



HAL
open science

Critically Editing a So-Called ‘ Sentences Commentary’

Monica Brinzei, Chris Schabel

► **To cite this version:**

Monica Brinzei, Chris Schabel. Critically Editing a So-Called ‘ Sentences Commentary’. *Sicut dicit. Editing Ancient and Medieval Commentaries on Authoritative Texts*, pp.243-271, 2019, 10.1484/M.LECTIO-EB.5.118730 . hal-03175585

HAL Id: hal-03175585

<https://hal.science/hal-03175585>

Submitted on 20 Mar 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Critically Editing a So-Called ‘*Sentences* Commentary’

Monica Brînzei & Chris Schabel

(IRHT, Paris & University of Cyprus, Nicosia)*

Modern methods in textual criticism were not employed in editing sets of questions on the *Sentences* before the Second World War, and in hindsight some of the results were predictable. In 1956 the Augustinian Damasus Trapp declared¹, ‘the venture of editing [John] Hiltalingen [of Basel] is in the process of realization’, and the present writers are pleased to announce that, with our initiative, scientific collaboration, and the ERC financial support, the five volumes of Hiltalingen’s questions on the *Sentences* are now appearing only six decades after Trapp’s revelation, edited by Trapp’s confrère Venicio Marcolino². This paper will serve as a general explanation for the long delays in producing such critical editions in this genre.

Among the many books on theology composed in the 12th century, Peter Lombard’s *Sentences*, written in Paris around 1150, was to become the dominant text. Lombard divided his *Sentences* into four books, the first on the Triune God, the second on Creation, the third on the Incarnation and the Virtues, and the fourth on the Sacraments and Last Things, which thus constituted a comprehensive work of systematic theology³. In the medieval universities that had evolved by around 1200, along with law and medicine, theology was a postgraduate field of study, indeed often dubbed the ‘queen of the sciences’. From the second third of the 13th century down to the end of the Middle Ages and beyond, in order to become masters of theology, advanced students or bachelors of theology were obliged to lecture for one or more academic years on the *Sentences*⁴. Lectures on the *Sentences* were also delivered all over Europe on a regular basis at the *studia* of the mendicant and monastic orders⁵. Many of these lecture series were recorded in written form, and the surviving texts, usually consisting of scholastic *quaestiones*, number well over one thousand. According to modern editorial standards, we have complete critical editions for about a dozen of these sets of questions.

* This paper often employs examples from our own editing work, but many of the conclusions will be common knowledge to students of questions on the *Sentences*, many of whom have inspired our work. Financial support was assured by ERC-Co-DEBATE n° 771589

¹ Trapp 1959, p. 249.

² Marcolino, coop. Brinzei & Oser-Grote 2016, 2017, 2018.

³ Rosemann 2007.

⁴ For the rise and the evolution of the genre see also the vols I, II and III edited by Evans 2002 and Rosemann 2010 and 2015.

⁵ Emery, Courtenay & Metzger 2012.

1. The Genre in Brief

Assuming the task of editing a set of questions on the *Sentences*, traditionally but misleadingly called a '*Sentences* commentary'⁶, a scholar may run into any number of difficulties and impediments that, taken together, may make this particular editorial activity uniquely troublesome. As we shall see below, the complexity of editing a '*Sentences* commentary' is related to the fact that they belong to the most widespread genre of properly academic writing in the Middle Ages, and so placing each work within the corpus of 'commentaries' on the *Sentences* is both necessary and time consuming.

What does not seem to present a methodological problem for editing so-called 'commentaries' on the *Sentences*, however, is the fact that all of these writings are tied to the textbook, the four books of the *Sentences*. Lombard, the *Magister Sententiarum*, composed his work in Latin and in Paris, so the eventual adoption of the *Sentences* as the theological textbook of the medieval universities and the *studia* of the religious orders did not involve any issues of translation or major problems of transmission, especially once the Franciscan Alexander of Hales introduced the convenient division of each of the four books into distinctions in the 1220s⁷.

