

THE SENTENCES COMMENTARY OF GERARD OF SIENA, O.E.S.A.: MANUSCRIPTS AND QUESTIONS

Gerard of Siena belongs to the second generation of Augustinian theologians, which included John of Lana of Bologna, Dionysius of Borgo San Sepolcro, and Henry of Friemar the Younger.¹ In his ground-breaking 1956 article on fourteenth-century Augustinian theologians, Damasus Trapp began his account with this generation, skipping over the immediate followers of Giles of Rome, such as James of Viterbo, Henry of Friemar the Elder, Augustine of Ancona and Prosper of Reggio Emilia.² Trapp was selective, examining in succession Dionysius of Borgo, Gerard of Siena, and Michael of Massa, while mentioning others, such as Alexander of San Elpidio, William of Cremona, John of Lana, and James of Pamiers, all of whom figured

¹ Mentioned here and in the following sentence are only those with a sufficient theological œuvre (*Sentences* commentaries and/or quodlibetal or disputed questions), out of a larger group whose opinions are cited or survive in fragments in the collections of others, such as that of Prosper of Reggio Emilia. On Gerard, see D. A. Perini, *Bibliographia Augustiniana*, vol. III (Firenze, 1935), pp. 187-189, which includes references to the older literature; P. Glorieux, *La littérature quodlibétique*, vol. II (Paris, 1935), pp. 97-98; D. Trapp, "Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century. Notes on Editions, Marginalia, Opinions and Book-Lore," *Augustiniana*, 6 (1956), 146-274, at 160-63, 172-73; D. Pacetti, "Un trattato sulle usure e le restituzione di Pietro di Giovanni Olivi, falsamente attribuito a Fr. Gerardo da Siena," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 46 (1953), 448-457; F. Casado, "Gerardo de Sena, ¿representante de ideas agustinianas?" *La Ciudad de Dios*, 166 (1954), 401-411; R. Auber, "Gérard de Sienne," *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, XX (1984), cols. 799-801 (biography based on Trapp); J. P. H. Clark, "Authorship in Ms. Balliol College, Oxford, 63," *Analecta Augustiniana* (henceforth cited as AA), 54 (1991), 81-114; O. Langholm, *Economics in the Medieval Schools. Wealth, Exchange, Value, Money and Usury, according to the Paris Theological Tradition, 1200-1350* (Leiden, 1992), pp. 549-560; A. Zumkeller, *Theology and History of the Augustinian School in the Middle Ages*, ed. J. E. Rotelle (Villanova, PA, 1996), pp. 35-36, 72-73 (translated and revised from Zumkeller, "Die Augustinerschule des Mittelalters: Vertreter und philosophische-theologische Lehre," AA, 27 (1964), 167-262); C. Schabel, "Parisian Commentaries from Peter Auriol to Gregory of Rimini, and the Problem of Predestination," in *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. I, ed. G. R. Evans (Leiden-Boston-Köln, 2002), 221-265, at 249-252; G. Ceccarelli, "'Whatever' Economics: Economic Thought in *Quodlibeta*," in *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages. The Thirteenth Century*, ed. C. Schabel (Leiden-Boston, 2006), pp. 475-505, at 493-494; C. Schabel and W. J. Courtenay, "Augustinian *Quodlibeta* after Giles of Rome," in *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages. The Fourteenth Century*, ed. C. Schabel (Leiden-Boston, 2007), pp. 545-568, at 557-562; W. J. Courtenay, "Balliol 63 and Parisian Theology around 1320," in *Vivarium*, 47 (2009), 375-406.

² Trapp, "Augustinian Theology," 160-63, 172-73.

in his narrative. For Trapp Gerard was a theologian of the mid-1320s who, like Dionysius earlier, adhered closely to the views of Giles of Rome, criticized the opinions of Peter Auriol, James of Viterbo, and Alexander of San Elpidio, and was attacked in turn by Michael of Massa, who interested Trapp more. Unlike his treatment of Dionysius of Borgo, Michael of Massa and many of the others discussed in that article, however, Trapp never wrote a separate article on Gerard. The main purpose of the present article is to provide an up-to-date list of manuscripts of Gerard's *Sentences* commentary, a list of those he cited, and a full list of questions.

The picture of Gerard presented by Trapp is the one that has been repeated in subsequent literature. Gerard played a central role in Trapp's narrative of the development of the Augustinian School in the early fourteenth century. Despite the numerous mandates within the Order to adhere to and defend the teaching of Giles of Rome, the Augustinian Hermits, just as with Dominican adherence to Thomas, experienced doctrinal currents that moved in a different direction on various issues, beyond positions associated with the principal doctor of the order. Among those who went beyond Giles, labeled by Trapp as "ultra-Aegidians," Trapp placed James of Viterbo (*sententiarius* c. 1288, DTh 1293) and Alexander of San Elpidio (*sententiarius* 1299-1300; DTh c. 1304). This supposedly led in the next generation to a conflict between those who, in the intensification of debate brought on by the approaches and opinions of John Duns Scotus, Durand of St. Pourçain and Peter Auriol, wished to remain faithful to the teachings of Thomas and Giles, and those who wished to move in a different and newer direction. Among the Augustinian *antiqui* who wished to follow Giles, Trapp placed Dionysius of Borgo and Gerard of Siena. Among the Augustinian *moderni*, or at least those among them he labeled Ultra-Aegidians, Trapp placed James of Viterbo, Alexander of San Elpidio, and Michael of Massa.

In Trapp's narrative this division took on a political dimension in the mid 1320s that enflamed academic rivalry between two Augustinian bachelors of theology from the region of Siena: Gerard of Siena and Michael of Massa. Trapp described Massa as a protégé of Alexander of San Elpidio, who was Prior General from 1312 until his appointment in 1326 as bishop of Melfi. Supposedly it was Alexander who aided in the appointment of Massa as *sententiarius* at Paris for 1325-26. The new Prior General, William of Cremona, allegedly supported closer adherence to Giles and consequently favored Gerard of Siena, who was promoted to the doctorate in the latter half of 1329, while Michael of Massa languished as a mere bachelor of theology until his death in 1337.

As dramatic as this narrative is, its evidential foundation is weak. Although we have a literal *Sentences* commentary by James of Viterbo on all four books along with numerous quodlibetal questions, we have no surviving *Sentences* commentary from either Alexander of San Elpidio or William of Cremona, and only three and a half quodlibetal questions from Alexander and two from William, along with citations to their opinions in Gerard of Siena and others.³ Certainly for William of Cremona that is too little to place him in any particular school or current of thought. And until the citations of Alexander of San Elpidio are assembled and analyzed, which has not yet been done, it is premature to place him as well. Particular difficulties are caused by Trapp's failure to spell out precisely what he meant by "ultra-Aegidian" other than a different approach than that taken by those who wished to follow Giles more closely. Furthermore, as pointed out elsewhere, the role Alexander of San Elpidio supposedly played in the career of Michael of Massa is undercut by the fact that Massa's citation of the opinion of the current Prior General of the Order appears to be a reference to William of Cremona, not to Alexander, as Trapp thought.⁴ And while Trapp dated Gerard's baccalaureate at Paris around 1325, possibly on the grounds that a four-year waiting period between reading the *Sentences* and receiving the license was stipulated in the statutes of the faculty of theology at Paris, a closer examination of the manuscripts of Gerard's questions on the first book of the *Sentences* places his baccalaureate in 1319-1321, not in the middle of the third decade.⁵ This, in turn, affects the supposed parallel between

³ There is only one opinion of William of Cremona cited and rejected by Gerard of Siena (Prol., q. 2, a. 2, on the subject of a science and metaphysics), but opinions of Alexander are cited by Gerard and numerous other Augustinians: Prosper of Reggio Emilia, Dionysius of Borgo, Gerard of Siena, an anonymous Augustinian bachelor in Balliol 63, Michael of Massa, Thomas of Strasbourg, Alphonsus Vargas of Toledo, and John Hiltalinger of Basel, although several of these later fourteenth-century theologians are simply recycling earlier citations.

⁴ See W. J. Courtenay, "The *Quaestiones in Sententias* of Michael de Massa, OESA. A Redating," *Augustiniana*, 45 (1995), 191-207, at 197-200.

⁵ Gdansk, Biblioteka Gdańska Polskiej Akademii Nauk, Mar. F 199, f. 171r: "Explicit lectura primi libri sententiarum edita a fratre Gerrando (!) de Senis sacre pagine baccellario ordinis sancti Augustini anno domini M^oCCC^oXVIII." Lectures on book I were usually completed in January, which means this date would correspond to 1320 according to the modern calendar. Vat. lat. 4291, f. 79ra: "Explicit lectura primi libri sententiarum edita a fratre Gerardo de Senis, sacre pagine baccellario, ordinis fratrum heremitarum sancti augustini. Deo gratias. Anno domini millesimo CCC vicesimo primo." This latter manuscript itself dates after 1329, since on f. 80vb in the same hand as the scribe of the text: "Explicit lectura primi libri sententiarum edita a fratre Gerardo de Senis, sacre pagine baccellario ordinis fratrum eremitarum sancti Augustini. Deo gratias. Nunc magister in theologia."

his biography and that of Michael of Massa that was central to Trapp's narrative.

Gerard's baccalaureate coincides with a particularly active period in the faculty of theology at Paris. Peter Auriol had read the *Sentences* in 1316-1318 and was regent master in 1318-1320. Dionysius of Borgo San Sepolcro read in the following year, 1317-1318 or 1319. In 1318-1319 Henry of Friemar the Younger, O.E.S.A., and Landulph Caracciolo, O.F.M., read the *Sentences*, and those reading in the same year or years as Gerard of Siena were Francis of Marchia, O.F.M., John Baconthorpe, O.Carm., and in the following year (1320-1321) Francis of Meyronnes, O.F.M., and Pierre Roger, O.S.B., the future Pope Clement VI. Although Gerard does not cite his immediate *socii*, he does refer to contemporary theologians active at Paris at the same time as himself or in the previous decade. In fact Gerard's questions on books I and II of the *Sentences* are among the richest sources describing and reacting to the opinions of early fourteenth-century Parisian doctors on a wide array of theological and philosophical topics of interest around 1320, including especially those of Peter Auriol. And thanks to recent work, it appears that Oxford, Balliol College 63 contains a version of certain questions that date back to their original oral presentation, before Gerard undertook the process of editing them for publication.⁶

Almost a decade separates the baccalaureate from the doctoral inception of Gerard of Siena. This was not unusual for Augustinians in this period. A similar hiatus between the baccalaureate and doctorate is evident in the careers of Gregory of Lucca, Augustine of Ancona, John Pagnotta, and John of Rome,⁷ which means one does not have to hypothesize a conspiracy to explain why Michael of Massa was still only a bachelor of theology at the time of his death in 1337. Some of that time Gerard spent preparing his questions for circulation in *ordinatio* form.⁸ While he may have given his lectures in the order I, IV, II, and III, which was common at the time, he was intending to publish them

⁶ Clark, "Authorship," and Courtenay, "Balliol 63".

⁷ Zumkeller, *Theology and History*, p. 15. Pagnotta, who incepted in 1317, was appointed to read the *Sentences* at Paris by the General Chapter at Bologna in 1306 and thus read in 1306-1307 or soon thereafter; AA, 3 (1909), 55; AA, 5 (1913), 205. John of Rome was appointed next in line at the same time but did not incept until 1319; AA, 3 (1909), 54-55; AA, 5 (1913), 205-206.

⁸ Even though the term 'edita' is used, the dates in Gdansk Mar. F 199 and Vat. lat. 4291, 1319 and 1321 respectively, refer to Gerard's reading of the *Sentences*, not to the date of the manuscript or to his completion of the editing process; see above, note 5.

in the traditional order: I, II, III, and IV. He completed the editing of all his questions on book I, but he only got as far as distinction 9 on book II. The only manuscript containing questions from books III and IV, albeit in a pre-edited version, is Oxford, Balliol College 63. The remaining portion of his questions on book II and all of those on books III and IV were never edited for circulation.

Gerard was still a bachelor of theology when he was present at a meeting on March 25, 1327, at which the new Prior General of the Order, William of Cremona, named masters Lanfranc of Milan and Gerard of Bergamo as procurators for the Order in its negotiations with the canons of San Pietro in Ciel d'Oro in Pavia on access to that church and the tomb of St. Augustine.⁹ He was still only a bachelor when he served as definitor for the province of Siena at the General Chapter at Paris in June 1329.¹⁰ During the following academic year, 1329-1330, he became regent master at Paris, presumably having been licensed in the autumn of 1329.¹¹ He was referred to as master when he took part in the General Chapter at Venice in June 1332.¹² The date for his death is given as 1336.

Gerard continued to be cited by Augustinians in the fourteenth century, but not by everyone, and not necessarily favorably. He was cited by Michael of Massa, Thomas of Strasbourg, Alfonsus Vargas, and John Hiltalinger. His fame increased in the fifteenth century, perhaps as a more conservative or traditional theology became dominant in many circles. Gerard's *Questiones in Sententias* was made a textbook in theology for the *studia generalia* of the Augustinian Order at the General Chapter at Pamiers in 1465.¹³ That may explain why several manuscripts of Gerard's *In primum librum Sententiarum* were copied soon thereafter: Angelica 551, Chicago 22, and Siena G.IV.10.

⁹ Perini, *Bibl. August.* III, p. 187.

¹⁰ AA, 4 (1911), p. 81: "frater Girardus de Senis bachelarius diffinitor provincie Senensis".

¹¹ *Livre II des Contrats du Grand Couvent de Paris de l'Ordre des Frères Hermite de S. Augustin* (Paris, Arch. Nat., S/3640), f. 5v, summarizing a document of May 26, 1330 included in Livre I (now lost), ff. 34-35: "F[rère] Andre de Perusio maistre en Théologie de l'ordre saint Augustin, le 26 may 1330 obtient de la faculté de théologie de Paris seize Regents estants assembler a saint Mathurin, F[rère] Gerard de Sienne estant regent de ce cours, que leur bacheleurs Augustines peuvent lire leur sentences sans este obliger de lire un cours de philosophie."; *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, 4 vols., ed. H. Denifle and É. Châtelain (Paris, 1889-1897), vol. II, p. 339, # 904.

¹² Perini, *Bibl. August.*, III, p. 187.

¹³ AA, 7 (1917-1918), 110.

What is needed is a full study of Gerard, particularly in the context of debates in the period of 1318-1322. Gerard was among the earliest critics of Peter Auriol at Paris alongside Thomas Wylton and others, an equally strong opponent of Durand of St. Pourçain, and one of the major voices in debates at Paris around 1320. As such he is deserving of the in-depth review of his life and works that has been accorded to other Augustinian theologians. The first section of this article will survey the manuscripts, most of which I have examined personally. This will be followed by a list of those cited and a full list of questions for books I and II, along with the chance survival of a few questions from books III and IV. That section will also contain within each question the structure of the article as rubricated in the margins or text of the manuscripts, which will provide a better guide to those cited and the context in which they were being cited.

I. The Manuscripts of Gerard's Commentary on the *Sentences*

Berlin, Staatsbibl., Theol. Fol. 35 (Rose 482), ff. 1ra-179vb [book I], ff. 180ra-180vb [*tabula questionum*], dated 1444 at London.¹⁴

Bologna, Collegio di Spagna, ms. 38, ff. 1ra-76vb [book I, incomplete: through dist. 12, art. 1], 14th cent.¹⁵

Bordeaux, Bibl. mun., ms. 161 (761), ff. 1ra-251vb [book I, incomplete]¹⁶

Chicago, Univ. Library (Regenstein), ms. 22, ff. 1ra-146vb [book I], ff. 147ra-148ra [*tabula questionum*], dated 1466-1469 at Padua.¹⁷

¹⁴ Paper manuscript; f. 180vb: "finitus est iste liber london. in anglia anno 1444 in die francisci per fratrum matheum de prussia." Discription in V. Rose, *Verzeichniss der Lateinischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, Bd. 2: *Die Handschriften der Kurfürstlichen Bibliothek und der Kurfürstlichen Lande, erste Abteilung* (Berlin, 1901), p. 338.

¹⁵ Parchment manuscript of the 14th century, in *littera parisiensis*, according to *I Codici del Collegio di Spagna di Bologna*, ed. D. Maffei et al. (Milan 1992), pp. 50-51.

¹⁶ Paper manuscript of the late 14th or early 15th century, according to *Catalogue Générale des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques de France. Départements*, vol. 23: *Bordeaux*, ed. C. Couderc (Paris, 1894), pp. 87-88.

