

Leonardo Graciotti

In the *Magister's* Shadow: Domenico Bonfioli's Student Notes from Pomponazzi's Lectures

Introduction

Over the past seventy years, the investigations into Pietro Pomponazzi's unpublished university courses have provided a clearer and more accurate understanding of his thought, as well as significant insights into the university milieu of Renaissance Padua and Bologna.¹ One of the most fascinating aspects of reading *reportationes* of university lectures is that they give us the impression of being, so to speak, flies on the wall – listening directly to the words of the *magister* (*viva voce*). However, whether they are first-order notes (*Mitschriften*) or second-order notes (*Nachschriften*), we should always bear in mind that a hidden presence lies between us and the *magister*: the student.² This intermediary figure becomes even more significant in the case of Pomponazzi's *reportationes*, as there is no evidence that he dictated his lectures or reviewed the notes taken by his pupils.³ The lack of authorial control is reflected in the marked differences among notes taken by different students from the same courses, which makes it impossible to establish a proper critical edition bearing Pomponazzi's name. In other words, the essence of these materials largely relies on the minds and hands of the students (or scribes), who collected, transcribed, copied and circulated the words of the *magister*.

1 After the studies by Francesco Fiorentino and Luigi Ferri, in the 1950s Bruno Nardi and Paul Oskar Kristeller drew historiographical attention to Pomponazzi's *reportationes*. A seminal introduction to this research remains: Bruno Nardi, *Studi su Pietro Pomponazzi*, Florence: Le Monnier, 1965.

2 For this distinction, see Ann M. Blair, Student Manuscripts and the Textbook, in: *Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe*, Emidio Campi, Simone De Angelis, Anja-Silvia Goeing, and Anthony Thomas Grafton (eds.), 39–40, Geneva: Droz, 2008.

3 Although it is still unclear whether and how widespread dictation was in Renaissance Italian universities, Cesare Oliva ruled out the attribution of this practice to Pomponazzi. On dictation between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Cesare Oliva, Note sull'insegnamento di Pietro Pomponazzi, *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana* 7, no. 2 (1926): 83–103, at 94–96; Blair, *Student Manuscripts*, 45–50; David A. Lines, *The Dynamics of Learning in Early Modern Italy: Art and Medicine at the University of Bologna*, Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 2023, 77 and 81.

While perusing Pomponazzi's *reportationes*, one comes across several figures associated with his circle. The Venetian patrician Antonio Surian, the Bassanese humanist Lazzaro Bonamico, the Modenese physician Giovanni Grillenzoni and the Cremonese physician Pietro Manna are only a few examples among the best known. The role of the student, however, has often been marginalised by scholars, who focused instead on grasping the key developments of Pomponazzi's thought. As a result, many of the personalities who gravitated around him for years, and to whose efforts we owe so much, have been left in the shadow of the *magister*. In this chapter, I would like to make an attempt in the opposite direction. By shifting the focus from the centre to the margins, I intend to shed some light on Domenico Bonfioli (*Dominicus Bonusfilius*, or *Bonifilii*), a nearly unknown pupil of Pomponazzi, who taught for many years at the University of Bologna.

1 **Dominicus Bonusfilius: Life and Works**

The earliest information on the noble family "de' Bonfioli" (or "de' Bonfiglioli") has been collected by Pompeo Scipione Dolfi in his *Cronologia delle famiglie nobili di Bologna*.⁴ They were originally related to the Orsucci family of Lucca and the Bonfiglioli family of Imola. Due to the civil wars, they first moved to Ferrara, and then to Bologna in 1458, with Nascimbene the son of Pietrobono Bonfioli.⁵ Domenico belonged to this family, but we lack information about his private life. We know that he was born in Bologna in the early sixteenth century to Nicolò Bonfioli and Dorotea (or Lucrezia) Fontana, and that at some point he married Maria da Saffuno.⁶ More details come from his academic career. He graduated in *artibus et medicina* from the University of Bologna on 6 July 1528, and he immediately became a board member (*collegiatus*). He first held the chair of logic in the morning (*logica de mane*) for three years (1529–1532), then the extraordinary one of philosophy

⁴ Pompeo Scipione Dolfi, *Cronologia delle famiglie nobili di Bologna, con le loro insegne, e nel fine i cimieri: Centuria prima, con un breve discorso della medesima città*, Bologna: Giovanni Battista Ferroni, 1670, 201–208.

⁵ The relocation to Bologna was probably facilitated by some relationship with the prominent Bolognese family of Malvezzi. This is not the place to delve into the link between these two families, but it is worth mentioning that many documents related to the Bonfioli family are today stored in the Malvezzi-Campeggi collection of the Archivio di Stato of Bologna.

⁶ Giovanni Fantuzzi, *Notizie degli scrittori bolognesi*, vol. 2, Bologna: Stamperia di San Tommaso d'Aquino, 1782, 299.

(*philosophia extraordinaria*) for four years (1532–1536).⁷ On 16 December 1536, he was called to Padua to teach logic *in primo loco*, with a salary of 100 florins.⁸ After a few years, in 1540, Domenico returned to Bologna to teach medicine in the early afternoon (*medicina in nonis*). From 1541 to 1550 he taught theoretical medicine (*medicina theoria ordinaria de mane*), and then again medicine *in nonis* for one year, before retiring in 1551.⁹ He died in a villa of his own in 1571 and was buried in the Bolognese church of Santa Cecilia.¹⁰

As for Bonfioli's own writings, Dolfi refers only to a four-volume commentary on Aristotle's *Topics* (Bononiae: Giovanni Battista Faelli, 1531), while Antonio Bumaldi (pseudonym of Ovidio Montalbani) also mentions some of his philosophical manuscripts, which were finely crafted and prepared for a few learned minds of his time.¹¹ One of these manuscripts mentioned by Bumaldi is probably the codex 18. L. 44, kept in the Biblioteca Storica dell'Istituto Campana in Osimo (Ancona, Italy). It contains several documents drafted by Bonfioli, including some *reportationes* of Pomponazzi's courses.¹² Moreover, at the Wellcome Library in London there is a copy of the *Tractatus celeberrimus de febribus* (Lugduni: François Fradin, 1507) by Marsilio Santasofia, which shows numerous annotations jotted down by Bonfioli along with a final ownership note: "Dominicus Bonusfilius 1537. Patavii".¹³ This is also the case with a second edition copy of Girolamo Savonarola's *Opera singulare contra l'astrologia divinatrice* (Venetiae: Lazarro Soardi, 1513), in which there are marginal notes and a final ownership's note, stating: "Dominicus Bonusfilius,

⁷ Serafino Mazzetti, *Repertorio di tutti i professori antichi, e moderni della famosa Università, e del celebre Istituto delle Scienze di Bologna*, Bologna: Tipografia di San Tommaso d'Aquino, 1847, 65. According to the teaching rolls (*rotuli*), he read progressively Aristotle's *De coelo et mundo*, *De anima*, *Physica* and again *De coelo et mundo*. See Umberto Dallari, *I rotuli dei lettori legisti e artisti dello Studio di Bologna dal 1384 al 1799*, vol. 2, Bologna: Regia Tipografia dei Fratelli Merlani, 1919, 69, 72, 75 and 78.

⁸ Jacopo Facciolati, *Fasti Gymnasi Patavini*, Patavii: Tipografia del Seminario, presso Giovanni Manfrè, 1757, 296.

⁹ See David A. Lines, Natural Philosophy in Renaissance Italy: The University of Bologna and the Beginnings of Specialization, *Early Science and Medicine* 6, no. 4 (2001): 267–323, at 310.

¹⁰ Fantuzzi, *Notizie*, 299; Mazzetti, *Repertorio*, 65.

¹¹ Dominicus Bonusfilius, *Commentaria in quatuor volumina Topicorum Aristotelis cum novo textu Iacobi Fabri*, Bononiae: Giovanni Battista Faelli, 1531. See Dolfi, *Cronologia*, 203; Antonio Bumaldi, *Bibliotheca Bononiensis*, Bononiae: Tipografia dell'Erede di Vittorio Benacci, 1641, 59 ("eius manuscripta subtilissime exarata circa Philosophiam totam in sublimiorum ingeniorum dimanarunt utilitatem").

