

MELITA THEOLOGICA

Vol. III, No. 2.

July-December, 1950.

Early Thomistic Controversies

DURING the life and after the death of St Thomas Aquinas Thomism had provoked many theologians whose ideas were directly opposed to those of the Dominican Master. The teaching of Aquinas was considered by them to be prejudicial to the teaching of the Fathers of the Church for in many important theological and philosophical questions St Thomas made great use of the Philosophers especially of Aristotle (1).

The Dominicans have withstood the adversaries of their master like a wall of brass. From 1277 to the present day the General Chapters of the Order of Preachers have recommended and protected the teaching of St Thomas, and the disciples of the great doctor have been urged to oppose by their writings all attacks against their master.

The first Dominicans strove to show that Aquinas' teaching was above suspicion, and if well understood was not opposed to the teaching of the Fathers of the Church. Thus the author of the so-called *Correctorium "Quare"* accuses William de la Mare of misunderstanding St Thomas (2).

To clear away the difficulties raised against Aquinas the Thomists undertook two kinds of literary work: the so-called "*Defensoria*", whose aim was to defend the teaching of the Angelic Doctor against the attacks of his adversaries; and what we may call the "*Expositoria*", which consisted in the drawing up of tables, concordances, abridgements and excerpts, with a view to restore the genuine thought of St Thomas, twisted by his

(1) See A. VELLA O.P., "*The Intellectual revolution of the thirteenth century*", in *The Classical Journal*, Malta, 1950. No. IV, pp. 49-66.

(2) "Si verba doctoris in solutione huius questionis inspexissent numquam sic in responsione huius tertii argumenti impigissent, nec aliquid omnino contra fidei veritatem invenissent", P. Glorieux, *Le Correctorium Corruptorii "Quare"*, (Bibliothèque Thomiste, ix, 1921) p. 29; and again: "Si verba pii doctoris huius Thome rectis oculis inspexissent numquam istam positionem errori favere dixissent", p. 29.

opponents, thus facilitating the meaning of the text (3). These *Expositoria* were compiled mainly at the beginning of the fourteenth century in view of the canonisation of St. Thomas, which took place in 1323. Here we are concerned with the first class of works, the *Defensoria*, which are far more important, as they were written immediately after the death of Aquinas by the very disciples of the Dominican Master.

We shall subdivide this section into two parts: (a) the literature of the *Correctoria*, and (b) other controversial writings in defence of St. Thomas.

(a) The Literature of the Correctoria.

The writings of Aquinas became more and more widespread, and to exclude them from the schools would have been as puerile as it was well-nigh impossible (4). Even some Franciscan Masters, such as Richard of Middleton (5) and William of Ware, were attracted to Thomism (6). To counteract this tendency, however, the Franciscan General Chapter held at Strasbourg in 1281, forbade the study of the *Summa* of brother Thomas.

(3) Cf. M. GRABMANN, "*Hilfsmittel des Thomasstudiums aus alter Zeit*", (Abbreviationes, Concordantiae, Tabulae), *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, ii, München, 1936, pp. 424-489.

(4) Similar evidence comes from the first book of the *Sentences* of GILES OF ROME, composed about 1275; from the *Quodlibets* of HENRY OF GHENT (1276-92), and from the *Quodlibets* of GODFREY OF FONTAINES (1285-97), who in their writings constantly refer to and discuss the teaching of the Dominican Master. See A. DONDAINE, O.P., "Un catalogue de dissensions doctrinales entre les Maîtres Parisiens de la fin du XIII^e siècle" *Rech. T.A.M.*, x/1938/, pp. 374-394; WILLIAM DE LA MARE in his second recension of *Correctorium fratris Thomae* wanted to comment on Aquinas' teaching in order to guard readers against errors, "quia multi legunt istum librum, qui est multo communior quam ille et hic non explicat, posset prebere simplicibus materiam et causam errandi..." Cited by R. CREYTENS, O.P., "Autour de la littérature des Correctoires", *Archiv. FF. Praed.*, xii/1942/ p. 329.

(5) Denis the Carthusian (*Opera Omnia*, xix, p. 37) mentions the Franciscan Middleton amongst the "praeclarioris sequaces S. Thomae".

(6) J. Pecham was so much aware that some Franciscans were allowing themselves to be led astray by Thomism, that on Sept. 5, 1279, he wrote a letter, addressed "patribus ac fratribus in capitulo Canteburgiæ congregandis", exhorting them: "Hinc prophanas vocum novitates et damnata studia declinatis. Hinc inflavit pruriginis quibusdam superincidens solem abstulit veritatis" MARTIN, *Registrum epistolarum*, i, p. 67.

unless it was accompanied by the *declarationes* of William de la Mare. The study of the *Summa* was not permitted to all Franciscans, but only to the well-versed professors of the Order. Moreover, the *declarationes* were to be written in separate books and not in the margin, and they were not to be copied by persons outside the Franciscan Order (7). These *declarationes* are generally known as *Correctorium fratris Thomae* (8).

William de la Mare was an English Franciscan Friar (9). He is said to have been an Oxford Master, but his name does not appear in the list of Oxford and Cambridge masters drawn up by Eccleston in his "De promotione lectorum" (10). Dr. Little says that until more is known of him it is not safe to claim him as an Oxonian (11). William became master at Paris in 1274-5 at the latest, and perhaps succeeded Pecham in the Franciscan chair there (12). It is generally held that he died in 1290.