One of us has recently argued, moreover, that there were no commentaries on the *Sentences* in the Middle Ages, both because the term '*Sentences* commentary' or 'commentary on the *Sentences*' was only applied after 1500, and because the great writings on the *Sentences* from the Golden Age, roughly from the burning of the Talmud in 1244 to the departure of German scholars from Paris in the 1380s during the Great Schism, often approach the status of independent treatises in systematic theology that merely adopt the barest skeleton of the structure of the original. Insofar as they relate to Lombard's text, the surviving written questions on the *Sentences* from this period do cover a broad spectrum of attitudes toward the original. At one extreme, there are a few *Expositiones litterales*, in which exegesis of the Lombard is the primary purpose of the text. These examples, however, are rare, do not stem from high-level university or mendicant teaching, and have generally been ignored by scholars interested in the history of thought and thus remain unedited. At the other extreme, we have questions on the *Sentences* merely arranged according to book, without references to distinctions, that follow the sequence of topics of the Master only approximately, omitting issues corresponding to a dozen or more distinctions at a time and adding numerous questions on subjects that Peter Lombard never even considered, for example in the physical sciences or in political thought.

Such was the flexibility of the model that it proved to be a useful introduction to systematic theology at a low level while providing a convenient matrix with which to organize teaching and writing at a high level. Presumably all great theologians in this period heard a presentation and explanation of Peter Lombard's original at some point and many of them in turn presented and explained the text themselves. When the time came to study theology at a place like Paris and eventually to deliver their own high-level lectures in theology, in their principal sermons delivered before each book the bachelors continued to heap praise on the

⁶ Schabel forthcoming.

⁷ That is, 48 for book I, 44 for II, 40 for III, and 50 for IV. See Friedman 2002, p. 44.

author and his textbook⁸, but in their teaching proper Lombard exegesis played a minor role, a role that in the written redactions appears solely in the introductory material to questions or not at all. Within the actual questions on the *Sentences*, Peter Lombard did retain the sobriquet ‘Master’, but, except on a few topics where the Lombard’s opinion remained noteworthy, he was mainly cited for the authorities he in turn cited or because *ut in littera* became a short-hand way of referring to an argument or quoted passage without having to give the text in full. Yet the *littera* was not in any way the focus of the discussion.

Despite the lack of methodological difficulties relating to the original text to which questions on the *Sentences* were tenuously linked, critically editing these writings does confront the scholar with a particular combination of problems. First, there is the sheer size of the average text: sets of questions on only one of the four books of the *Sentences* routinely take up two, three, or more normal octavo-sized volumes of around 300 pages in a modern edition, and if an author managed to cover all four books the complete set could require ten or more tomes. The Franciscan John Duns Scotus’ *Ordinatio*, for example, from the first decade of the 14th century, required fourteen large volumes, and the *apparatus criticus* was drastically reduced in the final installments. Indeed, the entire first volume of the *Ordinatio* is devoted not to part of book I, but to Lombard’s *Prologus*, just a few lines of text in the original⁹.

Second, many of these works survive in numerous manuscripts as well as early printings, so it is not uncommon to deal with a dozen witnesses, with the most popular texts being extant in fifty copies or more. The huge (more than 1500 columns) *Lectura Mellicensis* of Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl, read to the Benedictine monks of Melk Abbey in Austria in the early 1420s and covering just book IV minus the seventeen distinctions on marriage, survives in over two hundred manuscripts¹⁰, while the Prague questions of the little-known Conrad of Soltau from the late 1370s are found in about sixty-five codices¹¹.

Third, a number of *Sentences* lectures have come down to us in multiple redactions that need to be untangled before any real editing can begin. For example, a Parisian *Sententiarius* may have delivered an earlier set of lectures elsewhere, his Parisian lectures on the *Sentences* required much preparation, and he may have continued to revise written versions afterwards. For this reason, while we may know the chronology of Parisian lectures on the *Sentences*, a crucial date in an academic career, the dates given below for surviving questions will often be more approximate. The complex editing projects of the works on the *Sentences* by the Dominican Durand of Saint-Pourçain (c. 1310)¹² and the Franciscan Francis of Marchia (c. 1320)¹³ illustrate the difficulties of editing popular theological writings deriving from oral lectures in the convents of the mendicant orders.

Fourth and perhaps foremost, we have the *apparatus fontium*: around ten bachelors of theology lectured on the *Sentences* every year at Paris alone, covering the same basic material in roughly the same sequence, such that the potential source material for any given author is intimidating. Some *Sententiarii* cite explicitly dozens of other works on the *Sentences*, for instance the Augustinian John Hiltalingen of Basel, from the late 1360s, who names about three

⁸ For early speeches see Chenu 1932, and for later examples see Brown 1976 and Dunne 2001. These are not to be confused with the inception speeches treated in Spatz 1992.