¹² For a detailed description of the Osimo codex, see Leonardo Graciotti and Costanza Lucchetti, Pietro Pomponazzi nella Biblioteca Storica dell'Istituto Campana di Osimo: Il codice 18. L. 44, *Bruniana & Campanelliana* 27, no. 1–2 (2021): 117–134.

¹³ Marsilius de Sancta Sophia, *Tractatus celeberrimus de febribus*, Lugduni: François Fradin, 1507.

1539".¹⁴ There is no doubt that the hand that penned these two printed books is the same one found in the codex 18. L. 44 mentioned above.

During his studies at the University of Bologna, Bonfioli had the opportunity to attend Pomponazzi's last university course on Aristotle's *De sensu et sensato*, reported in the Osimo codex as *Expositio libelli De sensu et sensato*.¹⁵ After this *Expositio*, the codex contains a draft letter written and signed by Bonfioli. He stated that he was waiting to learn from his anonymous correspondent which of the Pomponazzi's notes he had collected on the *Parva naturalia* might have been of interest to him.¹⁶ He specified that these texts were gathered in the year that Pomponazzi passed away, before having completed the reading of the *Parva naturalia*.¹⁷ This suggests that Bonfioli had attended the course on *De sensu et sensato* (completed on 6 April 1525), and that Pomponazzi had continued with his lectures on the *Parva naturalia* until his death, occurred on 18 May 1525. Even if the *Expositio* had not been transcribed in its entirety by Bonfioli himself (there are moments when one has the impression that different hands are involved), he was certainly the one who collected, arranged and annotated it.

After completing the reading of *De sensu*, Pomponazzi presumably started with *De memoria et reminiscencia*, but died without finishing it.¹⁸ This can be deduced from a commentary on *De memoria* contained in the Osimo codex, whose author refers several times to his *magister* Pomponazzi.¹⁹ The similarity in the handwriting between this text and those marked by Bonfioli suggests that he was indeed

¹⁴ Hieronymus Savonarola, *Opera singulare contra l'astrologia divinatrice*, Venetiae: Lazarro Soardi, 1513. I learned of the existence of this copy through the online catalogue of the Libreria Rappaport, one of the most famous antiquarian bookshops of the twentieth century. Bernard E. Seacombe, grandson of the founder Carl Ewald Rappaport, has kindly provided me with some pictures of the volume, now in his possession. I would like to take this opportunity to openly express my gratitude to him.

¹⁵ Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 1r–79v. On this last university course, see Leonardo Graciotti, Medicine and Philosophy in Pomponazzi's "Expositio libelli de sensu et sensato" (1524–1525), *Micrologus* 31, Special Issue (2023): 295–310; Luca Burzelli, A Heated Debate: Pomponazzi and Contarini on the Nature of Fire, *Micrologus* 31, Special Issue (2023): 311–329.

¹⁶ "Expectabam pariter et a Magnificentia vestra indicem eorum, quae vellet ex scriptis Pomponati atque ex Bononia, qualia ego met, ipso docente, collegeram in *Parvis naturalibus*, non quidem virtute" (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 83r).

¹⁷ "Ideo eas, ut potui, in hoc uno collegi, quem tibi tradere potui ex Pomponatio, qui anno illo defecit, priusquam *Parva illa naturalia* perficere [perficire ms] posset" (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 83r).

¹⁸ To the best of my knowledge, there is no *reportatio* of Pomponazzi's course on *De memoria et reminiscencia*.

¹⁹ For this commentary on *De memoria et reminiscencia*, see Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 95r–105v. For explicit references to the *magister*, see "ut bene etiam dixit Pomponatus", "vide Pomponatum hic plura" (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 95r); "vide hic Pomponatum hoc in alia lectione" (Osimo, ms. 18. L.

the hardworking pupil who attended Pomponazzi's very last lectures and later used those notes to elaborate his own commentary on *De memoria*. The draft letter reveals that Bonfioli had promised his correspondent not only the materials on *De sensu et sensato*, but also those on the rest of the *Parva naturalia*'s collection.²⁰

Bonfioli's draft letter describes a work conceived not only for private use, but also for public circulation, although its diffusion was meant to be much more circumscribed than a printed publication. In this respect, some fundamental paratextual elements are mentioned here: index (*index*), tables (*tabellae*), branching diagrams (*arbores*), epilogue (*epilogus*), annotations (*annotationes*) and appendices (*corollaria*). Extraneous to Pomponazzi's speech, these elements are inserted by Bonfioli to introduce the content of the text and aid navigation, as well as memorisation.²¹ The draft letter also suggests that the anonymous correspondent had some interests in medical studies, as Bonfioli emphasised the value of this work not only for philosophy, but also for medicine.²² The paratextual elements were therefore even more useful, for they facilitated the transition from theoretical knowledge to practice, allowing the text to be consulted as needed. At the University of Bologna, Pomponazzi was mostly facing an audience of future physicians, who were obliged to attend lectures on natural philosophy designed as propaedeutic to the study of medicine. As already mentioned, Bonfioli himself reached the peak of his academic career teaching medicine. It just so happened that better organisation of these notes resulted in a useful tool in the future, both for theoretical teaching and for practical application.

Meant to be shared with others, the *Expositio libelli De sensu et sensato* was certainly not recorded directly under the *magister's* *viva voce*. The graphic reg-

44, 96v); “haec praceptor”, “sed respondet praceptor”, “Aliter, inquit praceptor, dicere nescio” (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 97v).

20 “Quod si haec tuae magnificentiae grata esse cognovero, cui video omnium labores homini studiosissimo fore tales, non cessabo hac aestate prius quam totius voluminis *Parvorum naturalium* tibi dedero tabellas aut arbores, quales colligere potero” (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 83r).

21 “Audiveram autem a Magnificentia vestra una die dici quam maxime existimaret tabellas, quae aut ad memoriam aut introductionem fortassis praeponi solent ... Quod si haec tuae Magnificentiae grata esse cognovero, cui video omnium labores homini studioso fore tales, non cessabo hac aestate prius quam totius voluminis *Parvorum naturalium* tibi dedero tabellas aut arbores, quales colligere potero ... Dicam nam hoc, mihi videtur fuisse mens autoris tum ex libri titulo seu rubrica, qui illum inscrispsit de sensiteriis, quibus primam partem dicam ultra praefacionem, et de sensilibus, quibus secundam partem appropriari putavi. Tum ex fine, quando dictorum fecit collectionem, quam mihi placuit separatim facere epilogum de quaestionibus” (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 83r–v).

22 “Doctrinam enim maximam sapere videntur, et prodesse, nedum philosophiae, immo et arti etiam medicae” (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 83r).

ularity, the fluidity of the discourse and the subsequent modifications as well as annotations reveal several stages of elaboration. When compared with the other *reportationes* of Pomponazzi's course, Bonfioli's text stands out for its accuracy and clarity in conveying the *magister's* exposition, as well as for its completeness: it is, in fact, the only one to include all fifty-three lectures delivered by Pomponazzi – together with the copy preserved in ms. lat. 6536 of the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris, to which I will return below. Moreover, although this was by no means a singular case, it is worth noting that Bonfioli included the initials of his name ("D. B." or "D. Bo.") in some of the marginal and interlinear notes, as if to emphasise his personal commitment to the text. Pomponazzi's *reportationes* probably had a wide circulation in the university milieu, so much so that in some cases several copies of the same *reportatio* have been preserved.²³ The students who had collected these notes sometimes included their names or initials, especially where they added personal notes: in this way they probably sought to make clear to the future reader or copyist which words belonged to the *magister* and which were their own annotations. This can be seen, for example, in the copy of the notes taken from Pomponazzi's lectures on *Liber septimus De physico auditu*, contained in the Osimo codex: the very last folio shows a final note enclosed between the initials "H.us B.us", that is, according to Bruno Nardi, "Hieronymus de Bono, bononiensis".²⁴ This copy was likely transcribed by Bonfioli, as suggested by the handwriting. But he decided to report the *magister's* words with the final annotation and the initials of his own colleague Girolamo de Bono.