-
- (7) "... ut non permittant multiplicari Summam fratris Thomae nisi apud lectores notabiliter intelligentes, et hoc non nisi cum declarationibus fratris Guillelmi de Mara, non in marginibus positis, sed in quaternis; et huiusmodi declarationes non scribantur per aliquem saecularem". G. FUSSENAGER, O.F.M., "Definitiones Cap. Gen. Argentinae celebrati, anno 1282", *Anal. Franc. Hist.*, xxvi/1933/, p. 139, n. 2.
- (8) These *Declarations* were identified until recently with *Correctorium fratris Thomae*. It was Fr. Pelster who discovered that they were a different work though written by the same author, William de la Mare, (Cf. F. PELSTER, "Das Ur-Correctorium Wilhelmus de la Mare. Eine theologische zu Lehren des hl. Thomas" in *Gregorianum*, xxviii/1947/, pp. 220-235). According to Pelster the decree of the General Chapter refers to the *Declarations* which he found, and not to the known *Correctorium*. Glorieux, however, has shown convincingly that these *Declarationes* are to be identified only with the decree of the General Chapter, *Declarationes in marginis positis*. Hence the general opinion that the companion to *Summa Theologica* to be used by the Franciscans was the known *Correctorium* still holds good. (Cf. P. GLORIEUX, *Recherches de Theologie ancienne et medievale*, xv/1948/, pp. 182-184).
- (9) Cf. E. LONGPRE, O.F.M., *Dictionnaire de Theol. catholique*, viii, cols. 2467-70.
- (10) Cf. A. LITTLE, *Tractatus fratris Thomae vulgo dicti De Eccleston, De adventu fratrum Minorum in Angliam* (Collection d'Etudes et de documents, t. vii), pp. 33-41.
- (11) Cf. A. LITTLE, "Franciscan School at Oxford", *Archiv. Franc. Hist.* xix/1926/, p. 865.
- (12) Cf. P. GLORIEUX, *Repertoire des Maîtres en théologie de Paris*, (Etudes de Phil. Mediev., xviii), 1934, n. 317, p. 99.

He wrote *Correctorium fratris Thomae*, which won him the title of standard-bearer of the anti-thomists (13), between 1278-9, for he refers to the condemnations of Paris as recent ("nuper"), and whereas he cites the bulls of Innocent III, Honorius III, and Gregory IX, he does not mention the important bull of Nicholas III, issued on August 14, 1279, "Exiit qui seminavit" (14).

In this work the Franciscan Master criticized 123 doctrinal points from the works of St Thomas. Of these 48 were from *Summa Theologica*, Pars Prima; 12 from Pars Prima-Secundae; 16 from Pars Secunda-Secundae; 9 from *De Veritate*; 10 from *De Anima*; 1 from *De Virtutibus*; 4 from *De Potentia*; 9 from *Quodlibets*, and 9 from *Commentary on the first book of the Sentences*. R. Creytens (15) through a comparative study of the text of William de la Mare, as it is contained in *Correctorium "Quare"*, and MS. Vat. lat. 4413, listed in the Catalogue as a *Compendium* of the *Summa* and of *Quaestiones disputatae* of Aquinas by an anonymous writer :

"D. Thomae, Prima pars Summae et Prima secundae et Secunda secundae in compendium redacta. Anon. Eiusdem quaestiones in compendium redactae. Anon."

has shown that in reality this work is a second recension of *Correctorium fratris Thomae*, undertaken by William de la Mare himself. He based this conclusion on the similarity of style, mode of expression and doctrinal content of the two *Corruptoria*. In elaborating this second recension the Franciscan Master "avait l'intention de retravailler profondément sa première attaque, en ordonnant mieux et plus rationnellement les arguments, en corroborant surtout les premiers arguments par un bon nombre de nouveaux" (16). He added 9 new articles to the Prima Pars of the first recension, 5 to Secunda secundae, and 11 to the Quaestiones *De Veritate*; altogether 25. The criticisms on the first book of the *Sentences* are not mentioned. This, however, does not mean that the work is incomplete, but, as Crey-

(13) Cf. L. WADDING, *Supplementum et castigatio ad Scriptores trium Ordinum S. Francisci...* opus posthumum Fr. H. Sbaraleae, Rome, 1806, p. 323.

(14) Cf. P. GLORIEUX, *Le Correctorium "Quare"*, p. 114.

(15) R. CREYTENS, O.P., *op. cit.*, pp. 317-330.

(16) R. CREYTENS, *op. cit.*, p. 324.

tens says, the author probably decided not to extend his attack to the first book of the *Sentences* (17).

As no mention is made of the Bull of Nicholas III in the first recension of the *Correctorium*, it has been established that this work was compiled in 1278-9. Now in the second recension William de la Mare discussing question 88 (Quare 74): "Utrum religiosus semper peccet mortaliter transgrediendo ea quae sunt in regula", brings forward the authority of Nicholas III, and says:

"In principio regule beati Francisci quam approbavit Innocentius III et confirmavit Honorius III successor eiusdem Innocentii et etiam Nicholaus III",

and again in question 134 (Quare 106): "Utrum monachus peccet mortaliter comedendo carnes", he says:

"Quod profitens regulam abstringit se ad omnia que in regula continentur ita quod peccat mortaliter contrarium faciundo, reprobatur per Gregorium nonum, Innocentium quartum, Alexandrum quartum et Nicholaum tertium, qui quatuor exponendo regulam beati Francisci dicunt quod fratres non obligantur per regulam nisi ad ea que in ipsa regula preceptorie vel inhibitorie sunt expressa" (18).

