

THE *QUAESTIONES IN SENTENTIAS* OF MICHAEL DE MASSA, OESA

A Redating

Michael de Massa's *Quaestiones in Sententias* remain one of the richest unedited and, for the most part, unstudied texts of the fourteenth century. The preliminary ground work was laid by Damasus Trapp almost a half century ago, but very little use has been made of Massa's work since then¹. This is due in part to the fact that Massa was rarely cited in medieval texts and therefore is thought to be a relatively minor figure. A more important inhibiting factor, however, comes from the fact that Trapp's attribution to Massa of the anonymous *Quaestiones* on book II of the *Sentences* contained only in one manuscript, Vat. lat. 1087, has not been universally accepted, thus calling into question what texts actually belong to Michael de Massa². This doubt has been generated not by stylistic differences but by the fact that several medieval authors cited Michael de Massa's questions on book I of the *Sentences*, but no one ever cited his questions on book II³. Moreover, the content of some of the

¹ A. D. TRAPP, *Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century*, in *Augustiniana* 6 (1956), 146-274, at 163-75; *Notes on some Manuscripts of the Augustinian Michael de Massa* († 1337), in *Augustinianum* 5 (1965), 58-133.

² For questions on the authenticity of Vat. lat. 1087, see W. COURTENAY and K. H. TACHAU, *Ockham, Ockhamists, and the English-German Nation at Paris, 1339-1341*, in *History of Universities* 2 (1982), 53-96, at 73; TACHAU, *Vision and Certitude in the Age of Ockham* (Leiden, 1988), 318.

³ E.g., GREGORY OF RIMINI, *Lectura super primum et secundum sententiarum*, ed. D. TRAPP and V. MARCOLINO, vol. I (Berlin and New York, 1981), 85; ALFONSUS VARGAS OF TOLEDO, *In primum sententiarum* (Venice, 1490; rpr. 1952), cols. 18, 75, 111, 152, 160, 188, 251, 288, 335, 445, 535, 572, 576, 579, 585. Massa's commentary on book I survives in several manuscripts: Bologna, Collegio di Spagna 40; Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 2214; Florence, Bibl. Naz., conv. soppr. C.VIII.794; and the first eight distinctions in Naples, Bibl. Naz., VII.C.1. It was also abbreviated twice in the early 15th century, once by Andrea [de Biglia?] OESA of Milan (Oxford, Bodl. Lib., Canonici misc. 276, and the prologue in Vatican, Vat. lat. 1084, ff. 144-152), and by Johannes de Marliano OESA of Milan between 1410 and 1430 (Bergamo, Bibl. civ. A.3.21; Pavia, Bibl. Univ. 226). On Biglia see J. C. SCHNAUBELT, *Andrea Biglia (c.1394-1435). His Life and Writings*, in *Augustiniana* 43 (1993), 103-160.

questions in Vat. lat. 1087, especially the physical theories of the *Occamistae*, would appear to belong chronologically closer to the debates that erupted over Ockham's thought at Paris at the end of the 1330s, while Massa's commentary on the *Sentences* has been dated by Trapp to 1325-26, a decade and a half earlier. Apart from the fact that it completely escaped contemporary notice, the major problem with Massa's authorship of the text in Vat. lat. 1087 is this: if a group known as the *Occamistae* were active at Paris by 1325, and if their views on physics were already controversial at that time, why is there no other mention of that group or those issues at Paris between 1326 and 1339?

The following re-examination of the evidence will concentrate on three points: the authenticity of Vat. lat. 1087 as a work of Michael de Massa; the dating of Massa's time as *sententiarius*; and the origin and assembling of the questions included in Vat. lat. 1087.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF VAT. LAT. 1087

The first task is, of course, to establish whether the commentary on book II of the *Sentences*, found only in Vat. lat. 1087, is unquestionably by Michael de Massa. Much of the evidence on which Trapp based his conclusion that Michael de Massa was the author of this text is, upon examination, suggestive but ultimately inconclusive. The fact that Vat. lat. 1087 was copied by the same scribe and belonged to the same owner as Bologna Univ. 2214, a manuscript of Massa's commentary on book I, does not prove that the same person 'authored' both works⁴. Moreover, the cross-references in book II to that author's commentary on book I are too general or too standard to establish that they refer specifically to Massa's commentary on book I and to no one else's⁵.

⁴ Both manuscripts are copied in a fourteenth-century *textualis* hand common to university book production. Neither hand could be characterized as *Littera Parisiensis*. That the hand of the two manuscripts is identical is established by the common formation of letters and by the frequent use of elongated, archaic (Uncial and Caroline) initial letters, especially the 'N', 'A', and 'E'. These paleographical characteristics suggest Italian provenance. Both manuscripts were in the possession of Thomas Parentucelli de Sarzana (later Pope Nicholas V), who gave Bologna, Univ. 2214 to the Bologna convent of the Augustinian Hermits on behalf of Nicholas Alberghi, Cardinal protector of the Augustinians. Vat. lat. 1087 remained in the papal library.

⁵ For example, Vat. lat. 1087, f. 58r refers to the author's earlier treatment on the subject of theology, a standard topic of many prologues on the *Sentences* (Trapp, 105). The same is true for references to discussions in his Prologue of Aureoli's theory of *experientiae* and *notitia abstractiva* (Vat. 183r-v, 191v, 214v; Trapp, 127, 130), whether the existence of God is *per se nota* in dist. 2 (Vat. 179v; Trapp, 69, 127), of the

At two points, however, the parallels seem closer. The author of the commentary on book II, as Trapp already noted, refers several times to his discussions of *creatio actio* in distinctions five and nine of book I, and although there are no verbatim parallel passages that would establish positive proof, Massa does discuss that issue in distinctions five and nine of book I more than would be true for most authors⁶. More telling, however, is a reference in Vat. lat 1087, f. 182r, that identifies its author as a member of a religious order ("omnes doctores nostri") and which appears to be a reference back to the question contained in Bologna, Univ. 2214, f. 50v⁷.

