

Augustinianism at Oxford in the Fourteenth Century

Among the various currents of thought that have been attributed to the fourteenth century, one of the most frequently discussed has been Augustinianism¹). Unlike Thomism and Scotism, which supposedly remained wedded to their thirteenth-century origins, fourteenth-century Augustinianism has been viewed as a fresh, new current, generally opposed to the other major intellectual movement of northern Europe in that age, Nominalism, so long the *bête noire* of late medieval studies. And yet, Augustinianism may be, like Nominalism, one of the most ill-defined and confusing of labels.

There is a sense in which much of the Western intellectual tradition throughout the Middle Ages and beyond can be called Augustinian. But historians of medieval scholastic thought have designated individuals or groups who, in the face of the challenge of Aristotelian thought, remained committed to a traditional philosophy and theology, grounded in the mind and heart of the Bishop of Hippo. Mandonnet and others detected a current of "Augustinian Platonism" in the thirteenth century, which Gilson separated into several streams, of which "Franciscan Augustinianism" as represented by Bonaventure was the most prominent²). Gilson also coined the phrase "The Second Augustinian School" to describe the thought of Henry of Ghent, John Duns Scotus,

¹) The literature on this topic is large and controversial. Among the more important contributions are: Karl Werner, *Die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters*, Vol. III: *Der Augustinismus in der Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters* (Vienna, 1883); Carl Stange, "Augustinischer Nominalismus", in Carl Stange, *Studien zu Theologie Luthers*, Vol. I (Gütersloh, 1928), pp. 1-19; Eduard Stakemeier, *Der Kampf um Augustin auf dem Tridentinum* (Paderborn, 1937); Damasus Trapp, "Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century", *Augustiniana*, 6 (1956), 146-274; Adolar Zumkeller, "Die Augustinerschule des Mittelalters: Vertreter und philosophisch-theologische Lehre", *Analecta Augustiniana*, 27 (1964), 167-262; Leif Grane, "Gregory von Rimini und Luthers Leipziger Disputation", *Studia Theologica*, 22 (1968), 31; Heiko A. Oberman, "Headwaters of the Reformation: Initia Lutheri — Initia Reformationis", in *Luther and the Dawn of the Modern Era*, ed. H.A. Oberman (Leiden, 1974), 40-88; David C. Steinmetz, "Luther and the late Medieval Augustinians: Another Look", *Concordia Theological Monthly*, 44 (1973), 245-260; H.A. Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation* (Tübingen, 1977), pp. 82-140.

²) Pierre Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant et l'averroïsme latin au XIII^e siècle* (Fribourg, 1899); Etienne Gilson, *La philosophie de saint Bonaventure* (Paris, 1924); "Les sources gréco-arabes de l'augustinisme avicennisant", *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, 4 (1929), 5-149.

and later Scotists³). Similarly, in speaking of an Augustinian revival in fourteenth-century thought, scholars have sought to characterize an intellectual movement separate from the perennial philosophy of the Middle Ages and from the various currents of thirteenth-century thought.

This new Augustinianism of the fourteenth century is usually divided into two stages. The first, associated with Giles of Rome and his immediate followers among the Augustinian Hermits, represents Thomistic thought gradually modified in the direction of affective theology under the influence of a more intensive reading of St. Augustine. The shift, already occurring in Giles, was away from a scientific theology based on God as intellect to an affective theology based on God as will and love, combined with a strong view of the primacy of grace and divine initiative in salvation. One of the most interesting products of this first stage was the idea of the lordship of grace, that only one in a state of grace had the right to exercise authority over persons and property.

The second stage, considered by many the more important, began in England with the secular theologian, Thomas Bradwardine, and at Paris with the Austin Friars, Gregory of Rimini and Hugolino of Orvieto. Here scholars have highlighted two major aspects: an historico-critical attitude toward sources and an anti-Pelagian ideology.