Here Creytens observes that the omission of the name of Nicholas III in the first recension was not accidental, for whereas in the first recension we have "qui tres exponendo", in the second we have "qui quatuor exponendo" (19). It can be therefore concluded that William de la Mare undertook the second recension after August 14, 1279, when the bull of Nicholas III was issued.

Creytens concludes that the *terminus ante quem* of William de la Mare's revised treatise could not be later than 1284 (20), because William does not mention in the second recension the condemnation of John Pecham at Oxford, on October 29, 1284; nor does he mention in his discussion of the relation of intellect and will in the same recension, the famous *propositio magistrulicis* of Giles of Rome, "Non est malitia in voluntate, nisi sit error vel aliqua nescientia in ratione", which was condemned by Stephen Tempier (21), and had to be withdrawn by Giles at the

(17) R. CREYTENS, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

(18) R. CREYTENS, *op. cit.*, p. 326.

(19) R. CREYTENS, *op. cit.*, p. 326.

(20) R. CREYTENS, *op. cit.*, p. 327.

(21) Cf. E. HOCEDEZ, "La condamnation de Gilles de Rome", *Rech. T.A.M.*, iv/1932/, p. 49.

end of 1285 or at the beginning of 1286, so that he could be re-admitted to the University of Paris (22).

In both recensions William de la Mare's criticisms are, with a few exceptions, philosophical rather than theological. The only theological criticisms concern the Blessed Trinity (*Correctorium* "Quare" art. 117), and religious poverty and obedience (arts. 71-5). From the third part of *Summa Theologica* only one question, namely that on the Eucharist, is criticized, but here again in relation to the theory of the Unity of form (art. 15).

The *Correctorium* was the beginning of a very fierce and widespread controversy, in spite of the precautions taken by the Franciscan Chapter held at Strasbourg. In fact it was almost impossible to keep secret William's criticisms in the thirteenth century, when at Paris and Oxford both Dominicans and Franciscans had their own chair, their own pupils and their own partisans (23). The Dominicans called *Correctorium fratris Thomae* of the Franciscan Master, *Corruptorium*, since it misrepresented the teaching of Aquinas (24). Further, in replying to the cri-

(22) Cf. *Infra*, p. 92.

(23) One of the Partisans of Aquinas wrote some burlesque verses on the *Correctoria* at the end of the thirteenth century. They have been transcribed by J. P. Müller, O.S.B., *Le Correctorium corruptorii de Jean Quidort de Paris*. Edition critique (Studia Anselmiana, fasc. xii-xiii), Rome, Saler Heider 1941, p. 281. We reproduce here only two strophes:

Corruptum correptorium
corrumpes corrigendo.
Fit auri probatorium
procellas permiscendo.
Succendit sufflatorium
profana plebs ludendo
vitulum configendo
per quintum evangelium
in celum ponendo.

Tollunt in altum dogmatum
figmenta perversorum,
splendet lux divinatorum.
super montes aromatum
Sed nullus cervorum
currat grex onagrorum,
Sequens ventum sophismatum
in scola sompniorum,
Strepuunt nugas fantasmatum

(24) Rambertus dei Primadizzi says in his *Apologeticum Veritatis*: "Visum est Mihi, non quidem propriis viribus inmitendo, nec de mea scientia, sed de veritatis auxilio et praefati doctoris meritis confidendo, ut veritatis particeps esse merear, contra libellum quendam, quem componentes vocant falso nomine *Correctorium*, alii autem verius appellant *Corruptorium*," *Apologeticum Veritatis contra Corruptorium*, ed. J. P. Müller, Città del Vaticano, 1943, (Studi e Testi, 108), p. 3.

ticisms levelled at St Thomas, they chiefly aimed not at elaborating their opinions, but at correcting William's by establishing what was the genuine thought of St Thomas (25). They considered that William de la Mare in his attacks was simply the spokesman of the whole Franciscan School, which, as a body, was actively intent on supporting and advancing these assaults. We have five Dominican replies to the Franciscan *Corruptorium* :

- i. Apologeticus pro S. Thoma;
- ii. Correctorium corruptorii "Circa" (so called because each article starts with the word *circa*);
- iii. Correctorium corruptorii "Quaestione" (so called after the first word);
- iv. Correctorium corruptorii "Quare" (after the first word used by the defendant Aquinas);
- v. Correctorium corruptorii "Sciendum" (because of the frequent use of this word by the author).

These five correctoria reply only to the first recension of William de la Mare, as the Dominicans did not know of his second recension. Creytens has deduced from this unawareness that the Dominican replies "virent le jour avant 1284 ou tout au plus vers cette même époque". On the other hand, as he did not find any allusion to the Dominican replies in the second recension of William de la Mare, he concluded that "la composition des correctoires dominicains et de la seconde rédaction de Guillaume se placent vers 1282, en peu avants ou après et que le dominicains travaillaient à leur réplique pendant que Guillaume avait sur le métier la seconde rédaction de son correctoire" (26).

