same style of the same period, which follows a part of Adam's first redaction without any indication of change in the manuscript; preserved only in MS Oxford, Merton College 272 fols 15^{va}-17^{va} (end of book II), 17^{va}-21^{va} (book III), 21^{va}-22^{ra} (part of book I); and a Pseudo-Adam, 'third redaction': MS Berlin, Lat. Qu. 906 f 115^r-173^v, discovered by Grabmann; this commentary contains literal quotations of Albertus Magnus, and many errors; according to Gauthier it consists of 'notes rédigées par un étudiant inexpérimenté' on the basis of Adam's commentary (*secundum magistrum Adam*) and then glossed with the help of Albert et Thomas, 'avant qu'un scribe ignare et négligent vienne copier le tout' (R.-A. Gauthier, Introduction, *Sancti Thomae de Aquino Opera omnia*, 45, 1 *Sentencia libri 'De anima'*, Rome / Paris 1984, pp. 249*-251*). The MSS of the main redaction are: Bologna, B.U. 2344 fols 24^r-53^v (*marg.*); Erfurt, Amplon. Fol. 318 fols 173^r-223^r; Krakow, Jagell. 762 fols 1^{ra}-40^{va}; Oxford, Bodl. Canon. misc. 322 fols 1^{ra}-63^{vb} (copy of an *exemplar* with indication of *pecie*); Oxford, Merton College 272 fols 1^{ra}-15^{va} (incomplete; followed by the second 'redaction'); Paris, BnF lat. 6319 fols 113^{ra}-143^r (+ fol. 112; *marg.*).

² My interest in Adam's commentary must be seen in the context of current research on the topic of the *sensus communis*, the common sense. The aim is to constitute a collection of texts, taken from treatises and commentaries, from the end of the twelfth century to at least the end of the thirteenth century (maybe further); the material gathered until now can be found in Part IV of this website. In this context I consulted a series of commentaries on *De anima*, among which the one attributed to Adam.

This subject has been suggested to me by the reading of a stimulating book of Daniel Heller-Roazen, *The Inner Touch. Archaeology of a Sensation*, New York, 2009, in which the chapter on the Medieval Latin authors is rather poorly documented.

³ Avicenna, *Liber de anima* ou *Liber sextus naturalium*, ed. S. van Riet, Leuven/Leiden 1968-1972.

⁴ Rega Wood has generously provided me with the provisional edition of this commentary (the editors of the forthcoming edition are J. Ottman, C.J. Martin, N. Lewis, and R. Wood); she also gave me information about the other commentaries that present parallel passages. I wish to thank her sincerely for her help.

⁵ R.-A. Gauthier, *Anonymi magistri artium Lectura in librum De anima a quodam discipulo reportata*, Grottaferrata, 1984.

⁶ B. C. Bazán & K. White, *Anonymi magistri artium Sentencia super II et III De anima*, Louvain-la-Neuve / Louvain / Paris, 1998.

The text I use for Adam's commentary is a transcription based on MS Bologna, Bibl. Universitaria 2344 (written in the margins) and MS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. misc. 322, the last one also used by Helen Powell for her edition⁷.

The style and character of Adam's commentary on *De anima* is much like those of his other commentaries, so that we can use the description offered by Silvia Donati concerning his commentary on the *Physics*⁸. First, she underlines the absence of elements indicating classroom lectures and the sober, impersonal style. She describes Adam's commentary as a good example of a *sententia*, concentrating on the conceptual contents of the text rather than on the literal explanation. Adam's aim is to reconstruct the general meaning, without any attention for linguistic aspects; neither does he develop doctrinal aspects by means of questions, apart from some rare exceptions. In reconstructing Aristotle's arguments Adam often uses the scheme of the syllogism. The various parts of his commentary are in general composed of the following elements: the *divisio textus*, the explanation of the text, consisting in the general analysis of the argumentation, and the systematic analysis, passage by passage, of the way Aristotle proceeds, and thirdly (rather rare) *notanda* giving supplementary information. Donati also mentions typical formulas, such as the way of introducing the paragraphs with *Consequenter cum dicit ...*, and the various phrases used in the analysis of the logical articulation (*intentio prime partis ...*, *huius rationis primo ponit maiorem/minorem/conclusionem ...* etc.).

