

Early Thomistic Controversies*

v. The *Correctorium Sciendum* has been attributed to John of Parma, to Hugh of Billom, to Durandus of Aurillac, called Durandellus (1), and to Robert of Orford.

To begin with we may exclude John of Parma and Hugh of Billom. Indeed this *Correctorium* has been attributed to them on very slight evidence. Dr. Pelster, relying on the ascription of MS. Bologna, Bibl. Comm. A. 913, and on the supposition that this *Correctorium* is of a late date, ascribed it to John of Parma (2). But as we shall see later, it is not as late as Pelster believes. As Glorieux has suggested, it is quite possible that the ascription to "Johannes Parmensis" is due to a confusion with "Johannes Parisiensis", who is the author of the *Correctorium "Circa"* (3). But, even granted the correctness of this ascription, the evidence of one single manuscript, when it is contradicted by stronger evidence (as the following pages will show) is of little value.

From the fact, on the one hand, that Hugh of Billom is credited in the Stams Catalogue with the authorship of a *Correctorium*, and, on the other hand, that in 1913 only five manuscripts and all of French origin were known, Mandonnet concluded that (a) the *Correctorium "Sciendum"* belongs to a Paris Master, and (b) this Master was Hugh of Billom (4).

(*) The first part of this article appeared in Vol. III, No. 2, pp. 57-74.

- (1) He is called Durandellus, as we have seen above, to distinguish him from the other Dominican Master, Durandus de saint Polçaine, who is called by a Bologna manuscript, the "quidam latrunculus Petri de Alvernia", for having attacked some thomist tenets. (Cf. M. DE WULF, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, II, p. 270).
- (2) F. PELSTER, S.J., *Scholastik*, i, (1926), p. 458; *ibid.*, iii, (1928), p. 450. Dr Pelster later abandoned this position. (Cf. *Thomistische Streitschriften gegen Aegidius Romanus: Thomas von Sutton und Robert von Orford*, O.P., *Gregorianum*, xxiv, (1943), p. 157).
- (3) P. GLORIEUX, "La littérature des Correctoires", *Revue Thomiste*, ix, (1938) pp. 69-96.
- (4) P. MANDONNET, "Premières travaux de polémique thomiste", *Revue de sciences philosophique et théologique*, viii (1913), p. 56.

Echard (5) and Card. Ehrle (6) suggested as author of this *Correctorium*, Durandellus. A note to article 8 of the *Correctorium "Sciendum"*, preserved in Bibliothèque Nat. lat., Paris, MS. 14550 (formerly Saint-Victor), which runs:

"Ad declarationem illius articuli, an scilicet in rebus incorruptibilibus sit nisi unum individuum in una specie, illud ad praesens ostendatur in corporalibus, quia in spiritualibus iam ostensum est....."

induced Père Echard to believe that the words "quia in spiritualibus iam ostensum est", refer to article 6 of the *II Sententiarum* of Durandellus. He also claimed that in the same article of the *II Book of the Sentences*, there is a cross reference to the *Correctorium*: "quantum ad corporalia de hoc in *Corruptorio*" (7). But according to Ehrle and Dr. Koch, the remark, "de hoc in corruptorio", is not to be found in the manuscript mentioned by Echard, nor was it met with in four other manuscripts, containing the same work of Durandellus, by Koch (8).

Card. Ehrle, basing himself on the ascription of MS. Troyes. 986. and on the evidence of Peter de Luna's Catalogue (9), attributed this *Correctorium* to Durandellus. M. Grabmann is of the same opinion (10). Yet this view cannot be accepted. We may note at the outset, that MS. Troyes is rather late, in fact it was written in 1478 (11). Further, Durandellus wrote his *Evidentiae contra Durandum*, or his work on the *Sentences*, mentioned by Echard, in 1332-34, whereas we know for certain that the *Cor-*

-
- (5) Cf. QUETIF-ECHARD, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, I, 588b, II, p. 819.
- (6) Cf. F. EHRLE, "Der Kampf um die Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin in den ersten fünfzig Jahren nach seinem Tode", *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, Innsbruck, xxxvii (1913), pp. 289-293.
- (7) ECHARD, *op. cit.*, I, p. 588.
- (8) Cf. J. KOCH, *Durandus de S. Porciano*, Forschungen z. Streit um Thomas v. Aquin zu Begium des 14 Jahrh. *Beiträge*, xxvi (1927), p. 153.
- (9) *Vaticanisches Archiv*, *Collectoriae* 469a. f. 18v: "Item Correptorium corruptorii Durandi, incipit in secundo folio: quod est *causa*, et finis in eodem: non; in penultimo folio incipit: quantum ad ambo, et finit in eodem: *materialiter*". Cited after Ehrle, *op. cit.*, p. 290.
- (10) Cf. M. GRABMANN, "Die werke des hl. Thomas v. Aquin", *Beiträge*, xxij. (1931) p. 133.
- (11) Cf. P. GLORIEUX, *La littérature des correctoires*, p. 82.

rectorium "*Sciendum*" was written before 1309, as it is attested to by two early MSS., Avignon 260, and particularly Bruges 491 (12), which were not written later than this date. Moreover, Dr. Koch has shown that the style of the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*" differs considerably from that of Durandellus. The author of the *Correctorium* begins each article with: "propter... articulum sciendum", "propter hoc quod tangitur... articulo", "ad declarationem illius articuli", or other similar phrases. This is followed by an exposition of St Thomas, after which comes that of William de la Mare, beginning with: "Contra hoc dicunt illi de corruptorio". Moreover, the number of each article is given at the end of each question. On the other hand, Durandellus uses rather a different method of procedure: he invariably begins: "Supra... distinctione est... articulus contra illud quod dicit S. Thomas", which is followed by the exposition of Aquinas's doctrine, after which he writes: "Contra istam conclusionem arguit Durandus". He ends the question by: "hoc enim ostendi potest ostensive etc.", without giving the number of the question. Finally Durandellus is very brief, concise and almost pedantic, while the author of the *Correctorium* is lengthy but very clear, as may be easily seen, concludes Koch, in their different exposition of Aquinas.

