

Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century

Notes on Editions, Marginalia, Opinions and Book-Lore

For the sake of convenience history has been divided by centuries. The genesis of historical events is not affected by the large time-element of a century. But the modern reader who has studied and learned his history by centuries, psychologically cannot avoid thinking in categories of centuries and tends to separate the chain of cause and effect by the century mark. Thus our tools become our masters.

When we discuss the history of theology in the 13th and 14th century the importance of the year 1300 is only fictitious ; 13th and 14th century theology can safely be compared to one another only if this psychological handicap is kept in mind.

A worse psychological impediment arises if one century — in our case the thirteenth — follows a line of progress which we spontaneously compare to a proud curve soaring up to a highest apex ; because we instinctively continue the parabolic line in our mind, and identify the following century — the fourteenth — with the descending curve. How often the evaluation of the 14th century has been victimized by such an instinctive comparison to a falling curve descending from an apex somewhere in the 13th century can only be left to an intelligent surmise.

We should not compare progress to one vertical parabolic curve but to many horizontal halves of successive curves. The line of progress ascends and seems to, or actually does, come close to the ideal ; but then it stops at a point which ignores the century mark altogether. Some of the new curves start successively on a lower or higher level, and rise and also stop: progress is not to

be identified with any one in particular as all contribute their greater or lesser share.

With these reservations in mind I want to contribute a few notes on the 14th-century Augustinian theology. I indicate here only the outlines of a larger study which could not be printed here on account of its technical encumbrance ; the larger study will be printed in book form and contain some detailed facts in support of this outline.

History above the level of simple chronography needs categories to present many facts under a few headlines. If in the following I attempt to give a preliminary description of two historical categories which to my mind are characteristic of the 14th-century theology I am not unaware of the present situation. Only more research in the neglected 14th century can show whether the two proposed categories come close to the facts of reality.

I would like to call the 13th century the great century of speculation, the 14th the great century of criticism, a criticism moving along two lines, the historico-critical and the logico-critical.

The 13th century created the great systems of Augustinianism, Thomism, and Scotism. When the first generation of Augustinianists, Thomists, and Scotists ascended the magisterial chairs they soon clashed violently and were forced to examine the positive premisses of their patristic sources, and the theoretical premisses of their theory of knowledge.

I am led to believe that the examination of the positive premisses brought about a historical — and therefore — historico-critical attitude ; with the examination of their theories of knowledge the genesis of a logico-critical attitude, I think, was in some way connected.

On the one hand much more attention was now paid to the exactness of quoting from the Fathers and to quoting in general ; quotations from Fathers and past theologians furnished material for a critique of the preceding days and ways.

On the other hand the priority, not primacy, of the *cognitio universalis* gave way to the priority, not primacy, of the *cognitio rei particularis*. This *cognitio rei particularis* as such did not question the possibility of reaching universal knowledge ; criticism only tried to build a new road to the heights of universal knowledge, along

a more toilsome ascending trail which, if longer, was believed to be safer.

The description of the logico-critical attitude is, of course, not yet complete. A sum of complex features enters into the true picture of the two attitudes. What follows affects largely the critical group but to a certain degree also the historical one.

A dialectical element must be considered as the predominant factor in the logico-critical attitude, together with a maximum demand for mathematical evidence and a postulate of such simplicity as to reduce the traditional distinctions — the mountain-high accumulations of realities, formalities, and modalities — to the barest minimum.

Maximum and Minimum are concepts in vogue. Algebraic symbols are applied to handle complex entities of the syllogism; pure algebraic reasoning replaces the long and flowing phrase. Is it only a time-saving device or is it a typical logico-critical, a quasi-mathematical manifestation? Geometry becomes an ideal for theology. The Commentaries are arranged *more geometrico*; among the quoted authors those are preferred who reason *more geometrico*. The 14th century introduces the arabic numbers into wide circulation. A new mathematical consciousness is all-pervading although it does not rise beyond the level of algebra. The theologians accept a new short-hand symbol for *instans*, the zero of time, from the zero sign of India.

Ontology gives way to description; the old ¹⁾ problem of « degree » is treated not as a fact to be explained but as a phenomenon to be described. It is a consequence of the new theory of knowledge. Among the Moderni one finds a frenzied interest in the degrees of perfections which, with the reader's forbearance, I compare to the Jacob's ladder of old reaching from the finite to the infinite. The modern theologians (*Moderni*) climb this ladder up and down; they count the rungs of the ladder (finite or infinite), they try to establish the relative importance of the two ladder ends (*recessus a summo gradu, recessus a non-gradu*). Here our pretended critical Moderni demonstrate an unexpected love and flair for an innate human tendency, speculation. Square-yards of parchment

¹⁾ A. MAIER, *Zwei Grundprobleme der scholastischen Naturphilosophie* (1. Das Problem der intensiven Grösse), in: *Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura* 37 (2. ed. Roma 1951) 3-88.

and lakes of ink are sacrificed for treatises on Maximum and Minimum as well as on the problem of degree.

The new shorthand symbol ²⁾ for the individual point of time, the instant, is symptomatic of a greater interest in the individual. In philosophy we have the *cognitio rei particularis*, in moral theology we find a greater reverence for the individual conscience, even the erroneous one. The 14th century discovers the individual; a breath-taking freedom prevails in the intellectual field. Freedom of conscience in the moral field is treated on a scale never to be attempted again.

One might seriously consider whether the 14th century was more interested in moral theology than in dogmatic theology. English theology especially deals with moral problems. A delight in casuistry is the result; a new English essay-style is born, quite different from the old Quaestio-style. Chillington, Rodington, Rosetus, Osbertus, Ulcredus Dunelmensis, inflate the few *Contra* of the old Quaestio into a long series of problems; they reduce the old *corpus articuli* to a few lines (*Sed his non obstantibus dico*) and then solve the initial problems with an even longer series of loosely connected small treatises.

Casuistry takes over also in the field of dogma and leads a few, the Modernists among the Moderns, to aberrations. The disquieting thought of the *potentia dei absoluta*, already prominent in Anselm, for whom the Moderns and the Modernists have so much affection, makes the revolutionary Modernists in particular lose sight of all perspective and of all horizons. On a ever-increasing scale allowances are made for a possible divine intervention liable to suspend the created order; ingenious but very doubtful « cases » are invented and uncritically adduced to invalidate the general rule.

It is really puzzling to note that the *cognitio rei particularis* which prides itself on a critical treatment of pure concepts is accompanied by an uncritical and conceited proclamation of non-contradictions between all kinds of admittedly imperfect concepts. Worse, these our « critics » blunder into the bland assumption that the non-contradiction between imperfect concepts guarantees the real

²⁾ The new shorthand symbol for « instans » is not rarely misread, esp. in the form *in instanti* [i Φⁱ] = *in continenti* cf. A. BIRKENMAJER, *Vermischte Untersuchungen*, in: *Beiträge Baeumkers* XX, 5 (Münster 1922) 125 line 26 and 27, where this misreading occurs.

possibility of very complicated facts. The 14th century knows far too much about the possibility of elephants with a thousand tails.

A linguistic feature of the 14th century one may admire or regret is the uninhibited creativeness which spurts forth from their pen. New terms are produced by the hundreds ; new sesquipedalian verbs and nouns are derived from the simple forms of old. Theological research is not facilitated thereby but our Western learned language still profits by the creativeness of the 14th century.

Sophistication and freedom mark the intellectual climate of the 14th-century lecture hall. A new teaching technique, the old *aporia*, is welcomed to enliven the atmosphere. To widen the horizons of the studious youth hard problems are formulated without being solved. Hair-raising statements are made *as if* the professor believed them true. While serious teachers seek to be thought-provoking, the vainglorious indulge in sensationalism.

The description of the two attitudes which I propose as categories to encompass the 14th-century complexities is naturally still problematical. Simple is the characterization of the historico-critical one: a new historical consciousness which stresses the importance of the sources more than had been done before. Complex in the extreme is the delineation of the logico-critical attitude.

With the help of these two directive lines I shall try to establish in a preliminary way some perspective among the confusing facts of the 14th-century theology.

I speak cautiously of attitudes, not of schools. No neat grouping is possible among the theologians of this century. Some evince a pronounced lack of historical-mindedness ; others insist on it. All to a greater or lesser degree show signs and symptoms of the logico-critical attitude ; a few indulge in outright extremist logicism.

The grouping if possible is therefore a question of degree. Lack of, or stress on, historical-mindedness facilitates the attribution to one category or the other ; extremism in the logico-critical field also establishes the type clearly.

As far as the Augustinian theologians of the 14th century are concerned they are to be classified as representatives of the historico-critical attitude. All quote Augustine and early scholastics very carefully, contemporary scholastics at least according to the level of the scholarship of their day. The Augustinians share their love for St. Augustine with many outsiders on the continent and in

England. Significantly none of the Augustinians can be called an extremist of the logico-critical attitude.

These extremists are the expressly condemned Nicholas of Autrecourt and John of Mirecourt, and the implicitly censured Nicholas of Aston and the Durham Benedictine Ulcredus³⁾.

The condemnations of 1347 fell upon their extremism. From Peter Ceffons we know that the main issue of 1347 was *subtilitas* and consequently *evidentia*. By *subtilitas* we must understand neglect of the Fathers and a logico-theological abuse of the doctrine of possible divine intervention. From the abuse of this premiss flow all the errors of 1347, errors in Christology, errors in the doctrine of grace, errors about causality and about evidence.

With the daring freedom theologians enjoyed in those days some extremists abused the premiss of possible divine intervention with the dexterity of magicians. *De potentia dei absoluta*, some pointed out, God might accept the sinner without grace: and joined the Pelagians of old. Under the same premiss they alleged the possibility that the Second Person of the Trinity might assume, dismiss and reassume a sinning nature: and so produced a monstrous Christ. While modern unbelievers are afraid of one single miracle lest the created order become unstable these audacious extremists admitted the possibility of infinite miracles: and thus cast effective doubts upon the principle of causality. Under the same magic premiss of possible divine interference with our sensations a conclusion was reached which did away with the last remnant of evidence in our knowledge.

This mania of the logico-critical attitude had to be checked and condemned; but the doctrine of possible divine intervention could obviously not be censured. Only common sense in the application of this theological principle had to be restored. The condemnations therefore fell upon an audacity which overshot the mark of pure criticism and ventured on a road that inevitably had to lead to a denial of common sense and of dogma.

Although each individual article of 1347 bears its individual theological censure it is not contradictory to consider these articles as one group condemned cumulatively, and to rate the individual

³⁾ New material on the unknown Englishmen, Aston and Ulcredus, is found below under Gregory and Klenkok pp. 229 ff; 201 ff, 207 ff, 235 ff.

articles only as exemplifications. If before and after the condemnations one or the other of the condemned and outrageous statements are found in a theological writing one need not stamp the author immediately as heretical; it may be nothing else than an example of *aporia*.

To give a final evaluation of the logico-critical attitude is not yet possible; its credit and debit sheet must wait to be balanced. Perhaps its greatest achievement was the establishment of a theory of *cognitio rei particularis* because it had a salutary corrective influence upon our theory of *cognitio universalis*. The defense of the individual conscience also had positive effects. The merits of the historico-critical attitude are plain; it was high time to arouse more interest in the theological past.

In the fore-going sketch I have tried to master the confusion of the 14th century with a terminology which purposely disregards the traditional cliché of « nominalism »⁴⁾. In the following I want to deal with the historico-critical attitude of the 14th-century Augustinian School. Curiously enough, the proof that the Augustinian theologians belonged to the historico-critical category often rests on the facts — of marginalia.

Marginalia in Manuscripts and in Editions of the Schola Moderna Augustiniana

Carefully written manuscripts and early editions of 14th-century theologians often contain numerous marginalia which could promote our knowledge of the literary history of scholasticism if the authenticity of these marginalia were not exposed to grave doubts. When 14th-century scholastics discuss different opinions the various tenets under discussion are often shrouded in anonymity within the text-column while on the margin definite identification is offered. The question arises therefore whether the marginal identifications of otherwise anonymous opinions are integral parts of the authentic work, or whether the marginal names were added by later editors and copyists.

⁴⁾ Cf. the interesting article of E. HOCHSTETTER, *Nominalismus*?, in: *Franciscan Studies* IX (1949) 370-403. — At the beginning of my paragraphs on Gregory p. 182 ff there is a further elaboration of my two new categories, esp. their implication of criticism.

It seems to me that copyists of the 14th century did not as a rule make any marginal additions for the purpose of identifying opinions which had remained anonymous in the text ; the very opposite seems to be true. If manuscripts of the 14th century have no marginalia, it is only too often due to the fastidiousness and carelessness of the amanuenses who simply neglected, or refused, to copy the marginalia of the original under their hands.

An examination of the marginalia within the context of the Schola Moderna Augustiniana leaves little doubt about their authenticity. The Augustinian Modern School had a characteristic historical mentality which made it desirable or imperative to identify any doctor whose opinions chanced to be discussed. From *Dionysius de Burgo* down to *Johannes Hiltalingen de Basilea* one can observe a steady progress in the ways and techniques of quoting contemporary authors by name. In *Dionysius* clear references are usually given in the form of short marginalia ; in *Hiltalingen*, on the other hand, authors, title, chapter and verse of quoted works are indicated with painstaking accuracy right within the text-column.

The technical progress in the manner of quoting is marked by three stages.

1. At first, if within the text-column the traditional anonymity of « *quidam* » was maintained, on the corresponding margin almost every « *quidam* » was identified by a short name or a sketchy quotation. However, as wide and blank margins were preferred by artistic standard, it was felt that numerous marginalia created an eye-sore in a solemn, or at least a better, manuscript.

2. Consequently, and at a second stage, a new technique was invented by the amanuenses that was to satisfy both the standards of beauty and exactness of quotation which the historical-minded century demanded more and more. For lack of a better term I call this new technique of the second stage the « *Quotational Inset* ». A *quotational inset* is a blank

The technique of the *quotational inset* made extraordinary demands on the alertness of the ordinary scribe ; soon the liabilities of the new system became only too apparent. Some amanuenses entered quotations into the *quotational inset* without using any different ink, and thus a less gifted colleague, who chanced to copy from their *black-in-black* production, was

rectangle adjacent to the dividing line between columns. Wherever identification of some traditional « *quidam* » was desirable, two or three lines of the text were shortened so as to leave a blank rectangle bordering on the dividing line between the two columns. With different ink the quotation was placed in this rectangle and, as a result, the beauty of the written page was greatly enhanced. With other words, the *quotational inset* was a highly complicated equivalent of our modern footnote.

led to commit the curious error of jumbling text and inset beyond recognition.

JUMBLING | This jumbling
TEXT & INSET | of text and inset
can be observed in the *Collatio*
at the beginning of many Com-
mentaries, and, to a lesser de-
gree, within the manuscripts of
authors like *Gerardus de Senis*,
Michael de Massa, and *Alfon-*
sus de Tolet. Another liability
of the technique of arranging
quotations in rectangular insets
came to the fore when the ama-
nuenses followed
| the common law
of inertia and neglected alto-
gether to fill in any of the
names destined for the blank
insets.

Whenever this happened to a 14th-century text, it relapsed into total anonymity in consequence of a failure of the very technique which was to safeguard critical and artistic standards. Yet these rectangular insets, even when left altogether in blank, can still become important witnesses in cases where of an author's several manuscripts, *one* has marginal identifications, and *another* nothing but blank insets. In such cases the historicity or authenticity of the marginal identifications in *one* manuscript is guaranteed by the mute but unshakable testimony of the rectangular insets left in blank by the *other* manuscript.

3. The third stage of progress in quoting technique is represented by authors like Johannes Hiltalingen de Basilea who eliminate all out-dated *quidam* in their very text-columns and insert in their stead the exact name of the author, the title and the chapters of the quoted work. Before the final editing these authors shift their marginalia from the margin into the text. In the age of the manuscript no better system could be adopted because no other system prevented the copyist from committing serious omissions or outright errors.

What has been said about marginal identifications applies equally to the manuscript proper and to the *incunabulum*. The first printers (1450-1550 ?) could not read or write anything but scholastic shorthand ; they took a good manuscript and reproduced it as they found it. Very obvious mistakes were probably corrected with the aid of a good guess or a second manuscript but as a rule the *incunabulum* represents only one manuscript. In this article I attribute value and rank of a good manuscript to the *incunabulum* or the early *editio princeps*.

Using the importance of marginal quotations and quotations in general as perspective, I now try to sketch a few notes on the historico-critical attitude which the following Augustinian works demonstrate ⁵⁾:

Dionysius de Burgo	Super Primum et Secundum Sententiarum
Gerardus de Senis	Super Primum et Secundum Sententiarum
Michael de Massa	Super Primum <i>et Secundum</i> Sententiarum
Thomas de Argentina	Super Quattuor Libros Sententiarum
Gregorius de Arimino	Super Primum et Secundum Sententiarum
Alfonsus Toletanus	Super Primum Sententiarum
Hugolinus de Urbeveteri	Super Quattuor Libros Sententiarum
Johannes Klenkok	Expositio Litteralis Super Quattuor Libros and Quaestiones Super Secundum Sententiarum
Facinus de Ast	Super Primum, Secundum, et Tertium Sententiarum
Johannes Hiltalingen de Basilea	Super Quattuor Libros Sententiarum
Simon de Cremona	Lectura secundum Hugolinum

⁵⁾ Cardinal Ehrle once had the intention to write a similar article. If such a giant had found the time to realize the project my sketchy work would be unnecessary. Cf. A. BIRKENMAJER, *Vermischte Untersuchungen* (1922) 216 n. 5 referring to Alfonsus. In a similar context J. KÜRZINGER, *Alfonsus Vargas*, in *Beiträge Baeumkers* XXII, 5-6 (Münster 1930) 42 n. 15: « Es ist überhaupt auffallend, dass gerade die Handschriften der Augustinertheologen durch zahlreiche Angaben dieser Art (= marginal identifications) sich auszeichnen. Stramme Ordnung in der äusseren Anlage, in der Einteilung und im Aufbau, ... scheint ein besonderer Vorzug dieser Schule zu sein ».

DIONYSIUS DE BURGO

The extant works of Dionysius ⁶⁾, his *Super Primum et Secundum*, are in MS Erfurt Amplon. 2° 131 f. 1-153^v. In my larger study I shall publish his list of *Quaestiones* with the necessary excerpts as I shall also do in the case of other unedited Augustinians who are dealt with in this article.

The marginal quotations of Dionysius are:

Aegidius
 Alexander de Marchia [= de S. Elpidio]
 Coton [Robertus Cowton]
 Durandus
 Godofridus
 Henricus de Gandavio
 Hervaeus
 Jacobus de Viterbio
 Johannes de Parisiis
 Petrus de Alvernia
 Scotus
 Thomas [de Aquino]
 Warro [Guillelmus ; Recollectiones Warrae f. 22^v]

Doctrinal Attitude of Dionysius de Burgo

Thomas of Strassburg ⁷⁾ with somewhat patronizing air calls Dionysius a *Junior Doctor* of the Augustinian School, that is, neither genuinely *Antiquus* nor properly *Modernus*. Though standing between the two groups of the *Antiqui* and the *Moderni* Dionysius (like Gerardus) claims the title of an Aegidian *Antiquus*. Yet this claim is based on the rather anachronistic pretense of having remained unaffected by the doctrinal impact of Scotus, Durandus, and Aureolus.

Dionysius quotes Aegidius and Thomas side by side ; they lead the way and Dionysius follows reverentially their every step. He is not willing to allow for any great doctrinal difference between

⁶⁾ For Dionysius de Robertis de Burgo cf. D. PERINI, *Bibliographia Augustiniana* II (1931) 26-28.

⁷⁾ Cf. THOMAS DE ARGENTINA, *Super Quattuor Libros Sententiarum* ed. 1490 Sent. 1-2 f. 77^v; ed. 1585 Sent. 1-2 f. 46^v.

these two Masters. To simplify the task of harmonization he limits his efforts to Aegidius and Thomas as individuals ignoring the discordant choirs of Aegidians and Thomists. For reestablishing harmony between Thomas and Aegidius, Dionysius turns back the wheel of time and undoes the doctrinal progress in Aegidian and Thomistic interpretation. Seldom does any scholar of either Aegidian or Thomistic school find grace before him. The two Augustinians, Jacobus de Viterbio and Alexander de Marchia, who must be considered as ultra-Aegidians⁸⁾, are impugned as well as the Thomists, Petrus de Alvernia, Hervaeus, and Johannes de Parisiis. If the friends of Thomas and Aegidius are treated with so little respect it need not be emphasized that their bitter foes do not fare better. The seculars, Henricus and Godofridus, the Franciscans, Scotus, Cowton, and Warro, or the disloyal Dominican Durandus have to reckon with the unrelenting opposition of Dionysius.

This way Dionysius hopes to enjoy the intellectual company of Thomas and Aegidius in undisturbed privacy. Perhaps it could be said that Dionysius was less motivated by a tendency of simplification than by a historical conviction — which later gained more ground — that amidst the discordant clamor of the schools the only solid criterium was the motto « Back to the sources » « Back to the great Masters ».

The two great Masters, Aegidius and Thomas, are not forced by Dionysius to give up their individuality; he is open-minded enough to let them disagree among themselves. Corporative spirit makes him prefer the *Doctor noster Aegidius*.

It would slant the judgment of the researcher were he to forget that theories and doctrines which are consciously rejected, always

⁸⁾ Cf. the doctoral dissertation of D. GUTIÉRREZ, *De B. Jacobi Viterbiensis O. E. S. A. vita, operibus et doctrina theologica* (Roma [Analecta Augustiniana] 1939). Gutiérrez has written a work which will last; but in his establishment of the relationship between St. Thomas and Jacobus (*op. cit.* 51 ff.) and between Aegidius and Jacobus (57 ff.) the Augustinianism of the Augustinian School is not taken too seriously. Jacobus is made to appear too much in the role of a Thomist. The outspoken veneration which Jacobus professed in regard to St. Thomas cannot be used to characterize his doctrine. Hiltalingen could have used the same expressions of enthusiastic admiration and reverence for St. Thomas without changing his doctrinal attitude in regard to St. Thomas. Hiltalingen gets incensed if someone speaks about « errors » of St. Thomas cf. my article on *Hiltalingen's Augustinian quotations* (Augustiniana IV [1954] 423).

have a subconscious subtle influence upon the thinking of the one who rejects them. Thesis shapes anti-thesis like a concave mold the convex figure. Dionysius should therefore not be considered right away as the expression of a common denominator of a genuine Thomas and Aegidius, or rather a genuine Aegidius and Thomas ; for his Aegidius and his Thomas look too persistently like an anti-Scotus or an anti-Durandus.

Quoting System of Dionysius

Dionysius' system of quoting represents the first stage among the three described above ; but there is no absolute uniformity. Often a contemporary *quidam* when discussed anonymously within the text is identified by name on the margin ; yet sometimes the names have already been shifted from the margin into the text proper. The old authorities (Aristotle etc.) and the *Authentici* ⁹⁾ (Anselm, Hugo etc.) are always quoted by name within the text-column ; theirs is a chapter-and-verse quotation. But many times even their quotations do not go beyond name and sketchy book-title. By his love for St. Augustine Dionysius points out the main characteristic of the Augustinian School although he still uses old-fashioned ways in quoting the Father. Modern Augustinianism begins only with Gregory of Rimini.

Authenticity of the Marginalia of Dionysius

In order to demonstrate that Dionysius belongs to the historical-minded group of the Augustinians the authenticity of his marginalia must first be proved. It is supported by several remarks in the text as well as on the margin. On f. 50^{rv} he mentions two opinions (about the increase of charity) and stresses their anonymity:

1. Deus trahit gradum caritatis de potentia < inexhaustibili > ad actum. On 50^v: *Ista opinio cuius auctor est mihi ignotus.*
2. *Alia opinio est cuius auctorem similiter ignoro.*

⁹⁾ The rule of different treatment for « authors » (*quidam* in text, name on margin) and *Authentici* (name and work within text) has its exceptions. Contemporary authors do occur in the text of Dionysius, but none as often as Aegidius and St. Thomas who thereby are raised almost to the rank of *Authentici*.

On the following margins he has similar remarks:

64^r 3. *Opinio cuius sit ignoro*

118^r 4. *Opinio cuius sit ignoro ; recitat eam Durandus*

121^r 5. *Alia opinio, nescio cuius*

139^r 6. *Opinio cuius sit nescio*

These opinions whose anonymity is expressly mentioned seem to have been taken from Durandus and other sources as the context of Dionysius shows. The surprise at such unscientific anonymity which someone — either Dionysius or his copyist — here voices, can hardly be credited to the copyist ; it makes much more sense to accept these six instances as an expression of the feelings of Dionysius himself who after all does quote the passages which are so « shockingly » anonymous. Logically, we may infer that all the other marginalia in Dionysius are intentional identifications provided by Dionysius himself who — so it seems — is anxious to outdo older authors like Durandus by a greater exactness and accuracy in quoting.

An objection against the authenticity of these marginalia could be based on the curious fact that Dionysius' own name is found on the margins ; ex. g. on f. 86^v:

Contra Durandum et Thomam Dionysius.

But no claim of authenticity need exclude those minor contributions of the copyist which do not entail any trouble of personal research. If a young Augustinian copied the passage on 86^v where Master Dionysius attacks the otherwise unassailable great Thomas it is only a tribute to the corporative spirit that the young Augustinian expressly underlined the extraordinary fact with an expanded version:

Contra Durandum et Thomam Dionysius,
instead of the cool and detached original version:

Contra Durandum et Thomam.

In several other instances where Dionysius' name is found on the margin, a much more practical purpose is intended. In long discussions of opinions and counter-opinions the reader of a manuscript gets so confused that he must be told which of these conflicting opinions the author himself, Dionysius, holds. Therefore either Dionysius himself or the copyist puts on the margin: « Dionysius ». This, however, does not speak against the authenticity of the other marginalia.

At least one of the marginalia was already in existence before Durandus quit his teaching career to become a bishop (1317). On the margin of 125^v we read:

Alia solutio quam NUNC Durandus dat.

To assume that a later editor could add this marginal note would mean to stretch the possibilities and probabilities to an impossible limit. If Dionysius, on the other hand, penned this one, *a pari* he penned the others. Dionysius therefore opens the line of the historical-minded Augustinian Modern School.

GERARDUS DE SENIS

Gerardus ¹⁰⁾ left us two Books of his Commentary. The *Super Primum* has been printed 1598 in an edition of very doubtful value. I have compared this edition with the MS Vat. lat. Chig. B VII 117 and used for the *Super Secundum* the MS Paris Nat. lat. Nouv. acq. 1431.

Both the *Super Primum* and the *Super Secundum* are rich in marginalia which point towards a historico-critical attitude of Gerardus.

Super Primum Gerardi

The editor of the *Super Primum* used two MSS, I myself the Chigianus. A comparison of the edition with the Chigianus showed that the marginalia of the edition correspond to the Manuscript which I could examine in microfilm. In the Chigianus the marginalia have been written with a different ink; Perini speaks of « litterae aureae ». A microfilm examination naturally cannot confirm Perini's

¹⁰⁾ For MSS of Gerardus cf. F. STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium Lombardi* I (Würzburg 1947) 115-16 no. 255. For biography cf. D. PERINI, *Bibliographia Augustiniana* III (1935) 187-89 [cf. also ? PERINI, II, 105]. The fantastic information about a posthumous magisterium of Gerardus refers to Michael de Massa; I deal with it later. — The title page of the edition of Gerardus' *Super Primum* reads: *Gerardi Senensis ordinis eremitarum divi Augustini sacrae theologiae doctoris celeberrimi In primum librum sententiarum doctissimae quaestiones, nunc primum opera F. Sanctis Ariminensis Augustiniani in lucem aeditae. Patavii ex bibliotheca Petri Pauli Tozzi MDXCVIII*. [On *Sanctes de Arimino* cf. PERINI, *Bibl. Aug.* I (1929) 57-58].

statement but the paleness of the marginalia-ink in my microfilm indicates at least that a different ink was used to write the marginalia of the Chigianus, a fact which underlines the importance of the Gerardus-marginalia. Few copyists went to the trouble of changing the ink for marginalia. We can therefore say with a considerable degree of certainty that the marginalia in Gerardus are authentic quotations apposed by Gerardus himself.

The marginalia technique of Gerardus is more consistent than the one of Dionysius. The *Authentici* (Damascenus, Anselmus etc.) are named and quoted in the text ; naturally St. Augustine abounds. Aegidius (ca. 36 times) is treated like an *Authenticus* under titles like Doctor Aegidius, Dominus Doctor noster, Doctor *Fundamentalis* Aegidius, frater Aegidius Doctor noster. Towards the end of the Super Primum Aegidius often receives the treatment of an ordinary contemporary scholar, that is, the name is on the margin but in the text only a *quidam*. From about dist. 25 to the end of the Super Primum, both in the text and on the margin, quotations become increasingly rarer.

A *quidam* of the text is identified on the margin in the case of:

Aureolus	ca. 29 times
Bonaventura	once (ed. p. 557)
Durandus	ca. 12 times
Gerardus de Carmelo	once (ed. p. 292)
Godofridus	ca. 9 times, once in text
Guillelmus de Warro	once (ed. p. 120)
Henricus de Gand.	ca. 36 times, once in text
Landulphus	3 times (ed. pp. 61, 70, 71)
Scotus	ca. 61 times
Simon Tornacensis	once (ed. p. 528)
S. Thomas	ca. 31 times (five times in text)
[frater Thomas	(ed. p. 144)
Divus Thomas	(ed. p. 264)]

The frequency of reference to an author does not characterize the doctrine of Gerardus adequately. The main opponent of Gerardus is Aureolus whose criticism implies that of Scotus in many cases. Next rank the interesting pair, Jacobus de Viterbio and Alexander de S. Elpidio. Aegidius is Gerardus' loadstar. The editor of the Super Primum (ed. p. 1) calls Gerardus « D. Aegidii Romani sectator praecipuus » and amplifies the statement in his preface on the « Auctoris vita ».

Super Secundum Gerardi

The *Super Secundum* I examined in the MS Paris Nat. lat. Nouv. acq. 1431. This MS furnishes a convincing proof that the marginalia of Gerardus are authentic ; for this beautiful MS contains *quotational insets* ¹¹⁾ from the beginning to the end. Only on the first 27 folia the insets have been filled with quotation or divisional remarks ; the rest of the insets are empty and blank. The blank quotational insets prove that the copyist was not the first to enrich the text of Gerardus with quotations ; on the contrary he found the insets together with the quotations in his *original*. If the quotational insets had been a product of the copyist's initiative, he would scarcely have gone to so much frustrated exertion. The insets on the first 27 folia have quotations which correspond to another MS of Gerardus, the Vat. lat. 959 [*Super Secundum Gerardi*]. According to Pelzer ¹²⁾ the Vat. lat. 959 — and we may say the original text of Gerardus — contained the following quotations in the *Super Secundum* :

Aureolus

Aegidius

Alexander de Marchia [whom I identify with *de S. Elpidio*]

Durandus

Gerardus [de Bononia, O. Carm.]

Godofridus

[Guillelmus de] Ware

Hervaeus

Jacobus de Viterbio

[Joh. Duns] Scotus

Johannes de Polliaco

Thomas [de Aquino]

What we have seen in the case of Dionysius and in the *Super Primum* of Gerardus applies also to the *Super Secundum* of Gerardus. The author traces his doctrinal course with his eyes fixed on the star of Aegidius (the *luminare maius* O. E. S. A.) but the impact of Aureolus is noticeable. Again the two most interesting names of the Aegidian school, Jacobus de Viterbio and Alexander de S. Elpidio, are bracketted together. These two are ultra-Aegi-

¹¹⁾ For *quotational insets* cf. above p. 153-54.

¹²⁾ Cf. A. PELZER, *Codices Vaticani Latini* II, I Cod. 679-1134 (Roma 1931) 416.

dians, certainly no Thomists ; they probably are the missing link between the Old Aegidian school and Scotism.

Michael de Massa considers Gerardus as too narrow-minded and apodictic in his criticism of the ultra-Aegidians and of Aureolus. Besides, and this is significant for the Augustinian School as it points towards a salient characteristic, Gerard's way of quoting comes under the fire of Michael de Massa. Michael ¹³⁾ feels that Gerardus does not give his opponents a chance to speak for themselves. A priori one may be inclined to minimize the sweeping criticism of Michael. Gerardus and Michael anticipated the *Stilus Alfonsi* with their inset-quotations ; it is true that Gerardus quotes bare names while Michael sometimes refers to chapter and verse. About the *Stilus Alfonsi* we have to speak later.

MICHAEL DE MASSA

Like Dionysius and Gerardus the almost unknown Michael ¹⁴⁾ de Massa has bequeathed to us a Commentary on the First and the Second Book of Lombard. I have examined the Super Primum of Michael de Massa according to the MS Bologna Università 2214 [= Bu] and the MS Bologna Collegio di Spagna 40 [= Bs] ¹⁵⁾.

¹³⁾ Cf. my larger study where the excerpts from Michael will be printed.

¹⁴⁾ Cf. D. PERINI, *Bibliographia Augustiniana* II (1931) 191-92: Michael Beccucci de Massa Senensis. — Of the properly theological production of Michael we still have some 900 folia:

ff. 234 = MS Università Bologna 2214 (In Primum Michaelis)

ff. 221 = anon. Vat. lat. 1087 (= In Secundum Michaelis)

ca. ff. 425 = exegetical works cf. PERINI, 191-92 and F. STEGMÜLLER, *Reperitorium Biblicum* III (Madrid 1951) 574-76.

There is considerable evidence that a large part of Michael's elucubrations was lost. Besides there are sermons and other works still extant. His classical leanings are betrayed by the titles of some works. Michael wielded a speedy quill and wrote a homely Latin. He was a theologian who showed more than medieval delight in philosophy. From the final edition of his Super Secundum he excluded all but « philosophical » questions.

¹⁵⁾ Bs = MS Bologna Collegio di Spagna 40 has a great lacuna between 68^v-69^r corresponding to Bu = MS Bologna Univ. 2214: 73^v-204^v.

Bu has this colophon (234^v): Hic liber est Scriptum in Primum Sententiarum Michaelis de Massa quem nobis [O. E. S. A.] donavit Reverendus Dominus Magister Thomas de Sarzana [Nicolaus V] pro parte Reverendissimi Domini S. Crucis per manus Reverendi Magistri Karoli Neapolitani. A later hand

The Super Secundum of Michael which was lost I have found in the anonymous Vat. lat. 1087.

Super Primum Michaelis

The margins of the Super Primum teem with quotations which identify the *quidam* of the text, sometimes with more than bare names. In my larger study on the 14th-century Augustinian School I shall print those names with the list of Michael's questions. The names are almost the same as in Gerardus because Michael criticizes each attack of Gerardus against other theologians, especially in the Gerardian dispute with Aureolus and the ultra-Aegidians, Jacobus de Viterbio and Alexander de S. Elpidio. Michael calls the latter *Pater noster Generalis* (Bu 130^r).

Besides Augustine and early scholastics these are the names which Michael quotes ¹⁶⁾:

*Aegidius	Henricus Anglicus [Bu 199 ^r]
Alexander de S. Elpidio	Hervaeus
Anglici [Bu 214 ^v]	*Jacobus de Viterbio
Bernardus [Bu 198 ^v]	Landulfus
Coton [Cowton]	Prosper [de Regio] Recollector
*Durandus	Petrus de Alvernia
Franciscus de Asculo	Petrus de Palude
Franciscus de Marchia [?]	Radulfus Brito
Franciscus Mayronis	*Scotus
Alius Franciscus [Bu 14 ^v]	Thomas Anglicus
*Gerardus de Senis	*Thomas [de Aquino, often
Godofridus	frater]

amplified: Qui Thomas de Sarzana, donator praesentis libri, fuit postea Summus Pontifex Nicolaus V vocatus. Et pro quo fuit donatus, fuit Beatus Nicolaus Cardinalis [Protector O. E. S. A.] Albergatus Titularis S. Crucis et episcopus Bononiensis. — As personal gift apparently Thomas de Sarzana received from Alberghi at the same time the actual Vat. lat. 1087 = Super Secundum Michaelis. In my detailed study I have proved that every Quaestio of this Vat. lat. 1087 belongs to Michael. I was led to compare the Vat. lat. 1087 and the Bologna 2214 by the coincidental discovery that both were written by the same artistic hand: on one lucky day the two MSS happened to lie on my desk side by side, D. GUTIÉRREZ [cf. *Notitia historica antiquae scholae Aegidianae*, in: *Analecta Augustiniana* XVIII, 1 (1941) 62 n. 78] missed the identification of the Vat. lat. 1087 only by a hair's breath. Time limited his examination of the MS Naples Nat. lat. VII C 1; otherwise he would have been the lucky finder.