⁹ See the reference to the Scotus edition in the Annex.

¹⁰ Brinzei & Schabel 2014, pp. 264–66 (for an addition to the old list of known manuscripts).

¹¹ See Maga’s new census: <http://conradusdesoltau.thesis-project.ro/mss.html>.

¹² See the Thomas Institut’s project: <http://www.thomasinst.uni-koeln.de/11754.html>.

¹³ See the reference to the Marchia edition in the Annex.

dozen¹⁴. It is more common, however, for an author to refer to *quidam* or *aliqui* or simply to copy passages with neither attribution nor indication that someone else's words are being employed, a phenomenon we find in many sets of *Sentences* questions, such as that of the Cistercian John of Mirecourt from the mid-1340s¹⁵. No edition, however, can be considered definitive without tracing these tacit sources, when they survive.

There is, however, one encouraging characteristic of these writings: scribes generally respected these theological texts and did not intervene willy-nilly, so the number of variants can often be rather low¹⁶. Moreover, aside from raw *reportationes*¹⁷, which present their own problems, the manuscripts preserving questions on the *Sentences* usually provide a readable text. Indeed, if one is fortunate enough to find a redaction from a famous author surviving in only one or two manuscripts, in an incomplete state, with a consistent citation practice or at least a predictable use of recent sources, then it is possible to edit an entire set of questions on the *Sentences* in three volumes in less than a decade, as in the case of the Franciscan Adam Wodeham's truncated *Lectura secunda* from his order's Norwich *studium* in the late 1320s, which breaks off at distinction 26 of book I¹⁸.

2. The Challenge of Editing Questions on the *Sentences*

The tradition of the *Sentences* dominated European universities for three centuries, during which sets of questions on the text evolved on different levels: content, structure, style, sources¹⁹. Even if editors have little trouble dealing with how an individual theologian employed his 'base text', the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, all editors are challenged by the body of writings on that base text that had accumulated by the time their author lectured and/or wrote his own questions on the *Sentences*. In the end, it was not how a theologian employed the Master's text so much as how he utilized the texts of later bachelors — as famous as the Dominican Thomas Aquinas (1250s) or as obscure as the Cistercian Gottschalk of Nepomuk (1360s) — that constitutes the main methodological problem.

As case studies, we will take some examples from the end of the Golden Age, both because they best represent the complexity of the growing body of source material and because they have only recently drawn the attention of modern editors, such that they are chronologically late in origin and in scholarship. In particular, we will look at a number of sets of questions on the *Sentences* from the 1360s and 1370s that are currently being edited, those of John Hiltalingen of Basel OESA, Gottschalk of Nepomuk OCist, James of Eltville OCist, Henry of Langenstein, Henry Totting of Oyta, Pierre d'Ailly, Peter of Candia OFM, and (slightly later in composition) Marsilius of Inghen.

¹⁴ See the reference to the Hiltalingen edition in the Annex.

¹⁵ Genest & Vignaux 1988, pp. 297–301.

¹⁶ This may be less often the case with genres from the Arts Faculty; see for example the rich *apparatus* of some new editions of commentaries on the *Liber de Causis* recently published in Calma 2017.

¹⁷ On *reportationes* of questions on the *Sentences* see now Duba 2017.

¹⁸ See the reference to the Wodeham edition in the Annex.

¹⁹ See the chapters in Evans 2002, especially Friedman 2002.

With regard to Peter Lombard and the textbook, the procedure of James of Eltville, who read the *Sentences* at Paris in 1369–1370, is usually simply to say that he is asking a question related to the subject matter of a certain distinction or distinctions. Let us take the long question on distinctions 38–39 of book I, around 1500 lines, as an example. Eltville never remarks about something *in littera* in this question. At one point Eltville comments that ‘the Master’ explains something very well, although this is not something pertaining to the distinctions at hand, but in the following distinction 40 in the original. When Eltville offers two Augustinian quotations, he then notes that the Master has them too, in distinction 44 of book I and in distinction 12 of book III. In one instance we are given a passage from Hugh of Saint-Victor and then Eltville adds that ‘the Master appears to follow it’ in various places, including distinctions 38–39, but also distinction 40: this is an ‘original’ contribution of Lombard, but assigned to Hugh!