Glorieux, who has in preparation a critical edition of this work, concluded from internal and external evidence that the author of the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*" was an English Dominican (13). If this is so, John of Parma, Hugh of Billom, and Durandellus have no claim to the authorship of this *Correctorium*. There remain therefore William of Macclesfield and Robert de Torto-Collo of Orford, both English Dominicans. But so far no evidence has been brought forward in support of William of Macclesfield, except the entry in the Stams Catalogue, crediting him, rather vaguely, with the authorship of one of the *Correctoria*.

The only solid evidence at our disposal is that in favour of Robert of Orford, known also as Torto-Collo. There was already in the beginning of the fifteenth century a tradition ascribing to John of Torto-Collo a *Correctorium* in defence of St Thomas: "Aliud autem opus quod vocatur correctorium corruptorii, et in-

(12) A. DE POORTER, *Catalogue de manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Publique de la ville de Bruges*, Belgium 1934, p. 561.

(13) GLORIEUX, *La littérature*, p. 82.

cipit 'Quare detraxisti sermonibus veritatis,'" wrote Louis de Valladolid (c. 1414) "fecit Hervaeus secundum aliquos, secundum alios Joannes de Torto-Collo, in quo respondetur cuidam impugnanti aliqua dicta B. Thomae" (14). In support of Hervé's authorship there is no evidence forthcoming. As Valladolid inserted the entry just quoted under that of Durandellus, and Hervé was wrongly identified with the latter (15), it is possible that the tradition in the time of Valladolid referred to Durandellus (Durandus of Aurillac) and not to Hervé of Nedellec. Moreover, the conclusion reached by Glorieux about the nationality of the author of the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*", also militates against Hervé, who was a Frenchman. On the other hand, we possess many proofs to corroborate the fifteenth century tradition in favour of Torto-Collo (Orford). John Bale (1552), who is independent of Valladolid, and seems to be himself the basis of Pits. Tanner, Bulaeus, and others, ascribes to Robert of Orford, a "*Protectorium Thomae Aquinatis*" (16). We may assume that he meant by *Protectorium* the *Correctorium*. It is well known that Bale on many occasions gives to a work a name other than its proper title. Stronger evidence than the external criteria is the witness of Robert of Orford himself, who in his works against Giles of Rome and Henry of Ghent declares himself to be the author of a *Responsorium ad Corruntorium*.

i. In MS. Merton College, Oxford, 276, discussing the question: "Utrum frui sit actus intellectus", where the controverted problem of the relationship between intellect and the will comes in, Robert of Orford concludes in favour of the primacy of the former, and after giving three arguments in support of Aquinas' view, he refers his reader to further arguments in the *Correctorium*, saying:

(14) H.C. SCHÆBEN, "Die Tabulae Ludvigs von Valladolid"... *Archivum FP. Pr.* i (1931), p. 257, n. 56a.

(15) BUNDERIUS, *Index*, f. 311: "Herveus Natalis Brito, magister, qui et Duradellus, ordinis Praedicatorum": f. 122: "Durandellus, alias Herveus, ordinis Praedicatorum" Cited by ECHARD, *Script. O.P.* i, p. 336a; and Alva, *Pleytos de los libros*, p. 102, claimed Hervé was the cousin of Durandus de s. Porçaine, and for this reason he was called Durandellus to be distinguished from him. But as Echard (*id. ibid.*) has rightly remarked, Alva's claim is "merum eius mentis somnium, nullo teste, nulla veri specie adinventum".

(16) J. BALAEUS, *Scriptores illustrium maioris Britanniae*, p. 323.

f. 2: "Quia ad hoc idem ostendende sunt alie rationes in *Responsorio ad Corruptorium*, questione 34."

ii. In MS. Vat. lat., 987, discussing the same question, he says:

f. 7vb: "Qualiter intellectus sit altior potentia quam voluntas, satis declaratum est *Responsorio contra Corruptorium*."

In the same manuscript he mentioned several times the same *Responsorium* (17), and in Quodlibet 12, quest. 28, expressly declares to have written it:

f. 122ra: "Sed quia non opponit se (Henricus de Gandavo) contra ea que ego scripsi circa materiam istam in *Responsorio ad Corruptorium* ideo non curavi tractare que sic recitat" (18).

It remains therefore certain that Robert of Orford wrote one of the five replies to the Franciscan Master, William de la Mare; and there are solid reasons to believe that the *Responsorium ad Corruptorium* is the *Correctorium "Sciendum"*, and not the "Quare", as claimed by Ehrle and Pelster.

We have first the evidence of MS. Madrid, Bibl. Nat., VII-H. 5, the colophon of which reads:

f. 46r: (Correctorium) corruptorii fratris Guillermi de Torto Collo, anglici magistri in theologia, ordinis fratrum predicatorum" (19).

This manuscript was known to Card. Ehrle (20) through the catalogue of Marques de Alventos, who thus listed this work:

"Correctorium corporum sancti Thomae per Fr. de Tortocollo, Vol. I, Vitela" (21).

(17) ff. 17b, 18ra, 56ra, 65ra, 72vb. Quoted after Bayerschmidt, "Robert von Colletorto, Verfasser des Correctoriums 'Sciendum'?", *Divus Thomas* (Fr.), xvii (1939), pp. 311-26.