We shall now discuss the question of authorship, beginning with those *Correctoria* whose authorship is not disputed.

- i. The *Apologeticus pro S. Thoma*, discovered in 1912 by Grabmann in the University Library of Bologna, MS. 1539, begins :

(25) The author of *Correctorium "Sciendum"*, for instance, art. 89, says : "Opponere contra rationes quas dant ad rationes fratris Thome non oporteret, quia intentum in hoc opusculo est magis solvere quam opponere", Cited by B. de Heredia "El Correctorium corruptorii de Guillermo de Torto-Collo", *La Ciencia Tomista*, xviii/1926/, p. 106; and the author of the *Correctorium "Quare"*, says : "In hoc enim opere ad nihil aliud quam ad ea quae adversarii nostri doctoris eximii obijciunt responsio ponitur et ponetur". P. Glorieux, *Le Correctorium "Quare"*, p. 208.

(26) R. CREYTENS, *op. cit.*, pp. 327-8,

“Quia sicut dicit Ecclesiastes, veritas ad eos, qui operantur illam, revertetur.”

Of this treatise, Grabmann says: “Des tous les correctoria corruptorii Fratris Thomae, c’est celui qui représente la physiologie la plus caractéristique et qui traite avec le plus de développements les questions controversées” (27). J. Müller has recently produced a critical edition of this text (28). The *Apologeticus pro S. Thoma* is ascribed to Rambert of Bologna, member of the noble family de’ Primadizzi, in the one known manuscript, Bologna, 1539, which contains 26 leaves. It is incomplete. On folio 1, we read:

“Fratris Roberti Bononiensis, Ordinis Predicatorum, Apologeticus pro S. Thoma” (29).

Rambert de’ Primadizzi was an Italian Dominican. He became Master in theology between 1290-95, and on February, 20, 1303, Pope Boniface VII appointed him Patriarch of Venice, Bishop of Castello (30). According to Mandonnet (31), he was consulted on the question of the poverty of Christ and the Apostles, during the pontificate of John XXII, probably about 1323. But this is not possible, as he died in 1308 at Venice, some time before the feast of St Martin (November 11) (32).

In the *Apologeticus* Rambert shows himself a great enthusiast for Aquinas, and calls him “venerandus frater Thomas”. He accuses his adversaries of malice and envy, since, if their intention were to search for truth and not to slander, they would have found the solution of the difficulty in the main argument,

(27) M. GRABMANN, “Le Correctorium corruptorii du dominicain Johannes Quidort”, *Rev. Néo-Scholast.*, xix/1912/, p. 418.

(28) J. P. MULLER, O.S.B., *Rambert de’ Primadizzi de Bologne. Apologeticum veritatis contra corruptorium*. Edition critique (Studi e Testi, cviii). Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Ap. Vaticana 1943.

(29) M. GRABMANN, “Die Italienische Thomistenschule des XIII, und beginnenden XIV Jahrhunderts”, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, i, p. 348.

(30) P. GLORIEUX, *Repertoire des Maîtres en théologie de Paris*, n. 51, p. 170.

(31) P. MANDONNET, “Premiers travaux...”, *Revue S.P.T.*, vii/1913/, p. 59.

(32) QUETIF-ECHARD, *Script. O.P.*, i, p. 504a.

and thus they would not have condemned an innocent man (33). He concludes his work by appealing to those who considered the teaching of Aquinas as irreconcilable with that of the Fathers of the Church :

“Videant ergo hujus positionis contradictores et impugnatores, quod cum fratrem Thomam impugnare nituntur, cum eo tales et tantos ecclesia doctores quales et quanti fuerunt qui superius sunt nominati Augustinus scilicet et Anselmus, Richardus et Boethius” (34).

ii. *Correctorium corruptorii* “Circa” replies only to the first fifty-seven articles of the *Corruptorium*, namely to those regarding the Prima Pars and Prima Secundae of *Summa Theologica*. It does not give the text of William de la Mare in full, but all the criticisms of the Franciscan Master are included. Müller published for the first time a critical edition of this text (35). From the omission of questions 7, 48, 50, 51 of the *Corruptorium*, as we have it in the “*Quare*”, and from the half finished phrases in questions 30 (cf. edition of “*Circa*”, p. 175), 36 (p. 209), 41 (p. 223), 56 (p. 227), and 57 (p. 279), Müller has concluded that the author “n’a jamais mis la dernière main à son ouvrage” (36). Grabmann was the first to show that the author of this *Correctorium* was John Quidort (37). According to Müller, John became bachelor in theology at Paris between 1282-84 (38). This

(33) “Quod autem dicti hujus impugnatio ex puro rancoris livore procedit, patet ex hoc, quod si ipsi non calumniandi sed inquirende veritatis desiderio moverentur, inspexissent que ille venerandus frater Thomas dicit in solutione principalis questionis, non ipsum sic innocentem condemnarent”. Cited by Grabmann, *Op. cit.*, p. 352.

(34) GRABMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 352.

(35) J.P. MULLER, O.S.B., *Le Correctorium corruptorii de Jean Quidort de Paris*, Edition critique (Studia Anselmiana, Fasc. xii-xiii), Rome, S.A.L.E.R.—Herder, 1941.

(36) J.P. MULLER, *op. cit.*, p. xxxvii. The omissions were inserted later from the *Correctorium* “*Quare*”.