All this is easily recognizable in Adam's commentary on *De anima*. In the rather short passage on the *sensus communis*⁹ we find text division and current explanation, marked by *Consequenter ibi*, sometimes a syllogism to transform Aristotle's treatment into a strictly logical frame, and three short *notanda*. His aim is to present the passage in a logical and unambiguous form.

Adam of course refers to Averroes (the *Commentator*), as he regularly does in his works (in this chapter several times explicitly); but he also refers twice to other commentators, concerning matters of interpretation of the structure:

Quidam isto modo non introducunt istos effectus, sed tamquam correlaria ipsos concludunt ex ipsa maiore, de quo non multum curandum (B 46^r lower margin ; C 46^{rb}).

Consequenter ibi : *At vero*, intendit de modo unitatis istius virtutis vel ut volunt quidam movet quasdam dubitationes circa predicta de sensu communi ; et dividitur in duas partes [...] (B 46^v marg. sup.; C 46^{vb}-47^{ra}).

Generally, Adam does not mention his predecessors explicitly, but he clearly had earlier commentaries at his disposal (*Quidam; ut volunt quidam*).

⁷ H. Powell, 'The Life and Writings of Adam of Buckfield with Special Reference to His Commentary on the "De anima" of Aristotle', PhD diss., Oxford, 1964, pp. 5-232, based on the MSS Oxford, Merton College, Cambridge, Canon. misc., and Krakow. I preferred to make a new transcription, because the edition of Powell is not fully reliable.

⁸ S. Donati, 'Il commento alla *Fisica* di Adamo da Bocfeld', *Documenti e Studi sulla Tradizione Filosofica Medievale* 9, 1998, pp. 126-131. See also R.J. Long's introduction to his edition of Adam's *Glossae super De vegetabilibus et plantis*, Leiden / Boston, 2013, pp. 7-9.

⁹ A transcription of the passage, based on MS Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 2344 compared with MS Oxford, Canon misc. 322, can be found in Part IV, 4 of this website.

Comparison with Rufus

One of those earlier commentaries almost certainly was the one I will call Rufus's commentary (for: attributed to Rufus by Rega Wood¹⁰). It seems to be the first commentary on the *De anima* in the form of an *expositio*; Rega Wood dates it around 1236-1237. It is a very detailed exposition, proceeding passage by passage, and including a meticulous *divisio textus*. It also contains *notanda* and *questiones*, some of which are discussed along the pattern of the disputed question. The commentary is not divided into *lectiones* (portions of the basic text read and commented on during a lecture) and it is rather difficult reading, often discussing technical points of natural philosophy. To my eyes it is not sure that this commentary is the result of classroom teaching; it may have been written in a somewhat different context of scholars aiming to understand, explain and complement Aristotle's text.

In her edition Rega Wood quotes at several places parallel passages found in Adam. One of them is the following:

(ADAM) Huius rationis primo ponit conclusionem quam intendit dicens quod caro non est illud ultimum sentiens¹¹ quo sentimus et discernimus diversitatem sensibilibus ad invicem ; et nomine carnis intendit tactum, quia famosum erat apud multos¹² quod caro esset instrumentum tactus ; ex quo patet sua conclusio (B 46v marg. ext. ; C 46^{va}).

(RUFUS) Et hanc rationem sic innuit dicens quod manifestum est quod caro non est sensus quo sentimus sensibilia diversorum sensuum. Et nomine carnis intendit sensum-tactum, quia famosa fuit opinio quod caro esset instrumentum tactus, quia [...] (ed. Wood 271 p. 330)¹³.

Another parallel occurs in a short *notandum*, present in both authors, concerning the special place of the instrument or organ of the *sensus communis*, situated in the body.

(ADAM) Et est notandum quod dicit ipsam indivisibilem loco, per hoc videtur quod hec virtus habeat instrumentum proprium situm in aliqua parte corporis, ab instrumentis sensuum particularium distinctum (B 46v marg. ext.; C 47ra).

(RUFUS) Ex hoc quod dicit loco, nota quod intendit sensum communem habere instrumentum sibi determinatum in loco uno determinato in corpore (ed. Wood 274 p. 334).