(18) Cited by PELSTER, *Thomistische Streitschriften*, p. 165.

(19) V.B. DE HEREDIA, "El correctorium corruptorii", *La Ciencia Tomista*, xviii (1926), p. 110.

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

(21) M. DE ALVENTOS, *Historia del Colegio viejo de San Bartolomé, major de la célebre Universidad de Salamanca*, Madrid 1770, i, p. 316.

and through the catalogue of the manuscripts of the Biblioteca Nacional, in which the title runs :

“Correctorium correctorii Thomae Aquinatis per fratrem Guillelmum de Torto-Collo, anglicum. magistrum in theologia ordinis praedicatorum. Codex pervetustus, 4o. Videtur auctor fuisse coevus Angelico Doctore” (22).

But Card. Ehrle, believing that this text was lost, and that it contained the *Correctorium* “Quare”, wrongly ascribed this work to Robert of Torto-Collo. It was found and identified as the *Correctorium* “*Sciendum*” by Beltran de Heredia, O.P., in 1926 (23). He dated it as late thirteenth century or perhaps beginning of the fourteenth, and decided that the colophon was written by the same scribe who wrote the whole work.

The right way to clarify the issue in this complicated question, is that suggested by Dr. Pelster (24), namely a comparison of the *Correctorium* and a work certainly pertaining to Robert of Orford. This has been undertaken by P. Bayerschmidt, who through a careful examination of Robert’s *Contra dicta Henrici de Gandavo* (MS. Vat. lat. 987) and the *Correctorium* “*Sciendum*” (MS. Staatsbibliothek, Berlin [theol. fol. 224], 468), came to the conclusion that the *Sciendum* belongs to Robert of Orford (25). He has found substantial identity between the two works in style, terminology and doctrinal content. We shall reproduce here some of the proofs brought forward by Bayerschmidt, adding some others from MS. Merton as regards the style, not however as regards the content, as none of the questions of the *Correctorium* “*Sciendum*” partially transcribed, corresponds to the Merton manuscript.

(a) The peculiarities of style are mentioned first, because they have less weight. Even a cursory examination makes it clear that in both works, we meet with typical similarity of style and terminology.

(22) Quoted after V.B. DE HEREDIA, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

(23) Cf. V.B. DE HEREDIA, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

(24) Cf. F. PELSTER, *Scholastik*, i (1926), p. 458.

(25) Cf. PAUL VON BAYERSCHMIDT, “Robert von Colletorto, Verfasser des *Correctoriums Sciendum?*”, *Divus Thomas*, (Fr.), xvii, (1939), pp. 311-326.

i. One of the peculiarities is the word *Sciendum*, which on account of its frequency Card. Ehrle has used to distinguish this *Correctorium* from the others, and which occurs constantly in MSS. Merton and Vatican. Compare :

Contra dicta Aegidii, (MS. Merton, 276), ff. 27ra, 30ra, 31rb, 38rb, 41va, 50ra, 50vb.

Contra dicta Henrici, (MS. Vat. lat. 987), ff. 1va, 1vb, 3rb, 22rb, 23ra, 33vb.

ii. Another peculiarity is the frequent use of the word *adducere*. Compare :

Correctorium "Sciendum", MS. Berlin, 468 : "alia argumenta oportuit adduxisse" (f. 183ra); "et ideo oportet alias rationes adduxisse ad eius improbationem" (f. 183vb); "unde alia argumenta oportet hic adduxisse" (f. 186ra).

Contra dicta Aegidii, MS. Merton, 276 : "Non sic est de exemplo quod frater Egidius adducit" (f. 44ra); "Sed Magister potest adduci ad oppositum" (f. 45rb); "Exemplum quod adducit de luce et colore in dyafano" (f. 45rb); "aliqua adducit ad eam probandam que videntur habere calumpniam" (f. 47rb).

Contra dicta Henrici, MS. Vat. lat. 987 : "quam adducit Magister Henricus" (f. 22 va); "nec rationem aliquam pro se adduxerit" (f. 25 vb).

iii. The *Correctorium "Sciendum"* is similar to the other works of Robert in that it is written in a very objective style and the main intention of the author is the defence of St Thomas. Compare :

Correctorium "Sciendum", MS. Madrid, VII-H. 5, art. 89 :

"Opponere contra rationes quae dant ad rationes fratris Thomae non oporteret, quia principale intentum in hoc opusculo est magis solvere quam opponere";

and again art. 109, he says :

"Non possunt negare quia quamquam sit aliquid sane dictum potest bene et male intelligi ab alio intelligente. Et quod concedunt hoc esse verum in alio modo intelligendi sufficit michi" (26).

In his *Contra dicta Aegidii*, MS. Merton, 276, Robert sometimes does not give the opinion of the Austin Bachelor, and when it is given it is sometimes left unrefuted. Thus he says :

(26) Quoted after V.B. DE HEREDIA, *op. cit.*, pp. 106, 110.

"Quod postea arguit (Aegidius) contra semetipsum est et argumento suo correspondet. De hoc non est michi curandum nisi quod errorem dicit" (f. 50 vb).

Much more important is the agreement in content between Robert's *Contra dicta Henrici* and the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*". Bayerschmidt (27) has given eight passages to show that in his work against Henry of Ghent Robert refers to the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*", and not to the "*Quare*".

Comparison of direct references :

(a) *Contra dicta Henrici* (MS. Vat. lat. 987),

fol. 17vb: "Angelis datum est gratia et gloria secundum capacitatem naturalem. Rationes de hoc invenies Prima Parte, questione 316, *Responsorii ad Correctorium*, questione 21".