(37) M. GRABMANN, “Le *Correctorium* *Corruptorii* du dominicain Johannes Quidort de Paris”, *Rev. Néo-Scolast.*, xix/1912/, pp. 404-418. Mgr. A. Pelzer has definitely excluded as author of this *Correctorium* the Italian Dominicans, Ricoldo de Montecroce, John of Pisa, John and Philip of Pistoia. Cf. “Pretendus auteurs de repliques au *correctoire* de Guillaume de la Mare”, *Archivum FF, Praed.*, xiii/1943/ pp. 95-100.

(38) J.P. MULLER, *op. cit.*, pp. xxxv-xxxvi,

work is ascribed to him by the Stams Catalogue (39), and is expressly mentioned at the beginning or in the colophon or in the margin, in nine extant manuscripts, and in another one, now lost, but seen by J. De Rubeis (40) in the Bibliotheca Marciana, formerly Convento Domenicano SS. Giovanni e Paolo, Venice, MS. 217 (41). This last manuscript also recorded the date of the work, which, according to De Rubeis, was not later than 1285. The colophon read :

“A Chřisto usque modo-pascha fuit videlicet 7 exeunte martii—1285 / anni fuerunt / ”.

This copy must have been written therefore before Easter (which fell that year on March 25) 1285.

Pelster contested this date on account of the fact that Quidort became master in theology in 1304 (42). However, this argument does not seem convincing, unless it can be shown that only a Master in theology was in a position to reply to an opponent of Aquinas. We may cite a parallel instance in Giles of Lessines, who while still a bachelor in theology, wrote *De unitate formae* against Robert Kilwardby (43).

Whilst Quidort was lecturing on the Sentences (1282-4), accusations were put forward against him. Thereupon the Dominican Master wrote a vindication of himself. This we know from MS. Bordeaux, 147, reading on folio 4v :

“Ibi incipit expositio articulorum qui impositi fuerunt fratri Joh. de Parisiis quando legit Sententias et durat usque ad CCCXXXVIII fol. et ibi incipit correctorium Summe fratris Thome et incipit: In prima parte Summe: terminatur autem CCCXLVIII fol.” (44).

Müller believes that this incident occurred while John Quidort was writing his *Correctorium*, which he probably left in-

(39) MEERSSEMAN, *op. cit.*, n. 34, p. 27.

(40) J. DE RUBEIS, O.P., *Dissertationes de Gestis et Scriptis S. Thomae Aquinatis*, published in the first volume of the Leonine Edition, (t. I, p. cclxix), *Dissertatio XXV*, c. 1.

(41) D.M. BERARDELLI, *Codicum omnium Latinorum et Italicorum qui manuscripti in Bibliotheca SS. Johannis et Pauli Venetiarum apud PP. Praedicatorum asservantur catalogus*, Nuova Raccolta d'Opuscoli scientifici e filologici, xxx/1779/, p. 101.

(42) F. PELSTER, *Skolastik*, iii/1928/, pp. 447-450.

(43) M. DE WULF, *Le traité “De unitate formae” de Gilles de Lessines*, (Les Philosophes Belges, t. 1), Louvain, 1901.

complete in order to write his defence against these accusations (45).

The method adopted in the *Correctorium* "Circa" is, as in the other four *Correctoria*, threefold. Each question begins invariably, except the last seven questions, with the word "Circa", under which the controverted teaching of St Thomas is given, with the exact reference to his works. Then follow the criticisms of William de la Mare, introduced with these phrases: "Contra hoc calumniantur", "Contra quod impingitur", "Contra istud dicit adversarius", "Contra id calumniatur adversarius", "Sed isti dicunt". Thirdly comes the defence of the Dominican Master. Quidort generally accuses the opponents of St Thomas of three mistakes: Sed isti tripliciter errant, quia errant in positione, errant in oppositionibus et errant in responsionibus ad argumenta (p. 4); Sed isti deficient in tribus, scilicet in substantia positionis et in oppositionibus suis et in responsione ad rationem (p. 14); Sed ipsi male ponunt et male opponunt et male respondent (p. 196); Sed adversarius male ponit et male opponit et male respondet ad rationem fr. Thome p. 219); Sed isti et male intelligunt et falsum supponunt et indebite arguunt (p. 227).

When William de la Mare puts the teaching of Aquinas on a level with that condemned by Stephen Tempier in 1277, Quidort rebukes him saying that his accusations clearly proceed from a corrupt heart (46), and in question 49, he uses against him these remarkable words:

"Si autem adversarius vellet impingere contra fratrem Thomam, quia non dicit ita expresse, possumus dicere, quod satis evidenter hoc expressit vel insinuat etiam in illo loco. Tamen consideret adversarius dictum Augustini, 1o De Trinitate, cap. 3: Si quis, inquit, legendo non intelligit et dicat "non bene dictum est, non fidem reprehendit, sed locutionem, quia forte potuit dici planius. Verumtamen nullus hominum ita locutus est ut in omnibus ab omnibus intelligeretur." Multi etiam fratrem Thomam sicut Augustinum, ut dicit ibidem

(44) P. GLORIEUX, "Bertrand de Trilia? ou Jean de Paris" *Rev. T.A.M.* xix/1950/ pp. 469-74.

(45) J.P. MULLER, *op. cit.*, p. xxxvi-xxxvii.