The modern reader would not know it, but most of Eltville’s question comes from the work of earlier *Sententiarum*. The fact that he does not cite these authors constitutes a significant methodological problem: often a theologian composing questions on the *Sentences* will not mention any of the ‘secondary sources’ he has before his eyes, and any explicit citations found in his text may instead be references to what he has *not* seen, but only borrowed from others. Once the editor has learned that her medieval author was a borrower, she is faced with the daunting task of searching everywhere for a verbatim or nearly verbatim source for any given passage. It is easiest when the author has just one or a handful of favorite later-medieval scholastics to copy from, but when there are still sections of text left unaccounted for, what then? It would be dangerous to assume that the remaining passages are ‘original’ to the author, but it may be almost impossible to locate the source. For example, when working on James of Eltville, it was only by extreme fortune that we found his source for his explicit presentation of Thomas Aquinas’ views on divine foreknowledge. In this case, Eltville did not read Aquinas directly and compose a synthetic description of his opinion, but he merely copied that of James of Metz, a Dominican who read the *Sentences* in Paris way back in 1300–1301 and who is virtually never heard from again by name²⁰. After this discovery, more passages from the Dominican James were identified in the Cistercian James, but with so many dozens of still unedited works on the *Sentences*, it is unlikely that all such sources will be located.

In fact, it is not just *almost* impossible, but impossible *tout court*, for there are many instances even where explicit citations cannot be tracked down merely because the texts have not survived. True, some of them may someday be found in a dusty corner of an archive, and occasionally we can get lucky when a later author had access to a lost text and identifies a *quidam* for us, as happened recently when a reference to a ‘Catalan bachelor’ cited in a famous set of questions on the *Physics* from about 1330 was discovered to be a citation of the Augustinian bachelor of the *Sentences* at Paris Bernat Oliver from the 1320s, only because an anonymous 15th-century commentator on the *Physics* questions still knew Bernat’s works²¹.

Obviously, when our author fails or neglects to mention that he has a source, if that source does not survive we will never know that our author copied the passage in question. On the other hand, the chance identification of such implicit sources can turn out to be crucial for the edition of the source text itself. For example, in the case of the questions on the *Sentences* of Henry of Langenstein (early 1370s), the only witness to his doctrinal position related to book I is manuscript Alençon, Bibliothèque municipale, 144. In the process of editing Nicholas of

²⁰ Schabel 2014, pp. 47–48.

²¹ Schabel 2015b, pp. 182–86.

Dinkesbühl's autograph of his own questions on the *Sentences*, Wien, Schottenstift Bibliothek, 269, this time from lectures given at Vienna around 1400, it was not only discovered that Langenstein was a major source for book I, but also that Dinkelsbühl had access to a manuscript that appears to have contained a more complete text than the codex from Alençon²².

In other instances, the source is mentioned but no traces of it survive. In such situations the texts being edited become unique witnesses to lost texts, requiring each editor to pay closer attention and attempt to discern what could be verbatim passages. For example, in his questions on book I John Hiltalingen mentions the Augustinian Bonsembiante Badoer and Richard Barbe (both fl. c. 1360) a few times, two authors who enjoyed a certain renown in their day but from whom we have not identified any surviving questions on the *Sentences* proper. From the testimony of Hiltalingen we can determine that both of them were very close to the doctrine of the Franciscan John of Ripa (mid-1350s)²³. The text of Hiltalingen has thus become a valuable testimony to the history of doctrine, even if the *apparatus fontium* will be limited to a *Non extat*.

The material factor of some sets of questions on the *Sentences* constitutes another methodological problem. Let us continue here with the case of the *Sentences* of the Cistercian James of Eltville. The editorial process has to confront **twenty-three** extant manuscripts and another four witness that are now lost, among them probably the author's own copy²⁴. Some of the biographical details of Eltville's life are reflected in the circulation of his manuscripts: Eltville was active at the Collège Saint-Bernard in Paris, whence he departed after his *Sentences* lectures to take up his post as abbot of Eberbach. The manuscripts of his questions on the *Sentences* can be ranged into various groups, the most tightly knit one being a German or *Eberbachensis* family. Of course, within all branches every witness stems from a creative and/or fallible scribe who enriched the number of individual variants. Taking the example of the *Prologue* at the beginning of the text, where one would expect the scribes to be more careful, we find the text divided into two questions that together consist of around 16,000 words in roughly eight folia. Although, as mentioned above, scribes generally treated questions on the *Sentences* with respect, nevertheless a complete collation of all twenty-three manuscripts still recorded about 4000 variants, from which approximately 75% represent individual errors. A complete *apparatus criticus* would entail reporting one error every four words, meaning that the *apparatus criticus* would take up as much space as the text itself, not including the *apparatus fontium*. For later questions the number of variants increases substantially, further reducing the ratio of text to *apparatus*. What modern publisher would print such a book?