Adam simply gives a somewhat longer paraphrase to make the meaning clear. And this may be said about the whole chapter: Adam painstakingly explains Aristotle's intention, mostly relying on Averroes's commentary. On the other hand, he does not include any more technical and philosophical discussions, like Rufus had done, in long developments or questions.

Comparison with Anonymus Gauthier

The anonymous commentary edited by Gauthier is quite different in character. It is a *reportatio* of the lectures of a Parisian master of arts, in the period between 1245 and 1250. One of the first commentaries divided into *lectiones*, it corresponds to the teaching methods in

¹⁰ This is not the place to address the lengthy discussion of the authorship of this commentary.

¹¹ Cf. Arist. 426b15 manifestum est quod caro non est ultimum sentiens; Averroes, *Commentarium magnum in Aristotelis 'De Anima libros'*, ed. F. Stuart Crawford, Cambridge (Mass.), p. 350.

¹² Cf. Avicenna, *Liber de anima seu Sextus de naturalibus IV-V*, ed. S. Van Riet, Louvain / Leiden, 1968-1972, 1, 138.

¹³ Preliminary edition, see n. 30. Anonymus Bazán does not mention this famous opinion, but interprets: '*et manifestum est quoniam <caro>, id est sensus gustus vel tactus, suple vel aliquis alius sensus proprius ...*'.

Paris during that period. The *divisio textus* is followed by explanation of Aristotle's text, but this part is often rather short, and it is followed by questions, some of which are discussed in the format of the *questio disputata*.

The passage on common sense is treated in two *lectiones*, the first containing at the end four questions or *dubia*, the second consisting of one long question on the organ of the *sensus communis* and the solution of some *dubia* rising from the discussion of this question. Whereas Rufus and Adam simply mentioned, in a *notandum*, the instrument or organ of the common sense as located in a specific part of the body, this anonymous master treats the subject in an elaborate question.

So, the presentation of the materials is very different and there seem to be very few parallels between the anonymous commentary and the one by Adam. Probably, Adam did not know this early commentary (which, by the way, has come down to us in only one manuscript).

Comparison with Anonymous Bazán

The anonymous commentary edited by Bazán is quite different from the one edited by Gauthier, although both are almost contemporaneous; it is much closer to Adam's commentary. It also seems to be a *reportatio* of lectures, although it is not clear in which university. It is divided into *lectiones*, but their structure is rather particular: after very elaborate text divisions, each passage is treated first in a *sententia* (or summary) providing the general meaning, and then in an *expositio textus*, which is so detailed and contains so many quotations that the editors have been able to identify the version of the translation the master had before his eyes. The lectures may contain some *notanda*, but there are no *dubia* or *questions*.

As Adam's commentary also proceeds like a running *sententia*, although lacking the literal explanation, one can easily compare the developments of both commentaries, which have of course much in common. The passage on the common sense in the anonymous commentary takes up two lectures (25 and 26), both starting with an extensive *divisio textus*. The *sententia* in the anonymous commentary is generally somewhat longer and more explicit than the one given by Adam, but Adam goes into more detail to make the structure of Aristotle's argument clear; he also uses the terminology typical of logical reasoning (*verificare, determinare, interimere, etc.*), for instance in the following passage:

(ADAM, B 45^v marge ext.; C 45^{ra}) Consequenter ibi: *Manifestum igitur*, determinat dubitationem istam, respondendo dupliciter; primo per interemptionem cuiusdam accepti in prima, secundo modo alio, ut patebit [...]. Consequenter ibi: *Amplius*, respondet ad illam dubitationem aliter, scilicet quodammodo illud concedendo [...]. Ubi sic procedit: primo dat responsionem suam, secundo verificat.

(ANONYMOUS BAZÁN, pp. 324-325) Hoc habito ponit unam solutionem dicens quod [...] Hoc habito, Aristotiles ponit aliam solutionem dicens quod [...].

