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In Memoriam Peter Stotz (1942–2020)

Peter Stotz, emeritus professor of Medieval Latin in the University of Zürich, died unexpectedly on the afternoon of 4 July 2020 in the local hospital near his home in Bülach, Canton Zürich, Switzerland. Immediate family members fortunately could be with him at his passing. He had remained busy with projects and scholarship, including plans for a broad study of *otium* in our sources (for him personally always “engaged leisure”). The COVID crisis made it difficult first to recognize and then impossible to manage an unrelated acute infection. Circumstances allowed a socially distanced and impressively attended memorial service on 13 July 2020 at Bülach’s Reform Church, at which fellow musicians from the orchestra in which he had played as a lead violinist since 1972 performed, and where his successor at the University of Zürich, Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, offered the eulogy at his express request.

As the first of eleven children, Peter Stotz learned early and exemplified later to all a constant and generous spirit of collaboration, discipline, and initiative. Colleagues will remember the day of his retirement in 2007 from the arrival of an electronic notice that afternoon announcing the occasion and his thereafter valid, non-university e-mail address, which became, then, a regular destination of messages and queries from me. He always read carefully and had a policy he once shared of re-reading, the day after composing and before only then sending, his replies. He took and made time, and when I had thought matters to an impasse or exhaustion, he reliably helped, often by posing just the right question for pressing a matter, if possible, further. To convince him of the need and workability of an emendation in Lupus of Ferrières was to know as much certainty as such matters allow. Everyone can be grateful when he was unconvinced. He invariably repeated back the crux of any philological problem in his own words to show that he had understood before addressing it, and he generously rechecked, where possible and uncertainty lingered, manuscripts and editions, far easier in recent years with digitized media, but still very time-consuming (and beyond all expectation). He was a teacher who modeled, expected, and fostered the highest standards, with scrupulous human decency and empathy. I often shared musical discoveries with him, and I finally, early last April (2020), shared with him the wonderful film *Set the Piano Stool on Fire* (2011), about Alfred Brendel and Kit Armstrong. He enjoyed it and understood what I meant (without regard to myself). He was our Alfred Brendel.

Peter Stotz was thoroughly grounded in the traditional aims and instruments of History (his undergraduate subject) and of Philology. From at least his time as a Stipendiat (1970–1972) with the *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch* in Munich (which he led as Project Director from 2011), he appreciated the scope of the challenges posed by the varied Latin idioms of the many Middle Ages. He approached the materials with a careful sensibility for historical context, literary form, and also the history and shape of
recent philological discussion. He embraced computer-based technical helps early, and he used and urged (in full step with Philipp Roelli’s energy) the now wonderfully ample Latin textual search-aid, the *Corpus corporum*, still based at the University of Zürich’s *Seminar für Griechische und Lateinische Philologie der Antike, des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*. His 1971 Zürich dissertation, directed by Hans Häfele, on hymnody at Carolingian St. Gallen (*Ardua spes mundi. Studien zu lateinischen Gedichten aus Sankt Gallen*, Bern, 1972), applied his musical ear and philological imagination to texts in their recovered monastic and liturgical context and fitted him with an acute eye for linguistic and palaeographical detail. His subsequent scholarship would range across the length and breadth of post-Classical Latin in cameo essays, small and large editorial projects, and always in valorizing the developments distinctive of later Latinities. His 1977 Zürich *Habilitation* produced a rich account of post-Classical variations on pseudo-Sapphic Latin metrical verse from Seneca to Piccolomini (*Sonderformen der sapphischen Dichtung. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der sapphischen Dichtung des lateinischen Mittelalters*, Munich, 1982). By the time of its publication, he had shifted his attention (as then Oberassistent at Zürich’s Institute for Swiss Reformation History) to the Latin literary culture and writings of the second generation of Swiss Reformation leaders, notably but not only Zwingli’s successor, Heinrich Bullinger. This was in no sense a distraction, but a labor of duty and love for a man deeply attached to his native city’s history and traditions. With visitors at what became, as successor to Hans Häfele, his *Seminar* for Medieval Latin after 1993, he also delighted in sharing the cloister of the Grossmünster, which physically linked his own scholar’s efforts over, for one, Bullinger’s *Ordo studiorum* (1983) and the dramatic life of the work’s storied author. He accompanied and joined in many continuing projects of editing and translating various early Reformers’ correspondence.