Univ. 2214, f. 50v

De quarto articulo ubi restat inquirendum: Utrum Deus ut est subiectum habitus theologici contineatur sub obiecto adaequato nostrae potentiae et sub obiecto adaequato habitus metaphysicae, patet ex dictis quid sit tenendum.

Vat. lat. 1087, f. 182rb

... dictum fuit in prologo libri Sententiarum in quaestione illa: Utrum subiectum theologiae contineatur sub obiecto adaequato metaphysicae. Tamen omnes doctores nostri

A subsequent user of Univ. 2214, believing the text in Vat. lat. 1087 to be by the same author as Univ. 2214, noted in the margin of Univ. 2214, f. 134va: "De tota materia istius quaestionis quaere in additionibus secundi proprii [sic]," referring to the question "Utrum creatio actio sit realiter idem quod actus aliquis absolutus intrinsecus ipsi Deo" in the Vatican ms, f. 17v. All references, however, in the text (as opposed to the margin) of Univ. 2214 to matters treated in book II as well as to books III and IV are all in the future tense, describing an as-yet unrealized plan, and

augmentation and diminution of qualities in dist. 17 (Vat. 72v, 91vb; Trapp, 109, 112), on numerical form in dist. 24 (Vat. 69v, 88v; Trapp 109, 110), of cause and effect in dist. 36 (Vat. 48r, Trapp, 101). In some cases, an earlier treatment of a topic appears in Univ. 2214 in a different distinction from the one referred to in Vat. lat. 1087; cf. Trapp, 106, 109.

⁶ See, for example, Vat. lat. 1087, ff. 11v, 18r, 19v, 20r, 21r, 21v, 22r, 23r.

⁷ If this particular wording is more common than I think it to be, then the evidence for attributing Vat. lat. 1087 to Michael de Massa would be weakened. Similar language does occur in other authors in the body of a question, but not as a question title; see, e.g., SCOTUS, *Ordinatio*, Prol., pt. 3, q. 3 in *Opera omnia*, vol. I (Rome, 1950), pp. 98, 114; OCKHAM, *Ordinatio*, Prol., q. 9, in *Opera theologica*, vol. 1 (St. Bonaventure, 1967), 230-31; THOMAS OF STRASBOURG, *In primum Sententiarum*, Prol., q.3 (Venice, 1564), f. 13v.

are not cross-references to the text of Vat. lat. 1087⁸. Similarly, the references in Univ. 2214 to *sexterni extraordinarii* are not references to the *additiones* found in book II, but are references to missing sections that were to have been inserted into or attached to book I⁹. Thus, despite the fact that some of the evidence and argumentation of Trapp does not prove his case, the evidence isolated here makes it almost certain that Vat. lat. 1087 was indeed written and edited by the same author as that of the commentary found in Bologna, Univ. 2214. Moreover, Michael de Massa's authorship of the commentary found in Bologna, Univ. 2214 is beyond question. He is mentioned in the colophon of that manuscript as the author¹⁰. And the numerous citations of the opinions of Michael in the *Sentences* commentaries of Gregory of Rimini and Alfonsus Vargas of Toledo mentioned above — all references to book I — can be found in this work.

⁸ E.g., Univ., f. 220vb: "sicut patebit in secundo libro"; Univ. 223va: "sicut videbitur in secundo libro de gravi movente se"; Univ. 226ra: "... pertranseo tum quia pro parte tetigi superius aliquas de gravioribus difficultatibus circa istam materiam, d.31, tum etiam quia istam quaestionem et alias duas sequentes intendo diffuse a proposito resumere in secundo libro ..."; Univ. 226rb: "Respondeo quia materiam istam intendo magis a proposito determinare in secundo libro ..."; Univ. 225va: "licet in hoc falsum dicant sicut videbitur, Deo duce, in tertio libro." The same holds true for most of the text in the Vatican manuscript. Vat., f. 15ra: "Et quia non intendo hic deducere quaestionem sub isto sensu: Utrum de potentia dei absoluta possit alicui creaturae communicari a deo potentia creandi, nam ista quaestio locum habebit circa principium quarti libri sententiarum"; Vat. 17va: "quaere in quaestione illa: Utrum Deus possit quodcumque ens corruptum reparare, libro quarto f." (the 'f' probably a scribal misreading of '[s]ententiarum'); Vat. 17vb: "de quibus videbitur quia principium quarti libri sententiarum"; Vat. 66rb: "probam in prima quaestione quarti libri" Vat. 69vb: "Hoc locum habet tractari in quarto libro et de hoc ibi videbitur"; Vat. 73vb: "Sed de hoc videbitur in quarto libro"; Vat. 77va: "Sed de ista materia nihil dico ad praesens definitive, dicam de hoc in quarto libro sententiarum"; Vat. 94ra: "Sic implicaretur difficultas Utrum Deus posset facere motum in instanti. Et de ista difficultate videbitur in quarto loco, et ideo pertranseo" (again, 'loco' probably a scribal misreading of 'libro'); Vat. 94va: "... quia dicunt aliqui quod entitas aevi, de facto contingenter intrinsece successio, potest fieri a Deo tota simul. Sed de hoc videbitur in quarto libro"; Vat. 175va: "Et de istis quattuor quaestionibus agetur in tertio libro in tractatu de partibus imaginis." Ibid.: "Et de istis quattuor quaestionibus agetur in quarto libro in tractatu de beatitudine."

⁹ Univ. 198ra: "De aliis vero tribus quaestionibus motis circa istam distinctionem require in sexternis extraordinariis in quibus tetigi succincte puncta difficultatum."; Univ. 210vb: "De ultima quaestione, scilicet Utrum verbum in divinis dicatur notionaliter, dicitur in sexterno extraordinario ubi patet quod dicitur notionaliter." It should be noted, however, that some questions in the *additiones* to book II are also called *quaestiones extraordinariae*.