Now William de la Mare (article xxi) argues that Aquinas's teaching that grace and glory are given to angels according to their natural capacity is slightly or not at all different (*parum vel nihil differt*) from the proposition condemned by William of Auvergne in 1241: "quod angeli qui habuerunt meliora naturalia de necessitate habuerunt maiorem gratiam et gloriam" (28). The author of the *Correctorium* "*Quare*" does not expound St Thomas's teaching on this particular point, whereas the author of "*Sciendum*", in a very clear and precise way proposes many arguments. We adduce here one or two of them.

Correctorium "*Sciendum*" (MS. Berlin, 468).

fol. 140ra: "...gratia datur angelis secundum capacitatem naturalem. Motus enim forma est. Forma autem non recipitur nisi in materia disposita. Secundum ergo quod materia est melius disposita, perfectius recipetur in ea ipsa forma. Similiter motio motoris est motus ipsius mobilis. Motus autem recipit motum secundum motum ipsius mobilis. Unde facilius movetur corpus circulariter quam angulariter. Secundum ergo maiorem dispositionem vel minorem, hoc est secundum connatum maiorem et minorem plus vel minus recipit et gratia. Cum autem angeli superiores, qui steterunt, secundum maiorem connatum conversi sunt in Deum... sequitur, quod angeli superiores in natura plus data est gratia et gloria".

(27) Cf. P. BAYERSCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, pp. 313-20.

(28) Cf. P. GLORIEUX, *Le Correctorium* "*Quare*" pp. 93-95.

(b) *Contra dicta Henrici* (MS. vat. lat. 987),

fol. 17vb: "Item Gregorius dicit, quod in illa celesti patria licet quedam data sunt excellentius, nihil tamen possidetur singulariter. De hoc vide in *Responsorio ad Corruptorium*, questione 11".

Here again the corresponding passage of St Gregory the Great is found, not in the *Correctorium* "Quare", but in "*Sciendum*".

Correctorium "*Sciendum*" (MS. Berlin, 468) "Item quod angeli sint diversarum specierum patet per Gregorium, 33 *Moralium* in fine, qui dicit quod lucifer fuit supremus et hic loquendo de puris naturalibus, quia non solum est ordo in angelis accidentalibus, sed etiam secundum gradus substantiales nec talis forma substantialis suscipit magis et minus".

(c) *Contra Henricum*, f. 17vb :

"Sed tunc non est anima pars speciei nec omnes anime essent unius speciei, sed essent tot species quot anime, sicut in angelis: de hoc quere in *Responsorio ad Corruptorium*, questione 12".

Here Robert refers to article 12 of the *Corruptorium*, which gives St Thomas's teaching that in immaterial things genus and difference are formed according as these things can be considered as to be determined or as already determined (29). In *Contra dicta Henrici*, says Bayerschmidt, Robert maintains that the *genus* is derived from form, and mentions for the sake of comparison, the soul as the essential form of man. In the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*" the same teaching is contained :

"Quod autem in compositis ex materia et forma genus sumatur ab uno et differentia ab alio et tamen sunt una natura, patet sic: genus sumitur a materia, sed non a materia partis... et sic in diffinitione sit partis, quia ibi exprimitur altera pars".

(d) *Contra Henricum*, f. 18ra :

"Constat quod habitus virtuosi recipiunt magis et minus secundum quod recipiuntur in subiecto. Tamen per

(29) ST THOMAS, *Summa*, I, q. lxxv, a 7.

comparationem ad obiectum et secundum speciem nequaquam, quod diffuse patet in *Responsorio ad Corruptorium*, questione 61”.

The teaching of habits and their increase is dealt with at length only in the *Correctorium* “*Sciendum*” :

f. 165vb: “Ideo duplíciter potest intelligi perfectio in habitibus sive in formis et per consequens duplex augmentatio. Si consideretur secundum quod participatur a subiecto, vel igitur dat speciem subiecto sicut forma substantialis, non autem accidentalís. Tamen esse speciei in quodam consistit indivisibili, quia unica differentia adveniens generi, constituit speciem et unica remota tollitur species. Et ideo nulla forma secundum quod habitus suscipit magis et minus... et ideo secundum formam substantialem, que dat speciem mateeie, non dicitur aliquid magis et minus... Subiectum ergo magis participare forme est magis reduci in actum illius forme, quia forma et actus sunt idem. Subiectum autem magis reduci in actum forme illius, hoc est ipsum magis subici illi forme. Et quia forme debetur agere et forme magis vincenti superat suum susceptibile, magis debetur agere. Et ita sequitur intentionem actus forme, secundum quod subiectum magis in actum illius reducitur. Ista autem intentio forme est ab agente. Quia sicut ex actione agentis est, ut habeat formam et eam participat, quod perfectius eum participet, dummodo ratio illius forme non consistit in indivisibili. Huius autem forma est caritas et anime virtutes, et ideo dicto modo augentur. Hoc est conveniens ratio augmenti in omni forma, quae augetur secundum quod habitus eius perfectio consideratur ex esse in subiecto”.

Here again, therefore, Robert is referring to article 61 of the *Correctorium* “*Sciendum*”, since the author of the *Correctorium* “*Quare*” treats the question in a less speculative manner; he has only this short passage on the whole problem :

“Agens enim in naturalibus intendit reducere patiens quod est in potentia suae similitudinis, quantum potest... et hoc secundum quod potentia subiecta actui quae quidem quantum de se est, ad multa se habens magis ac minus terminatur ab actu illo” (30).

(30) GLORIEUX, *Correctorium* “*Quare*”, p. 249.

Bayerschmidt gives the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*" three other passages to whose doctrine Robert of Orford refers in the "Vatican Manuscript" (31).