¹⁶⁾ An asterisc (*) before the name points out a main opponent of Michael. — « Robert Cowton » is persistently quoted by the early Augustinians.

Guarro [Guillelmus]
*Henricus Gandavensis

[Ockham Vat. lat. 1087 f. 135^v]

The authenticity of these names is guaranteed not only by the agreement of the two MSS which I have perused but especially by the extraordinary fact that already the older manuscript which MS Bologna 2214 transcribed had been equipped with quotational insets. Extraordinary I call this fact because the MS Bologna 2214 itself belongs to the 14th century ; its predecessor must therefore be assigned to the mid-century. 709

The proof for the existence of quotational insets in the older MS, preceding the Bu, is final and stringent. Very often the Bu jumbles ¹⁷⁾ inset quotations with the text. In some places the amanuensis of the Bu found empty or blank insets, misunderstood their meaning, thought they indicated missing text-passages, and therefore left smaller or larger *lacunae* in his Bu. One example I want to reproduce. On Bu 160^v we have: *first*, a small lacuna ; then a jumbled text with a *lacuna* ; *finally*, a *lacuna* of three empty lines where the text is complete, however.

Bu 160^v: Quantum ad primum respondet Thomas Parte I q. 43 art. I quod nomine missionis duo importantur. ... Sed istum modum dicendi [] [] quidam doctor modernus (on margin (!): Petrus Aureolus contra Thomam)... Sed ista reprobatio non videtur magni vigoris primo quia praecedens opinio [] contra inducitur[] non dicit quod...

Nam aliquid potest procedere vel secundum imperium vel secundum consilium vel *secundum originem*

[]

[]

[] [] (Three empty lines! Text, however, complete!) *sicut dicit praecedens opinio*.

The amanuensis did not notice that the text was complete (cf. *secundum originem sicut dicit praecedens opinio*). He suspected that the blank quotational inset in the preceding manuscript he copied, indicated that some passage was missing in his original. He therefore left a very generous *lacuna* to fill in a missing passage while actually nothing else had been left out but only a full inset quotation! Quotational insets, whether blank or full, prove the authenticity of marginalia ; in this case in the manuscript, preceding the

¹⁷⁾ About jumbling quotational insets with the text proper cf. above p. 154.

Bu, there were already quotational insets left in blank. Michael therefore emerges as the author of his marginalia. No later editor apposed them afterwards. Thus Michael joins the historical-minded group of the 14th-century Augustinian theologians ¹⁸⁾.

Super Secundum Michaelis de Massa
= Anon. Vat. lat. 1087

The satisfaction which the researcher in Augustiniana derives from the discovery of the *Super Secundum Michaelis* unfortunately is tempered with disappointment. The Vat. lat. 1087 and the Bu were penned by the same hand, a fact not determinable before the days of photography. The Vat. lat. 1087 and the Bu were both in the possession of the Cardinal Protector of the Augustinians, Nicolaus Albergati, and (by testamentary disposition ?) passed through the hands of Thomas de Sarzana (later Nicolaus V), one into the Augustinian library of Bologna, the other (Vat. lat. 1087) into the Apostolic Library. Yet there is one great lamentable difference: the margins of the Vat. lat. 1087 are devoid of any marginalia.

With little effort we could learn so much from Michael's *Super Secundum* about the fate of later Aegidianism if detailed identifications of single opinions existed on the margins of Vat. lat. 1087. Even so, the *Super Secundum Michaelis* must be carefully studied to determine the results which the Aegidian leaven still produced around 1330. Paleographically the Vat. lat. 1087 presents no difficulties. It is a beautiful manuscript and well readable; only its size is a little forbidding (221 folia).

Of the rich material which an intense study will have to classify and clarify I give here only a few indications. In my larger study I reproduce the necessary passages.

1. With a somewhat brutal formula, Aegidius had hammered it into the consciousness of his fellow-scholars that there is a real difference between existence and essence « *sicut inter rem et rem* ». For Aegidius « *res* » was one of the five transcendentals; « *res* » was a « something », that is, a stronger word for « *modus* ». To explain Giles' position to the modern mind the Aegidian constitution of complete « being » can be symbolized mathematically as

¹⁸⁾ About pieces of Michael's *Super Primum* in the Vat. lat. 1084 cf. below under Alfonsus p. 220.

$$1 \times 1 = 1,$$

because complete « being » is constituted by the one mode of existence and, or better, together with the other mode of essence. Hocedez and others have enticed the modern dialectician to train his logical punches on Aegidius by misinterpreting the Aegidian formula as

$$1 + 1 = 2.$$

Michael de Massa in his *Super Secundum* has something to say about the Aegidian formula which he dislikes, and about the fundamental Aegidian thesis which he accepts-with his customary sophisticated reservations.

2. The ultra-Aegidians, Jacobus de Viterbio and Alexander de S. Elpidio, were the first to see or to sense that complete « being » necessitates not only two but three modes:

$$1 \times 1 \times 1 = 1,$$

and applied this insight to their description of the Trinity as constituted by three absolute modes: « esse naturaliter » (Pater), « esse intellectualiter » (Filius), and « esse amabiliter » (Spiritus Sanctus). But their formula failed to gain support. Stoutly refusing to accept the basic premiss, viz., the modal character involved in these three « esse », medieval critique rewrote the formula as

$$1 + 1 + 1 = 3,$$

and thereupon ostracized the great formula of Jacobus. Today it might perhaps gain the favor of the Far Eastern mentality if it still belonged to the patrimony of western theology and had been purified from liabilities which only century-long discussion eliminates.

Michael de Massa approaches the Jacobean ideas with a very open mind and feels no sympathy for the apodictic oppositionist, Gerardus.

3. The *possibile obiectivum*, too, Michael discusses in the right context, i. e. within the Jacobean modalities.

Reading the 14th-century Augustinians who sometimes bracket together both « modalitates » and « formalitates » one has the feeling that the *modalitates* of Aegidius and his followers fathered the *distinctiones formales ex natura rei*. It is probable that Michael was rejected by his own Augustinians for a similar reason; his *modalitates* looked too much like the *formalitates* of Scotus.

Michael and Medieval Book-Lore

Michalski ¹⁹⁾ in a masterly article has indicated the problems which medieval editors created and modern editors have to solve ; there seem to exist a number of different editions of the same medieval work. Michael de Massa makes a valuable contribution to the understanding and solution of these editorial problems.

The Super Secundum of Michael de Massa consisted originally of two different sets of Quaestiones which in the edition of the Vat. lat. 1087 have been fused into one set. Originally, Michael had written an *Opus Ordinarium Super Secundum* (one set of questions), and later *Additiones Super Secundum* (another set of questions).

From facts which a close observation of the Vat. lat. 1087 establishes we can reconstruct certain realities of medieval book-lore.

Medieval *Lectores* who coveted a chance to go to some university wrote their *Lectura Lectoris* in such a clever way that the text-units coincided with the sexterni-units. Even at the expense of some blank folia the Lector would not allow his text-unit to overflow into the next sexterni-unit.

Upon nomination to the *Baccalareatus*, and after his arrival in Paris, the aspirant *Baccalarius* would write *Additiones* to his *Lectura Lectoris* because his Parisian teaching had to take milieu and actuality into account. Again he used the same clever technique of maintaining coincidence of text-unit and sexterni-unit. Both the *Lectura Lectoris* and the *Additiones* were unbound. If the *Baccalarius*, or *Magister*, so desired he could at any time assemble (*ordinare*) a more or less complete edition, consisting of *Lectura Lectoris* (*Opus Ordinarium*) and *Additiones*, without any further copying process and, consequently, without waste of time and money. All a *Baccalarius*, or *Doctor*, had to do was to insert the different sexterni-units in the place he desired: the text-unit could never be disturbed by this reshuffling ²⁰⁾.

¹⁹⁾ Cf. C. MICHALSKI, *Die vielfachen Redaktionen einiger Kommentare zu Petrus Lombardus*, in: *Studi e Testi* 37, *Miscellanea F. Ehrle* I (Roma 1924) 219-264.

²⁰⁾ But what would happen if, before the reshuffling, the margins of all Sexterni had gradually been filled with all kinds of notae, notulae etc. ? If the blank pecia-ends, which the technique of « text-unit = sexterni-unit » demanded,

Michael de Massa proceeded exactly in this fashion. He possessed the loose *Quaterni* of his *Opus Ordinarium* (= *Lectura Lectoris*) and the loose *Quaterni* of his *Additiones*. The first two *Quaterni* ²¹⁾ of his *Additiones* he decided to insert after the first two *Quaterni* of the *Opus Ordinarium*. The text-units which today in the Vat. lat. 1087 cover ff. 1-51^v were thereby not disarranged.

Michael also determined to drop from his edition (Vat. lat. 1087) the whole *materia de angelis* which he had composed as comment to Lombard's 2 Sent. dist. 2-11 for his *Opus Ordinarium*; but Michael forgot to erase the cross-references to the *materia de angelis*, found still today here and there (cf. Vat. lat. 1087 f. 68^v or 94^v).

After the reshuffling of the *Quaterni* had been done, after inclusion or exclusion of the single *Quaterni* had been decided on, Michael had an amanuensis prepare the archetypus for the actual Vat. lat. 1087. From this moment on, the text-units were frozen in their place because they overflowed from one *Quinio* ²²⁾ into the next. The book-binder took over where the editor stopped.

We must therefore say that no real « editing » was done in the Vat. lat. 1087, only a reshuffling and selecting of *Quaterni*. It is true that in places where *Quaterni* were reshuffled to form a more comprehensive treatise on a particular subject, new *prooemia* were needed and also written as one may verify on the very first folium of the Vat. lat. 1087.

Prospectus on Integrating Parts of Vat. lat. 1087

1. *Opus Ordinarium Super Secundum Michaelis de Massa.*

[QQ] ff.

1-4: 1^r-17^v = Dist. 1 > In the unbound original = ff. 17 + 17

5-8: 34^r-51^v = Dist. 1 > = 2 + 2 *Quaterni*

had been used for notulae and other additions? Worse, if fragmentary *Sexterni* and other loose leaves had been inserted? Such a problem was faced by the amanuensis who had to copy the first complete Gregorius (cf. below p. 193 ff). Another interesting story of medieval book-lore comes up during the treatment of Simon de Cremona (cf. below p. 255 ff).

²¹⁾ Cf. below the *Prospectus* on integrating parts of Vat. lat. 1087.

²²⁾ According to Pelzer's Catalogue the Vat. lat. 1087 has *Quiniones*. Cf. A. PELZER, *Cod. Vat. Lat. 679-1134* (Roma 1931) 684.

The serial number of the first 8 *Quaestiones Operis Ordinarii* can be reestablished with certainty. The rest of the *Opus Ordinarium* cannot be identified in the Vat. lat. 1087. Some questions of Michael which he quotes in cross-references, have not been incorporated at all in the Vatican manuscript, and are probably lost.

2. *Additiones Super Secundum Michaelis de Massa* = AA

[QQ]	ff.	[??]
1- 8:	17 ^v - 34 ^v = AA dist. 1	
	[In the unbound original = ff. 17 = 2 Quaterni]	
9-10:	91 ^r - 97 ^v = De instanti	
11-13:	68 ^v - 74 ^r = De duratione et motu	
	[In original = ff. 12 = 1 Sexternus ?]	
	51 ^v - 68 ^v = De aeternitate	
	[In the unbound original = ff. 17 = 2 Quaterni]	
	74 ^r - 91 ^r = De tempore	
	[In the unbound original = ff. 17 = 2 Quaterni]	
	97 ^v -130 ^v = De materia	
	De forma	
	De esse et essentia	
	De genere et differentia	
	De caelo	
	[In the unbound original = ff. 34 = 4 Quaterni]	
	130 ^v -169 ^v = 10 QQ de extensione	
	169 ^v -175 ^r = 4 QQ de materia extensa per quantitatem	
	175 ^r -205 ^r = 16 QQ de veritate primi principii et motione voluntatis	
	205 ^r -221 ^v = 4 QQ de specie	
	[In the unbound original = ff. 92 = 14 Quaterni]	

Only the first 13 serial numbers of the *Quaestiones Additionum* can be reestablished with absolute certitude. It is very impressive to note how many of the *text-units* of the Vat. lat. 1087 even today evince the fact that once they coincided with the *quaterni-unit*.

The Enigmatic Figure of Michael de Massa

Was Michael de Massa the « Durandus » of the Augustinian Order ? There is some mystery about his figure. How is it possible that a man like Michael who left a literary legacy of some 900 extant folia, or some 1000 folia, if the sermons are included, should almost never be quoted by his confrères ? Admitting that the 14th-

century Augustinians had a galaxy of Doctors they certainly had not enough stars of first or second magnitude like Michael to put them under the proverbial bushel.

Thomas of Strassburg, Baccalarius 1336, at least should have quoted Michael, Baccalarius, as we shall see, 1325-26. But the name is never mentioned directly although indirectly involved in Thomas' discussion with the ultra-Aegidians, Jacobus and Alexander. Gregory barely mentions Michael; Hugolinus, an Italian like his great countryman, ignores our Michael. John of Basel reports only a faint and indirect echo of Michael. Alfonsus is the only Augustinian to give any importance to Michael.

Is it because Michael died without the halo of the Magisterium? Or was he condemned by his Order to die without the degree because he fell out of the Aegidian tradition and was unloyal to his Order like Durandus? If so, we would have to say that the Augustinians had learned something from the Durandus scandal and therefore gave Michael no publicity by condemnations but the more effective treatment of freezing him under a layer of silence, and keeping him from promotion by simply not presenting him to the University authorities.

The biographers²³) have little to tell with certainty about Michael. He was a Sieneese, belonged to the family of the Beccucci from Massa, was Definitor at the General Chapter of Venice, 1332, and died at Paris (?) on May 10, 1337, where he was interred in the Augustinian church.

When the biographers add that he died young (in florida aetate) one may ask whether this information is based on documentary evidence or established on the assumption that a Baccalarius had to be in his best years.

Kürzinger, Glorieux, and Pelster²⁴), have made it possible to fix another important date of Michael's life: his Baccalareatus in 1325-26. The date results from the *Quodlibetum Jacobi de Appamiis* which I shall discuss here below.

It was perhaps one of the last official acts of the General

²³) Cf. foot-note 14.

²⁴) Cf. J. KÜRZINGER, *Alfonsus Vargas*, in: *Beiträge Baeumkers* XXII, 5-6 (1930) 85-86. — P. GLORIEUX, *La littérature quodlibétique* II (Bibl. Thomiste 21: Paris 1935) 142-43. — F. PELSTER, *Zur ersten Polemik gegen Aureoli*, in: *Franciscan Studies* XV, 1 (1955) 30-47.

Alexander Fassitelli de S. Elpidio [de Marchia] ²⁵⁾ to procure the Baccalareatus for his protégé, Michael de Massa. During the Generalate of Alexander (1312-26 ; † 1326) Gerardus de Senis had bitterly attacked the doctrines of the ultra-Aegidian, Alexander, while Michael had defended Alexander and — we may imagine — had won his sympathy and protection. For his opponent, Gerardus de Senis, Alexander cannot have harbored the same warm feelings.

It was circumstances which cast Michael and Gerardus in the role of rivals and enemies. Both were from Siena, both were in the same age group, both at the same stage of their scholastic career. But Gerardus tenaciously clung to the traditional Aegidianism of the Order while Michael went along with the ultra-Aegidianism, once promoted by Jacobus, and at the moment greatly favored by Alexander who had the prestige of a Doctor and the power of a General.

The Commentary of Gerardus, probably a *Lectura Lectoris*, was published first ; Michael published his somewhat later and made Gerardus his whipping boy. On every folium of Michael we meet with a sharp criticism of Gerardus himself and, more so, of the critique which Gerardus applies to the ultra-Aegidians and to Aureolus. Michael always suggests that Gerardus does not understand the issues because they are beyond the ken of his poor confrère. Michael himself is too sophisticated to take an apodictic stand ; it is often a *sic-et-non* attitude he is content with.

Michael apparently had to pay the price for challenging Aegidianism in the person of Gerardus. While Michael was Baccalarius, 1326, Alexander became bishop and died shortly afterwards. The new General, Guillelmus Amidani de Cremona (1326-43) ²⁶⁾ did not favor Michael but Gerardus. Gerardus was made Magister in 1329, Michael died in 1337 without having been presented by the Order for the Magisterium. Thomas of Strassburg, Baccalarius in 1336, ostracized the name of Michael. The name would have been a star in the literary firmament if Thomas had acted differently because Thomas was destined to be copied all over the christian world.

Ambrosius Massari Coriolanus ²⁷⁾ tells an interesting story about

²⁵⁾ Cf. D. PERINI, *Bibl. Aug.* II (Firenze 1931) 46-48.

²⁶⁾ Cf. D. PERINI, *Bibl. Aug.* I (Firenze 1929) 28-32.

²⁷⁾ Cf. D. PERINI, *Bibl. Aug.* II (Firenze 1931) 194-97. — The Gerardus story is found in PERINI, *Bibl. Aug.* III (Firenze 1935) 187.

Gerardus (!) which certainly has to be understood as relating to Michael. According to Massari, as Perini repeats, a posthumous Magisterium was given to Gerardus (!):

Tradit in Chronica < sacratissimi ordinis ff. herem S. Aug. > Coriolanus illum < Gerardum ! > Senis fato concessisse, cum tantum esset Baccalareus ; et vita functum, inconsueto honore, et inaudito exemplo, ob eius singularem scientiam sollemniter *instante populo et episcopo* fuisse laureatum.

Perini knows that Gerardus is mentioned by Augustinian documents as Baccalarius in Paris on March 25, 1327, and as Magister at the General Chapter of Venice on Pentecost, 1332. Denifle²⁸) proves that Gerardus was Regens even before (1329-30). For this reason Perini interprets the story as referring to a posthumous Magisterium « in utroque iure ». Perini wonders why some historians make Gerardus die young, and others at a decrepit age.

The solution is much easier. Everything becomes plausible in the curious story if we accept that Michael was victimized by his Order and condemned to die without the Magisterium, whether at Paris or at Siena, does not change the situation greatly. The tradition which has Michael die in Paris may be founded on the same reasoning post factum that a Baccalarius had to be young and had to be in Paris. If the family of the Beccucci at Siena was not edified by the treatment Michael had received at the hand of his superiors, a « spontaneous » reaction of bishop and people (cf. *instante populo et episcopo* ; no Augustinian reaction is mentioned) could be arranged without difficulty. Either at the funeral of Michael at Siena, or at a Solemn High Mass for the repose of his soul the Magisterial cap was placed on his bier or his tumba and Michael proclaimed Magister by an act of popular arbitration.

Michael and the Quodlibetum Jacobi de Appamiis [AD 1326]

The MSS of the Quodlibetum Jacobi de Appamiis identify the opponents. Instead of *quidam* the Augustinian lists:

Aegidius doctor noster (together with Thomas)
Aureolus
Bernardus Olivieri (arguit frater...)
Dionysius de Burgo (respondet magister... nostri ordinis)
Durandus (dominus... episcopus anicensis)

²⁸) Cf. DENIFLE, *Chart. Paris.* II 339 no. 904.

Franciscus de Marchia (magister... in quadam quaestione quam determinavit in curia de qua < ego J. de Apamiis > respondi sic)

Franciscus de Maironis

Geraldus Odonis

Hervaeus

Jacobus de Viterbio doctor inventivus

Michael de Massa (*respondet* frater... nostri ordinis)

Obertus monachus (magister)

Scotus

Stephanus (magister)

Thomas Anglicus < Wilton >

Thomas de Fabiano (!) (quidam doctor nostri ordinis)

S. Thomas

Date of Quodlibetum Jacobi de Appamiis = 1326

= Date of Baccalareatus Michaelis de Massa

To date this Quodlibetum we must keep in mind that apparently three Augustinian Magistri, Jacobus de Appamiis, Dionysius, and Thomas de Fabriano (!), were present. One master was absent, Bernardus Olivieri who is called simply « frater ». Olivieri was Magister already in 1313 ; his Magisterium was no longer of any news value ; he was an old man whom the title « frater » suited better than the « Magister » since Aegidius was often honored with the plain « frater ».

One might think of a General Chapter of the Augustinians, perhaps the one of Florence in 1326, to bring such a group of Augustinian Magistri together. But we have to set the stage at Paris because the Franciscan Baccalarius, Geraldus Odonis, must have a chance to be present.

Of Dionysius de Burgo we know that he finished the First Book as Baccalarius Parisiensis on Jan. 12, 1317 (colophon of MS Erfurt Amplon. 2° 131 f. 96^v) ; Thomas de Fabriano is elected Definitor Generalis in 1320 with the title of Baccalarius (*Analecta Augustiniana* IV [1911-12] 40 n. 3). Here in the Quodlibetum Dionysius precedes Thomas by seniority. If we make an assumption about the probable date of their Magisteria we shall see that the pieces of the puzzle fall neatly into their places ²⁹⁾:

²⁹⁾ It is noteworthy that Gerardus de Senis does not take part in the solemn proceedings. He is either absent from Paris or « unable » to come because of Michael de Massa. Gerardus was still Baccalarius as we have mentioned before. — The death of Alexander is reported by PERINI (II, 47). — The date

Dionysius de Burgo, Mag. Regens Parisius	1324-25, Senior	1326
Thomas de Fabriano, Mag. Regens Parisius		1325-26
Jacobus de Appamiis, Magister Novus	1326	(before March 13 ?)
Michael de Massa, Baccalarius Parisiensis	1325-26	
In the first Book of Michael the Master Alexander de S. Elpidio is quoted as Pater noster Generalis, therefore possibly at a date before	1326	(Feb. 18)
Geraldus Odonis, Baccalarius Paris., O. Min.		1326
Franciscus de Marchia, Mag. O. Min. in Curia where Jacobus was Respondens before	1326	
Durandus, episcopus Aniciensis (Annecy) until	1326	(March 13)

All the facts of the Quodlibetum are put in relief by our assumption about the probable date of the Magisteria. Although Magistri were badly needed at home and therefore not allowed to overstay their legal term at Paris we see a plausible possibility to have three together at Paris where the Franciscan Baccalarius is studying, at a date while Durandus is still bishop of Annecy, and Alexander still General of the Augustinians. From these perfect coincidences we glean the important fact that Michael was Baccalarius in 1326, eleven long years before his death which overtook him while still Baccalarius.

THOMAS DE ARGENTINA

Thomas de Argentina ³⁰⁾ is another Augustinian theologian who belongs to the historico-critical group of the 14th-century theolo-

of the Baccalareatus of Odonis is given by PELSTER, *Zur ersten Polemik* (p. 40). — The Durandus-date is also in UEBERWEG, *Grundriss* II (Berlin 1928) 519. — The Franciscus-MS Napoli VII C 27 proves by colophon that he was Baccalarius Parisiensis in 1320. As the *Dict. Théol. Catholique* (XII, 2: 2104) says, a lost Franciscus-MS of Dodici Apostoli (Rome) proves that the Reportatum « per fratrem Guilelmum de Rubione » [= Franciscus-MS] was made « Parisius ». STEGMÜLLER (*Repertorium Lombardi* I [1947] 106) adds that the Reportatum « a Guilelmo de Rubione » according to MS Prague Metrop. Chapter 531 was made AD 1323. Summing up these two colophons we find that Franciscus de Marchia was in Paris from 1320-23, and could be Magister in Curia (Avignon) before 1326 when Jacobus de Appamiis had to act as Respondens under him.

³⁰⁾ Cf. B. LINDNER, *Die Erkenntnislehre des Thomas v. Strassburg*, in: *Bei-*

gians. Not only was he the first to present us with a commentary on all the Four Books of Lombardus in pleasant brevity and clarity, he also was privileged to find an early printer who reproduced a very good manuscript of the Rhineland (Strassburg ?), perhaps the very *archetypus* which home-convents³¹⁾ of great scholars were solicitous to procure.

The homely text of Thomas never presented great editing problems ; if the manuscript (*archetypus* ?) which the *editio princeps* « repeated » to the last detail, marginalia included, is a typical text-witness then it is evident that there are only about eleven short variations to parallel texts, clearly marked as such, and some longer *Additiones* at the end of the Fourth Book. These longer *Additiones* incorporate the discussions which took place during the *Principia Baccalarii Thomae* and also embody some treatises or discussions due to the question of the *visio beatifica* under John XXII and Benedict XII.

It is not excluded that the *Lectura Lectoris* of Thomas was already the finished literary product we have in the actual *Lectura Baccalarii* ; it even appears probable that the *Lectura Lectoris* was already in some libraries of the Order when Thomas started his *Baccalareatus Parisiensis* in the year 1336³²⁾.

A few additional elements³³⁾ represent the whole difference between a *Lectura Lectoris* and *Lectura Baccalarii*. We probably are not wrong in assuming that the final edition of Thomas was released between 1336-43.

träge Baumkerns XXVII, 4-5 (Münster 1930). — J. SHANNON, *Good Works and Predestination acc. to Thomas of Strassburg* (Diss. Univ. Greg. 1940). Both authors used the Venice edition (1564) of Thomas of Strassburg. Shannon (p. 12) says: This edition has less errors than the others (!). — The editions of Thomas are: Strassburg 1490; Venice 1564, 1588; Genoa 1585. There is a rumor about a fifth edition, Geneva 1635, about which see Shannon (p. 12).

³¹⁾ The Venice edition 1522 of Gregory goes back to an *archetypus* of Rimini, the home convent of Gregory. Cf. below p. 191.

³²⁾ When Aureolus started his *Baccalareatus Parisiensis* one of his best MS was being transcribed at Cahors. Cf. E. M. BUYTAERT in the introduction (p. XII) to the edition of Peter Aureoli *Scriptum Super Primum Sententiarum* I [Prol. et Dist. 1], in: *Franciscan Institute Publications* (Text Series No. 3) [St. Bonaventure 1952].

³³⁾ The additional elements are an Index rerum (Tabula alphabetica) and, of course, the Collatio, and the Additiones at the end which incorporate the discussions that took place during the Principia etc.

I have not examined any manuscript of Thomas in detail ; in the case of Thomas, as later in the case of Gregory, I have been forced to restrict my examination to printed editions. But in both instances I have definite proof that *one* manuscript, and a good one at that, was copied by a printer who could neither read nor write nor print anything but scholastic shorthand, and who meticulously repeated in print what he found in one good manuscript.

The *editio princeps* of Thomas is due to the learned promoter Pallas Spangel, to the printer Martinus Flach of Strassburg (1490) and to the corrector Nicolaus. Pallas Spangel ³⁴⁾ tells us that he found the *Super Primum et Secundum* of Thomas in one volume, and the *Super Tertium et Quartum* in another. Spangel arrogates to himself no editor's halo ; he modestly admits that he was only lucky to discover the MSS, to peruse them, recognize them as excellent and transmit them to the printer for eventual printing. The corrector confirms ³⁵⁾ that Spangel was the promoting agent ; he claims to have done the correcting of the proof-sheets. We therefore have in the ed. 1490 *one* good manuscript.

The later editions: Venice 1564, 1588 and Genoa 1585 are reprints from the *editio princeps*. I have very carefully checked up on the relationship between ed. 1490 and ed. 1585 ³⁶⁾ which I have at hand. I have also compared the excerpts from the ed. 1564 which Shannon and Lindner reproduce. The result is: complete identity of text with only an increasing ratio of mistakes ! Of course, later printers add to their edition all features, which the printers' code later demanded.

Quoting Technique of Thomas of Strassburg

Once Thomas of Strassburg had been printed he remained popular throughout the following centuries. Completeness in regard to all of Lombard's problems, clarity and conciseness of exposition, rich documentation in historical theology, all these advantages gave Thomas a place of honor on the shelves and desks of theologians belonging to the post-reformation period and even to the movement of scholastic revival.

³⁴⁾ On the first fly-leaf of the ed. 1490.

³⁵⁾ On the last fly-leaf of the ed. 1490, added in the year 1491.

³⁶⁾ Of 250 marginalia (names, text-divisions, glosses, etc.) 240 are *exactly* the same ! That means a concordance of 96. %.

The art of Gutenberg had two opposite effects: it made printed medieval authors accessible but condemned those who by 1600 had not been printed to inaccessibility. The printers who strove after an ideal of perfect readability gradually dropped scholastic stenography from their columns, and by unintentional chain-reaction destroyed the art of writing and reading scholastic shorthand. By 1600 only a few theologians were able to plow through shorthand texts in manuscripts which became more and more museum pieces, kept in jealously locked and practically inaccessible libraries.

After 1600 the marginalia in such printed authors as offered inexhaustible treasures of information about theological history, assumed an importance that has perhaps been overlooked. Research in this regard may well confirm the suspicion that the negative attitude towards the 14th-century theology which became the fashion in the post-reformation period, is based exclusively or partially — on mere marginalia of printed medieval authors !

Among the printed Augustinians it was Thomas, Gregory, and Alfonsus who provided the reader with encyclopedic historical information on account of their rich marginalia. The proof for their authenticity has therefore not only a bearing on the historical attitude of the Augustinian medieval school but equally on subsequent theological history.

The authenticity of the many and sometimes detailed marginalia of Thomas of Strassburg I cannot demonstrate with absolute and final arguments because I have not seen all MSS ; only one good MS has been « copied by print » in the edition of 1490. We must for a while be satisfied with the additional external evidence which the historical context of the Augustinian School provides. In the case of Gregory we are in the same predicament ; in the case of Alfonsus, however, chronologically close or very close to Thomas and Gregory, I have gone through all MSS and definitely established the authenticity of all marginalia. I state this clearly to avoid the objection of a *circulus vitiosus* ; I do not intend to argue from the marginalia to the historical character of the 14th-century Augustinian School, and then from the context within the Augustinian School alone to the historicity of the marginalia found in Thomas and Gregory.

The technique of quoting we find in Thomas belongs to the first stage of its development as delineated above. The *quidam* of the texts are identified on the margins, mostly by bare names. A

systematic rule cannot be observed. The copious quotations from Augustine who provided the inspiration for the Augustinian School, figure within the text-column; the early scholastics, especially Anselm, who fathered the movement of the « Theologia Moderna », are similarly quoted in the text.

The names which Thomas quotes on the margins I shall insert in my larger study under the divisions of the Commentary to make them available for all editions of Thomas. Here I indicate the interesting ones:

*Aegidius, venerabilis doctor, doctor noster, frater noster

*Alexander de Marchia Augustiniensis = de S. Elpidio ³⁷⁾

*Aureolus

Bonaventura ³⁸⁾

Cocon [Cowton, Robertus]

Dionysius de Burgo (doctor noster junior: ed. 1490 1-2 Sent. f. 77^v; ed. 1585 1-2 Sent. f. 46^v)

*Durandus

Franciscus de Mayronis

*Gerardus de Senis, O. E. S. A.

Geraldus Minor

Gerardus Carmelita... (ed. 1490 1-2 Sent. f. 86^r and 87^v; ed. 1585 1-2 Sent. f. 53^v and 54^v)

³⁷⁾ 1. Ed. 1490 1-2 Sent. f. 76^v: *Alex. Ord. S. Augustini* who goes with Henricus; omitted by ed. 1585 f. 46^r.

Immediately afterwards: *Contra Henricum et Alexandrum* both in ed. 1490 and ed. 1585!

2. Ed. 1490 1-2 Sent. f. 131^r: *Alexander de Marcia Augustin.*

Ed. 1585 1-2 Sent. f. 90^v: *Alexander de Marsia Aug.*!

3. Ed. 1490 3-4 Sent. f. 65^v: *Alexander de ver.* (quidam de nostris).

Ed. 1585 3-4 Sent. f. 50^v: *Ale. ver.* = Alexander de mar<Marchia>.

Michael de Massa is not quoted nominally but certainly involved in the discussion against *Jacobus* and *Alexander*.

³⁸⁾ The 14th century Augustinians give Bonaventura no importance. Thomas quotes him very rarely:

1. Ed. 1490 1-2 Sent. f. 65^r: *Bonaven.*

Ed. 1585 1-2 Sent. f. 37^r: *Bonaven.*; but ed. 1585 misplaces *Bonaven.* 16 lines too high!

2. Ed. 1490 1-2 Sent. f. 134^r: *Bonaven.*

Ed. 1585 1-2 Sent. f. 93^r: *Bonaven.*

Ed. 1564 1-2 Sent. f. (?). B. LINDNER [cf. *Die Erkenntnislehre d. Th. v. Strassburg*, in: *Beiträge Baumkfers* XXVII, 4-5 (Münster 1930) 7 note 1] could not find the text accompanying this *marginale* (*unus doctor qui diebus suis magnae fuit reputationis*). Does the Venice edition 1564 not have this *marginale* « *Bonaven.* » ? ?

*Godofridus

*Henricus de Gandavio

Henricus de Virmaria, O. E. S. A. (ed. 1490 3-4 Sent. f. 28^r; ed. 1585 3-4 Sent. f. 21^v)

*Hervaeus

*Jacobus de Viterbio, O. E. S. A. ³⁹⁾

Johannes de Lana, O. E. S. A. (ed. 1490 3-4 Sent. f. 8^r and 85^r [Jo. de La.]; ed. 1585 3-4 Sent. f. 5^v and 66^v [but ed. 1585 makes two auctoritates of one: *Ratio Jo.* and *< Ratio > de Lap.*])

Petrus de Alvernia

Petrus Johannis

Petrus de Tarantasia

Prosper [de Regio, O. E. S. A.] (ed. 1490 3-4 Sent. f. 49^r and 50^r; ed. 1585 3-4 Sent. f. 37^v and 38^v)

RU = Gudofridus ? Guarro ? ⁴⁰⁾

*Scotus

*S. Thomas

*Varro

³⁹⁾ Ed. 1490 1-2 Sent. f. 84^v misreads *Jacobus de Vitriaco*; ed. 1585 f. 52^v correspondingly: *Jacobus de &c.*!

2. Ed. 1490 1-2 Sent. f. 83^r and ed. 1585 f. 51^v: *ratio Jacobo.*

3. Ed. 1490 1-2 Sent. f. 111^v *Jaco. de Viter.* 2 q. 2.

Ed. 1585 1-2 Sent. f. 88^r *Ja. de Vite.* 3. *quolibet q. 7 art. 4 item in quaest. super praedicamen.* (addition of Venice edition of 1564).

Here and later (ed. 1490 f. 127^r) *Linconiensis et sui squaces* are represented as historical premiss to the Jacobean doctrine of *modi absoluti*. Cf. M. SCHMAUS, *Der Liber propugnatorius* II Teil: *Die trinitarischen Lehrdifferenzen*, in: *Beiträge Baumkfers* XXIX, 1 (Münster 1930) 475-77.

4. Ed. 1490 1-2 Sent. f. 187^r and ed. 1585 f. 135^r: *Ja. multa narrat de tempore 3 quolibet* [ed. 1585: *quolice*] q. 12.

5. From *Jaco. Augustiniensis* comes the mysterious *Cocon Augustiniensis* in ed. 1490 f. 115^v whom ed. 1585 f. 77^v omits!

⁴⁰⁾ Ed. 1490 1-2 Sent. f. 71^v: *Ru*

Ed. 1585 1-2 Sent. f. 42^r: *Rub* = Gudofridus (because with Henricus).

2. Ed. 1490 1-2 Sent. f. 110^v: *Ru contra Aegidium.*

Ed. 1585 1-2 Sent. f. 73^v *omittit.*

But this *Ru* might be *Varro* cf. Dionysius de Burgo MS Erfurt Amplon. 2^o 131 f. 52^r and 53^r where an identical opinion is attributed to *Guarro* in a discussion involving Alexander and Jacobus.