The editor thus has to settle for a critical edition with an incomplete *apparatus*. This has the negative effect of offering an inferior product to those who will study the reception of the author's text. In the case of James of Eltville, for example, this affects future work on the questions of the *Sentences* by theologians from Vienna in the early 15th century. An incomplete *apparatus criticus* for Eltville's edition will hamper efforts to identify the codex (or the precise place in the *stemma* of a lost codex) of Eltville that was used by Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl or Thomas of Ebendorfer (1420s) in their extended quotations from the Cistercian. This scenario is familiar to all those who employ the critical edition of the questions on the *Sentences* of the

²² For a demonstration of this situation see Schabel 2015a. Marco Toste is preparing a critical edition of Langenstein's book I.

²³ John Hiltalingen of Basel 2016, p. 217: 'Et in hoc Bonsemlans sequitur ipsum. Sed secundum opinionem Iohannis de Marchia, quem Barbe sequitur quaestione sua prima, diceretur, quod non ab obiecto, sed solum a specie intelligibili'. Other similar examples: pp. 281, 306, 316, 324.

²⁴ See the manuscript from Eberbach's medieval library: Palmer 1998, pp. 323, 330.

Augustinian Gregory of Rimini (mid-1340s), the *apparatus criticus* of which has been reduced to the bare minimum, provoking frustration in every effort to identify the manuscripts used in the huge reception of Rimini's questions on the *Sentences* after 1350. Eltville himself borrowed extensive passages from the Augustinian, but the critical edition is of little assistance in identifying the codex on Eltville's desk and the extent to which Eltville was faithful to his model.

One final detail about the manuscript tradition of Eltville's text: among the twenty-three witnesses, the oldest manuscript — assuming it is not an early draft — appears to be an abbreviation, further proof of the medieval success of the work. How should this version be incorporated, if at all, into the *apparatus criticus*? Should the editor collate this text and report the differences, just indicate the passages that are summarized, or simply ignore this codex in the editorial process?

This brings us to another methodological complication involving the corpus of questions on the *Sentences*: the subgenre of abbreviated texts. Given that authors sometimes revised, expanded, or contracted their texts, or that one theologian occasionally relied overwhelmingly on only one previous text, it is not always clear without an explicit colophon that a given text is an abbreviation rather than an early or late redaction by the same author or a 'different' work by another theologian. We do have clear examples of abbreviations, like that of the Franciscan Adam Wodeham made by Henry Totting of Oyta (1370s), or that of the Augustinian Alphonsus Vargas of Toledo (mid-1340s) by John of Wasia (1370s), or that of the Franciscan John of Ripa by Paul of Venice (c. 1400) (for the first we have an early modern print, while the last has been critically edited). In parallel with these, we also find instances where a second theologian produces his 'own' work by summarizing that of another, as in the case of the questions on the *Sentences* of Humbert of Prouilly (1290s), who summarized the Augustinian Giles of Rome (early 1270s) for book I and Thomas Aquinas for books II–IV²⁵, probably with a pedagogical purpose in response to the needs of his Cistercian brothers. Without explicit information, however, we remain in the dark about the nature of other cases of briefer versions of questions on the *Sentences*.

Besides abbreviations, the *Sentences* genre also connects us to a series of other subgenres: *principia*, *vesperiae*, *aulica*, *resumpta*. Starting in the early 14th century, *principia* are the written records of live debates between the bachelors who were about to begin their lectures on a given book of the *Sentences*. Although perhaps not part of a given author's questions on the *Sentences* proper, where *principia* survive they usually accompany the questions in the manuscripts. Moreover, the intrinsic interest of *principia* impels the modern editor to include these texts in the critical edition: *principia* contain rich material concerning doctrinal debates, names of otherwise unknown theologians (*socii*), and fragments of lost writings. Thus, recent editions have incorporated surviving *principia* preceding the questions, notably those of the Augustinian Hugolino of Orvieto (1348–1349), John Hiltalingen, and Pierre d'Ailly (1377–1378)²⁶.