¹⁰ Bologna, Univ. 2214, f. 234vb: "Hic liber est scriptum in primum Sententiarum Michaelis de Masa"

THE DATE OF MICHAEL DE MASSA'S PARISIAN BACCALAUREATE

But did Michael de Massa lecture on the *Sentences* at Paris in 1325-26? We have very few biographical details for Michael de Massa. We know that he came from Massa in the region of Siena and belonged to the Beccucci family. We also know that he was *definitor* for his province at the General Chapter of the Augustinian order at Venice in June 1332, and that he died at Paris in May 1337 while still a bachelor of theology and was buried with copies of his writings at the Augustinian convent in Paris¹¹. The dating of his *Sentences* commentary to 1325-26 was proposed by Trapp on two pieces of evidence. Michael's opinions are cited in a quodlibetal question of the Augustinian, James of Pamiers (de Appamiis)¹², thought to have been given early in 1326 on the basis that some of the authors cited were active in 1325-26 and that Durand of St. Pourçain is cited in the Quodlibet as bishop of Le Puy, a position he ceased to hold in 1326. Secondly, Trapp introduced supporting information that Massa in his commentary on book I (Univ. 2214, f. 130r-v) referred to Alexander of S. Elpidio as prior general of the Augustinian order — an office Alexander ceased to hold in February 1326 when he became bishop of Amalfi. Since Massa frequently cites his fellow Augustinian, Gerard of Siena, who read the *Sentences* at Paris c.1322-23, Massa's commentary on book I of the *Sentences* would seem to have been written between 1323 and 1326.

The evidence for a *terminus ante quem* of 1326 based on James of Pamiers and Alexander of S. Elpidio is not as certain as has been assumed. First, the Quodlibetal question of James of Pamiers, contrary to what has been said of it, was probably not composed in 1325-26, nor was it necessarily held at Paris. The *terminus post quem* for the quodlibet is 1324, since in one of the questions James refers to a *quaestio* that master Francis of Marchia determined at Avignon, and Francis was *lector* at the Franciscan convent in Avignon from 1324 to 1328¹³. The fact that James also cites

¹¹ D. A. PERINI, *Bibliographia Augustiniana* II (Firenze, 1931), 191-92.

¹² F. PELSTER, *Zur ersten Polemik gegen Aureoli: seine Quästionen und sein Correctorium Petri Aureoli, das Quodlibet des Jacobus de Apamiis O.E.S.A.*, in *Franciscan Studies* 15 (1955), 30-47, at 44: "Quantum ad primum respondet frater Michael de Massa nostri ordinis quod sine aliqua repugnancia essencia et relatio vel quecunque alia, nisi aliud repugnet, possunt esse vere duo positiva et habere per consequens veram dualitatem sine omni distincione et non-ydemptitate et negacione unius ab alio, servatis propriis positivis."

¹³ *Ibid.*, at 44: "Contra istas rationes arguit magister Franciscus de Ma[rchia] in quadam questione, quam determinavit in curia ..."

the views of Giral Ot (Gerard Odonis) on the distinction of essence and relation, and the latter completed his lectures on the *Sentences* in 1326, suggests a *terminus post quem* of 1325 or 1326¹⁴. But 1326 is not the *terminus ante quem*. The reference to Durand as bishop of Le Puy is found only on the margin of the Leipzig manuscript of the quodlibet in a later hand that also describes James of Viterbo as "doctor inventivus"¹⁵. If a later owner of the Leipzig manuscript remembered Durand for his eight years as bishop of Le Puy rather than his last years as bishop of Meaux, it has no bearing on the *terminus ante quem* of James' Quodlibet. Nor is it the case that those whose opinions are cited in the Quodlibet need have been present at the disputation. If the Quodlibet was determined at Paris, it must date to around 1332. Only regent masters could determine such disputations at a *studium generale*, and James was still a bachelor at the general chapter at Paris in 1329 but was a doctor of theology by the time of the general chapter at Venice in 1332¹⁶.

What is certain is that at the time Jacques de Pamiers wrote his quodlibetic question, Michael de Massa views had come to his attention. And apart from the approximate date of Pamiers' regency, the only secure *terminus ante quem* for his Quodlibet is that provided by Alfonsus Vargas of Toledo's citation of Pamiers' *Quaestiones quodlibetales et ordinariae* in the former's *Super primum Sententiarum* given at Paris in 1344-45¹⁷.

Trapp's other piece of evidence for the 1325-26 date is more sub-

¹⁴ Ibid., at 42: "Ad idem arguunt quidam alii, Rand Geroldus Odonis". The date for Odonis' *Sentences* commentary, his earliest known work, is given in the colophon to Madrid, Bibl. Nac., Ms. lat. 65, f. 203v. James of Pamiers apparently also refers to Thomas de Fabiano as "quidam doctor nostri ordinis" (TRAPP, *Augustinian Theology*, 174), and Fabiano was fulfilling his one- or two-year term as regent when, in May 1328, he is so addressed by John XXII (*Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, edited by E. CHATELAIN and H. DENIFLE (hereafter cited as CUP), vol. II (Paris, 1891), 310-12, #875).

¹⁵ Ibid. at 42: "L Rand in Hand des 14/15 Jahrh. Dominus Durandus episcopus Aniciensis de ordine predicatorum et Iacobus de Viterbio doctor inventivus." See Leipzig, Univ. Bibl., ms 529, f. 102. There were at least two Augustinian theologians by the name of James of Viterbo. The reference is undoubtedly to the famous successor of Giles of Rome at the end of the thirteenth century, not the bachelor of theology who read the *Sentences* in 1328-29 (CUP II, 310-12, #875).