So, Adam's commentary is more detailed regarding the logical structure of Aristotle's way of proceeding (he often constructs syllogisms to show its logical coherence), but the Anonymous insists on the literal comprehension of Aristotle's text in his *expositio littere*:

(ANONYMOUS BAZÁN, p. 326) Circa hanc litteram sic procedit dicens: *Amplius autem et videns est tanquam coloratum*, id est visus quodam modo habet colorem in sentiendo coloratum. Et hoc manifestat : *enim*, pro quia,

supple illud *mediante quo sentimus est susceptivum unumquodque sensibilis sine materia*, id est est susceptivum speciei uniuscuiusque sensibilis sine esse materiali [...].

Adam, Rufus, and Anonymous Bazán

A last example will show the relations between Adam, Rufus and Anonymous Bazán, this time taken in chronological order: first Rufus (around 1236-1237), and afterwards Anonymous Bazán (around 1246-1247) and Adam (who probably wrote his commentaries between 1243, when he became Master of Arts, and 1249). It concerns the question how something, and in this particular case the common sense, can be divisible and indivisible at the same time.

(RUFUS, ed. Wood, pp. 334-335) Consequenter solvit dicens quod sensus communis est una simplex virtus secundum substantiam et numero, et ita in eodem tempore iudicat, sed est diversum secundum esse. Consequenter istam solutionem magis pertractat, dicens quod quia est diversum secundum esse et rationem, sentit diversa sensibilia; quia autem unum simpliciter secundum substantiam, in eodem tempore sentit illa. Est enim sensus communis quiddam indivisibile et unum secundum locum et numero.

Et ex hoc quod dicit 'loco' nota quod intendit sensum communem habere instrumentum sibi determinatum in loco uno determinato in corpore.

Et quod possibile sit sensum communem esse uno modo divisibilem, alio modo indivisibilem, ostendit, quia divisibile et indivisibile, que sunt contraria, sunt idem in subiecto, diversa tamen secundum rationem. Et similiter sensus communis loco et numero est indivisibile, sed secundum esse divisibile est, id est secundum quod sentit sive immutatur a sensibilibus diversorum sensuum est diversum secundum rationem.

(ANONYMUS BAZAN, pp. 343-344) Hoc habito, Aristotiles ponit solutionem quorundam. Quidam enim dicebant quod sensus communis esset indivisibilis secundum essentiam, et in tempore indivisibili apprehendit contraria; tamen dicebant quod est divisibilis secundum esse, id est secundum diversas species receptas. Et quia sensus communis uno modo est divisibilis, dicebant quod non est inconveniens ipsum moveri motibus contrariis, quia non movetur motibus contrariis in quantum est indivisibilis, set in quantum est divisibilis.

Deinde reprobat hanc solutionem, dicens quod sensus communis simpliciter est indivisibilis et nullo modo divisibilis, scilicet [...] Quod autem dicebant, quod esset divisibilis secundum diversas species apprehensas, hoc est impossibile: nam contraria neque actu possent esse in eodem, nec actu possunt apprehendi ab eodem, set solum potentia; quare solum est divisibilis potentia. Ipsi autem subponebant quod species prout sunt in sensu communi sunt actu contrarie; hoc autem falsum est, quia species apprehenduntur a sensu communi prout sunt in esse spirituali et non materiali. Species autem prout sunt sub esse spirituali non contrariantur sibi, set prout sunt sub esse materiali; hoc autem modo non apprehenduntur et ideo ipsi falsum subponebant.

(ADAM, B 46v marg. ext.; C 46vb-47ra) Consequenter ibi: *At vero*, intendit de modo unitatis istius virtutis, vel, ut volunt quidam, movet quasdam questiones circa predicta de sensu communi. Et dividitur in partes duas; in prima dat rationem quod hec virtus non potest esse una, et eam solvit, incomplete tamen; in secunda, ibi: *Potentia enim*, opponit contra ipsam solutionem, ut ipsam compleat. Primo ad hoc dat rationem suam, secundo solvit. Ratio est hec: impossibile est idem et indivisibile in eodem tempore et indivisibile moveri motibus contrariis; cum igitur hec virtus de qua prelocutum est in eodem tempore moveatur motibus contrariis, scilicet in recipiendo sensibilia contraria et in iudicando de ipsis, ipsa virtus una non est et indivisibilis; huius rationis primo ponit maiorem, secundo ibi: *Si enim*, innuit minorem.