At the foundation lay a more precise, source-critical approach to the writings of Augustine. Thirteenth-century theologians knew their Augustine primarily through a few standard works (*Confessions*, *City of God*, *On Christian Doctrine*) and through the abundant quotations that circulated under his name in *florilegia*, canon law, and the *Sentences*. Moreover, the precise source of a "saying" of Augustine was seldom acknowledged beyond his name and occasionally a mention of the work. By the second quarter of the fourteenth century that was beginning to change. One finds (1) a wider variety of works being cited, (2) longer quotations that were not part of the previous collections of "memorable sayings", (3) a concern that the texts quoted should be accurate, based upon a reliable textual tradition, of sufficient length to reveal Augustine's thought, and (4) referenced precisely to the work, chapter (an innovation of the thirteenth century), and often section of chapter, so

³) Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1955), pp. 446-471.

that the reader could check the quotation for himself. Much of this rigorous, scholarly attitude toward the sources may only be the application to Augustine of a humanist trait that one finds elsewhere in the fourteenth century. But it also betrays a far wider, first-hand reading of the Augustinian corpus, especially of works that had not received much attention in the thirteenth century.

This broader reading may have facilitated a shift toward the mature, or later Augustine as revealed in the works written after 410. For the second aspect of the newer Augustinianism was a strong, anti-Pelagian stance on the issue of grace and justification. They disallowed any ability on the part of man to prepare himself for the gift of grace and emphasized divine action and auxiliary grace far more than human effort and human merit. This reaffirmation of God's role in salvation, with its emphasis on *sola gratia*, predestination *ante praevisa merita*, and on occasion double predestination, went hand-in-hand with a stronger view of divine omnipotence that sometimes bordered on divine omnivulence. In some versions the contingency of the future (and with it the freedom of man) was reduced under the belief that the future cannot take place in any way other than God foreknows it, while in other versions the necessity of the past was questioned under the assumption that God's omnipotence over His creation should not be limited by the passage of time⁴).

The prominent part played by the Austin Friars in both stages of this revival has led some historians to equate "Augustinian" and "Augustinianism" with the thought of theologians who belonged to the Augustinian Hermits⁵). Yet not all Austin Friars display the marks of the newer Augustinianism, and one can find outside the Order several who do. We should therefore distinguish Augustinianism as a theological movement from Augustinianism as a religious order.

With that in mind, let me suggest we adopt the term "Neo-Augustinianism" for the current of thought described above, regardless of the organizational affiliation of the authors involved. Then Adolar Zumkeller's phrase, the "Augustinian School", could be used (as it was in the fourteenth century) to describe the theologians of the Austin

⁴) For further discussion see: W.J. Courtenay, "John of Mirecourt and Gregory of Rimini on Whether God Can Undo the Past", *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 39 (1972), 224-256; 40 (1973), 147-174.

⁵) E.g., Trapp, 146-274.

Friars, no matter what their individual intellectual orientation⁶). Any Austin theologian would have been aware of belonging to an Augustinian School in this sense. Neo-Augustinianism, however, remains a modern historian's label for a body of ideas, and we must be careful not to see it as a self-conscious movement with dedicated members. Moreover, the ideas grouped under the label Neo-Augustinianism derive from but need not be faithful to St. Augustine. As political Augustinianism of the early Middle Ages was a departure from the actual teaching of Augustine and a particular interpretation of the *City of God*, so Neo-Augustinianism takes a theocentric approach to certain philosophical and theological problems and in so doing arrives at solutions that differ from Augustine.

In the following remarks I wish to focus on a neglected chapter of fourteenth-century Augustinianism, namely the appearance and development of Neo-Augustinianism and the Augustinian School at Oxford in the first half of the century. In our present picture of fourteenth-century events the appearance of the second stage of Neo-Augustinianism looks like an act of God, springing up simultaneously in separate places without much historical preparation. The comfortable theological assumptions ranging from semi-Pelagianism to moderate Augustinianism were shattered by the voice of the African saint, speaking through his prophets Thomas Bradwardine and Gregory of Rimini. Despite important differences between Bradwardine's *De causa Dei* and Rimini's *Lectura*, their simultaneous publication in 1344 contained a common message: Let God be God! In that dual event more than one historian has seen the headwaters of the Reformation: Martin Luther as the ultimate heir to the Augustinianism of the "via Gregorii". Although there is considerable dispute over the intellectual succession that links Rimini and Luther, there is general unanimity in viewing 1344 as a break with the past. Even Zumkeller, who sees considerable continuity within the teaching tradition of the Austin Friars, admits that Gregory represents a new wave⁷). But were Rimini and Bradwardine unrelated phenomena, and was Bradwardine's thought without antecedents or preparation? It is to those questions I now turn.