¹⁶ D. TRAPP, "J. von Pamiers," *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, V (1960), col. 835; see also: *Antiquiores quae extant definitiones capitulorum generalium Ordinis*, in *Analecta Augustiniana* 4 (1911-1912) 81 and 108. Formed bachelors could determine Quodlibetic disputations at a lesser *studium* of the order, but if that is the context of Pamiers' Quodlibet, it would still be dated closer to 1330.

¹⁷ J. KÜRZINGER, *Alfonsus Vargas Toletanus und seine theologische Einleitungslehre*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, XXII, 5-6 (Münster i.W., 1930), pp. 84-87.

stantive but also more complicated. Toward the beginning of question three of distinction eight on the problem of divine attributes, Michael introduces in succession the opinions of Henry of Ghent, Thomas Aquinas, "our father general" (meaning the prior general of the Augustinian order at that time), followed by Godfrey of Fontaines. These citations, all of which mention specifically (although not always correctly) the title and question of each author's work being cited, are indicated in the margin of Bologna, Univ. 2214, f. 130ra, in the same scribal hand as "O.H.", "O.T.", "O.G.", and "O.Goth", respectively. Three columns later Michael refers to "magister Alexander," meaning Alexander of S. Elpidio, who is frequently cited in Michael's commentary on book I as "magister Alexander" or occasionally "frater Alexander". The marginal reference to "O.G." opposite the textual identification of "a certain venerable doctor, namely our father general in his first Quodlibet, q. 2" could stand for "opinio Generalis," but it could also stand for the first name of the authority cited, as in every other case in the margins of this manuscript, except for Scotus, who is cited by last name or as Johannes Scotus¹⁸. If Alexander was the prior general in question, it is surprising that the marginal abbreviation, which Massa himself created, was not "O.A." or "O.Alex," just as was done later when "op. mgri. Alex." in the margin identifies "op. alterius doctor" in the text. Consequently, the question needs to be explored whether the general referred to by Massa was Alexander of S. Elpidio or, possibly, William of Cremona (i.e., "O[pinio] G[uillelmi]), who became the Augustinian general immediately after Alexander in 1326 and remained so until his death in 1342.

The position of Alexander (de Marchia) of S. Elpidio on the divine attributes was cited and discussed by at least two authors apart from Michael de Massa. As described by Gerard of Siena and Thomas of Strasbourg, Alexander agreed with Henry of Ghent that the distinction of attributes in God was a distinction of reason "ad intra" that did not entail any comparison in the created order, "ad extra". Alexander modified Henry's position by insisting that the distinction of attributes "ad intra" was not based on any internal comparison or negotiative act but by a

¹⁸ It should be noted that the scribe was not simply transferring to the margin what he read in the text. As with many fourteenth-century *Sentences* commentaries, these marginal notes in Michael de Massa's commentary often identify authors (usually more contemporary authors) who are not referred to in the text by name (e.g., "quidam." "alii," "quidam alius doctor").

simple awareness or intuition¹⁹. Gerard of Siena added the further information that Alexander's position was put forward in the second question of his first *Quodlibet*²⁰.

In addition to Michael de Massa's reference to the position of the Augustinian general on the divine attributes, Michael also refers three columns later to the position of Alexander of S. Elpidio on the same issue as if the position of Alexander is being introduced for the first time. His description of Alexander's position at this point coincides with the position attributed to Alexander by Gerard of Siena and Thomas of Strasbourg²¹. When that position is compared to the position of the Augustinian general described earlier by Massa, the positions are similar but not identical. The general's position, as described by Massa, does reject any internal comparative ratiocination and does employ the distinctive "Alexandrine?" phrase "per simplicem intuitum", but in place of a distinction "secundum rationem," Massa attributes to the Augustinian general a distinction "actualiter et complete" — language that does not appear in any of the three descriptions of Alexander's position, but which Massa did apply in

¹⁹ GERARD OF SIENA, *In primum Sententiarum*, dist. 2, q. 2, a. 3 (Chicago, Univ. lib. Ms 22, fol. 38rb): "Ideo sit alius modus dicendi quem ponit magister Alexander [marg.: Opinio magistri Alexandri de Marchia] 1 suo quodlibet, q. 2, dicens quod distinctio attributorum sumitur per intellectum divinum ad intra, non quod per actum negotiativum, sicut probat praefata opinio, sed per simplicem intuitum. ... Talis distinctio rationis in essentia divina est prior distinctione reali in creaturis; ergo distinctio attributorum in essentia divina non sumitur ex creaturis; et per consequens ab intra. ... Ergo per simplicem intuitum illam distinctionem reducit in actum sine omni comparatione ad extra." THOMAS OF STRASBOURG, *Commentaria in IIII Libros Sententiarum*, I, d. 6, a. 3 (Venice, 1564), p. 45: "Dicit ergo ille doctor [marg.: Alexander ordinis S. Augustini], quod rationes attributales sunt potentia distinguibiles in essentia divina, et per hoc differt ab aliis de formalitatibus, qui dicunt, quod sint actu formaliter distinctae. Per hoc autem, quod dicit intellectum divinum ea distinguere ab intra, differt ab illis, qui ponunt talem distinctionem fieri solum in ordine ad creaturas. Et addit tertio, quod talis distinctio fiat per simplicem intuitum, et non per intellectum comparante divinam essentiam sub ratione unius attributi ad seipsam sub ratione alterius attributi: quia eo ipso, quod potentialiter sunt in divina essentia quantum ad istam distinctionem rationis per simplicem intuitum intellectus perfecte essentiam cognoscentis, talis distinctio reducitur in actum, et per hoc differt ab illis, quorum rationes adduxi proxime ante istum."

²⁰ This information is contained in the Chicago manuscript (see previous note), in Padua, Bibl. Univ., ms. 2229, and probably in other manuscripts of Gerard as well.