In many cases, annotations and names of the students were lost in subsequent copies. This is the case with the copy of Bonfioli's *reportatio* contained in ms. lat. 6536 of the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris. The scribe (or perhaps scribes) of this transcription drew from various *reportationes* at different time. From Lecture 14 onwards, the text turns into an exact copy of Bonfioli's *reportatio*, except for the *marginalia*: most of the notes found in Bonfioli's *reportatio* are omitted, including those marked with his initials. Why were they not included? Given the current state of the evidence, it is difficult to provide a definitive answer. I can only offer a tenta-

²³ About Pomponazzi's lectures, Ludovico Castelvetro writes: "Et perché Egli non iscriveva nulla delle sue letture, per la mano del Grilenzone si sono conservate, il quale avendone fatta copia a molti sono al presente tanto divulgata, quantunque non siano stampate, che non è nium Lettore pubblico di Filosofia, che non le abbia et non se ne abbellisca leggendo". See Ludovico Castelvetro, Racconto delle vite d'alcuni letterati del suo tempo di M. L. C. Modenese scritte per suo piacere, in: *Appendice I*, Giuseppe Cavazzuti (ed.), 1-15, Modena: Società Tipografica Modenese – Antica Tipografia Soliani, 1903, 4.

²⁴ Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 222r. Nardi had originally attributed these initials to Girolamo Bettoni da Correggio. Later he ascribed them to Girolamo de Bono (see Nardi, *Studi*, 75–76 and 296).

tive hypothesis. Bonfioli's *Expositio* in the Osimo codex shows a darker ink between fol. 21r and fol. 37v.²⁵ The stroke is slightly different, but the handwriting seems to be the same as in the other fascicles. These folios, however, were clearly produced at a different time than the earlier and the later ones. The marginal notes here included present two types of ink: a darker one, like the body of the text; a lighter one, as in the other folios of the *Expositio*. The notes of the first group are copied in the Parisian codex, while those of the second group, which include all the notes signed by Bonfioli, have been omitted. I therefore wonder whether the scribe of the Parisian codex had in hand a draft version (with the notes written in darker ink) of Bonfioli's *reportatio*, which lacked most of the *marginalia* added by Bonfioli himself at a later stage. While I cannot offer a definitive answer, this example suggests that a careful study of the *marginalia* may reveal insights into the processes of production, sharing and circulation of these university course notes.

Bonfioli's *Expositio libelli De sensu et sensato* is clearly the result of a process that began in the university classroom and continued in private: from a phase of transcription and reworking of the *magister's* words, up to a moment of close reading and editing of the text. We do not know exactly how many people were involved in this process, and it is not excluded that Bonfioli may have employed professional copyists. In any case, the final step probably coincided with the inclusion of various kinds of *marginalia*: some of them aimed at integrating missing parts of the text through cross-reference marks, or at providing precise coordinates for the passages quoted by the *magister*; others focused on subdividing and organising the text to make it easier for the reader; still others supplemented the text with additional references, argumentations, and personal comments, carefully marked with his own initials. The latter are particularly interesting, as they reveal the intellectual engagement of the student-reader-author in understanding the *magister's* lectures.

2 Paratextual Notes

From the very first folio's *recto*, it is immediately clear which marginal notes serve as paratextual elements for the text's browsing and which ones reveal Bonfioli's personal commitment. Pomponazzi's *Expositio* starts after the heading ("Lectura Magistri Petri Pomponatii in *Parva naturalia* Aristotelis. Anno domini 1524, die 24 novembris. *De sensu et sensato*") with the first lemma of the Aristotelian text, dis-

25 Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 21r–37v.

tinguished from the *magister*'s commentary by being underlined.²⁶ The first lecture serves as an introduction (*accessus ad auctorem*), in which Pomponazzi presents *De sensu et sensato* and places it within the Aristotelian *corpus*. He explains that Aristotle's natural philosophy consists of two parts: on the one hand, there are the books dedicated to inanimate beings (*de rebus inanimatis*), that is, the *Physics*, *De coelo et mundo*, *De generatione et corruptione* and the *Meteorology*; on the other, there are the books devoted to living beings (*de animatis*), that is, *De anima*, the *Parva naturalia* and the treatises on animals and plants. Three notes appear here in the right-hand margin.²⁷

The first and third of them are signed "D. B." and are introduced by "nota quod". In the former, Bonfioli briefly recalls the first book of *Physics* for the investigation of the principles of nature; in the latter, he focuses on plants. According to Pomponazzi, Aristotle intended to write a treatise on plants, since he had already dealt with animals; but he may not have been able to complete this project, which was later carried out by his pupil Theophrastus. Echoing the words of the *magister*, Bonfioli recalls that Aristotle mentioned his action plan at the beginning of Book I of *Meteorology* and at the end of *De longitudine et brevitate vitae*; later on, Theophrastus developed it, following the method of history (*per hystoriam*) used by Aristotle for animals, that is, describing the essence and operations of plants, their generation, and their death.²⁸ In these two notes, Bonfioli follows Pomponazzi's exposition, merely providing further arguments and bibliographical references. However, he signals with his own initials that he personally contributed these additions.

The second of the three notes above mentioned has no initials and presents the contents of the text with a short summary heading: "Division of books about living beings".²⁹ Notes of this kind are completely impersonal, that is, without personal commitment, which is why the author's initials are not necessary. They appear quite frequently along the margins of the entire exposition, dividing the text into paragraphs. For example, limiting our attention to Pomponazzi's first lecture, we find the following short titles: "Why these books are called *Parva naturalia*"; "Order of the *Parva naturalia* within the books on the animals"; "Division of the *Parva nat-*

26 Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 1r.

27 Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 1r.

28 "Nota quod de his Aristoteles proposuit in principio libri *Meteororum* et fine *De longitudine ac brevitate vitae*. In illo ita processit Theophrastus, sicut Aristoteles de animalibus per hystoriam, propter quid, utrobique tria dicens, scilicet essentiam cum operationibus, generationem vitam et mortem cum cognatis. D. B." (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 1r).

29 "Divisio librorum de animatis" (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 1r).

uralia"; "Order of the *Parva naturalia*"; "Title of this book"; "Usefulness".³⁰ In addition to the summary headings, Pomponazzi's *Expositio* is frequently partitioned by means of standard formulas. Through these, Bonfioli indicates to the reader that the main text contains: a literal exposition (*textus expositio*), an objection (*objec-tio*), a common solution (*responsio communis*), a confutation or a counterargument (*confutatio, impugnatio*), a personal solution (*solutio, evasio propria*) or a remarkable point (*notabilis*).

Notes with a navigational function also include all the bibliographical references that Bonfioli provides in the margin or in the line-spacing of the text. For example, in the first folio's *recto*, where Pomponazzi states that Aristotle's *De anima* firstly deals with the definition of the soul (*Philosophus prius agit de ipsa anima secundum suam definitionem*), Bonfioli specifies: "up to text 33", that is, "up to *De anima*, II, 415a14" in the Bekker edition.³¹ Bibliographical references of this kind are found every time Pomponazzi invokes *De anima*, as well as others Aristotelian works. But Bonfioli does not merely rely on *magister's* quotations. Rather, he often extracts by himself the implicit reference from the body of the text. For instance, in the margin of fol. 9r, where Pomponazzi states that according to the physicians the same nerves are involved in speaking and listening (*ut dicunt medici, sunt idem nervi qui faciunt ad auditum et ad loquellam*), Bonfioli adds some references to Avicenna's *Canon* on his own initiative.³² These bibliographical notes provides us with clues to the works' editions used by Bonfioli, although the references do not always seem appropriate. By way of example, one can observe the left-hand marginal note in fol. 6v. As reported in the body text, according to Aristotle all the animals that are capable of local motion have sight, except for the mole (*omnia animalia quae localiter moventur habent visum praeter talpam*). Here Bonfioli refers to Galen's *De usu partium*, XVII (vide Galenus, 17, *De usu partium*), although the exact reference is probably *De usu partium*, XIV, chapter 6, the only place where Galen mentions the Aristotelian example of moles' eyes.³³

³⁰ "Cur dicuntur *Parva Naturalia*", "Ordo *Parvorum* inter libros de animalibus", "Divisio *Parvorum naturalium*" (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 1v); "Ordo *Parvorum*" (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 2r); "Titulus libri huius", "Utilitas" (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 2v).