¹⁷ E. J. Goodspeed, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Libraries of the University of Chicago* (Chicago, 1912), pp. 20-23. In the course of identifying fly-leaf pages from the earlier binding of Ms. 22 for an address to the Modern Language Association, E. K. Rand collected information on the Bordeaux, Padua, Siena, and Toulouse manuscripts of Gerard's work; his unpublished notes for that lecture are held in Special Collections at the University of Chicago Library.

- Coimbra, Bibl. Univ. 727, ff. 1ra-186vb [book I], ff. 186vb-187vb [tabula questionum]¹⁸
- Gdansk, Biblioteka Gdańska Polskiej Akademii Nauk (formerly Stadtbibliothek), Mar. F 199, ff. 1ra-169vb [book I], ff. 170r-171r [tabula questionum], dated 1319.¹⁹
- Napoli, Bibl. Naz., VII.C.6, ff. 15ra-62vb [book I, incomplete: prologue to dist. 13, quest. 1, art. 3]²⁰
- Napoli, Bibl. Naz., VII.C.8, ff. 7ra-203vb [book I], ff. 1r-5r, 204r-209v [tabula questionum in an early modern hand]²¹
- Oxford, Balliol College 55, ff. 1r-339v [principal sermon and book I], ff. 339v-341r [tabula questionum, incomplete]²²
- Oxford, Balliol College 63, ff. 60ra-66rb [book I, Prol. q. 2, a. 3 & 4; Prol. q. 3, a. 1-4; Prol. q. 4, a. 1 & 3; Prol. q. 5, a. 1 & 6; dist. 1, q. 2, a. 3; dist. 1, q. 3, a. 2 & 3; dist. 2, q. 2, a. 2 & 3; dist. 3, q. 1, a. 1; dist. 3, q. 2, a. 2 & 4; dist. 3, q. 3, a. 4; and a question from book III], ff. 87va-88ra [two questions from book III and two questions from book IV]²³

¹⁸ Noted by V. Doucet, *Commentaires sur les Sentences. Supplément au Répertoire de M. Frédéric Stegmüller* (Firenze-Quaracchi, 1954), 33. I am grateful to José Meirinhos of the University of Porto for providing the information on this manuscript, incorrectly identified in the Coimbre catalogue.

¹⁹ Parchment manuscript of the 14th century, according to *Katalog der Danziger Stadtbibliothek*, Vol. V (Danzig, 1921): Otto Günther, ed., *Die Handschriften der Kirchenbibliothek von St. Marien in Danzig*, pt. 5, pp. 187-188. On f. 171r: "Explicit lectura primi libri sententiarum edita a fratre Gerrando (!) de Senis sacre pagine baccellario ordinis sancti Augustini anno domini M^oCCC^oXVIII." If Gerard completed his lectures in January, as would be normal, this date would correspond to 1320 according to the modern calendar. Adolar Zumkeller, *Manuskripte von Werken der Autoren des Augustiner-Eremitenordens in mitteleuropäischen Bibliotheken* (Würzburg, 1966), p. 117, doubted the accuracy of this *explicit* because Gerard was still only a bachelor of theology in 1327 and did not incept until 1329 or 1330. But, as already noted, such a long period as a formed bachelor was not unusual among the Augustinians in this period.

²⁰ Parchment manuscript of the 14th century, double column, in a careful but small hand, without marginal identifications of authors cited; no colored rubrication; space left for initials, but not filled in.

²¹ Paper manuscript of the 15th century, rubricated in alternating red and blue.

²² Parchment manuscript, two-column format and in a careful large hand, bequeathed to Balliol College along with other manuscripts by William Gray, bishop of Ely, after his death in 1478. Thought by R.A.B. Mynors, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College Oxford* (Oxford 1963), p. 38, to be mid-15th century ("probably written in the Rhineland, during the donor's sojourn in Cologne, A.D. 1442-4"), but it looks more like a mid-to-late 14th century French hand (not German), possibly acquired by Gray while at Padua or elsewhere in Italy after 1444. It appears to be the only manuscript that contains Gerard's principal sermon given before lecturing on book I of the *Sentences*.

²³ For details, see Clark, "Authorship," and Courtenay, "Balliol 63," cited above in note 1.

Padova, Bibl. Univ. 2229, ff. 1ra-160rb [book I], ff. 160rb-161va [*tabula questionum*], 14th cent.²⁴

Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. nouv. acq. 1431, ff. 15ra-175rb [book II, but only through dist. 6, quest. 1, art. 7], ff. 175rb-176rb [*tabula questionum*], 15th cent.²⁵

Perugia, Bibl. Comunale 87 (B 31), ff. 1ra-132vb [book I], 14th cent.²⁶

Rome, Bibl. Angelica 89 (A.8.1), ff. 1ra-197rb [book I], 197rb-198vb [*tabula questionum*], 15th cent.²⁷

Rome, Bibl. Angelica 101 (A.8.13), ff. 1ra-237rb [book I], 237va-239va [*tabula questionum*], with possessor notes on 239v & 240r, late 14th or 15th cent.²⁸

²⁴ Parchment manuscript of the fourteenth century, but written after 1324, since Thomas is cited as 'beatus Thomas' or 'sanctus Thomas'. Double column, rubricated in red and blue, with citations in red in the text. Text faded at beginning and end due to moisture damage. No indication of original provenance or date, nor of author and title of work, except for title of *tabula* on f. 160rb: "Articuli super proemio primi libri sententiarum." Last folio is a palimpsest.

²⁵ The last question is complete and ends on 175rb with: "cum aliis angelis cadentibus non appetit nec appetere potuit per se et directe equalitatem dei." The index of question titles begins immediately on 175rb and lists only those in this manuscript.

²⁶ According to A. Bellucii in Mazzatinti, *Inventari dei Manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia*, vol. 5 (1895), p. 77, it is a parchment manuscript of the 14th century, double column, in a small but legible hand of two scribes; rubricated in red and blue, with opinions identified in the margins.

²⁷ Paper manuscript, double-column format in a small Italian hand.

²⁸ Double-column format on paper, with illuminated initials and some marginal notes in a 16th or 17th century hand. Manuscript dated by Henricus Narducci, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum praeter Graecos et Orientales in Bibliotheca Angelica, olim coenobii sancti Augustini de urbe*, vol. I (Rome, 1893), p. 34, as late 14th cent., but more likely 15th cent. On f. 239va: "Explicit lectura primi libri sententiarum edita fratre Gerardo de Senis sacre pagine bacallario ordinis fratrum hermitarum sancti Augustini. Deo tribuatur honor, laus et gratiarum actio. Hic propter sue doctrine excellentiam mortuus magistratus fuit." This last phrase may be the source from which an early owner of the manuscript, Ambrosius de Cora, believed Gerard died while still a bachelor of theology and was given the title of master by the Order after his death. Ambrosius mentioned the story in his *Chronica*, but Perini, *Bibl. August.* III, p. 187, who repeated the story, acknowledged that Gerard was a master of theology before his death, as did Trapp, "Augustinian Theology," pp. 172-73. At the bottom of f. 239vb are three statements of ownership, all struck through and therefore difficult to read. The earliest reads: "Iste liber est ad usum fratris Ambrosii de Cora, quem emit Parisius dum ibi erat in lectoria." The one immediately above it reads: "Iste liber est fratris Angeli de Cortoio, quem emit Bononi dum ibi predicator? ___ die? octobris? quinque 1446." And the one immediately above that reads: "Iste liber est fratris Pauli de Nepe, quem emit Senis dum ibi erat lector a magistro Angelo de Cortoio, tunc provinciali, octo ducatis largi. 1453 15 julii." According to a note at the end of Siena G.IV. 10, Angelo de Cortoio was still regent at Siena when he died there on June 25, 1467. L. Zdekauer, *Lo studio di Siena nel Rinascimento* (Milan, 1894), assuming that "Fratris Angeli de Cortonio, sacre theologie et divinitatis magistri sublimissimi" in a document of 1364 (p. 144) was the same person mentioned in the *explicit* in Siena

Rome, Bibl. Angelica 338 (C. 8. 6), ff. 1ra-212rb [book I], 212va-213vb [*tabula questionum*, incomplete], 14th cent.

Rome, Bibl. Angelica 551 (F.3.3), ff. 1ra-279vb [book I], 280ra-289ra [*tabula questionum*], dated 1469.²⁹

Rome, Bibl. Angelica 625 (Q.1.12), ff. 1ra-157rb [book II, through dist. 9, art. 9], 15th cent.³⁰

Rome, Bibl. Angelica 920 (R.4.9), ff. 1r-385v [book II, through dist. 9, art. 9], 386r-388v [*tabula questionum*] 17th cent. (1638)³¹

G.IV.10, suggested (p. 146) that the date of his death in the Siena manuscript should be corrected to 1367. The problem with that solution, however, is that Siena G.IV.10 is a fifteenth-century manuscript, and the person who paid for its production, Ugolino de Cortoio, was a student of Angelo, who provided the money and who thus belongs to the mid-fifteenth century. Angelo is presumably identical with the magister Angelus de Cortonio mentioned in *Iuliani de Salem O.S.A. Registrum Generalatus 1451-1459*, ed. D. Gionta (Roma, 1994), pp. 340, 342-43, 346, 351, 359 and in the records of the General Chapter of the Augustinian Order at Pamiers in 1465, when he was designated as third in sequence to be lector at Siena [AA, 7 (1917-1918), 114]. The date of that appointment is consistent with his having died at Siena in 1367 while lector. This also means that Ugolino de Cortoio cannot be Hugolino Zefferini of Cortona, who died in 1367 according to D. Gutiérrez, *The Augustinians in the Middle Ages, 1357-1517* (Villanova, 1983), p. 111, if Zefferini's dates are correct. I am grateful to Karl Gersbach for bringing the Salem register to my attention.

²⁹ This is a double-column luxury edition, 15th cent., on high quality paper, in a clear gothic hand similar to *littera parisiensis*; without marginalia, although a few references to cited opinions are inserted in red in the text. Folio 1r illuminated with crest of Nicolaus Machinensis, bishop of Modruš. On f. 279vb: "Explicit lectura primi libri Sententiarum edita a fratre Gerardo de Senis sacre pagine baccalario, ordinis fratrum heremitarum sancti Augustini. Scriptum per me Hugonem Leck de Hollandia, Traiecten. dioc., ad instantiam reverendissimi domini N[icolai] episcopi Modrusien. civitatis Asculique gubernatoris anno domini M.CCCC.lxix. decima octave die mensis octobris in die sancti Luce."

³⁰ Parchment ms, probably 15th cent., although catalogue dates it to the 14th cent., from the O.E.S.A. convent in Rimini. Text ends on f. 157ra with dist. 9, art. 9, whose explicit is: "Et per consequens apparet ex omnibus istis quid sit dicendum quantum ad istum articulum. Restat ergo videndum.x." [meaning dist. 10]. Folios 158r-225v was originally a separate manuscript containing on ff. 158ra-208vb Gerard's *Quodlibeta*, with *tabula questionum* on ff. 208vb-209ra; and on ff. 209ra-225ra Gerard's *Tractatus de usuris et de prescriptionibus*, with a list of those questions on f. 225rb. On f. 1r at top: "Ex conventus s[ancti] Joan[nis] Evang[elista]e de Arim[ini] ad usu[m] f[ratris] Sanctis Arim[inensis], sed a magistro Angelo Vancio Arimini Romam missum pro biblioteca s[anctorum] p[atrum] n[ost]rorum Augustini. 1638." This corresponds to a note on f. 1r of Rome, Angelica 920: "Hic liber est Mag[istri] Angeli Vancii Arimini Augustiniani, quem postea anno d[omini] 1638, Romam ipse misit pro Bibliotheca S. P. N. Augustini, impressione dignum." Santos of Rimini may be identical with the Augustinian friar of that name who helped prepare Gerard's questions on book I of the *Sentences* for the Padua edition of 1598: "In primum librum Sententiarum doctissimae quaestiones, nunc primum opera Fr. Sanctis [Guicciardii] Ariminensis in lucem editae."

³¹ Also from the Augustinian convent in Rimini. It is a copy of Angelica 625, prepared by or for Angelo Vancio in 1638, before the latter sent Angelica 625 to the convent in Rome.

- Rome, Bibl. Angelica 1088 (S.1.12), ff. 1ra-158vb [book I], 158vb-159vb [*tabula questionum*], 14th cent.³²
- Rome, Bibl. Angelica 1089 (S.1.13), ff. 1ra-136ra [book I], 137ra-vb [*tabula questionum*, incomplete], 14th cent.³³
- Siena, Bibl. Comunale G.IV.10, ff. 1r-144v [book I], 15th cent.³⁴
- Toulouse, Bibl. mun. 251 (III.51), ff. 1ra-133v [book I], 14th cent.³⁵
- Tübingen, Universitätsbibl. Mc. 129, ff. 1r-112v [Prologue], dated 1449.³⁶
- Vatican City, Bibl. Apost. Vat., Vat. lat. 959, ff. 1ra-166va [book II, through dist. 9, art. 9], 14th cent.
- Vatican City, Bibl. Apost. Vat., Vat. lat. 4291, ff. 1ra-79ra [book I, incomplete: dist. 8, quest. 3, art. 2 through dist. 48], ff. 79ra-80vb [*tabula questionum*], 14th cent.³⁷
- Vatican City, Bibl. Apost. Vat., Vat. lat. 10452, ff. 9ra-18vb [book I, fragment: dist. 11, quest. 2, art. 2 through dist. 14, quest. 1, art. 2]
- Vatican City, Bibl. Apost. Vat., Chig. B.VII.117, ff. 1ra-156r [book I], ff. 156v-157v [*tabula questionum*]

Friedrich Stegmüller listed several other manuscripts that have not been located, possibly as a result of error.³⁸ He listed a manuscript

³² Large formal parchment manuscript, almost certainly 15th century; same explicit as ms. 1089. Like ms. 338, and unlike 1089, ms. 1088 is sparsely rubricated in its last few questions.

³³ Large formal parchment manuscript of late 14th, or more likely 15th century, undated; double column with wide margins; rubricated in margin and text; f. 1r decorated. Explicit of question on dist. 48: "... cupio dissolvi et essentia cum Christo, cui Christo cum suo patre et spiritu sancto sit honor et gloria in secula seculorum, et istius libri benedictus sit possessor. AMEN." Water damaged on beginning and ending folios. Format and spelling 'Auriolus' as 'Oriolus' are similar to the Chicago ms.

³⁴ Paper manuscript, which, according to the hand-written catalogue, concludes, f. 144: "Iste liber est fratris Ugolini de Cortoio, O.S.A., quem ego feci scribere de quibusdam pecuniis dimissis mihi ab egregio sacrarum literarum doctori et preceptoris meo magistro Angelo de Cortoio, quem obiit A.D. 1467, die 25 mensis junii, tunc regente Senis."

³⁵ Parchment manuscript of the 14th century.

³⁶ Paper manuscript, single-column format, containing only the prologue questions. I am grateful to Karl Ubl for consulting the manuscript in person.

³⁷ Parchment manuscript in *littera parisiensis*, acquired at Paris by Augustine of Trent, O.E.S.A., who loaned the early quires of the manuscript to Gerard of Padua, O.E.S.A., who did not return them. Vat. lat. 4291, f. 80vb: "Ista lectura est fratris Augustini de Tridento studentis parisiensis ordinis fratrum heremitarum sancti Augustini. Principium huius lecture concessi est religio viro fratri Gerardo de Padua, lectori; qui potest recuperare eam recuperet." More important is the colophon on f. 79ra: "Explicit lectura primi libri sententiarum edita a fratre Gerardo de Senis, sacre pagine bacellario, ordinis fratrum heremitarum sancti augustini. Deo gratias. Anno domini millesimo CCC vicesimo primo [1321]."

³⁸ F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium Commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, vol. I (Würzburg, 1947), pp. 115-116, #255.

from the Ricketts library in Chicago, ms 185 (C I), but the manuscripts from that private collection were sold or dispersed after the death of Mr. Ricketts, and the libraries that possess Ricketts' manuscripts today, such as the Lilly Library at the University of Indiana, do not have possession of or knowledge about that particular manuscript.³⁹ It is possible that it may resurface in the future.