²¹ MICHAEL DE MASSA, *In primum Sententiarum*, d. 8, q. 3 (Bologna, Univ. 2214, f. 130vb): "Est autem alia opinio alterius doctoris [marg.: op<inio> mag<ist>ri Alex<andri>] quae dicit quod attributa divina distinguuntur secundum rationem absque omni habitudine ad extra, et hoc per divinum intellectum non quidem collationum vel negotiorum, sed attingentem simplici intuitu essentiam divinam."

his descriptions of the positions of Henry of Ghent and Godfrey of Fontaines²².

On the basis of these passages, it is difficult to determine whether these citations in Michael to the opinion of the Augustinian general and to Alexander represent one and the same person or two different authors. The presence of the phrase "per simplicem intuitum" in both passages does not solve the problem, since William of Cremona, writing after Alexander, might well have adopted that part of Alexander's argument. Yet the matter can be brought nearer to a solution. In 1932 Victorin Doucet described a Naples manuscript (Bibl. Naz. VIII.C.6) that contained, among other works, the first three questions from an anonymous Quodlibet (ff. 7a-10b) which, two years later, he identified as belonging to Alexander of S. Elpidio on the basis of the citation in Gerard of Siena mentioned above²³.

²² Ibid., f. 130ra: "... opinio cuiusdam venerabilis doctoris, scilicet patris nostri generalis, quam ipse ponit primo suo quodlibeto, q. 2, ubi ipsi dicit quod attributa divina distinguuntur actualiter et complete, et fiunt complete plura per actum intelligendi divinum absque omni collatione in composita ad intra vel ad extra, sed per simplicem intuitum intellectus divini." Compare this with Massa's description of Henry of Ghent's position, f. 130ra: "quod attributa divina distinguuntur non quidem actualiter et complete ante omnem actum cuiuscumque intellectus, sed actualiter et complete distinguuntur per actum intellectus divini, non quidem actum simplicem intuitive transeuntem prius quidem super realem distinctionem divinarum personarum ad intra" and Massa's description of Godfrey of Fontaines's position, f. 130ra: "quod attributa divina distinguuntur actualiter et complete" How this is achieved differs between Henry and Godfrey. For a discussion of the last two authors' positions on the divine attributes, see J. F. WIPPEL, *The Metaphysical Thought of Godfrey of Fontaines* (Washington, 1981), pp. 115-123.

²³ V. DOUCET, in his review of Glorieux's *Répertoire des Maîtres en Théologie de Paris*, in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 27 (1934), 587: "Le Quodlibet est cité par Gérard de Sienne, I Sent.: *Est alius modus dicendi quem ponit magister Alexander* [en marge: *opinio mag. Alexandri de Marchia*] 1° suo quodlibet, q. 2, dicens quod distinctio attributorum sumitur per intellectum divinum ad intra, non quod per actum negotiativum ... sed per simplicem intuitum (Padoue Univ. 2229, f. 44a). Or cette citation correspond exactement et pour tous les points, au Quodlibet anonyme de MS. de Naples, Nat. VII. C. 6 (f. 7a-10b), que nous avons décrit dans l'AFH XXV, 1932, 520. Il n'y a pas de doute, nous avons là un des quodlibets d'Alexandre de Sant'Elpidio." P. GLORIEUX, *La littérature quodlibétique*, vol. II (Paris, 1935), 302. Question 2: "Utrum distinctio attributorum in essentia divina sumatur per comparisonem ad extra vel ad intra." Only the first three-and-a-half questions of this anonymous Quodlibet appear in the manuscript (ff. 7a-10b), but there is a list in the prologue of all fifteen questions. In the first question the author refers to his third quodlibet, which means that his regency lasted at least two years (i.e., two quodlibets per year). Glorieux refers to the numbering of the questions as a "particularité" which, added to some other "formules de style," initially suggested to him the authorship of Henry of Friemar, OESA or some other Austin Friar. The contents of the full manuscript are described in V. DOUCET, *De Cod. Neapolitano. VII C. 6*, in AFH 25 (1932), 518-24.

Now that we have three descriptions of Alexander's position and supporting argumentation as well as Massa's description of the position of the Augustinian general, the Naples manuscript needs to be rechecked. William of Cremona also authored several quodlibets. Two questions from his third quodlibet appear in that same Naples manuscript, and the first question of the quodlibets attributed to Alexander by Doucet refers to a question in its author's third quodlibet²⁴. In the form in which we have it, the latter text was edited and probably reorganized after later quodlibets were completed. In light of that, it is not impossible that two authors, closely related in time, place, and religious order, might arrange their questions in a similar topical sequence.

There is one other piece of evidence, however, noted but not utilized by Trapp, that does support an early date for the version of Massa's commentary on book I contained in Bologna, Univ. 2214. Throughout that manuscript Aquinas is referred to as "frater Thomas," never "sanctus Thomas," suggesting a date of composition before (or at least not long after) Thomas' canonization in July 1323²⁵. The other Bolognese manuscript of Massa's *In primum sententiarum*, Collegio di Spagna Ms 40, changes almost all these references to "sanctus Thomas". Such a change might seem natural for any scribe copying a text after 1324, but as was noted above, Univ. 2214 itself was copied by the same scribe as Vat. lat. 1087, which refers to Aquinas as "sanctus Thomas". Assuming that these last two manuscripts were copied after 1324, probably after the death of Massa, it is surprising that the scribe remained faithful to his exemplar of book I in this regard and did not correct Thomas' title. Indeed, the change from "frater Thomas" to "sanctus Thomas" in the two Bolognese manuscripts may not be a result of scribal correction but the result of a later redaction. The text of the Collegio di Spagna manuscript differs at a number of points from that found in Univ. 2214 and also has passages not found in the latter manuscript²⁶. But were those changes introduced when Massa revised his text after reading the *Sentences* at Paris, or does the text

²⁴ Naples, Bibl. Naz., VII.C.6, ff. 72vb-73va; cf. GLORIEUX, *La littérature quodlibétique* II, 116. The questions are listed as six and seven in sequence in this Quodlibet, but in reverse order in the manuscript, which indicates they were known by numbers. It may also be that the two questions from "magister Guillelmus" in the Naples manuscript, ff. 10va-14rb, that follows immediately upon the anonymous quodlibetic questions, are also by William of Cremona.