3. Ed. 1490 1-2 Sent. f. 187^v: *Hen. et Ru contra primam rationem.*

Ed. 1585 1-2 Sent. f. 135^r: *H. et 5 contra primam rationem!* f. 135^v: *Contra Henr. et Rub.*

Doctrine of Thomas of Strassburg

Before we pass on to Gregory of Rimini I would like to have the reader stop and take stock of the first half of the 14th-century Augustinian theology. If our subject were not as dry as sand I would repeat the phrase of Dante (Par. II, 4): Tornate a riveder li vostri liti.

Thomas of Strassburg marks the turning point in Augustinian Modern theology. I call him the « last Augustinian of Aegidius » and Gregory the « first Augustinian of Augustine ». The two terms are not mutually exclusive. Aegidianism is old-fashioned Augustinianism coupled with the *cognitio universalis*, the Gregorian Augustinianism is « Modern », is better acquainted with *all* the books of Augustine not only with his major works, and goes hand in hand with the *cognitio rei particularis*.

Aegidius remained the venerated figure of the Augustinian School before and after Gregory, but after Gregory especially more corrective reservations were made in regard to Aegidius. What is so new in Gregory is the fact that he is the best Augustine scholar of the Middle Ages from the milieu which created the Milleloquium ⁴¹).

⁴¹) About the Augustinian erudition of Gregory cf. H. NORIS, *Vindiciae Augustinianae*, in: *Supplementum ad opera S. Augustini* [PL 47: 651-52]: Nullus autem veterum scolasticorum in Augustini lectione Gregorium superavit. Hanc illi laudem ultro recentiores tribuunt. Dicitur a Vasquez 1-2 disp. 185 num. 13 « apprimè in Augustini doctrina versatus ». A Vandero appellatur « vir doctissimus, et si quis alius doctrinae Augustinianae perstudiosus » disp. 1 de Libertate Dei num. 23. Addit Fasolus part. 1 q. 23. art. 1 dub. 3. num. 34. « cuius libri Augustini auctoritatibus et sententiis passim abundant ». Idem nuncupatur a Raynaudo « homo in Augustini lectione versatissimus », in cens. inoff. [Pro Valer. Cemeliens.] cens. num. 2. Denique Decamsius scribit: « Gregorius Ariminensis, quem non vitae tantum instituto, sed etiam doctrina Augustinum fuisse norunt omnes, qui vel strictim eius libros attigerunt. », lib. III. de Haeresi Jans., disp. 3. cap. 20. All these elogia originate from a time when only printed medieval authors could furnish the tertium comparationis. Hiltalingen was then already buried under the dust of centuries. But at least these scholars who knew their Augustine recognized in Gregory a revered brother. That much can be derived from these elogia. — The latest article about the Milleloquium appeared in *Traditio* cf. B. M. PEEBLES, *The Verse Embellishments of the Milleloquium S. Augustini*, in: *Traditio* X (1954) 555-66. Dr. Peebles has directed the dissertation of a student of his, which is still unpublished. Cf. V. A. FITZPATRICK, *Bartholomaeus of Urbino, The Sermons Embraced in his Milleloquium S. Augustini* (Cath. Univ.

With this explanation in mind we may call Thomas the last Aegidian without coining a new pompous cliché. Thomas professed the *cognitio rei particularis* which had been adopted by his predecessors but — and this is the difference — source erudition in regard to the *whole* Augustine cannot yet be claimed by Thomas.

The Aegidianism from Dionysius to Thomas is a doctrinal impulse which decreases with the ratio of distance from Aegidius under the impact of Scotus, Durandus, Aureolus. Dionysius, Socius of Aureolus but unaffected (?) by him, struggles with Scotus and Durandus.

Gerardus continues to contend with these old adversaries but has to engage in a duel with Aureolus which the detached arbiter, Michael de Massa, thinks is above the strength of Gerardus, too dogmatic and unpliant, too obstinate to combat a new opponent with new weapons.

Michael de Massa is the last of the ultra-Aegidians, a group represented mainly by Jacobus of Viterbo and Alexander de S. Elpidio. The inter-Augustinian feud between « orthodox » Aegidians and « ultra-Aegidians », to our knowledge not as bitter as the fray between Durandus and the Thomists, reaches in Michael a crisis. Gerardus bitterly opposes a powerful Magister who is his own General, Alexander Fassitelli de S. Elpidio (General 1312-26; + 1326). Under the new General, Guillelmus Amidani (1326-43) Gerardus becomes Magister in 1329 while Michael with all his enormous literary production dies in 1337 without any Magisterium.

GREGORY OF RIMINI

Antesignanus Nominalistarum ? Or Leader against the Nominalists ?

If an issue which has been settled long ago is raised again it cannot be done without stirring up the dust of centuries. With the

Washington 1954) I-X, 1-65, 1*-56*. — In its idea and in its execution the Milleloquium is an awe-inspiring enterprise. The idea was conceived already by *Augustinus Trionfo* (cf. D. PERINI, *Bibl. Aug.* IV [Firenze 1938] 25): MS Florence Laurent. Plut. XIII cod. 15 f. 1-178 « *Flores B. Augustini seu Milleloquium ex scriptis S. Augustini, auctore Augustino Anconitano, et primo quidem ex libris XXII de Civitate Dei* ». Trionfo died April 2, 1328, at an age of 88. The Milleloquium appeared 1345.

following remarks about Gregory I expect to start discussions but hope not to engage in controversies because I want to fulfill only the historian's obligation to point out new facts which may alter the premisses of an old issue.

Gregory ⁴²⁾ is known as the *antesignanus nominalistarum* ⁴³⁾ or

⁴²⁾ Cf. N. MERLIN, *Grégoire de Rimini*, in: *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* VI, 2 (Paris 1947) 1852-54, an article written with exceptional and uncommon cautiousness and reserve. — D. PERINI, *Bibliographia Augustiniana* I (Firenze 1929) 53-57. — R. ARBESMANN - W. HÜMPFNER ed. *Jordani de Saxonia, Liber Vitasfratrum*, in: *Cassiciacum* I (American Series) [New York 1943] 477.

For some literature on doctrine cf. J. WÜRSDÖRFER, *Erkennen und Wissen nach Gregor v. Rimini*, in: *Beiträge Baeumkers* XX, 1 (Münster 1917). — M. SCHÜLER, *Prädestination, Sünde u. Freiheit bei Gregor v. Rimini* (Stuttgart 1934). — P. VIGNAUX, *Justification et prédestination au XIV^e siècle* (Duns Scot, ... Grégoire de Rimini), in: *Bibl. de l'école des hautes études* (Sciences religieuses) XLVIII (Paris 1934).

⁴³⁾ Johannes Thurmayr (b. at Abensberg, July 4, 1477; died at Ratisbon January 9, 1534) was appointed as historiographer of his country, Bavaria, in 1517, and wrote the *Annales Boiorum* (down to the year 1460). On account of his reformist sympathies the *Annales* were not published until 1554 at Ingolstadt. Cf. *Catholic Encyclopedia* XIV (New York 1912) 713.

The anti-papal and anti-scholastic sentiments which animate Avensberg (*Aventinus*) made the re-edition of his works welcome in the last century. *Aventinus* who wrote after 1517 had called Gregory of Rimini the *antesignanus* of the nominalists and could do so with little contradiction, because after 1450 one relied on printed sources only. — F. Ehrle who very eruditely treats the controversy between the two *Viae*, the *Antiqua* and *Moderna*, in his work *Der Sentenzenkommentar Peters von Candia* should not have included this quarrel of the 15th century in a book, whose title promised to deal with theologians of the 14th century. Ehrle never proved, that this dispute of the 15th century established perspective and common denominator for the theology before the Great Schism. Though he corrected (p. 167) an error (by Hermelink) about the teaching activity of Gregory at Wien, an error already derived from a misinterpretation of *Aventinus*, he incorporated the latter's passage on Gregory (p. 163 n. 1), because he attributed to it a great significance for the 14th century. The passage is to be found in *Abensberg* lib. 6 (cap. 3) and reads:

Sub idem tempus Gratianus ille jus pontificale dilaniavit (!) atque confudit (!). Etenim uti in nostris Bibliotecis syncerum est, duas continet partes...

Hisce quoque temporibus fuisse reperio Rucellinum Britannicum <Racelinum Britannum>, Magistrum Petri Abelaerdi, novi Lycaei conditorem. Qui primus scientiam vocum sive dictionum instituit, novam Philosophandi viam invenit. Eo namque autore duo Aristotelicorum, Peripateticorum genera esse caeperunt, unum illud vetus, locuples in rebus procreandis, quod scientiam rerum sibi vendicat, quamobrem Reales vocantur: alterum novum, quod eam distrahit, Nominales ideo nuncupati, quod avari rerum, prodigi nominum, atque notionum ver-

standard bearer of the « nominalists » ; if indications are not wrong he was the very opposite, namely, the leader against the « nominalists », the promoter of the condemnations which fell upon the Modernists. The Gregorian equivocation is very probably the result of polemics. Thus it may be useful to repeat what has been said at the beginning of this article and to stress this time the polemical character of the controversy between *Antiqui* and *Moderni*. That some groups of the 14th century were historical-minded emerges more and more from factual observations ; that in consequence, these groups were also historico-critical is an assumption whose importance must now be stressed. That many *Moderni* were logical-minded, and therefore logico-critical must also be underlined.

It seems that the *Moderni* felt that they had a mission to correct the defects of the past. Criticism, however, often entails that ugly polemic feature of veering not only to the other side but to the extreme of the other side.

The historico-critical attitude which I think was prevalent among a large group of *Moderni*, especially among the Augustinians, put a pronounced stress on better quoting. *Moderni* and *Antiqui*, it is true, were of one mind in regard to the importance of tradition. If this basic agreement had been remembered no quarrel would have been possible. But the *Moderni* paraded their

borum videntur esse adsertores. In hisce duobus generibus dissidium et bellum civile est, illius Thomas Aquinas Italus, et Joannes Dunso Scotus: Huius Vuilhelmus Occomensis Anglius (eius sepulchrum Marmoreum apud nos in Boiaria Monachii in templo Franciscanorum monstratur), Marsilius Haidelbergensis <Hae-dulobergensis> Academiae, Joannes Buridanus Viennensis Gymnasii institutor (!) [renowned teacher of Paris; died after 1358; cf. UEBERWEG II (1928) 596], Gregorius Ariminensis Viennae humatus, antesignani sunt...

Cf. *Annalium Boiorum libri septem Aventino auctore* (Ingolstadt by A. and S. Weissenborn 1554) 624. For new edition cf. *Johannes Turmair's (gen. Aventinus) Sämtliche Werke*, ed. S. Riezler, III. Bd. (*Annales ducum Boiariae lib. V-VIII*) München 1884 p. 200. Riezler's edition is practically the same as that of 1554; only chapters are added, and the orthography is changed.

The light weight of Aventinus' historical erudition and competence is counter-balanced by nothing but a heavy dosis of anti-papal and anti-scholastic animosity. The passage quoted was dragged in by Aventinus for emotional reasons (cf. ed. 1554 p. 627: *quamvis haec nihil ad historiam attineant*). But Aventinus achieved his purpose of blackening the record of Gregory in a way beyond his fondest expectations. He is even used by Ueberweg's *Grundriss* II (1928) 589 to give a « competent » evaluation of Gregory.

provocative pride in good quoting ; the Antiqui naturally retorted with the charge of ecclecticism, a charge reechoing through the ages.

Again and again when the texts of the 14th century themselves are studied one comes across examples of astounding mastery over the sources of theology both ancient and contemporary. Interest in the sources is a very healthy sign and symptom in a theology which deals with historical revelation, historically closed and historically developed. But as soon as past developments come under consideration the theologian must take a stand, otherwise he is only a recording device ; if many past developments come under the lense of the theological observer, a historico-critical judgment must be formulated many times.

In the early decades of a historical movement the enthusiasm of quoting, of looking over the shoulder of ancient or more recent predecessors, may become a fashion, pedantic and affected, perhaps eclectic.

Research must decide how much the historico-critical attitude of the 14th century achieved and to what extent it failed, overshooting the mark and creating new fetishes. Perhaps we owe to this historico-critical attitude the beginning of a then direly needed patrology. We have it now ; but standing on the highest rung of the ladder one may easily forget that the lower rungs were equally or even more important.

In the logico-critical field the Moderni felt that they had been entrusted with the mission to correct the theory of the *cognitio universalis*. Missionaries usually do not start like St. Paul on the Areopagus to announce that they preach the same God under a new name ; they speak only of the horrors of the old idols and stress differences. It would be poor psychology to deprive the new gospel of its impact ; the abominations of the old, and the advantages of the new tidings must be scored. The horrors which the Moderni saw, or apparently saw, was the identification of admittedly incomplete concepts with the richness of reality. The Moderni did not preach that they had no quarrel with the Antiqui in regard to their common belief in the possibility of reaching universal knowledge ; on this point both agreed. Psychologically, the Moderni stressed the differences between themselves and the Antiqui. The former emphasized the Modern tenet of a preliminary but progressively perfectable character of concepts, the preliminary character of signification. While the Antiqui in practice — not in the ultimate

L f

analysis of theory — treated concepts more like cups made to order and big enough to contain reality supposed to be contained, the Moderni polemically insisted on the sign-character of the concept. The Antiqui on their part being human, did not concede to the Moderni that they agreed on the incompleteness of our concepts ; psychologically again, their defensive mood pushed them into a hot denial of the sign-character of concepts. Passing from the defensive to the offensive — always a very good tactic — the Antiqui, consciously or unconsciously, foisted on all Moderni, not only on the few revolutionary Modernists, the heresy that the possibility of reaching universal knowledge has to be despaired of.

Once the contention had started it reached a high degree of bitterness like all controversies in which both parties happen to be right. The Antiqui won the victory and wrote the history of this quarrel, but the « truth of victory » alas, is not always the « victory of truth ».

The Antiqui of the 15th century imputed the whole 14th century with nominalism, which in the beginning meant only a denial of universal knowledge. From the 15th century down to our own days the research in 14th-century theology has suffered from the incubus of nominalism.

If the research-worker cast himself in the role of defense lawyer his judgment got dangerously warped ; if he cast himself in the role of district attorney he only tried to prove a ready-made indictment with specific allegations.

In the course of time the bill of indictment against the 14th century was changed and lengthened to include as many points as there are letters in the word nominalism but having to do as little with the original indictment as the 10 letters of the word nominalism have with the issue of nominalism.

One may ask, for example, why the fashion of the 14th century to attribute such a sweeping scope to the possibility of divine intervention should be nominalism. Did not St. Anselm himself, one of the most popular authorities of the 14th century, initiate this disturbing reasoning without incurring the censure of nominalism ? Did not a few who held the Old view on knowledge in the 14th century play with the same uncomfortable thought ?

Obviously a radical application of the principle of the *potentia dei absoluta* has to act like an explosive, and leads to the errors condemned in 1347. But the remedy is not acceptance or refusal of

either universal or particular knowledge. Common sense is ; and common sense in theological language means reverence before the tradition of the Fathers.

This common sense had been abandoned by the *subtilitates* of the revolutionaries (Autrecourt, Mirecourt, Ulcredus, and Aston). That *subtilitas* was the main issue of the condemnations is said again and again by Peter Ceffons. That *subtilitas* stemmed from an abandoning of the Fathers in favor of logical games is made clear by a comparison between the warning of Clement VI and the answer of Peter Ceffons.

Pope Clement VI ⁴⁴⁾ on May 20, 1346 had issued a pessimistic warning against the logico-critical group and discouraged strongly their *subtilitates*. In September of the year, 1348, Ceffons ⁴⁵⁾ took issue with the Pope's warning and countered the pessimistic view with his own optimism. Ceffons does not identify the author of the pessimistic view but reading the two texts side by side it would seem that Ceffons had Pope Clement VI in mind.

Ceffons

Says the pessimist: Aliorum etiam dicta pertranseo qui asserunt quod ubi incipit *subtilitas* scientiaeque florere, ibi etiam ex quadam connexione floret malitia.

Says the optimist: Et si *subtilitas* alicubi decrescat et scientiae inventio, consequenter et *studium victoriae* strenuitasque decrescunt ; et si literati et literatura persecutionem sustineant et tribulationem et scientia reprimatur: vertitur quasi praesagium *ad damnum militiae* et ad incommodum regionis. Et si *studium scientiae* ab aliqua regione discedat, illius loci gloria et opulentia minuetur.

Clement VI

Plerique quoque theologi... de textu Bibliae originalibus et dictis sanctorum ac doctorum expositionibus... non curantes, philosophicis quaestionibus et aliis curiosis disputationibus et suspectis opinionibus doctrinisque peregrinis et variis se involvunt quae *nec domi nec militiae nec alicubi prosunt*, et omissis necessariis supervacua docere et dicere satagunt.

[On the indispensability of the Bible Ceffons has this to say (f. 14^r):

Multoties melius est allegare dicta gentilium et poetarum quam verba Sacrae Scripturae.]

⁴⁴⁾ Cf. F. EHRLE, *Der Sentenzenkommentar Peters v. Candia* (Münster 1925) 115 n. 1.

⁴⁵⁾ Cf. MS Troyes 62 f. 4^v (Primum Principium Petri de Ceffons). Similarly Peter explains « subtilitas » in his *Epistula ad Correctores* (Traditio 1956).

Whereas the Pope affirms that neglect of Bible and Fathers produces disputations which are of no practical value in civilian life or in the military camp (we are in the midst of the 100-Years War) Ceffons stresses the importance of *subtilitas* and sciences and literature for the knighthood of France and for its glory and opulence. A modern thinker would never bring *subtilitas* and *militia* together ; that both Ceffons and the Pope do cannot be explained unless Ceffons answered the Pope. Thereby *subtilitas* in Ceffons has to be interpreted as meaning neglect of Bible and Fathers as the Pope says.

Subtilitas which ignored the restraint of the Fathers and applied the disturbing thought of possible divine intervention to every sense experience, to every fact of the *unio hypostatica* and of justification, provided the magic hat from which the logicistic magicians around 1347 could draw every philosophical and theological error.

Common sense, reverence for the Fathers, could only be expected from the historical-minded among the 14th-century theologians. So far we formulate suppositions.

But here are facts. Peter Ceffons who hates the promoters of the condemnations of his fellow-Cistercian, Mirecourt, with a resentment close to fury indicts « three old foreign infernal witches » as the heresy hunters of 1347 and paints them with a very heavy brush in the *Epistula introductoria* of Ms Troyes 62. He does not lift the veil of anonymity from their identity. But within the Commentary of Ms Troyes 62 he returns several times to the personifications of his hate and animosity, uses the identical denunciatory words of the *Epistula*, and this time names the name of Gregory ! This time Gregory is connected with the heresy sleuths !

This is a surprising development. He who for centuries has been called the *antesignanus nominalistarum*, the standard bearer of the nominalists, may eventually be the standard bearer of the anti-nominalists, the promoter of those condemnations which fell upon the Modernists among the Moderns. The legend of Gregory will have to be reexamined with these new facts and on the basis of the Gregorian texts, now available to every medievalist.

Ceffons assigns as main issues of the condemnations *subtilitas* and consequently *evidentia*. Gregory is a representative of the historico-critical attitude, one of the best or the very best Augustine scholar of the Middle Ages, and therefore far away from the revol-

utionary *subtilitas*. From the Commentary of Gregory it results that he entered the lists and fought under the shield of St. Augustine for the *evidentia cognitionis rei particularis* ⁴⁶).

Up to now these Gregory texts have been read too often with the eyes of district attorneys in the law-suit of nominalism vs. realism. Perhaps if they are read within another historical context

⁴⁶) I can naturally not indicate all the passages of Gregory which deal with *evidentia*. Only one I reproduce (ed. 1522 [1955] f. 38N): Secundo quia secundum hoc sequitur quod naturaliter non posset haberi aliqua certitudo de existentia vel aliqua conditione contingenti alicuius rei sensibilis per viam sensus, nec per consequens per viam intellectus: quod videtur absurdum. Absurdum enim est quod non habeam naturaliter certitudinem utrum ignis qui comburit manum meam — posito quod ita sit — sit vere in rerum natura vel solum appareat. Immo quod plus est <absurdum> quod non sim certus quod ipse me calefaciat et comburat. Et utrum vos sitis hic et ego nunc loquar, et audiam vocem meam, et huiusmodi alia. Quibus positis perit omnis scientia cuius principia sumuntur a sensu, cum scientia sit certa et evidens notitia. Et quod plus est <absurdum> sequitur quod tota vita nostra et convictus inter homines non plus procedat ex certa evidentia quam opera eorum qui dormientes ex quibusdam visis in somnis corporaliter loquuntur, et aliam [= alia] exterius operantur: quae omnia penitus sunt absurda. Consequentia statim patet; quia ex quo sensatio huius haberi potest non praesente [*against Aureolus!*] et pari ratione non existente obiecto, non est possibile quod per illam notitiam sim certus quod ipsum existat, et sit praesens quando est, potius quam quando non est. — To prove Gregory's acquaintance with S. Augustine I would have to list all his Augustinian quotations. The reader of the edition, now available in reprint, can easily verify the many instances where Gregory is not satisfied with a few meagre words of Augustine but excerpts chapter after chapter *in succession*. Cf. ed. 1522 (1955) 37 Csq. where Gregory proves the priority (not primacy) of the cognitio rei particularis against St. Thomas with the texts of Augustine 2 De libero arbitrio cap. 6 <c. 3; PL 32: 1245>... et capitulo sequenti <cap. 3; PL 32: 1245>... Et addit [Augustinus]... et in fine capituli concludit <c. 4; PL 32: 1246>...

Cf. ed. 1522 (1955) 38 Hsq. where Gregory combats Aureolus with these Augustinian quotations: 15 De trinitate c. 10 et 3 lib. De academicis... 11 Confess. cap. 18 et 19... unde cap. 20... [PL 32: 819]. — The Augustinianism of Gregory must be taken seriously. Generally speaking the Augustinianism of the Augustinians was not a question of pure free choice. Their historical claims of an Augustinian foundation had always run into difficulties; the legal existence of the Order had been uncertain until a great pope, Boniface VIII, guaranteed the survival of an Order which in gratitude to the papacy supplied its most outspoken defenders. What was lacking in the historical claim of an Augustinian foundation had to be supplemented by a doctrinal Augustinianism so evident that nobody could question their being sons of St. Augustine. Augustinianism in the doctrinal sense was of vital importance, vital in its full meaning.

they will emerge as monuments of victory of *evidentia* over fideism or scepticism.

For us today it makes all the difference in the world that Gregory defended the *evidentia cognitionis rei particularis*. At such an « evidence » we may even scoff. But history must be written in context. In 1347 the Antiqui were nowhere in sight to defend the cause of evidence of any kind ; some Moderni must have shouldered the burden of defeating the revolutionaries among the logico-critical group. Why should it not have been Gregory who did belong to the historico-critical group, who had reverence for the Fathers, who believed in the *evidentia cognitionis rei particularis*, who could meet the adversaries on their own ground, protected as he was by the shield of St. Augustine ?

In that case we must find a plausible explanation for the bad name of Gregory. Historical misrepresentations do happen. The infamy of Ockham, the politician, blackened the fame of Ockham, the teacher. The sinister halo of Gregory probably came from a fusion of two strong animosities, the animosity of the Antiqui against one of the outstanding Moderni, and the animosity of sympathizers of Mirecourt against the promoter of the condemnations. This last antagonism died with the antagonists but the volume of dislike it had helped to create carried through the centuries an echo of Gregory which was all but flattering.

There were unimpeachable men amongst the sympathizers of Mirecourt. Peter d'Ailly made strong reservations in regard to justice and motives of the condemnations. Peter Ceffons had only condemnatory words for those who condemned and none for those who were condemned in 1347⁴⁷⁾.

*From Gregory to the Archetypus
From Montefalconius to Lucantonius*

The Gregory edition of 1522 (reprint 1955) comes from the presses of the efficient printers family De Giunta, natives of Florence, who have to their credit famous *editiones principes*, classical or otherwise, among them the renowned edition of Aristoteles-Averroes. Lucantonio de Giunta printed our Gregory Super Primum et Secundum at Venice in 1522.

⁴⁷⁾ Cf. below under *Klenkōk* p. 225, 228.

The promoter of the Gregory edition is the Augustinian Magister Augustinus Chiaravalle Montefalconius Tudertinus ⁴⁸). Perini describes his indefatigable activity as editor of the

Defensorium Aegidii Romani (Venice 1516 per heredes Scoti)
Super Primum Aegidii (Venice 1521 by the same printers)
Marsilius de Inghen and Paulus Venetus (same year and printer)
Gregorius Ariminensis (Venice 1522 by L. de Giunta).

In the dedication of this Gregory to Cardinal Dominicus Grimani our Montefalconius reports that he had learned:

in < Gregorii > archetypis < Ariminensibus > plurima contineri quae in ceteris impressis — sive adversariorum invidia sive quavis alia causa — fuerant praetermissa...

The source of this information, as Montefalconius says, was Magister Sebastianus Arimineus < Ariminensis > ⁴⁹). We therefore must consider the *archetypi* as *Ariminenses*. Rimini was the home convent and the scene of Gregory's teaching activity. Home convents of famous doctors prided themselves on the *archetypi* (good complete editions or copies) of their great sons.

Montefalconius in the dedication claims only that he saw to it that a *complete* Gregory would be printed enriched by passages missing in previous editions.

The passages which are new in our Gregory edition are clearly marked as such by a hand pointing at the beginning of the passage, and an undulating line running along the whole length of the passage down to its very end. Montefalconius makes a non-committal statement about the creator of these hands and these lines:

Ut autem facile occurrat quid haec nova excussio plus ceteris habeat, manus cum lineis protinus indicabit; quidquid enim lineis illis clauditur, in reliquis *codicibus* (!) fuerat praetermissum.

As the word « *codicibus* » intimates, these signs were not apposed by Montefalconius during a long and weary collation with other editions but were already found in the *archetypus Ariminensis*.

⁴⁸) Cf. D. PERINI, *Bibliographia Augustiniana* I (Firenze 1929) 224-25.

⁴⁹) PERINI I (1929) 32-33 lists two brothers: Ammiani Nicolaus and Ammiani Sebastianus: they might be nephews of our Magister Sebastianus Ariminensis because both are from Fano near Rimini, both students around 1550. Perini does not list any Magister Sebastianus around 1520.

Against this reduction of « editing » to less than a minimum speaks the fact that the new passages are often accompanied by marginal « excuses » (apparently of an editor !) to the address of the reader. Perusing these « excuses » one's first impression is that Montefalconius, or the printer, want to disculpate themselves before the reader.

But is it not interesting that the « excuses » are only in places where even the most hurried copyist *before* Montefalconius would have noticed an interruption of his text ? I give here a list ⁵⁰⁾ of the marginal « excuses » which all are found in places where the new passage has a phantastic beginning. Two texts begin with an absurd number out of all serial connection (cf. 4° and 16), two start with meaningless words (cf. *Motus. ut idem significet* and *Generationis creaturarum* < in a First Book ! >).

1. 87H (a variation parallel to 86Ns_q.) begins: 4° < should be: 2° > *deficit ratio...*

2. 68L (a variation parallel to 68Hs_q.) begins: 16 *ubi ait...*

3. 64D (a variation or rather exemplification for 63G) begins: *Motus. ut idem significet...*

4. 54Q (a variation for 55Qs_q.) begins like a text-unit of a 2 Sent. *Generationis creaturarum* <should be: *Generationis terminus* >

In all these cases any amanuensis would hesitate and check up the sequence of his text. In all these cases we have the following excuses on the margin (in small print), but not by *Montefalconius*, rather by the copyist of the *archetypus* of Rimini:

1. Reliquum non poterat legi in originali
2. Quamvis sensus sit imperfectus, non aliter habetur in originali
3. Sic sub sensu imperfecto in originali
4. Quamvis sensus illius *principii* (!) sit imperfectus, ita tamen habetur in originali ubi nihil mutare praesumpsimus.

⁵⁰⁾ We have not deleted the particulars on the edition of Gregory 1522 (1955) which the author gives because we hope to arouse some interest. — The *Cassiciacum* (American Series) has 100 copies of the Gregory edition 1522 (1955) which we inserted in our *Cassiciacum* in order to encourage the venture of *Franciscan Studies* and the editing house of Schöningh. To European confrères and to priest-friends we are willing to grant a chance to put *Gregorius* and *Alfonsus* on the desk of those who are anxious to promote studies in Augustinian Theology. Of the *Alfonsus* edition 1490 (*Cassiciacum* II: 1952) some copies are left. [Ed.]

The last « marginal excuse » sounds like the diction of a critical printer. But I can point out the beginning of a variation (60F, parallel to 67Ksq) where the sense is most strikingly and most extravagantly interrupted. Yet the amanuensis could not notice it in the first lines and therefore did not notice it at all. *As the reader may expect there is no « marginal excuse » at 60F.*

If Montefalconius had done any collating in order to appose the undulating lines he would have transposed those variations which are absolutely out of their places (in my list below no. 16, no. 38, no. 41). He would have noticed that no. 39 needed *two* undulating lines, being a variation *within* a variation. He would have found more *variant readings* than the lonely one on f. 17 F: subiectum] *alias* OBIECTUM, or f. 44P: reflexionem] *alias* RESPONSIONEM.

If Montefalconius were the creator of these signs (hands etc.) he would have adopted an altogether different system: small print for additions which do *not* disturb but smoothly continue the text; parallel print for variations. The undulating system of our reprint has the variation sometime *before*, sometimes *after*, the passage to be corrected or re-edited! If all indications are not misleading, our contention that Montefalconius did *not* invent the undulating lines, stands and holds. — The copyist of the *archetypus Ariminensis* is probably their creator, a fact important enough to be underscored; for it means that the print of 1522 is nothing but a printed *copy* of the *archetypus*. Neither de Giunta nor Montefalconius can be credited with, or suspected of, any great changes.

From Gregory to archetypus

Having excluded Montefalconius and de Giunta from any malversation of the Gregory texts we now have to go a step back and examine the activity of the amanuensis who *first* wrote the *archetypus*. This can be done without looking into the crystal ball. From the facts we establish when dealing with Michael de Massa and Simon de Cremona in the course of this article, we know what we are supposed to understand by « *Additiones* », a word which occurs frequently in the *Tabula* of the Gregory edition (i. e. in a Gregory MS).

Gregory had a *Lectura Lectoris* from the days of his early teaching which in the course of years had accumulated rich and

exact *marginalia* (names of quoted authors, *chapters* of quoted works etc.). Gregory added before and during his *Baccalareatus* « *Additiones* » that were much poorer in *marginalia* on account of the time element, as can still be seen in the edition of 1522.

But both the *Lectura Lectoris* (Here shortly: LL) and the *Additiones* (here: AA) had been written or copied with the time-saving technique of keeping text-units neatly within sexterni-units. This coincidence of text-unit = sexterni-unit (here shortly: $TU = SU$) made it possible at any time to insert the AA into the LL without waste of time or money. No amanuensis would have had any difficulty in copying such a complete *Lectura*, consisting of LL and AA.

Yet Gregory was never satisfied with his texts; he corrected, he lengthened, he recast small and great passages in the LL as well as in the AA (cf. no. 39 in list of *Additiones Supra Primum*). The margins were crowded by the quill of Gregory; reference-signs (triangles, hands etc.) referred from the text-marginalia to the spot in the column that was to absorb them.

Worse — and this at the moment is an assumption — Gregory was too penurious or too parsimonious to waste the *blanks at the pecia-ends* which a faithful employment of the technique $SU = TU$ entailed. Thereby Gregory caused a confusion among his texts that was beyond the ordinary amanuensis to unravel. Logically, it can be supposed that Gregory used the *pecia-ends* only for larger secondary additions.

With this assumption of Gregory's parsimonious procedure we can explain the vagabonding of larger secondary additions within our edition of 1522 (= archetypus). Small additions were shifted without difficulty from the margin to a close-by text-line. Larger additions, variations etc. were left alone by the unfortunate amanuensis who had to plow through Gregory's complete *Lectura* with its crowded margins and its crowded *pecia-ends*.

Let us explain this with factual observations made on the opening folia of the *Supra Secundum Gregorii* (ed. 1522) = $LL^2 + AA^2$.

- f. 1 [A]- 5 [O] was originally SU 1 of LL^2 (today quaestio 1)
- 6 [F]- 9 [D] was originally SU 2 of LL^2 (today quaestio 2)
- 9 [D]-11 [O] was originally SU 1 of AA^2 (today quaestio ?) ⁵¹⁾
- 11 [O]-15 [B] was originally SU 3 of LL^2 (today quaestio 3)
- 15 [B]-21 [D] was originally SU 4 of LL^2 (today quaestio 4)

⁵¹⁾ How the AA^2 were inserted into the LL^2 is patent and needs no explanation.

LL²: SU 1 (today: 1[A]-5[O])

Within SU 1 Gregory had put a few marginalia opposite the column that was to absorb them, namely 2[E] and 2[F]. He had recast the beginning of *articulus secundus* 3[F] but restricted himself to a short passage. When the complete *Lectura* was first copied, no difficulty was experienced in inserting those marginalia.

Trouble was brewing at the end of LL²: SU 1 where Gregory had used the *pecia-end* (originally a blank) to inscribe:

first, a variation to the conclusion of AA²: SU 1 (ed. 5P-6C || 11 Ksq !)
second, a variation to the opening of LL²: SU 1 (ed. 6C-6F || 1A-1D !)

The first copyist of the complete *Lectura* gave up in despair; the copyist of the *archetypus Ariminensis* changed nothing; Montefalconius changed nothing and felt not obliged to excuse himself on the margin !!

LL²: SU 2 (today: 6[F]-9[D])

Here there were no marginal additions nor a crowded *pecia-end*. Copying presented no difficulty.

AA²: SU 1 (today: 9[D]-11[O])

The same is true here. The peruser of the reprint 1955 will not overlook that the AA have practically no marginalia; not even text-divisions like *cclo. 1... cclo. 2* etc. — The chapter numbers of quotations from Augustine and others are *within* ⁵²⁾ the text-column while in the LL they are on the margins; because a *Baccalarius* did not use too many indirect quotations whose chapters had to be supplied or re-examined at a later date (?).

LL²: SU 3 (today: 11[O]-15[B])

Three small marginal additions were in Gregory's manual copy opposite the place they were to go to; the amanuensis of the

⁵²⁾ Alfonsus, Hugolinus, and Hiltalingen put the chapter numbers of Augustinian quotations into the text-column. But in order to re-examine or to verify chapter numbers of indirect quotations Alfonsus often felt compelled to leave an ugly blank within the column for the future number. These ugly blanks within the column were avoided by the system of Gregory.

first complete *Lectura* made no mistake ; today they are in ed. 1522 (1955): 13[B], 14[G], 14[E]. The last one would better follow 14[F] of which it is a variant.

It seems that there was a blank at the pecia-end which Gregory utilized for *two secondary additions to LL²: SU 4* ; one (today 15[D]-15[J]) explains what Gregory first thought needed no explanation « non prolixius declaro quia multum vulgata (cf. 15D) » ; the other improves upon a *ratio secunda*, today 16[L]-17[G] || 17Hsq. — The amanuensis must have found good reference signs to guide the insertion of these two secondary additions.

LL²: SU 4 (today: 15[B]-21[D])

Three small marginal additions were absorbed into the column-text correctly, today: 15[O], 16[K], 17[L]. A fourth, *today a parenthesis within* 19[J], was left on the margin by the first amanuensis of the complete *Lectura* !

The reason for leaving the « parenthesis » on the margin was the following:

The pecia-end of LL²: SU 4 had been utilized for two secondary additions, provided with good reference-signs to guide their insertion. One of these two was short (today 19[J]-19[K]), the other of the two was very long (today 19[L]-20[D]).

The reference-sign (some hand or triangle) for the short one guided to the same spot where the « parenthesis » was to be inserted. Thereupon the first amanuensis of the complete *Lectura* left the « parenthesis » on the margin. But once the two secondary additions had been shifted from the pecia-end into their indicated places, this marginal « parenthesis » was three long columns away from the place it was to occupy (today 20[D]).