⁶) Zumkeller, p. 172-173, equates the *Augustinerschule* with its *Lehrrichtung*. I think it would make our research and discussions more precise if we would differentiate between the "Augustinian School" and "the common teaching within the Augustinian School".

⁷) Zumkeller, 172, 216-223.

The Augustinian School at Oxford

If the history of Neo-Augustinianism on the Continent in the fourteenth century is any indication, one would expect to find the early emergence of this interest in England within the convents of the Austin Friars, particularly the Oxford convent. This source, however, is not as rich as one would wish. Of the 145 known masters and bachelors at Oxford in the fourteenth century, indeed of the entire Augustinian School at Oxford from the thirteenth century to the Reformation (of whom almost 300 names are known), only sermons, chronicles, political tracts, and a few scholastic works have survived. Products of the university lecture halls, such as commentaries on the Bible, on Aristotle, on Lombard's *Sentences*, and Quodlibetic disputations — the type of works that one has in abundance for the other mendicant orders and for the Austin Friars at Paris — are extremely rare among English Austins. Since there is no particular reason to assume the manuscript survival rate among the English houses of the Order should differ greatly from those of the other mendicant orders in England, one can only conclude that the Oxford (and Cambridge) Austins were either unproductive in publishing their lectures and disputations or wrote works of a quality that failed to attract any significant readership even among the Augustinians. Of the Austin masters in the early fourteenth century, only some questions and sermons of William of Heckham have survived along with fragments of two *Sentences* commentaries, all bearing strong traces of Aegidian thought⁸). There are no discernable elements of Neo-Augustinianism in these works and none of the works appears to have been cited by later writers. In the entire next generation, out of twenty-nine known Austins at Oxford, there was not a single known author, unless the 'Grafton' referred to by Adam Wodeham in 1330 was the Austin Hugh of Grafton⁹).

Two important and related changes affected the Austin convent at Oxford in the second half of the fourteenth century. The first was the Black Death, which, judging by the greatly reduced numbers of Austins at Oxford in the next two decades, had a disastrous effect on the English Province of the Order. The second was the increased representation of

⁸) Francis Roth, *The English Austin Friars, 1249-1538*, Vol. I: *History* (New York, 1966), pp. 379-382, 598-599; A. G. Little and F. Pelster, *Oxford Theology and Theologians* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 226-232, 287-294, 335-338.

⁹) W.J. Courtenay, *Adam Wodeham* (Leiden, 1978), pp. 106-109.

foreign friars at Oxford, especially from Italy and Germany. The channels of communication were open in the direction of Parisian scholasticism and Italian humanism. How much of this was imported or what effect it had on the Oxford convent is more conjectural. In the second half of the fourteenth century, out of a handful of known authors, the only theologian whose intellectual orientation is clearly Neo-Augustinian is John Klenkok. However, Klenkok was German, had studied previously at Prague, and brought his knowledge of Gregory and Hugolino with him to Oxford when he lectured there in 1354-55. Although Klenkok was cited by later Continental theologians, he was not cited in England, and his Continental brand of Neo-Augustinianism appears to have made no impact on his fellow Austins. Neo-Augustinianism, therefore, did not originate at Oxford among the Austins.

One possible contribution made by the Oxford Austins, albeit indirect, was through the expansion of their library. Only at the end of the thirteenth century did the Order launch a program to improve the library holdings at the teaching convents. A significant portion of their financial resources went to that end, and the most rapid growth was probably in the early fourteenth century. Money was put into books, not the construction of library buildings, which came later. The library at the Paris convent, the leading theological *studium* of the Order, held less than fifty volumes in 1290 although it was subsequently known as one of the richer collections in Paris and almost 200 manuscripts belonging to the convent before 1400 have survived¹⁰). In 1372 the library of the Austin Friars in York, which probably numbered less than its equivalent in London and certainly was smaller than the Oxford library, contained 656 volumes¹¹).