Most readers will remember Peter Stotz well for his lively and well-tempered conversation at scholarly meetings. He always engaged solicitously with younger researchers, and quietly and generously wrought yeoman service as a pre-publication assessor for numerous journals, series, and presses. He shepherded to print a spate of fascicules of the *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch* (from 2011) and oversaw as editor numerous volumes in the series *Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters* (between 1995 and 2017). Scholarship will recall him best for his own magisterial *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*, an independent project funded by the Swiss National Research Foundation between 1984 and 1992, and then published (and much augmented) between 1996 and 2004, as five tomes in the eminent *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*. By his efforts, *Mittellatein* – in the form of “Stotz, HLSMA” – gained a place alongside the standard reference on Classical Latin grammar by Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr. He took especial care to account for the phonetic and morphological innovations in some of the most characteristically medieval registers and types of Latin.
Peter Stotz was rightly proud that his University acted to ensure a seamless continuity in the work of his Seminar by implementing the search for a successor before his Emeritierung. In Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, he knew both a successor and friend who maintains his own high standard of intramural, national, and international presence and engagement. For his expertise and accomplishments, he figured, and continued to figure, in the leadership of many national and international scholarly bodies, not least the Central Council of the Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Munich). He had been made a Corresponding Member of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences in 2003 and awarded the Ausonius Prize of the University of Trier in 2004. His retirement (after 2007) remained a tirelessly engaged leisure (otium), which produced, inter alia, a widely acclaimed study of the Bible as Latin text and textual problem (Die Bibel auf Latein – unantastbar?, Zürich, 2012), with a French translation in 2015, based on the by then third German edition. Along with collaborating in other editorial and translating work (not least on Swiss Reformers), he published, in April 2020 (amidst the challenges of Covidtide), a wonderful anthology of hymns and translations: Hora est – psallite! Proben liturgischer Dichtung von Ambrosius bis Melanchthon (Stuttgart, 2020). He had mailed a copy to me, labeled and inscribed in his unmistakable and clear minuscule script, which the post office seemed to have lost, until it arrived like a gift from beyond the week after his death.

Peter Stotz died six days after his 78th birthday. His family fortunately could be with him. He is survived by his wife, two children, and four much-beloved grandchildren. He is and will always be fondly and dearly remembered as a teacher, mentor, scholar, artist, friend, husband, father, and grandfather. His memory is a blessing.

Michael I. Allen, University of Chicago
together much illuminating material. His text and especially his translation have to be used with some caution, however. The latter contains a significant number of errors, occasioned in part by failure to take into account Fortunatus’s distinctive poetic idiom, but also by misunderstandings or misjudgments of the possible meanings of the text. For those with some French Quesnel’s Budé version of the VSM is still the most reliable translation.

Michael Roberts, Wesleyan University


Geoffrey of Aspall was a prolific commentator on Aristotle who flourished in about the mid-thirteenth century, probably at Oxford. Recent scholarship has attributed to Aspall a significant number of previously anonymous texts, primarily on philological grounds. At present, there are three editions of Aspall’s commentaries on Aristotle: his Quaestiones on the De Anima, edited by Vlatka Ćizmić (2010), his Quaestiones on the De Somno et Vigilia, edited by Sten Ebbesen (2014), and this welcome addition, the Quaestiones super Physicam, edited by Silvia Donati and Cecilia Trifogli (2017).

In addition to the Latin text, this two-volume edition includes a facing English translation of the Quaestiones, prepared by E. Jennifer Ashworth and Cecilia Trifogli. Aspall’s text is present in four manuscripts, none of which is complete. The isolated readings in the different witnesses are so manifold that it is reasonable to conclude, as the editors do, that they are variants of the text, rather than copies of a single model. These variants probably represent multiple reportationes – that is, more than one edition of notes on Aspall’s lectures taken by a student, rather than by Aspall himself – albeit of a single series of lectures. To further complicate matters, none of the manuscripts seem to correspond to a discrete reportatio; rather, the versions are apparently conflated.