When the next copyist — or even Montefalconius — came to this parenthesis, left on the margin, he desperately shifted it right into the opposite lines of the column where it created such a wonderful confusion that at this spot we read today the marginal « excuse »:

Istud quod clauditur lineis parenthesis erat in originali in margine, impertinens ut patet.

To strengthen my assumption about the penurious utilization of blank pecia-ends (which the technique of TU = SU imperatively demanded and which the absent-minded Gregory disastrously ignor-

ed) I list ⁵³⁾ the smaller and larger additions at the beginning of the *Supra Primum Gregorii*.

*Smaller and Larger Additions
at the Beginning of the Supra Primum Gregorii*

no. 1		27C			
no. 2		28A-28D			
no. 3	pecia-end ?	<<33C-33M>>			33Msq.
no. 4	end ?	34Q-35B			34N
no. 5		35D			
no. 6		35F			
no. 7		35J-35L	+		35Lsq.
no. 8		38A			
no. 9		<<38F-38H>>			38Hsq.
no. 10		38L			
	(quinta[38L] = quarta !)				
no. 11		38N		<<38N-38[O]>>	
no. 12		40J-40L			
	(more: Avicenna)				
no. 13		40M		<<40M>>	
no. 14		40[O]			
	(more: Aristoteles)				
no. 15		41E-41F			
	(more: Augustine)				
**no. 16		<<42M>>			42P
	(wide apart !)				
no. 17		43E-43G			
	(much more: Augustine)				

⁵³⁾ From the examination of this list which refers to the beginning of the *Supra Primum*, and the preceding paragraph of my article about the initial text-units of the *Supra Secundum* (cf. LL²: SU 1-4, and AA²: SU 1) the reader gets some preliminary directions on how to use the reprinted Gregory of 1955: Small additions may be expected as a rule to be in their right places; large ones, especially if found at the end of a text-unit, may be «vagabonds». One must carefully examine them in order to establish their rightful place. — The confusion of no. 3, no. 25, no. 38, in this list goes probably back to Gregory's unfortunate idea of utilizing *empty pecia-ends*. One might object that the same confusion would have happened if loose leaves (bearing the secondary additions) had somewhere been inserted by Gregory without exact reference-signs (hands, triangles etc.) to guide Gregory's first copyist. However, a strange coincidence must then be explained, namely, the reason why so many vagabonding additions are found at the end of text-units. Besides, far too often these vagabonding additions make the impression that the writer, Gregory, was forced to stop abruptly not because he ran out of ideas but because he ran out of parchment-space; if loose leaves had been utilized for secondary additions, these *abrupt conclusions* would seem less probable.

no. 18		<<43N-44A>>		44Asq.
no. 19		45G		
no. 20		45Q-46C	+	45N
	(an answer, promised in [45N]: Sed de hoc alias)			
no. 21		46E, 48Q		
	(more: Hieronymus)			
no. 22		<<50M-52J>>		52Jsq.
	(ADDITIO)			
no. 23		53P		
no. 24		54L		<<54M-54N>>
*no. 25	pecia-end ?	<<54Q-55Q>>		55Qsq.
	(Generationis CREATURARUM[54Q] = Generationis TERMINUS !)			
no. 26		56C		
no. 27		56F		
no. 28		56G		
no. 29		57E, H		
no. 30		57K		
no. 31		57M		
no. 32		58A		
no. 33		58B		
no. 34		<<58D-58F>>		58Fsq.
no. 35		58K-58M		
no. 36		59C		
no. 37		<<59P>>		59Q
**no. 38	pecia-end ?	<<60F-63D>>		67K-68G
	(separated by entire text-unit !)			
no. 39		<<61C-61F>>		61Fsq.
	(NOT MARKED AS SUCH !)			
no. 40		63N-63 [O]		
*no. 41		<<64D-64E>>		63G
	(wide apart !)			
no. 42		64L		
	(more: Commentator)			
no. 43		65C		
no. 44		66A		
no. 45		66D		
*no. 46		68H-68L		<<68L-69L>>
	(from pecia-end ?)			

..... = means an addition which continues the text without disturbance.

<< >> = means a variation for a *parallel* (= ||) text, found *either* before or after the variation.

+

* = means an ampliation which the text *needed*.

** = means presence of marginal excuses.

*** = absence.

With a few interlineary remarks I have tried to characterize the nature of additions as well as variations. The reader who has the reprint of 1955 in his hand will be able to judge for himself whether originally empty *pecia-ends* have anything to do with the text condition of our reprinted Gregory.

Authenticity of the Marginal Names in Gregory

Without previous examination of all the MSS of Gregory and without collation of his many editions it would seem arrogant to pronounce upon the historicity of the marginalia which are found in the Venice edition of 1522 (1955). I willingly concede that at the present moment not even the scrutiny of this one edition can be considered satisfactory. Yet it seems to me that I have enough indications to conclude that the edition of 1522 (1955) is a complete and authentic *Lectura* of Gregory, something like the *Lectura annotata*⁵⁴) of Hugolinus was before Simon de Cremona converted it into the *Lectura recollecta Hugolini*.

The copyists who touched our Gregory did so with such reverence as made them write on the margin of 54Q⁵⁵):

Nihil mutare praesumpsimus.

The care and concern devoted to these marginal names in the Gregory of 1522 (1955) is attested by many significant *minutiae*. The amanuenses who carried the marginal names from copy to copy put them in sharper relief by transmitting even anonymities. He who faithfully copied this marginale:

Doctor innominatus (34H, 34P),

knew that the authors Gregory quoted were always presenting exact credentials and personal identification cards. Whoever penned marginals like:

⁵⁴) Cf. below under *Simon de Cremona* p. 255 ff.

⁵⁵) Folia-numbers refer to the Super Primum of Gregory ed. 1522 (1955) unless when starred (*). In the ed. 1522 (1955) some folia numbers are missing: (5), (44), (56), (94), (118*); some folia numbers are wrong: 52=45, 75=74, 160=106, 127=126, 148=149, 47*=46*.

Sic allegat Thomas (60E, 51*O, 52*D),

was convinced that quotations were important enough to be traced back to the original sources ; if that tracing back was impossible at the moment at least the indirect source had to be exactly indicated for further reference. This is plainly stated in our Gregory 125Q:

Sic allegat Henricus 4 Quol. q. 5 ;

VIDENDUM IN ORIGINALI.

And on 45D: Ista auctoritas 10 Confess. [c. 15]

NON HABETUR IN ORIGINALI.

Verification of 10 Confess. [c. 15 ; PL 32: 789] shows, however, that the auctoritas does occur at the indicated place ; only some words are discordant. Here it becomes evident that the writer of this marginal note expected a more than ordinary degree of source-erudition and source-treatment.

These observations could be multiplied in the case of our Gregory. But the ordinary reader may not yet be disposed to attribute such quoting enthusiasm to a Gregory of the 14th century. One is inclined rather to invent some utopain « later editor » and credit him, not Gregory, with the interest and the erudition which breathe from the margins of Gregory. Such utopian thinking has to bow before the facts. Whenever we have a chance to check up on the claims of so-called « later editors » we find them hollow. I use as example the often mentioned MS Troyes 62 which contains the *Lectura* of the Cistercian Peter Ceffons, « edited » and « corrected » according to the directions of Peter himself. The « editor », however, did so little « editing » that all the directions which Peter gave the « editor » by marginal hints, have been naively shifted from the margin into the text even when and where they were patently ignored as the reader of MS Troyes 62 detects again and again to his greatest amusement.

Our Montefalconius, too, as we have seen, did not do much « editing » ; we can understand that the miraculous volume of his « editing » activity — five works in six years — could not be done except by « long-distance control ».

Under such circumstances it is much more plausible to credit the marginal notes of Gregory to Gregory himself, aided perhaps by a Socius. In the 14th century we find the love for text erudition

which makes it plausible ; the 15th century was far away from that ideal because the theologians comfortably limited their interest to one Doctor noster.

To give this theorizing the impact of conviction I want to point out the improbabilities and incongruities involved by the bland invention of utopian « later editors ».

Gregory quotes a *Monachus* whom no one but Gregory himself, or at least a close contemporary of Gregory, could have possibly identified with a marginal name and chapter-and-verse quotation. This *Monachus* was completely unknown from a date preceding Johannes Maior by some 50 years (ca. 1450) down to our days when by some lucky chance I could identify the *Monachus*. In this case a « later editor » around 1450 is completely impossible because the *Monachus* belonged to the Moderni, and the Schola Moderna was dead by then.

Gregory and the Monachus Niger

Gregory quotes (149P): *Monachus* q. 2 art. 3
 (171D): *Monachus* q. 3 art. 1
 (43°F): *Monachus* q. 4 art. 1

By chance I came across an anonymous MS Fribourg Cordeliers 26 which contains 10 Quaestiones (f. 83^r-136^r), written in English essay-style and copied by an English hand. These anonymous Fribourg Quaestiones contain the *Monachus*-quotations of Gregory at the place Gregory indicates and with the very words Gregory adduces. I give a list of the Fribourg Quaestiones later in this article. This is the concordance between Gregory and the Friburgensis:

Gregory 149P: *Monachus* q. 2 art. 3 = Friburgensis q. 2 art. 3 f. 92^{rv}
 171D: *Monachus* q. 3 art. 1 = Friburgensis q. 3 art. 1 f. 98^v
 43°F: *Monachus* q. 4 art. 1 = Friburgensis q. 4 art. 1 f. 106^{rv}

Our *Monachus* is quoted by:

1. Richardus Chillington (MSS Paris Nat. lat. 15561 f. 218^v; 14576 157^v)
2. Gregory
3. Revocatio Nicolai de Ultricuria (ed. J. Lappe [BB VI, 2 ; Münster 1908] 41*)
4. Johannes Klenkok, O. E. S. A., Baccalarius Oxoniensis (1354)
5. Johannes Hiltalingen de Basilea, Bacc. Parisiensis (1365-66)

6. <Fridericus de Ratisbona, O. Min. > MS Fribourg Cord. 26 f. 206^v, 207^r

7. Angelus Dobelin, O. E. S. A., Bacc. Parisiensis ca. 1374

8. Johannes Maior, Historia Maioris Britanniae [Paris 1521] f. 8^r

The complete identification of the Monachus implies several steps: Monachus = M. Niger = Friburgensis = Ulcredus = Uhtred.

1. Chillington identifies: Monachus = M. Niger != Friburgensis ?

2. Gregory identifies: Monachus = Friburgensis !

3. The Revocatio identifies: M. Niger = Friburgensis ? = Wicierus !

4. Klenkok identifies: M. Niger = Friburgensis ? = *Ulcredus Dunelm.* = Uhtred ?

5. Hiltalingen identifies: M. Niger = Friburgensis != *Ulcredus Dunelm.* ?

6. <Fridericus> identifies: M. Niger = Uhtred !

7. Dobelin identifies: Friburgensis = *Ulcredus Dunelm.* ?
Friburgensis = Wicierus !

Wherever I put a question mark in this synopsis I want to indicate that absolute and unexceptionable certainty is not available.

1. Chillington ⁵⁶⁾ calls his source Monachus Niger, and *probably* refers to the Friburgensis.

2. Gregory leaves no doubt about the identification of the Monachus with the Friburgensis, but he does not call him Ulcredus.

3. At the end of a Cedula ⁵⁷⁾ of Nicolaus de Ultricurua from the year 1342 (Lappe 41*) we read: Et dictas quaestiones, et multa alia opera sua < Nicolai > dicuntur habere quidam monachus M[...] Ordinis sancti Benedicti, qui vocatur Wicierus. I conjecture: *quidam monachus Niger Ordinis sancti Benedicti qui vocatur Ulclerus*. We may identify Ulclerus with the Friburgensis; for if we are looking for an « alter Ultricurius » to repeat Autrecourt-statements in undiluted form we can find no better one than the Friburgensis ⁵⁸⁾.

⁵⁶⁾ The text of Chillington in q. 3 of his *Quaestiones theologales* (MS Paris Nat. lat. 15561 f. 218^v) reads: ... licet conclusio concedatur a Monacho Nigro qui probat quod idem homo numero possit simul et semel esse Romae et Parisius. Et probat sic... The MS Paris Nat. lat. 14576 f. 157^v has the same text with a little variation. Chillington has no chapter-and-verse quotation of the Monachus Niger but probably refers to the Friburgensis (q. 2 or q. 4). — More about Chillington on p. 246.

⁵⁷⁾ The passage « Et dictas quaestiones... vocatur Wicierus » originally was not in the text of the Cedula but stood on the margin as a marginal note; only later was this passage shifted into the text.

⁵⁸⁾ For Autrecourt-passages found in the Fribourg Quaestiones cf. later in this article, under Klenkok p. 236.

Whether this proves that the Fribourg-Quaestiones were already published under a veil of anonymity so thin that the Paris authorities knew about the identity of the Friburgensis, may be left undecided ⁵⁹). The contents of the Friburgensis makes it very probable that here we are dealing with the « quidam monachus Niger Ordinis sancti Benedicti qui vocatur Ulclerus », that is with the person so intensely interested in the works and doctrines of Autrecourt.

4. Klenkok ⁶⁰) was the Socius Baccalarii Monachi Nigri Ulcredi Dunelmensis (1354-55). What Klenkok says about his Socius does not refer to the Fribourg Quaestiones with unexceptionable clarity. Klenkok knows several points of doctrine of the Ulcredus Dunelmensis and acquaints his German fellow-Augustinians with them.

5. Hiltalingen ⁶¹) quotes a *Magister Monachus Niger* who is definitely the Friburgensis; he also quotes a *Magister Monachus Niger Ulcredus*, to all appearances the same as the *Magister Monachus Niger*. But this Ulcredus is taken from Klenkok, not from the Fribourg Quaestiones. Absolute certainty is not available about identification of the Friburgensis with Ulcredus.

6. Fridericus de Ratisbona, O. Min., was very probably at Oxford; he calls Klenkok « Reverendus Pater Klenkok » and the

⁵⁹) If the Parisian authorities knew about the Autrecourt-tendencies which Wicierus professed *because* Wicierus had already published the Friburgensis the date of publication of the Friburgensis would fall between 1341 and 1342. Wicierus [= Uthred] became a Monachus Niger in the year 1341 cf. MARCETT 2. — The latest studies on Uthred are: M. E. MARCETT, *Uthred de Boldon, Friar William Jordan, and Piers Plowman* (privately printed and distributed New York 1938). — W. A. PANTIN, *Two Treatises of Uthred of Boldon on the Monastic Life*, in: *Studies in Medieval History pres. to F. M. Powicke* (Oxford 1948) 363-85. — M. D. KNOWLES, *The Censured Opinions of Uthred of Boldon*, in: *Proceedings of the British Academy XXXVII* (London 1955) 305-42. [Knowles reedits the *Contra querelas fratrum* and prints in parallel paragraphs: 1. the « heresies » disclaimed by Boldon, and 2. the « censures » emanating from Simon Langham, archbishop of Canterbury. He can thereby prove that the « heresies » and the « censures » are to be identified. — The learned paper starts with an introduction (307-10) which paints the Oxford of 1325-1375 in very dark and pessimistic colors. I doubt the justification and rightfulness of such a pessimism]. [I thank Miss M. E. Marcett for a gracious gift-copy of her dissertation and for her kindness to lend me her copy of the article of Knowles].

⁶⁰) About Klenkok's reaction to the Friburgensis cf. later in this article p. 235 ff.

⁶¹) Hiltalingen quotes the Monachus Niger Clm 26711 f. 95^r and 196^r; he quotes the Monachus Niger Ulcredus f. 339^v.

latter talks about a Lector Minorum who seems to be a friend or countryman. Fridericus very probably bought the Fribourg Quaestiones at Oxford, but he did not identify the writer. There is an old erased possessor's name over the Fribourg folium 82^r. Fridericus in his own, also anonymous because daring, Commentary calls one of his sources Dominus Ulcredus Monachus, and again Dominus Ulcredus Monachus (MS Fribourg Cordeliers 26 f. <modern> 206^v and 207^r) but he clearly refers to the champion in the English poverty quarrel, and to the accademic teacher, Uhtred, not to the Friburgensis.

7. Angelus Dobelin knows the Magister Ulcredus and Magister Ultridus de Dunelmino only from extant and lost works of Klenkok. So far I have not been able to locate his rich Ulcredus quotations in the Friburgensis. While on the one hand Angelus knows no more than Klenkok, on the other he makes a definite identification of the *Wicierus* with the Friburgensis. The story is too long to be told here; I have to publish it in my larger study.

8. For John Major [Historia Maioris Britanniae (Paris 1521) f. 8^r], an otherwise well informed chronicler, the Monachus is not even a glorious name on the roster of the Oxonian doctors. He copies a list of Oxonian doctors from an older document but uses an interpunction so misleading that I had to correct it (with []) because John Major's interpunction identifies the Monachus with John Rodington. This is the passage ⁶²⁾ which John Major incorporates:

Haec universitas emisit utpote Alexandrum Halensem, Richardum Middiltonum, Joannem Duns Doctorem subtilem, Ockam, Adam [Hibernicum], Ro. Holkotum, Bokinham, Eliphatum, Clementonem Langley, Joannem Roditon [Monachum Anglicanum], Suiset calculatorem acutissimum, Heutisbertum dialecticum exercitatissimum, Strodum, Bravardinum, et plerosque alios.

To follow the footsteps of the Monachus over the pages of contemporary and later documents is certainly an exciting experience. For the moment the identification of Gregory's Monachus with

⁶²⁾ The passage is quoted by J. LECHNER, *Johannes v. Rodington, O. F. M., und sein Quodlibet de conscientia*, in: *Aus der Geisteswelt des Mittelalters* (BB Suppl. III, 2 Münster 1935) 1129 n. 30. Lechner could not explain why Rodington should be a Monachus Anglicanus.

Uhtred⁶³) may be left aside ; for our purpose here it is enough to have proved the identity between Gregory's Monachus and the Friburgensis. Even this identification depended on a number of strokes of good luck. Chance had to bring the microfilms from different libraries together ; chance had to direct their examination in a definite pattern. I had Gregory's chapter-and-verse quotation to guide and help me in tracing the Monachus.

Could an utopian « later editor » of Gregory have done the same without the aid of any chapter-and-verse quotation ? For a « later editor », confronted with an unidentified text-passage in Gregory, is supposed to recognize this unidentified passage immediately as belonging to the Monachus ; then he is supposed to find a Monachus although the extant MSS of the Monachus demonstrate his having travelled incognito ; finally he is supposed to find chapter-and-verse in an anonymous MS like our Friburgensis.

Under these circumstances historical reasoning must come to the conclusion that an utopian « later editor » has to be discarded because no margin of probabilities, however slim, is in his favor. Gregory must therefore be credited with his due: the quotations are in his Commentary, the quotations are his.

Tentative List of Marginalia in Sent. 1-2 of Gregory

(* = Marginale in Sent. 2)

Adam <Goddam>

29: O, 31C, 102G, 166D,
34*B, 36*P, 55*P, 56*J, 66*B,
80*D, 92*G, 97*E, 97*O,

Secunda Lectura: 3M, 25H,
36G, 113*A, 113*J

Lectura Lugd.: 13J

= *Lectura Londr.*: 88*B

Aegidius, Doctor noster, Dominus

17C, 34E, 35B, 64L, 75F,
82: O, 105B, 105H, 106H,
122: O, 154G, 155N, 168G,
180L, 40*D, 41*C, 45*E,
71*M, 86*N

Al<n>vic

12*C, 38*C

Altissiodorensis (otherwise
in text):

45*E

Anglici (adhuc aliqui viventes)
163D

Anonymus = Do. inno. (?),
Doctor innominatus

34H, 34P

Audifax

26L

Aureolus

2H, 3B (knows no Augustine!), 13L, 17K, 23E, 23N,
28D, 28L, 34G, 38C, 41G,
47B (om), 50: O, 55G, 57D,
59D, 63E, 68: O, 75A, 81K,
82F, 86N, 118E, 120: B, 123:

⁶³) More about the identification of Monachus and Uhtred later p. 235 ff.

- O, 128F, 128J, 130C, 136C,
 144E, 147Q, 151Q, 152D,
 178G, 3*F, 11*B, 22*K, 22*N,
 25*K, 44*D, 48*M, 53*M,
 55*P, 61*E, 75*M, 79*M,
 79*P, 122*K
 <Bernardus> *Oliverius* 8G
Bochikam <Tho. Bucking-
 ham>
 163: O
Burlaeus
 28*E[96: O], 107L
Caton <Chatton>
 53L, 101Q, 22*L (?)
Climenton 94: O, 139A
 Cluiton sophisma: 36*K
 Johannes Climenton: 115K
Durandus
 24J, 29N, 32M
 Durandus 2^o opere: 55*O
Franciscus de Marchia
 5H, 5M, 5P
 Franciscus de Esculo 50Q
Garro
 64: O
Girardus Novariensis
 168A
Gothofridus
 107L
Gualterus
 96: O [cf. *Burlaeus*]
Guillelmus de Bello Monte Ord.
 Min.
 127*Q
Henricus Gan.
 11: O, 56D, 122: O, 126Q,
 139K, 11*Q, 36*Q (Dominus
 = *Hibernicus*)
Hentisbry
 4K
Hervaeus
 1*D, 6*E, 8*O
Hibernicus
 165E, 166D (quaest. De reve-
 latione), 167E, 12*F, 35*N,
 36*D, 40*L, 41*H, 44*H,
 45*E, 50*E, 51*P, 85*P,
 111*Q, [36*Q]
Johannes de Lana [O. E. S. A.]
 7N, 7Q
Michael de Massa Ord. nostri
 10N, 11A
Monachus <Niger Dunelmensis
 Ulcredus>
 149P (q. 2 art. 3)
 171D (q. 3 art. 1)
 43*F (q. 4 art. 1)
Ockham
 1D, 8J, 13J, 17L, 23E, 23M,
 26L, 35M, 45Q (editor
 doubts); 53N, 55G, 57F, 64N,
 75G, 78M, 79J, 81K, 82F,
 82: O, 119A, 120A, 126N,
 130H, 135P, 135Q, 138Q,
 150E, 152K, 165E, 169J,
 180: O, 34*H, 41*E, 44*G,
 59*G, 70*J, 72*A, 85*H,
 87*A, 92*G, 97*N
Petrus de Tarentasia
 45*E
Praepositinus
 126N, 45*E
Scotus
 15F (1^a Lectura et Rep.), 16:
 O, 17G, 17H, 18H, 23D,
 26M, 28: O, 33D, 35L, 59:
 O, 60C (Rep.), 64M, 65P,
 66F (formalitates), 74E, 74G
 (Rep.), 74J (Rep. also in text),
 78A, 78G, 79H (Rep.), 79: O,
 81J, 82F, 95: O, 96Fsq, 101P,
 118A, 119Q, 126L, 133K,
 133Q, 134B, 139F, 139L,
 141C, 141E, 152C, 168G,
 179K, 180: O.
 1*D, 6*E, 8*MN, 33*L (in
 text), 40*N, 41*D, 44*E, 51*P,
 52*J, 53*N, 70*E, 72*B,
 79*P, 87*Q, 91*Q, 92*G,
Thomas Anglicus
 95*K, 97*M, 114*M
 1*D, 6*F
Thomas de Argentina 1 Sent.
 d. 41 q. 1 art. 1
 157Q

Thomas Bradwardin

105*K, 125*N

O, 122: O, 124G, 126L, 139K.

154F (Divus), 155A, 180L.

S. Thomas

6K, 10C, 11: O, 28: O, 34E,

40*D, 41*C, 44*D, 45*E,

35J, 47M, 47N, 47P, (47P:

46*N, 51*P, 69*A, 69*H,

editor defends Th.), 60E,

71*M, 79*B, 79*J, 87*G,

64L, 74: O, 80: O, 82F, 82:

118*B

*Socii Gregorii et chronologica*1. *Albertus Praedicator:*

106*Bsq., 106*L, 107*A,

108*H

[*Praedicator:* 57*K, 57*N,

124*D]

2. *Franciscus de Trivisio,*

O. P.:

57*K, 57*N, 124*D

3. *Guillelmus de Bello Monte*

O. Min.: 127*Q

4. *Johannes Scotus:*

57*H, 57*K, 57*Q,

64*Hsq, 64*M

[VESPERIAE et QUOL. *Gregorii:*

111*BC; his own name:

64*P]

<Magistri Monachi Nigri Ulcredi Boldon Dunelmensis>

*Quaestiones seu Determinationes:*MS Fribourg Cordeliers 26 f. 82^r-142^v

(= Modern foliation: 140-142 blank)

82^r Utrum omnis credens non sicut ecclesia credit erret in credendo necessario ad salutem. Quod non quia in aliquibus necessariis ad salutem aliquis non tenetur credere sicut ecclesia credit vel tenetur credere

82^v In ista quaestione erunt tres articuli, primus erit respondere ad quaestionem; *secundus* Utrum ad habitum credendi [83^r] vel [in] quocumque alio habitu morali stet error in intellectu respectu illorum ad quae habitus inclinatur [83^v-84^v]; *tertius* [articulus] erit movere dubia [84^v-86^v].

86^v Utrum circumstantia temporis gratiae ex se causet aliquam bonitatem in opere virtuoso. Quod sic; omnis circumstantia ex se addit aliquam bonitatem vel malitiam operi cui annectitur

87^r In ista quaestione erunt tres articuli; *primus* Utrum aliquis habitus virtuosus determinet sibi certas circumstantias sine quibus esse non possit; *secundus* Utrum homo per aliquod tempus notabile possit multos actus aequae intensos vel re-

missos efficere [89^v-91^v] ; *tertius* articulus erit movere dubia circa dicta [91^v-96^r].

96^r Utrum ex hoc quod caro Christi fuit formata in instanti et [Q 3] eodem instanti unita Verbo sequatur deum esse infinitae virtutis intensive qui hoc fecit. Quod sic quia si esset virtus in magnitudine et moveret caelum et moveret illud in instanti

96^r In ista quaestione erunt tres articuli ; *primus* erit Utrum circumscripta fide possit probari deum esse infinitae virtutis intensive evidenter ; *secundus* erit Utrum possit probari evidenter aliquam puram creaturam esse bonitatis vel malitiae infinitae intensive [102^r-104^v] ; *tertius* articulus est videre Utrum creatura aliqua possit agere in instanti [104^v-105^v].

105^v Utrum posito quod Beata Virgo fuisset in originali per in- [Q 4] stans potuerit deus immediate post illud instans eam munda-
dasse ab originali. Et probo quod non quia sit idem instans
A et quaero

105^v In ista quaestione non intendo investigare Utrum Beata Virgo Maria fuerit concepta in peccato originali vel non, quia maior difficultas eius dependet ex dictis sanctorum eo quod veritas illius soli deo cognita est sicut credo, ad minus non tale patet viatori. Verumtamen melius credo quod non concepta sit propter redemptorem et ipsius Matris reverentiam. *Primo* intendo investigare Utrum deus possit immediate post aliquod instans certum dandum aliquam rem spiritualem vel corporalem producere totam simul. *Secundus* articulus est investigare istum modum loquendi [108^r] <immediate> post hoc instans erit aliud instans immediate et <tamen> nullum instans erit immediate post hoc instans et huiusmodi [107^v-109^v] ; *tertius* articulus est movere dubia [109^v-111^v].

111^v Circa distinctionem 12 Tertii Libri in qua Magister tractat [Q 5] Utrum Christus potuerit peccare et circa Principium Quarti in quo tractat de Sacramentis quaero :

Utrum Christus tenebatur ad praecepta divina et ad susceptionem sacramentorum vel sacramenti sub paena actus peccati ita quod si non observasset praecepta nec suscepisset sacramenta peccasset. Et arguo primo quod non

111^v In ista quaestione erunt tres articuli ; *primus* erit Utrum deus possit praecipere homini omne illud quod ipse meritorie possit facere ; *secundus* Utrum sit aliquod opus supererogationis ad quod homo non tenetur [113^v-117^v] ; *tertius* articulus erit respondere ad formam quaestionis quae fuit Utrum tenebatur ad praecepta divina vel susceptionem sacramentorum sub paena peccati ita quod si hoc non fecisset quod peccasset [117^v-120^v].

120^v Circa distinctionem 37 Tertii in qua Magister tractat de

[Q 6] decem praeceptis decalogi et <circa> Principium Quarti ubi tractat de institutione sacramentorum quaero istam quaestionem:

Utrum leges, ordinatae inter fideles ad puniendum transgressores praeceptorum decem et contemptores sacramentorum ecclesiae, obligent conscientias hominum ad earum observationem. Et probó quod non

120^v In ista quaestione erunt tres articuli breves quorum *primus* erit videre Utrum sit de veritate legum quod de probatis legitime secundum formam legis — sive illa probata sint vera sive non — fiat executio ; *secundus* articulus est videre Utrum declinans malum solum timore paenae et non amore iustitiae sit iustus [123^r-124^r] ; *tertius* articulus est videre Utrum iudex sententiens secundum probata canonice coram eo cum debitis circumstantiis requisitis, peccet [124^r-124^v].

124^v Circa distinctionem 8 Quarti Libri in qua tractat ut videtur [Q 7] de sacramento altaris quaero istam quaestionem:

Utrum beatus in patria possit distincte cognoscere quando sub accidentibus panis est Corpus Christi et quando substantia panis. Et probó quod non

125^r In ista quaestione erunt duo articuli quorum *primus* erit respondere ad formam quaestionis et ad argumenta principalia ; et *secundus* Utrum beatus possit videre in Verbo aliquid non pertinens ad eius beatitudinem essentialem [127^r-128^r].

128^r Circa distinctionem 19 huius Quarti in qua incipit Magister [Q 8] tractare de sacramento paenitentiae quaero istam quaestionem:

Utrum in aliquo existente in peccato mortali et de illo paenitente requiratur contritio vel confessio secundum leges communes ad hoc quod eius peccatum deleatur. Et probó primo quod non

129^r In ista quaestione erunt duo articuli, *primus* Utrum contritio et confessio ad hoc quod sit meritoria ad delendum culpam mortalem vel ad merendum praemium in patria, requiratur quod fiat in caritate ; *secundus* erit respondere ad formam quaestionis et ad argumenta principalia [129^v-131^r] ; sic patet de tota *quaestione*

131^r Circa distinctionem 43 huius Quarti in qua incipit Magister [Q 9] tractare de resurrectione et extremo iudicio quaero istam quaestionem:

Utrum deus possit hominum corpora resuscitare ad modum quo creditur ea resuscitari sine aliquo alio miraculo ab illo quod sit in <sic> resuscitando. Probó quod non

131^v *Determinatio quaestionis*. In ista quaestione erunt duo articuli, *primus* erit Utrum in resurrectione generali resurgent aliqua corpora quae numquam fuerunt ante istam resurrectionem corpora humana ; et *secundus* erit Utrum per sen-

tentiam datam a iudice aliquod bonum accresceret bonis et aliquod malum malis [132^r-134^r].

134^r Circa distinctionem 45 in qua Magister tractat de suffragiis [Q 10] defunctorum quaero:

Utrum per suffragia facta ab omnibus fidelibus hic pro animabus existentibus in purgatorio animae istae citius liberentur a paena quam si non fierent illa suffragia pro illis. Et probo quod non

134^r *Determinatio quaestionis*. In ista quaestione erunt duo articuli, *primus* erit videre Utrum specialia suffragia specialiter facta pro certis personis vel animabus existentibus in paena purgatorii plus valeant illis pro quibus specialiter fiunt quam aliis aequae bonis pro quibus specialiter non fiunt et qui tantum in hac vita meruerunt sicut illi; *secundus* erit respondere ad formam quaestionis et ad argumenta principalia [135^r-136^r; et sic patet de quaestione et *per consequens de toto* !]

136^r [Sequitur Tabula in praedictas quaestiones sive Determinationes] Gratia Domini nostri Jesu Christi cum spiritu vestro fratres. Amen.

[Adam] Quod a tempore peccati Adae...

139^r *Timor*

Sequitur TOTUM (last words; there is no Tabula on the rest).

139^r *In augmentatione communiter dicta*, est pro principio supponendum quod velocitas in augmentatione attenditur penes maximum acquisitum, hoc est illud velocius augmentatur quod in aequali tempore acquirit maiorem quantitatem. Ex quo principio sequitur... = QUAESTIO DE AUGMENTATIONE: *explicit truncata* (139^v).

[Handwriting: the same English hand of 1350]

The preceding ten Quaestiones are Determinationes on the *Third* and *Fourth* Book of Lombard; QQ 5-10 say so specifically, QQ 2-4 suggest that by their contents. Q 1 alone might create the doubt whether it originally belonged to this « Commentary ».

However, the subject matter of Q 1 being « faith » it is likely that Q 1 was supposed to comment Lombard's 3 Sent. dist. 23 ff. While the text proper of this « Commentary » starts *all* questions *without* a serial number, the Tabula has some references to serial numbers which correspond to the actual ones in our « Commentary ».

Cf. <i>Anima</i> :	Q. 2 art. 2
<i>Credere</i> :	Q. 1 art. 1
	Q. 1 art. 3
<i>Circumstantia</i> :	Q. 2
	Q. 2 art. 3
<i>Cognitio</i> :	Q. 1 art. 2
<i>Errare</i> :	Q. 1 art. 1

<i>Esse</i> :	Q. 2 art. 3
<i>Habitus</i> :	Q. 1 art. 2
	Q. 2 art. 3 dubio 2
<i>Instans</i> :	Q. 4
<i>Peccatum</i> :	Q. 8 art. 1
	Q. 8 art. 2
<i>Resurrectio</i> :	Q. 9 art. 1
	Q. 9 art. 2
<i>Suffragia</i> :	Q. 10
	Q. 10 art. 1

One might brush off these serial references of the *Tabula* as the work of the *amanuensis*, who not finding a serial numeration in the QQ, was anxious to supply it himself. But one glance into the *Tabula* shows that the *amanuensis* never compared the data of the *Tabula* with the actual text because he made mistakes which the most cursory collation could have avoided. The opposite is true: the *amanuensis* omitted serial numbers because there are many « *ibidem* » which suppose a preceding serial number but are not preceded by a serial number in our actual *Tabula*.

Thus we are justified in considering this « Commentary » as complete. A reference of Gregory of Rimini to our « Commentary » proves that at least the first four QQ have the original serial number; cf. Gregory 2 Sent. dist. 3-5 q. 1 art. 1 (1955) 43^F where he refers to *Monachus* q. 4 art. 1 quoting a long text which corresponds exactly to MS Fribourg Cordeliers 26 f. 106^v and coincides exactly with the serial numbers of our « Commentary ».

MSS of this Commentary

Fribourg Cordeliers 26 f. 82^r-142^v: Anon.

Erfurt CA 2° 132 f. 38-73: Anon. Sent. q. 1-11

Paris Nat. lat. 15561 f. 248-266: Anon. I-IV Sent. q. 1-10.

These last two MSS are supplied by Stegmüller's *Repertorium Lombardi* I (1947) 444 no. 993. From Stegmüller's indications it becomes clear that the Erfurt and Paris MSS have the ten Questions of our « Commentary » in our serial sequence; but the Erfurt MS has an eleventh question at the beginning which does not belong to our « Commentary ». This additional Question has the title: *Utrum veritatis visione libertas videatur in homine*.

It is found among the Questions of *Osbertus Anglicus* and *Xiberta*, [*De scriptoribus* s. XIV O. Carm. (1931) 248 ff.] has discussed its authenticity and contents (p. 279).

Author of this « Commentary »

The anonymity of the three MSS does not eclipse the name of

the author completely. At the head of the Fribourg text is a proprietor's remark which under special light, with modern equipment, might still be legible and furnish valuable information. The Paris MS 15561 does have an identification of the author, namely *Monachus*, although not over the text, but over an old *Tabula* which is incomplete and crossed out on fol. 248 (third column and third quarter of the column). While the *amanuensis* started the text of our « Commentary » on the *fourth* column of MS Paris 15561 f. 248 he intended to list the ten questions on a blank space of the *third* column of f. 248, one by one as he went along copying. He put actually in this blank space of the *third* column:

Tabula super MONACHUM

Utrum quilibet non sicut ecclesia credit, erret in credendo necessaria ad salutem.