(46) "Quod dicitur, quod ista opinio favere dicitur articulis condemnatis VIo, XIo, et XIIo, patet falsum esse et ex cordis corruptione simpliciter processisse". Muller, *op. cit.*, p. 117; On John of Quidort, see F. Pelster, "Ein anonymes Tractat des Johannes von Paris O.P. über das Formenproblem in Cod. Vat. Lat. 862", *Divus Thomas* (Frib.), xxiv/1946/, pp. 3-28.

opinantur "sensisse quod non sensit", vel forte quia tardiores in acquirendo, vel ex perverso affectu ad personam scribentis" (47).

It is far more difficult to determine the authorship of the other three *Correctoria*. It will be easier if we begin by stating the known facts.

The Stams Catalogue, in addition to the *Correctorium* "Circa", ascribed to John of Paris, attributes one *Correctorium* to each of the following:

- (a) "Frater Hugo, natione Gallicus, magister in theologia, archiepiscopus et cardinalis, scripsit... item contra corruptorem S. Thome" (48).
- (b) "Frater Guillelmus de Mafflet, Anglicus, magister in theologia, scripsit... item contra corruptorem S. Thome" (49).
- (c) "Frater Richardus Clapoil, natione Angelicus, magister in theologia, scripsit... item contra corruptorem S. Thome" (50).

Moreover, Louis of Valadolid, in *Tabula Sancti Jacobi*, says:

"Aliud autem opus quod vocatur correctorium corruptorii et incipit 'Quare' detraxisti sermonibus veritatis, etc., fecit Herveus secundum aliquos, secundum alios Johannes de Torto-Collo, in quo respondetur cuidam impugnanti aliqua dicta Beati Thome" (51).

Finally Durandus de Aurillac (called Durandellus, to be distinguished from Durandus de saint-Porçain), is twice alleged to be the author of a *Correctorium*, namely in MSS., Nat. lat., Paris, 14550, and Paris University, 198 (52).

We shall now discuss the different claims.

iii. *Correctorium* "Questione XII" is extant in only one manuscript, Merton College, Oxford, 267, ff. 2r-55 + 55-88. It is

(47) MULLER, *op. cit.*, p. 254.

(48) G. MEERSSEMAN, O.P., *Laurentii Pignon Catalogi et Chronica*, n. 15.

(49) G. MEERSSEMAN, *op. cit.* n. 19, p. 25.

(50) G. MEERSSEMAN, *op. cit.*, n. 20, p. 25; Clapoil refers to Knapwell. He appears under these different forms: Knapwell, Clapwell, Crapwell, Clapoil, Capella. They all refer to one and the same man.

(51) H.C. SCHEEBEN, O.P., "Die Tabulae Ludwigs von Valladolid", *Archiv. FF. Praed.* i/1931/, p. 223.

(52) Cf. F. EHRLE, S.J., "Der Kampf um die Lehre des hl. Thomas", *Zeitsch.* xxxvii/1913!, p. 290.

incomplete. The text of William de la Mare is given in full, but the replies go only to the first thirty questions (fol. 55). The colophon, *Expliciunt responsiones contra corruptorium*, was, nevertheless, put at the end of the manuscript (fol. 88).

The author is unknown. F. Pelster says that it is almost certainly a work of Thomas Sutton (53). Beltran de Heredia has ascribed it to Richard Knapwell or William of Macclesfield (54), while Glorieux would rather suggest William of Macclesfield or Hugh of Billom, but in conclusion he adds that it would be better to suspend judgement, since the only manuscript we have does not give any clue (55).

The author inveighs bitterly against the inconsistency of his opponents, because they are not ashamed to reprove in Aquinas that very same teaching which they praise rightly in Bonaventure (56).

iv. *The Correctorium "Quare"* contains the whole *Corruptorium* of William de la Mare *ad verbum*, and a strong reply to each of his criticisms. It is extant in twelve manuscripts (57), all more or less complete, and by 1701 had already been printed twelve times (58). A critical edition was published in 1927 by Glorieux (59).

Each article is made up of three parts, although the *Corruptorium* of William de la Mare contained two parts: the text of St Thomas reproduced in full or a summary of it, and its criticisms. The three parts are easily distinguished by the stereotyped opening phrases "Haec dicit Thomas" after the first part;

(53) F. PELSTER, *Scholastik*, iii/1928/, p. 450.

(54) V.B. DE HEREDIA, O.P., "El Corectorium", *La Ciencia Tomista*, xviii/1926/, p. 111.

(55) P. GLORIEUX, "La littérature des correctoires", *Rev. Thomiste*, xi/1928/, p. 83.

(56) "Miror istorum hominum malevolam insipientiam, qui invidia excecati in dictis unius doctoris reprobare non verentur id ipsum, quod in dictis alterius laudant. Nam Bonaventura, quem merito laudant, id ipsum dicit, quod hi calumpniatur in Thoma". Quoted after Ehrle, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

(57) P. GLORIEUX, *La littérature...*, *Rev. Th.* xi/1929/, p. 77.

(58) G. BOFFITO, *Saggio di Bibliografia Egidiana* (Florence, 1911) p. 43.

(59) P. GLORIEUX, *Le premières polémiques thomistes. I: Le Correctorium Corruptorii "Quare"*. Edition critique, (Bibliothèque thomiste, t. ix). Le Saulchoir (Kain). *Rev. T.A.M.*, 1927.