Stegmüller's listing of Orléans, Bibl. mun. 161, is in error. It was not among the manuscripts of Gerard's *In primum librum Sententiarum* listed by Perini.⁴⁰ Orléans 161 is a ninth- or tenth-century copy of Augustine's *Homilies on the Gospel of John*, with some additional tenth-century pieces related to that work. Nothing in the manuscript is later than the tenth century. It is, of course, possible that only the number is incorrect, but a search through the catalogue of manuscripts at Orléans did not reveal any that held or looked as if they might hold all or even portions of Gerard's work.⁴¹

As for Stegmüller's listing of Oxford, Bodleian Libr. 217, presumably containing Gerard's questions on book I of the *Sentences*, Stegmüller probably derived his information from Perini, who described it as "Oxoniensi Cod. 217". Stegmüller interpreted this to mean Bodleian 217, but Gerard's *Questiones* are not found under that number, nor in any other manuscript in that series in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. A search through manuscripts in Oxford colleges with the number 217 also did not locate the manuscript Perini mentioned. Again, it is possible that this manuscript will be located in the future.

As Trapp already noted, the Padua edition of 1598 is not a reliable guide to Gerard's questions of book I, as initially disseminated. Changes have been made in the text, and although Trapp did not notice or mention it, sources cited are sometimes attributed incorrectly. For example, in the Prologue, quest. 5, a. 1, a position attributed in the manuscripts to Peter Auriol is identified in the Padua edition as belonging to Landulph of Caracciolo. Similarly, in Prologue, quest. 5, a. 4, a position identified in the manuscripts as that of Godfrey of Fontaines is attributed to Landulph of Caracciolo in the Padua edition. The printed edition also cites Bonaventure and Simon of Tournai even though these authors are not cited in the manuscripts. Moreover, the wording of passages in the text sometimes differs between the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts, and differs again in the

³⁹ I am grateful to David Pavelich of Special Collections at the University of Chicago Library for helping with this search, and to Becky Cape of the Lilly Library for providing this information.

⁴⁰ Perini, *Bibl. August.* III, pp. 187-88.

⁴¹ *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements*, vol. 12: Orléans, ed. Ch. Cuissard (Paris, 1889).

Padua edition. Consequently, when citing Gerard's work as initially edited and disseminated by Gerard, it is best to use a fourteenth-century manuscript, among which Padua, Univ. 2229, Rome, Angelica 338, and Vatican, Chigi B.VII.117, are particularly good.

The location of opinions of contemporary and earlier scholastic authors cited by Gerard of Siena is provided in the list of questions below, drawn from the rubricated identifications and comments inset into the text or occasionally in the margin. These insets, usually in red, are in the third person and provide a subject heading for each section of a question (called 'articles' in Gerard's structure). In Bal-liol 63, which contains selected questions from what is probably the earliest version of Gerard's work, authors are named in the text or identified in the margin. In the other manuscripts, which contain the text as edited by Gerard for circulation, even in the earliest of these manuscripts, scholastic authors are cited in the text as "quidam" or a similar pronoun and identified by name in a rubricated inset. If, as Trapp maintained, citations move from the margin into the text in the course of the fourteenth century, the use of insets is already there by 1320.⁴²

To provide an overview of scholastic authors cited by Gerard in his questions on books I and II of the *Sentences*, the following list is included. The form used by Gerard is given brackets, along with the book or books of Gerard's commentary in which they are cited. Although Gerard cites Aristotle, Augustine, Avicenna, and the Commentator [Averroes], the only other pre-thirteenth-century author he mentions is Joachim of Fiore in his attack on the Master of the *Sentences*. Gerard principally opposes the opinions of Auriol, Scotus, Thomas, Henry of Ghent, Durand, Godfrey of Fontaines, James of Viterbo, and Herveus Natalis (in order of frequency), while he favors and defends the arguments of Giles of Rome, whom he sometimes links with Thomas.

Alexander of St. Elpidio de Marchia, O.E.S.A. [Alexander de Marchia; I and II]

Durand of St. Pourçain, O.P. [Durandus; I and II]

Gerard of Bologna, O.Carm. [Carmelita, Gerardus de Carmello; I and II]

Giles of Rome, O.E.S.A. [Egidius; I and II]

Godfrey of Fontaines [Godefredus; I and II]

⁴² D. Trapp, "Hiltalinger's Augustinian Quotations," *Augustiniana*, 4 (1954), 412-449, at 420-21; "Augustinian Theology," 152-55.

Henry of Ghent [Henricus de Gandavo; I and II]
 Henry of Harclay [Henricus Anglicus; I]
 Herveus Natalis, O.P. [Herveus; I and II]
 James of Viterbo, O.E.S.A. [Jacobus de Viterbio; I and II]
 John Duns Scotus, O.F.M. [Scotus; I and II]
 John of Pouilly [Johannes de Puliaco; I and II]
 Peter Auriol, O.F.M. [Auriolus, Oriolus; I and II]
 Peter of Auvergne [Petrus de Alvernia; I]
 Prepositinus of Cremona [Prepositinus; I and II]
 Robert Cowton, O.F.M. [Coton; I]
 Robert Grosseteste [Lincolniensis; I]
 Thomas Aquinas, O.P. [Thomas, or frater Thomas; I and II]
 William of Cremona, O.E.S.A. [Guillelmus Cremonensis; I]
 William of Ware, O.F.M. [Guarro; I and II]

II. Gerard of Siena, Prologue & Sent. I, dist. 1-48⁴³

A = Rome, Bibl. Angelica 338; C = Chicago, Univ. Libr. 22

◊ = rubricated citations and section titles inserted into the text⁴⁴

Prologus, quest. 1: Utrum cognitio divine veritatis acquisita in theologia possit haberi per scientias a philosophis adinventas. [A 1ra; C 1ra]

art. 1: Utrum omnes scientie speculative intendant unam veritatem. [A 1ra; C 1ra] <Movet dubium contra dictam; movet dubium; instantia contra solutionem; solutio instantie; prima conclusio; secunda conclusio; nota quod de significando non est scientia>

art. 2: Utrum veritas considerata a theologo contineatur sub veritate considerata a metaphysico. [A 3vb; C 3ra] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; instantia contra dictam; nota queritur non sunt nisi tres scientie [*in margin* reales]; responsio ad questionem; contra Thomam>

⁴³ The wording of the titles of the articles follows that of the text, which differs slightly from the title announced at the beginning of the question or as given in the *tabula questionum*.

⁴⁴ Citations and section titles have also been confirmed in Vatican, Chigi B.VII.117, but to save space the foliation for that manuscript has not been included in the list of questions. In those few instances where a citation in Angelica 338 differs from that found in either the Vatican or Chicago manuscripts (for example, 'Henricus' where 'Herveus' is intended), preference has been given to Angelica, which is earlier than Chicago and found to be more reliable than Chigi.

- art. 3: Utrum de eadem veritate possit considerare theologus et metaphysicus sine etiam quecunque alie scientie diverse, stante diversitate scientiarum. [A 5rb; C 4ra] <Opinio Thome; contra Thomam; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- quest. 2: Utrum veritas theologie contineatur sub obiecto adequato nostre potentie intellective. [A 6vb; C 4vb]
- art. 1: Utrum obiectum adequatum nostri intellectus sit quidditas rei materialis. [A 7ra; C 5ra] <Opinio Thome; contra Thomam; opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 2: Utrum subiectum metaphysice sit equalis ambitus cum obiecto nostre potentie intellective. [A 8va; C 6ra] <Opinio Guillelmi Cremonensis; contra Guillelmum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 3: Utrum deus sub absoluta ratione deitatis sit infinitus, et utrum sub tali ratione sit subiectum in theologia. [A 10ra; C 6vb] <Henricus, quodl. 12, q. 1; opinio domini Egidii; opinio Thome in prima parte; Scotus in scripto; contra Scotum; Henricus, quodl. 12, q. 1; ad rationes Thome; confirmatio opinionis Egidii; ad rationes Thome; contra Scotum>
- art. 4: Utrum veritas quam scimus de deo per theologiam contineatur sub obiecto nostri intellectus. [A 12rb; C 8ra] <Opinio Scoti supra, 3 distinctione in scripto; contra Scotum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; Scotus; contra Scotum; Henricus in summa, q. 3 ar[ticuli] 4, in solutione primi argumenti; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- quest. 3: Utrum cognitio veritatis theologie habeat tantam certitudinem quantum habet cognitio veritatis scientiarum humanitatis inventarum. [A 13vb; C 9ra]
- art. 1: Utrum articuli fidei sint principia istius scientie. [A 13vb; C 9rb] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 2: Utrum certitudo veritatis in ista scientia dependeat a superiori scientia sicut a subalternante. [A 14vb; C 9vb] <Opinio Thome, parte prima, q. 1, a. 1; contra Thomam; instantia contra dicta; Auriolus; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; opinio Egidii>
- art. 3: Utrum certitudo veritatis in ista scientia addat aliquid super certitudinem fidei ratione cuius certitudinis faciat adhesionem fidei firmiorem. [A 16ra; C 10vb] <Auriolus; contra Auriolum; quid

sibi videtur dicendum; Durandus; Auriolus; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 4: Utrum ista scientia habeat tantam certitudinem quantam habent alie scientie humanitus adinvente. [A 17va; C 11vb] <Opinio Guarronis; contra Guarronem; Scotus, libro 3, d. 44; contra Scotum; opinio Henrici de Gandavo; opinio Godfredi; contra Godfredum; movet dubium contra seipsum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

quest. 4: Utrum cognitio veritatis theologicæ compaciatur secum enigma fidei et evidentiam scientie. [A 19ra; C 12va]

art. 1: Utrum fides habeat oppositionem ad scientiam ratione sui enigmatis vel quocumque alio modo. [A 19rb; C 12vb] <Opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; movet instantias contra se; solutio rationum alterius opinionis>

art. 2: Utrum stante lumine fidei sit dare aliud lumen in quo veritates theologicæ scientificæ videantur et cognoscantur. [A 20vb; C 13va] <Opinio Henrici; contra Henricum>

art. 3: Utrum deus possit dare viatori scientiam abstractivam de veritate sue essentie que simul staret cum fide, ita quod non traheret viatorem extra statum vie. [A 21vb; C 14rb] <Opinio Scoti in quolibet et in tertio sententiarum; Auriolus contra Scotum⁴⁵; dictum Aurioli de intuitiva et abstractiva; contra Auriolum; primum inconueniens; secundum inconueniens; tertium inconueniens; contra secundum punctum; contra descriptionem Aurioli de intuitive et abstractiva; Herveus contra Scotum; contra Herveum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; opinio Scoti; descriptio intuitive et abstractivæ secundum propriam opinionem; responsio argumenta>

quest. 5: Utrum cognitio veritatis theologicæ sit finis istius scientie, vel utrum habeat aliquem alium finem. [A 25ra; C 16rb]

art. 1: *title*: Utrum distinctio inter speculativum et practicum sumatur ex obiecto. *text*: Utrum distinctio speculativi a practico sumatur ab obiecto. [A 25rb; C 16rb] <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; primus defectus *through* quintus defectus; ponit speculativum et practicum non esse essentielles differentias scientie; Auriolus; contra Auriolum; opinio Godfredi; contra Godfredum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

⁴⁵ Chicago adds: "libro, d. 3, a. 2"

- art. 2: Utrum finis theologie sit speculatio veritatis. [A 29a; C 18vb] <Opinio Henrici; Contra Henricum>
- art. 3: Utrum finis theologie sit praxis vel operatio quod idem est, ac per consequens utrum sit dicenda practica. [A 29vb; C 19ra] <Scotus et plures alii; contra Scotum; Auriolus; contra Auriolum>
- art. 4: Utrum complectatur ambos istos fines, scilicet praxim et speculationem, ac per consequens utrum possit denominari utroque modo, scilicet practica et speculativa. [A 31ra; C19va] <Opinio Thome; contra Thomam; Godfredus; contra Godfredum>
- art. 5: Utrum dilectio sit simpliciter et principaliter finis theologie. [A 31vb; C 20ra] <Opinio Egidii; impugnaciones que fiunt contra Egidium ab aliis; Auriolus; Guarro; confirmatio opinionis Egidii; ad rationes factas contra Egidium>
- art. 6: Utrum talis dilectio debeat reduci ad speculationem vel ad praxim, vel sit collocanda in quodam tertio genere distinctum ab ipsis, et per consequens Utrum sit denominanda dilectiva sive affectiva. [A 33ra; C 21ra] <Egidius; dubitationes contra Egidium; confirmatio opinionis Egidii; Godfredus; solutio ad rationes contrarium contra Egidium>
- Dist. 1, quest. 1: Utrum fruitio sit essentialiter unus actus. [A 34va; C 22ra]
- art. 1: Utrum fruitio sit omnium personarum. [A 34va; C 22ra]
- art. 2: Utrum fruitio sit actus intellectus et voluntatis. [A 35ra; C 22rb] <Modus ponendi Thome in prima secunde, q. xi, ar. 1; contra istum modum ponendi; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 3: Utrum fruitio aggreget amorem et dilectionem. [A 35va; C 22vb] <Modus dicendi quorundam; contra istum modum dicendi; quid sibi videtur dicendum; solutio quorundam; improbatio solutionis; solutio propria; solutio argumentorum>
- quest. 2: Utrum obiectum fruitionis ordinate et proprie dicte sit unum tantum. [A 36va; C 23va]
- art. 1: Utrum obiectum fruitionis ordinate possit esse aliquod bonum creatum. [A 36vb; C 23vb] <Opinio Avicen.; contra Avicen.>
- art. 2: Utrum voluntas fruatur summo bono immediate vel mediante aliquo alio. [A 37rb; C 24ra] <Opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 3: Utrum summum bonum habeat plures rationes fruibiles. [A 38va; C 24vb] <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; quid sibi videtur; solutio argumentorum; solutio Scoti; improbatio dicte solutionis; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

quest. 3: Utrum obiectum fruitionis obiciat se intellectui ad videndum vel cognoscendum eadem ratione sub qua se obicit voluntati ad fruendum. [A 41rb; C 26va]

art. 1: Utrum intellectus et voluntas sint potentie eque immateriales et abstracte. [A 41rb; C 26va]

art. 2: Utrum distinctio actuum sit a potentiis vel ab obiectis. [A 41vb; C 26vb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 3: Utrum obiectum fruitionis obiciat se voluntati ad fruendum et intellectui ad videndum sub eadem ratione. [A 42va; C 27rb] <Opinio communis; improbatio opinionis; improbatio secunde opinionis; Opinio Godfredi; improbatio dicte opinionis; opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; dubitationes et responsiones>

quest. 4: Utrum obiectum fruitionis possit movere voluntatem ad actum fruendi non movendo intellectum ad actum videndi. [A 44va; C 28va]

art. 1: Utrum fantasia sic habeat essentialem ordinem ad intellectum, sicut intellectus ad voluntatem. [A 44va; C 28vb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: Utrum iste ordo, qui est in essentia actum intellectus et voluntatis, sit ita essentialis, quod actus voluntatis supponat actum intellectus, quasi sit de intrinseca ratione sui obiecti, puta: Utrum fruitio ita supponat visionem quam sit de intrinseca ratione obiecti fruibilis. [A 45ra; C 29ra] <Opinio quorundam; opinio Henrici; [contra Henricum]; opinio Jacobi de Viterbio; contra Jacobum de Viterbio; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 3: Utrum in fruitione beata obiectum fruibile possit movere unam istarum potentiarum ad actum suum sine alia. [A 45va; C 29rb] <Opinio Egidii; improbatio Godfredi; opinio Godofredi; improbatio Godefredi contra Egidium; confirmatio opinionis Egidii; solutio Godfredi>

quest. 5: Utrum uti sit necessario distinctus actus ab ipso frui. [A 47va; C 30va]

art. 1: Utrum uti et frui sint actus eiusdem potentie. [A 47vb; C 30vb] <Opinio Thome; expositio Durandi; contra Thomam; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: Utrum uti et frui sint idem actus. [A 48ra; C 31ra]

art. 3: Utrum omnia que sunt citra deum sint utilia. [A 48va; C 31vb]

Dist. 2, quest. 1: *Utrum sit tantum unus deus.* [A 48va; C 31rb]

art. 1: *Utrum sit dare unum principium summe malum per cuius participationem omnia alia mala sint mala.* [A 48vb; C 31va]

art. 2: *Utrum principio summe bono quod est deus repugnet plurificari ex ea ratione qua ens independens.* [A 49ra; C 31vb] <Opinio Guarronis; contra Guarronem>

art. 3: *Utrum repugnet sibi plurificari ratione sue perfectionis.* [A 49va; C 32ra] <Instantia contra rationem; remotio instantie; Scotus; contra Scotum>

art. 4: *Utrum repugnet esse plures deos ratione perfectionis et ordinis universi.* [A 50vb; C 33ra] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; instantia contra rationes; solutio instantie; instantia contra rationem; solutio instantie>

quest. 2: *Utrum cum unitate divine essentie stet pluralitas perfectionum attributalium.* [A 52ra; C 34ra]

art. 1: *Utrum perfectiones attributales acceptas per suas proprias et intrinsecas rationes realiter sint distincte.* [A 52rb; C 34ra] <Modus dicendi Henrici; contra Henricum; quid sibi videtur dicendum.⁴⁶>

art. 2: *Utrum pluralitas istarum perfectionum sit in deo realiter circumscripta omni operatione intellectus.* [A 53ra; C 34va] <Opinio Scoti; improbatio que fit contra istam opinionem;⁴⁷ solutio rationum que fiunt contra Scotum; solutio prime rationis; solutio secunde rationis; solutio tertie rationis; solutio 4; solutio 5; improbatio solutionum;⁴⁸ contra Scotum; solutio ad rationes Scoti>

art. 3: *Utrum ista distinctio attributorum secundum rationem sit concepta et sumpta ab intra vel ab extra.* [A 56rb; C 37rb] <Opinio Henrici de Gandavo; contra Henricum; opinio magistri Alexandri de Marchia, primo quodl., q.2; contra Alexandrum;⁴⁹ opinio Godfredi; contra Godfredum; opinio fratris Thome et fratris Egidii; quid sibi videtur dicendum; movet dubia contra dicta; solutio rationum principalium>

⁴⁶ Chicago adds: "opinio Orioli"

⁴⁷ Chicago adds: "ratio Aura."