The rest of the ten questions he could not list in the *third* column because he omitted some text at the bottom of 248,4 and needed the blank of 248,3 for repairing his omission ! Therefore he crossed out

Tabula super Monachum... necessaria ad salutem ;
but even so the *amanuensis* gave us the definite information that the author of our « Commentary » is a MONACHUS ⁶⁴).

About the importance of this « *Monachus* » the *amanuensis* of MS 15561 gave us another important hint: after having crossed out the incipient *Tabula* on f. 248,3 he put over the beginning of the text proper (f. 248, 4) the words: *Tabula. Hunc habeto perfecte !* indicating that the study of the « *Monachus* » was considered necessary, during the Schism because Lechner dates the MS 15561 as AD 1378-94 (cf. Lechner 1133). — The ten questions of our « Commentary » are found twice in MS 15561, once in the form of an amplified *Tabula* (f. 248, 4 - 251, 1) and again in the form of an abbreviation (f. 251-266).

In the amplified *Tabula* only the *septima*, *octava*, and *nona* have serial numbers which mostly correspond to the ones established in MS Fribourg Cordeliers 26. Q 1-10 of the amplified *Tabula* are on

- 248,4 = Q. 1
- 249,1 = Q. 2
- 249,3 = Q. 2 art. 2
- 250,1 = Q. 3
- 250,1 = Q. 4
- 250,2 = Q. 5

⁶⁴) LECHNER (BB Suppl. III, 2 Münster 1935) 1132-1138 gave a very careful description of MS Paris Nat. lat. 15561 but missed the small precious item: *Tabula super Monachum* because the *Monachus* was as completely unknown to Lechner as to everybody else.

250,2 = Q.	6 art. 1 ; Q. 6 art. 2 ; Q. 7	[MS puts <i>septima</i> in wrong place]
250,2 = Q.	8	[MS has <i>octava</i>]
250,3 = Q.	9	[MS has <i>nona</i>]
250,3 = Q.	10	

1. What precedes is not the complete text of the questions but only an amplified Tabula ; therefore the amanuensis headed the amplified Tabula with *Tabula: hunc <Monachum> habeto perfecte* ; and on 251,1 (after an erased Index of Chillington cf. Lechner 1137) he says:

Tabula magis explicamus materias seu extractiones *quedam* <= quae est !> non opus nec tertia pars operis ut patet ex scripto <Monachi>.

2. What follows in MS 15561 (f. 251-266) is an abbreviation of the ten questions that follow one another in the exact sequence of MS Fribourg Cordeliers 26 ; the titles of the questions are also identical to the ones of Fribourg.

The MS Paris Nat. lat. 15561 establishes two facts: first, that the ten questions of Fribourg are a complete work with firmly established serial sequence ; second, that its author is a *Monachus*.

ALFONSUS VARGAS TOLETANUS

Alfonsus wrote a Commentary on the First Book of Lombardus, and only on the First Book. Kürzinger⁶⁵), pioneer in Alfonsus research, has left the question undecided on account of an *Abbreviatio Alfonsi* which bears a misnomer. Johannes de Wasia (MS Erfurt Amplon. 2° 110 f. 1-158) made an *Abbreviation Alfonsi Super Primum* and added a Second, Third, and Fourth Book *excerpted from other authors*. Unwittingly he has become responsible for the wrong assumption that Alfonsus published more than a *Super Primum* because a later hand put the fatal misnomer at the beginning: *Lectura magistri Alffoncii... super 4 libros Sententiarum abbreviata per magistrum Johannem de Wasia*. My examination of Wasia's Second, Third, and Fourth Book reveals that no *Alfonsus*-items occur in Book 2, 3, and 4, while they abound in Book 1 of

⁶⁵) Cf. J. KÜRZINGER [*Alfonsus Vargas Toletanus u. seine theol. Einleitungslehre*, in: *Beiträge Baeumkers* XXII, 5-6 (Münster 1930) 20] where Kürzinger describes the MS Erfurt Amplon. 2° 110 very shortly. — I am obliged to Prof. J. Kürzinger for a gracious gift-copy at a time after the war when no copies of Aschendorff were available; also for his generous cooperation in examining and procuring the microfilms of the MS Eichstätt 471 which made it possible to identify a pseudo-Facinus as Klenkok QQ Super Secundum.

Wasia = *Alfonsus Super Primum*)⁶⁶). John Hiltalingen of Basel quotes Alfonsus very extensively, but knows nothing of a *Lectura Alfonsi Super Secundum, Tertium, et Quartum*. Simon de Cremona, too, uses many times his predecessor Alfonsus, but he has only a *Super Primum* of Alfonsus.

⁶⁶) A short description of the *Lectura* of Wasia in MS Erfurt Amplon. 2^o 110 is necessary to dispel further doubts about the relationship Alfonsus-Wasia. The MS 110 is an autograph of Magister Johannes de Wasia Anno <13>76 (1376). The autograph character appears to be established by the fact of empty spaces within the column, by twofold paginations resulting from a later insertion of the Principia. Several inks have been used; peciae are irregular. Cross-references like « Quaere in *latere* (German: « Seite!) ultimo » are not infrequent. On fly-leaf by later hand: *Lectura Magistri Alffoncii Ord. fr. her. S. Aug. Super 4^{or} libros sententiarum abbreviata per mag. Johannem de Wasia Parisiensem*; a even later hand repeats similar title.

f. 1-16^v: Collatio 1 — Collatio 2 — Principium 2 — Collatio 3 — Principium 3 — Principium 4 — Collatio 4.

Socii: Johannes Trelon, Rodulphus de Bonavilla O. P., Johannes de Castro Theodorici.

f. 17^r-59^v: <Super Primum> [Margins cut, legible: Magister Joh. de Wasia Anno 76 (1376)].

Quotes: Ocquam, Landulphus, Bernardus Oliverii, Alexander de Hales, Henricus, Jacobus de Appamiis, Franciscus de Maironis, Gerardus de Senis, Aureolus, Magister Fernandus, Michael de Massa, Johannes Forestarii, Rodington, Scotus, Garro, Franciscus de Marchia, Durandus, Hibernicus, Gregorius, Durandus in *Novo Scripto* (57^r): *all authors found in the Super Primum Alfonsi!* Alfonsus is not quoted; but later (*Super Secundum* (!) f. 80^v): *Alfonsi lib. 1 q. 6 art. 2.*

f. 60^r-100^v: *Liber Secundus a Mag. Joh. de Wasia. Anno 76 (1376).*

Quotes: Monachus (often), Hibernicus, Thomas, Bonaventura, Alexander de Hales, Gregorius, Scotus, Richardus, Aureolus, Durandus, Olcoth, Valerius Maximus, Hugolinus de originali peccato dist. 30 et tribus sequentibus. [Book 2 unfinished].

f. 101^r-138^v: *Circa 3 Sententiarum a Mag. Joh. de Wasia compilatum.*

Quotes: Thomas, Codefridus de Font., Monachus (very often), Ocquam, Altissiodorensis, Adam, Bohegam, Syraf (from Adam, i. e. Firaf, Fitzralph), Osbertus et Monachus q. 29 Primi, Kilmeton, Buridan 5 cap., Rodington, *Johannes Monachus lib. 1 q. 43* [Mirecourt] f. 125^v!

f. 139^r-158^v: *Circa 4 Sententiarum a Mag. Jo. de Wasia compilatum.*

Quotes: Bonaventura, Durandus, Thomas, Chatton, Alexander de Halis, Henricus Quol. 1 q. 23, Hibernicus, Moderni [breaks off within treatment of Eucharist].

According to all appearances Sent. 2-4 are abbreviated from Mirecourt. *Book 1 alone is an Alfonsus abbreviatus.*

But Hiltalingen creates a new doubt about Book 2-4 of Alfonsus.

Hiltalingen 10 Responsiones q. 2 Clm 26711 f. 220^r sq.: *Alfonsus lib. 3 q. 3 recitat quattuor conclusiones Aegidii...* Two of the four conclusions Hiltalingen

The First Book of Alfonsus is remarkable as a literary history of the Augustinian Schola Moderna and the 14th century in general. His wealth of information on theologians, preceding or contemporary, exercised a special attraction on the 15th century. By then men of the type of John of Basel — one of the last to slave through the texts of the much maligned 14th century — were no longer to be found; for it required a gigantic labor to dominate the enormous theological literature which accumulated in the 14th century. The 15th-century theologians were content to « return to the great masters », an attitude hailed by the « orthodox » because they mistrusted the freedom-loving theologians of the 14th century, hailed also by easy-going scholars because it was so much more convenient to study one author than ten or twenty. Yet these 15th-century theologians were vain enough to plume their texts with quotations which an encyclopedia like Alfonsus' could provide. Hiltalingen was already forgotten on account of his *damnatio memoriae* ⁶⁷).

The abundance of Alfonsus MSS in the 15th century is thus to be explained; an early print (1490) followed logically. And therefore Alfonsus lived on in the immortality — of the foot-notes.

enumerates (without knowing that they have been taken from Aegidius *De compositione angelorum*) are said to be adduced by « Alfonsus » against Scotus; two are said to be turned against Aegidius by « Alfonsus » because « Alfonsus » dislikes the modal difference between suppositum and natura which Aegidius defends.

The three MSS of the Decem Responsiones do not abbreviate the word « Alfonsus » but the absence of any abbreviation does not prove that Hiltalingen himself did not have a simple *Al^o* instead of a complete « *Alfonsus* ». The solution of the puzzle must be sought in *Alveus* = *Hervaeus* who was equally against Scotus as he was against Aegidius; *Alveus* = *Hervaeus* was a bitter enemy of modal distinctions, did not believe in the real difference between essence and existence, and therefore could not accept a modal difference between suppositum and natura. Unfortunately I have no opportunity to collate *Alveus* = *Hervaeus* lib. 3 q. 3. where I hope to find the four conclusions of Aegidius. — In regard to the chronology of Johannes de Wasia Stegmüller's indications must be corrected cf. F. STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium Lombardi* I (1947) 247 no. 504: *Johannes de Wasia* [Waes] 1379 mag. artium; 1392 mag. theol.; obiit ante 1402. It is certain that Wasia was Magister Artium at least in 1376 when he started out on his theological career as Baccalarius Parisiensis. — F. EHRLE, *Der Sentenzenkommentar Peters v. Candia* (Münster 1925) 148 n. 3 does not contradict the fact that Johannes de Wasia became Baccalarius in 1376 because Ehrle only proves that Wasia was Baccalarius in 1379.

⁶⁷) Hiltalingen was in the schismatic fold during the Schism (1378-1415) as schismatic agent, schismatic anti-general, schismatic bishop.

To make Alfonsus Super Primum available for the modern historian a reprint seemed to be desirable as long as a critical edition is not in the offing nor to be hoped for in the next decades. But a simple reprint without further ado would raise the same objections as are usually brought against such methods of reproduction by scholars who are resigned to wait for editions in the year 2000. I therefore made a cursory collation of all the Alfonsus MSS, with the excusable exception of the Warsaw MS, in order to guarantee the faithfulness of some 600 spots⁶⁸) in the reprint of 1952. From this MSS collation results a definite and unexceptionable argument for the authenticity of the historical information contained in the Venice edition of 1490 (reprint 1952).

The many quotations which render Alfonsus so interesting for the historian are *genuine features of the original text*, not later additions by scholastic « editors ». Alfonsus even in the status of a reprint can serve as *prisma* for anyone who desires to examine the richness of 14th-century theology.

List of Alfonsus' Manuscripts

1. A = Angelica (Rome)	F. A. 577	[ca. 1400]
2. B = Berlin Staatsbibl.	Theol. Fol. 203	[ca. 1450]
3. C = München Univ.	Fol. 105	[AD 1456]
4. D = München Staatsbibl.	Clm 26650	[AD 1475]
5. F = Firenze Bibl. Naz.	II. I. 196	[AD 1470]
6. L = Lyon	459 (388)	[AD 1467]
7. M = Milano Ambrosiana	A 139 inf.	[AD 1444]
8. N = Milano Ambrosiana	B 14 inf.	[AD 1458]
9. R = Ravenna Classense	147	
10. T = Toulouse	250	[ca. 1370]
11. V = Vat. Ottob. lat.	496	[ca. 1400]

Stegmüller, *Repertorium Lombardi* I (Würzburg 1947) 35 lists also a Warsaw MS which I could not see, and a Wien MS (Dominikaner 49) which is irretrievable according to a kind letter of Dec. 19, 1949. What I know about the Ravenna manuscript I owe to a special library trip of the Rev. Reinhold Schraml, O. E. S. A. The rest of the manuscripts I could examine in microfilms for which I thank the respective librarians.

The manuscripts can be divided into a northern and a southern

⁶⁸) This MSS-collation will be printed apart.

group; the northern: T FRC DL and the southern A V BMN (N = a direct copy of M).

The complete Alfonsus ⁶⁹⁾ consists of the following items:

1. Collatio « Ego sum alpha et o, Apoc. 1^o » (allusion to « Ego sum Alfonso »)
2. Prologus
3. Commentarius in Primum Sententiarum
4. Tabula <Alphabetica> and Tituli Quaestionum

The *Collatio* is found in: C[D]F R L

(D is acephalous)

not in:

The *Tabula* is found in: C D F R

not in:

The *Tituli* Quaestionum are not in: CDT

T A V BMN

T

L A V BMN

The southern and the northern group of the MSS also follow a different attitude towards the quoting technique of Alfonsus. The quotations with which Alfonsus enriched his text so abundantly were originally placed in quotational insets. The southern group of the MSS adheres to this system much more faithfully than the northern group. Against the Alfonsian origin of the quotational

⁶⁹⁾ The Alfonsus edition of Paganinus de Paganinis (Venice 1490) consists of:

1. Dedication of the edition to the Augustinian General Anselmus Lolli dei Mandestri de Montefalco (cf. D. PERINI, *Bibl. Augustiniana* II [Firenze 1931] 159) by the editor, Thomas de Spilimbergo (cf. PERINI, *Bibl. Aug.* III [1935] 207).

2. TABULA. Tabula operis praeclari in Librum Primum Sententiarum... incipit numine felici. PRAEFATIO. Quoniam non aequae est (published in this article).

3. Collatio « Ego sum alpha et o, Apoc. 1^o ».

4. Prologus.

5. Commentarius in Primum Sententiarum [The Tituli QQ are missing in the edition].

In the photostatic reprint of 1952 the *Tabula* has been omitted; it will be printed apart together with the Tituli QQ. Instead of the uncertain foliation of Paganinus de Paganinis the reprint has a serial number over each column and serial numbers along the lines of the column in order to facilitate MS-collation.

Concordance between numbers of old folia and new columns.

folium ed. 1490

columns reprint 1952

$$\text{ex. g. f. } 21^{\text{ra}} = 20 \times 4 - 32 + 1 = 80 - 31 = 49$$

$$\text{f. } 31^{\text{rb}} = 30 \times 4 - 32 + 2 = 120 - 30 = 90$$

$$\text{f. } 41^{\text{va}} = 40 \times 4 - 32 + 3 = 160 - 29 = 131$$

$$\text{f. } 51^{\text{vb}} = 50 \times 4 - 32 + 4 = 200 - 28 = 172$$

[With other words *eight* folia are missing in the reprint].

insets a legitimate objection could be formulated on the basis of the northern group's vacillating practice of the quotational inset were it not this very northern group that contains the theory of the quotational inset (*Praefatio Tabulae*, *Quoniam non aequè est...*). I therefore edit this *Praefatio Tabulae* and print it right here to dispel any misgivings about the quotational insets of Alfonsus.

Praefatio Tabulae according to CD T FR and E (editio 1490)

Quoniam non aequè est¹ facile registrare opera² multiplicibus contenta³ partibus sicut brevibus divisa⁴ capitulis, sed maxime⁵ Sententiarum Scripta propter multas opiniones et diversas conclusiones⁶, propositiones correlarias, suppositiones⁷ ac obiectiones varias — sine quibus theologi doctores Lecturas suas super Sententias et opera talia valoris et utilia possent⁸ bene nullatenus ordinare⁹ — ideo si in Registro vel Tabula infrascripta quotationes¹⁰ proluxe¹¹ vel obscure quandoque¹² reperiantur, Tabulae ordinator¹³, qui hoc pro posse vitavit, supportetur benigne, maxime quia causa¹⁴ prolixitatis evitandae hoc aliquando facere cogeatur¹⁵. Ex cuius causa quandoque similiter¹⁶, licet raro, conclusiones propositiones suppositiones et alia huiusmodi non sic¹⁷ in Tabula distincte conscripsit vel proluxe ut in ORIGINALI positum reperit. Et ideo ex Tabula nihil doctori imponatur, nec eius opinioni sic simpliciter — maxime de dubiis¹⁸ — ascribatur, sed primitus liber vel opus¹⁹ eius n. FONTE videatur²⁰. Studeant insuper Tabula ista uti volentes ut, quod quaerunt²¹ facilius queant²² invenire, in suorum marginibus librorum articulos conclusiones et²³ omnia supradicta, ubi²⁴ cadunt, signare per ordinem ET MAXIME QUAE IN LIBRO <de rubeo !> NON PONUNTUR, QUIA²⁵ — QUOD RARO IN ALIIS VIDI — IN HOC OPERE DE²⁶ RUBEIO OBJECTIONES ET²⁷ DOCTORUM OPINIONES INTERSCRIBUNTUR²⁸. Noscant etiam quod tertius et quartus articulus ponuntur continuo²⁹ simul et tractantur; et ideo in Tabula tertius solum³⁰, pro se ipso et quarto³¹, nominatur. Etiam quandoque de pluribus simul distinctionibus³² quaestio unica quaeritur; et tunc solum prima distinctio pro ceteris ponitur in Registro.

- 1) ER *invertit* 2) R *invertit* 3) R *bis* contenta 4) R diversa 5) DE *add* si 6) R *add* et 7) R suppositionum 8) E *posset* 9) E *ordinari* 10) R quotationum 11) F *prolixa* 12) FR *add* forte 13) E *ordinatio* 14) E *invertit* 15) R hoc alii facere cogeantur 16) CDE *om* similiter 17) CDE sint E: sint in tabula distinctae sic distinxit ut in originali 18) R duobus 19) E *om* liber vel 20) D *om* Sed primitus liber vel ... in fonte videatur 21) R insuper ista tabula volentes ut quod quaerunt 22) E *valeant* 23) R et cetera 24) T antedicta ut ibi CDE ut ibi 25) CDTE *om* quia 26) D *om* de; D: ... in aliis vidi. In hoc opere rubeo 27) CDE *om* et 28) E inscribuntur C *om* quia quod raro... interscribuntur 29) CE *om* con-

tinuo D continere 30) R *invertit* 31) CFE quartus 32) D
dictionibus.

The variants again approach C to D, F to R ; E (= ed. 1490) is close to CD. The numerous variants and mistakes are not indicative of the low quality of the Alfonsus MSS but of the logical difficulties which the contents of the *Praefatio* involves.

In regard to contents, the *Registrator* admits the clumsy prolixity of his quotations but he pleads an excuse. Less prolixity, though welcome to the reader and actually (*quandoque licet raro*) employed by the *Registrator*, would in the end, he says, entail only more prolixity. The readers are advised by the *Registrator* to list on the margins of their personal Alfonsus copies all subdivisions of the text, like *cclo 1,2... art. 1,2... suppositio 1,2...*, especially where the text itself has not put them in relief (by different ink or block-letters, as the southern group of MSS often does). The fact that the original text itself already brings into relief some subdivisions, is implied by the *quia (quod raro in aliis vidi)*. Highly astonished is the *Registrator* at the unique Alfonsus technique of quoting which is called «*stilus Alfonsi*» by Baltassar de Tolentino, and termed by me the system of the *inset-quotation*:

Quod raro in aliis vidi — in hoc opere *de rubeo* obiectiones et doctorum opiniones *interscribuntur* !

If this statement of the *Registrator* is duly weighed one cannot allow for any suspicion that the southern group of the Alfonsus MSS themselves *invented* the technique of the *inset-quotation*. The *inset-quotation* therefore belongs to the original Alfonsus and underlines the importance and care, which Alfonsus gave to his references.

A similar system of *inset-quotation* I found in the MSS of Gerardus de Senis and Michael de Massa. Baltassar de Tolentino agrees with my findings.

In the Vat. lat. 1085 (Pelzer's Catalogue p. 651-53) Baltassar says that he intends to compile an Augustinian Theology which is to be richer than Alfonsus' *Super Primum* but yet to follow Alfonsus' technique (*sub stilo Alfonsi*). Among the sources of Baltassar Gerardus de Senis is identified.

In the Baltassar compilation of the Vat. lat. 1084 (Pelzer's Catalogue p. 646-51) Pelzer identified Alfonsus Vargas Tole-
tanus and Gerardus de Senis ; I can add the identification

of Vat. lat. 1084 f. 158^r-173^r = Michael de Massa, Prol. q. 7-8; 1 Sent. dist. 1 q. 1-9. Prol. q. 1 — 3 = f. 144^r-151^v.

Also in the Vat. lat. 893 (Pelzer's Catalogue p. 279-80 and Addenda p. XXVII) Baltassar inserts some parts of Gerardus de Senis.

It is remarkable that Baltassar among the authors whom he pretends to treat « *sub stilo Alfonsi* », includes at least two *who themselves follow the stilus Alfonsi*.

From Baltassar, from the MSS of Alfonsus, Gerardus, and Michael, from the *Praefatio Tabulae* <Alfonsi> it becomes evident that the *quotational inset* was a characteristic and unique feature of the Augustinian Modern School. Their interest in correct quoting is thus amply proved; the authenticity of the *marginalia* in Dionysius de Burgo, Thomas Argentinas, and Gregorius Arminensis is confirmed. The Alfonsus technique may be exceptional ⁷⁰⁾ if compared with that of some non-Augustinian works. Alfonsus is not exceptional within the Augustinian School.

List of Quotations in Alfonsus Toletanus

(The numbers refer to the columns of the reprint 1952)

Adam	183, 236, 301, 481
Aegidius, O. E. S. A.	63, 246, 275, 356, 414, 422, 425, 476, 478
Alexander de Halis	125
Alexander de S. Elpidio, O. E. S. A.	173, 187
Alfonsus de Portugallia (Mag.) ...	142, 177, 194, 199, 247
Anglici	76
Aureolus	6, 22, 56, 64, 99, 110, 131, 146, 255, 269, 282, 289, 330, 332, 349, 419, 482, 490, 492, 499, 501, 512, 515, 523, 551, 582, 594, 605, 613, 615
Bernardus Oliverii, O. E. S. A. ...	10, 64, 148, 320
Burlaeus [= doctor <i>noster</i> ?]	451, 463 [MSS: doctor <i>multi-</i> <i>pliciter</i>]
Caton	447
Durandus	211, 355, 360, 412, 499, 592

⁷⁰⁾ Cf. *Praefatio Tabulae*: « Quod raro in aliis vidi ». — The *Praefatio Tabulae Gregorii* (ed. 1522, reprint 1955 f. + 3) is almost identical to the one of Alfonsus; but in Gregory's case no claim is made that the quotational inset existed in the Gregory-MSS. It seems that Dionysius, Thomas, and Gregorius preferred the safer method of marginal quoting.

Fernandus (Mag.)	150, 170, 193, 196
Ferrati (Mag. Joh.)	172, 186
Forrestarius, Joh., O. E. S. A. ...	54, 159, 166, 173, 189, 231, 263
Franciscus de Marchia	33, 46, 48, 390, 393, 394, 506, 527, 528, 560, 579, 585, 597
Franciscus de Mayronis	49, 85, 88, 89, 115, 132, 158, 276, 326, 340, 376, 396, 397, 403, 601
Franciscus de Tarvisio, O. P. ...	614, 622
Gerardus de Senis, O. E. S. A. ...	57, 65, 159, 160, 246, 261, 276, 362, 422, 431, 436, 438, 493, 585
Godofridus de Fontanis	124, 138
Gregorius Arminensis, O. E. S. A.	534, 537, 639, 656
Guarro (Guill. de Ware)	98, 123, 350, 397
Henricus de Gandavio	38, 110, 125, 133, 276, 357,
Hervaeus	370
Hibernicus (Rich. Fitzralph) ...	641
Hugo (Mag. O. Min.)	201
Jacobus de Appamiis, O. E. S. A.	43, 608, 609
Jacobus de Viterbio, O. E. S. A.	98, 230, 364, 372, 539, 541
Johannes de Magno Monasterio ...	306
Johannes Scotus (Mag., <i>not</i> Duns) .	615
Landulfus	10, 21, 72, 78, 91, 164, 203, 233, 235, 262, 263 264, 322, 376, 412, 510, 513, 580
Lucas de Massana, O. E. S. A. ...	196
Michael de Massa, O. E. S. A. ...	18, 75, 111, 152, 160, 188, 251, 288, 335, 445, 535 572 576, 579, 585
Ockham	4, 27, 75, 110, 115, 116, 153, 217, 237, 286, 347, 363, 366, 382, 403, 477, 541, 543, 548, 564
Opinio Communis	13, 15, 24, 26, 104, 138, 186, 575, 582
Praedicator (Bacc., O. P.)	173, 176, 193
Rodington, Joh.	4, 21, 27, 69, 100, 112, 134, 136, 209, 227, 236, 265, 277, 411, 563
Rudolfus Minor (Bacc., O. Min.) ...	195, 631, 644, 647
Scotus	21, 72, 115, 120, 121, 125, 127, 131, 203, 262, 264 271, 279, 301, 317, 323, 339, 373, 375, 402, 407, 421, 505, 509, 513, 514, 533, 547, 559, 586, 601
Thomas Anglicus	584

S. Thomas de Aquino	36, 63, 91, 137, 309, 346, 399, 407, 422, 425, 435, 476
Thomas de Argentina, O. E. S. A.	42, 63, 128, 190, 251, 415, 417, 426, 428, 436, 515, 543, 627, 655

Theology of Alfonsus

Alfonsus shows a marked historico-critical attitude. More than an Aegidian he is an Augustinian of Augustine because he quotes him better than the Aegidians did. Many times the edition of 1490, and also the manuscripts, leave a blank for the missing chapter of an Augustinian quotation (c. []), a sign that Alfonsus was aware of the need and the advantages of exact quoting. The ideal was before his eyes; when an exact quotation with accurate capitulation could not be procured immediately the high standard demanded to fill in the chapter-numbers at a later time. Human frailty had its toll; but if these blanks had not remained unfilled we would have one argument less for the historical attitude of Alfonsus.

HUGOLINUS OF ORVIETO

In Hugolinus-research Zumkeller ⁷¹⁾ is leading the way. His studies, especially an outstanding book of investigation and critical text, inform on Hugolin's biography and works, on his doctrine about

⁷¹⁾ Cf. A. ZUMKELLER, *Hugolin v. Orvieto u. seine theol. Erkenntnislehre*, in: *Cassiciacum* (German Series) Bd. IX 2 Reihe 3 (Würzburg 1941). The book has 263 pages of investigation and 129 of critical text in model edition. — The list of names I give are from the last chapter of the investigations (Kap. 6: Die Lehrrichtung Hugolins v. Orvieto 255-62). — [] in my list means a name sifted from Zumkeller's text-edition; <> means that Zumkeller is not responsible for a statement. — « Stukle » I have found myself by chance in Hugolin 1 Sent. dist. 3 q. 3 art. 3 MS Paris Nat. lat. 14559 f. 66^v. — I want to thank my confrère for his peerless generosity in sending me photostats of Paris Nat. lat. 14559.

A. Zumkeller has obliged me with other generous MSS loans and with his personal cooperation and encouragement. — The date of the Lectura-year of Hugolinus is now a certainty; Ceffons was the Socius of Hugolinus. The two refer to one another in their Principia (cf. my forthcoming article in *Traditio* 1956). About the *Recollectio Hugolini* cf. below under *Simon of Cremona*. — The special studies on Hugolinus have begun with articles of A. ZUMKELLER, *Hugolin v. Orvieto* († 1373) *über Urstand und Erbsünde*, in: *Augustiniana* III (1953) 35-62, 165-93; IV (1954) 25-46. *Hug. v. Orvieto über Prädestination, Rechtfertigung u. Verdienst* *ibid.* IV (1954) 109-156; V (1955) 5-51.

faith and knowledge, about original sin and justice, predestination, justification, and merit. The source treatment is exemplary, the judgment competent although somewhat influenced by the incubus of « nominalism ».

If that valuable book of 1941 had not become so rare because of aerial bombardments it would be enough to refer the reader to Zumkeller. Under the actual circumstances it will be advisable to acquaint the reader with the results of Zumkeller's studies as far as this article requires. I myself have consulted Hugolinus only for reference purposes.

The Commentary Hugolinus wrote on the Four Books brings him into alinement with the historical-minded group of the later Augustinians. St. Augustine whom he quotes on almost every folium is the light, the inspiration, and the premiss of the thought of Hugolinus. Contemporary authors he quotes with fair accuracy but always in the text. More than one half of these quotations are from Augustinians.

Less than 50 %

Adam
Climenton <Richard> Langley
Buckingham <Thomas>
Franciscus de Marchia
Henricus de Gandavio
Robert Holcot
Robert Halifax
Ockham
Scotus
<Stukle ?>
S. Thomas
[Jacobus de Spinalo, O. Min.]

More than 50 %

Aegidius, Doctor noster, Dominus
Jacobus de Viterbo, Doctor inventivus (Quodl. I and II)
Alfonsus
Henricus Senior de Alemania =
Henricus Senior de Vrimaria
Gregorius Ariminensis
[Milleloquium]

The list is representative mostly for the First Book ; if the picture should not change as the other Books of Hugolins are being studied this list would be interesting for its omissions.

JOHN KLENKOK

The condemnations of 1347 intended to check a dangerous Modernism which, from the premiss of a possibility of divine intervention, drew conclusions as revolutionary as those of Autrecourt and Mirecourt. The condemned articuli of 1347 were apparently

only exemplifications, that is, their number was not intended to be so strictly fixed that there could not have been one more or one less; they exemplified only the trend which fell under the reprobation of the Church. The two condemned authors, consequently, were only scape goats, only Parisians under the authority of Paris. Actually, also some Oxonians were affected by the decrees of 1347. Nicholas Aston (1345) wrote a Commentary over which broods the miasma of fideism or scepticism. Ulcredus Dunelmensis who can hardly escape being identified with the *Friburgensis* (MS Fribourg Cord. 26) published (!) an undiluted Autrecourt-Commentary. But Paris could not interfere with the internal affairs of Oxford. The condemnation of Aston and Ulcredus was left to Oxford — which never made a move so far as we know.

What kind of reaction the condemnations of 1347 produced on the continent would be a matter of speculation if Peter Ceffons had been less loquacious on the pages of his Commentary MS Troyes 62. Usually victims of condemnations are mourned in silence, are buried and quickly forgotten; rarely are any reactions recorded. Ceffons is an exception. He is very vocal in denouncing the condemnations of 1347. He makes the charge that the propositions of Mirecourt were torn from their context and their meaning distorted.

From the texts of the Oxonian revolutionaries, Aston as well as Ulcredus (= *Friburgensis*), we know that these shocking conclusions were not so much apodictic statements as they were challenges which an alert teacher threw at his students to make them think and to widen their horizons. « *Ad dandam viam iuvenibus ulterius cogitandi* » says Ulcredus twice in MS Fribourg Cord. 26 (f. 83^r and 105^r). « *Causa collationis* » says Aston very often, and we have no reasons to believe him insincere. For *aporia* was a teaching technique adopted in the lecture halls of the 14th century as Peter Ceffons (MS Troyes 62 f. 78^v) expressly affirms:

Hic attendatur quod non teneo ego quod deus vult peccatum, sed dicta supra aut inferius <pono> ad videndum quid dicerent consequenter illi qui tenent. Nec reputo omnia quae supra tetigi, sufficient ultimate ad veritatem. Sed bonum est aliquando recitare et *fingere sive vera sive falsa*, ut videatur qualiter dici potest. Advertendum tamen quod his diebus non admittitur Parisius quod deus velit peccatum, sed fuit hoc revocatum... licet non audierim responsiones quae mihi satisfacerent... *Ille autem esset nimis iniquus qui*

me accusaret dicendo quod ego ultimate teneo quod deus velit peccatum. Unde dico quod aliqua falsa finxi supra ex certa causa [End of I Sent. q. 43].

In texts which I hope to publish in *Traditio* 1956 Ceffons says that « three old foreign heresy-hunting witches » — a gracious terminology Ceffons applies to the promoters of the condemnations, i. e., to Gregory, to Robertus de Bardis and someone else — did nothing but tear sentences from their context in order to reduce them into *articuli condemnandi*. Venomously Ceffons says that even the innocent Marian antiphon « *Cunctas haereses sola interemisti in universo mundo* » could be distorted into heresy by the three old foreign promoters of the condemnations if they only were given a chance.

We have other trustworthy sources, among them Peter d'Ailly who states that « *multa fuerunt condemnata contra eum <de Ultricuria> quae tamen postea in scholis publice <<per modum aporiae ?>> sunt confessa* (Ueberweg II [1928] 591).

One senses in these sources that the condemnations caused painful reactions and resentments easily imaginable.

But the Church was right in insisting on more common sense, on more prudence in the application of the disturbing idea of a possible divine intervention. And the Church succeeded in bringing about a saner attitude.

On the continent even a thinker as independent as Ceffons uses more prudence when talking about « evidence » which had been hopelessly compromised by the wild application of a « possibility of divine intervention ». Many of his passages attest to this new cautiousness which the Church imposed. I transcribe some from the MS Troyes 62.

- f. 36^r Nolo enim pro nunc loqui et periculosum et his diebus aliquid invenire << fingere ! >> in quo non communicat communis schola.
- f. 45^v Non libenter intro materiam de « evidentiis » eo quod est evidetiae [as demanded by the Church] odiosa.
- f. 48^r De significabilibus complexis, utrum istis diebus sit securius ea ponere sicut ea posuerunt *Adam, Chatton et Gregorius* [paladins of orthodoxy Ceffons hates], aut ea negare — saltem per imaginationem << fictionem ? >> — sit securius. Et potest argui pro qualibet parte quod est alia securior... videtur quaedam novitas non nimis segura... securius est hoc dicere... Non videtur tamen multum securum dicere

- his diebus quod deus « nihil » scit ; nollem et pro quarta vini [a quart of wine] in publico hanc conclusionem posuisse.
- f. 48^v Nec esset securum his diebus quod solum illud est mihi evidens de quo apparet mihi aliquantulum esse... Nec acceptatur quin sit mihi evidens quod ignis comburit, et quod <sunt> multi homines alii a me.
- f. 51^r Qui dicit quod omnes, miratur nemo.
- f. 51^v Periculosum est his diebus ut aestimo aliquid definire... Non recito quia potest inveniri in *Adam* in Primo Opere, et in *Gregorio* Super Primum in Prologo, et credo etiam quod aliquid vidi de ea <opinione> in *Chattone* [One sees that Ceffons can be sarcastic in regard to his beloved paladins of orthodoxy].
- f. 71^r Sed hoc pro me non dico: periculosum esset. Et quandoque circa hoc occurrebant multa *subtilia* [subtilitates were condemned especially] quae non scribo ne forte per malignos ascribantur mihi aliter quam bene.
- f. 72^v Et dico tibi quod nullus auderet Parisius dicere illa omnia quae sequerentur ex hoc quod nullum continuum est aliquid unum. Nec ego etiam dico sed *do* per aliqua quae alias scripsi *materiam cogitandi*. Unde verum est quod bonum est aliqua alia recitare quia per hoc quaeritur intellectus et *datur materia inveniendi veritatem*.

I shall publish more of these excerpts from Ceffons. Although Ceffons is convinced as much as ever that the « *aporia* » is a good technique of teaching, he no longer uses it in his classroom. One sees that the condemnations had their effect in Paris: more prudence prevailed where formerly extravagant exhibitionism had had its day.