On the basis of these facts, the editors infer that the manuscripts’ divergences are the product not of errors in transmission, but of ex post facto editorial intervention. With this in mind, the editors have opted to present the version that seems to have been subject to the least heavy-handed editing (Oxford, Merton College, MS 272/304), as the most reliable means of recovering Aspall’s original lectures. The editors use the other manuscripts to correct this one, but they adhere to the text of the Oxford manuscript even when the other, more heavily edited manuscripts are stylistically superior. This makes for a relatively streamlined apparatus criticus.

Book VI of Aspall’s Quaestiones is absent from the Oxford manuscript. For this book, which appears in Volume II of the edition, the editors follow the manuscript Todi, Biblioteca Comunale, MS 23 (163), selected for much the same reasons as its
Oxford counterpart. Volume II also contains an appendix, which comprises isolated readings and divergent texts of the *Quaestiones* from the other manuscripts, along with anonymous questions from the Todi manuscript on Book V which cannot be attributed to Aspall with certainty.

Thus this edition displays a *codex optimus* approach, comprising Books I–IV and VIII of the *Quaestiones* preserved in the Oxford manuscript, along with the Todi manuscript version of Book VI and with an anonymous set of questions on Book V. None of the manuscripts contains the questions of Book VII, which (as of this writing, at least) seems to be lost.

To render the Latin (and English) more readable and easier to cite, the editors have supplied their own numbered breaks in the text, which do not as a rule follow breaks in the manuscripts. Arguments *pro* and *contra*, along with *solutiones*, are not distinguished, either by numbers or by headings, but are simply numbered in the order they appear. To give an example: in Book II, question 13, the objections appear in the paragraphs numbered 1–7; the *ad oppositum* and its elaboration in paragraphs 8–12; the *solutio* in paragraphs 13–14; and the responses to the objections in paragraphs 15–18. This system breaks up the paragraphs nicely, but does not provide any further information about how they are interrelated. This is less than ideal. Frequently in Aspall’s *Quaestiones*, as with other scholastic texts, a first (second, third, etc.) response responds to a first (second, third, etc.) objection that was set out much earlier. Accordingly, a more conventional numbering system, like the ones employed in most editions of Thomas Aquinas’s *Summa Theologiae*, would have been much more useful.

There is much to praise about the accompanying English translation: it is lucid and consistent, and does not shy away from changing the structure of the Latin sentences to render them in smooth, unstilted English. The result is an eminently readable translation. The text also strikes a balance between the two extremes of giving only English terms, on one hand, and peppering the text with untranslated technical terms, on the other – contrary vices of many philosophical translations. Thus the English translation retains the (notoriously difficult to translate) *ratio* when it is used to mean a way of understanding something, though this is never done when *ratio* is used to mean “argument,” in which cases it is straightforwardly translated.

Much of what makes reading Aspall difficult is the brief and cursory way in which he presents his views: typically, he states them in passing in his responses to objections rather than in full responses, in the style of a thinker like Aquinas or Scotus. This mode of presentation can make it difficult to figure out what Aspall’s doctrines actually are. It is therefore all the more helpful that the present edition contains an extensive philosophical introduction, which expounds point by point the main doctrines of Aspall’s *Quaestiones*.

The scope of Aspall’s discussions in the *Quaestiones* is vast: in addition to questions on traditional subjects in Aristotelian physics (such as the movement of the celestial
bodies, and the definition of nature, causation, and chance), Aspall discusses subjects in metaphysics (e.g. the ontological status of prime matter, and its potencies), epistemology (e.g. the knowability of prime matter and of the continuum), and even biology (e.g. the generation of animals and of monsters like olive-sprouting grape-vines and man-headed oxen). A review like this can scarcely present it all, even obiter. Therefore, I will limit myself here to two subjects: Aspall’s case for the diminished active potency of prime matter and his discussion of monsters. I have selected the former because it is Aspall’s most distinctive and novel doctrine; and the latter because it is fun.

To begin with the former: in Aristotelian physics, perceptible things like spoons, snowflakes and statues are made up of matter and form. Form can change without any loss of underlying matter. This allows us to account for physical change without positing new substances created ex nihilo. When, for instance, we pour molten iron into a mold, melt a snowflake or break a sculpture, the form or structure of the thing changes, though the underlying stuff remains quantitatively the same. This is the basic claim of Aristotelian hylomorphism. Simplicius and Augustine, building on Aristotle, describe the underlying stuff as prime matter (materia prima), and the medieval Aristotelians take this ball and run with it.