⁴⁸ Chicago adds: "solutio Got."

⁴⁹ Only in Chicago. Angelica 338, in text, reads: "ista opinio satis mihi placeret si ego possem capere"

quest. 3: Utrum cum unitate essentie stet pluralitas personarum. [A 59va; C 39vb]

art. 1: Utrum suppositum et natura in rebus creatis ita sint⁵⁰ adequata quod unum non possit plurificari sine altero. [A 59vb; C 39vb]

art. 2: Utrum divina supposita vel divine persone distinguantur realiter, ita quod sint plures res. [A 60ra; C 40rb]

art. 3: Utrum ista realis pluralitas personarum repugnet unitati trinitatis.⁵¹ [A 60rb; C 40rb] <[Scotus in] scriptis; contra Scotum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; solutio ad rationes principales>

Dist. 3, quest. 1: Utrum deus cognoscatur a nobis aliquo communi conceptu cum creaturis. [A 61vb; C 41va]

art. 1: Utrum ratio entis dicta de deo et creaturis sit una communis ratio. [A 62ra; C 41va] <Scotus in scripto super d. 3 et super 8; contra Scotum>

art. 2: Utrum, dato quod ens non habeat aliquam unam rationem determinatam secundum quam dicatur univoce, habeat unum communem conceptum. [A 63ra; C 42va] <Opinio Petri Aureoli; contra Auriolum>

art. 3: Utrum ens in sua latitudine habeat plures rationes et plures conceptus. [A 64ra; C 43ra] <Opinio Jacobi de Viterbio; modus Cotonis; contra Cottonem; contra Jacobum de Viterbio et contra opinionem communem>

art. 4: Utrum deus concipiatur a nobis in aliquo conceptu commune cum creaturis. [A 64va; C 43va]

quest. 2: Utrum deus sit primum cognitum ab intellectu nostro. [A 66rb; C 44vb]

art. 1: Utrum deus sit a nobis primo cognitum. [A 66va; C 45ra] <Henricus de Gandavo in summa q. 7 ar[ticuli] 24 [mss: 30]>

art. 2: Utrum cognoscamus de deo in via quid est. [A 57rb; C 45va] <Opinio Egidii; rationes que fiunt contra Egidium; confirmatio conclusionis Egidii et quid sibi videtur dicendum⁵²>

art. 3: Utrum deum esse sit per se notum. [A 68ra; C 46ra] <Opinio Thome in prima parte; contra Thomam; opinio Henrici in

⁵⁰ Vat. Chigi, f. 42rb, and 1598 edition have 'sit'.

⁵¹ Padua Univ. 2229, f. 46rb, and Chicago 22, 40rb, read: "Utrum talis pluralitas personarum repugnet unitati divine essentie".

⁵² "Contra Godefredum" in Balliol 63 and in margin of Angelica 338.

summa, q. 2 ar[ticuli] 22; contra Henricum; opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; opinio fratris Egidii; declaratio opinionis Egidii et quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 4: Utrum deum esse possit demonstrari. [A 69rb; C 47ra] <Opinio Henrici de Gandavo in summa q. 4 articuli 22; contra Henricum; opinio Egidii; declaratio opinionis Egidii et quid sibi videtur dicendum>

quest. 3: Utrum, dato quod primum cognitum ab intellectu nostro non sit deus, utrum sit aliquod universale. [A 69vb; C 47rb]

art. 1: Utrum primum cognitum ab intellectu nostro sit aliqua species specialissima in mente et abstracta ab individuís. [A 780ra; C 47va] <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; solutio ad rationes opinionis>

art. 2: Utrum de ratione universalis sit esse abstractum ab hic et nunc. [A 70ra; C 47vb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 3: Utrum universale sit ens rationis vel ens reale. [A 71va; C 48va] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 4: Utrum primum cognitum ab intellectu nostro sit aliquod universale. [A 72va; C 49rb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

quest. 4: Utrum trinitas personarum in deo representetur in creatura tam per vestigium quam per ymaginem. [A 73va; C 50ra]

art. 1: In quo differat representatio trinitatis per vestigium ab ea que est per ymaginem. [A 73va; C 50ra] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: Utrum partes vestigii sint distincte inter se realiter vel sola ratione. [A 74va; C 50va] <Scotus; contra Scotum; opinio Petri Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 3: Utrum partes imaginis sint in anima realiter distincte. [A 75rb; C 51ra] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; Godofredus; contra Godfredum>

art. 4: Utrum per ymaginem que est in anima nostra possit demonstrari trinitas personarum. [A 77rb; C 52va] <Auriolus; contra Auriolum>

Dist. 4, quest. 1: Utrum in divinis sit vera generatio. [A 77vb; C 52vb]

art. 1: Utrum vera generatio secundum quod reperitur in creaturis sit vera actio de genere actionis. [A 77vb; C 52vb] <Opinio Henrici; contra Henricum; opinio propria>

- art. 2: Quot conditiones sunt necessario requisite ad veram generationem.⁵³ [A 78rb; C 53rb]
- art. 3: Utrum in divinis sit vera generatio que sit de genere actionis. [A 78vb; C 53va] <Scotus; quid sibi videtur dicendum; Egidius; contra probationem aliorum⁵⁴>
- Dist. 5, quest. 1: Utrum divina essentia sit generans. [A 81rb; C 54va]
- art. 1: Utrum actus, qui debetur supposito hic in creaturis, possit attribui ipsi forme. [A 81rb; C 54va]
- art. 2: Utrum duobus existentibus idem possit aliquid attribui uni quod non attribuat alteri. [A 81vb; C 54vb] <Opinio quorundam; improbatio quam facit Egidius; quid sibi videtur dicendum; remotio duorum dubiorum>
- art. 3: Utrum actus generationis possit attribui essentie divine eam denominando ita quod dicatur generationis. [A 82ra; C 55vb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; prima dubitatio contra dictam; solutio; contra solutionem; solutio Scoti; contra solutionem Scoti; solvit ipse; opinio Henrici in summa, q. 3 articuli 58 [mss: 54]; contra solutionem Henrici; solvit ipse alio modo; solutio ad argumenta principalia>
- quest. 2: Utrum divina essentia sit formalis terminus generationis. [A 83ra; C 56rb]
- art. 1: Utrum divina essentia generetur aliquomodo sive per se sive per accidens. [A 83ra; C 56va] <Controversia que fuit inter Magistrum et abba Johachum; opinio quorundum; contra dictam opinionem et quid sibi videtur dicendum; instantia contra solutionem>
- art. 2: Utrum divina essentia sit formalis terminus generationis. [A 84ra; C 57ra] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; remotio dubitationum>
- quest. 3: Utrum divina essentia sit subiectum generationis. [A 85ra; C 57va]
- art. 1: Primo est videndum que et quod sunt de ratione subiecti. [A 85ra; C 57vb]

⁵³ The manuscripts add "secundum quod de ea determinat Philosophus," which in the edition reads "secundum mentem Aristotelis".

⁵⁴ Chicago adds: "solutio ad argumenta contra Durandi".

- art. 2: Utrum subiectum [generationis] et terminus possint coincidere in idem re. [A 85rb; C 57vb] <Dubitatio contra dictam; solutio dubitationis>
- art. 3: Utrum divina essentia sit subiectum generationis. [A 85vb; C 58rb] <Opinio Henrici in summa sua, q. 3 articuli 58 [mss: 14]; contra Henricum; opinio Scoti; contra Scotum et quid sibi videtur dicendum; dubitationes>
- quest. 4, art. 1: Utrum filius generetur de substantia patris. [A 88va; C 60rb] <Ratio Scoti; contra Scotum; opinio Henrici; contra Henricum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- Dist. 6, quest. 1: Utrum pater generet filium naturali necessitate. [A 89rb; C 60vb]
- art. 1: Utrum generare in patre sit ita naturale quod precedat intelligere et velle. [A 89va; C 61ra] <Opinio Scoti et plurium aliorum; contra Scotum et alios qui videntur tenere dictam opinionem; opinio aliorum opposita; improbatio istius opinionis; quid sibi videtur dicendum; solutio ad rationem duarum opinionum precedentium; solutio rationum secunde opinionis>
- art. 2: Utrum in deo sit aliquis modus necessitatis respectu istius actus. [A 92ra; C 62vb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum secundum conclusionem>
- quest. 2: Utrum pater generet filium voluntate. [A 92rb; C 63ra]
- art. 1: Utrum pater generet filium volens. [A 92vb; C 63rb] <Opinio quorundam; contra prefatam opinionem; solutio ad rationes prefate opiniones>
- art. 2: Utrum voluntas concurret in generatione filii in ratione principii. [C 63rb; announced, but not a separate article in Angelica 338]
- Dist. 7, quest. 1: Utrum potentia generandi in deo sit aliquid absolutum. [A 93va; C 64ra]
- art. 1: Primo videndum est designatio nominis 'potentia'. [A 93va; C 64ra] <Auriolus; contra Auriolum et quid sibi videtur dicendum; Scotus; contra Scotum; frater Egidius; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 2: Utrum potentia generandi sit in deo patre. [A 94va; C 64va] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum, et quid sibi videtur dicendum; solutio ad rationes alterius opinionis>

art. 3: *Utrum talis potentia dicat aliquid absolutum.* [A 96ra; C 65va]
 <Opinio antiqua quorundam; Scotus contra istam opinionem;
 contra Scotum quod rationes sue non concludant; alie rationes
 quas facit ipse contra opinionem prefatam; opinio Thome in
 quolibet [de potentia dei]; Durandus; contra opinionem
 Thome; opinio Henrici in summa, q. 4 articuli 39; Scotus con-
 tra Henricum; solutio rationum Scoti quas facit contra Hen-
 ricum; contra Henricum alie rationes quas facit ipse; opinio
 Scoti; contra Scotum; opinio Egidii; confirmatio opinionis
 Egidii; solutio ad rationes aliarum opinionum; solutio Scoti;
 contra solutionem Scoti; solutio Durandi; contra solutionem
 Durandi; ad rationes secunde opinionis; ad rationes tertie opin-
 ionis; ad rationes quarte opinionis; ad rationes quinte opinio-
 nis>

Dist. 8, quest. 1: *Utrum in deo sit aliqua realis compositio.* [A 100ra;
 C 68rb]

art. 1: *Utrum sit compositus ex materia et forma.* [A 100rb; C 68rb]
 <Ymaginatio plurium; contra dictam ymaginationem et quid
 sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: *Utrum sit compositus ex partibus quantitativis.* [A 101rb;
 C 69ra] <Dubitatio; una responsio; solutio Commentatoris;
 instantia Thome contra Commentatorem; alia solutio Thome;
 contra Thomam>

art. 3: *Utrum componatur alicui sicut substantia accidenti.* [A 102rb;
 C 69va]

art. 4: *Utrum componatur cum aliquo sicut motor cum mobili.* [A 102va;
 C 69vb] <Opinio plurium; contra dictam opinionem et quid sibi
 videtur dicendum>

art. 5: *Utrum deus componatur cum universo.* [A 103va; C 70rb]

quest. 2: *Utrum in deo sit aliqua compositio secundum rationem.* [A 104ra;
 C 70vb]

art. 1: *Utrum compositio generis et differentie sit in intellectu intelli-
 gente vel in re intellecta.* [A 104rb; C 70vb] <Opinio plurium;
 contra dictam opinionem; opinio alia; contra istam opinionem;
 quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: *Utrum repugnet deo quod de ipso habeamus duos conceptus,
 unum confusum, alterum determinatum.* [A 106va; C 72rb]
 <Opinio quorundam; procedit contra dictam opinionem tenendo
 viam communem; instantia contra probationem; Scotus; contra

- Scotum; alia instantia; solutio aliorum; contra dictam solutionem; solutio quam dat ipse>
- art. 3: Utrum circa deum possimus componere veram enunciationem. [A 108rb; C 73rb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 4: Utrum possimus componere circa deum verum ordinem sillogisticum. [A 108vb; C 73vb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- quest. 3: Utrum anima sit ita simplex quod possit esse in toto corpore et in suis partibus sine aliqua sui extensione et divisione. [A 109rb; c 74ra]
- art. 1: Utrum quolibet substantia corporalis animata vel inanimata habeat esse corporeum in genere substantie per suam formam substantialem. [A 109rb; C 74ra] <Opinio Avicen.; contra Avicen.; quid sibi videtur dicendum iuxta intentionem Commentatoris; modus dicendi plurium qui non possunt vitare difficultatem de extensione anime intellective; modus dicendi proprius secundum quem vitat difficultatem de extensione anime intellective; prima dubitatio contra dictam; solutio>
- art. 2: Utrum quolibet alia anima ab anima intellectiva extendatur cum corpore. [A 111rb; C 75va] <Opinio Thome; contra opinionem Thome; quid sibi videtur dicendum; ratio Egidii; impugnatio quorundam contra Egidium; declaratio rationis Egidii; solutio rationum que fiebant contra Egidium; prima dubitatio contra dictam; solutio; solutio ad rationes que erant pro opinio Thome>
- art. 3: Utrum anima intellectiva sit ita simplex quod nullo modo extendatur in corpore. [A 113ra; C 76vb] <Opinio Girardi de Carmello; contra Girardum de Carmello; quid sibi videtur dicendum; responsio ad rationes alterius opinionis>
- Dist. 9, quest. 1: Utrum generatio in divinis distinguat filium a patre. [A 114ra; C 77va]
- art. 1: Utrum generatio in divinis sit assimilativa vel distinctiva, et si utrumque illorum sibi competat, utrum prius sibi competat assimilare quam distinguere, vel econtrario. [A 114ra; C 77vb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 2: Utrum filius per generationem sic distinguatur a patre quod sit alius ab eo, quasi specificè vel quasi numeraliter. [A 114rb; C 78ra] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; rationes aliorum contra dictam conclusionem; rationes quorundam ad dictas rationes ac etiam earum in probationes; quid sibi videtur dicendum ad dictas rationes>