Did Oxford pay any attention to the Parisian condemnations of 1347 ? Why were Aston and Ulcredus (= Friburgensis) not expressly proscribed by Oxford ? We cannot answer this question to our satisfaction. The Augustinian, John Klenkok ⁷²⁾, who read

⁷²⁾ For his biography I have to refer to my larger study. — Cf. Hans BÜTOW, *Zur Lebensgeschichte des Augustinermönches Johannes Klenkok, Bekämpfers des Sachsenspiegel*, in: *Historische Vierteljahrschrift* XXIX, 3 (Dresden 1935) 541-75 [77]. Bütow on page 545 n. 16 has the important but almost unintelligible text from Cod. Guelf. Helmst. 542: ... Petro de Vernio militantis ecclesiae... dimissis penitus inferiorum: frater Johannes Clenckok, sacre pagine professor, noticia scolastica, tironum noticie comparata, dum idem dominus esset gymnasiis ei notus... Dr Suchel of the Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel upon my request has graciously collated the text again. But my expectations have not been realized. The text remains as is. Yet I would like to propose a conjecture which

at Oxford in 1354-55 together with Ulcredus Dunelmensis and the famous English chronicler Thomas Stubbs, furnishes some incomplete but welcome historical evidence on the Oxonian echo of the Parisian condemnations. Perhaps Oxford was not shocked enough by the condemnations of Autrecourt's fideism, but with the main contention of Paris they were willing to agree. Paris demanded more common sense, more prudence, more respect for the Fathers; Oxford practiced more prudence after 1347. Apparent to all was the inadmissibility of the Modernist *subtilitates* which made such a revolutionary abuse of the premiss of possible divine intervention.

I select one passage from Klenkok which attests to Oxonian caution and prudence after 1347.

II² = MS Erfurt Amplon. 4^o 118 f. 95^v

= MS Klosterneuburg 304 f. 132^r:

Osbertus autem quoddam <quondam ! Kl. speaks ca. 1354-59> doctor universitatis nostrae scil. Oxoniae [K: Osbertus doctor universitatis nostrae; legit Sententias Oxoniae] posuit quod quodlibet peccatum per quod peccans NON crederet se amisurum gratiam <K add: dei> esset veniale et consequenter dixit quod Judaei peccaverint venialiter interficiendo Apostolos quoniam <E: quando> arbitrabantur obsequium se praestare deo. Et similiter dixit quod

makes the text readable: «Johannes Clenckok sacrae paginae professor notitiā scholasticā, notitia *canonum* comparatā dum idem domnus <de Vernio> esset gymnasiis <Bononiensibus> ei <Klenkok> notus. It would mean that Klenkok met with de Vernio at the Law Study of Bologna. That Klenkok himself studied Law at Bologna seems practically certain. Two passages from his works are here recorded: 1 Sent. dist. 14 q. 2 [MS Amplon. Q 118 f. 126^v = Klosterneuburg 304 f. 79^r = Siena G V 16 f. 9^v]. Contigit Parisius dum ego <Klenkok> essem in Italia... 4 Sent. dist. 45 c. 3 De pompis [MS Klosterneuburg 304 f. 192^r = Siena G V 16 f. 104^r] Vituperantur autem variae et sumptuosae pompae sepulturae sicut Bononiae est... (Here Klenkok gives such detailed descriptions that he must have been at Bologna). In his pastoral theology (4 Sent. dist. 15) Klenkok displays a canonist's erudition! In his famous controversy with the jurists of the Sachsenspiegel Klenkok is taken seriously and never told to leave the Law books alone and return to his Bible! These and other reasons force me to rewrite the traditional biography somewhat: 1342-46 Law study at Bologna; 1346-52 study at Prague for the Lector's degree; 1354 Baccalarius Oxoniensis; 1359 Magister Oxoniensis. — [To Dr. Suchel I am also obliged for an examination of an ex-libris of John Hiltalingen of Basel which is found in Cod. Guelf. Helmst. 1064].

Petrus negando Christum, David in adulterio cum Bethsabée et nece Uriae peccaverint venialiter. Quae omnia male sonant in fide ; immo unus Baccalarius ⁷³⁾ *tempore meo Parisius fuit coactus revocare conclusiones istius positionis in ista materia. Unde caute est ambulandum. De istis autem deo dante scribam plenius in Quaestionibus Super isto Secundo.*

Unde caute est ambulandum is not the usual stock phrase we find so often. The Parisian recantation became Oxonian standard and had the effect of making Oxonians more prudent in regard to *subtilitates* based on the sovereignty of individual conscience. Klenkok gave such importance to the impact of the Parisian recantation that he decided to take up the same matter in a new work of his, namely, his *Quaestiones super Secundum*.

But at the same time Oxford eyed Parisian condemnations with a certain jealousy. The same Klenkok says in his 1 Sent. dist. 1 (E: f. 199^r ; K: f. 68^r ; Siena f. 1^r):

Non semper bene damnantur articuli Parisius ; dicitur enim quod damnatum sit Parisius quod animae Christi et Judae sint aequae perfectae in essentialibus <Error> ; quod tamen non est verum. Item nuper <die 16 Maii 1354> quidam <Guido, O. E. S. A. !> revocavit Parisius... quod tamen verum creditur.

Jealousy between the two great sister universities may have deprived Oxford of some salutary effects of the condemnations of 1347. Wyclif did exploit the situation. But Oxford's responsibility should not be exaggerated.

In a certain sense Oxford reacted to the Modernism of the Modernists before Paris, but not officially. Thomas Bradwardine (1344) wrote a work of the title *De causa dei* to defend God's cause against the new Pelagianists, Modernists who under the pre-

⁷³⁾ B. M. XIBERTA, *De scriptoribus schol. saec. XIV ex Ord. Carm.*, in: *Bibl. de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 6 (Louvain 1931) 246 has an interesting item in his description of the Osbertus-MS of Prague Metrop. Chap. C 105: « manu quae reliquum codicem scripsit: *Lectura Osberti super sententias quam comparavit magister Albertus de Boemia Oxoniae* ». This Albertus is probably Adalbertus Ranconis de Ericinio. About him cf. A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting v. Oyta*, in: *Baeumkers Beiträge* XXXIII 4-5 (Münster 1937) 17-18, 20, 22 ff, 25-28. Adalbertus might be the « discipulus Osberti » who had to recant in Paris (and therefore interrupted his theological career ?). Hiltalingen 2 Sent. q. 16 Clm. 26711 f. 190^v, 191^r, 191^v mentions the Osbertus controversy and seems to prove the fact that an Albertus fell into some error.

miss of possible divine intervention completely upset the traditional doctrine of grace ⁷⁴).

The Pelagianism Bradwardine impugned was not imaginary but very real ; unfortunately he could not keep free from exaggerations himself and had to recant an extreme Augustinianism, much to the delight — we may imagine — of the Modernists. Klenkok mentions the censures against Bradwardine and approves them ; of censures against his own Oxonian Modernists — Aston and Ulcredus (= Friburgensis) — Klenkok mentions nothing. The nature of an *Expositio litteralis* brought it about that Klenkok did not write the customary questions on faith and knowledge. Only within discussions on faith and knowledge would it have been imperative to give closer attention to Aston and Ulcredus.

Klenkok and Aston

The Oxonian Nicholas Aston ⁷⁵) (1345), Socius of Osbertus and Thomas Buckingham, wrote in a vein diametrically opposed to Bradwardine's. Bradwardine wrote positive theology based on the Fathers, particularly on Augustine ; Aston composed a Commentary full of shocking *subtilitates*. Aston's questions, altogether 12, are in MS Oxford Oriel 15. Many cross-references within these 12 questions make it plain that in the Oriel 15 we are dealing with a complete work. Only once Aston refers to a work we do not have, namely, the *Tractatus de solutione insolubilium* (MS Oriel 15 f. 211^v).

⁷⁴) Cf. S. HAHN, *Thomas Bradwardinus*, in: *Baeumkers Beiträge* V, 2 (Münster 1905) 8. n. 1 and Ulcredus MS Frib. Cord. 26 f. 91^r: Ego respondeo ad Augustinum!... Voluntas est causa principalior.

⁷⁵) B. M. XIBERTA, *De scriptoribus scholasticis s. XIV ex ordine Carm.*, in: *Bibliothèque de la RHE* 6 (Louvain 1931) 242 did not know that Aston quotes the Summa of Bradwardine in the MS Oriel 15 f. 214^r: Doctor Profundus lib. 1 cap. 17 et 18; f. 217^r: Doctor Profundus lib. 1 cap. 13; f. 219^v: Doctor Profundus lib. Summae 1 cap. 12; the same on f. 220^r; f. 221^r: Doctor Profundus lib. 1 cap. 1 «Possible est deum esse, ergo deus est (= Leibniz). — The Lectura-year of Osbertus-Aston-Buckingham falls between the Summa of Bradwardine (1344) and the chancellorship of Buckingham (1346). — Buckingham also quotes Bradwardine in MS Vat. lat. 4353 f. 80^v: Faciam formam quam fecit 'doctor noster' <Mertonensis> Bardwardinus anno proximo <1344> ad istam eandem conclusionem. Cf. A. MAIER, *Die Vorläufer Galileis im 14. Jahrhundert*, in: *Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura* 22 (Roma 1949) 96 n. 27. For the <> Maier is not responsible.

12 QQ Magistri Nicholai Aston (Astone) Oxoniae disputatae
[MS Oxford Oriel 15]

- 210^v Q. 1 Utrum veritatem creatam poterit veritas <in>creata
hypostatice sustentare.
212^r Q. 2 Utrum diabolus esse sit naturali ratione probabile.
213^r Q. 3 Utrum ad omnem actionem causae secundae, efficientia
causae primae necessario requiratur.
213^v Q. 4 Utrum certa praevio futurorum contingentium sit ex
praedeterminatione voluntatis divinae.
214^v Q. 5 Utrum omne praeteritum necessario sit praeteritum.
215^v Q. 6 Utrum positivum vel privativum formaliter opponatur
peccato.
217^r Q. 7 Utrum inter 'necesse esse' et 'impossibile esse' mediet
'possibile esse'.
218^r Q. 8 Utrum cuiuslibet futurationis et praeteritionis sit deus
causa.
218^v Q. 9 Utrum illud quod nunc est, pro nunc sit possibile quod
non est nunc.
219^v Q. 10 Utrum privationes et negationes sunt a deo.
220^v Q. 11 Utrum aliqua propositio significans praecise deum non
esse, contradictionem includat.
222^r Q. 12 Utrum antichristus potest esse diabolus incarnatus ⁷⁶).

Aston travels very light, unburdened by any apparatus of quotations; they would not befit a logicistic Modernist. The Doctor Subtilis is quoted some fifteen times as is also St. Augustine, and rather correctly. Anselm, whom Moderni and Modernists love, appears only some five times; Aegidius, Henry, Cowton, Fyshacre, Linconiensis, Altissiodorensis, once or twice. Holy Scripture is ignored.

Quaestio 11 made Aston famous; it contains the *Achilles Astensis*: Denial or assertion of God's existence can only be stated in a disjunctive: God *either* exists or does not exist! Therefore a simple denial of God's existence is a contradiction! In other words,

⁷⁶) At the end of Q. 12 Aston dares all his Socii to attack him; with words that savour of ritual and customary formality he makes a challenge and charges that *all* their conclusions are false. In Clm 27034 f. 208^v after an Oxonian Lectura we read the same ritualistic and formalistic challenge! This challenge should make us pause, and warn us to go slow with our condemnations of Aston. He often claims that he speaks only « causa collationis ». If that is true — and here at the end of Q. 12 it evidently is — then all the flamboyant « conclusions » would be nothing else but products and examples of his teaching technique (aporia) aiming at arousing a sleepy audience: ad dandam viam iuvenibus ulterius cogitandi! Sensationalism and exhibitionism need not be excluded.

the atheist must not only deny but prove. This *Achilles Astensis* migrated from the pages of one scholastic to the other's (Hugolin, Hiltalingen, Dionysius de Montina, O. E. S. A., Angelus Dobelin, O. E. S. A., Peter of Candia etc.)⁷⁷).

Aston writes the English « essay-style » and indulges in logico-theological casuistry. With the principle of 'possible divine intervention' as his premiss, Aston reaches conclusions which breathe absolute fideism, or scepticism if Michalski is right. (cf. MS Oriel 15 Q. 1 f. 211^r; Q. 5 f. 215^r; Q. 12 f. 222^r). In Q. 12 we read these floundering absurdities:

Dubium cuilibet numquid Socius suus sit antichristus...

Omnis nostra cognitio sensitiva quae non est *infusa*, non est certitudo quia in omni tali potest esse illusio [Q. 5 *adds*: ergo nulla cognitio intellectiva est certa quia defectus cognitionis sensitivae facit defectum cognitionis intellectivae... Ideo semper haesitandum est numquid substantia illa sit talis; vel *pia fide credendum est*]... Ideo apparet mihi quod pro statu naturae lapsae et viae, non potest sciri quod ille homo sit ille homo. Vel quod ille homo differt ab illo homine in alio loco; quia si ille homo esset in diversis locis, posset obviare sibi ipsi, et non cognoscere se ipsum sed credere quod esset alius homo. Et posset sui ipsius caput amputare, et nescire hoc. Nec potest scire quod ille homo est homo, et non asinus [Q. 5 *adds* the other gem that the teacher in the chair might be an ass]. Nec a fortiori, an ille homo sit antichristus... Ex quibus patet quod *evidentiae* quas habemus quasi « determinatas », sunt fallibiles... Quilibet potest *credere* de Socio suo quod Socius suus non est antichristus, non tamen hoc scit.

An irate Magister Socius (Thomas Buckingham ?) retorts « Anyone who says 'I am the Antichrist', is really an antichrist ». Aston picks up the angry retort and turns it against the *Magister Socius* with all the finesses of logic. But at least we see some faint reaction against Aston right in his own lecture hall.

Hiltalingen from distant Paris made his exceptions against Aston; the Augustinian John Klenkok, an Oxonian by adoption 1354-59, did not record his attitude towards Aston.

⁷⁷) Achilles meant an invincible insoluble argument, and alludes to the known race between Achilles and the tortoise. For the Ratio Achilles cf. A. MAIER, *Die Vorläufer Galileis* (1949) 163.

Klenkok's Lectura

John Klenkok read as *Baccalarius Oxoniensis* 1354-55 and became Magister on August 5, 1359 (cf. MS Klosterneuburg 304 f. 195^v). He wrote among other works an *Expositio Litteralis super Sententias*.

The *Expositio Litteralis* belongs to that type of Lombard Commentary which follows chapters and words of Lombard step by step, in contradistinction to the *Quaestiones-Commentary* which develops one or two Lombard ideas as are of special interest within the constellation of theological thought.

Ordinary Lectores, without any Parisian aspirations, used the *Expositio Litteralis* because it made the solid food of Lombard palatable to beginners. The Lectores with Parisian hopes and the Magistri, on their part, preferred a *Quaestiones-Commentary*. But in actual teaching they prefaced each *Quaestio* with a *Divisio textus*, that is, an *Expositio Litteralis* in rudimentary form. Literary ambition aiming at « originality » led some Lectores and practically all Magistri to exclude an *Expositio Litteralis* from their publications; easy-going copyists omitted the *Divisio textus* from the *Quaestiones-Commentaries* they were to copy.

A tragic result ensues from this exclusive ambition or this lazy omission. If a hasty historian only evaluates the *Quaestiones-Commentaries* he is liable to draw a pitifully incomplete picture of the theological teaching of the past. In reality even Commentaries as arid as the ones of Aston or Ulcredus must be put back into the frame of a lost *Expositio litteralis*, or at least, a *Divisio textus Lombardi*. A lost *Expositio litteralis* is all the more to be postulated as complement of the true picture of medieval teaching in the case of later Commentaries that in four gigantic questions absolve all the Four Books of Lombard.

For these reasons the historian is indebted to John Klenkok for having published his *Expositio litteralis* because it gives us an idea of how rich an *Expositio litteralis* could be.

The MSS of the *Expositio litteralis* of Klenkok are the following.

Expositio litteralis

I² = MS Erfurt Ampl. 4^o 118f. 119^r-135^v
 MS Klosterneuburg 304 f. 68^r- 94^v
 MS Siena G V 16 f. 1^r- 20^v

	II ¹ = MS Siena G V 16 f. 20 ^v -35 ^v
	II ² = MS Erfurt Amplon. 118 f. 86 ^r -107 ^v
	MS Klosterneuburg 304 f. 95 ^r -134 ^v
[QQ Super Secundum]	II ³ = MS Eichstätt 471 f. 157 ^r -186 ^r
	III ² = MS Klosterneuburg 304 f. 134 ^v -151 ^v
	MS Siena G V 16 f. 35 ^v -48 ^r
	IV ² = MS Klosterneuburg 304 f. 152 ^r -195 ^r
	MS Siena G V 16 f. 48 ^v -105 ^v

There are, or were, two editions of each Book of the *Expositio*. The first edition, or the *Expositio* as untouched as the *Lector Klenkok* used it, is lost except in the case of the II¹; Book I, II, III, IV exist in a second edition (I² II² III² IV²). Stegmüller (*Repertorium Lombardi* [1947] 200 no. 413) lists another MS of Klenkok which may have some surprises in store. But under present conditions I cannot examine it.

It was under the impact of the events of 1347 that Klenkok felt compelled to write a third edition but only of the *Super Secundum*, namely, the *Quaestiones Super Secundum* (= II³) which Klenkok already announced in the second edition. Hilta-lingen quoted the II³ repeatedly and very neatly. No doubt whatsoever remains that this II³ of Klenkok is the pseudoepigrahic « Facinus » of MS Eichstätt 471.

First Edition

In the untouched II¹ and partly in I² II² III² IV² Klenkok's first concern is to introduce the student into the wealth of Augustinian thought which Lombard has incorporated. Practically all unidentified quotations of Lombard's original are identified by Klenkok with chapter-number, not rarely even with two chapter-numbers, a sign that the Augustinian « capitulation » was still fluctuating. Klenkok trains his student to go back to the very sources, and not to be satisfied with indirect quotations. This significant fact assigns Klenkok to the historical-minded group of the Augustinians whose habit he wears.

How many of the corrections Klenkok contributed to the original Lombardus are Klenkok's own work, or how many go back to good Lombard copies which started already in the 13th century to accumulate corrected Augustine quotations, must be

established later ⁷⁸). If after closer examination the effort of Klenkok should turn out to be less imposing than it seemed at first, Klenkok's merit would still remain undiminished: his was the special interest in corrected Augustine quotations, his the concern about good Lombard copies equipped with the best Augustine quotations available.

The first edition of the *Expositio litteralis* creates the impression that Klenkok was a man of exclusively practical interests because of his early training as a canonist of Bologna. Lombard's Fourth Book gives Klenkok a chance to parade his canonistic erudition. In 4 Sent. dist. 15 he writes a veritable pastoral theology for the confessional. So many economic problems are touched and treated there that a man without canonistic training could not possibly have written the work. In the Second Book of Lombard it is the problem of grace and merit which appeals to Klenkok.

Klenkok's theological fame came from this Second Book. He gave a much needed definition of venial sin which was to arouse theological comment far and wide. Gerhard Groote from the Netherlands wrote a letter to William Vroede (Mag. Pragensis March 13, 1373 cf. Bütow 561) to solicit information about Klenkok's definition. As canonist Klenkok was immortalized in the history of German Law (*Sachsenspiegel*).

Second Edition

For his *Lectura Oxoniensis* (1354) Klenkok rewrote the *Expositio litteralis*. In this second edition his main concern shifted towards theological problems. Too many things had happened since he published the first edition during his stay at Prague. The impact of the Parisian condemnations had made itself felt everywhere.

⁷⁸) Cf. the Quaracchi edition of Lombard (1916), *Prolegomena* p. LXXIII about the Lombard-MS Erfurt Amplon. 108. — Also J. DE GHELLINCK, *Le mouvement théologique du XII^e siècle*, wherever he speaks of this Erfurt-MS esp. 241 n. 2; 314 n. 1; 317 n. 3; 351 f, 354 ff, 362 ff, 369 f. De Ghellinck has written a special article on corrected Lombard quotations: *Les notes marginales du Liber Sententiarum*, in: *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* XIV (1913) 511-36, 705-19. — Cf. also A. LANDGRAF, *Philologisches zur Frühscholastik*, III, *Die Zitierweise*, in: *Medieval Studies* VIII (Toronto 1946) 59-67.

As adoptive Oxonian he stepped into a milieu characterized by Bradwardine, Osbertus, Aston, and Ulcredus (= Friburgensis), four names which meant four chapters in Oxford's history. It was common knowledge at the time that the Durham Benedictine Ulcredus had circulated an anonymous Autrecourt-Commentary ⁷⁹), our Friburgensis MS Cord. 26. The secret of this anonymity was kept so well that the whole world knew about it. To Chillington and Gregory it was not unknown that a Monachus Niger was the author of the Friburgensis; the Paris authorities, and certainly Klenkok, were informed about a Benedictine of the name Wicierus = Ulclerus who very openly professed Autrecourt leanings. Did Klenkok in his Oxford days take a strong stand against the Friburgensis = Ulcredus? From the extant writings of Klenkok this question cannot be answered either affirmatively or negatively.

Klenkok and the Friburgensis

In the *Lectura Oxoniensis* of Klenkok one would expect to see a strong reaction against the Friburgensis. But the Fribourg-Quaestiones are almost ignored by Klenkok; their fideism is never rebutted. It is a baffling *argumentum ex silentio* against the identification of the Friburgensis with Ulcredus, Socius of Klenkok.

Ignorance on the part of Klenkok cannot have been the reason. Klenkok knew the writings of Gregory too well to have overlooked

⁷⁹) The attribution of the anonymous Fribourg-Quaestiones to Ulcredus [= Uhtred Boldon] incurs the difficulties of the supposed author's youth. Uhtred was born in the second decade of the 14th century (cf. M. E. MARCETT, *Uhtred de Boldon* [New York 1938] 2) and would have published the Fribourg-Quaestiones at the age of thirty or even less. But if the Fribourg-Quaestiones are only an overhauled « Autrecourt » (whose writings we do not have anymore) the youth of the author, Uhtred, increases the probability of the rash venture which the publication of such a daring work implies. Uhtred would, however, have to give the « anonymous Autrecourt » some English features. In the Fribourg Quaestiones are mentioned: London (f. 82^v), the fogs of England (f. 83^v); words like *manutentia* (maintenance) [f. 92^r]; *relevare*, *relevatio* [= relief!] (often); *invasio*, *invadere* [= attack, invade] (f. 100^v); *habilitas* [= ability] (f. 103^v); *bona vita* [= good life] (f. 109^v); *accommodare* [= accommodate] (f. 115^v); *in privato* [= in private] (f. 121^v); *ordinare testamentum* [= ordain] (f. 134^v); *ribaldus* [= ribald] (f. 135^v); *lecator* [= lecherous]. — On account of certain mistakes the Fribourg copy cannot be considered as the autograph of Uhtred.

the *Monachus* (= Friburgensis) whom Gregory quotes. Perhaps it was decency on the part of Klenkok which made him ignore the Friburgensis. No one, not even Klenkok, could *prove* with apodictic certainty that the Friburgensis and Ulcredus were one and the same person. Alibis cannot always be torn down before a court and it would have meant court-action and condemnation for Ulcredus if his alibi as Friburgensis could have been definitely unmasked. One so inimical to Ulcredus, or Uhtred, as the Dominican William Jordan (cf. MARCETT 49 ff) would have been delighted to denounce Ulcredus for his heretical Friburgensis if proof had been available. It may be that Klenkok respected the mystery of the « Chinese wall » which separated the Friburgensis from the Uhtred of Oxford, colleague of Klenkok.

An *argumentum ex silentio* always has its liabilities ; in this case it is doubly fragile, for Klenkok wrote no *Quaestiones de Prologo Lombardi* where the matter of fideism would have come up in natural context !

In my larger study I can show that as late as 1374-78 an immediate disciple of Klenkok, Angelus Dobelin, did not even know that the fideism of the Friburgensis was condemned at Paris in 1347. But Dobelin cannot corroborate eventual suspicions that Klenkok was in ignorance about the Friburgensis or about the identity of its author. If Dobelin drew his main information from the writings of Klenkok — a very plausible supposition — then he was in the same predicament we are in. Klenkok has not written any questions on the Prologus ; what Klenkok thought about the fideism of the Friburgensis can only be guessed at.

The fideism of the Friburgensis is outrageous. I copy a few choice items from q. 3 art. 1, a question also Gregory quotes.

MS Fribourg Cord. 26 f. 100^r:

Non est purum philosophicum ponere aliquod primum in entibus.

Non est purum philosophicum ponere aliquam substantiam esse.

Non est purum philosophicum ponere substantiam distingui ab accidentibus.

Non est purum philosophicum ponere causas esse in mundo.

To describe all the facts which throw light on the relationship Klenkok-Ulcredus-Uhtred I must reserve to my larger study. Some passages from Hiltalingen may indirectly illustrate this relationship.

1. Hiltalingen 1 Sent. q. 15 Clm 26711 f. 95^r: Ex hoc apparet quod *Monachus Niger* non bene dicit ut videtur dicendo quod existens in peccato tenetur credere se esse extra caritatem, et tenetur credere se esse in caritate = Fribourg QQ q. 1 art. 1 MS Cord. 26 f. 83^r
2. Hiltalingen 2 Sent. q. 18 Clm 26711 f. 196^r: NON quanto tentatio est turpior vel peior, tanto voluntas ad sibi resistendum est liberior et potentior... contra *Nigrum Monachum* = Fribourg QQ q. 3 art. 2 f. 102^v: Quanto peccatum est enormius et gravius, tanto potest anima illud citius vitare.
3. Hiltalingen 4 Sent. q. 9 Clm 26711 f. 339^v: Contra *Ulcredum Nigrum Monachum*: Nullus homo ex puris naturalibus cum adiutorio dei quale semper est sibi, potest viam ad aeternam vitam invenire vel mereri.

To Hiltalingen the Fribourg-author and the Ulcredus found in Klenkok were apparently the same person.

The passage no. 3 was quoted indirectly from Klenkok at the very place where Klenkok identifies Ulcredus with Uhtred. Compare Klenkok 4 Sent. dist. 14 [MS Klosterneuburg 304 f. 164^v, Siena G V 16 f. 60^v]:

In istum errorem [Pelagii] etiam videtur incidere Socius Ulcredus de Dumelino (!) Niger Monachus dicens quod quilibet homo ex naturalibus suis cum adiutorio dei tali quale est sibi praesens, possit invenire viam ad vitam aeternam; et videtur directe error Pelagii.

There is no doubt ⁷ that Hiltalingen quoted from Klenkok. Uhtred answered Klenkok on this very point in the *Contra querelas fratrum* ⁸⁰⁾

art. 17: Quod quis potest mereri ex puris naturalibus, ita quod nihil requiritur a parte merentis praeter naturalia ad eligendum actum meritorium. HUNC <articulum> NON TENUI nec intendo tenere <ego Uhtred>.

⁸⁰⁾ Cf. M. E. MARCETT, *Uhtred de Boldon* (New York 1938) 33. — M. D. KNOWLES, *The Censured Opinions of Uhtred of Boldon*, in: *Proceedings of the British Academy XXXVII* (1955) 332-342 reedits the *Contra querelas fratrum* partly, and for the first time puts the querelae parallel with censures emanating from the Archbishop of Canterbury, Simon Langham on Nov. 9, 1368, against alleged heretical propositions. These propositions — though anonymously censured by Langham — mostly correspond to the ones disclaimed by Uhtred's *Contra querelas fratrum*. Art. 17 and 19 are found in Knowles on page 338.

art. 19: Quod est medium sufficiens in natura ad attingendum finem hominis naturalem. HUNC TENUI et persuasi et reputo esse verum.

The *Contra querelas fratrum* was therefore not only published against the Dominican William Jordan but also against Klenkok, Socius of Uhtred. In the *Contra querelas fratrum* another accusation of Klenkok is rebutted.

Klenkok 3 Sent. dist. 37 [Siena G V 16 f. 46^r; Klosterneuburg 304 f. 149^r]:

Sed numquid ignorantia facti excusat a peccato?... Dicit Ulcredus Monachus de Dunelmino quod ignorantia facti nec iudicem excusat; probat quia talis innocens iniuste pateretur, igitur iudex et similiter minister iniuste agerent. Item tunc similiter pagani essent excusati quia non credunt in Christum, quia habent ignorantiam facti.

Klenkok gives the withering answer of an incensed canonist:

Istius dicti oppositum est apud theologos ita notum quod Concilium Lateranense ponit contradictorium huius dicti per « Regulam iuris » quod ignorantia facti excusat. Nec apud legem aliquam credo dubitandum esse de hoc.

This is one of the few instances where Klenkok seems to identify Uhtred = Ulclerus = Ulcredus with the Friburgensis, who in q. 6 art. 3 (MS Fribourg Cord. 26 f. 124^r) furnishes a basis for Klenkok's charge.

Uhtred answers Klenkok in *Contra querelas fratrum* ⁸¹⁾ art. 24:

Quod ignorantia facti non excusat, nec excusare potest quempiam a peccato. HUNC NON DIXI quin ignorantia facti saepius excusat in parte, et poterit contingere in diversis casibus quod in toto.

These are two very strange coincidences: Klenkok makes a charge, and Uhtred answers with a flat denial. Shall we believe the accuser or the excuser?

At the end of the *Contra querelas fratrum* ⁸²⁾ Uhtred serves notice that another accusation of the « fratres » (Klenkok and Jordan) is equally false:

⁸¹⁾ Cf. MARCETT, 34. — KNOWLES, 339 (art. 24 does not occur in the censures of Langham).

⁸²⁾ Cf. MARCETT, 35. — KNOWLES, 340.

Praeter autem istos articulos *unum librum* <Uhtred> *edidit* in quo non solum isti sed multi alii continentur errores.

Uhtred affirms:

Librum nondum edidi, sed plura dixi et scripsi quae fortassis a clericis poterunt impugnari, sed ab omnibus falsis fratribus quamtumcumque malevolis non poterunt infirmari.

The « *liber* » in question might be the Fribourg-Quaestiones. If they were more or less a work of Autrecourt, published by Uhtred, the latter could always swear that he had not written it while Autrecourt could safely affirm that he had not published it.

Whatever may be the final solution of these problems, through Klenkok a new development has arisen in the story of Uhtred; its side-light illuminates a Janus-face. Uhtred's real personality becomes a mystery. The thin *alias* of the stealthy *Monachus Niger* = *Ulcredus*⁸³) has been unveiled but for convenience' sake the two names, Ulcredus and Uhtredus, may be retained: Uhtred, for the Oxonian we know; Ulcredus, for the author of the Fribourg-quaestiones.

FACINUS DE AST

MS Erfurt Amplon. 2° 115: Book I (colophon: 1362-63; hand = no. 1)
Book II and III (hand = no. 2)

MS Vat. Ottob. lat. 446: Book II and III

MS Coll. Navarra (lost) Book II and III (colophon: *duplex Lectura*)

MS Eichstätt 471: belongs to Klenkok (QQ Super Secundum)

In the weak light which fragmentary evidence sheds upon Facinus the outlines of his historical and doctrinal figure remain obscure.

⁸³) Anyone willing to deny this identification must unearth a second *Monachus Niger* — a task not too hopeless — with almost the same name as the one of Uhtred — a task rather hopeless. For around 1342 one knew in Paris that *quidam Monachus N<iger> Ordinis sancti Benedicti, qui vocatur Wicierus <Ulclerus>* was in possession of the works of Autrecourt (cf. J. LAPPE, *Nicolaus v. Autrecourt* BB VI, 2 [Münster 1908] 41*). And this *Wicierus* is already identifiable with the author of the Fribourg Quaestiones where a pure and undiluted « Autrecourt » speaks: *Non est purum philosophicum ponere aliquod primum in entibus, ponere aliquam substantiam esse, ponere substantiam distingui ab accidentibus, ponere causas esse in mundo* (MS Fribourg Cord. 26 f. 100r).

Facinus de Ast ⁸⁴), rarely de Aste, is a Lombard from Asti; birth and death are unrecorded. What offices Facinus held in Church and Order we ignore.

With a few historical facts and some logical deductions we can describe his scholastic career. Probably a Parisian Lector, certainly a Parisian Baccalarius during the biennium 1361-63, he was probably raised to the magisterial dignity at the Avignonesse General Chapter of the Augustinians on Pentecost, 1368. During the quinquennium between Baccalareatus and Magisterium he taught at Avignon. Support for these dates will be found in my larger study.

Klenkok and Facinus can be assigned to the historico-critical group of the Augustinians only with qualifications. The exactness of the quotations from Augustine furnish an argument for an attribution to this group. The quotations which Facinus culls from St. Augustine in his First Book are numerous, rich, and rather faithful. Many of those I have checked are taken from the *Milleloquium S. Augustini*; but the importance they had in the eyes of the author, or at least of the amanuensis, is evinced by the spe-

⁸⁴) On Facinus de Ast (!) cf. D. PERINI, *Bibliographia Augustiniana* I (Firenze 1929) 66. Perini reproduces the colophon of the lost Navarra manuscript on the authority of Quétif-Echard (I, 740): Explicit Secundum et Tertium Sententiarum Excellentissimi Sacrae Theologiae Doctoris Fratris Facini de Aste (!), Magistri Universitatis Parisiensis, qui *duplicem* [= *zplie* ? ?] *lecturam* super Sententias et super totam Philosophiam *duplicata* [= *z + phi*^{ca} ? ? = et physicam!! ? ?] scripsit. If my conjecture *duplicata* = originally in Navarra MS: et *physicam*, is correct then we have all the works which Perini lists, besides the Super Primum which Perini does not know:

1. Super Secundum et Tertium.

2. In libros de Anima Aristotelis Quaestiones quae olim asservabantur in nostra [O. E. S. A.] Bibl. conventus S. Marci Mediol. = Tractatus Magistri Facini de Ast O. E. <S. A.> *De maximo et minimo*; begins in MS Fribourg Cordeliers 26 f. 9^v: Quaestio utrum quaelibet creatura in sua natura sit certis limitibus circumscripta... In oppositum videtur esse Aristoteles in textu [De anima] qui dicit...

3. Quaestiones in libros Physicorum = MS Fribourg Cord. 26 f. 14^r-28^v.

The duplex Lectura of Facinus consists of Sent. 2-3: 1361-62 and of Sent. 4-1: 1362-63 (Book Four is lost). This way we can explain why Hiltalingen, Baccalarius Parisiensis 1365-66, quotes the Book II-III extensively but knows nothing of Book I which was still unpublished when Hiltalingen started. Facinus himself was no longer in Paris, but from 1363-68 at Avignon. [With the flexional forms of «Asti» the scholastics experienced some linguistic difficulties and wrote plain «Ast» because Astensis was no longer available].

cial treatment Augustinian quotations receive at the hand of Facinus or his copyist: they are all underlined very carefully from the first to the last word. In the Second and Third Book Augustinian quotations are much poorer.

Contemporary or preceding scholastics remain practically all anonymous; Scotus and other school-heads are identified in the text. No identifications are found on the margins, at least not in the extant MSS. If the very first copy or manual of Facinus presented the same appearance Facinus did not advance beyond the most rudimentary stage of quoting, a circumstance which regretfully obscures his theological physiognomy.

Hiltalingen, who is indispensable for any research in the 14th century, furnishes the key to the mysteries which veil the historical perspective in the case of Facinus. Hiltalingen quotes Facinus over 60 times, Dobelin only several times. These quotations from Facinus fix definite reference-points for surveying the doctrines of Facinus in a preliminary way. Hiltalingen, who knows only Book II and III of Facinus, establishes contact or contrast between Facinus and the following scholastics:

Adam	Brinkil	Ripa, Johannes
Altissiodorensis	Buckingham	Rodington
Aston, Nicolaus	Chillington	Rosetus
Bonsemblans (?)	Hugolinus	Rudolfus de Castello, O. E. S. A.
Bradwardine	Gregorius	Scotus and Thomas

With the careful quotations Hiltalingen drew from Facinus we are enabled to unveil his *quidam* in some 20 places of Book II and III. Before each line of Facinus comes in focus much work will have to be done. It will be a rewarding effort because Facinus seems to contain the first reaction to Johannes de Ripa and his disciple Ludovicus de Padua. Already in the Prologus of Facinus we notice his alertness to the problems which the great systematic Franciscan, Johannes de Ripa, had raised.