The following parallel passages on the theory of the Unity of Form from MS. Vat. lat. 987 and MS. Berlin, 468, show also an agreement in doctrine so close as to justify the conclusion that they are the work of one author.

MS. Vat. lat. 987

f. 19ra: "In separatione anime est generatio nove forme, non de novo inducte, sed forme partis, que vadit ad actum separata forma totius et est corruptio, quia forma partis amittit esse actu, quod habebat a forma totius, scilicet ab anima".

f. 32rb: "Nec pono aliam formam fuisse introductam in morte Christi. Absit enim, ut hoc ponerem, sed eandem formam partis numero remanere, sed sub alio esse in Christo vivo et mortuo".

f. 92: "forma corporalis fuit forma partis".

MS. Berlin, 468

f. 149rb: "Non introducitur nova forma totius, sed remoto esse totius forma partis... fit forma totius, quia corpus quod fuit pars animalis, separata anima, quoddam totum in se est ab alia forma quam ab anima".

f. 161rb-va: "Cum vero obiciunt contra responsiones, quas arguunt non oportet solveze, non enim dico quod alia succedit, sed quod eadem forma partis, que prius erat in habitu, iam est actu, remota forma totius. Et sic debet intelligi quod corruptio illius est generatio alterius. Corruptio enim forme totius est generatio forme partis... non enim pono aliam formam induci ut dictum est, sed formam partis resultare sicut forte est in partibus annulosis".

To sum up: we have excluded as author of the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*", John of Parma, suggested by Dr. Pelster; Hugh of Billom, suggested by Mandonnet; Durandellus, suggested by Echard, Card. Ehrle, and Grabmann; Macclesfield, accredited as author of a *Correctorium* only by the Stams Catalogue; and Hervé of Nedellec, mentioned by Valladolid, as probable author of the *Correctorium* "*Quare*". On the other hand, in favour of Robert of Orford's authorship, besides the witness of Robert himself, and the evidence of MS. Madrid, we have established important unities of style and content between this treatise and the other writings of the Dominican Master, and we have excluded Ehrle's and Pelster's supposition, that Orford is the author of the *Correctorium* "*Quare*". It remains therefore reasonably cer-

(31) BAYERSCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, pp. 316-20.

tain that Robert of Orford is the author of the *Correctorium "Sciendum"*.

(b) Other Controversial Writings

Having considered the counter attacks of the Dominicans to defend St Thomas's teaching in what we have styled "the literature of the *Correctoria*", we pass now to examine some other controversial writings written by the early followers of thomism.

In the Dominican General Chapter held in Paris in 1286, the friars were strongly recommended to give effective support to the teaching of the venerable master, friar Thomas Aquinas :

"Districtius iniungimus et mandamus, ut fratres omnes et singuli prout sciunt et possunt, efficacem dent operam ac doctrinam venerabilis magistri Thomae de Aquino, recolendae memoriae, promovendam et saltem ut est opinio defendendam" (32).

As a result of this strong recommendation many treatises were written in defence of the Dominican Master.

In addition to the problem of the Unity of Form, several other thomist tenets, such as the possibility of an eternal creation, the immediate vision of God, the distinction between essence and existence, and the relation of the faculties in the essence of the soul, were attacked by different masters. Against those, says the author of *Brevissima Chronica* :

"Suscitavit Dominus spiritum gloriosorum doctorum Ordinis Praedicatorum, qui doctrinam impugnatam gloriosius defensarent, fundarent et declararent" (33).

Each Province produced prominent masters, who distin-

(32) Ed. B.M. REICHART, *Acta Capitulum Generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum*, (Monumenta Ord. Praed. Historica, Romae, 1899), iii, p. 235.

(33) Ed. MARTENE-DURAND, O.S.B., *Veterum Scriptorum Amplissima Collectio*, Paris, 1729, Vol. VI, p. 370.

guished themselves in the cause of thomism (34). We shall limit ourselves here to naming a few Oxford Dominicans. The part taken by the Dominican Provincial, William of Hothum, and Richard Knapwell against the Archbishop of Canterbury, John Pecham, has already been dealt with in connection with the condemnation at Oxford (35).

Among the earliest English Thomists we find William of Macclesfield. He has been divided by Pits (36) into three different persons, namely Maclefeldus (1304), Messeleclus (1304), and Manusfeldus (1320). The identification of these names has been established by Echard (37). Macclesfield is said to have studied in Paris, and became bachelor there (38). But in support of the latter view there is no evidence forthcoming. Between 1284-86 he studied for the mastership in theology at Oxford, and according to Dr. Little he became Regent Master of the Dominican studies here in 1299-30 (39). He was created Cardinal bishop of Santa Sabina on December 1303 by Pope Benedict XI. But when the news of his elevation reached England, he was already dead (40). The early Dominican Catalogues ascribe to him three

(34) On the part taken by Italian Dominicans, see T. TAURISANO, O.P., *Discepoli e Biografi di S. Tommaso*, S. Tommaso d'Aquino, (Miscellanea Storico-Artistica, Roma, 1924), pp. 111-186; M. GRABMANN "La scuola tomistica Italiana nel secolo XIII e principio del XIV secolo": *Rivista di Filosofia-Neoscolastica*, xv, (1923), p. 145sq.; 2nd edition *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, i, (1926), pp. 332-391.

On Spanish Dominicans, see Fr. FHRLE, S.J., "Arnaldo di Villanova ed i Thomatiste", *Gregorianum*, i, (1920), pp. 475-501.

On French Dominicans see GLORIEUX's Bibliographies in *Repertoire des Maitres en Theologie de Paris* Paris 1933.