- quest. 2: Utrum sit aliquis ordo inter patrem et filium in divinis.
[A 115va; C 78vb]
- art. 1: Utrum inter patrem et filium sit aliquis ordo. [A 115va; C 78vb]
- art. 2: Utrum, concesso tali ordine, sit necessarium concedere quod pater sit prior filio. [A 115vb; C 79ra:] <Opinio Scoti cum rationibus eorum qui eam sequuntur; contra dictam opinionem et quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- Dist. 10, quest. 1: Utrum spiritus sanctus procedat per modum voluntatis. [A 118ra; C 80va]
- art. 1: Utrum spiritus sanctus procedat ut amor per modum voluntatis. [A 118ra; C 80vb] <Opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; opinio communis; Scotus declarat opinionem communem; contra Scotum; Henricus declarat opinionem communem; contra Henricum; Egidii declarantis opinionem communem; Durandus contra Egidium; declaratio et confirmatio opinionis Egidii; Auriolus contra dicta; ratio Aurioli; contra Auriolum>
- art. 2: Utrum, concesso tali modo procedendi, possimus salvare quod divina natura communicetur spiritui sancto. [A 121rb; C 83ra] <Henricus ubi supra; contra Henricum; Scotus ubi supra; contra Scotum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 3: Utrum possimus salvare quod productio sancti spiritus sit necessaria, non obstante quod ipsius principium est voluntas. [A 121vb; C 83va] <Henricus ibidem; contra Henricum; Scotus; contra Scotum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; primum dubium; secundum dubium>
- Dist. 11, quest. 1: Utrum spiritus sanctus procedat a filio. [A 122rb; C 84ra]
- art. 1: Utrum spiritus sanctus procedat a filio. [A 122va; C 84ra] <Ratio Egidii; impugnatio quam facit Auriolus; contra impugnationem Aurioli; impugnatio prefate rationis; remotio prefate rationis>
- art. 2: Utrum, concesso quod procederet a filio, distingueretur ab eo duplici relatione. [A 124ra; C 85ra] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Henrici, quodl. 5, q. 9; contra Henricum>
- quest. 2: Utrum, si spiritus sanctus non procedat a filio, distinguitur ab eo. [A 125va; C 86ra]
- art. 1: Utrum sit per se et essentielle, in primo modo dicendi per se, ipsi sancto spiritui, quod procedat a filio. [A 125va; C 86rb]

<Opinio plurium; contra dictam opinionem, et quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: Utrum eodem modo sit essenziale et per se filium spirare spiritum sanctum, vel sit hoc ei quasi adventitium et accidentale. [A 126rb; C 86va] <Petrus Auriolus; contra Petrum Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; solutio ad rationes alterius opinionis>

art. 3: text: Utrum spiritus sanctus distingueretur a filio, dato quod ab eo non procederet. [A 127ra; C 87rb] <Opinio quarundam contra Egidium; opinio Thome in prima parte, quest. 36, art. 2, et Egidius in primo lib., 11 dist., et God[efredus], 3 quodl.; ponit rationes eorum sostenendo eas contra impugnationes; opinio Henrici, quodl. 5, q. 9, et Scoti; Henricus; Auriolus; contra Auriolum et quid sibi videtur dicendum; solutio ad rationes alterius opinionis>

Dist. 12, quest. 1: Utrum spiritus sanctus procedat a patre et filio. [A 129vb; C 89rb]

art. 1: Utrum concordia et mutuitas amoris sit de intrinseca ratione voluntatis, prout est principium productivum spiritus sancti. [A 130ra; C 89va] <Opinio Henrici; Scotus contra Henricum; quid sibi videtur dicendum contra opinionem Henrici; quid sibi videtur dicendum contra opinionem Scoti; postmittit aliqua ad id quod intendit dicere; quid sibi videtur dicendum ad principale quesitum; solutio ad rationes Henrici et Scoti>

art. 2: Utrum, hoc concesso, sequatur quod pater et filius spirent spiritum sanctum in quantum plures vel in quantum unum. [A 132vb; C 91rb] <Opinio Henrici; opinio Scoti; contra Henricum; contra Scotum; confirmatio opinionis Egidii>

art. 3: Utrum ex hoc ulterius sequatur quod sint plures spiratores. [A 133rb; C 91vb] <Thomas in prima parte; Scotus concordans cum Thoma in questione; contra conclusionem Thome et Scoti; contra modum ponendi Scoti specialiter; opinio Egidii; confirmatio opinionis Egidii>

Dist. 13, quest. 1: Utrum processio spiritus sancti et generatio filii sint processiones distincte realiter et alterius rationis. [A 134ra; C 92rb]

art. 1: Utrum processio spiritus sancti et generatio filii distinguantur ex terminis. [A 134ra; C 92rb] <Opinio quorundam; instantie facte ab aliis contra dictam opinionem; contra dictas instantias>

- art. 2: Utrum prefate processiones distinguantur ex suis principiis. [A 134vb; C 92vb] <Opinio Henrici, quodl. 5, q. 1,⁵⁵ contra Henricum>
- art. 3: Utrum dicte processiones distinguantur seipsis. [A 135ra; C 93ra] <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum>
- art. 4: Utrum dicte processiones distinguantur penes supposita producta a quibus sunt, vel penes supposita producta in quibus existunt, vel quocumque alio modo. [A 136ra; C 93va] <Opinio Thome; contra Thomam; opinio Egidii; confirmatio opinionis Egidii; solvit quedam dubia ex quorum solutione apparet quid sibi videtur dicendum de distinctione intellectus et voluntatis in deo; responsio ad motiva aliarum opinionum>
- Dist. 14, quest. 1: Utrum sit gemina processio spiritus sancti, scilicet eterna et temporalis. [A 137vb; C 94vb]
- art. 1: Utrum spiritus sanctus procedat temporaliter. [A 137vb; C 94vb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum secundum communem viam.>
- art. 2: Utrum in tali processione temporali donetur ipsemet spiritus sanctus vel solum donum sue gratie. [A 138rb; C 95rb] <tenet communem viam>
- art. 3: Utrum in collatione talium donorum sic geminetur processio spiritus sancti quod sint due processiones distincte per quas spiritus sanctus acquirat duo distincta esse. [A 138va; C 95rb] <Opinio communis; contra opinionem communem; quid sibi videtur decendum>
- Dist. 15, quest. 1: Utrum missio sit communis toti trinitati. [A 139ra; C 95va]
- art. 1: Quid sit missio et quomodo ponenda etiam in divinis est videntum. [A 139ra; C 95vb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum iuxta communem viam>
- art. 2: Utrum missio sit quid essenziale vel quid notionale. [A 139rb; C 95vb]
- art. 3: Utrum quilibet persona mittat seipsam. [A 139va; C 96ra] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum non obstantibus modis dicendi aliorum>

⁵⁵ Angelica 338 has only "opinio Henrici, q. 1," while Chicago 22 has "opinio Henrici, q[uodl.] 5, q. 1," which corresponds to Henry of Ghent, Quodl. VI, q. 1.

art. 4: Utrum missio filii separetur a missione spiritus sancti. [A 139va; C 96rb]

Dist. 16, quest. 1: Utrum in divinis sit dare missionem visibilem. [A 140ra; C 96rb]

art. 1: Quid sit missio visibilis, et quale differat visibilis missio spiritus sancti a filii missione. [A 140ra; C 96rb]

art. 2: Utrum missio visibilis spiritus sancti debuerit fieri quocumque tempore et quibuscumque personis. [A 140rb; C 96va]

art. 3: Utrum ille species in quibus spiritus sanctus apparuit super christum et super apostolos fuerint vere res. [A 140va; C 96vb]

Dist. 17, quest. 1: Utrum caritas sit habitus creatus in anima necessarius ad eliciendum actum meritorium et ad dandum esse gratuitum. [A 140vb; C 97ra]

art. 1: Utrum opinio Magistri de spiritu sancto sit sustinenda. [A 141ra; C 97ra] <Modus dicendi domini Egidii; Durandus contra Egidium; contra Durandum et pro Egidio; responsiones Thome, secunda secunde, q. 23, ar. 2>

art. 2: Utrum actus dilectionis meritorius possit elici a voluntate sine habitu caritatis creato. [A 141vb; C 97va] <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; opinio Henrici; contra Henricum; Durandus; contra Durandum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 3: Utrum esse gratuitum, quod videtur esse actus primus, possit haberi sine habitu caritatis creato. [A 143ra; C 98va] <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; opinio Thome, prima secunde, q. 110, ar. 1; Auriolus; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

quest. 2: Utrum caritas possit augeri. [A 144rb; C 99va]

art. 1: Utrum caritas augeatur per extentionem unius gradus perfectioris de potentia alterius [gradus] imperfectioris. [A 144vb; C 99vb] <Opinio Henrici, 12 quodl., q. 6 [mss: 4]; contra Henricum>

art. 2: Utrum [caritas] augeatur per inductionem gradus posterioris et corruptionem prioris. [A 145ra; C 100ra] <Opinio Godefredi; contra Godefredum>

art. 3: Utrum caritas augeatur per additionem alicuius gradus, qui sit caritas addita ad gradum precedentem. [A 145vb; C 100va] <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum>

art. 4: Utrum caritas augeatur per aliquem gradum vel realitatem, que sit tamen caritas. [A 146va; C 101ra] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum>

- art. 5: Utrum caritas augeatur per aliquam realitatem, que sit eius pars materialis. [A 147va; C 101vb] <Opinio Guarronis; contra Guarronem>
- art. 6: Utrum caritas augeatur per aliquam realitatem, que sit eius gradus individualis. [A 148ra; C 102ra] <Opinio quorundam; contra dictam opinionem>
- art. 7: Utrum [caritas] augeatur in sua essentia. [A 148va; C 102rb] <Opinio communis; contra opinionem communem; opinio Thome, secunda secunde; contra modum ponendi Thome; contra Durandum; solutio ad rationes que erant pro contraria parte>
- art. 8: Utrum caritas augeatur per aliquem modum quantitativum intrinsecum sue essentie. [A 149vb; C 103rb] <Opinio Jacobi de Viterbio; contra Jacobum de Viterbio>
- art. 9: Utrum caritas augeatur secundum esse, quod dat subiecto. [A 150rb; C 103vb] <Opinio Egidii cum suo modo ponendi et cum suis rationibus; confirmatio opinionis Egidii; inconvenientia que inducuntur a quibusdam contra fundamentum opinionis Egidii; responsio ad illa inconvenientia que inducuntur contra Egidium; opinio de modis quos ponit Egidius; rationes que fiunt specialiter contra conclusionem fratris Egidii; solutio ad rationes>
- art. 10: Utrum caritas possit augeri in infinitum. [A 152rb; C 105rb] <Opinio Thome in scripto et in secundo sententiarum; contra opinionem Thome; opinio Egidii; instantia quem quidam faciunt contra Egidium; dubia contra conclusionem principalem questionis; solutio que datur communiter ad illud dubium; instantia contra solutionem; solvit ipse alterius; solutio communis; solvit ille alterius>
- art. 11: Utrum caritas possit minui. [A 154ra; C 106va] <Opinio Godefredi et Petri de Alvernia; rationes alie quas superaddit pro ista opinione; contra Godefredum et Petrum de Alvernia; opinio contraria in qua plures concordant; confirmat conclusionem per alias rationes; solutio ad rationes alterius>
- Dist. 18, quest. 1: Utrum illud quod significatur nomine 'doni' in divinis sit quid essenziale. [A 155va; C 107va]
- art. 1: Utrum nomen 'doni' significet quid essenziale. [A 155vb; C 107vb] <Opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; modus dicendi Egidii; confirmatio opinionis Egidii>
- art. 2: Utrum illud quod significatur per istud nomen conveniat solum spiritui sancto. [A 156rb; C 108ra] <Durandus; contra Durandum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Dist. 19, quest. 1: Utrum divine persone sint equales. [A 156vb; C 108rb]

art. 1: Utrum divine persone sint equales. [A 156vb; C 108va] <Responsio Scoti; contra Scotum; quid sibi videtur dicendum ad primum dubium; remotio secundi dubii; remotio tertii dubii; responsio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum ad quartum dubium>

art. 2: Utrum una divina persona sit in alia. [A 157vb; C 109rb] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; opinio Henrici in summa; contra Henricum; opinio Thome et Egidii; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 3: Utrum divine persone sint partes essentielles vel integrales unius essentie. [A 159vb; C 110va] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; Durandus; contra Durandum et quid sibi videtur dicendum>

quest. 2: Utrum sit dare aliquam veritatem preter veritatem divinam. [A 160va; C 111rb]

art. 1: Utrum veritas sit formaliter in rebus secundum esse quod habent extra animam. [A 161ra; C 111va] <Opinio Thome in prima parte; quid sibi videtur dicendum; dubitatio contra dictam; solutio dubitationis>

art. 2: Utrum veritas sit formaliter in intellectu. [A 161va; C 112ra] <Opinio Egidii in primo sententiarum et in 4 quodlibet; Godefredus, secundo quodlibet; impugnatio quam facit Durandus; declaratio Egidii; solutio ad rationes Durandi>

art. 3: Utrum veritas sit formaliter in rebus secundum esse cognitum et abstractum quod habunt. [A 162ra; C 112rb] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 4: Utrum veritas sit formaliter aliquid consequens vel derelictum circa res intellectas ex nostro modo intelligendi eas. [A 163ra; C 113ra] <Opinio Henrici et Durandi; contra Henricum et Durandum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; dubitationes contra dictam; solutio prime dubitationis; solutio secundi dubitationis; solutio tertii dubitationis; probat hic quod enunciatio non dicat aliquam naturam positivam; conclusio istius articuli; conclusio totius principalis questionis>

Dist. 20, quest. 1: Utrum filius sit equalis patri in potentia. [A 164vb; C 114rb]

art. 1: Utrum posse generare contineatur sub omnipotentia patris. [A 164vb; C 114va] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio

Durandi; contra Durandum; opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; opinio Thome in prima parte; contra Thomam; opinio Egidii in primo suo; Scotus contra Egidium; confirmatio opinionis Egidii; solutio ad rationes Scoti quas faciebat contra Egidium>
 art. 2: Utrum contineatur sub omnipotentia filii. [A 166ra; C 115rb] <Opinio Egidii; Scotus contra Egidium; Auriolus contra Egidium; confirmatio opinionis Egidii; solutio ad rationes Scoti quas facit contra Egidium; solutio ad rationes Aurioli que erant contra Egidium>

Dist. 21, quest. 1: Utrum dictio exclusiva addita patri excludat filium vel econverso. [A 166vb; C 115vb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Dist. 22, quest. 1: Utrum deus possit a nobis viatoribus nominari aliquo nomine significante suam essentiam. [A 167va; C 116rb]

art. 1: Utrum possimus nominare deum aliquo nomine imo significante suam essentiam. [A 167va; C 116rb] <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; responsio ad motiva Scoti; opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Henrici in summa; contra Henricum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; ponit unam distinctionem cum duabus conclusionibus; conclusio totius articuli>

art. 2: Utrum possimus deum nominare pluribus nominibus que non sint synonyma. [A 169rb; C 117va] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Dist. 23, quest. 1:

art. 1: Utrum nomen 'persone' vel quodcumque aliud nomen vel ponatur ad significandum intentionem rei intellecte vel ipsam rem intellectam. [A 170ra; C 118ra] <Auriolus; contra Auriolum;⁵⁶ quid sibi videtur dicendum; dubium contra se et solvit; solutio primi dubii; solutio secundi; solutio tertii; conclusio principalis cum quatuor rationibus>

art. 2: Utrum prima intentio et secunda cadant super ea[n]dem rem intellectam. [A 171ra; C 118vb] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 3: Utrum nomen 'persone' sit nomen prime vel secunde intentionis. [A 172ra; C 119rb] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Henrici in summa; contra Henricum; quid sibi videtur dicendum >

⁵⁶ Chicago 22 has 'Durandus' and 'contra Durandum'.