³¹ "Usque ad t. c. 33" (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 1r). In this case, Bonfioli does not specify the book, but the reference is clearly to the *textus commento* 33 of *De anima*, II.

³² Specifically, he makes reference to *Canon*, I, fen. I, doctrina V, summa III, cap. 2 (*De anatomia nervorum egredientium a cerebro et eorum viis*), 3 (*De anatomia nervorum nuche et colli et viis eorum*), 4 (*De anatomia nervorum nuche spondilium que sunt in rectitudine pectoris*) and to *Canon*, III, fen. IV, cap. 3 (*De nocumentis auditus*). See Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 9r.

³³ See Galen, *On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body*, vol. 2, Margaret Tallmadge May (ed.), Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press, 1968, 629.

In addition to Aristotle, Galen and Avicenna, Bonfioli makes references to Plato, Theophrastus, Virgil, Themistius, Alexander of Aphrodisias, Simplicius, Averroes, Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Gentile da Foligno, Peter of Abano, Dino del Garbo, Tommaso del Garbo, John of Jandun, Marcantonio Zimara, Niccolò Leonico Tomeo and many others. Most of the time, he accurately quotes the work and the specific place he wants to suggest, while in some cases he simply mentions the author's name, without giving any other precise indication. The strong presence of physicians among the authors mentioned above, as well as the number of specific references to medical texts, is quite remarkable: it confirms what Bonfioli himself states in the draft letter described earlier regarding the value of this work for medical studies. Moreover, these marginal notes tell us about Bonfioli's cultural background and his presumably easy access to certain texts. Finally, the diligence with which the appropriate bibliographical references are included in the *reportatio* shows an important aspect of the transition from oral lecture to written commentary: the aim is not only to reproduce the words of the *magister*, but also to edit a text that is suitable for public circulation, albeit still in manuscript form.

Another kind of paratextual notes is those in which Bonfioli summarises the *quaestiones* and *dubitaciones* addressed by Pomponazzi. For example, towards the end of fol. 4r, we read in the right-hand margin: "Whether or not the natural philosopher is intitled to deal with health and sickness".³⁴ This kind of questions are collected by Bonfioli in the index found at the end of the *Expositio*, that is, the "Tabula quaestionum generalium quae habentur in hoc libro *De sensu et sensato* a Domino Petro Pomponatio Mantuano".³⁵ Here the issue concerning the legitimacy of a philosophical enquiry on health and sickness is recalled in a more expansive fashion, with a cross-reference to the specific place where it is raised: "In what manner the physician begins with issues related to natural philosophy, while the philosopher ends with medical problems, and in what sense the physician is subordinate to the natural philosopher: fourth folio's recto, towards the end".³⁶ The same pattern recurs for the other issues raised by Pomponazzi and collected by Bonfioli in the final table, so as to further facilitate reading, as well as quick browsing into the text. Many of these issues are labelled as remarkable points (*notabilia*), while others as doubts (*dubitaciones*).

34 "Utrum naturalis considerat de sanitate et aegritudine" (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 4r).

35 Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 79r–v.

36 "Quo modo medicus faciat initium a naturalibus, philosophus autem ad medicinalia desinit, et quo modo medicus philosopho naturali subordinetur: charta 4, facie prima, circa finem" (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 79r). For the *Tabula quaestionum generalium*, see the appendix to this chapter.

3 D. B.'s Annotations Supporting Pomponazzi

As mentioned above, beyond adding paratextual markers, Bonfioli often engages with the text in a more personal way through his *marginalia*. In many cases, he seems to intervene in favour of the *magister*, either by reinforcing his points with additional arguments and references or neutralising opposing positions. One such example can be found in the first folio's *verso*. Pomponazzi mentions Thomas Aquinas to explain why Aristotle did not include a treatise on the intellect and the intelligibles in his *Parva naturalia*: the investigation conducted in this collection concerns the operations of the soul in its relation to the bodily organs; since the intellect is independent of any bodily organs (*intellectus nullius corporis actus est*), its consideration is beyond the scope of this study, as Bonfioli makes clear:

Some other people say that he made indeed [a book on the intellect], and this book is the one on animals, for there he deals with animals in relation to the human being, who is the intellect. This is what Aristotle suggested in that book. But this is false, because there the question is about the matter of the animal, not its operations – as it will be argued later. D. B.³⁷

Bonfioli takes a stand here in support of Pomponazzi's argument. Against those who believe that Aristotle dealt with the intellect and the intelligible in his book on animals, Bonfioli argues that there Aristotle simply investigates the organic body of the animals, without taking into consideration the intellectual faculties of the human beings.³⁸ Furthermore, to corroborate his alignment with Pomponazzi, Bonfioli adds a cross-reference to a later passage in the *Expositio*.

Another interesting note is found in fol. 2r. Here Pomponazzi describes the *Parva naturalia*'s treatises devoted to the vegetative function of the soul, that is, *De morte et vita*, *De iuventute et senectute*, *De longitudine et brevitate vitae* and *De sanitate et aegritudine*. But no trace of this last work remains, and commentators have often questioned its existence.³⁹ Bonfioli details the sources that helped give rise to this belief:

That Aristotle wrote a book entitled *De sanitate et langore* comes from *De partibus animalium*, II (chapter 7, in the end), the beginning of *De longitudine ac brevitate vitae*, the end of *De*

³⁷ “Alii dicunt quod fecit, et est liber de animalibus, quia agit ibi de animalibus in ordine ad hominem, qui est intellectus. Et ita ibi proposuit Aristoteles. Sed hoc est falsum, quoniam ut infra dicetur, ibi agitur de materia animalis, non de operationibus. D. B.” (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 1v).

³⁸ Bonfioli is probably referring to Aristotle, *De generatione animalium*, II, 744a30–35.

³⁹ See René-Antoine Gauthier's critical apparatus in Thomas de Aquino, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 45.2: *Sentencia libri De sensu et sensato cuius secundus tractatus est De memoria et reminiscencia*, René Antoine Gauthier (ed.), Rome: Commissio Leonina; Paris: J. Vrin, 1985, 5.

morte et vita, and the beginning of *De sensu et sensato* (where there is also its introduction). Moreover, [he dealt with it] in *Historia animalium*, VIII, from chapter 18 onwards. And even Theophrastus [discussed it] in his *De causis plantarum*, V, chapter 9. D. B.⁴⁰

Bonfioli does not merely report Pomponazzi's statement – who in accordance with Aquinas attributed this lost treatise to Aristotle – but adds all the references to the Aristotelian *corpus* that corroborate the *magister's* position.⁴¹ In addition, he mentions Theophrastus' *De causis plantarum*, V, chapter 9, in which plant pathology is discussed.⁴² All these references confirm, in Bonfioli's opinion, that a treatise on health and sickness was part of the Aristotelian project.

In some cases, Bonfioli substantiates the issues discussed by adding arguments in the margins. For instance, in the first lecture, Pomponazzi explains why *De sensu* is the first treatise of the *Parva naturalia* collection. The main reason is that initially we have a better grasp of the external rather than the internal senses (*quia sensus exteriores sunt nobis notiores interioribus*).⁴³ Bonfioli adds two more reasons:

Or because the external sense is about present things and memory pertains to the past, while sleep and wakefulness are related to future things, especially sleep because of his nature. Or because sleep and wakefulness do not belong to the soul like the external and internal senses, but they are more related to the body. D. B.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ "Nota quod Aristoteles fecit liber *De sanitate et langore* patet ex eo secundo *De partibus animalium*, capitulo 7, in fine; ad principium *De longitudine ac brevitate vitae*; in fine *De morte et vita*; principio *De sensu ac sensato*, hic habetur etiam principium eius. Item quia in *Historia* tractavit, VIII, capitulo 18 inde et etiam Theophrastus, 5, *De causis plantarum*, capitulum 9. D.B" (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 2r).