Consequenter ibi: *Simul ergo*, solvit istam rationem, licet incomplete, et hoc dando modum unum quo dici potest hec virtus una et indivisibilis, dicens quod est una et indivisibilis secundum materiam et subiectum, divisibilis autem secundum substantiam et essentiam, ut dicitur de pomo quod est subiecto indivisibilis et divisibilis secundum essentias diversas in ipso, ut secundum colorem, odorem, saporem. Exemplum est Commentatoris. Uno igitur modo est dicere illam virtutem esse divisibilem, scilicet secundum esse et hoc modo posse recipere contraria sensibilia et diversa, et sic quodam modo motibus contrariis movetur. Alio modo est dicere ipsam esse unam et indivisibilem, scilicet secundum substantiam et materiam et locum, et sic posset iudicare et discernere in tempore indivisibili et iudicio uno diversitatem ipsorum apprehensorum.

Et est notandum quod dicit ipsam indivisibilem loco; per hoc videtur quod hec virtus habeat instrumentum proprium, situm in aliqua parte corporis, ab instrumentis sensuum particularium distinctum. Consequenter ibi: *Potentia enim*, opponit contra istam solutionem ; unde primo opponit sic: impossibile est [...]

Rufus interprets Aristotle's text as meaning that it is possible that the common sense is at the same time divisible and indivisible, depending on the way it is considered: as for its place and number it is indivisible, but as for its being (as it receives the impressions of different senses) it is divisible.

Clearly, Rufus reads *quidem* at this place (Aristotle 427a2¹⁴), whereas Anonymus Bazán (and by the way Albertus Magnus¹⁵) reads *quidam* ("Quidam enim dicebant ...") and thus the anonymous commentator opposes himself to Rufus's interpretation. He considers that the opinion of these *quidam* is untenable, as Aristotle shows: 'Deinde reprobat hanc solutionem, dicens quod ...'.

Adam, as usual, first constructs the passage in a logical frame. The term *quidam* he uses in this context refers to a different interpretation of the structure of Aristotle's proceeding, as we saw earlier. Then, his general interpretation is more or less comparable to Rufus's interpretation (Aristotle raises a doubt, solves it, then raises a new doubt inspired by this solution, before giving his final solution), but also to the one of Anonymus Bazán: both say that Aristotle presents a first, unsatisfying solution (either the solution of *quidam* or an 'incomplete' solution) and then attacks this (*reprobat* or *opponit contra*). Adam also refers to Rufus (without of course mentioning him explicitly) in the *notandum* on the instrument of the *sensus communis*¹⁶. The topic of the instrument or organ of the *sensus communis*, lacking in Averroes, can already be found in Alexander of Hales, who refers to the different views of the *medici* and the *philosophi* on this subject; the anonymous author edited by Gauthier develops the subject in a special question about the organ of the common sense and also refers to the different opinions of the *medici* and the *philosophi*. Albertus Magnus, in his *De homine* (or *Questiones de anima*), also discusses this topic, quoting Avicenna and Averroes¹⁷. However, the similarity of the remark in comparable terms in a short *notandum*, suggests that Adam found this observation in Rufus's commentary.

In short, Adam probably knows the commentary of Rufus and perhaps also the anonymous one. However, he adds an example that is found in neither of them, the example of the apple, which is one as an object but can be divided according to its different qualities, like color, smell, taste. Not surprisingly, this is an example given by Averroes, as he adds explicitly¹⁸.

Conclusion

What can we conclude from this comparison? First, for interpreting Aristotle's text, Adam had probably at his disposal not only the commentary of Averroes, but also some

¹⁴ In the text of Aristotle reproduced in the edition of Bazán at 427a2 we read: 'Ergo simul quidam et numero indivisibile et indivisibili tempore; esse autem separabilis. Est igitur quodam modo quod sicut divisibile divisa sentit ; est autem sicut indivisibile : enim divisibile est, loco autem et numero indivisibile'.

¹⁵ Albertus Magnus, *De anima* 2, 4, 11, ed. C. Stroick, Münster, 1968, p. 163.

¹⁶ For a longer discussion of this topic, see this website part IV, 3.

¹⁷ Ed. H. Anzulewicz & J. R. Söder, Münster, 2008, pp. 274-275.