Dist. 24, quest. 1:

art. 1: *Utrum in deo sit unitas.* [A 172vb; C 120ra]

art. 2: *Utrum unitas in deo vel in quocumque alio ente dicat privativum vel aliquid positivum.* [A 173ra; C 120rb] <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum et quid sibi videtur dicendum; ponit unam distinctionem de prima conclusione ex qua postea solvit rationes contrarie opinionis; solvit ad rationes Scoti; ex hiis que dicta sunt arguit contra opinionem Avicen. de uno quod convertitur cum ente>

art. 3: *Utrum unum, quod est principium numeri, sit idem cum uno quod convertitur cum ente.* [A 174ra; C 120vb] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; solutio ad rationes opinionis; contra dictam opinionem; opinio Thome; Herveus et Durandus declarantes opinionem Thome; contra opinionem Thome et contra Herveum et Durandum sustentantes dictam opinionem; opinio Egidii; rationes quas faciunt Durandus et Herveus contra Egidium; declaratio opinionis Egidii; confirmatio prime conclusionis; confirmatio secunde conclusionis; confirmatio tertie conclusionis; solutio ad rationes Hervei et Durandi contra Egidium>

quest. 2: *Utrum in deo sit aliquis numerus.* [A 176va; C 122vb]

art. 1: *Utrum numerus quod est multitudo transcendens sit in deo.* [A 176va; C 122vb] <Opinio Thome in prima parte, quest. 30, art. 3; contra Thomam; opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; opinio Egidii; confirmatio opinionis Egidii; dubitatio utilis>

Dist. 25, quest. 1: *Utrum plurificetur in divinis cum dico '3 personas'.* [A 177rb; C 123ra]

art. 1: *Utrum illud quod significatur nomine 'persone' sive in divinis sive in creaturis sit aliquod commune abstrahibile ab eis.* [A 177rb; C 123rb] <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: *Utrum nomen 'persone' significet determinate substantiam vel relationem.* [A 177vb; C 123va] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Hervei; contra Herveum; opinio Thome in prima parte, q. 30, ar. 4; contra Thomam; opinio Egidii; confirmatio opinionis Egidii; dubitatio contra opinionem; solutio eiusdem>

Dist. 26, quest. 1: *Utrum divine persone habeant aliquas proprietates per quas constituentur in esse personali et distinguantur ab invicem.* [A 178vb; C 124rb]

- art. 1: Utrum divine persone habeant aliquas proprietates per quas constituentur in suo esse personali et ab invicem distinguantur. [A 178vb; C 124rb] <Opinio Prepositini; contra Prepositinum>
- art. 2: Utrum tales proprietates per quas constituuntur et distinguuntur sint aliqui modi absoluti. [A 179rb; C 124va] <Opinio Lincolniensis. [text: quedam opinio antiqua]; contra opinionem Lincolniensem; solutio ad rationes alterius opinionis>
- art. 3: Utrum dicte proprietates sint relative. [A 180ra; C 125ra] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; opinio Thome in prima parte, q. 40, ar. 2, in solutione ultimi argumenti; contra Thomam; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 4: Utrum cum tribus suppositis relativis possit stare aliquod suppositum absolutum. [A 180vb; C 125va] <Opinio quedam antiqua; impugnatio dicte opinionis, que sit a pluribus; quid sibi videtur dicendum contra dictam opinionem>
- Dist. 27, quest. 1: Utrum verbum mentis nostre habeat aliquam similitudinem cum verbo increato. [A 181rb; C 126ra]
- art. 1: Utrum verbum mentis nostre sit ipsamet res intellecta. [A 181va; C 126rb] <Opinio Petri de Alvernia; contra Petrum de Alvernia; opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum>
- art. 2: Utrum verbum mentis nostre sit aliquid inherens intellectui existens in eo subjective, sicut species vel sicut actus vel sicut conceptus formatus per actum. [A 182ra; C 126va] <Opinio quorundam; contra dictam opinionem; opinio Godefredi; opinio Scoti; contra Godfredum et Scotum; opinio Henrici; contra Henricum; opinio Thome et Egidii; intellectus opinionis quam dat Herveus et plures alii; contra intellectum quem dat Herveus et plures alii ad prefatam opinionem; quid sibi videtur dicendum quantum ad opinionem Thome et Egidii, premittendo quedam ad intellectum dicte opinionis; ponit quatuor conclusiones, quarum due superius sunt probate; probatio tertie conclusionis; probatio quarti conclusionis>
- art. 3: Utrum verbum in divinis dicatur tantum notionaliter. [A 183vb; C 127vb] <Opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum>
- Dist. 28, quest. 1: Utrum innascibilitas in divinis dicat aliquam rationem positivam. [A 184va; C 128rb]
- art. 1: Utrum innascibilitas in divinis dicat aliquam rationem positivam. [A 184va; C 128rb] <Opinio quorundam; contra dictam opinionem>

art. 2: Utrum illa ratio que importatur nomine 'innascibilitatis' fundetur super essentiam vel super aliquam personam. [A 184vb; C 128va] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Hervei; contra Herveum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 3: Utrum innascibilitas sit proprietas constitutiva persone patris. [A 185va; C 129ra] <Opinio quorundam; contra istam opinionem et confirmationem opinionis communis>

Dist. 29, quest. 1: Utrum hoc nomen 'principium' dicatur secundum unam rationem de principio divinarum personarum et de principio creaturarum. [A 185vb; C 129rb]

art. 1: Utrum hoc nomen 'principium' dicatur de principio divinarum personarum et principio creaturarum secundum unam rationem. [A 186ra; C 129rb] <Opinio Henrici anglici; contra Henricum anglicum; opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; opinio Egidii quam sequuntur [mss: sequitur] Scotus et plures alii; confirmatio opinionis Egidii>

art. 2: Utrum principium filii, quod est generatio activa [A: actio], et principium spiritus sancti, quod est activa spiratio, realiter distinguantur. [A 186vb; C 129vb] <Opinio quorundam; contra dictam opinionem; modus dicendi contra Thomam; Egidius contra Thomam; opinio Egidii; confirmatio opinionis Egidii>

Dist. 30, quest. 1: Utrum tales relationes dicte de deo ex tempore sint reales. [A 187va; C 130rb]

art. 1: Utrum relationes dicte de deo temporaliter sint reales. [A 187vb; C 130va] <Opinio Jacobi de Viterbio in quodlibet de predicamentis, q. 14; contra Jacobum de Viterbio; opinio communis; Durandus; contra Durandum; opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; opinio Henrici, quodl. [I]X, q. 1; contra Henricum; opinio Thome in prima parte et in scripto; expositio dicte opinionis quam facit Herveus; contra opinionem Thome et expositionem Hervei; opinio fratris Egidii; confirmatio opinionis Egidii; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: Utrum, dato quod relationes dei ad creaturam non sint reales, sint in deo secundum rationem. [A 189va; C 131va] <Opinio Henrici, quodl. 9, [q. 1]; contra Henricum; opinio Jacobi de Viterbio ubi supra; contra Jacobum de Viterbio; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Dist. 31, quest. 1: Utrum equalitas et similitudo sint nomina relationum realium. [A 189vb; C 131vb]

- art. 1: Utrum ydemptitas sit relatio rationis. [A 189vb; C 132ra] <Opinio quorundam; contra dictam opinionem>
- art. 2: Utrum similitudo et equalitas in creaturis fundentur super unitate specifica. [A 190rb; C 132rb] <Opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 3: Utrum similitudo et equalitas sint relationes reales in deo vel dicatur solum privative. [A 190va; C 132va] <Opinio Jacobi de Viterbio quam etiam sequitur Scotus; contra Jacobum et contra Scotum; opinio Egidii; Durandus contra Egidium; contra Durandum et solutio ad rationes quas facit; confirmatio conclusionis principalis quam tenet Egidius; solutio ad rationes opinionis>

Dist. 32, quest. 1: Utrum pater et filius se diligant spiritu sancto. [A 191rb; C 133ra]⁵⁷ <Opinio quorundam, contra dictam opinionem; opinio Aurioli, contra Auriolum; opinio Thome et expositio Hervei; contra Herveum; opinio Egidii; confirmatio opinionis Egidii; solutio secundi dubii dat Egidius; Herveus contra Egidium; confirmatio vie Egidii; solutio tertii dubii et quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Dist. 33, quest. 1: Utrum proprietates relative sint idem quod essentia. [A 192rb; C 133va]

- art. 1: Utrum aliqua relatio sit in creaturis que sit verum ens reale. [A 192rb; C 133vb] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum et quid sibi videtur ad istum articulum; solutio ad rationes alterius opinionis>
- art. 2: Utrum talis relatio, que supponatur esse vera res extra animam, sit realiter distincta a suo fundamento vel sit idem realiter cum eo. [A 193va; C 134va] <Opinio Godefredi et Scoti et aliorum; contra Godefredum et Scotum; opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; opinio Jacobi de Viterbio; contra Jacobum; opinio Thome et Egidii; confirmatio opinionis Thome et Egidii; expositio istius opinionis sicut sibi videtur>
- art. 3: Utrum, stante ydemptitate reali inter relationem et fundamentum, possit sustineri quod relatio constituat distinctum predica-

⁵⁷ The printed edition lists three articles here: art. 1: In qua habitudine constituitur ablatus cum dicitur 'pater et filius diligunt se spiritu sancto'; art. 2: Utrum diligere accipiat in proposito essentialiter vel notionaliter; art. 3: Utrum magis concedenda sit ista 'pater et filius diligunt se spiritu sancto' quam ista 'pater sapit se, vel intelligit se, verbo'. In the manuscripts it is all one question.

- mentum a suo fundamento. [A 194vb; C 135va] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; prima conclusio istius articuli>
- quest. 2: Utrum proprietates personales sint relationes reales distincte aliquo modo ab essentia. [A 195rb; C 136ra]
- art. 1: Utrum proprietates personales sint relationes reales. [A 195va; C 136ra] <Dubia contra conclusionem; solutio ad prefata dubia; opinio Jacobi de Viterbio; opinio Egidii>
- art. 2: Utrum dicte proprietates relative sint distincte ab essentia realiter. [A 195vb; C 136rb] <Opinio Durandi; contra Durandum>
- art. 3: Utrum inter essentiam et proprietates relativas sit aliqua non-ydemptitas quantum ad earum proprias rationes formales. [A 196rb; C 136vb] <Opinio Jacobi de Viterbio; opinio Scoti; contra Jacobum et contra Scotum; contra Scotum specialiter tria inconvenientia; expositio quam quidam faciunt de opinione Scoti; contra dictam expositionem>
- art. 4: Utrum inter essentiam et proprietates relativas sit aliqua non-ydemptitas secundum proprias earum unitates et indivisiones. [A 197rb; C 137rb] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum>
- art. 5: Utrum inter essentiam et proprietates relativas sit ponenda necessario aliqua distinctio rationis. [A 198ra; C 137vb] <Opinio Thome; opinio Hervei; contra Herveum; quid sibi videtur [dicendum] et premititur ibi duos modis ydemptitatis; ex duplici ydemptitate concludit dupliciter distinctionem rationis; ostendit quod est una distinctio rationis que equivalet distinctioni reali; dubia contra conclusionem; solutio ad dubium; solutio ad rationes Durandi; solutio ad rationes Jacobi; solutio ad rationes Scoti>
- quest. 3: Utrum proprietates relative sint idem quod origines. [A 200ra; C 139rb]
- art. 1: Utrum proprietates relative sint idem quod origines. [A 200rb; C 139rb] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 2: Utrum dicte proprietates constituent personas inquantum origines vel inquantum proprietates relative. [A 200vb; C 139va] <[Opinio] Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur [dicendum]>
- art. 3: Utrum abstractis proprietatibus relativis per intellectum remaneant persone constitute. [A 201rb; C 140ra]

Dist. 34, quest. 1: *Utrum persona sit ita simplex sicut essentia.* [A 201rb; C 140ra] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum iuxta illud quod dixit in precedentibus>

Dist. 35, quest. 1:

art. 1: *Utrum deus habeat scientiam de hiis que sunt extra se.* [A 201vb; C 140rb] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur [dicendum]>

art. 2: *Utrum cognoscat ea que sunt extra se distincte.* [A 202vb; C 141ra] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 3: *Utrum cognoscat singularia.* [A 203ra; C 141rb] <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Thome; contra Thomam; opinio Egidii; confirmatio opinionis Egidii>

Dist. 36, quest.: *Utrum in deo sint ydee.* [A 203vb; C 141vb]

art. 1: *Utrum in deo sint ydee.* [A 204ra; C 141vb] <Opinio Scoti et Petri de Alvernia; contra Scotum et Petrum de Alvernia; opinio Johanni de Puliaco; contra Johannem de Puliaco; opinio Thome et Egidii; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: *Utrum inter ydeas sit aliqua distinctio.* [A 204va; C 142rb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 3: *Utrum ydee in deo sint principium cognoscendi vel operandi.* [A 204vb; C 142va] <Opinio Thome; opinio Egidii; confirmatio opinionis Egidii>

Dist. 37, quest.: *Utrum deus sit ubique.* [A 205ra; C 142va]

art. 1: *Utrum deus sit ubique.* [A 205ra; C 142va] <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum et quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: *Utrum convenienter assignentur illi tres modi essendi generales qui deo attribuuntur, videlicet per essentiam, presentiam, et potentiam.* [A 205rb; C 142vb] <quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Dist. 38, quest.: *Utrum futura contingentia in divina essentia immutabiliter represententur.* [A 205vb; C 143ra]

art. 1: *Utrum futura contingentia in divina essentia immutabiliter represententur.* [A 205vb; C 143ra] <Opinio quorundam; improbatio quam facit Scotus; opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: *Utrum futura contingentia in divina essentia immutabiliter representata sint divino intellectui presentia.* [A 206rb; C 143rb]

<Opinio Gothofredi; contra dictam opinionem; opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Thome et Egidii; impugnatio que fit ab aliis contra istam opinionem; confirmatio opinionis Thome et Egidii; dubitatio contra conclusionem; solutio dubitationis>

Dist. 39, quest.: Utrum divina providentia ad omnia se extendat. [A 207rb; C 143vb]

art. 1: Utrum divina providentia ad omnia se extendat. [A 207rb; C 143vb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: Utrum divina providentia sit idem quod fatum. [A 207va; C 144rb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Dist. 40, quest.: Utrum deo conveniat aliquos predestinare et aliquos reprobari. [A 207vb; C 144rb]

art. 1: Utrum deo conveniat aliquos predestinare et aliquos reprobari. [A 207vb; C 144rb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: Utrum predestinatus necessario et infallibiliter salvetur et reprobatus necessario et infallibiliter damnetur. [A 208rb; C 144va] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Dist. 41, quest.: Utrum sit aliquod meritum predestinationis et reprobationis, et ideo quero: Utrum predestinatio habeat aliquam causam. [A 208va; C 144vb]

art. 1: Utrum possit reddi ex parte nostra aliqua causa ipsius predestinationis. [A 208va; C 144vb]

art. 2: Utrum predestinatio possit haberi per nostra bona opera vel per preces sanctorum. [A 209rb; C 145ra] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Dist. 42, quest.: Utrum in deo sit potentia. [A 209rb; C 145rb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Dist. 43, quest.: Utrum deus sit omnipotens. [A 209vb; C 145rb]

art. 1: Utrum deus sit omnipotens. [A 209vb; C 145rb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: Utrum deus secundum suam omnipotentiam agat ex necessitate nature. [A 210ra; C 145va] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 3: Utrum agat ex necessitate iustitie. [A 210rb; C 145va] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Dist. 44, quest.: Utrum deus possit facere universum melius quam fecit. [A 210va; C 145vb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Dist. 45, quest.: Utrum divina voluntas convenienter distinguatur in voluntatem signi et beneplaciti. [A 210vb; C 146ra] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Dist. 46, quest.: Utrum voluntas dei sit ita efficax quod semper necessario impleatur. [A 211ra; C 146ra] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Dist. 47, quest.: Utrum illud quod sit contra voluntatem dei uno modo sit secundum eius voluntatem alio modo. [A 211va; C 146rb]

art. 1: Utrum illud quod sit contra voluntatem dei antecedentem obsequatur voluntati consequenti. [A 211va; C 146rb] <Opinio plurium; contra istam opinionem; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2: Utrum illud quod est contra voluntatem dei quocumque modo possit cadere sub precepto. [A 211vb; C 146va] <Opinio Egidii; Herveus⁵⁸ contra Egidium; confirmatio opinionis Egidii>

Dist. 48, quest.: Utrum voluntas nostra debeat esse conformis voluntati divine. [A 212ra; C 146vb] <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

III. Gerard of Siena, Sent. II, dist. 1-9⁵⁹

A = Rome, Bibl. Angelica 625; P = Paris, BN, nouv. acq. lat. 1431;

V = Vat. lat. 959⁶⁰

<> = rubricated citations and section titles inserted into the text

Sent II, dist. 1, quest. 1 [A 1ra; P 15ra; V 1ra]: Circa primam distinctionem secundi libri in qua agitur de creaturarum productione in generali quero primo: Utrum universitas creature habet

⁵⁸ 'Henricus' in Angelica 1089.

⁵⁹ Again, the wording of the titles of the articles follows that of the text, which differs slightly from the title announced at the beginning of the question or as given in the *tabula questionum* in the manuscripts.