⁴¹ Bonfioli refers to *De partibus animalium*, II, 653a10, where Aristotle clearly referred to a work on the origin of diseases; *De longitudine et brevitate vitae*, 464b30–33, where a future treatise on sickness and health is announced; *De vita et morte*, 480b23–30, where he claimed that natural philosophy deals with the causes of health and sickness; *Historia animalium*, VII, 601a23–608a1, where Aristotle dealt with animal pathology. As for the last reference, note that Book VIII quoted by Bonfioli corresponds to Book VII in modern editions: the variation is due to the fact that, following Theodore Gaza's edition (published in 1476), many later editors placed Book IX after Book VI, resulting in a different order of the work. For further details, see the introduction in Aristotle, *History of Animals (Book VII–X)*, David Mowbray Balme and Allan Gotthelf (eds.), Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1991, 1–50.

⁴² See Theophrastus, *De causis plantarum (Books V–VI)*, Benedict Einarson and George Konrad Karl Link (eds.), Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1990, 85–89.

⁴³ Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 2r. See Aristotle, *Physics*, 184a23–26.

⁴⁴ "Vel quia sensus exterior est praesentium, memoria praeteritorum, somnus et vigilia futurum respiciunt, et maxime somnus pree ipso. Vel quia somnus et vigilia non ita sunt animae ut sensus exteriores et interiores, sed magis corporis sunt. D. B." (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 2r).

According to the first hypothesis, *De sensu et sensato* is the first treatise because the external senses examined there always concern present things; this is followed by *De memoria et reminiscencia*, which deals with the memory of the past (always implying a previous sense perception), and finally *De somno et vigilia*, which addresses the perception of future things. It is therefore necessary to start with the external senses (*De sensu*) and then gradually proceed to the other treatises. The second hypothesis rests on the fact that *De sensu* (which deals with the external senses) and *De memoria* (which regards the internal senses) precede *De somno*, for they are more related to the activity of the soul, whereas sleep and wakefulness (discussed in *De somno*) are functions which are more dependent on the body. In this view, the collection of the *Parva naturalia* seamlessly leads from an investigation into the operations involving the soul–body compound to those strictly related to the body.

It is worth pointing out that Pomponazzi's lectures were probably a rather flexible framework, to the point that Stefano Perfetti called them a sort of Aristotelian workshop.⁴⁵ Indeed, the *reportationes* suggest that students sometimes intervened directly with questions or objections. For instance, in Lecture 43 of Bonfioli's *repartatio* one can read: "As our Furnus was saying yesterday ...".⁴⁶ The objector to whom Pomponazzi was referring here is Gianfrancesco Forno of Modena, as Bonfioli pointedly indicates in the margin (*Obiectio Furni Mutinensis*). The young and talented Forno was probably well known in the Bolognese milieu.⁴⁷ He was a student of Pomponazzi in Bologna, where he later obtained the chair of logic in 1520. His reputation grew after taking part in a public philosophical dispute in Modena during the General Chapter of Dominicans, in which Pomponazzi also participated.⁴⁸ According to Tiraboschi, Forno held the extraordinary chair of philosophy in

⁴⁵ See Perfetti's introduction in Pietro Pomponazzi, *Expositio super primo et secundo De partibus animalium*, Stefano Perfetti (ed.), Florence: Olschki, 2004, XXIV–XXVI.

⁴⁶ "Quod autem dicebat heri Furnus noster ..." (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 65r).

⁴⁷ For biographical details, see Girolamo Tiraboschi, *Biblioteca modenese o notizie della vita e delle opere degli scrittori natii degli stati del serenissimo signor duca di Modena*, vol. 2, Modena: Società Tipografica, 1782, 348–351.

⁴⁸ There is a reference to Forno and his public dispute in Pomponazzi's *Expositio libri De generatione et corruptione*, contained in the codex 18. L. 44: the handwriting seems to be attributable to Bonfioli, but we do not know whether he was actually present at this course (held on holidays in 1519) or later collected these notes (see Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 278r). The presence of Pomponazzi and Forno at the General Chapter of Dominicans in Modena had become part of a novel (III, 38) written by Matteo Bandello. See Matteo Bandello, *Novelle*, Giuseppe Guido Ferrero (ed.), 739–742, Turin: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1978; Luca Badini Confalonieri, Bandello e Pomponazzi: la parte del filosofo, in: *Il cammino di madonna Oretta: Studi di letteratura italiana dal due al Novecento*, Luca Badini Confalonieri (ed.), 63–72, Alessandria: Edizione dell'Orso, 2004.

Pisa between 1521 and 1524. However, at least since 1523, he had already become part of Ercole Gonzaga's entourage, as testified in a letter sent on 10 January 1523 by Vincenzo de' Preti (mentor of Ercole Gonzaga) to his mother, Isabella D'Este.⁴⁹ Forno provided the future cardinal with the study support, as well as with private lectures on logic. It was probably with Ercole Gonzaga that Forno attended Pomponazzi's lectures on *De sensu et sensato* and raised his objections, at the risk of receiving straight response by the *magister*: "This argument is worthless".⁵⁰

Pomponazzi himself often left some issues open, encouraging his students to reflect on them – for instance during the Christmas holidays.⁵¹ In some of these cases, Bonfioli writes his own opinion in the margin or in the line spacings of the text. For instance, towards the end of fol. 2r, Pomponazzi wonders whether Aristotle had sufficiently dealt with the sensory faculty in his *De sensu et sensato*, *De memoria et reminiscencia* and *De somno et vigilia*. According to Averroes, these three treatises were sufficient, but others might have argued that the part on the internal senses, that is, imagination and common sense, was missing, even though Aristotle had announced it. Pomponazzi does not engage with this question, and postpones it to a more appropriate place, leaving it to his students (*nunc relinqu oibis*).⁵² Here, in the right-hand margin, Bonfioli fits his own note: he claims that imagination is the same faculty as memory, and that Aristotle dealt with it in *De anima*, III.⁵³ Due to this association between memory and imagination, Bonfioli seems to suggest that the ideal place Pomponazzi was referring to in order to address this issue was *De memoria et reminiscencia*.

49 "Il studio ... segue gagliardamente mattino e sera, et sin qui M. Lazaro spera benissimo de lui, né M.^{ro} Petro si diffida punto per li principij mostra [sic nostra], secondo dice anche m. Zo. Fran.^{co} Forno, qual non manca di farlo ben instrutto in questi principij" (Alessandro Luzio, Ercole Gonzaga allo studio di Bologna, *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana* 8 (1886): 374–386, at 381).

50 "Hoc nihil valet ..." (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 65r).

51 At the end of Lecture 16 on 20 December 1524, Pomponazzi states: "Et ideo ne istis festis vellitis omnino vos ludo deditos esse has propositas quaestiones pro eo tempore vobis pensitandas relinqu" (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 24v).

52 Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 2r.

53 "Ego dico, ut tenuit *De anima*, II, in fine, quod phantasia sit eadem virtus cum memoria, de qua, ut cogit, egit in libro *De anima*, II, t. c. 150, inde ... D. B." (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 2r). Bonfioli's reference corresponds to Book III in modern editions of *De anima*. See Aristotle, *De anima*, 427a16–429a10.