“Haec sunt verba eorum” after the second part; and “Responso ad haec secundum Thomam” as the beginning of the reply.

Glorieux in preparing his critical edition collated the various manuscripts, and discovered that the variations, omissions, and additions imply two different revisions. The first, containing the replies 1-105, is preserved in one MS. Vat. Ottobonianus lat. 184, of late thirteenth century origin, probably of English origin. The second is common to all the other manuscripts. Glorieux also concluded that the first recension itself was executed by two masters: one was responsible for the attacks against *Summa Theologica* from article 1 to 76, the other for those against *Quaestiones disputatae* from article 77 to 105. The latter omitted to go through those thomist theories already defended by the first master, which shows that they were working in collaboration. The refutation of the articles 106 to 118, appearing in the second recension was made by yet another master, who according to Glorieux “aurait eu pour but compléter, unifier et retoucher en quelques détails l'ouvrage primitive” (60). Whereas the name of St Thomas in the first recension appears sporadically as “doctor noster”, “eximius magister”, “frater Thomas”, here he is always referred to as “frater Thomas”. Again, this reviser introduced the stereotyped phrases “haec sunt verba eorum”, etc., and also gave the numbering of the articles.

Having attempted to solve the problem by a consideration of the styles of these three masters, Glorieux goes on to examine their use of quotation. In the first part of the work the author referring to the same doctrine already discussed, says simply: “patet supra articulo proximo” (p. 197, I, 19); “patere potest ex dictis supra in solutione articuli 31 et 32” (p. 206, I, 21); “patet in responsione articuli primi” (p. 223, I, 15). Now the reviser introduced a new phrase, more or less invariable: “...per ea qua dicta sunt in responsionibus ad obiecta contra primam partem, articulo...” (Cf. p. 362, I, 31; p. 363, I, 20; p. 368, I, 14; p. 378, I, 16, etc.). Another modification in the second redaction is the suppression of the reference to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Discussing the delicate and most debated question of the Unity or plurality of forms, the original text had: “Forsan Dominus Cantuariensis vel aliquis cui Dominus istam veritatem lucidius voluerit revelare docebit nos respondere”. In

(60) P. GLORIEUX, *op. cit.*, p. xxxviii.

the revision, the words "*Dominus Cantuariensis vel*" were omitted and the phrase runs: "Forsan docebit nos respondere aliquis cui Dominus istam veritatem lucidius voluerit revelare" (61).

This *Correctorium* was probably the first to be written against William de la Mare. From the allusion to "*Dominus Cantuariensis*" for John Pecham, we can infer that it was written about 1284, when the Archbishop of Canterbury renewed the condemnation of his predecessor, Robert Kilwardby.

In view of the different redactions of the *Correctorium "Quare"*, it is not very easy to trace its authorship. It has always been published under the name of Giles of Rome: *Castigatorium Egidii de Roma in corruptorium librorum sancti Thome de Aquino a quodam emulo depravatorum* (62). The only evidence there is for Giles, is the inscription of MS. Paris, Nat. lat. 14549: fol. 2: "*Correctorium corruptorii Thome ab Egidio de Roma incipiens quare detraxistis.*"

Glorieux (63) has examined this colophon and shown that the underlined words were written later by a different hand.

Originally, he thinks, it was written as follows:

"*Correctorium corruptorii Thome incipiens quare detraxistis.*"

Probably these last three words were erased to allow the insertion of "*Egidio de Roma*", and, as there was no space for the restoration of the remaining words the scribe put them in the margin. The same scribe who altered this account wrote also an incipit, which runs:

"*Continens responsiones et solutiones ad ea que obijciuntur contra doctrinam Thome in diversis libris suis, scilicet in prima parte, etc.*"

Glorieux proceeded to show that the attribution to Giles is inconsistent with internal and external evidence. The first bibliographer who attributes a *Correctorium* to Giles is Ambrosius da Cori, in his *Chronica S. Augustini* (Roma, 1481), who

(61) Cf. GLORIEUX, *op. cit.*, p. 206. The phrase *Dominus Cantuariensis* is found only in three English manuscripts, namely Ottob. Vatic. lat. 114; Vat. lat. 4287; Avignon, 260. John Pecham is attacked directly, says Glorieux, (Cf. Comment les thèses thomistes furent prosriptes à Oxford, *Rev. Th.*, x/1927/, p. 285) in articles 31, 32, 48, 52, 90, 98, 102, indirectly in innumerable passages.

(62) Printed in Strasbourg, in 1509. For the other editions, see P. Glorieux, *Correctorium "Quare"*... p. x.

(63) Cf. GLORIEUX, *op. cit.*, p. xlvi.

was then followed by J. Trithemius (64), and all the historians of his Order. Before Cori we do not find any bibliographer mentioning Giles as the author of a work in defence of Aquinas. In support of Glorieux's view we may add that not only is Giles not author of the *Correctorium*, but also that Robert of Orford considered that there were, in his *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*", arguments which might validly be used against him; for Robert refers his readers in *Dicta contra fratrem Aegidium* (65) to *Responsorium ad Corruptorium* for further arguments against Giles.