Unlike *principia*, which were tied directly to *Sentences* lectures, the *vesperiae*, *aulica*, and *resumpta* were part of the later procedure for a theologian's promotion to master of theology, consisting of questions disputed on the eve, morning, and afternoon of the promotion respectively. An author's *vesperiae*, *aulica*, and *resumpta* may also appear in the

²⁵ Brnzei 2011, pp. 81–148.

²⁶ Between 2018 and 2023, the new project *DEBATE: Innovation as Performance in Medieval Universities*, awarded with Consolidator ERC grant n° 711589, will investigate all surviving *principia*.

same manuscripts as his questions on the *Sentences*, despite the fact that their connection with the *Sentences* lectures is much looser²⁷.

Finally, not all texts associated with *Sentences* lectures are in the form of questions or expositions of the Lombard, but rather serve as aids to the reader or student. Such texts may not contain material of philosophical interest, but sometimes they were ‘best-sellers’ in terms of circulation. Take here the example of the *Conclusiones* of John de Fonte, composed around 1300 in Montpellier as an instrument addressed to the Franciscan students of Montpellier and surviving in around 100 manuscripts²⁸. This medieval text is not to be confused with another ‘genre’ of *conclusiones*, the modern one, represented by André Combes’ edition of the *Conclusiones* of John of Ripa: realizing, perhaps, that a full critical edition would require many decades, Combes opted to extract Ripa’s bare *conclusiones* from his questions and publish those in a separate volume, although he recognized that his edition read without the questions themselves would be a ‘mutilation’ of the doctrine of the Super-subtle Doctor²⁹. Nevertheless, the modern compilation of these medieval *conclusiones* can help the contemporary reader as a guide to the text, while we await the real thing³⁰.

Although it is too early to state definitively, it seems that the genre of abbreviations linked to the *Sentences* steadily increased in popularity. From the late 13th century until the 15th century they played a significant role in the diffusion of theological doctrines. Editions of the most copied examples are therefore important for our understanding of this period³¹.

3. Helping the Reader Overcome Structural Complexity

The above methodological considerations for the most part concern the scientific aspects of editing questions on the *Sentences*. Yet often the editor also faces and must overcome methodological difficulties of a more or less practical nature relating to the structural complexity of many of the examples of the genre. How should one best help the reader follow the internal architecture without modifying the text itself? The authors themselves were aware of this difficulty and sometimes inserted an explicit division announced after the title of the question or after the opening arguments *pro* and *contra*. This was insufficient for the more complicated questions, however, in which one finds, for example, three articles, each article divided into various numbers of propositions, in support of each proposition a further set of arguments *pro*, *contra*, and *responsiones*, and a group of corollaries for greater clarity in support of each proposition. Most modern readers, for whom scholastic Latin is not their everyday language of instruction and who are trained to avoid labyrinthine structures in their own writing and, theoretically at least, lectures, will have difficulty following a text of this sort, one that may derive from a more or less spontaneous oral performance.

²⁷ Bazán 1985.

²⁸ Courtenay 2009, pp. 109–27.

²⁹ Combes 1957, p. 14.

³⁰ Andrea Nannini is preparing the edition of a first volume.

³¹ Hoenen forthcoming; Slotemaker 2015, pp. 171–73.

Recent publications have considered the issue of the complex structure of some questions on the *Sentences*³², without identifying a satisfying remedy for the reader. Thus far, *ad hoc* solutions have been applied according to the tastes and creativity of the editors: some number paragraphs with internal references in parentheses³³, others introduce numerous sections and even paragraph titles and subtitles³⁴, while a few even include maps of each question as annexes to their editions³⁵. To understand the need for a reading guide for such texts we can quote James Long's justification for his efforts to clarify the structure in his edition of the Oxford questions on the *Sentences* of Richard Fishacre (early 1240s):

To assist the reader through such a thicket of arguments and counter-arguments, I have added headings in square brackets to identify the questions (and sometimes the objections, solutions, and responses as well), the structures of which are not always transparent. The *Index rerum* lists those questions that stand free of the text and also a number of extended expositions whose theme would not be readily discernible from the lemma. In addition, I have numbered the arguments and counter-arguments, but arguments to which there were no responses received no number. In thus organizing the material, I repeat, my sole aim was accessibility, and the reader should not be tempted to conclude that there is more order in the text than is in reality there. The truth is that Fishacre's text can often be downright confusing, and no amount of editorial shaping can change that fact³⁶.