Unfortunately, we do not have details on the Oxford library and we can only conjecture about the holdings from Austin libraries in other teaching convents. Volumes that certainly would have been acquired by the Oxford convent in the early fourteenth century (if they were not present earlier) would have been a complete edition of the works of Augustine, most of the works of Thomas Aquinas, and a complete edition of Giles of Rome. For our purposes the presence of good copies of the entire corpus of Augustine, particularly the later, anti-Pelagian

¹⁰) Zumkeller, 171; Roth, 369.

¹¹) Roth, 375-376; N.R. Ker, ed., *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain* (London, 1964), p. 218.

writings, is important. Although the library was housed at the end of the dormitory and was for the use of the Austin Friars, we must remember that the convent was the center of the School of Arts and the School of Theology, and it is possible that others had access to the collection such that a broader, more extensive knowledge of Augustine could have been influenced by the Austin library. Those coming and going from the refectory and chapel, as Bradwardine must surely have done frequently, could not have failed to notice the lay scribes in the west range of the cloister, who were hired to expand the holdings of the Augustinian collection.

Neo-Augustinianism at Oxford

To the degree that there were elements of Neo-Augustinianism among the Austin Friars in England, they only begin to appear after mid-century and among those already influenced by Gregory of Rimini on the Continent. It is unlikely, therefore, that the Austins were the sources of this new intellectual current at Oxford. When, where, and how did it then enter?

In one form or another Oxford thought displayed elements of Augustinianism throughout the thirteenth century, from Grosseteste, through Kilwardby and Fishacre, to Duns Scotus. Allowing for differences among these thinkers, they were all heirs to the tradition of philosophical Augustinianism, or Augustinian Platonism. Only in Grosseteste and Scotus do we find elements that go to make up aspects of Neo-Augustinianism, and they are offset by elements that do not belong to the latter current. Richard Fitzralph, a secular theologian lecturing on the Sentences at Oxford in 1326-27, may have been "behind the times" in many ways, but the way in which he utilized Augustine was, I think, typical of most of his contemporaries¹²). He was heavily dependent on Henry of Ghent and, behind him, on Anselm. With the publication of Thomas Bradwardine's *De causa Dei* in 1344, however, we have most of the major elements of Neo-Augustinianism. Was this solely a creation of Bradwardine, or was it to some degree derived from contemporary and earlier developments?

¹²) J. A. Robson, *Wyclif and the Oxford Schools* (Cambridge, 1961), pp. 70-96; Gordon Leff, *Richard Fitzralph* (Manchester, 1963). Both of these works must be used with care, particularly in their descriptions of the intellectual milieu of Fitzralph. Their descriptions of Fitzralph's thought, however, are more reliable.

It is my suspicion that a major source for the second stage of Neo-Augustinianism was Oxford in the generation of 1330-1340, *before* the publication of *De causa Dei*, and before the *Lectura* of Gregory of Rimini. Bradwardine's achievement, although dramatic and stunning, is not without background. Several factors came together in that decade to prepare the way.

The first factor was the intensification of the production of commentaries on the works of Augustine. Augustine's works were probably never school texts and thus, unlike the Bible, Aristotle, canon law, or Lombard's *Sentences*, never received extensive analytical treatment. However, to the fourteenth-century reader, Augustine's style and classical allusions were sufficiently difficult to make an introduction desirable. The growth in commentaries attests, therefore, to a growing interest in Augustine on the part of the commentators and a growth in the reading public that placed the commentaries in demand.

So much is clear from the work of Beryl Smalley, who has seen the commentaries as part of a classicizing, humanist interest among English friars¹³). What has not been stressed sufficiently is that the writing of commentaries on the works of Augustine was a predominantly English effort and that these commentaries cluster in the decade 1325-1335. The earliest, of course, were the commentaries on *De civitate Dei* by the Dominican Nicholas Trevet and the Augustinian Hermit Alexander of San Elpidio, both dating from the early fourteenth century¹⁴). But this work was not immediately continued. Later, starting around 1325, there was a flurry of activity. John Baconthorpe wrote a commentary on *De civitate Dei*, a commentary on the *De Trinitate*, and a short work of conclusions extracted from the *De Trinitate*¹⁵). Around 1328 Richard Fitzralph composed his *Glossulae super De Trinitate*, which is cited by Adam Wodeham, although copies are not known to exist¹⁶). The Dominican, Thomas Waleys, wrote a commentary at Avignon around 1332 on the first nine books of *De civitate Dei*, which came to replace the work of his fellow religious, Trevet¹⁷). Finally, John Ridevall, a Franciscan theologian at Oxford, wrote a critique of Trevet's com-

¹³) Beryl Smalley, *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1960).