4 D. B.'s Annotations Challenging Pomponazzi

Despite his overall agreement with the *magister*, Bonfioli occasionally expresses dissent by adding his own counterarguments in the margins. This happens for example in Lecture 6, where Pomponazzi criticises Thomas Aquinas' interpretation of an Aristotelian passage against the ancient philosophers, who attributed the element of fire to sight. The question was: if sight is composed of fire, why are we not able to see it? And yet the same point could be raised against Aristotle, who considered the eye to be made of water. In his defence, Aquinas argued that this criticism was certainly valid for the ancient philosophers, for they believed that an actual assimilation was taking place between the organ and the object of vision; but not for Aristotle, who considered the presence of a medium to be crucial for the visual act to occur. Pomponazzi is not convinced by this interpretation for two reasons: firstly, because the ancient philosophers intended real assimilation as the apprehension of something that is external to the sense organ, and not as the perception of itself; secondly, because this kind of criticism would be valid only for those (*ad hominem*) who considered vision as a real assimilation, but not against all those (*simpliciter*) who believed the eye to be constituted of fire.⁵⁴

Bonfioli's note is quite intricate, but he clearly disagrees with Pomponazzi and argues in favour of Aquinas. First of all, he says that the ancient philosophers did not make this kind of distinction (*antiqui non faciunt hanc differentiam*) between what is external and what is internal to the sense organ, and indeed there is no point in making it (*nec est facienda*), for if they admit the actual assimilation of something that is external to the organ, they will accept it even more so when the object is internal (*magis debet fieri per intrinsecum*), given the greater similarity to the organ. Secondly, Bonfioli states that it is acceptable that the Aristotelian argument specifically refers to those who consider vision as an actual assimilation, because if it were valid in general, it would turn against Aristotle himself (*Nam si Aristoteles non loquatur ad hominem facientem cognitionem ex simili, procedit etiam contra se ipsum*).

Bonfioli also adds that it is perhaps more correct (*rectius*) – compared to Aquinas' argumentation – to say that Aristotle was preparing the ground for criticising those who believed that vision occurred by the distension of the most external parts of the eyes outwards (*nunc loquatur contra eos qui ponunt visionem fieri a sensu active per extremis*), as he would later say: if this were the case, it would not be possible to perceive what is inside (*ad ipsum non sequi qui potest fieri intra*) and they would not be able to sustain the igneous nature of the eye. On the contrary,

54 Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 10r.

Aristotle could argue that the eye is made of water, because he believes that vision occurs within the eye.⁵⁵ Leaving aside the proposed argumentation, what is noteworthy here is Bonfioli's direct engagement in interpreting the Aristotelian passage and discussing the *magister*'s position – a pattern that recurs on many other occasions.

One final peculiar case I would like to mention here can be found in the left-hand margin of fol. 6v. According to Aristotle, sight, hearing, and smell are necessary for such animals that are capable of local movement. In this regard, Pomponazzi questions whether these animals should possess all these three senses or just one is sufficient. Relying on his own experience, Pomponazzi says that the second hypothesis seems more reliable to him, because there are a few animals that, albeit capable of local motion, are devoid of sight (such as the mole). Here Bonfioli writes:

One can doubt whether the sense of smell is extended to the whole species, because, according to Aristotle, the sense of smell has the utmost affinity with flavour, which is the object of taste, a necessary sense. However, when the question regards individuals, it is not, and I have seen many human beings who lacked the sense of smell. This was the case with a certain Doctor of Arts and Medicine, namely the outstanding *magister* Giustiniano Fantino, who is very dear to me. And so also was Mrs Bartolomea (my father's sister) and Mrs Catelina (my sister), of whom I know with certainty. D. B.⁵⁶

Bonfioli maintains that, according to Aristotle, the sense of smell is necessary for the survival of living beings because it is related to the sense of taste, and consequently to feeding. Thus, as for sight, there is the issue of how one can live without it. However, if one looks at the individuals, it is evident that there are some people

55 "Primum dicendum est, quoniam antiqui non faciunt hanc differentiam, nec est facienda, quoniam magis debet fieri [feri ms] per intrinsecum, eo quod magis est similitudo, cum sit intrinsecum, in qua similitudine ipsi fundantur. Tum, quod non haberent rationem huius? Secundum etiam quoniam potest admitti quod ratio est ad hominem. Verum rectius dico quod ratio est simpliciter probans, non ex eo quod iste dicit tantum, quia ipse etiam non respondet ad argumentum. Nam si Aristoteles non loquatur ad hominem facientem cognitionem ex simili, procedit etiam contra se ipsum, cum sit ibi natura aliqua apud oculum, sed est simpliciter ad dicentes hoc signum. Vel rectius quod nunc loquatur contra eos qui ponunt visionem fieri a sensu active per extrema [extremis ms], ut ipse idem dicet statim, quare ad ipsum non sequi qui potest fieri intra. D. B." (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 10r).

56 "De olfatu etiam est dubitatio in tota specie, quoniam, ut dicit Aristoteles, habet maximam affinitatem cum sapore, qui est obiectum gustus necessarii. De individuis autem non est dubium, et vidi multos homines non olfacere. Sic fuit quidam doctor artium et medicine, excellens Magister Iustinianus Fantinus mihi affectus. Item Domina Bartholomea soror patris mei et Domina Chatelina, soror mea, de quibus certe scio ego. D. B." (Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 6v).

who are able to live without it. Bonfioli mentions three cases known to him personally: his professor Giustiniano Fantino, his aunt Bartolomea and his sister Catelina.⁵⁷ The presence of these personal references, as well as Bonfioli's validating tag ("de quibus certe scio ego"), suggests that this work was not conceived solely for private use, but was also intended to be shared or consulted by others, to which he offers his own testimony in support of the argument put forward.

5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have sought to offer a glimpse into the wealth of information that can be found in the *marginalia* dotting the pages of Domenico Bonfioli's *reportationes* on Pomponazzi's course. Besides reiterating the importance of marginal notes, which has rightly been emphasised by eminent scholars in recent years, my focus here was to shed light on the specific technical functions these annotations played within students' *reportationes*.⁵⁸ Back in 1998, during a conference held at Erice, Jacqueline Hamesse (one of the leading specialists of the "literary genre" of *reportationes*) had already pointed out how much work remained to be done on the *marginalia* found in medieval university philosophical texts, and how many secrets still needed to be revealed: both the notes collected by students and texts used by the *magistri* are rich in marginal annotations that, for the most part, still remain unexplored.⁵⁹ This holds true even when early modern *reportationes* are taken into account. In the specific case of Pomponazzi studies, for example, a com-

57 I could not find any information on Bartolomea and Catelina. As for Giustiniano Fantino, Giovanni Nicolò Pasquali Alidosi refers that in 1503 he became board member of Philosophy and Medicine at the University of Bologna, where he taught Logic, Philosophy and Medicine (both theoretical and practical) until 1524. It is not clear when he died, but we know that he was buried at the church of S. Domenico in Bologna (see Giovanni Nicolò Pasquali Alidosi, *I dottori bolognesi di teologia, Filosofia, Medicina e d'Arti Liberali: Dall'anno 1000 per tutto marzo del 1623*, Bologna: Nicòlò Tebaldini, 1623, 98). According to Nardi, Fantino was one of the academic sponsors (*promotores*) of the famous philosopher Ludovico Boccadifero on 15 March 1516 (see Nardi, *Studi*, 321). It was probably in the last period of Fantino's teaching that Bonfioli had the opportunity to attend his courses.

58 For a recent assessment of the field of history of reading, see Anthony Thomas Grafton, Nicholas Popper, and William H. Sherman (eds.), *Gabriel Harvey and the History of Reading: Essays by Lisa Jardine and Others*, London: UCL Press, 2024.

59 Jacqueline Hamesse, *Les marginalia dans les textes philosophiques universitaires médiévaux*, in: *Talking to the Text: Marginalia from Papyri to Print: Proceedings of a Conference Held at Erice, 26 September – 3 October 1998, as the 12th Course of International School for the Study of Written Records*, vol. 1, Vincenzo Fera, Giacomo Ferràù, and Silvia Rizzo (eds.), 301–321, Messina: Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Umanistici, 2002.

prehensive analysis of the *marginalia* found in the notes taken by his students during his university courses promises to yield a great deal of information. This should be combined with a “social approach” that considers Pomponazzi’s thought in relation to that of his students, colleagues, friends and adversaries – in the belief that any philosophical thought, although original, is never completely isolated, but always intertwined with the contribution coming from other participants in the social business of thinking.