If the Byzantine organization of some questions on the *Sentences* were not troublesome enough, we also encounter, especially after 1350, what can be called the 'matryoshka' or 'Russian-doll phenomenon'. We have already mentioned that sets of questions on the *Sentences* from the latter half of the 14th century are often derivative, composed following a cut-and-paste method, a so-called *bricolage textuelle* that describes, methodologically speaking, what in modern terms is identified as plagiarism. The Russian-doll phenomenon is the extreme case of genealogical *bricolage textuelle*, when a quotation is nested within another quotation which is in turn nested in yet another quotation, and so on, on multiple levels. The first job of the editor in compiling the *apparatus fontium*, of course, is to identify and reconstruct this process and all participants as precisely as possible. But the task certainly does not end there.

Let us suppose the editor has done the *apparatus fontium* to everyone's satisfaction. How should she present this information visually on the two-dimensional space she has available to her in print form? If we recall that even in the simple instance where one scholastic copies another in a given passage, that passage will often contain quotations of the Bible, or a patristic author, or Aristotle, or some other authority from before the university era, how

³² Slotemaker 2015, pp. 160–63; Hallamaa 2010, pp. 377–79; Ayelet forthcoming.

³³ Gottschalk of Nepomuk 2016.

³⁴ See for example the edition of Chatton (see Annex), where the editor has inserted numerous elements of division such as these: *Dictum 1, Dictum 2, Opinio Ockham per quattuor dicta – dictum 1, contra opinionem Ockham contra dictum*, etc.

³⁵ In the edition of Richard Fishacre's work on the *Sentences*, the first Oxford example, we find a diagram with the plan of the text at the beginning of each distinction. The edition of Pierre d'Ailly's questions assists the reader with a set of 'maps' published at the end of the volume that offer a detailed plan of the *arbores* of the question. This is a modern decision, but there is evidence that medieval authors worked with this type of diagram; see for example Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat., 294, where in the beginning of Fishacre's work there is such a diagram accompanied by the following: 'cuius divisionem in modum arboris ramificatae sic depingo'. On diagrams in questions on the *Sentences*, see Even-Ezra forthcoming.

³⁶ Richard Fishacre 2008, pp. 46–47.

should these two layers of quotation best be illustrated? Lest one think that this is only a problem for the editor of texts from after the Black Death, there are plenty of examples from much earlier, such as the Dominican William of Peter of Godino, author of the so-called *Lectura Thomasina*, an influential work stemming from lectures delivered at Paris in 1299–1300³⁷. Indeed, it is probably the case that many of the greatest authors copied or paraphrased much more than we have revealed or admitted.

Yet it gets much worse: what if there is a chain of authors one after the other, quoting the previous person's words, explicitly or otherwise? We recently published the *Filioque* discussion of Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl³⁸, a secular theologian who, as mentioned, lectured on the *Sentences* at Vienna around 1400. The main purpose of the edition was to show how Dinkelsbühl developed his text, because he added extensive marginalia, inserted sheets of paper, and made further marginal notations on those. Photographs assisted in our presentation, but there was more. Dinkelsbühl's main immediate sources, rarely cited, were the Parisian questions on the *Sentences* of three theologians who lectured around 1370, the oft-mentioned Cistercian James of Eltville and the slightly younger (and more famous) seculars Henry of Langenstein and Henry Totting of Oyta, the two Henry's being founders of the Viennese Faculty of Theology. Not only do the passages tacitly taken from these theologians include explicit quotations from authorities, but each of Dinkelsbühl's models employed the same methodology that he did. Thus much of Langenstein's presentation is copied or paraphrased or rearranged from the Augustinian Gregory of Rimini from the mid-1340s, who in turn cites explicitly a number of earlier theologians. Similarly, some of what Dinkelsbühl borrows from Oyta without attribution Oyta had taken from the Oxonian Adam Wodeham, active around 1330, including some of Wodeham's extensive (and tacit in Oyta and Dinkelsbühl) quotations of Walter Chatton, another Oxford Franciscan, from the 1320s. Finally, in recycling material from Eltville, Dinkelsbühl accidentally filled his text with the words of Giles of Rome, John Duns Scotus, Richard FitzRalph, John of Mirecourt, and Hugolino of Orvieto, the Mirecourt section being particularly extensive, a dozen consecutive paragraphs.