⁶⁰ It is possible that Vat. lat. 959 is a copy of Angelica 625 or a similar manuscript, since some remarks that are in the margin in Angelica 625 are in the text in Vat. lat. 959.

aliquod necesse esse ex se formaliter in quo a deo creante non dependeat.

art. 1 [A 1rb; P 15 rb; V 1rb]: Utrum universitas creature ante actum sue creationis habuerit ex se formaliter esse intelligibile obiectivum per quod divine intelligentie obiceretur. <Opinio Aurioli, contra Auriolum; communis opinio; contra communem opinionem; quid sibi videtur dicendum; prima conclusio; secunda conclusio; tertia conclusio; quarta conclusio; quinta conclusio; opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio communis; quomodo discordat ab opinione communi et ab opinione Aurioli>

art. 2 [A 5vb; P 22rb; V 6ra]: Utrum universitas creature ante actum sue creationis habuerit ex se formaliter aliquod esse cognoscibile possibile terminativum ad quod respectus divine potentie productive terminaretur. <Opinio Jacobi de Viterbio; Alexander de Marchia [San Elpidio]; contra Jacobum et Alexandrum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 3 [A 8va; P 25vb; V 9ra]: Utrum universitas creature ante actum sue creationis habuerit in se formaliter verum esse essentie constitutivum per quod in determinato genere et determinata specie constitueretur. <Opinio Henrici; contra Henricum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Sent. II, dist. 1, q. 2 [A 9va; P 27ra; V 10rb]: Supposito quod universitas creature nullum habet esse in quo a deo creante non dependeat, utrum dependeat ab eo in aliquo genere vere causalitatis.

art. 1 [A 10ra; P 27vb; V 10vb]: Utrum universitas creature dependeat a deo sicut a vera causa finali amata et desiderata. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2 [A 10vb; P 29ra; V 11vb]: Utrum dependentia a deo sicut a causa finali sit idem quod inclinatio ipsius in deum, et ex hoc ipso utrum deus sit causa finalis creature quod terminus dicte sue inclinationis. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Henrici; contra Henricum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 3 [A 12rb; P 31ra; V 13va]: Utrum universitas creature dependeat a deo sicut a vera causa efficiente. <Opinio Durandi, Carmelite et Johannis de Puliaco, Aurioli et plurium aliorum; Herveus contra Gerardum carmelitam et contra omnes qui tenent prefatam opinionem; contra Aureolum et Gerardum carmelitam; contra Herveum;⁶¹ quid sibi videtur dicendum>

⁶¹ Chicago: 'Henricum'.

art. 4 [A 15va; P 36ra; V 17va]: Utrum universitas creature dependeat a deo sicut a vera causa formali mensurante et in esse conservante. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 5 [A 16va; P 37rb; V 18va]: Utrum sit eadem dependentia qua universitas creature dependet a deo sicut a vera causa efficiente et qua dependet ab eodem sicut a vera forma conservante.

Sent. II, dist. 1, q. 3 [A 17ra; P 38ra; V 19ra]: Supposito ex precedentibus quod universitas creature a deo dependeat sicut a causa efficiente et conservante secundum viam philosophorum, utrum possit demonstrari quod fuerit producta ab eterno vel ex tempore.

art. 1 [A 17rb; P 38va; V 19va]: Utrum sint aliquae rationes Aristotelis vel Commentatoris ad probandum universalis creature eternitatem ita efficaces, quod non appareat earum solutio huiusmodi in puris naturalibus constituto vel utrum omnes tales rationes ex puris naturalibus possint solvi. <Opinio Aristotelis et Commentatoris; quid sibi videtur dicendum; ad rationes Aristotelis et Commentatoris>

art. 2 [A 20rb; P 42rb; V 22va]: Utrum repugnet universitati creature quod sit eterna ratione infiniti temporis preteriti. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum et quid sibi videtur dicendum; ad rationes contrarie opinionis>

art. 3 [A 21vb; P 44rb; V 24rb]: Utrum repugnet universitati creature quod sit eterna ex eo quod producta a deo in diversitate substantie. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 4 [A 23rb; P 46va; V 26ra]: Utrum universitati creature repugnet quod sit eterna ex eo quod producta a deo libere et contingenter. <Contra Henricum [et] plures alii; Auriolus contra Henricum, tenens opinionem contrariam; contra Auriolum; contra Henricum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 5 [A 24rb; P 47va; V 26vb]: Utrum repugnet universitati creature quod sit ab eterno ex eo quod producta de nihilo, sive quod idem est, utrum productio de nihilo, que a theologis appellatur creatio, fuerit possibilis ab eterno. <Auriolus; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Sent. II, dist. 1, q. 4 [A 25rb; P 48vb; V 27vb]: Utrum creatio secundum quod nominat productionem de nihilo fuerit possibilis ex tempore.

art. 1 [A 25va; P 49va; V 28ra]: Utrum creatio sive productio de nihilo includat repugnantiam contradictionis propter quam

- videatur non fuisse possibilis ex tempore. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 2 [A 27ra; P 51rb; V 29va]: Utrum possibilitas creationis arguat necessario in re creata realem differentiam inter esse et essentiam.⁶² <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Henrici de Gandavo; contra Henricum; opinio Jacobi de Viterbio; contra Jacobum de Viterbio; opinio Egidii; confirmatio opinionis Egidii>
- art. 3 [A 29vb; P 54va; V 32va]: Utrum possibilitas creationis arguat quod necessario creantem virtutem infiniti vigoris. <Opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum >
- art. 4 [A 31rb; P 56va; V 34ra]: Utrum deum esse infinite virtutis in vigore sit possibile demonstrari per aliquam viam que non procedat, supposita possibilitate creationis vel quibusdam aliis que sunt fidei, et utrum Aristoteles hoc demonstraverit in 8 physicorum. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- Sent. II, dist. 1, q. 5 [A 33ra; P 58vb; V 36ra]: Utrum creatio sit extra deum aliqua res de aliquo determinato genere.
- art. 1 [A 33va; P 59rb; V 36rb]: Utrum creatio sit vera actio de genere actionis. <Contra Thomam; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 2 [A 34va; P 60va; V 37va]: Utrum actio transiens de genere actionis sit in agente, ac per consequens, utrum creatio actio sit in deo creante. <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; solutio ad rationes alterius opinionis>
- art. 3 [A 37ra; P 63rb; V 39vb]: Utrum vera actio transiens de genere actionis semper fundetur in motu, ac per consequens, utrum creatio ex hoc ipso quod est actio de genere actionis ad extra necessario sit quedam mutatio. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; opinio Durandi; contra Durandum>
- art. 4 [A 38rb; P 64vb; V 41rb]: Utrum actio et passio prout faciunt distincta genera sint unus motus, ac per consequens, utrum creatio actio et creatio passio sint una mutatio vel unus actus. <[Opinio] Gothefredi et plurium aliorum; contra Gothofredum; opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 5 [A 39vb; P 66va; V 42vb]: Utrum creatio sit idem realiter unus actus quod creatura, vel utrum addat aliquid super rem creatam. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

⁶² Article edited by David Gutiérrez, "Magistri Gerardi Senensis O.E.S.A. († 1336) articulus de reali distinctione inter esse et essentiam," *Analecta Augustiniana*, 21 (1947), 266-281.

- art. 6 [A 41va; P 69ra; V 44va]: Utrum creatio sit idem quod conservatio. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Jacobi de Viterbio; contra Jacobum; alia opinio antiqua plurium; contra istam opinionem; quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda; conclusio tertia; conclusio quarta; conclusio quinta; conclusio sexta; solutio ad rationes Aurioli>
- Sent. II, dist. 2, q. 1 [A 43vb; P 71vb; V 46vb]: Utrum angeli fuerint creati sub aliqua durationis mensura.
- art. 1 [A 44va; P 72va; V 47va]: Utrum angeli in sui creatione acceperint aliquam durationem propter quam sit necessario ponenda aliqua durationis mensura preter tempus. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 2 [A 45va; P 73vb; V 48va]: Utrum tempus sit idem quod motus. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; solutio ad rationes precedentes>
- art. 3 [A 47rb; P 75vb; V 50ra]: Utrum tempus sit successio motus. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 4 [A 48ra; P 77rb; V 50vb]: Utrum tempus sit numerus motus. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Oriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 5 [A 49rb; P 78va; V 52ra]: Utrum tempus sit numerus prioris et posterioris in motu. <quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 6 [A 50vb; P 80rb; V 53va]: Utrum tempus sit numerus in rerum natura circumscripto actu anime numerantis. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; prima dubitatio; secunda dubitatio; solutio ad secundam dubitationem>
- art. 7 [A 52rb; P 81vb; V 55ra]: Utrum tempus sit numerus numeratus. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 8 [A 53rb; P 83ra; V 56ra]: Utrum tempus sit numerus fundatus in solo motu primi mobilis. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio fratris Jacobi de Viterbio [mss: Egidii de Viterbio]; contra Jacobum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 9 [A 55vb; P 85vb; V 58vb]: Utrum tempus sit mensura omnium temporalium immediate per seipsum vel mediante suo 'nunc'. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 10 [A 56va; P 86vb; V 59va]: Utrum 'nunc' temporis sequatur ita mutatum esse sicut tempus sequitur motum. <Opinio Egidii; contra Egidium; declaratio opinionis Egidii et quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda; conclusio tertia; solutio ad rationes alterius opinionis>

- art. 11 [A 59rb; P 89vb; V 62va]: Utrum sit unum 'nunc' in toto tempore. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- Sent. II, dist. 2, q. 2 [A 60vb; P 91rb; V 64ra]: Utrum [evum] habeat aliquam similitudinem cum tempore sive etiam cum ipso 'quando' quod derelinquitur ex tempore.
- art. 1 [A 61ra; P 91vb; V 64va]: Utrum in evo sit aliqua successio per quam ad modum temporis se habeat in seipso difformiter. <Opinio antiqua cum apprehensionibus; contra prefatam opinionem; opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; secunda conclusio; solutio ad rationes alterius opinionis>
- art. 2 [A 63rb; P 94vb; V 67ra]: Utrum evum ad modum temporis sit idem cum suo fundamento realiter. <Opinio Henrici; contra Henricum>
- art. 3 [A 64rb; P 96ra; V 68ra]: Utrum evum ad modum temporis habeat proprium 'nunc' temporis a quo distinguatur realiter. <Opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; ad questionem; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda; conclusio tertia>
- art. 4 [A 66va; P 98vb; V 70vb]: Utrum evum ad modum ipsius 'quando' agebatur, contineatur et claudatur sub aliqua mensura terminabitur. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; declarat quid sit ipsi; ponit duos intellectus de isto articulo et iuxta primum intellectum ponit unam conclusionem; iuxta secundum intellectum ponit secundam conclusionem>
- art. 5 [A 68ra; P 100va; V 72rb]: Utrum sicut quando in quandalibus, ita evum in eviternis multiplicetur realiter. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Thome et Gothofredi et plurium aliorum; contra Thomam et Gothofredum et plures aliorum; opinio Henrici; opinio fratris Egidii; confirmatio opinionis fratris Egidii; ad rationes que consueverunt fieri contra Egidium>
- art. 6 [A 71ra; P 103vb; V 75va]: Utrum sicut evum mensurat esse angelorum, ita oporteat ponere necessario aliquod tempus quod mensuret eorum operationes conformiter. <Opinio quorundam; contra dictam opinionem; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 7 [A 72ra; P 104vb; V 76va]: Utrum tempus quod mensurat operationes angelorum sit continuum vel discretum distinctum a tempore nostro totaliter. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

Sent. II, dist. 2, q. 3 [A 72vb; P 105vb; V 77rb]: *Utrum locus sit res de aliquo determinato genere.*

art. 1 [A 73ra; P 106ra; V 77rb]: *Utrum locus secundum suum formale sit positio. <Contra Auriolum>*

art. 2 [A 73vb; P 107va; V 78rb]: *Utrum locus secundum suum formale sit ordo secundum determinatam distantiam vel propinquitatem ad totum celum. <Opinio que videtur esse communis; contra prefatam opinionem que videtur esse communis; quid sibi videtur dicendum; prima conclusio; conclusio secunda; conclusio tertia; conclusio quarta>*

art. 3 [A 75rb; P 108vb; V 79vb]: *Utrum locus secundum suum formale sit qualitas locati conservativa. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda>*

art. 4 [A 75vb; P 109rb; V 80rb]: *Utrum locus secundum suum formale sit quantitas locati circumscriptiva. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda>*

art. 5 [A 76va; P 110rb; V 81rb]: *Utrum locus secundum suum formale sit distincta species quantitatis a superficie. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda>*

Sent. II, dist. 2, q. 4 [A 77va; P 111rb; V 82rb]: *Utrum [angeli] fuerint creati in aliquo loco.*

art. 1 [A 78va; P 112rb; V 83rb]: *Utrum angelus sit in loco diffinitive. <Opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>*

art. 2 [A 80ra; P 113vb; V 84vb]: *Utrum angelus sit diffinitive in loco ratione sue essentie. <Opinio antiqua quorundam; contra opinionem prefatam et quid sibi videtur dicendum>*

art. 3 [A 80vb; P 114vb; V 85va]: *Utrum angelus sit diffinitive in loco ratione sue operationis. <Opinio multorum; contra dictam opinionem; Auriolus sequens dictam opinionem; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; removet unam dubitationem>*

art. 4 [A 82ra; P 116ra; V 86vb]: *Utrum angelus sit diffinitive in loco ratione alicuius virtutis quantitative. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>*

art. 5 [A 82vb; P 116vb; V 87va]: *Utrum unus angelus possit esse simul in diversis locis. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>*

art. 6 [A 83ra; P 117rb; V 88ra]: *Utrum plures angeli possint simul esse in eodem loco. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda>*

- art. 7 [A 84ra; P 118rb; V 89ra]: Utrum angelus possit moveri localiter. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 8 [A 84vb; P 119ra; V 89vb]: Utrum angelus quando movetur localiter moveatur motu continuo. <Opinio Thome in prima parte; contra opinionem Thome; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 9 [A 85vb; P 120ra; V 90vb]: Utrum angelus quando movetur localiter moveatur motu discontinuo sive discreto qui componitur ex mutatis esse indivisibilibus. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 10 [A 86rb; P 120va; V 91rb]: Utrum angelus possit moveri localiter de extremo ad extremum non transeundo per medium. <Opinio Thome in prima parte; contra opinionem Thome; quid sibi videtur dicendum; opinio fratris Egidii in primo sententiarum; declaratio et confirmatio opinionis fratris Egidii>
- art. 11 [A 87vb; P 121vb; V 92rb]: Utrum angelus moveatur de loco ad locum in instanti. <Opinio Guarronis; contra Guarronem; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 12 [A 89ra; P 122vb; V 93va]: Utrum pluribus instantibus motus angelici correspondeat unum instans temporis nostri. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum premissa una distinctione; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda>

Sent. II, dist. 2, q. 5 [A 90vb; P 124vb; V 95va]: Utrum celum empireum sit locus appropriatus angelis et hominibus beatis.

- art. 1 [A 91rb; P 125rb; V 96ra]: Utrum propter locationem angelorum et aliorum beatorum celum empireum necessario sit in rerum potentia ponendum. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 2 [A 91vb; P 126ra; V 96va]: Utrum celum empireum sit corpus alterius generis et alterius nature ab omnibus corporibus naturalibus. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda; Auriolus; contra Auriolum>
- art. 3 [A 93ra; P 127ra; V 97vb]: Utrum celum empireum sit lucidius aliis corporibus celestibus. <Responsio Durandi et Petri Aurioli; contra Durandum et Auriolum; responsio fratris Egidii; confirmatio illius vie tamquam tangit frater Egidius; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda>
- art. 4 [A 93vb; P 128ra; V 98va]: Utrum celum empireum influat in illa inferiora quemadmodum alia celestia corpora. <Opinio Thome; contra opinionem Thome; opinio fratris Egidii; confirmatio opinionis fratris Egidii>

Sent. II, dist. 3, q. 1 [A 94va; P 128vb; V 99rb]: Utrum natura angelica sit ita simpliciter quod careat omni compositione reali.