Bonfioli is one of those participants who deserves some attention. The present study of his *reportationes* can only serve as a starting point. First of all, it would be necessary to carefully examine the autograph documents contained in the Osimo codex: these include, for example, three draft letters on logic, written to Giovanni Battista Goineo – a humanist from Pirano (Slovenia) who was probably his pupil at the University of Bologna.⁶⁰ Then, in the same codex, it would be necessary to study all the *reportationes* annotated by Bonfioli, trying to clarify where he is the author, and where he simply copied others’ notes. It also would be useful to study the marginal notes written by Bonfioli in the printed texts mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, looking for other books with his possession notes. Finally, his *Commentary on Aristotle’s Topics* mentioned above and published by Bonfioli in 1531 should be carefully scrutinised. The work was published under the pontificate of Clement VII, who in 1529 offered a diplomatic role in Bologna to the famous Francesco Guicciardini (1483–1540). It is precisely with a dedication letter to Guicciardini that Bonfioli opens the volume, followed by many other letters to political and influential figures in Bologna. Moreover, Bonfioli’s *Commentary* presents many paratextual notes to guide the reader. It is indeed worth noting that the same formulas found in his *reportatio* of the *Expositio libelli De sensu et sensato* also occur here.

According to the approach taken in this chapter, I propose in the appendix Bonfioli’s *Tabula quaestionum generalium*, hoping that it will provide some support to those who wish to take up Pomponazzi’s last university course.

⁶⁰ See Osimo, ms. 18. L. 44, 91r–94v. For more information on Goineo, see Silvano Cavazza, Goineo, Giovanni Battista, *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 57 (2001): 562–565.

6 Appendix

The following *Tabula* is found in codex 18. L. 44 (fol. 79r–v) of the Biblioteca Storica dell'Istituto Campana di Osimo, in Ancona (Italy). All the *quaestiones* are listed without indicating those marked as *notabilia* and *dubitaciones*. Square brackets indicate the marginal headings inserted by Bonfioli to group the issues by topics. References to *chartae* and *facies* have been abbreviated as “fol.” (*folio*), “r” (*recto*) and “v” (*verso*). As modern cartulation differs from the original one, some references had to be changed: they are indicated with angle brackets (⟨...⟩).

fol. 79r

Tabula quaestionum generalium quae habentur in hoc libro *De sensu et sensato*
a Domino Petro Pomponatio Mantuano

Quo modo medicus faciat initium a naturalibus, philosophus autem ad medicinaria desinat, et quo modo medicus philosopho naturali subordinetur (fol. 4r, circa finem).

[De comparatione sensuum invicem ad animalia]

Utrum gustus sit necessarius animali, et de consideratione philosophi in hac re (fol. 6r, circa medium).

Utrum cuilibet animali progressivo sint necessarii omnes sensus qui fiunt per medium extrinsecum, vel quidam tantum (fol. 6v, circa medium).

Utrum magis faciant ad scientiam visus quam auditus. Utrum magis faciant ad scientiam visus et auditus quam tactus. Utrum ceci a nativitate sint prudentiores surdis et mutis. Utrum omnis surdus a nativitate [nativitate *ms*] sit mutus (fol. 9v, in principio: haec omnia ibi continentur).

[De visione, et modo fiendi ipsius]

Utrum lux quae appetit in corporibus politis et tersis sit in illis effective (fol. 10r, circa finem).

Quid sit visio et quo modo fiat visio (fol. 15v, in principio).

Utrum visio fiat intus, vel extramittendo (fol. 16r).

Utrum Aristoteles bene probaverit visionem fieri in nervis obticis [obticiis *ms*] (fol. 16v).

Utrum valeant aliae rationes Philosophi ad probandum de oculo quod attribuitur aquae (fol. 17r, ultra principium).

Utrum valeant rationes Philosophi ad probandum olfatum attribui igni (fol. 17r).

Cui elemento attribuatur olfatus, et de contradictione Aristotelis in hac re (fol. 17v, circa medium).

[De sensiterio tactus]

Utrum tactus a praedominio sit terreus (fol. 18r).
 Utrum gustus sit terreus a praedominio (fol. 18v).
 Utrum sensiterium sensus tactus sit in corde (fol. 18v, circa finem).
 Utrum cor sit principium tactus (fol. 19r).
 Utrum primum sentiens in tactu sit cor (fol. 19v).
 Utrum organum gustus sit in corde (fol. 19v).

[De organo trium sensuum qui fiunt per medium]

Utrum organum trium sensuum qui fiunt per medium extrinsecum, scilicet olfatus, auditus et visus sit in cerebro (fol. 20r).
 Unde motus fuit Aristoteles ad ponendum organum illorum trium sensuum qui fiunt per medium exstrinsecum in cerebro (ibidem fol. 20r, parum infra).

[De obiectu visus, seu de colore et lumine]

Quid sit dyaphanum, et per quid efficiatur dyaphanum (fol. 21v, in fine).
 Quid sit illa extremitas quae ponitur in diffinitione coloris (fol. 23r (fol. 22v))
 Quae qualitas sit color, vel quo modo causetur color (fol. 23r, in fine (in principio)).
 Vide multa consideranda circa diffinitionem coloris (fol. 24r, in fine, et fol. 25r, in fine (fols. 23v–24v)).
 Utrum colores medii sint extremi simul accepti, vel unum trium resultans (fol. 29r (fol. 27r)).

[De sapore, seu de obiecto gustus]

Utrum aqua in sui substantia efficiatur sapida, et colorata (fol. 33r; in principio (fol. 29v)).
 Qualis sit ordo primarum qualitatum ad quattuor elementa (fol. 33r, circa finem (fol. 29v)).
 Utrum materia saporis sit humidum, agens vero sit siccum (fol. 36r, in principio (fol. 31v)).
 Utrum illa particula posita in diffinitione saporis, scilicet alterativa de potentia ad actum, sit de intrinseca ratione saporis (fol. 36r (fol. 31v)).
 Utrum siccum sit magis effectivum saporum quam calidum, vel econtra (fol. 37r, in medio (fol. 32r)).
 Utrum ignis agat inquantum ignis (fol. 37v, circa medium (fol. 32v, in principio)).

[Quaedam pulchra, scilicet digna]

Quare est quod nulla forma substantialis per se immediate agit (fol. 39r, ultra principium (fols. 32v–33r)).

Quae sit immediata causa productiva ignis, vel alterius substantiae. Quod sit reducens aquam ad pristinam frigiditatem (fol. 39v, in principio (et) in medio (fols. 33v-34r)).

fol. 79v

[De sapore]

Utrum dulce et amarum sint sapores extremi (fol. 42r, in principio (fol. 35r)).

Utrum sapores medii generentur ab extremis (fol. 45r, ultra principium).

Utrum omnia viventia nutriantur dulci (fol. 45r, in fine).

[De odore, seu de obiecto olfatus]

Quid sit odor, ubi plures habentur opiniones de mente Philosophi (fol. 52r).

Utrum odor secundum se possit aliquo modo nutrire, nutritione improprie dicta (fol. 51r, circa medium).

Utrum odor alteret nutribile realiter, vel spiritualiter (fol. 57v, ultra medium).

Quo modo ex odore possit provenire actio realis (fol. 58r, in principio).

Utrum odor possit nutrire vera nutritione partes spirituosas animalis (fol. 58v, circa medium).

Utrum odor possit vere nutrire partes carnivores et solidas animalis (fol. 59r, in fine).

Utrum sint duae species odorum realiter distinctae, vel una tantum secundum rem (fol. 60r, in fine).

Utrum bruta percipient odores secundum se delectabiles (fol. 60v, circa medium).

Utrum homo peius odoret [odores *ms*] multis animalibus (fol. 61v, in principio).

[Haec quae sequuntur sunt supra tribus quaestionibus Aristotelis, in fine. Prima est de speciebus sensibilium, utrum dividuntur in infinitum]

Utrum omnis magnitudo naturalis sit sensibilis (fol. 64v, circa finem).