¹⁴) Smalley, 58-65; Zumkeller, 172.

¹⁵) B. M. Xiberta, *De scriptoribus scholasticis saec. XIV ex ordine Carmelitarum* (Louvain, 1931), pp. 189-190.

¹⁶) Courtenay, *Adam Wodeham*, 79.

¹⁷) Smalley, 88-100.

mentary (ca. 1331), a commentary of his own on *De civitate Dei* (c. 1333), and a commentary on the *Confessions*¹⁸).

Although not all these commentaries were written at Oxford or even in England, they were mostly composed by English theologians, all of whom were connected with Oxford at some point. The fact that several of these commentaries are referred to as lectures suggests that Augustine may briefly have become a minor text in the schools. While this commentatorial tradition did not extend to the anti-Pelagian writings, as far as we know, it does reflect a sharpening of focus on the thought of Augustine at Oxford, or at least among English theologians. It is remarkable that the Austin Friars in England, as far as I am aware, contributed nothing to this development.

Contemporary with the most active period of commentary production we find the appearance of two elements that lie nearer the heart of Neo-Augustinianism. The first of these was the appearance of a more theocentric approach to the problem of future contingents. Before 1325 theologians sought principally to protect the contingency of future events while acknowledging that God's foreknowledge was somehow accurate and immutable. After 1325 we encounter theologians who are more interested in protecting the inviolability of divine foreknowledge and preordination, even at the expense of the contingency of the future.

The first stage in this shift occurred around 1325. The traditional dilemma over future contingents seemingly trapped one between contingency and divine foreknowledge, and contingency was saved by modifying the quality of divine knowledge, or analyzing the relation of time and eternity, or the meaning of tensed propositions. The problem was sharpened, however, by the introduction of the idea of a "revealed contingent", which located God's foreknowledge in our temporal sequence, and any denial of the inevitable nature of the future event would impugn the nature of God, since it would make Him a liar. The potentiality for recasting the problem lay within the biblical texts, and yet those who struggled with the question of future contingents in earlier centuries did not develop that dimension or did not see that the fact of revelation transformed the temporality of the contingent¹⁹). As far as I

¹⁸) Smalley, 121-132.

¹⁹) The unrealized biblical potential can be seen in Nicholas of Lyra's praise of David's prophetic gift. Although the case is mentioned as a future contingent (Christ's Advent) foreknown by a human, no mention is made of revelation nor of its impact on the contingent quality of the future event. See J.S. Preus, *From Shadow to Promise. Old Testament Interpretation from Augustine to the Young Luther* (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 65-67.

am aware, the earliest discussion of this version of the future contingent problem occurred at Oxford in Fitzralph in 1326-27²⁰). At the same time or shortly thereafter, a solution was suggested that moved in the direction of determined future events by arguing that future events, once revealed by God to man, are no longer contingent but happen of necessity, while all others remain contingent. This position, which was discussed and attacked by Robert Holcot in a quodlibet of 1332, seems to move in the direction of Bradwardine, a feature that led Fritz Hoffmann to conclude that Holcot was referring to an early position of Bradwardine²¹). However, the view was pre-Bradwardine and was put forward, as Adam Wodeham reveals, by a certain "Master Walter" in the course of an academic exercise without defending the truth of the position²²). However, as Wodeham adds, others at Oxford were defending it, but less well in his view. Who this Master Walter was remains a mystery. Genest has conjectured that it was Walter Burley, but this is unlikely. Burley was on the Continent and at Avignon for most of this period, he was not a teaching master at Oxford at the time (which Master

Bradwardine's views on future contingents were heavily indebted to Grosseteste, yet this version of the problem and the strong theocentric approach of Bradwardine are lacking in Grosseteste. Compare Grosseteste, *De libero arbitrio*, in Ludwig Baur, *Die philosophischen Werke des Robert Grosseteste*; Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, Vol. 9 (Münster, 1912), pp. 150-196; Ludwig Baur, *Die Philosophie des Robert Grosseteste, Bischofs von Lincoln (d. 1253)*; Beiträge, Vol. 18, 4-6 (Münster, 1917), pp. 208-252.