- art. 1 [A 94vb; P 129ra; V 99vb]: Utrum substantia angeli sit composita ex pluribus principiis quorum alterum sit purum possibile in genere intelligibile. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum premissa una de distinctione; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda; conclusio tertia; conclusio quarta; conclusio quinta; conclusio sexta; responsio ad rationes et fundamenta alterius opinionis>
- art. 2 [A 98va; P 132vb; V 103rb]: Utrum substantia angeli sit composita ex pluribus principiis quorum alterum sit materia prima, que est purum possibile non solum in genere substantialium [P: sensibile] sed etiam in toto genere entium. <Opinio antiqua plurium; contra opinionem prefatam et quid sibi videtur dicendum; rationes Durandi ad oppositam conclusionem; contra rationes Durandi>
- art. 3 [A 100rb; P 134va; V 104vb]: Utrum in substantia angeli esset composita ex pluribus principiis quorum alterum esset materia prima, que est purum possibile in genere substantialium [P: sensibile], et in toto genere entium sequeretur quod dicta substantia angeli esset corporea. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- Sent. II, dist. 3, q. 2 [A 101rb; P 135vb; V 106ra]: Utrum substantia spiritualis angelica sit ita simplex quod careat compositione secundum rationem generis.
- art. 1 [A 102ra; P 136rb; V 106vb]: Utrum substantia spiritualis angelica sit in genere. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 2 [A 103va; P 137vb; V 108ra]: Utrum substantia spiritualis angelica sit in eodem genere cum substantia corporali. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 3 [A 103vb; P 138ra; V 108rb]: Utrum genus substantie secundum quod est substantie corporali et spirituali sit genus naturale vel logicum vel quoddam aliud genus. <Opinio Henrici; contra Henricum; opinio Gothofredi; contra Gothofredum; opinio fratris Jacobi de Viterbio; contra Jacobum; opinio fratris Egidii; quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda; conclusio tertia; conclusio quarta>
- art. 4 [A 106ra; P 140ra; V 110rb]: Utrum genus substantie spiritualis angelice habet differentiam cum qua possit componi, que sumatur ab eadem simplici realitate cum dicto genere. <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Gothofredi; contra Gothofredum; opinio Jacobi de Viterbio; contra Jacobum; opinio fratris Egidii; Gothofredus contra Egidium; solutio rationum que fiunt contra Egidium; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

- tur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda; conclusio tertia; solutio ad responsiones aliorum opinionum>
- art. 5 [A 110va; P 144ra; V 114rb]: Utrum compositio generis cum differentia que sit per actum rationis circa substantiam spirituales angelicas sit in ipso actu rationis vel in ipsa substantia spirituali angelica cui actus rationis dictam compositionem attribuit. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; prima conclusio iuxta primam acceptionem; secunda conclusio iuxta secundam acceptionem; due conclusiones iuxta tertiam acceptionem; prima conclusio iuxta tertiam acceptionem; secunda conclusio iuxta tertiam acceptionem; dubia contra dicta; solutio ad dubia>
- art. 6 [A 112va; P 146ra; V 116ra]: Utrum differentia cum qua componitur genus substantie spiritualis debeat poni in recta linea predicamentali sicut species, et per consequens, utrum predicetur in quid sicut species. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; due conclusiones iuxta primam acceptionem; prima conclusio iuxta primam acceptionem; secunda conclusio iuxta primam acceptionem; due conclusiones circa secundam acceptionem; prima conclusio iuxta secundam acceptionem; secunda conclusio iuxta secundam acceptionem>
- art. 7 [A 113vb; P 147rb; V 117rb]: Utrum in substantiis spiritualibus descendatur a genere in nobiliorem speciem per compositionem et aggregationem plurium differentiarum quemadmodum in substantiis corporalibus. <Opinio Henrici; contra Henricum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- Sent. II, dist. 3, q. 3 [A 115rb; P 148va; V 118va]: Utrum angelus naturali cognitione cognoscat seipsum et ea que sunt creata cum ipso.
- art. 1 [A 115vb; P 149ra; V 119ra]: Utrum angelus semper se intelligat.
- art. 2 [A 116vb; P 149vb; V 119vb]: Utrum quando angelus se intelligit idem actus sit in eo intelligendi cum sua substantia que intelligitur. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 3 [A 118rb; P 150vb; V 120vb]: Utrum quando angelus intelligit seipsum ille actus intelligendi causetur a sua substantia mediante aliqua specie intelligibili. <Opinio communis; contra opinionem communem; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 4 [A 118vb; P 151rb; V 121va]: Utrum actus intelligendi quo angelus intelligit seipsum causetur immediate a sua essentia. <Contra opinionem communem et quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 5 [A 119va; P 152ra; V 122ra]: Utrum idem sint in angelo intellectus et quod intelligitur quando angelus intelligit res materiales. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; responsio ad primum dubium; responsio ad secundum dubium>

art. 6 [A 120vb; P 153rb; V 123ra]: Utrum idem sint in angelo intellectus et quod intelligitur quando angelus intelligit res immateriales. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; responsio ad quesitum iuxta primum intellectum; responsio ad quesitum iuxta secundum intellectum; probatio primi modi idemnitatis; probatio secundi modi idemnitatis; probatio tertii modi idemnitatis>

Sent. II, dist. 4 [A 122rb; P 155ra; V 124vb]: Utrum omnes angeli fuerint creati in statu eodem vel consimili quantum ad beatitudinem et gratiam sive etiam quantum ad aliam perfectionem.

art. 1 [A 122vb; P 155va; V 125rb]: Utrum omnes angeli generaliter vel saltem aliqui specialiter fuerint creati beati. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda; conclusio tertia; conclusio quarta>

art. 2 [A 124ra; P 156vb; V 126va]: Utrum omnes angeli vel saltem aliqui specialiter fuerint creati in gratia. <Durandus sequens opinionem Thome; contra Durandum et opinionem quam sequitur; opinio quam tenet frater Egidius; tenet et ipse eandem conclusionem et confirmat eam dupliciter>

art. 3 [A 125rb; P 158ra; V 127vb]: Utrum boni angeli potuerunt prescire suam finalem beatitudinem. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum iuxta conclusionem suam>

art. 4 [A 125vb; P 158vb; V 128rb]: Utrum mali angeli potuerunt prescire suam finalem miseriam. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum iuxta conclusionem suam>

Sent. II, dist. 5, q. 1 [A 126va; P 159rb; V 129ra]: Utrum aliqui angeli potuerint se a deo divertere per peccatum.

art. 1 [A 126vb; P 159vb; V 129va]: Utrum in angelis potuerit esse peccatum. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2 [A 127rb; P 160rb; V 129vb]: Utrum peccatum malorum angelorum habuerit ortum ex errore vel ignorantia vel ex aliqua alia causa. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda; conclusio tertia; dubitatio contra tertiam conclusionem; solutio>

art. 3 [A 128vb; P 161va; V 131rb]: Utrum mali angeli qui peccaverunt potuerunt peccare in primo instanti sue creationis. <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum et quid sibi videtur dicendum>

- art. 4 [A 129rb; P 162rb; V 131vb]: Utrum causa quare angelus peccans non potuit peccare in primo instanti sue creationis sit accipienda ex parte angeli peccantis. <opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 5 [A 130rb; P 163ra; V 132vb]: Utrum causa quare angelus peccans non potuit peccare in primo instanti sue creationis sit accipienda ex parte dei creantis. <Opinio Thome; contra opinionem Thome; quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 6 [A 130vb; P 163va; V 133rb]: Utrum causa quare angelus non potuit peccare in primo instanti sue creationis sit accipienda ex parte illius primi instantis. <Opinio communis plurium; contra communem opinionem plurium; quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda; conclusio tertia; conclusio quarta; conclusio quinta; conclusio sexta>
- Sent. II, dist. 5, q. 2 [A 131vb; P 165ra; V 134va]: Utrum boni angeli in sui conversione ad deum receperunt gratiam.
- art. 1 [A 132ra; P 165rb; V 134vb]: Utrum in bonis angelis [actus] conversionis ad deum precessit aliqua dispositio ad gratiam. <Opinio Thome; contra opinionem Thome; opinio fratris Egidii; declaratio et confirmatio opinionis Egidii>
- art. 2 [A 133rb; P 166vb; V 136rb]: Utrum boni angeli receperunt gratiam ante actum sue conversionis in deum. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda; tertia conclusio>
- art. 3 [A 133vb; P 167rb; V 136vb]: Utrum boni angeli per gratiam meruerint gloriam. <Facit tres rationes pro conclusione comuni que ab omnibus credentur>
- art. 4 [A 134ra; P 167vb; V 137rb]: Utrum boni angeli meruerunt gloriam vel ultimam suam beatitudinem per unum solum actum. <Facit etiam hic tres rationes>
- art. 5 [A 134rb; P 168ra; V 137va]: Utrum in bonis angelis meritum precesserit premium. <Opinio Magistri sententiarum ac etiam Prepositini; rationes que fiunt communiter contra opinionem Magistri sententiarum et Prepositini; addit tria alia inconvenientia contra dictam opinionem Magistri; opinio Thome in prima parte; confirmatio quam fecit Durandus; contra opinionem Thome et contra Durandum qui eam sequitur; opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; opinio antiqua quam recitat Magister in littera; contra dictam opinionem; opinio quam tenet frater Egidius; quid sibi videtur dicendum pro declaratione et confirmatione dicte opinionis quam tenet frater Egidius; concludit hic

conclusionem principalem confirmando eam per quatuor rationes; solutio ad rationes contrarie opinionis>

Sent. II, dist. 6 [A 136vb; P 170vb; V 140ra]: Utrum inter angelos cadentes fuerit aliquis primus.

art. 1 [A 137rb; P 171rb; V 140va]: Utrum inter angelos cadentes fuerit aliquis primus cuius occasione alii peccando ceciderint. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 2 [A 137vb; P 171vb; V 141ra]: Utrum primus angelus inter cadentes fuerit de supremo ordine. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 3 [A 138ra; P 172ra; V 141rb]: Utrum de quolibet ordine angelorum aliqui ceciderint.

art. 4 [A 138rb; P 172rb; V 141va]: Utrum primus angelus inter cadentes una cum aliis angelis cadentibus peccaverit peccato superbie. <Opinio communis quam tenet Thomas; Scotus contra opinionem communem; Auriolus concordans opinionem Scoti contra opinionem communem; contra Petrum et Scotum; quid sibi videtur dicendum pro communi opinione quam sustinet; solutio ad rationes Scoti>

art. 5 [A 140ra; P 174ra; V 143rb]: Utrum primus angelus inter cadentes una cum aliis angelis cadentibus appetierit dei equalitatem per se et directe. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum; opinio Scoti; contra Scotum; quid sibi videtur dicendum secundum opinionem communem, quam sustinet>

art. 6 [A 141va; V 145ra]: Utrum omnes angeli cadentes fuerint uniformes in appetendo dei equalitatem per accidens et indirecte. <Ponit tres modos quibus mali angeli potuerunt uniformiter [appetere] dei equalitatem [secundum] communem [opinionem]; contra opinionem communem; quid sibi videtur dicendum; reducit totum quod intendit de isto articulo ad duas conclusiones>

art. 7 [A 142va; V 146ra]: Utrum inter angelos cadentes sit ordo prelationis.

Sent. II, dist. 7, quest. 1 [A 142vb; V 146rb]: Utrum angeli beati ita sint confirmati in bono quod non possint peccare.

art. 1 [A 143ra; V 146va]: Utrum angeli beati ita sint confirmati in bono quod non possint peccare.

art. 2 [A 143ra; V 146vb]: Utrum non posse peccare in angelis beatitudinis proveniat ex aperta visione summi boni. <Opinio

- Thome [*mss*: Scoti] in prima parte; contra Thomam [*mss*: Scotum]; opinio Durandi; contra Durandum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda>
- art. 3 [A 143vb; V 147va]: Utrum non posse peccare in angelis beatis proveniat ex satietate appetitus. <Modus Thome et plurium aliorum; contra modum prefatum; quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda>
- art. 4 [A 144rb; V 148ra]: Utrum non posse peccare in angelis beatis proveniat ex immutabilitate fruitionis. <Opinio fratris Egidii; confirmatio opinionis Egidii>
- Sent. II, dist. 7, quest. 2 [A 144vb; V 148vb]: Utrum mali angeli sint ita obstinati in malicia quod penitere non possint.
- art. 1 [A 145ra; V 149ra]: Utrum mali angeli vel demones sint ita obstinati in malicia quod penitere non possint.
- art. 2 [A 145rb; V 149rb]: Utrum obstinatio demonum habet ortum ab aliquo ortu habitu a deo infuso. <Opinio Jacobi; contra opinionem Jacobi; solutio ad rationes alterius opinionis>
- art. 3 [A 146ra; V 150rb]: Utrum obstinatio demonum habet ortum ab aliqua causa naturali intrinseca. <Opinio Thome; contra opinionem Thome; opinio Henrici viii quodlibet, [q. 10?]; contra Henricum; opinio fratris Egidii; confirmatio opinionis Egidii et quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- art. 4 [A 147rb; V 151vb]: Utrum obstinatio demonum habet ortum ab ipso deo subtrahente suam influentiam. <Opinio fratris Egidii; declaratio et confirmatio opinionis fratris Egidii et quid sibi videtur dicendum>
- Sent. II, dist. 8 [A 147vb; V 152vb]: Utrum angeli possint assumere corpora.
- art. 1 [A 148ra; V 153ra]: Utrum angeli sive boni sive mali possint assumere corpora. <Colligit quid sibi videtur dicendum in isto articulo sub quinque conclusionibus>
- art. 2 [A 148va; V 153vb]: Utrum angeli in corporibus assumptis possint exercere opera vite.
- art. 3 [A 148vb; V 154rb]: Utrum angeli mali possint in corporibus assumptis vel non assumptis ludificare sensus. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda; conclusio tertia; conclusio quarta>
- art. 4 [A 149vb; V 155va]: Utrum angeli boni vel mali moveant corpora assumpta vel quecumque alia corpora per solum intellec-

tum et voluntatem. <Opinio plurium; contra opinionem prefatam; opinio magis communis; contra dictam opinionem magis communem; responsio Durandi sustentis opinionem communem; contra responsionem Durandi; opinio Jacobi de Viterbio; contra Jacobum de Viterbio; quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda; solutio ad rationes Jacobi>

Sent. II, dist. 9 [A 151va; V 158rb]: Utrum inter ordines angelorum sit distinctio secundum naturam vel solum secundum officia.

art. 1 [A 152ra; V 159ra]: Utrum distinctio inter ordines angelorum sit secundum gradus específicos quos in sui natura a sue creationis principio habuerunt vel solum secundum diversitatem officiorum. <Quid sibi videtur dicendum; conclusio prima; conclusio secunda; conclusio tertia; conclusio quarta>

art. 2 [A 152vb; V 160ra]: Utrum natura specifica in angelis sive in aliis entibus materialibus habeat propriam et realem unitatem distinctam ab unitate numerali. <Opinio Scoti; contra opinionem Scoti; quid sibi videtur dicendum; solutio ad rationes Scoti>

art. 3 [A 154ra; V 161vb]: Utrum unitas nature specificè extra intellectum sit unitas alicuius indifferentie. <Opinio Scoti; Auriolus contra Scotum; contra Auriolum; contra Scotum; quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 4 [A 154va; V 162va]: Utrum natura specifica extra intellectum sit ex seipsa individua. <Opinio Aurioli; contra Auriolum et quid sibi videtur dicendum>

art. 5 [A 154vb; V 162vb]: Utrum natura specifica contrahatur ad esse individuale per aliquid privativum. <Opinio Henrici; contra Henricum>

art. 6 [A 155ra; V 163ra]: Utrum principium individuationis per quod natura specifica in entibus materialibus contrahitur ad esse individuale sit materia. <Opinio illorum qui volunt sequi Thomam; contra opinionem illorum qui sequuntur Thomam>

art. 7 [A 155va; V 164ra]: Utrum principium individuationis per quod natura specifica in entibus materialibus contrahitur ad esse individuale sit forma. <Opinio Gothofredi; contra Gothofredum>

art. 8 [A 155vb; V 164va]: Utrum principium individuationis per quod natura specifica in entibus materialibus contrahitur ad esse individuale sit quantitas. <Opinio fratris Egidii; Scotus contra Egidium; confirmatio opinionis Egidii; solutio ad rationes Scoti>

art. 9 [A 157ra; V 166ra]: Utrum individuum principium individuationis per quod natura specifica in quibuscumque entibus contrahitur ad esse individuale sit aliquis gradus individuationis. <Opinio Scoti; contra Scotum et quid sibi videtur dicendum>
text ends [A 157rb; V 166va]: Et per consequens apparet ex omnibus istis quid sit dicendum quantum ad istum articulum. Restat ergo videndum [art. *or dist.*].x.

IV. Gerard of Siena, *Questiones in libros III & IV Sententiarum*
 (Oxford, Balliol College 63)

Balliol 63, ff. 65vb-66rb: "Utrum sola persona filii sine aliis personis potuerit incarnari."

Balliol 63, ff. 87va-88ra: "Questio Gerardi in principio tertii."

ff. 87va-87vb: "Utrum una persona possit incarnari absque hoc quod alia incarnetur." Cf. previous question.

f. 87vb: "Utrum fuit necesse Christum pati pro redemptione generis humani."

ff. 88ra [Gerard of Siena?], *Sent.* IV:

f. 88ra: "Utrum corpus Christi possit esse sub sacramento altaris sine sui mutatione."

f. 88ra: "Utrum anima beata appetat reuniri corpori."

William J. COURTENAY

Department of History

University of Wisconsin, Madison (U.S.A.)