With Brinkil Facinus agrees on the freedom of the intellectual faculties. Another Anglicus, Ulcredus Monachus Niger Dunelmensis, seems to loom among the sources of Facinus; but I am not too certain. Among our list of quoted authors there are enough *Anglici* to make Facinus a little different from other Augustinians. Allowing for the attainment of a sharper focus we can already say that the picture of Facinus will look more « English ».

His style points in the same direction ; it is the essay-style we find in Chillington, Rodington, and other Anglici although it is not so pronounced as in his English forerunners. Facinus has no neat mathematical pattern of text-division like Hiltalingen or Simon de Cremona. Whether this is really indicative of an English attitude I cannot say.

Coexistence in the same manuscripts is sometimes denotative of similarity of doctrine, sometimes indicative of coexistence on the the same university roster. In MS Fribourg Cordeliers 26 Facinus is bound together with a number of « English » doctors: Rosetus, Guillelmus de Cremona (= Brinkil). Ulcredus Monachus, and the assembler of this collectanea manuscript, Fridericus de Ratisbona, O. Min. But there is also Hiltalingen (Decem Responsiones) who certainly is no Anglicus. In MS Fribourg Cordeliers 26 some philosophical works of Facinus have been copied: De maximo et minimo (f. 9^v-13^v), Super libros physicorum (Super Primum: f. 14^r-24^r; Super Secundum: f. 24^r-27^r; Super Tertium: f. 27^r-28^r; De materia 5ⁱ libri: f. 28^r-28^v). Certain references in these *Lectiones* of Facinus impugn and lampoon Fridericus de Ratisbona. This is the reason why Fridericus included Facinus in his personal collectanea manuscript of Fribourg. With all the others who co-exist in the same manuscript, Fridericus had similar personal scholastic associations, only one excepted, namely, Rosetus.

JOHN HILTALINGEN OF BASEL

Gateway to Research and Study in Augustinian Modern Theology

The style of Hiltalingen ⁸⁵⁾ is far away from the loose essay-form of the Anglici, Chillington, Rodington, Osbertus, and others. His place is at the other extreme ; he divides his texts *more geometrico*, and likes authors who write *more geometrico*.

⁸⁵⁾ For a short biography of Hiltalingen cf. D. TRAPP, *Hiltalinger's Augustinian Quotations*, in: *Augustiniana* IV (1954) 412-14. — In the meantime I have found a new important document on Hiltalingen in L. PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste* I (ed. 8-9, Freiburg 1926) 800-02, esp. 802 n. 1. It shows Hiltalingen, in the diplomatic service of Gregory XI, on a mission as angel of peace in Florence. The companion of Hiltalingen is Magister Ludovicus de Venetiis [= de Padual], O. Min.; the date of their diplomatic passport is July 20, 1377. — [On the advice of my revered teacher, Angelus Walz, O. P., I shall write in the future *Hiltalingen*, not *Hiltalinger* as in the past.]

He quotes :	times
Alanus, De maximis theologicis	35
Ps. Alanus, De arte fidei	
« Alexander », De memoria rerum difficilium	20
Definitiones XXIV Philosophorum	13
Auctor libri De Causis (also quoted « Proclus »)	16
Sometimes also the Auctor 6 principiorum.	

Among the masters of dialectics he quotes :

Antonius de Arimino, O. E. S. A.
 Billingham
 Burlaeus
 Firbich (Feribrigus, Virbiche)
 Hentisbri (Wm. Heytesbury)
 John Dumbleton (Tholinethon, Culmenthon)
 Petrus Heliae, the grammarian.

But Hiltalingen does not pertain to the logico-critical extremists. His way of thinking is marked by moderation and conservatism ; 83 times the *sententia communis* is invoked as standard. Hiltalingen has a great respect for the tradition of the Fathers and for the historical perspective and context of doctrines. This feature stamps Hiltalingen with the distinctive mark of the historico-critical group of the Augustinians whose trend many other Modern theologians followed. Among the patristic sources of Hiltalingen figure :

Ambrosius (31 times, indirectly), Athanasius (twice, ind.) Basilus (5), Beda (3), Chrysostomus (12, ind.), Gregorius (32, some ind.), Hieronymus (20, some ind.), Hilarius (20), Isidorus (often ind.), Origenes (6), Petrus Ravennas Chrysologus, Prosper (twice).

If a man of pronounced historical and positive tendencies, could quote no more from the treasures of the Fathers in general, we may understand that it was high time that the historical movement which Augustinian theology inaugurated started rolling.

Augustine was practically the only patristic channel of the Medieval West. Augustine was quoted by Hiltalingen about 800-1000 times with accuracy and good capitulations ; Damascenus some 65 times with examples of Hiltalingen's text-erudition ; Dionysius some 70 times with a capitulation which profited by the Letter-system, Boethius some 30 times.

The most positive source of theology, Holy Scripture, Hiltalingen did certainly not neglect ; well over a thousand times we find him quoting it without distorting its literary sense.

The early scholastics and Authentici are found in Hiltalingen:

	times
S. Bernardus	31
Hugo de S. Victore	85
Richardus de S. Victore	25
Altissiodorensis	110
Anselmus (with good capitulation)	156
Ps. Anselmus (Eadmerus: De similitud.)	4

The *Auctor de fide et legibus* (Guill. de Alvernia), who widened the horizons in regard to freedom of conscience, Hiltalingen quotes 26 times. Legal sources are quoted, once or twice each: Remigius, Raymundus, Paulus, Archidiaconus Vincentius [Baisius] Guido, Johannes Andreae, Johannes Monachus, and of course Gratianus etc.

	times
Astensis	50
Hostiensis	20

Popes are quoted especially on poverty and beatific vision:

John XXII (15 times) ;	
Benedict XII ⁸⁶⁾ (36 times) ;	« Benedictus deus » Contra: Eccardum, Michaellem de Cesena, Ockham, Petrum Johannem Olivi).

Marsilius and *Johannes de Ganduno* are quoted in this connection some 18 times.

Among the scholastics proper are some who must be considered as setting stars at the time Hiltalingen wrote. One might expect to find them oftener on the pages of Hiltalingen. I enter the number of quotations in parentheses, with a star if the indirect manner of quoting is rather obvious.

⁸⁶⁾ Knowing the dogmatic importance of a papal saying or writing, Hiltalingen remarks in Clm 26711 f. 226^{rv}: Notandum tamen quod non erat tunc papa cum praedictam rationem contra praedictum Petrum <Olivi> fecit sed vocabatur Jacobus tit. S. Priscae presbyter Cardinalis ut patet in rubrica operis antedicti.

S. Albertus	(6)	Landulfus	(1)
Alexander de Halis	(5)	Matthaeus de Aquasp.	(1)
S. Bonaventura	(13)	Petrus Abaelardus	(1)
Durandus *	(23)	Petrus de Alvernia	(1)
Franciscus de Marchia	(3)	Petrus de Tarentasia	(6)
Gilbertus Porret.	(2)	Praepositinus	(4)
Godofridus	(7)	Richardus de Mediav.	(5)
Guido Terreni	(3)	Robertus Cowton	(3)
Hervaeus	(2)	Simon Carnot. Tornac.	(1)
Linconiensis *	(8)	Wm. of Ware (Varro)*	(1)

Of course, there is no ready-made thumb rule for counting quotations; one remains always hesitant between two alternatives: whether the occurrence of the simple name or the number of quoted chapters should be counted.

The following short list sets the tone for Hiltalingen's system:

Aegidius Romanus (Dominus, Magnus, Doctor noster)	252
Thomas de Argentina, Doctor noster (Sent. 1-4)	188
Gregorius, Doctor noster Authenticus (Sent. 1-2)	133
Hugolinus, Magister, Dominus (Sent. 1-4)	193
S. Thomas (with special reverence when contradicted)	232
Henricus de Gandavo	152
Scotus	246

These are the non-Augustinian sources of Hiltalingen:

Sententia communis	83
Adam (1 ^a , 2 ^a Lectura)	27 (often with Gregorius)
Albertus (discipulus Osberti ?)	2
Armacanus (Hibernicus, R. Fitzralph)	
[Lectura	
De paupertate Christi	
Libellus quem edidit in Curia	
Summa de QQ Armenorum]	75
Bacon<thorp>	5
Bradwardine, Doctor Profundus	80 (perfect capitulations)
Brinkil ⁸⁷⁾	39

⁸⁷⁾ The complete name of Brinkil is Doctor Anglicus, O. Min., Richardus Brinkil Folvil. Very rich material about this Anglicus is found in the QQ Super Secundum Guillelmi de Cremona, O. Min., [Socius of Hiltalingen] MS Fribourg Cordeliers 26 f. <modern> 143^r-190^r. I shall publish excerpts from William of Cremona whom Ehrle [*Der Sentenzenkommentar Peters v. Candia* (Münster 1925) 279] misidentifies as the Augustinian General William Amidani of Cremona. Ehrle (68 f, 71, 277-78) deals with Brinkil on the basis of other documents.

Chillington [= once <i>Calikan</i>] ⁸⁸⁾	25
Franciscus de Perusio, Vesperiae	4
Halifax (Audifax, Eliphat: indirectly ?)	6
Jacobus de Spinalo	1
Johannes de Ripa	
[Determinationes	
Super Primum	
QQ Ordinariae]	76
Nicolaus Aston	13
Nicolaus de Orem	3
Ockham	18
Osbertus	10
[Pickingham, Buckingham ?]	7
Paulus de Perusio	26
Richardus Barbe (discipulus de Ripa)	5
Robertus Holcot	14
Rodington	5
Rosetus	15
Petrus Aureoli (originally)	23
[Large secondary additions	
in MS Toulouse 248]	
Petrus Clarevallensis Ceffons	1
Ulcredus Monachus Niger	3

The Augustinians quoted by Hiltalingen are:

⁸⁸⁾ Chillington edited: 10 QQ theologales, 10 QQ morales = Super librum Ethicorum, 10 QQ physicales = Super librum De generatione, found together in the MS Bruges 503, written by one hand of ca. 1350. The QQ theologales 1-10 are listed (all ten) in MS Bruges 188 f. 2^v; but in no MS are all ten preserved. — The QQ morales are announced in the QQ theologales as finished; cf. MSS Paris Nat. lat. 14576 f. 140^r = Vat. lat. 4353 f. 24^r = Bruges 503 f. 98^r (alias respondam in QQ super librum Ethicorum; similarly in Paris Nat. lat. 15561 f. 210^v). The QQ morales 1-10 are copied in MS Bruges 503 f. 51^r-79^v but attributed by the same hand to Magister *Clariton* [= Chillington] de Anglia; the style is the English essay-form, the same as in the QQ theologales. Of course the endless quotations from Augustine we find in the QQ theologales are not in the Aristotelian commentary of Chillington on the liber Ethicorum. — Chillington also wrote QQ physicales as he says himself in the QQ theologales cf. Vat. lat. 4353 f. 41^r (alias probavi legendo physicam). Also the Vat. lat. 986 f. 56^r quotes Kilmiton (!) in QQ suis super librum Physicorum. Hiltalingen quotes the QQ physicales under the name of *Calikan* [= Chillington] cf. Clm 26711 f. 174^v. This large passage of Hiltalingen is found exactly, without variation, in MS Bruges 503 f. 50^r.

	times
Alexander de S. Elpidio, quondam Generalis noster [= <i>Alexander</i> in: Thom. Argent.] whom he quotes in- directly ; cf. ed. 1585 [Th. Arg.] f. 62 ^r , 97 ^r	2
Alfonsus de Toletio	34
Antonius de Arimino (in Logica parte 2 cc. 3, 4, 6)	4
Bartholomaeus de Urbinio, several times, [also under <i>Milleloquium</i>]	
Bernardus Oliverius, indirectly from Alfonsus	
Bonsimilant: Sent. 1-2 ; Principia ; Vesperiae ⁸⁹⁾	51
Facinus de Ast: Sent. 2-3 ; never Sent. 1	64
Gerardus de Senis: Sent. 1-2	31
Gregorius, Doctor noster Authenticus: Sent. 1-2	133
Gyso de Colonia	3
Godofridus de Hardeby	2
Henricus de Vrimaria	8
Hermannus de Schildicz (Mag.)	11
Hugolinus, Mag. Generalis, Dominus: Sent. 1-4 [Sent. 3 very rarely, Sent. 4 rarely]	193
Jacobus de Appamiis quidam antiquus doctor huius scholae [indirectly from Gregory]	1
Jacobus de Viterbio, Doctor noster Inventivus [Quol. 1-3, QQ De praedicamentis divinis]	72
Johannes de Lana [indirectly]	1
Johannes de Braculis, « Magister » (Socius of Ebracus) [De symbolo = De radicibus theologiae De videndo deum ; but no Lectura !]	33
Johannes Klenkok [Quolibetum, Postilla super can. Johannis, super Actus Apostolorum, Expositio litteralis Sent. 1-4, QQ Super Secundum]	87
Rudolfus de Castello, Magister (Regens 1360) [Determinaciones, Vesperiae]	6
Johannes Romani, Magister	2
Jordanus de Saxonia, Lector [Postilla, Theorem. de passione, De stimulo amoris, Super Missus est]	12
Michael de Massa venerabilis vir licet non Magister [indirectly from Alfonsus !]	3
Prosper de Regio [indirectly]	1

⁸⁹⁾ The Vesperiae of Bonsimilant I have found anonymous in Vat. lat. 981 after the Determination of J. de Ripa. The Vesperiae are on f. 71^v-74^v. F. 75^r-97^v probably belong to Bonsimilant. Being a Socius of Ludovicus de Padua [= de Venetiis], O. Min., (who was a disciple of de Ripa and caused the indirect condemnation of Ripa) Bonsimilant is in the Vat. lat. 981 for a very natural reason.

Onofrius de Florentia [Bacc. in Responsione]	4
Thomas de Argentina	188
Aegidius	252

John of Basel quotes Aegidius 252 times but disagrees with him over 50 times. He calls him either plainly Aegidius, or Aegidius Magnus (3 times), Dominus Aegidius (20), Dominus Aegidius Magnus (3 times). He treats him as the head of the School, Doctor noster Aegidius (3 times), and has him parade at the head of long processions: Doctores nostri Aegidius, Thomas, Bonsimilant; or: Aegidius cum sua parte (Gerardus, Thomas); or: Schola nostra, Aegidius, Gregorius, Hugolinus, Jacobus et alii doctores scholae nostrae; or: Aegidius, Gerardus, Thomas, Hugolinus, Klenkok. It need not be underlined that Hiltalingen tells us sometimes that his opinion is *de mente Aegidii*, that he lavishes his praise on the sayings of the Master with the scholastic *pulchre, satis pulchre, bene, satis prolixè, diffuse et prolixè*. This last compliment is almost a criticism because Aegidius can be very long-winded indeed. Amusing it is to see that John gives his Doctor Noster no titles when he contradicts him with a *salva reverentia*.

The works of Aegidius known to Hiltalingen are:

times

74	Sent. 1
60	Sent. 2
11	Sent. 3
9	Tractatus de Corpore Christi [theoremata et commenta]
8	De primo principio [secundum aliam intitulationem: De esse et essentia]
1	De regimine principum
2	De clerico imperfecte ordinato
1	De cognitione angelorum
3	Tractatus de mensura angelorum
1	De compositione angelorum, indirectly from Alfonsus [= Alveus, Hervaeus ?] <i>lib. 3 q. 3</i> !
6	Theoremata de esse et essentia [theoremata, commenta, articuli]
9	Liber de articulis Petri Johannis [Tractatus de erroribus (de reprobatione errorum) Petri Johannis]
6	Tractatus de erroribus philosophorum
3	Tractatus de peccato originali
1	Tractatus de resignatione papae
6	Expositio decretalis Firmiter, Extra De summa trinitate...
1	Expositio decretalis Cum Marthae

- 1 Tractatus quomodo reges... bona immobilia possunt ecclesiae dare
- 4 De influentia dei in beatos
- 39 Quodlibeta 1-6
- 1 Tractatus de subjecto theologiae

Names marking the different steps in the career of Hiltalingen

Socii: Dominicus Michael de Sorbona
 [Mag. Stephanus Godetti (Galdeti)]
 Guillelmus de Cremona, O. Min.
 Paulus de Fonte, O. Carm.
 Godoscalus de Pomulcz, O. Cist.]

Albertus Ranconis [de Bohemia]
 Bartholomaeus de Ripario, Mag. O. P.: Tolosae
 Bonsimilant, Mag. O. E. S. A.
 Conradus de Ebraco, nondum Mag. O. Cist.
 Dionysius Foullechat, Bacc. O. Min.
 Eberhardus nunc abbas Furnensis
 Guillelmus Cantor Parisiensis, Mag. [de Salvarvilla]: Parisiis
 Guillelmus Arnaldi, Mag.: Parisiis
 Guillelmus Jordan de universitate Oxoniensi, Mag.
 Johannes de Calore de Sorbona, Mag. (Prior ?)
 Johannes Cusin, Mag. O. P.
 Johannes Romani, Mag. O. E. S. A.
 Nicolaus de Amatrice, Mag. O. E. S. A.
 Onofrius de Florentia, Bacc. O. E. S. A.
 Stephanus Godetti [Galdeti]

The preceding list of quotations found in Hiltalingen is by no means definitive ; some names have not yet been definitely identified, others will come up in indirect quotations. There are of course many quotations from Canon Law, which I have not mentioned. Self-quotations occur in Hiltalingen 229 times ; they are valuable in examining his doctrinal progress.

The venture of editing Hiltalingen is in the process of realization ; the encyclopedic wealth of information contained in his writings makes him the gateway to research and study in Augustinian Modern Theology.

With Hiltalingen we have reached practically the end of the Augustinian Schola Moderna. There are some extant *Lecturae* subsequent to Hiltalingen but they are mostly *Lecturae secundum alium* : Simon's *Lectura secundum Hugolinum* ; Montina's *Lectura secundum Conradum = secundum Hugolinum* ; Dobelin's *Lectura secundum*

dum Klenkok et Hiltalingen ; Gracilis' Lectura secundum Hiltalingen.

These Lecturae secundum alium are not merely repetitious ; they contain sometimes new elements of information but in this article I have to aim at brevity ; it must suffice to evaluate the Lectura secundum alium as a type. For this purpose I want to examine at least one Lectura secundum alium. I choose the interesting case of Simon de Cremona (MS Cremona 118).

SIMON DE CREMONA

The importance of a Lectura secundum alium

In the patrimony of Augustinian scholasticism of the 14th century figures a beautiful Commentary on the Four Books of Lombard by Simon of Cremona [*Baccalarius Secundarius Augustiniensis in scholis interioribus O. E. S. A. 1365-66*].

The date of his Lectura has been established with probability in another article ⁹⁰). With the additional facts contained in this article, the date 1365-66 becomes practically certain.

Simon does not pretend to write a new Commentary of his own but states plainly that he reads *secundum Hugolinum* whom he excerpts in all Four Books, adding in the First Book passages from Alfonsus, in the first two Books some from Bonsimblans [Badoarius] de Padua.

The characterization of Simon's doctrine is thereby intimated. In regard to style one has to admit that Simon writes a facile Latin. The manner of subdividing his text-material is far away from the loose English essay-style. He follows a mathematical pattern of subdivision: 3×3 , that is, *three* principal arguments at the beginning, are answered by *three* articles in the *Quaestio*. This rule is applied with methodical care, but the inconveniences of a too detailed divisional pattern which we find in Hiltalingen ($3 \times 3 \times 3$) ⁹¹) are avoided by Simon's.

⁹⁰) Cf. D. TRAPP, *The Portiuncula Discussion of Cremona*, in: *Recherches de théol. ancienne et médiévale* XXII (1955) 82 n. 9. Also F. STEGMÜLLER, *Disput. de indulgentiis S. de Cremona [et] Tractatus de deo trino Hugolini de Urbev.* in: *Annali Biblioteca Gov. Cremona* VII, 1 (1955) 5-7.

⁹¹) Cf. D. TRAPP, *Hiltalinger's Augustinian Quotations*, in: *Augustiniana* IV (1954) 417.

Like Hugolin, Klenkok, and Hiltalingen, Simon does not quote on the margin of text-columns; he quotes in the text itself. Quotations from Augustine are good at the beginning of the Commentary, poor at the end. In the Third Book which I have copied, I found only some 50 short and meager quotations from Augustine. There are many names in Simon's texts, for he belongs to the historico-critical group of the Augustinians. To indicate all names would create a wrong impression as they have been taken from Alfonsus, Gregory, Hugolin, and Bonsimblans. I list only the significant ones:

Socii: Franciscus de Mediolano, Bacc. Ord. Serv. S. Mariae
Magister Stephanus de Collegio Laudunensi

Doctores: Aegidius, Doctor noster *Egregius*
Alfonsus, Dominus, Doctor noster
Bonsimblans (!), Magister de Padua
Gregorius, Doctor noster *Authenticus*
Ugolinus (at end: Hugolinus)
Doctor noster *Luculentus* (very often)
Patriarcha Constantinopolitanus (sometimes)
(The other names will be enumerated together
with the *Tituli Quaestionum* in my larger study).

Simon's *Lectura* belongs to the type of the *Lectura secundum alium*. This type is not rare in the late 14th century, as we know, and has a history extending into the preceding decades although we cannot verify it with the same ease because the authors quote less and on account of less quoting parade more originality.

I am only interested here in those *Lecturae secundum alium* where the « *alius* » is an Augustinian. Of that kind I know several after 1365, both among the Augustinians and — this is rather strange at first sight — also among the Cistercians.

There seems to be a symbiotic relationship between the Augustinian and the Cistercian theology of the late 14th century.

1 Godescalcus de Pomulcz ⁹²⁾, Baccalarius O. Cist., 1365-66, wrote *secundum Gregorium*, as the Augustinian *Socius* of Godescalcus, John of Basel, and the Cistercian contemporary,

⁹²⁾ On the MSS of Peter Gracilis, Simon of Cremona, Angelus Dobelin, Dionysius de Montina, Conrad of Ebrach, John Hiltalingen, Jacobus of Eltville, and Godescalcus of Pomulcz [Pomuk] cf. F. STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium Lombardi* I (1947) s. v.

Jacobus de Altavilla, *Baccalarius* 1369-70, well knew. Hiltalingen names *Gregory and Godescalcus* in one breath four times within his 1 Sent. q. 2 and q. 6. Jacobus brackets the two together in his Commentary MS Cambrai 570 f. 2^r, 5^v, 45^v, 128^v; in the last place the identification is somewhat puzzling « *Dominus Cocalchus Bacellarius huius Colengii <de S. Bernardo>* » but *Baccalarius* need not, and does not, mean here *Socius*.

2 Jacobus de Altavilla, *Baccalarius* O. Cist., 1369-70, composed his Sentences *secundum Johannem* de Basilea. I have examined a large part of the First and Second Book of Jacobus (MS Cambrai 570) and found very many and copious passages which are taken literally from Hiltalingen.

3 This *Lectura* of *Jacobus secundum Johannem de Basilea* was read also to the Monks of Ebrach, 1382, when Henry of Langenstein on his return from Paris stopped at the abbey of his friend, Jacobus de Altavilla, and acted as guest-lecturer ⁹³).

4 Conradus de Ebrach, *Baccalarius* O. Cist., 1370-71, drafted his Sentences *secundum Hugolinum*. My confrère, Adolar Zumkeller, has already mentioned it ⁹⁴). Conrad's Warsaw MS 390 (Zumkeller 23) adds this note:

⁹³) Cf. A. LANG, *Heinrich Toting v. Oyta*, in: *Beiträge Baeumkers* XXXIII, 4-5 (Münster 1937) 32 f. — Lang mentions only the Henry MS Erfurt Ampon 2^o 118 as the Ebrach *Lectura*.

F. STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium Lombardi* I (Würzburg 1947) 155 under no. 331 mentions also the MS München Clm 11591 which I have found to be identical to the MSS of Jacobus de Altavilla. Clm 11591 which Stegmüller attributes to Henry of Langenstein must therefore be returned to the rightful owner, namely, to Jacobus de Altavilla, if Clm 11591 is typical as text-witness for Henry's *Lectura at Ebrach* because the Clm 11591 is absolutely identical to the MS Cambrai 570 (Jacobus) in all the numerous passages which I copied during the confrontation Jacobus-Hiltalingen.

⁹⁴) Cf. Adolar ZUMKELLER, *Dionysius de Montina*, in: *Cassiciacum* (German series) Bd. X (2. Reihe, 4. Bd) [Würzburg 1948] 18 in footnote.

A. LANG, *Die Wege der Glaubensbegründung bei den Schol. des 14. Jh.*, in: *Beiträge Baeumkers* XXX, 1-2 (Münster 1930) 238: « Sein Standpunkt (Lang refers to Conradus) deckt sich mit den Ansichten der Augustinerschule... Am nachdrücklichsten scheint er mir durch Hugolinus Malabranca beeinflusst zu sein ». Zumkeller quotes this passage of Lang, who based his statement certainly on MS Paris Nat. lat. 3070 f. 11^v mentioned above in the text.

Nota quod <Conradus> sequitur Hugolinum qui <Conradus ?> fecit quasdam responsiones suorum <Hugoloni ?> dictorum Parisius.

The Klosterneuburg MS 292 f. 97^v (Zumkeller 40) documents the relationship Hugolinus-Conradus with the words of Conradus himself: Hugolinus Generalis eiusdem ordinis <O. E. S. A.> quem in isto articulo et in multis aliis sequor <ego Conradus>.

I saw another statement of this sort in Conrad's MS Paris Nat. lat. 3070 f. 11^v:

Respondeo <Conradus> sequendo doctrinam solidam Magistri Hugolini sicut solitus sum frequenter.

5 Dionysius de Montina, *Baccalarius O. E. S. A. 1371-72*, read this Conradus-Commentary to his own Augustinians because it was a new kind of Hugolinus presented with the critique of Conradus, and therefore of lively interest to the Augustinians ⁹⁵).

6 Among the Augustinians themselves, Angelus Dobelin, *Baccalarius 1374-75*, read openly *secundum Klenkok et Hiltalingen*.

⁹⁵) The reader may ask how works of Augustinians could be read in the lecture hall of the Cistercians. Any answer must postulate a great doctrinal similarity between the two orders. Corporative pride would have never permitted it if this similarity had not existed. To make the *recitatio* of an outsider possible, too-revealing quotations were a little retouched. The great doctors like Aegidius and Thomas of Strassburg were allowed to stay in the *recitatio* of the Augustinian outsider; their names were not suppressed. Smaller figures or contemporary Augustinians quoted in the *recitatio* were rendered anonymous and shrouded under a « *quidam* ». I have often been amused by this technique which Jacobus de Altavilla in his *recitatio* of Hiltalingen uses; ex. g. in 2 Sent. q. 7 (= Hiltalingen 2 Sent. q. 15 and 16) Jacobus repeats the definition of the *peccatum veniale* given by Klenkok who is expressly named in Hiltalingen but rendered nameless by Jacobus: « *quidam doctor linguae meae* » [Klenkok and Altavilla are both German]. The Jacobus MS Kassel Theol. Fol. 16 f. 199^v and Cambrai 570 f. 162^v have the same phrase.

The editor of Dionysius de Montina who wanted to make him a Cistercian used the same palliative technique in regard to quotations found in Dionysius.

These *Lecturae secundum alium* were read with the approval of the Superiors who were happy to know that the voice of a good Master was re-echoing in their lecture halls. As long as the basic requirements of their school tradition were fulfilled, even an outsider could be « recited ». The annual turnover of professors (*Baccalarii*) provided for variety, but was also likely to endanger continuity and solidity of doctrine.

7 Petrus Gacilis, *Baccalarius* 1375-76, followed not only the footsteps but the very phrases of Hiltalingen in a way so deceptive that it does not cast the best light on Gracilis. He read *secundum Hiltalingen* without ever mentioning him. Only by a lucky coincidence was I enabled to « unmask » Gracilis' dubious literary honesty. I am willing, however, to give him the benefit of the doubt. The MS of Gracilis, Brit. Museum, Royal 10 A 1, is a late copy (1440); the original may have had an *Incipit* or *Explicit* which clearly stated that the *Lectura Gracilis* was *secundum Hiltalingen*. When the British manuscript was copied the name of Hiltalingen was under the cloud of a *damnatio memoriae* ⁹⁶).

8 Bertholdus de Ratisbona to whom we owe the preservation of the literary legacy of Hiltalingen (Clm 26711) was *Baccalarius Oxoniensis* O. E. S. A., 1398-99. He was the *Recollector* of Hiltalingen and read him to his Augustinian students at Oxford and later in Wien ⁹⁷)

9 Simon de Cremona, *Baccalarius Secundarius* O. E. S. A., 1365-66, read *secundum Hugolinum*. And in this case we are supported by the sources in saying that Simon *therefore* recollected the works of Hugolinus.

Before such a list of *extant Lecturae secundum alium*, a list which *lost Lecturae* might increase, one may have a feeling of deep dismay. Today we immediately think of « plagiarism » and regret the waste of ink which these productions seem to imply.

The last two in our list, Bertholdus and Simon, give a different evaluation to the *Lecturae secundum alium*: the greater the « plagiarism », the greater may be the merit before posterity !

In the age of the manuscript, to copy meant to deserve the gratitude of posterity, to excerpt meant to promote the cause of solid science. Thus we are indebted even to the worst « plagiarist ».

But some of these *Lecturae secundum alium* were not animated

⁹⁶) Hiltalingen was one of the most active agents of the schismatic curia of Avignon; after the Schism (1378-1415) Hiltalingen's name was suspect because he had been anti-general under Avignon and schismatic bishop of Lombez near Lourdes.

⁹⁷) On Bertholdus de Ratisbona cf. a forthcoming study on the history of the Augustinians in Wien by Dr. Fr. Rennhofer (to appear in 1956).

at all by the spirit of plagiarism ; on the contrary, by the avowed intention to make complete editions of an author. To these *Lecturae secundum alium* we owe that the works of many authors have been preserved in one *corpus*. In the age of the manuscript the different « Books » could freely be scattered, an all-inclusive copy could very well become impossible.

After the Baccalareatus of an author his single books were lying around in their first draft, perhaps completely unbound, their margins crowded with *notae*, *notulae*, their sequence of text in disorder on account of inserted *sexterni*, and *folia* of all sizes ⁹⁸). In his capacity as Baccalareus Formatus the author was busy with sermons and other scholastic requirements, among them the time-consuming preparation for the prescribed *Responsiones*. To qualify for the *Magisterium* it was enough to present for approval a *complete draft* ; the amanuensis inserted *sexterni*, *folia*, *notae* and *notulae* somewhere in the text, rightly or wrongly, as time and competence would permit. Such a *complete draft* we have in the Gregory edition of 1522 (reprint 1955) ⁹⁹) because Gregory never found a Baccalarius willing enough to give the finishing touch of the editor to Gregory's *Lectura notata* (complete draft).

But Hugolinus was lucky enough to meet a *Recollector* (editor) in a Baccalarius whom I identify with Simon de Cremona. Simon studied the complete draft of Hugolin (*Lectura notata*) before his own Baccalareatus in 1365, put enough reference signs and remarks into Hugolin's complete draft to be able to read Hugolin in class, and after the Baccalareatus (1365-71 ?), at least before 1377, released a complete and harmoniously *edited* Hugolin-text for circulation. This is the story I want to develop in the following.

SIMON THE RECOLLECTOR HUGOLINI

Several MSS of Hugolinus ¹⁰⁰) conclude the *Lectura* with this remark :

⁹⁸) Cf. my forthcoming edition of the *Epistula Introductoria* of Peter Ceffons in *Traditio* (1956).

⁹⁹) Cf. above in this article p. 193 ff under Gregory of Rimini.

¹⁰⁰) Cf. A. ZUMKELLER, *Hugolin v. Orvieto u. seine theol. Erkenntnislehre* (Würzburg 1941) 105-123. Zumkeller has not identified the Recollector Hugolini.

Lectura fuit notata A. D. 1352, sed
Recollectio fuit facta A. D. 1365.

Most MSS of Hugolinus begin with a *Recollector's* preface of which I excerpt the most significant and relevant passages:

Exemplo veri summi Magistri dicentis Joh. 15 « Quaecumque audivi a Patre meo, nota feci vobis »

<1> *dicta* scil. per... Hugolinum... studui pro viribus in unum *recolligere* et

<2> ceteris in mea Lectura Sententiarum Parisius impertiri... Tanto quippe magis aestimo *mihi et aliis*... proficere quanto studiosius

<3> *coepero* illius *scripta* requirere et

<4> inventa frequentius atque attentius recensere... Sed antequam ulterius proseguar, fateor me ad huiusmodi RECOLLECTIONEM DEBITO ORDINE SECTANDAM omnino non sufficere. Et ideo si quid correctionis dignum reperi, non auctorem <Hugolinum> huius operis arguas, sed collectori... ignoscas...

Interpretation based exclusively on this text alone

<1> The primary intention of the Recollector was to recollect or collect again the *dicta Hugolini*; it existed already in the past (cf. *studui*), before 1365, but its realization was left to the future, to the time after 1365 (cf. *ad recollectionem sectandam*).

<2> The secondary purpose of the Recollector was to read the recollected *dicta Hugolini* to a scholastic audience during the *Baccalareatus Recollectoris*.

<3> He could not read the *Lectura notata* of 1352 in the lecture hall as the text passages were disarrayed in many places. To achieve harmony among the *dicta Hugolini*, incorporated in the interim-edition of 1352, the Recollector was conscious of the imperative need to look immediately for MSS of Hugolin (cf. *quanto coepero illius scripta requirere*) and to peruse them carefully and repeatedly (cf. *quanto coepero inventa scripta frequentius et attentius recensere*), before his own *Baccalareatus* (cf. *tanto magis aestimo mihi proficere*), during his teaching as *Baccalareus* (cf. *tanto magis aestimo aliis proficere*), and after his *Baccalareatus* in preparation for the final edition of Hugolinus which the

Recollector hoped would be perfect. For any imperfections the Recollector assumed personal responsibility.

Interpretation in the light of accessory evidence

- 1352 An interim-edition in the customary shorthand (*nota*) was prepared which shifted all additions and marginalia somewhere into the text-column. This interim-edition must have looked like the reprint of Gregorius Ariminensis of the year 1955.
- 1365 While other Baccalarii prepared themselves for their *Lectura* by revising their own *Lectura* texts, SIMON DE CREMONA, O. E. S. A., decided to read « *secundum Hugolinum* » ; he went over the *Lectura notata* of 1352 several times, and made his reference signs where disarrayed text-passages needed better harmony and sequence. When in doubt he consulted other MSS, copies of the *Lectura Lectoris Hugolini*, or the *Lectura Ordinata Hugolini*, or perhaps the original from which the *Lectura notata* had been copied.
- 1365 The *Lectura notata* of 1352, in recollected form, was read in the lecture hall of the Parisian Augustinians, and so underwent its first test of fire. The result of this public reading, the *reportata* by students of SIMON, and Simon's further application brought about a copy of Hugolinus which Simon considered as harmonious and complete as his ideal demanded. Simon had an *archetypus* copied by a *stationarius* of Paris.
- 1377 Before his *Licentia* ¹⁰¹⁾ Simon had to present a *Lectura* of his own for official approval to meet the requirements of the *Magisterium*. Simon assembled this *Lectura* of his own from a *florilegium* of Hugolinus' Four Books, inserting excerpts of Alfonsus in the First Book, and excerpts of Bonsemblans in Book 1-2. This *Lectura Simonis* was copied by a *stationarius* of Paris and is our actual MS Cremona 118. The same *stationarius* was ordered by Simon to make a copy of the *archetypus* of Hugolin which Simon took along to Italy ; this Hugolinus-copy was first in Simon's possession, passed into the hands of the Augustinian General Bartholomaeus Venetus (*de civitate Venetiarum*) and was in-

¹⁰¹⁾ Cf. foot-note n. 90.

corporated among the library treasures of Pope Gregory XII (1411). It is our MS Vat. lat. 1094 ¹⁰²). A comparison between the handwriting of Vat. lat. 1094 and Cremona 118 leaves little or no doubt that both these MSS are the product of the same artistic pen, the same illuminator !