²⁰) Leff, *Richard Fitzralph*, 39-50; Jean-François Genest, "Le De Futuris Contingentibus de Thomas Bradwardine", unpubl. diss. (Paris, 1975).

²¹) Fritz Hoffmann, *Die theologische Methode des Oxforder Dominikanerlehrers Robert Holcot*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Phil. und Theol. des Mittelalters, Neue Fol., 5 (Münster, 1971), p. 328; Holcot, *Quaestiones Quodlibetales*, Balliol Ms. 246, fol. 246^{va} and Cambridge, Pembroke Ms. 236, fol. 185^{rb}: "Circa primum est notandum quod est opinio cuiusdam valentis quod facta revelatione absoluta de quocumque articulo de futuro, cuius est ista: 'resurrectio mortuorum erit', non manet ille articulus postea contingens, sed necesse est sic esse sicut per illud revelatum denotatur fore; nec potest Deus impedire vel omittere ne illud impleat, quia tale 'posse' foret contra Dei voluntatem et veritatem, et ideo non foret 'posse', sicut posse facere contradictoria esse simul vera non est 'posse', immo contra potentiam Dei".

²²) Adam Wodeham, *Lectura Oxoniensis*, III, q. 4, Paris, Univ. 193, fol. 186^b and Paris, Mazarine 915, fol. 180^a: "Hic respondet Magister quidam modernus, gratia tamen exercitii sine assertione, et nonnulli alii de Villa minus bene ut estimo, quod facta revelatione absoluta, qualis est de resurrectione mortuorum et aliis articulis fidei de futuro, quod non potest evenire oppositum, nec impediri, quia posse contra veritatem non esset possibile". In the paragraph description at the foot of Paris, Univ. 193, fol. 186^b occurs: "Opinio Galteri quod facta revelatione absoluta oppositum non potest evenire". See also Henry Totting of Oyta's abbreviation of Wodeham's *Lectura* (Paris, 1512), fol. 122^{vb}, where the opinion is identified in the margin as: "Opinio Galteri".

Walter was, according to Wodeham), and Wodeham usually referred to Burley by name. It is possible that Wodeham was referring to Walter Chatton, who was then regent at Oxford. The fact that Master Walter floated this opinion purely for academic discussion might explain why the idea does not appear earlier in Chatton and why it differs from his approach in those writings. At present, however, the identity of Master Walter is unsolved.

Bradwardine, in a lengthy question on future contingents dated probably between 1333 and 1335, cited and attacked the opinion of Master Walter²³). But he did so not in order to defend the contingency of revealed future events but to defend the immutable quality of God's will and knowledge of the future. Although Bradwardine rejects the opinion, one can view it as a half-way house toward the position Bradwardine adopted in *De causa Dei*. Bradwardine dropped the modifier "revealed" and allowed God's foreknowledge to overtake and almost erase future contingency. While divine determinism may not have been Bradwardine's own view of his position, his contemporaries considered that the result.

The second element in Neo-Augustinianism that appears by 1334 is the mounting attack on aspects of the Franciscan view of grace and justification that seemed semi-Pelagian. Charges of Pelagianism are not infrequent in medieval theology, and around 1320 we find Ockham defending himself against that very charge. What is new in the decade 1330-1340 is the number of theologians who become concerned over this problem and who single out Ockham, Wodeham, and Holcot for attack. Among the anti-Pelagians, in addition to Bradwardine, we need to place the Franciscan Robert of Halifax²⁴). Although critical of Bradwardine's view of future contingents, he joined him in condemning Wodeham's view of justification. As the defensive position of Ockham and Wodeham reveals, Bradwardine marks a forceful culmination of this critique, not its beginning.