The author of the *Correctorium* "*Quare*" was certainly a Dominican. Glorieux has shown this both from external and internal evidence. We have many manuscripts attributing this work to an English Dominican (66). Echard (67) saw two manuscripts, now lost—one at the Dominican Priory of Saint Jacques, Paris, and the other at Venice, which he described in his *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*. The first bore the colophon "Explicit correptorium Anglici contra dicta adversariorum fratris Thomae de Aquino, et est fratris Jacobi de Capella post cuius mortem redeat ad conventum Parisiensem, nam habuit a fratre Johanne de Sancto Laurentio bone memorie"; and in another page "Emendatorium corruptorii, et est cuiusdam Anglici respondentis prout ipse scivit et potuit ad ea que contra dicta solida S. Thomae quidam perverse impugnare nisi ausi sunt". The other, MS. Venice, S. Antonio (68), read: "Correctorium fratris Guillelmi de Mara, de ordine minorum, secundum dicta fratris Thome de Aquino contra correctorium fratris Johannis de Crapuel, ordinis Predicatorum". The English origin of this work is also evident from the sarcastic reference to "Dominus Can-

(64) Cf. J. TRITHEMIUS, *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, 1801, fol. 93v.

(65) Cf. Edition, p. 42*.

(66) I. MS. Mazarine, Paris, 853, fol. 79rb: "Incipiunt tituli prime et secunde partis beati Thome de ordine predicatorum, contra quos obiecerunt multi et obiectionum solutiones per fr. Jo. paris magistrum"; MS., Todi, 141, fol. 115: "Hec est tabula correctorii fratris Guillelmi de Mara, ord. minorum, contra quosdam articulos fr. Thome de Aquino, ordinis predicatorum, cum responsionibus cuiusdam fratris predicatoris; MS. Angelica, 104: "Explicunt tituli questionum... per correptorem fratrum ordinis predicatorum".

(67) QUETIF-ECHARD, *S.O.P.*, I, p. 503.

(68) Cf. TOMMASINI, *Bibliothecae Venetae manuscriptoe*, Utinoe, 1650, p. 9.

tuariensis", which makes us believe that the writer was acquainted with him.

The contents also confirm the Dominican authorship. In the first recension of the work, the author calls Thomas "frater noster", "doctor noster", "magister noster", which phrases indicate that he was a member of the same Order (69). Furthermore, the author shows himself a Dominican by the attitude he adopts in the controversy between that Order and the Franciscans, as to which was the stricter Order (70).

The problem now facing us is to identify this Dominican.

P. Mandonnet put forward Richard Knapwell for the first recension, and William of Macclesfield for the second (71). Card. Ehrle, after considering all the then available evidence on the question, suggested four candidates: first, Robert of Torto-Collo (Orford) and William (Richard) Knapwell; then Hugh of Billom and William of Macclesfield (72). F. Pelster believed that Robert of Orford was the author and that he had incorporated in this work the treatises of his teacher Knapwell and his friend Sutton (73). But in a recent study (74) he has withdrawn this opinion and suggests as author, but without giving any evidence in support of the suggestion, Thomas Sutton, to whom he has already ascribed *Correctorium "Quaestione XII"*.

Beltran de Heredia suggests Richard Knapwell or William of Macclesfield (75). Hufnagel gives Richard Knapwell as the probable author (76). Glorieux in his introduction to the edition of the present *Correctorium* after eliminating the different possible authors, concludes: "le seul nom qui s'affirme et semble presque devoir s'imposer est celui de Richard Clapwell (77). And

(69) Cf. for examples Glorieux, *Correctorium "Quare"*, pp. 35, 36, 104, 111, 157, 208.

(70) Cf. GLORIEUX, *op cit.* pp. 282-323.

(71) P. MANDONNET, *Premiers travaux...*, pp. 55-6.

(72) F. EHRLE, *Der Kampf...*, p. 316.

(73) F. PELSTER, *Scholastik*, iii/1928/, p. 450.

(74) F. PELSTER, *Thomistische Streitschriften...*, *Gregorianum*, xxiv/1943/, pp. 134-52.

(75) V.B. DE HEREDIA, *El Correctorium...*, p. 111.

(76) A. HUFNAGEL, "Studien zur entwicklung des thomistischen Erkenntnisbegriffes im Anschluss an das *Correctorium 'Quare'*," *Beiträge*, xxxi/1935/.

(77) P. GLORIEUX, *Le Correctorium "Quare"*, p. lv.

in his notes on the literature of the *Correctoria* he sums up the whole question in these words: "... des rapprochements fort intéressants... entre les theses du Correctoire aux articles 31 et 32 et les theses de Richard Clapwell condamnées par Pecham en 1286, laissent apercevoir entre elles une telle parenté d'idée, de fond et même de forme, que l'attribution de 'Quare' à ce Dominicain d'Oxford en est rendue presque certain" (78). Having proposed the theory of the two recensions of the *Correctorium*, one would have expected some suggestions with regard to the author of the second recension. But Glorieux has not a word about it.

It seems reasonable to suggest first: (a) that the *Correctorium* "Quare" is the work not of a single man, but written in collaboration; and (b) that the main part was composed by Richard Knapwell. This seems to be in agreement with the evidence at our disposal, especially with the explicit statement of the Stams Tabula and the two manuscripts, Saint Jacques, Paris, and San Antonio, Venice.

(To be concluded)

A. VELLA, O.P.

(78) P. GLORIEUX, *La littérature des correctoires*, p. 82.