This interpretation hinges on the identification of the *Recollector Hugolini* with Simon de Cremona, O. E. S. A. I find it fascinating that this identification is vouched for by a threefold coincidental identity between the *Recollectio Hugolini* and the Commentary of Simon de Cremona.

First, Simon did read *secundum Hugolinum* as his MS Cremona 118 amply proves, and the *Recollector's* claim requires.

Second, the Lectura-year of Simon coincides with the identical date of the *Recollectio*: 1365.

Third, one of the best Hugolinus MS, the Vat. lat. 1094, certainly a close descendent of the *archetypus recollectoris*, as well as Simon's own *Lectura*, the MS Cremona 118, are products of the same penmanship and the same artistic taste. According to Pelzer's Catalogue the Vat. lat. 1094 has been written by three hands ; also the MS Cremona 118 has three hands. The main hand is identical in both MSS. At the end of the MS Cremona 118 is a discussion on the Portiuncula indulgence probably by the hand of Simon himself. It would clinch the proof if this hand were also found in the Vat. lat. 1094.

Recollector = *recollector operum*
and/or = *recollector ordinatorque idearum* ?

To render our interpretation more plausible we must focus and fix the meaning of *recolligere* and its derivative *recollector*. Why *recollector* should mean *editor* as our interpretation demands is not a priori evident. To the modern ear, at least, *recollector* implies more *recolligere omnia opera* than *recolligere omnes textus dispersos recollectosque ' debito ordine ' ordinare*.

A factual consideration shows that the two meanings need not be mutually exclusive ; no editor can go to work without having

¹⁰²) Cf. A. ZUMKELLER, *Hugolin v. Orvieto* (1941) 115 and A. PELZER, *Codices Vaticani Latini 679-1134* II, 1 (Vatican 1931) 697 where a possessor's name is partly erased: « ... de civitate venetiarum ». I interpret the erasure as: Bartholomaeus de Civitate Venetiarum.

under his hands all the literary productions of an author if he wants to make a complete edition, *collectanea* in medieval parlance.

Therefore the first meaning which we might read into this medieval word *recollector*, is never excluded when we meet with medieval *Recollectores* because they, actually, assembled the *opera omnia* of those authors whom a kind fate preserved from oblivion.

But the second signification of *recollector* = *editor* is not only involved automatically by the realities of medieval book-lore but also warranted by the medieval dictionary.

Hugolin's *Recollector* himself insinuates that *recolligere* signifies *recolligere debito ordine* (cf. ad recollectionem debito ordine sectandam). That *recolligere* conveys the idea of *recolligere OMNIA debito ordine* is made patently obvious by the terminology which Michael de Massa, O. E. S. A., uses in his *Lectura* on the First Book.

Michael writes a Commentary which although consisting of *Quaestiones* has yet the ambition to treat *all the ideas* of Lombard. Historically speaking, the first Commentaries on Lombardus were text-commentaries which followed the text-passages of Lombardus with a step-by-step explanation; the later Commentaries on Lombardus (ca. 1350) consisted, on the contrary, of *Quaestiones* which had only a loose connection with *one or two ideas* of Lombardus.

An intermediate category of Commentary is found in Michael de Massa († 1337). After having read to his students the *capitula* of a Lombard-*distinctio* Michael formulates one sentence (*problema, propositio, assumpta*) which is supposed to contain *all the ideas* of Lombardus and therefore gives Michael a chance to draw from each word or *clausula* of this *propositio* material for one or more *Quaestiones* so that all the ideas of Lombard receive full treatment.

Now — this is important to note — Michael always calls this *propositio* a *propositio RECOLLECTA* ¹⁰³⁾ or *propositio RECOLLIGENDA*

¹⁰³⁾ Cf. Michael's MS Bologna Università 2214 [= Bu] and Bologna Collegio di Spagna 40 [= Bs].

Dist. 1 [Bu 59^r Bs 57^r] Veteris et novae legis etc. Ex contentis in hac distinctione *recolligo* [Bu: colligo] unum tale problema: Fruendum est rebus in quibus voluntas quietata conquiescit.

Q 1-4 Prima pars huius problematis... (Here four *Quaestiones* are announced).

Q 5-8 [Bu 65^r Bs 61^v] Restat nunc declarare *Quaestiones* pertinentes ad secundam

where *recolligere* without any possible doubt must mean — « to assemble ALL ideas ».

From the medieval dictionary used by the Recollector Hugolini and by Michael de Massa, we know consequently that *recolligere* implies not only *recolligere dicta debitoque ordine ordinare* but even more *recolligere ordinareque OMNIA dicta*.

Faithfulness of Simon's Recollectio Hugolini

The contingencies of any editing effort obviously require also the elimination of superfluous material and the change of a few words here and there.

Peter de Ceffons in his *Epistula introductoria ad Correctores* (MS Troyes 62) which I hope to publish in *Traditio* frankly advises the *Correctores* to delete passages or quotations as they see fit, an advice which the *Correctores* did not follow at all. There are too many 'loose ends' left in the Commentary of Peter de Ceffons. But the words of Ceffons underline the possibility that medieval editors may have suppressed text-passages from their *Recollecciones* ¹⁰⁴).

partem problematis quo respiciebat fruitionis obiectum cum dicebatur *rebus* (cf. above). Et circa istam particulam moveo quattuor Quaestiones...

Q 9-12 [Bu 72^v Bs 68^r] Restat nunc tractare Quaestiones pertinentes ad tertiam partem supradicti problematis...

Dist. 2 [Bu 79^v; Bs lacuna] Hoc itaque vera et pia fide tenendum. Ex contentis in hac secunda distinctione *recolligo* unum tale problema: unam esse causam omnium quae est deus...

Q 1-4 Sit igitur prima Quaestio circa primam partem praetacti problematis pertractandi.

Q 5-8 [Bu 87^r] Restat nunc pertractare Quaestiones pertinentes ad secundam particulam.

Dist. 3 [Bu 93^v] Apostolus namque ait... Ideo ex contentis in hac distinctione *recolligo* unam talem propositionem: Sub adaequato obiecto nostrae potentiae intellectivae trinitatem personarum, relucens in vestigio et imagine creaturae, non est rationale aliquo modo contineri.

« *Propositio recollecta, recolligenda* » is similarly used on Bu 93^v (twice), Bu 108^v, Bu 117^r, Bu 133^r, Bu 152^r, Bu 162^r, Bu 196^r.

¹⁰⁴) There are *Recollecciones Warrae* (quoted by Dionysius de Burgo MS Erfurt Amplon. 2^o 131 f. 22^v). The *Recollecciones* quoted in Vat. lat. 943 apparently refer to Prosper de Regio, called *Recollector*, because he tried to collect a complete Summa on the Lombardus of his day from his personal and from other works. — In the Index of Pelzer's *Catalogue* (p. 91) s. v. Libraria[Res] there is rich material on *Recollecciones*.

The question arises whether Simon de Cremona, *Recollector Hugolini* (1365) used a free hand in cancelling texts of the *Lectura notata* (1352).

All signs point in the opposite direction. The many texts which John of Basel quotes from Hugolinus all coincide with the *Lectura Recollecta* although — we are forced to say now — they were taken from the *Lectura notata* (1352). If John had quoted one or two passages from Hugolin they might have been culled from the *Lectura Recollectoris* some years after 1365 and shifted¹⁰⁵) from Hiltalingen's margins into Hiltalingen's text well after 1365, the year of the *Baccalareatus* of Hiltalingen.

But Hiltalingen quotes Hugolin close to two hundred times (!) with text-passages more than abundant. This fact and chronological considerations make it highly improbable that Hiltalingen used only the *Lectura Recollectoris Hugolini*. In Hiltalingen's *Decem Responsiones* (1366-70) and his *Vesperiae* (1371) he may have quoted from the *Lectura Recollectoris*.

For the *Responsio* 7 of Hiltalingen I set the stage at Avignon, Pentecost 1368, when the Augustinians in General Chapter elected Hugolin as their General. In this *Responsio* 7 Hiltalingen twice (Clm 26711 f. 274) quotes Hugolin as *Prior nunc Generalis noster* while the *Responsio* 8 in a similar case has the calmer title of Hugolin: *Prior noster Generalis* (Clm 26711 f. 284^v). The *Decem Responsiones* of Hiltalingen were published immediately after delivery; they are veritable show-pieces of Hiltalingen's learning and therefore had to appear quickly if they were to enjoy some of the ephemeral glory of Paris. Neither their time of delivery nor their date of publication make it impossible that the *Decem Responsiones* culled some quotations from the *Recollectio Hugolini*.

The same applies to the *Vesperiae* of Hiltalingen (1371) where Hugolin significantly is called « Dominus » [*Patriarcha Constantinopolitanus*: Feb. 10, 1371¹⁰⁶].

More complicated is the case of the *Lectura Hiltalingen* (1365-66).

Delivery and editing of the Third Book of Hiltalingen were far apart. Hiltalingen's reference to Hugolin as *Pater Generalis noster*

¹⁰⁵) On *marginalia-shift* cf. D. TRAPP, *Hiltalinger's Augustinian Quotations*, in: *Augustiniana* IV (1954) 420.

¹⁰⁶) The date is found in A. ZUMKELLER, *Hugolin v. Orvieto* (1941) 94.

actually means *qui fuit Generalis noster* as I have proved in the just quoted article ¹⁰⁷). First and Second Book of Hiltalingen were published when the election of Hugolin as General was still news ; it causes no wonder that Hugolin is titled *nunc Prior Generalis noster* in Hiltalingen's 1 Sent. q. 1 and 2 Sent. q. 2 ; or *Prior Generalis noster* 1 Sent. q. 9.

Titles which Hiltalingen bestowed upon Hugolin during the quoting process were brought up to date during the editing process, at least in some instances. By these titles it can never be proved that Hiltalingen used as his source *only* the *Lectura Recollectoris Hugolini*.

About two hundred times therefore we have proof that the *Lectura recollecta* and the *Lectura notata* of Hugolin have an identical text ; this optimistic figure of 200 may be reduced to 150 or even to 100, if the *Lectura recollecta* was also used by Hiltalingen — which cannot be demonstrated too often.

But does not Hiltalingen himself voice some doubts about the *Lectura recollecta* ? My confrère A. Zumkeller ¹⁰⁸), was impressed by some passages in Hiltalingen which seem to discredit the *Lectura recollecta*.

In 1 Sent. q. 32 Clm 26711 f. 141^v Hiltalingen quotes Hugolin as his opponent and finds Hugolin's opposite view so amazing that the usual scholastic phrase « *Miror de tanto doctore* » would have been appropriate ; actually, Hiltalingen expresses his amazement with a different turn of expression :

Unde non possum credere quod doctor iste <Hugolinus> fecerit hanc rationem sicut continetur in libro.

Facere rationem here means to formulate an argument in oral discussion ; from this passage we can prove only that Hiltalingen doubted whether the written wording corresponded to the oral formulation. About the written phrases of one edition (*Lectura notata*) and of another edition (*Lectura recollecta*) nothing is said.

In the *Vesperiae* of Hiltalingen there is a much more interesting statement. In the course of a discussion with the *Magister Stephanus Galdeti* who heavily leans on Gregory of Rimini (!) Hiltalingen makes the position of Galdeti precarious by denying

¹⁰⁷) Cf. *Augustinian Quotations* 428.

¹⁰⁸) Cf. A. ZUMKELLER, *Hugolin v. Orvieto* (1941) 121.

any justification for such an interpretation of Gregory ; whereupon Galdeti insists that the Augustinian, Hugolin, manifestly supports this interpretation of Gregory. Hiltalingen evicts Galdeti from this new position by charging Hugolinus with misinterpretation of Gregory :

Et si aliter intelligeret Hugolinus vel translator Hugolinus [MS Clm 26711 f. 395^r: *Hug.*] dicerem quod non verum Gregorio imponeret sicut satis patet ex dictis Gregorii.

Zumkeller reads the abbreviating 'suspension' « *Hug.* » as *Hugolini* and thereby creates an artificial allusion to the *Recollector Hugolini* = *Translator Hugolini*. *Translator* in this place means *commentator* ; context and medieval dictionary guarantee this meaning.

According to Hiltalingen 1 Sent. q. 9 Hugolinus once interprets Augustine (*De cognitione verae vitae*) in a way which does not meet with the approval of Hiltalingen who words his criticism thus :

Ideo videtur quod translator [Hugolinus] huius rationis <Augustinianae> non bene formavit formam...

Among the book-titles of Henry of Oyta¹⁰⁹) are many *translationes* on Aristotle, that is commentaries. I report them here to prove my point. Oyta wrote :

Translatio veteris artis
Translatio priorum
Translatio posteriorm
Translatio elenchorum
Translatio physicorum

In conclusion we may say that we have no reasons to doubt the faithfulness of the *Lectura Recollectoris* ; at the same time we have many to underline the excellence of this text-witness of Hugolinus. Simon de Cremona who renounced the glory of a *Lectura* of his own, and was realistic enough to use for his *Baccalareatus* the *Lectura Hugolini*, shouldered the burden of the editing efforts which the *Lectura Hugolini notata* (1352) needed to become the *Lectura recollecta* (1365 sq.). In his obscure role as editor Simon has done more for the Augustinian tradition than other writers with their own *Lecturae*.

¹⁰⁹) Cf. A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting v. Oyta*, in: *Beiträge Baumbachers* XXXIII 4-5 (Münster 1937) 131, 132; also 133 n. 167.

CONCLUSION

Characterization of the Augustinian Modern School

Augustinianism is the cohesive factor of the Augustinian Old and Modern School ; first in the old-fashioned way of relying more on the principal works of Augustine without exact quoting, then — after Gregory — with a new Modern wealth of Augustinian erudition taken from all of Augustine's works. This historico-critical attitude produced the gigantic compilation of the *Milleloquium S. Augustini*¹¹⁰).

The historical mentality of the Augustinians is evinced by their quoting from other scholastics ; the Augustinians are conscious of the advantage which better quoting gives. They all quote with gusto although with varying accuracy in different decades of the 14th century. Their quoting technique passes through three progressive stages ; it culminates in Alfonsus and Hiltalingen who are veritable literary source books of medieval theoloy.

The road-signs along the development of the Augustinian Modern School are the names of Scotus, Durandus, Aureolus, Ockham, Johannes de Ripa, and, of course, St. Thomas and Aegidius.

St. Thomas throughout the 14th century remains the revered *Doctor communis*, Aegidius the *Doctor noster* ; they are always listened to first but often contradicted *salva reverentia*, St. Thomas more than the *Doctor noster*.

Among the Aegidians is one group which must be called ultra-Aegidian ; the two names, Jacobus de Viterbio and Alexander de S. Elpidio, lead the opposition within the Augustinian older School. Michael de Massa who belongs to the ultra-Aegidians disappears from the roster of the Augustinian scholars.

Interesting, too, is a pair of early doctors who had an intimate connection with the early Aegidian School ; there is practically no early Augustinian who does not quote Robert Cowton, and William of Ware (Guarro).

¹¹⁰) For an introduction to the *Milleloquium* cf. B. PEEBLES, *The Verse Embellishments of the Milleloquium S. Augustini*, in: *Traditio* X (New York 1954) 555-566.

The Franciscan School gives the Augustinian *Moderni* great inspiration. In the wake of Scotus, Aureolus, Ockham, and Johannes de Ripa the traditional views are reexamined again and again, a process which has not only negative results in the development of the Augustinian School.

The Cistercian School is also close to the Augustinian in the later 14th century but so far it seems that it is by giving that the Augustinians receive.

Characterization of the individual Augustinian Moderni

Dionysius and Gerardus are Augustinians of Aegidius, the first influenced by Scotus, Durandus, and Hervaeus; the second by the same and also by Aureolus. Michael de Massa, the last of the ultra-Aegidians, is sympathetic towards Aureolus and unfriendly towards Gerardus whose fanatic critique of Aureolus he rectifies on every *folium*. Michael assumes a sophisticated attitude towards Jacobus and Alexander, two masters whom he takes under his shield when Gerardus impugns them mercilessly; yet Michael acts more as tutelary patron than obsequious disciple of the two. Ockham and Ockhamists find no grace before Michael. Thomas of Strassburg is the last of the Aegidians; Gregory the first Augustinian of St. Augustine, Alfonsus the first literary historian. Hugolinus starts to quote within the text, although not too frequently; he hails the Parisian condemnations of 1347 without reservations. Klenkok, too, has the new quoting technique; he reflects the Oxonian echo of the condemnations of 1347 but formulates some reservations. Klenkok follows the historico-critical trend in the Modern theology of the 14th century. Mysterious remains the figure of Facinus de Ast who is influenced by the Anglici and Johannes de Ripa; he quotes by name only St. Augustine, and in his First Book very carefully. Hiltalingen is the best literary historian of the Augustinians, the gateway to research in Augustinian theology. Simon de Cremona is another Hugolin, Dionysius de Montina an indirect Hugolin, Angelus Dobelin writes *secundum Hiltalingen et Klenkok*, Gracilis *secundum Hiltalingen*.

*Synopsis of Augustinian Dates
Guaranteed by Concurring Socii*

To base the lamentably uncertain chronology of many a Baccalareatus on the safe foundation of the concurring Socii is still a wise policy. Yet there are few MSS which give an elenchus of the Socii; only personal friends or Magistri apparently enjoyed the privilege to be cited by name. Besides even in Paris a bi-ennial Lectura was possible. Aureolus read Book I and IV: 1316-17, Book II and III: 1317-18; Gregory¹¹¹) II-III: 1342-43, IV-I: 1343-44; Facinus II-III: 1361-62, IV-I: 1362-63. The chronological argument drawn from concurring Socii thus loses some of its infallibility. In the following synopsis an * indicates the author who supplies the names of the Socii, [] means a construction based on outside evidence.

Thomas de Argentina: Lectura Parisiensis; extant LL 1-4. [Mag. 1341]
1336-37: I-IV

Socii: Thomas*

Petrus de Croso

Johannes Vogolon, O. Carm.

Gregorius de Arimino: Lectura Parisiensis; extant LL 1-2. Mag. 1345
1342-43: II-III [Reprint 1955]
1343-44: IV-I

Socii: Gregorius*

Johannes Scotus

Franciscus de Tervisio, O. P.

Guillelmus de Bellomonte

Alfonsus de Tolet: Lectura Parisiensis; extant L 1. Mag. 1348
1344-45 [Reprint 1952]

Socii: Alfonsus*

Paulus Perusinus, O. Carm.*

Magister Fernandus

Magister Johannes Ferrati

Rudolfus Minor

Mag. Johannes Scotus

Johannes de Magno Monasterio

¹¹¹) In the Gregory edition of 1522 (1955) there is a misleading colophon at the end of the Supra Secundum; this colophon belongs only to the Supra Primum whence it was shifted to the end of the Supra Secundum. Over the beginning of the Supra Secundum (f. 1 [A] we read the correct date for the delivery of the Supra Secundum: « Inceptus est die 17 Maii 1342. In nomine Jesu Christi ». — Gregory must have read the extant Supra Secundum and the lost Supra Tertium partly in the summer semester (vacations) of 1342.

Hugolinus de Urbeveteri: Lectura Paris. ; extant LL 1-4. Mag. 1352
1348-49

Socîi: Hugolinus

Petrus de Ceffons*

Dominus Prior Sorbonae Mag. Grimerius Bonifatii

Magister Laurentius

Magister Johannes

[Bartholomaeus de Ansiacho, O. P.]

[Petrus de Turribus, O. Carm.]

Johannes Klenkok: Lectura Oxoniensis ; extant LL 1-4 and QQ
Super 2^m. Mag. 1359

1354-55

Socîi: Klenkok*

Ulcredus Monachus Niger Dunelmensis

Thomas Stubbs, O. P.

Facinus de Ast: Lectura Parisiensis; extant LL 2-3; L. 1. [Mag. 1368]
[1361-62: II-III]

1362-63: IV-I

Socîi: [none]

Johannes de Basilea: Lectura Parisiensis ; extant LL 1-4. Mag. 1371
1365-66

Socîi: Dominus Michael de Zerbona

[Paulus de Fonte, O. Carm.]

[Godoscalcus de Pomulcz, O. Cist.]

[Guillelmus de Cremona, O. Min.]

[Mag. Stephanus Galdeti]

Hiltalingen*

[Simon de Cremona]

Simon de Cremona: Lectura Parisiensis ; extant LL 1-4. Mag. 1377
1365-66

Socîi: Franciscus de Mediolano, Ord. Serv. S. Mariae

Magister Stephanus de Collegio Laudunensi

Simon*

[Hiltalingen]

Dionysius de Montina: Lect. Paris. ; extant LL 1-4 [Mag. ca. 1374]
1371-72

Socîi: Dionysius*

Magister Galeranus de Pendref de Collegio Navarrae

Johannes Thomae, O. P.

Gombaldus de Ulagia

Angelus Dobelin: Lectura Parisiensis ; extant LL 1-4. [Mag. 1379]
[1374-75]

Socîi: Andreas Brunonis

Marsilius [Luisius Marsilius, de Marsiliis, O. E. S. A.]

Angelus*

Petrus Gracilis: Lectura Parisiensis ; extant LL 1-4. [Mag. 1381]
1375-76

*Socii: Gracilis**

Mag. Petrus de Alliaco
 Mag. Nicolaus de Messereyo de Coll. Haricuriae
 Mag. Gerardus de Hoysen
 Johannes de Florentia Servita
 Robertus Bernardita
 Bacc. Collegii *Maioris Monasterii*

Without extant Lecturae:

Guido O. E. S. A.: Baccalarius Parisiensis ; revocatio Maii 16, 1354.
 1353-54

Rudolfus de Castello: Baccalarius Parisiensis. Mag. Regens 1360
 ca. 1355

Bonaventura Baduarius: Baccalarius Parisiensis. Mag. 1362
 [1359-60]

Bonsemblans Baduarius: Baccalarius Parisiensis. [Mag. 1363]
 [1358-59]

Socii: Mag. Johannes de Calore de Cerbona
 Mag. Alanus
 Petrus de Cluniaco
 [Mag. Ludovicus de Padua (Venetiis) O. Min.]
 Bonsemblans*

Nicolaus de Amatrice: Baccalarius Parisiensis. [Mag. 1370]
 [1364-65]

Socii: N. de Amatrice
 [Nicolaus a S. Saturnino, O. P.
 Hugo de Montfort, O. P.
 Franciscus Baconis: *]
 [Dionysius Foullechat, O. Min.]

Onofrius [Stecchetti dei Visdomini] de Florentia: Bacc. Parisiensis
 1369-70

Socii: Onofrius ¹¹²⁾
 Johannes Corbechon, O. E. S. A.
 Johannes Regis, O. Min.*

¹¹²⁾ Apparently nothing has been left of the writings of Onofrius. D. PERINI, *Bibliographia Augustiniana* III (1935) 210-211 has a list on which figures also a Commentary to the Sentences, MS Rome Angelica 217 (B. 8.21). However it belongs to Hannibaldus de Hannibaldis and Robertus de Kilwardby [STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium Lombardi* (1947) 296 no. 612]. Already Narducci had seen that the handwriting made the attribution to Onofrius very problematical [cf. PERINI, 210].

John of Basel quotes Onofrius 4 times in I Sent. q. 21; q. 32; and in the Vesperiae, art. 2 concl. 6. According to these quotations the doctrine of Onofrius was one wave in the stream of Augustinian theology and rose and fell rhythmically within it. Once Onofrius is bracketted with Gregorius, and Hiltalingen takes exception to both. Then Onofrius tries unsuccessfully to save Hugolinus. Together with Gregorius, Hugolinus, and Thomas Argen-

Mag. Richardus de Bello Monte, secretarius Reginae

Mag. Franciscus Christopheri de Sorbona

Mag. Johannes Textoris de Sorbona

Jacobus de Altavilla, O. Cist.

Dominicus, O. P.

Mag. Johannes de Diadona

Johannes de Braculis: Baccalarius Parisiensis [Mag. ca. 1374]

Lector Parisiensis 1361

1370-71

Socii: J. de Braculis

[Conradus de Ebrach, O. Cist.*

Petrus (Borroni, Bayroni), O. P.

Bartholomaeus, O. P.]

APPENDIX

Heraldic Mystifications

P. GLORIEUX, *Le commentaire sur les Sentences attribué à Jean Gerson*, in: *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* XVIII (1951) 128-39 has all the facts and details about the *Socii* of Onofrius. To Glorieux goes the credit for the identification of the Ps.-Gerson (MS Paris Nat. lat. 15156) with *Johannes Regis*. If Glorieux still harbors some lingering doubts about the correctness of his identification it is only because he overlooks the heraldic importance of a *Thema Collationis Principii*. A *Baccalarius Principians* had to select a *Thema* from Holy Scripture for a sermon on Lombard, his Sentences and on Holy Scripture. It marked the first public appearance before the University, and originally had the purpose of showing the rhetorical capacities of the new latinist, who by custom was bound to use a highly complicated rhetorical pattern of rhymed tetrads. Later on, in the 14th century, the *Thema* itself had to contain a heraldic allusion to the author's name, a requirement which made the selection very difficult. — I have

tinus « *Pater et amicus Baccalarius Onofrius in Responsione proxima Ordinaria* » defends the possibility of eternal creation but Hiltalingen maintains its absolute impossibility.

Hiltalingen quotes the *Lectura* of Onofrius (1369-70) from hearsay; the *Responsio* which Onofrius had to deliver before Masters and Students, Hiltalingen quotes from memory.

In the work of Johannes Regis, *Socius Onofrii* [MS Paris Nat. lat. 15156], there are other short reminiscences from Onofrius; in the work of Jacobus de Altavilla, *Socius Onofrii*, Onofrius seems not to be quoted. Jacobus wrangles only with a « *Socius Collegii S. Bernardi* » who does not belong to the year 1369-70 but 1365-66, the year of Hiltalingen's *Lectura*, namely Godoscalcus de Pomulcz, O. Cist.

examined all the *Themata Collationis Principii* which Stegmüller (*Repertorium Lombardi*) lists. The result of my examination shows so many heraldic allusions to the names of the authors that these mystifications must be considered common practice to secure « copyright » during the historical-minded 14th century.

1. One kind of heraldic mystification alludes from a similar Latin word of the *Thema* to the similar Latin name of the author. ex. g. the *Thema*: *Ascendit in unam navem quae erat Simonis* Lc. 5 belongs to the Commentary of Simon of Cremona. [Lc. 5 = Luca 5 may contain an allusion to the father's name of Simon: Luca].

Dionysius de Montina selects his *Thema* from Act. 17, 34 with the words *Dionysius Areopagita*; gr. pagos means « a craggy hill » = *Montinus*; according to the allusion the author's name must be *Dionysius Montinus* [de Montina].

Johannes de Wasia [Waes] selects: *Facies* [German pronunciation: *Vasies*] eius sicut sol lucet. Scribitur Apoc. 1.

Alfonsus chooses: *Ego sum alpha et O = I am Alfo<nso>*.
[Ceffons lampoons: <Ego sum> O !].

2. Another kind of heraldic mystification supposes a translation of the Latin *Thema* into the vernacular, and alludes from the similar vernacular word of the translated *Thema* to the similar name of the author ex. gr., Gerson's authentic *Thema*: *Quaesivi sponsam* [garçonne ?] mihi assumere [Sap. 8, 2] may mean « I Gerson [garçonne] tried to espouse Eternal Wisdom ! (Glorieux reports this authentic *Thema* l. c. p. 137 n. 17).

3. A third kind of heraldic mystification alludes from the general meaning of the *Thema* to the author's name. This is the case of the pseudoepigr. MS Paris Nat. lat. 15156 which certainly belongs to Johannes Regis because the *Thema Collationis Principii* is: *Ipse vero apprehensum sanavit eum* Lc. 14. To the medieval mind the general meaning of the *Thema* evoked the association to the solemn ceremony of a king's healing the king's evil by royal touch (cf. Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th ed. (1936) XIII, 398-99). « King's », or in this case, « du roi » corresponds to the Latin « Regis » [Johannes REGIS].

The reader's amusement will have reached by now an intense degree; but I ask him to ponder the following coincidence: the writer who attributed the MS Paris Nat. lat. 15156 wrongly to Gerson also looked for an heraldic mystification under the *Thema*: *Ipse vero apprehensum sanavit eum* because he knew it to be hidden somewhere; his wrong attribution came from: *Sanavit* = *Sanatio* = *Guerison* = *Gerson* !

To open the discussion on the heraldic importance of the *Thema Collationis* I add a few more of mystifications in the vernacular. Of course I do not pretend to have the final answers.

Italian

Thema of Johannes de Ripa:

Amice ascende superius...

= Sozio va [de riva, *dialect.* for « di sopra ? »]

= So ' Ziova ' [de Riva ?]

= Sono Giovanni [da Ripa ?]

Thema of Dionysius de Burgo:

Ascendit Petrus in superiora domus Act. 10

= Salì Pertus « al Borgo » di casa, negli atti dieci

= Herewith appeareth Berto, by family-name al Borgo, in the records [of baptism] « Diegi » (*dialect.* for *Dionigi*?)

English

Thema of Adam Goddam (*not: Wodham*):

Ista est lex Adam, Domine Deus 2 Reg. 7

= This is the Writ of Adam, Lord God<ham>: Second Book of Kings 7

= This is the Writ of Adam Lord Godham, his Second *Lectura*: King's <year> 7 (Edward III: 1327-77) = 1334

Pelzer's Catalogue to Vat. lat. 1110 indicates as date:

« MCCCXXXII et alio (?) »

= MCCCXXXII et <IIII^o> ??

French (Italian ?)

Thema of Aureolus (Oriolus)

Expandit librum coram me qui scriptus erat intus et foris Ez. 2

= Il <l'auteur> ouvrit un livre chez moi écrit *dedans et dehors*

= dès d'ans et « de ore » (?)

= The author opened the Book before me, written years ago and recently (allusion to the *Lectura Secunda* of Orioli ?)

Other *Themata* of Orioli contain the word « rotae ». In Dante, Paradiso XXIV, 13 (E come cerchi in tempra d'*oriuoli*...) ORIOLI is the same as clockwork (ROTAE). If no southern French word of the 14th century ORIOLES exists one could suppose that Dante was no stranger in southern France around 1317. Thus the

Thema: Ingredere in medio rotarum... Ez. 10 (: Orioli 1 Sent.)

= Enter <my reader> into ORIOLI... [Ezéché. dit (!)]

= allusion to a place-name Aizecq ?]

Thema: Rota una iuxta Cherub unum, et rota alia iuxta Cherub unum Ez. 10

= One Oriolo stood by a cherub, and another Oriolo... (allusion to double edition of Orioli ?)

Interestingly also the Hebrew « cherub » (chariots of God) evokes the idea of « rotae » (Orioli).

German

Thema of Thomas of Strassburg, born at Hagenau:

Dedit abyssus vocem suam Habacus 3

abyssus = vallis silvestris = Hagenau

= Hagenau gab seinen Namen: Habacuc drei <= dreh!>

= Hagenau gave him the name: turn around Habacuc

<Guggenbach ? ?>

<Kuchenback ? ?>

German Incipit of the Oxonian Klenkok (Klenke).

Confidens in illum qui labore lassus refecturum se promisit
intellectum <dans> parvulis — quorum ut essem *Minimus* tribuit —...

Parvulus = Klein (Low German: *Klen*)

Parvulorum Minimus = Kleinchen (Low German: *Klenke*).

We know from documents that Klenkok's Low German family-name was abbreviated Klenke in the 15th century. Here we find that the same is true for the 14th century.

The question is open now for discussion. There is some truth in my observations.

Anyone acquainted with *Collationes Principiorum* of the 14th century which are so fantastic that most MSS have omitted them, must have wondered sometimes where the limit of human aberration lies if such productions could be read before a University.

But if the *Thema Collationis* by custom had to contain an allusion to the name of the author we can easily understand why the *Collationes Principiorum* of many 14th-century Commentaries had to stretch their *Themata* on a Procrustean bed in order to wring from them some allusion to Peter Lombard, his *Sentences*, and Holy Scripture all the more so as a difficult tetradic pattern in rhetorical rhymes was prescribed. If no allusion to the author's name had been needed, the Sapiential Books of Holy Scripture would have provided beautiful *Themata Collationis* in the 14th century as they actually did in the 13th.

P. Damasus TRAPP, O. E. S. A.

New York

Augustinian Historical Institute

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge the use of the following MSS and thank for gracious microfilm copies (*).

- | | |
|---|---|
| <i>Berlin Staatsbibl.</i> *Theol. Fol. 203 | <i>München Universität</i> *Fol. 105 |
| <i>Bologna Coll. di Sp.</i> *40, *Univ. 2214 | <i>Napoli Naz.</i> VII C 27, VII C 1 |
| <i>Bruges Bibl. Publ.</i> *188, *503 | <i>Oxford Oriel Coll.</i> *15 |
| <i>Cambrai</i> *570 | <i>Paris Nat. lat.</i> *3070, *14576, 15156, *15561, Nouv. acq. *1431. |
| <i>Cremona</i> *118 | <i>Prague Metrop. Chapt.</i> 531, C 105 |
| <i>Eichstätt</i> *471 | <i>Ravenna Classense</i> 147 |
| <i>Erfurt Amplon.</i> 2°108, *2°110, *2°115, 2°117, 2°118, *2°131, 2°132, *4°117. | <i>Roma Angelica</i> 217, *577 |
| <i>Firenze Naz.</i> *II. I. 196 | <i>Vat. lat.</i> 893, *943, *959, *981, *986, *1084, 1085, *1087, 1094, 1110, *4353 |
| <i>Fribourg Cordeliers</i> *26 | <i>Chis.</i> * B VII 117, <i>Ottob. lat.</i> *446, *496 |
| <i>Kassel</i> *Theol. Fol 16 | <i>Siena</i> * G V 16 |
| <i>Klosterneuburg</i> 292, *304 | <i>Toulouse</i> *250 |
| <i>London Brit Mus.</i> *Royal 10 A 1 | <i>Troyes</i> *62 |
| <i>Lyon</i> *459 (388) | <i>Wien Dominikaner</i> 49 |
| <i>Milano Ambr.</i> *A 139 inf., *B 14 inf. | <i>Warsaw Nat.</i> 390 |
| <i>München Staatsbibl.</i> *Clm 11591 | <i>Wolfenbüttel</i> Cod. Guelf. Helmst. 542, 1064 |
| *Clm 26650, *Clm 26711, *Clm 27034 | |

SHORT INDEX

Augustinian Theologians:

Alfonsus Vargas Tol.	213 ff
Dionysius de Burgo	156 ff
Facinus de Ast	239 ff
Gerardus de Senis	160 ff
Gregorius Ariminensis	182 ff
Hugolinus de Urbevet.	222 f
[Jacobus de Appamiis]	173 ff
Johannes Hiltalingen	242 ff
Johannes Klenkok	223 ff
Michael de Massa	163 ff
Simon de Cremona	250 ff
Thomas de Argentina	175 ff

Non-Augustinian Theologians:

Brinkil	245
Johannes de Wasia	214 f
Nicolaus de Aston	229 ff
Osberus, O. Carm	227 f
Petrus de Ceffons	225 f
Richardus Chillington	246
Ulcredus (Uhtred) [= Autrecourt »]	201 ff, 207 ff, 235 ff

Book-Lore:

Additiones	168 ff, 194 ff
Essay-style	149
Expositio litteralis	232 ff

Heraldic mystifications	269 ff
Inset-quotations	153 f, 162, 165, 217 ff
Lectura sec. alium	251 ff
Pecia-ends	194 ff
Recollector	255 ff
Text-unit = Sexterni-unit	168 ff, 194 ff

Editions:

Alfonsus 1490 (reprint 1952)	216 ff, 220 ff
Gregory 1522 (reprint 1955)	190 ff, 205 ff

Gerardus 1598	160
Thomas 1490, etc.	176 ff

Varia:

Anonymi identified	164, 211, 214, 219 f, 233, 240, 247, 269
Burlaeus Augustiniensis	220
Cocon Augustiniensis	180
MSS by same hand	164, 258
Nominalism	147 ff, 184 ff
Scholastic shorthand	178
Subtilitas	187 f