On German Dominicans, see M. GRABMANN, "Forschungen zur ältesten Deutschen Thomisenschule des Dominicaner ordens", *Mitt. Geist.*, i, (1926), p. 392-431.

(35) See A. VELLA, "The intellectual revolution of the thirteenth century", *The Classical Journal*, Malta, 1950, No. IV, pp. 62-65.

(36) J. PITS, *De rebus Anglicis*, pp. 388, 389, 408.

(37) QUETIF-ECHARD, *Scriptores O.P.*, i, p. 493.

(38) Cf. P. GLORIEUX, "Le manuscrit d'Assise. Bibl. Comm., Date et mode de composition", *Rech. T.A.M.*, viii (1936), p. 289.

(39) LITTLE-PELSTER, *Oxford Theology and Theologians*, Oxford (1934), p. 272.

(40) "Antequam rumor ad eum perveniret, infirmatus et ad extremam horam perductus, (Cantuariae) in Domino obdormivit" (TRIVET, *Annales*, p. 404).

works: "Contra Dicta Henrici de Gondavo quibus impugnat Thomam; item contra corruptorem Thome; item questiones de angelis" (41). Philip Wolf in his *Bibliotheca Dominicana*, as quoted by J. Bale, adds: "Super Sententias; contra Godfridum Brabantinum; quodlibeta" (42). Possible references to his commentary on the *Sentences* appear in MS. Merton College, Oxford, 103, fol. 219; and Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, Ms. 300, fol. 62 (43). By *Contra corruptorem Thome* is probably meant the second recension of the Correctorium "Quare". It is evident that *Contra Henricum* and *Contra Godfridum Brabantinum* (de Fontaines) were controversial writings in defence of Aquinas' teaching. These two works, as well as the *Questiones de angelis* and the *Quodlibeta*, had not so far been identified.

Undoubtedly one of the stoutest defenders of Thomism among the Oxford group was Thomas Sutton. Sutton was probably a fellow of Merton College, Oxford (44). He became Regent-Master of the Dominican School at Oxford not later than 1298-99. His works are mostly controversial, directed against the great masters of the period, namely Henry of Ghent and William de la Mare—representatives of the older tradition—as well as against the newly-founded Franciscan School led by John Duns Scotus. The ancient list of Dominican writers, the *Stams Catalogue* attributes to him:

"Super prædicamenta; super sex principia; item complevit scriptum Thomae super perihieremeneias (45); item super priora; item de unitate formarum; item de relatione; item summam theologiae; item super psalterium" (46).

-
- (41) Ed. MEERSSEMANN, *Catalogus Pignon...*, n. 19, p. 25; n. 18, p. 60; n. 18, p. 72.
- (42) J. BALE, *Index...*, p. 502.
- (43) Cf. L. MEJER, "Wilhelm von Nottingham (+1336); ein Zeuge für die Entwicklung der distinctio formalis der Universität Oxford", *Philosophia Pærennis* (Festgabe J. Geyer), i, p. 256.
- (44) "Quodlibeta m. Thome Sutton, socii de Merton, postmodum ordinis prædicatorum" (F. Powicke, *The Medieval Books of Merton College*, p. 166).
- (45) The present supplement published in the *Opera Omnia* of St Thomas does not belong to Sutton, but to Card. Cajetan.
- (46) MEERSSEMANN, *Catalogus Pignon...*, n. 16, p. 60.

Besides *De unitate formarum* mentioned by the Stams Catalogue (47), he compiled two other treatises on this question, namely *Contra pluralitatem formarum*, written about 1290 against Henry of Ghent (48), and *De productione formae substantialis*, written also about 1290: this has been edited but not yet published by Dr. Callus (49). The part played by Sutton at Oxford on this problem was of such importance that William of Ockham replies to him by a special treatise: "De pluritate formarum contra Suttonum, librum unum" (50).

Sutton also completed the Commentary of Aquinas on *De Generatione et Corruptione* of Aristotle, preserved at Merton College, Oxford, MS. 274, ff. 92-107, reading on folio, 107:

"Hic terminatur expositio fratris Thome et incipit expositio fratris Thome de Sutthonia" (51).

Between 1284-87 Sutton composed four Quodlibets, directed mainly against Henry of Ghent, whose opinions he refers to as "opinio cuiusdam relicta in scriptis" (Quodl. I, 3), "propter opinionem quamdam in scriptis relictam de novo" (Quodl. I, 16) (52). Dr. Sharp, who has recently given a short survey of Sutton's thomistic psychology, metaphysics, angelology, and natural theology pointed out that he consistently refers to Henry of Ghent in his treatment of the principle of individuation, the distinction between essence and existence, the function of the species in cognition, the presence of potentiality in God, the

(47) Preserved at Vienna, MS. State library, 1536, ff. 220-225; Prague MS. Univ. libr. III, E. 6. 122v-132v; Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibl. 322, f. 11-17.

(48) Cf. E. GILSON, *La Philosophie au Moyen Age*, Paris, 1945, p. 542.

(49) Cf. Unpublished Dissertation for D. Phil., Oxford, 1934.

(50) WADDING, *Scriptores Ord. Minorum*, p. 107a.

(51) F. EHRLE, S.J., "Thomas de Sutton, sein Leben, seine Quodlibet und seine Quaestiones disputatae" (Festschrift George von Hertling zum 70. Geburtstag), München 1913, p. 431.