²⁵ The fact that in Univ. 2214 Scotus is cited as "Johannes Scotus" also suggests an early date.

²⁶ Compare, for example, Bologna Univ. 2214, f. 47r and Bologna, Collegio di Spagna 40, f. 38v; Univ., f. 50r-50v, and Spagna, f. 43v-44r; Univ., f. 55v-55v, and Spagna, f. 52r-52v.

found in Univ. 2214 represent a pre-Parisian version?

Trapp was ultimately convinced that 1325-26 was the date for Massa's Parisian baccalaureate, but at various points in his 1956 article he also referred to Massa's commentary on the *Sentences* as a *lectura lectoris*, a series of lectures or questions written during the period of the lectorate, that is the period between the five years initial study in theology and the point at which, if one were fortunate, one was chosen to return to Paris as *sententiarius*²⁷. During these years as *lector*, which could last well over a decade, one taught in the various *studia* of the province. Gregory of Rimini, for example, after his years of initial study at Paris, lectured for twelve years in various *studia* in northern Italy (specifically Bologna, Padua, and Perugia) before being appointed to read the *Sentences* at Paris²⁸. Similarly, the period of lectorate and baccalaureate for Dionysius de Mutina was fourteen years inclusive.²⁹

The *Sentences* of Peter Lombard was one of the major texts on which lectures would be needed in the provincial *studia*, and lectors no doubt fulfilled that task out of curricular need as well as preparation for their time as *sententiarius* in a *studium generale*. This was not a peculiarity of the Augustinian educational system. It became common in the fourteenth century for prospective bachelors to read the *Sentences* at a lesser *studium* of the order before advancing to the level of bachelor at Paris. Pre-university lectures on the *Sentences* have survived for Peter Aureol, Walter Chatton, Adam Wodeham, and the Augustinian John of Burgos³⁰.

It has commonly been assumed that pre-university lectures on the *Sentences* were written within two or three years of becoming a university

²⁷ E. YPMA, *La formation des professeurs chez les ermites de Saint Augustin de 1256 à 1354* (Paris, 1956), pp. 42-45.

²⁸ CUP II, 557 (#1097). For a re-examination of these biographical details, see V. MARCOLINO, "Einleitung," in GREGORIUS ARIMINENSIS OESA *Lectura Super Primum et Secundum Sententiarum*, ed. A. D. TRAPP and V. MARCOLINO, Bd. 1 (Berlin, 1981), pp. xi-xvii.

²⁹ CUP II, 404, #952: "qui tam in Parisiensi quam in aliis studiis generalibus quatuordecim annis legerat et Sententias in dicto studio Parisiensi compleverat"

³⁰ K. H. TACHAU, *French Theology in the mid-fourteenth century*, in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 51 (1984), 41-80, at 55-59. John of Burgos read the *Sentences* at Amiens five years before he revised them for presentation at Paris as *sententiarius*. James of Pamiers's citation of Massa's opinions does not change this picture, since Pamier's *Quodlibet*, as we have seen, could date to the mid-to-late 1330s, after Massa's baccalaureate. Moreover, citing another scholar before the latter's baccalaureate, while unusual, is not unheard of. Walter Chatton cited and discussed the opinions of one of his own precocious theological students, namely Adam Wodeham, some eight or ten years before Wodeham became *sententiarius* at Oxford; see G. GAL, introduction to Ockham, *Summa logicae*, 53*-54*.

sententiarius. But this impression is derived from the fact that all bachelors usually spent the year before their first *sentential* lecture in preparation for that task, and some of the pre-university lectures cited above, most of them Franciscan, can be placed in the years immediately preceding the official university lectures. But no other mendicant order had as long a period of pre-baccalaureate teaching as the Augustinians, and the examination and appointment of lectors within the Augustinian order credentialed them to lecture on any of the required texts of the theological program. Thus, if the text of Bologna, Univ. 2214 is a *lectura lectoris*, as Trapp suspected, then the reference to the opinion of the prior general on divine attributes is just as much a part of the pre-university lectures as referring to Aquinas as "frater Thomas". And in light of the fact that the lectorate credentialed one to lecture on any of the required texts, there is no way of determining at what point in the lectorate one might begin to compose lectures on the *Sentences*.

There is no easy way to determine whether the version of Massa's *In primum sententiarum* belongs to his baccalaureate or to his pre-baccalaureate years as *lector*, and if the latter, when during his lectorate they might have been written. Yet the fact that Michael de Massa died at Paris while relatively young and still a bachelor of theology³¹ — at least twelve years after the text of his commentary on book I in Univ. 2214 — I am inclined to view that text as a pre-Parisian, pre-baccalaureate version of the commentary he later gave as *sententiarius* at the Grands Augustins convent in Paris. That latter event need not have occurred before he was appointed *definitor* for his province at the Venice chapter in 1332. Gregory of Rimini, while lector at the convent of Bologna in 1338 was appointed *definitor* for that province at the General Chapter in Siena, four years before he became *sententiarius* at Paris³². In short, Massa's reading of the *Sentences* at Paris must have occurred after that of Gerard of Siena, c. 1323, and before Massa's death in 1337, but none of the evidence described above requires us to date his Parisian *lectura* at any particular point within that range.