A third element in Neo-Augustinianism appearing at Oxford in this period is the source-critical attitude. If one compares the form of

²³) Bradwardine, *De futuris contingentibus*, Vat. lat. 813, fol. 17^r: "Illa sunt necessaria, quae Deus praedixit fore, sed alia futura non". See B.M. Xiberta, "Fragments d'une questio inedita de Tomas Bradwardine", *Aus der Geisteswelt des Mittelalters*, ed. A. Lang, J. Lechner, and M. Schmaus, Beiträge zur Gesch. der Phil. M.a., Suppl. III (Munster, 1935), pp. 1169-1180; Genest, "Le De Futuris Contingentibus de Thomas Bradwardine".

²⁴) Courtenay, *Adam Wodeham*, 118-120.

citation, particularly of St. Augustine, in Bradwardine's *De causa Dei* and Rimini's *Lectura*, one realizes that much of the source approach of Gregory is already present in Bradwardine. How much of it was present before 1344, however, is conjectural, since we do not have Bradwardine's *Sentences* commentary for comparison.

One could point to many other events in England in these years that, although tangential to Neo-Augustinianism, further illustrate the strong interest in Augustine. One recalls Fitzralph's conversion experience in later years, which he described in the language of Augustine's *Confessions*²⁵); or Fitzralph's enthusiastic adoption at that same period in life of the idea of the lordship of grace²⁶); or Thomas Buckingham, whose opinions on grace and justification were modified in the direction of Augustine under the influence of Bradwardine, and whose personal library contained several works of Augustine, two of which were left to Merton College at his death²⁷).

Gregory of Rimini had access to the Oxford version of Neo-Augustinianism before he began his lectures at Paris in 1342²⁸). In the earliest version of his commentary he had exact quotations from Wodeham, Holcot, Bradwardine, and Halifax. In view of the fact that Halifax and Buckingham cite Bradwardine's *Summa*, i.e. *De causa Dei*, and all three are cited by Rimini, an early version of Bradwardine's work must have been in circulation by 1340 or slightly earlier. Yet Rimini's Neo-Augustinianism owes as much to Italy as to Oxford. It had a deeper grounding in the source-consciousness of the Italian humanists and in the concerns for Augustine that produced the *Milleloquium*. Gregory's knowledge of English theology may also have been acquired in Italy, culled from the growing collection of contemporary English theologians in Italian mendicant libraries, for until Gregory's *Lectura*, which ab-

²⁵) W.A. Pantin, *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1955), pp. 132-133: "Nor were You, the Solid Truth, absent from me those six years [at the Court of Rome, i.e. Avignon], but, in Your Holy Scriptures you shone upon me as in a certain radiant mirror; whereas in my former years, in the trifles of the philosophers, you had been hidden from me as in a certain dark cloud. For previously, I used to think that through the teachings of Aristotle and certain argumentations that were profound only to men profound in vanity, — I used to think that I had penetrated to the depths of Your Truth, with the citizens of Your Heaven; until You, the Solid Truth, shone upon me in Your Scriptures, scattering the cloud of my error, and showing me how I was croaking in the marshes with the toads and frogs".

²⁶) A. Gwynn, *The English Austin Friars in the time of Wyclif* (Oxford, 1940).

²⁷) J.A. Robson, *Wyclif and the Oxford Schools* (Cambridge, 1961), 32-69.

²⁸) Courtenay, *Adam Wodeham*, 117-118, note 5.

ounds in English sources, almost no contemporary English theologians were cited at Paris.

The English version of Neo-Augustinianism, while it may have been a source for Rimini, has a character of its own. It developed earlier than at Paris, with roots both in a revived interest in the teachings of Augustine and in a metalinguistic fascination with problems of contingency and justification. It also owed little to the inspiration of the Austin Friars and much to the interests of secular theologians. Bradwardine was its culmination and principal representative, but not its beginning. The English chapter in Augustinianism, therefore, alerts us to the need for differentiating in our research between the intellectual current of Neo-Augustinianism and the teaching of the Augustinian School.

WILLIAM J. COURTENAY