¹⁸ Averroes, 147, ed. Crawford p. 354: 'ut dicimus de pomo quod est indivisibile subiecto et divisibile secundum entia diversa in eo, scilicet colorem et odorem et saporem'.

earlier commentaries, especially the one attributed to Richard Rufus and perhaps also the anonymous commentary edited by Bazán, or a similar commentary which is unknown to us¹⁹.

However, we have seen that his way of proceeding is quite different. Whereas Rufus, after the *divisio textus*, extensively discusses Aristotle's text in its order, Adam insists on the structure of this text and tries to present it in a logical frame, if possible in the form of a syllogism. Then he gives an easily comprehensible summary of the passage, while Rufus often goes into detailed discussion.

The anonymous commentary edited by Bazán also gives a summary of each passage, but this is followed by detailed literal explanation of the text. And, contrary to Adam, the Anonymous, although giving very extensive text divisions, is not interested in constructing the text according to a logical frame.

The anonymous commentary edited by Gauthier, apart from the element of the *divisio textus*, which they all have in common, is completely different. It was manifestly meant for the classroom, probably at the arts faculty in Paris.

Adam's aim clearly was to provide a thorough, but readable account of what Aristotle meant to say in his treatise, leaving aside linguistic details and the development of philosophical problems, either in questions (completely lacking in his commentary, apart from one question at the end of book I²⁰) or in discursive developments. We can say that he succeeded very well in realizing this aim, as his contemporaries apparently also thought. We can quote R. James Long (talking about Adam's type of commentary): "it does reveal Adam as a remarkable teacher for the clarity and the orderliness of his thought"²¹.

Long assumes a possibly longer period of teaching than is commonly assumed: 1243-1258 at the latest. Jennifer Ottman thinks that this specific commentary of Adam dates from the first half of the 1240s, partly because Anonymus Gauthier 'seems to be familiar with some opinions that Buckfield either held or reported, if not necessarily with his written text as such'²². Jennifer Ottman also discovered an occurrence of the term *lectio* in Adam's commentary (ms. Oxford, Bodl. L., Canon. misc. 322 f 62rb); although the commentary is not explicitly divided into *lectiones*, this seems somehow to point to a teaching environment.

If we assume that Adam commented on Aristotle's natural philosophy between 1243 and 1249, probably in Oxford²³, and on the grounds of the similarity between his commentary on *De anima* and his other commentaries, we can only presume that he wrote this commentary for an Oxford public, either the schoolmen or a larger public including the schoolmen. The teaching methods at the faculty of arts in Oxford may have been somewhat different from those in Paris, but they certainly included the method of the *lectio*, the literal comment of the basic texts. Adam's commentary does not correspond to this approach; however, it certainly was very helpful for all scholars to understand the general meaning of

¹⁹ I have not discussed the relationship between Adam's commentary and the one by Albertus Magnus, because this still needs further investigation. Albert's commentary is generally dated between 1254 and 1257; his *Questiones de anima* (ca. 1242) are quite different in character and the same is true for the treatise *De sensu communi*, which is probably a compilation of the relevant passages of Albert's work.

²⁰ Cf. D. A. Callus, 'Two Early Oxford Masters on the Problem of Plurality of Forms. Adam of Buckfield – Richard Rufus of Cornwall', *Revue Néo-scholastique de Philosophie* 42, 1939, pp. 411-445 (435-438).

²¹ R. J. Long, introduction to Adam of Bockenfield, *Glossae super De vegetabilibus et plantis*, Leiden / Boston, 2013, p. 8.

²² Private information; further information of dating will be available either in the forthcoming edition of Rufus's *De anima* or in separate article, if a fuller account seems justified.

²³ Cf. Long, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3.

Aristotle's treatise. In short, whether Adam composed his commentaries as aids for his oral teaching or on the contrary afterwards, integrating his lecture notes into smooth, clear summaries, we cannot know. The occurrence of the term *lectio* evidently referring to his teaching may indicate that he wrote his summary after having lectured on the subject. Anyway, I do not see Adam reading this commentary before the students, but rather composing it quietly in his study, surrounded by whatever sources were available to him, in the intention to provide a readable version of a corpus of difficult but fundamental texts for whoever was interested in Aristotle's philosophy.