Utrum species sensibilium sint infinitae (fol. 65v, in principio).

[Secunda est utrum sensibile prius medium mutet quam sensum]

Utrum odor habeat prius esse in medio quam in extreto (fol. 67v, ultra principium).

Utrum odor multiplicetur realiter in aere, vel spiritualiter (fol. 67v, in fine).

Utrum sonus prius habeat esse in medio quam in sensu auditus (fol. 68r, circa finem).

Utrum ad auditionem debeat moveri unus aer continuus a corpore sonoro usque ad sensum auditus (ibidem paululum post).

Quo modo intelligatur illud dictum Philosophi in secunda dubitatione, quod plures audiunt quodammodo eundem sonum, et quodammodo aliud sonum (fol. 69r, ultra medium).

Utrum sentiremus sapores non tangendo, si viveremus in humido aquo (fol. 69v, in medio).

Utrum sit dare primum in motu alterationis (fol. 69v, in fine).

[Tertia dubitatio est utrum contingat simul duo sentire]

Quare est quod non ita possumus duo simul sentire aliis sensibus sicut visu (fol. 75v, in principio).

Qualis fiat mixtio in coloribus, cum simul videmus duo opposita (fol. 76r, in principio).

Utrum omnes visiones quae simul fiunt sint eiusdem speciei, vel eiusdem [eedem ms] numero (ibi continetur).

Quare virtutes interiores possunt simul opposita percipere, et non exteriores (fol. 77r, circa medium).

Utrum contingat simul audire et olfacere, seu videre aut huiusmodi (fol. 77r, in medio).

Utrum sensus communis esset sufficens pro omnibus sensationibus exterioribus (fol. 77r, ultra medium).

[De quadam ratione Aristotelis in fine libri, ubi revertitur ad probandum nullum indivisibile esse sensibile]

Utrum Aristoteles bene probaverit nullum indivisibile esse sensibile (fol. 77v, circa finem).

Utrum sit dare maximum *(in)* quod sic et minimum in quod non (fol. 79r, ultra medium).

Finis. Laus deo.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Aristotle. *History of Animals (Book VII–X)*, David Mowbray Balme and Allan Gotthelf (eds.). Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1991.

Bandello, Matteo. *Novelle*. Giuseppe Guido Ferrero (ed.). Turin: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1978.

Bonusfilius, Dominicus. *Commentaria in quatuor volumina Topicorum Aristotelis cum novo textu Iacobi Fabri*. Bononiae: Giovanni Battista Faelli, 1531.

Bumaldi, Antonio. *Bibliotheca Bononiensis*. Bononiae: Tipografia dell'Erede di Vittorio Benacci, 1641.

Castelvetro, Ludovico. *Racconto delle vite d'alcuni letterati del suo tempo di M. L. C. Modenese scritte per suo piacere. In Appendice I*, Giuseppe Cavazzuti (ed.), 1–15. Modena: Società Tipografica Modenese – Antica Tipografia Soliani, 1903.

Dallari, Umberto. *I rotoli dei lettori legisti e artisti dello Studio di Bologna dal 1384 al 1799*, vol. 2. Bologna: Regia Tipografia dei Fratelli Merlani, 1919.

Dolfi, Pompeo Scipione. *Cronologia delle famiglie nobili di Bologna, con le loro insegne, e nel fine i cimieri. Centuria prima, con un breve discorso della medesima città di Pompeo Scipione Dolfi nobile bolognese*. Bologna: Giovanni Battista Ferroni, 1670.

Facciolati, Jacopo. *Fasti Gymnasi Patavini*. Patavii: Tipografia del Seminario, presso Giovanni Manfrè, 1757.

Fantuzzi, Giovanni. *Notizie degli scrittori bolognesi*, vol. 2. Bologna: Stamperia di San Tommaso d'Aquino, 1782.

Galen. *On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body*, vol. 2, Margaret Tallmadge May (ed.). Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press, 1968.

Marsilius de Sancta Sophia. *Tractatus celeberrimus de febribus*. Lugduni: François Fradin, 1507.

Mazzetti, Serafino. *Repertorio di tutti i professori antichi, e moderni della famosa Università, e del celebre Istituto delle Scienze di Bologna*. Bologna: Tipografia di San Tommaso d'Aquino, 1847.

Pasquali Alidosi, Giovanni Nicolò. *I dottori bolognesi di teologia, Filosofia, Medicina e d'Arti Liberali: Dall'anno 1000 per tutto marzo del 1623*. Bologna: Nicolò Tebaldini, 1623.

Pietro Pomponazzi. *Expositio super primo et secundo De partibus animalium*, Stefano Perfetti (ed.). Florence: Olschki, 2004.

Savonarola, Hieronimus. *Opera singulare contra l'astrologia divinatrice*. Venetiae: Lazarro Soardi, 1513.

Theophrastus. *De causis plantarum (Books V–VI)*. Benedict Einarson and George Konrad Karl Link (eds.). Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1990.

Thomas de Aquino. *Opera Omnia*, vol. 45.2: *Sententia libri De sensu et sensato cuius secundus tractatus est De memoria et reminiscencia*, René Antoine Gauthier (ed.). Rome: Commissio Leonina; Paris: J. Vrin, 1985.

Tiraboschi, Girolamo. *Biblioteca modenese o notizie della vita e delle opere degli scrittori natii degli stati del serenissimo signor duca di Modena*, vol. 2. Modena: Società Tipografica, 1782.

Secondary Sources

Badini Confalonieri, Luca. Bandello e Pomponazzi: la parte del filosofo. In *Il cammino di madonna Oretta: Studi di letteratura italiana dal due al Novecento*, Luca Badini Confalonieri (ed.), 63–72. Alessandria: Edizione dell'Orso, 2004.

Blair, Ann M. Student Manuscripts and the Textbook. In *Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe*, Emidio Campi, Simone De Angelis, Anja-Silvia Goeing, and Anthony Thomas Grafton (eds.), 39–73. Geneva: Droz, 2008.

Burzelli, Luca. A Heated Debate: Pomponazzi and Contarini on the Nature of Fire. *Micrologus* 31, Special Issue (2023): 311–329.

Cavazza, Silvano. Goineo, Giovanni Battista. *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 57 (2001): 562–565.

Hamesse, Jacqueline. Les marginalia dans les textes philosophiques universitaires médiévaux. In *Talking to the Text: Marginalia from Papyri to Print: Proceedings of a Conference Held at Erice, 26 September – 3 October 1998, as the 12th Course of International School for the Study of Written Records*, vol. 1, Vincenzo Fera, Giacomo Ferraù, and Silvia Rizzo (eds.), 301–321. Messina: Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Umanistici, 2002.

Graciotti, Leonardo and Costanza Lucchetti. Pietro Pomponazzi nella Biblioteca Storica dell'Istituto Campana di Osimo: Il codice 18. L. 44. *Bruniana & Campanelliana* 27, no. 1–2 (2021): 117–134.

Graciotti, Leonardo. Medicine and Philosophy in Pomponazzi's "Expositio libelli de sensu et sensato". *Micrologus* 31, Special Issue (2023): 295–310.

Grafton, Anthony Thomas, Nicholas Popper, and William H. Sherman (eds.). *Gabriel Harvey and the History of Reading: Essays by Lisa Jardine and Others*. London: UCL Press, 2024.

Lines, David A. Natural Philosophy in Renaissance Italy: The University of Bologna and the Beginnings of Specialization. *Early Science and Medicine* 6, no. 4 (2001): 267–323.

Lines, David A. *The Dynamics of Learning in Early Modern Italy: Art and Medicine at the University of Bologna*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 2023.

Luzio, Alessandro. Ercole Gonzaga allo studio di Bologna. *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana* 8 (1886): 374–386.

Nardi, Bruno. *Studi su Pietro Pomponazzi*. Florence: Le Monnier, 1965.

Oliva, Cesare. Note sull'insegnamento di Pietro Pomponazzi. *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana* 7, no. 2 (1926): 83–103.