(52) F. EHRLE, *op. cit.*, pp. 439-40; Schmaus published T. Sutton's *Quodlibets* I qq. 2, 4, 5, 7; III, q. 9; IV, qq. 1-4, *Beiträge*, xxix (1930), pp. 6-106; F. Pelster published Quodl. III, qq. 8, 9, 26, (Opuscula et Textus, Fasc. V, Monasterii 1928).

possibility of *scientia practica* in God, and the relation of the divine ideas to individuals (53). The *Correctorium* "Quaestione XII" against William de la Mare, which we have discussed above, was probably written by him also. F. Pelster has recently attributed to him two more works, the *Correctorium* "Quare" (54) and *Impugnaciones contra fratrem Aegidium contradicentem Thomae* (55). These attributions are hardly satisfactory, as we shall try to illustrate in some detail in one of our next articles. We have already given reasons for attributing the main part of the *Correctorium* "Quare" to Knapwell.

About 1311 Sutton crossed swords with the celebrated Franciscan, John Duns Scotus, against whom he wrote a defensive work in support of Aquinas on the first and fourth book of the *Sentences*. The former was usually ascribed to the English Dominican, Thomas Jorz. It was restored to Sutton by Pelster (56). He and Schmaus have brought forward further proofs in support of its authorship. Schmaus studied the divergences between Aquinas and Scotus on the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, as given by Sutton, and showed their respective position in regard to the two great currents of Augustinianism and Aristotelianism (57). The fourth book of the *Sentences* of Sutton against Duns Scotus is preserved in Codex Rossianus lat. IX, 121, ff. 132v-160v. Pelster has made available the title of each question (58).

One of the first followers of Duns Scotus was the English Franciscan, Robert Cowton (fl. 1340), whose *Abbreviationes super Sententias* (Scoti) are quoted by Wycliffé in his *De Bene-*

-
- (53) D.E. SHARP, "Thomas of Sutton", *Rev. Néo-Scolast. Hommage à Monsieur M. de Wulff*, xxxvi (1934), pp. 32-54; *ibid.*, xxxvii (1934), pp. 88-104; 219-33.
- (54) F. PELSTER, "Thomas v. Sutton und das *Correctorium* "Quare detraxisti", in *Melanges A. Pelzer*, Louvain, (1947), pp. 441-466.
- (55) F. PELSTER, *Thomistische Streitschriften*, pp. 136-152.
- (56) F. PELSTER, "Thomas von Sutton, ein Oxforder Verteidiger der thomistischen Lehre", *Zeitschrift*, xlvi (1922), pp. 229-31; *Scholastik*, ii (1927), p. 127.
- (57) M. SCHMAUS, "Der über propugnatorius des Thomas Anglicus und die Lehrunterschiede Zwischen Thomas von Aquin und Duns Scotus", *Beiträge*, xxix (1930).
- (58) F. PELSTER, *Thomas von Sutton*, pp. 400-1,

dicta Incarnatione. (59). He wrote also a commentary on the four books of the *Sentences*, in which he attacked Aquinas, accusing him of contradicting himself very often, and defended the teaching of his Franciscan Master. In MS. Vat. Ottob. 1126, containing these *Sentences*, Cowton says for instance :

f. 155va. "respondebo... primo per rationem propter aliquas instantias factas contra istam rationem Subtilis Doctoris" (60).

Thomas Sutton replied to Cowton's criticisms in the first three books of the *Sentences*, explaining and reconciling the texts wherever the Friars Minor "imponunt communi doctori, quantum ad hoc quod contradicat sibi ipsi" (61), and further in his *Quaestiones Disputatae*, preserved at Erfurt, MS. Amplon, 369, he derides the title of Subtle Doctor given by Cowton to Duns Scotus, saying :

f. 29va: "Patet igitur quod totum dictum istorum, qui tam subtiliter putant nova invenire, non est nisi fictitium puerile" (62).

According to Père Mandonnet (63), Thomas Sutton probably is also the author of *Concordantia dictorum Thomae*. Because Sutton speaks in the first person this treatise has wrongly been assumed to be a work of Aquinas himself. It is published amongst *Opuscula Spuria* of St Thomas (64).

Another English Dominican Master who wielded a weighty, incisive, and effective pen when he thought that thomist principles should be asserted or thomist tenets defended, was Robert of Orford, who as we have already seen, wrote the *Correctorium*

(59) *Johannis Wycliffe De Benedicta Incarnatione*, ed. E. Harris, Wyclif Society 1886, p. 57.

(60) Cited by Pelster, *op. cit.*, p. 393.

(61) MS. Magdalen College, Oxford, 99, f. 180va. This same text is preserved in the Vatican, Rossianus lat. IX, 121, ff. 1r-132v; and Todi, Municipal library, 12. The Prologue and the titles of these manuscripts are edited by Pelster, *op. cit.*, pp. 395-400.

(62) Cited by Pelster, *op. cit.*, p. 393.

(63) P. MANDONNET, "Premiers travaux de polémique thomiste", *Rev. S.P.T.*, vii, (1913), p. 255; F. Pelster concluded its authenticity in *Gregorianum*, iv, (1923), pp. 72-105.

(64) *S. Thomae Aquinatis opuscula omnia genuina necnon spuria melioris notae debito ordine collecta*, cura et studio P. Mandonnet, Paris 1927, V. pp. 444-74.

"*Sciendum*". Robert has been styled by the bibliographers "acer-
rimus defensor doctrinae Angelici Doctoris" (65). His main works
were directed against two famous Paris Masters, Henry of Ghent
and Giles of Rome—in Bulaeus's words "tunc temporis celeberrimi
in Academia professores" (66). With these treatises Robert
contributed greatly to the victory of Thomism, and as F'eret has
rightly pointed out, "son ardeur le mettait au premier rang des
d'efenseurs" (67).