Trapp was inclined to date Massa's baccalaureate early, in 1325-26, and to explain his failure to advance to the doctorate on grounds of his being blocked or delayed for ideological reasons, namely that his supposed adherence to the "ultra-Aegidians" placed him out of favor during the

³¹ PERINI, *Bibliographia Augustiniana* II, 191: "decessit Parisiis die 10 mai anno 1337, cum adhuc esset Baccalaureus et in florida aetate, sepultusque fuit in nostra ecclesia, et in eius sepulchro subsignata volumina a se edita"

³² MARCOLINO, "Einleitung," xii.

generalship of William of Cremona³³. But if one dates his baccalaureate later, in the late 1320s or early 1330s, then what appears to be a delay in promotion to the magisterium becomes more understandable. Parisian statutes in the 1320s and 1330s required a minimum six-year period between reading the *Sentences* and promotion to the magisterium, during which time the formed bachelor was expected to be in residence at Paris and to participate in disputations³⁴. Since there is no evidence that Massa sought or obtained a papal exemption from this rule (i.e., promotion *ex gratia*), as many others did during the pontificate of John XXII, we may assume that the rule applied to him. The normal waiting period may have been delayed even more by papal intervention in the process of appointments to read the *Sentences* and promotion to the magisterium at Paris. Since only one bachelor in a religious order could read the *Sentences* in any one academic year, and since promotion to the magisterium by any means entailed an obligation of regency (at least for the better part of an academic year) and residency (part of which could be fulfilled as *magister non regens*), every papal insertion into the sequence of candidates established by the general chapter of the order meant a delay in the advancement of someone else. Despite the attempts of the Augustinian order to ensure that promotions *per litteram* or *per bullam* did not disadvantage those seeking promotion *rigorose*, these interventions probably did cause delays. The records of the Augustinian general chapters during the later years of John's pontificate attest to the tensions caused by papal intervention. And it was probably to accommodate the needs of candidates in the religious orders that during the 1332-1334 period John attempted to bend Parisian practice by pressuring the chancellor to allow designated mendicants to read the *Sentences* during the summer vacation, beginning as soon as the one reading during the academic year could be persuaded to "complete" his lectures.

Neither the six-year rule nor the interposing of other candidates can explain a delay of more than twelve years between the baccalaureate and

³³ TRAPP, *Augustinian Theology*, 170-73.

³⁴ In a letter of 1323 requesting promotion *ex gratia* of Pierre Roger (later Clement VI), John XXII referred to the six-year rule, CUP II, 272, #822: "Non obstantibus quod a tempore lecture sue libri Sententiarum sex annorum spatium minime sit elapsum, per quorum spatium de consuetudine seu statuto ejusdem studii debent, ut dicitur, bacalarii expectare, priusquam ad magisterium in dicta scientia presententur" And in a similar letter in 1344 from Clement VI on behalf of Bertaud of St. Denis, CUP II, 551-52, #1093: "necnon libros Sententiarum laudabiliter, cum jam sit in secundo anno inclusive post eandem lecturam Non obstantibus quod a tempore lecture sue libri Sententiarum sex annorum spatium minime sit elapsum, per quorum spatium de consuetudine seu statuto ejusdem studii debent, ut dicitur, bacalarii expectare, priusquam ad magisterium in dicta scientia presententur"

Massa's status as bachelor at the time of his death. We are probably looking, therefore, at a textual legacy that includes a pre-Parisian *Lectura lectoris* (c. 1324 sqq.), a Parisian *Lectura baccalarii* (c. 1332 in light of his academic rank and place of residence at the time of his death in 1337), and possibly questions that derive from a later source or revision (c. 1333-37). It is to this last problem that I now turn.

THE CONTENT OF VAT. LAT. 1087

Unlike Massa's *In primum sententiarum*, his commentary on book II of the *Sentences* in Vat. lat. 1087 contains questions derived from different academic occasions or periods in the editorial process. Portions of that manuscript are referred to as his *Lectura ordinaria* or *Opus ordinarium*³⁵, while other sections are designated as *additiones* and, for two questions, *quaestiones extraordinariae*³⁶. Trapp discussed these different text units at some length, believing that Massa intentionally constructed his questions on the *Sentences*, even the pre-Parisian version, as distinct text units. Trapp viewed the term *opus ordinarium* as Massa's title for his *Lectura lectoris*, composed before he became a bachelor at Paris. During

³⁵ The term *lectura ordinaria* appears only once in Vat. lat. 1087, f. 25va ("quia de tali entitate fuit quaestio a proposito in lectura ordinaria super secundum sententiarum quaestione quinta in universo") and refers to q. 5 on f. 34ra, which, although the first question in that section, is the fifth question of those designated as *opus ordinarium*, the first four appearing on ff. 1ra-17vb. The term *opus ordinarium* appears on f. 52rb ("Sed antecedens fuit probatum in opere ordinario circa principium secundi sententiarum quaestione illa: Utrum Deus possit aliquid de novo creare"); f. 53va ("quaere eas in tertia difficultate principalis quaestionis super secundum sententiarum in opere ordinario"); f. 61rb ("expositum fuit circa principium primae quaestionis super secundo sententiarum in opere ordinario"); f. 68va ("et istam difficultatem tractabo in opere ordinario in materia de angelis" — a section that never got added); f. 91vb ("multipliciter probavi quaestione prima difficultate secunda in opere ordinario super secundo libro sententiarum"); f. 94vb ("nec tamen difficultatem istam intendo pertractare nunc ad praesens, sed pertractabo in materia de angelis in opere ordinario super secundum librum sententiarum" — again, in the future tense). All these cross-references, including the reference to the *lectura ordinaria*, are found in the *additiones*, not in the *opus ordinarium* itself.