The later Aristotelians usually describe prime matter in privative terms. It is matter at its simplest, devoid of form altogether. Since form is active and actual, matter devoid of form is purely passive and potential. It therefore has no essential properties of its own. Nor does it ever exist without form; rather, it is naturally inclined toward (inclinatur ad) or has an appetite for (appetit) form.

In Aspall’s view, there is an explanatory gap in the Aristotelians’ accounts of prime matter. We can see it in the final two sentences of the preceding paragraph: how can prime matter be at once purely passive and receptive, but also actively inclined toward or desirous of form? No one thing can be both purely passive, and also active. Therefore, Aspall thinks, prime matter is not up to the job the Aristotelians assign to it. Still, we need something to serve as the material principle of nature. But anything else drawn from Aristotelian physics – the elements, for instance – will already be a non-simple composite of matter and form. The elements are accordingly disqualified as candidates for the basic stuff of the material world. Aspall’s novel solution is that formless matter has a diminished active potency for receiving form.

Matter minus form thus has two diminished potencies: a passive potency for receiving form, analogous to the passive potency a bowl has for receiving liquid; and an active potency, by virtue of which prime matter seeks out and takes on form. These two potencies are distinguished in ratio: they are logically distinct aspects of the concept of prime matter. The passive potency is essential to matter, as substance devoid of form; therefore it is indistinguishable from it in ratio. But the active potency is not
straightforwardly essential to matter, since it can be distinguished from matter itself. This is a strikingly novel doctrine.

Monsters, for their part, are relevant to Aristotelian physics because of the problems they seem to pose for a teleological account of nature. Aristotle himself discusses monsters in passing in *Physics* 2.8, in the course of a discussion of ends (*tele*): since nature acts for an end, whatever happens always, or for the most part, happens for that end (199b25–26). Therefore, errors such as mutants should be rare and mutually inconsistent, as are errors in art. If this is the case, monsters pose no greater problem for a teleological account of nature than typos do for a teleological account of writing: Aristotelian physics predicts that monsters, like typos, will be occasional one-offs.

With this in mind, Aspall provides a considerable discussion on monsters, devoting roughly a quarter of Book II (questions 31–43) to them and related questions on animal generation. No one would doubt the monstrosity and rarity of such bizarre specimens as man-headed oxen; but Aspall notes that Aristotle also classes mules as monsters in his *De generatione animalium* 2.8. This poses a problem. The regularity and consistency of mules *qua* monsters looks like a counterexample to the Aristotelian doctrine of final causation: if nature is teleologically ordered, how can these monsters come about so consistently?

To solve this problem, Aspall introduces a distinction between monsters in a broad sense, and monsters in a proper sense. Monsters in the broad sense are brought about by natural processes of generation, but they are monstrous in the sense that they, as offspring, do not have a resemblance (*assimilatio*) to their progenitors. And such are mules, which are generated in accordance with nature, but do not follow the general law of resemblance between parents and offspring. Monsters in the proper sense, on the other hand, are not brought about regularly by nature, or are not brought about by nature at all. Into the former category go one-offs like man-headed oxen. And into the latter go monstrosities like grafted plants, where for example a stalk capable of sprouting grapes is nourished by the roots of an olive tree. These are not generated naturally, since their two parts (an olive tree top and a grapevine bottom) come from different seeds, and thus from different processes of generation. They are combined not by nature, but by art. Therefore, Aristotelian teleology is safe from mules and other monsters.

In sum, Aspall’s *Quaestiones* on the *Physics* of Aristotle is a rich and interesting book. And this edition and translation by Silvia Donati, Cecilia Trifogli, and E. Jennifer Ashworth presents it clearly and elegantly. There is much research to be done on Geoffrey of Aspall, and much to be learned about his philosophical views and the scope of his influence. This excellent Latin edition and lucid accompanying English translation will undoubtedly serve researchers for generations to come.

Boaz Faraday Schuman, University of Toronto