Henry of Ghent was one of the Parisian Masters who were
consulted by Stephen Tempier in the condemnation of March
7, 1277 (68). When he was still Bachelor of Arts he commented
on certain Aristotelian books (69), but later he changed his views,
and looked askance at the New Learning, as destructive of
dogma, and not in harmony with St Augustine. His chief theolog-
ical work is the fifteen *Quodlibets* (70) disputed at Paris between
1276 and 1291-2 (71). In these *Quodlibets* he attacked various
thomist tenets, and made a point, whenever he discussed one of
the condemned articles, of recalling its condemnation (72).

In his *Contra dicta Henrici de Gandavo*, Robert of Orford

- (65) Cf. A. ALTAMURA, *Bibliotheca Dominicana*, p. 69; A. Lusitanus, *Bibliotheca Fratrum Praedicatorum*, p. 216.
- (66) G. E. BULEAUS, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis*, iii, p. 709.
- (67) P. FERET, *La faculté de théologie de Paris*, ii, p. 167.
- (68) *Quodlibet* II, q. 9 (ed. Venetiis 1613, p. 60v, in relation to proposition 204, of the syllabus of 1277: "angelum esse in loco per suam actionem", he says: "in hoc enim concordabant omnes magistri Theologiae congregati super hoc, quorum ego eram unus, unanimiter concedentes...")
- (69) Cf. JEAN PAULUS, *Henri de Gand*, Essai sur les tendances de sa Métaphysique, Paris 1938, pp. xviii-xix.
- (70) "Excellit quidem in suis *Quodlibetis* Henricus a Gandavo. Excellit S. Thomas praesertim in *Secunda-Secundae*", said the mystic Johannes Gerson (1363-1429). Quoted after Lajard, *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, xx, p. 203.
- (71) Cf. P. GLORIEUX, *La littérature quodlibétique*, i, pp. 176-199.
- (72) *Quodl.* ii, q. 8, p. 55v. concerning the principle of individuation: "inter erroneos articulos nuper ab Episcopo Parisiensi damnatos est illa positio..." and *Quodl.* ii, q. 9, p. 59v: "Si enim sic esset in situ, vel in loco ipsa substantia eius per naturalem dependentiam ad situm et locum: esset ratio essendi ipsum in loco, quod erroneum est: secundum quod bene dicit unus articulus ab Episcopo damnatus talis: Quod substantiae separatae nusquam sunt secundum substantiam, error est, si intelligatur ita, quod substantia non sit in loco".

replied to fourteen of these Quodlibets. Three important questions of these replies, preserved at the Vatican, MS. Vat. lat. 987, have been printed; they are: the question concerning the distinction between *esse* and *essentia* by Grabmann (73); the question relating to the oneness of "esse" in Christ by Hocedez (74); and a third one on original sin by Martin (75).

Giles of Rome, who according to the testimony of William Tocco (76) was for three years a pupil of St Thomas, was present at the condemnation of 1277, still reading for the Mastership in theology. Whilst bachelor he had advanced in his lectures and in his writings some thomist tenets which did not please the Bishop of Paris, Stephen Tempier, and the masters of the University of Paris. Giles consequently was asked to withdraw these propositions, but he not only refused to acquiesce in this demand, but the more strongly maintained them (77). For this reason Giles was compelled to leave the University. Afterwards, however, the Austin Friar, to obtain the chair of Theology in the University of Paris, changed his views and became an opponent of Aquinas. His strongest criticisms are to be found in his Commentary on the first Book of the *Sentences*. Against these views Robert of Orford wrote his *Reprobationes dictorum fratris Aegidii in I Sententiarum*. The name *reprobationes* stands for a refutation set up in literary form to restore the sound teaching of Aquinas, twisted by Giles of Rome. A copy of this treatise is pre-

-
- (73) Cf. M. GRABMANN, *Doctrina S. Thomae de distinctione reali inter essentiam et esse ex documentis ineditis saeculi XIII*, *Acta Hebdomadae Thomisticae*, 1924, p. 157-9.
- (74) E. HOCEDEZ, S.J., *Quaestio de unico esse in Christo* (Textus et documenta, Univ. Gregoriana, Series Theologica, 14), 1933, pp. 95-100).
- (75) Cf. R. MARTIN, O.P., *La controverse sur le Péché Originel au début du XIV^e siècle* (Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, X, 1930, pp. 13-19).
- (76) *Acta Sanctorum*, die 7 Martii, c. VII, n. 41, p. 670b: "Quidam Magister Eremitarum Frater Aegidius, qui postmodum fuit Archiepiscopus Bituricensis, qui tredecim (?) annis istum Magistrum audiverat". The *tredecim* is probably a mistake for *tribus*, i.e. during the three years of the second regency of Aquinas in Paris.
- (77) Cf. H. DENIFLE, O.P., *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, I, n. 522.

served in Merton College, Oxford, MS. 276 (78). Up to the XVII Distinction Robert of Orford found 64 points of difference between Aquinas and Giles. He not only refuted the latter when St Thomas was directly attacked, but also when a different interpretation is given, such as in the problem: "Whether the *quaestio quid est* presupposes the *quaestio quia est*", in which thesis Giles claims to be interpreting Aristotle and St Augustine.

It would seem that the Dominican Masters' defensive works had a great influence on Giles of Rome since later the Austin Master, especially in his Commentary on the III Book of the *Sentences*, practically agreed with the Angelic Doctor on every debatable question. E. Richeldi, who made a special study on this book, has shown that the references made by Giles in this work, under *scripta communia dicta communia, ut communiter dicitur*, are always to the teaching of St Thomas, and whole passages are cited from Aquinas (79).

A. VELLA.

(78) We have transcribed this early XIV century manuscript, and we hope to publish it when any opportunity is offered to us.

(79) Cf. E. RICHELDI, *La Cristologia di Egidio Romano*, (Modena, Tip. Pontificia Arcivescovile, 1938).