³⁶ The term *additiones* appears in Vat. lat. 1087, f. 51vb as a cross-reference from a section of the *opus ordinarium* to a question in the *additiones*: "in additionibus, quaestione prima: Utrum creatio actio sit actus aliquis absolutus intrinsecus ipsi Deo". But that title also occurs internally within the *additiones*; e.g. f. 91rb: "quia tamen de ista materia tractavi a materia [sic] et diffuse superius in quaestione 9 in additionibus: Utrum videlicet Deus possit facere creaturam quae duret per unicum instans tantum"; f. 131vb: "Item superius in principio additionum in materia de creatione in quaestione illa: Utrum". Within the sequence of additional questions, the two on duration are called *quaestiones extraordinariae*.

the year before his year or biennium as Parisian *sententiarius*, and probably continuing while he read at Paris, Massa supposedly wrote a series of new questions that became his *additiones*. According to Trapp, the phrases *sexterni extraordinarii* and *quaestiones extraordinariae* are simply other expressions for these *additiones*. The implication of this view is that all text units would have been produced either before Massa became a bachelor of theology or during his year or years as *sententiarius*. At one point, however, Trapp suggested that some of the additional questions might derive from *quaestiones disputatae*³⁷.

Another view is, however, possible. Nowhere does Massa use the phrase *Lectura lectoris*. He does use the expressions *Lectura ordinaria* and *opus ordinarium*. In light of the fact that in university usage *ordinatio* was the term applied to the version of a work revised and edited for publication, it is unlikely that Massa would use such an expression to refer to pre-baccalaureate questions on the *Sentences*. It is more likely that Massa meant by that title either his first revised version of his sentential questions from his Parisian baccalaureate, or at least the "official" version presented as *sententiarius*. It is important to note in this regard that Massa never refers to his commentary on book I as his *opus ordinarium*. Only a substantial portion of his questions on book II are referred to in that manner. And that portion dates after 1326, since Alexander of S. Elpidio is referred to as "reverendus magister bonae memoriae"³⁸.

At the same time, both Massa's commentaries on books I and II refer to text units separate from the main body of those works. In the case of book I, these additional text units are referred to as *sexterni extraordinarii*, presumably meaning quires containing one or more questions that were not part of the original text³⁹. One of these references is to an additional question on the Trinity that was probably to have been part of book I. The other is a reference to questions on motion that may be referring to material eventually included in book II.

The *quaestiones extraordinariae* that survive are found only in book II, belong together with the *additiones*, and may well be chronologically the last questions written, as the name suggests. Whether

³⁷ TRAPP, *Massa*, 111.

³⁸ Vat. lat. 1087, f. 97vb (at the beginning of questions that belong to the *opus ordinarium*). Alexander died in 1326.

³⁹ Bologna, Univ. 2214, f. 198ra: "De aliis vero tribus quaestionibus motis circa istam distinctionem require in sexternis extraordinariis in quibus succincte tetigi puncta difficultatum." Ibid., f. 210vb and Bologna, Collegio di Spagna 40, f. 73vb: "De ultima quaestione, scilicet: Utrum verbum in divinis dicatur notionaliter, dicetur in sexto extraordinario, ubi patet quod dicitur notionaliter."

or not these later questions derive from a different academic context, such as questions on Aristotle's *Physics*, they were written after the initial questions on book II of the *Sentences*⁴⁰. Although in the form in which they survive they were designed or redesigned as additional questions on the *Sentences*, it is unclear whether their fusion into one volume was Massa's plan or was an assembly that took place after his death. All cross-references to the *additiones* that specify a location within the same volume, as indicated by *superius*, are internal to the *additiones* and do not indicate whether the *additiones* were to be bound in with the *opus ordinarium*. In fact, at one point in the *additiones* (Vat. lat. 1087, f. 54vb), those questions are described as a separate work: "sicut dictum fuit superius, quaestione 1 et quaestione 3 istius operis in principio," presumably to distinguish it from his *opus ordinarium*. It should also be noted that the first group of additional questions (ff. 17v-34v) has many internal references to itself as being in different parts of one "sextern". But at the time the additional questions were being edited, the *opus ordinarium* was also undergoing revision, not all of which found its way into the Vatican manuscript. Twice Massa referred to his questions on angels (in the future tense!) that were to have been part of the *opus ordinarium*.

The questions that concentrate on issues in physics, primarily questions on motion and time, all belong to the *additiones* and were written after the sentential questions on book II. It is in these questions that we find the references to the *Occamistae* and to Ockhamist physics. The inclusion or fusion of these questions within the body of Massa's *In secundum sententiarum*, which seems to have been an incomplete process at the time of his death and was left, as Trapp suggested, to a later scribe or editor, makes it likely that these later questions belong to the last years of Massa's life. Dating both the editorial process as well as Massa's questions in *additionibus* to the 1330s helps explain why, apart from the undatable reference to Massa by James of Pamiers, Massa's *In primum sententiarum* is not cited by other authors until Gregory of Rimini did so in 1342, and why Massa's *In secundum sententiarum*, in a state of revision

⁴⁰ It was not unusual for mendicants in the period between the lectures on the *Sentences* and promotion to the doctorate to lecture on Aristotle. Ockham's questions on Aristotle's *Physics* belong to this period in his career, as do those of Hugolino of Orvieto; cf. W. ECKERMANN, *Der Physikkommentar Hugolins von Orvieto OESA* (Berlin, 1972). There are other instances of fourteenth-century authors, for example Walter Chatton, incorporating into their *Sentences* commentaries questions derived from disputations; cf. S. F. BROWN, *Walter Chatton's 'Lectura' and William of Ockham's 'Quaestiones In Libros Physicorum Aristotelis'*, in *Essays Honoring Allan B. Wolter*, ed. W. A. FRANK and G. J. ETZKORN (St. Bonaventure, 1985), 81-115, at 93.

at the time of his death, was never cited by anyone. It also explains why the content of Massa's *In secundum sententiarum*, especially the sections entitled by Massa himself as the *additiones*, reflect controversies that, according to all other evidence, became a concern at Paris in the mid-to-late 1330s. Michael de Massa may still be the earliest evidence of those concerns, but that evidence appears to be much closer to the events of 1339-41 than previously thought.

Madison, Wisconsin

William J. COURTENAY