Sometimes a footnote tied to the start of the paragraph is sufficient to explain to the reader what is happening in that section, although it is awkward and not always very precise. It is even less attractive as a method when the paragraph manifests the Russian-doll phenomenon to the fullest. On occasion, one will have a chain that begins with Scholar A, who has a quotation of Father Z in passage X. Scholar B incorporates passage X and adds to it. Scholar C incorporates Scholar B's passage, modifies and adds to it, and so on. Presenting this situation clearly on the page is complex and requires a friendly attitude on the part of the printer, since in addition to different kinds of quotation marks one may have to employ extensive italics, different sized fonts, and even bold print.

Let us consider a real example. In the first volume of the critical edition of the questions of Pierre d'Ailly, on page 188, in the third of the four apparatuses (the first is for biblical quotations, the second for explicit quotations, the third for implicit ones, and the fourth for variants), one reads that d'Ailly is explicitly quoting Rom. 1. 19, the *Liber viginti quattuor philosophorum*, and Ex. 8. 9. In fact, surrounding this triad of authorities a whole tradition is nested, since the same combination is found implicitly in Alexander Neckam, William of Auxerre, Alexander of Hales, Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great, and John of Mirecourt in

³⁷ A recent conference in Cologne on William, the abovementioned James of Metz's immediate predecessor as Dominican bachelor of the *Sentences* at Paris, revealed that the editors, Francesca Bonini and Andrea Colli, have precisely the same difficulty.

³⁸ Schabel 2015a.

connection with the same doctrinal issue treated by d'Ailly, how philosophical knowledge about the Trinity is possible. Fully unpacking this footnote in the modern critical edition of d'Ailly required an entire article presenting the implicit pedigree of the examples down to d'Ailly's day³⁹.

This practice of nesting quotations is visible not only in the case of canonical quotations from the Bible, the Fathers, or Aristotle, but it also occurs at the level of borrowed arguments. Continuing with Pierre d'Ailly, there is another Russian-doll situation in which passages from the Franciscan Peter Auriol (late 1310s) are used by Walter Chatton, from whom they are borrowed by Adam Wodeham and eventually appear in Gregory of Rimini, arriving in d'Ailly via John of Mirecourt, who seems to have taken them from Wodeham. Within this chain the authors investigate the possibility for knowledge of an absent object, but even if they all reproduce the same arguments, they interpret them in rather different ways⁴⁰. Faced with this scenario, the editor not only has to decide what to report in the *apparatus fontium*, but also how to portray in the text what is reported in the *apparatus*.

A Catalogue of Editions of Sets of Questions on the *Sentences*

This paper is neither exhaustive nor covers all problems encountered during the process of editing a set of questions on the *Sentences*. Each project is unique in itself and presents particular technical or practical difficulties. Stegmüller's⁴¹ repertory, dating from 1947, but still the main inventory of questions on the *Sentences*, records around 1400 surviving texts. In order to give the reader an idea of what has been edited and what is still waiting to be published, below we present a list of modern editions, including only critical editions published as individual volumes. Each year editions of fragments of questions or of individual questions enrich the collection of edited texts, and these smaller publications are not noted here⁴². Our inventory begins with medieval sets of questions on the *Sentences* (one book or more) printed before c. 1600.

Texts Printed Before c. 1600 (44 total)

Franciscans (18): (13th) Richard de Mediavilla, Alexander of Hales, John de Fonte, Bonaventure; (14th) John Duns Scotus, Francis of Meyronnes, John Bassol, Peter of Aquila, William of Ockham, Landolfo Caracciolo, Adam Wodeham, Andrew of Novocastro, William Rubio, Antonius Andreas, Peter Auriol; (15th) William of Vaurouillon, Nicholas of Orbellis, Stephen Brulefer (maybe we can add here Brianonsis)

³⁹ Calma 2009.

⁴⁰ A diagram and an interpretation of this case study is in Calma 2012, pp. 479–80.

⁴¹ Stegmüller 1947 with the supplement in Doucet 1954.

⁴² A valuable inventory of such smaller texts, including other genres as well, is in Schönberger & Kible 1994 and later versions.

Dominicans (9): (13th) Thomas Aquinas, Hannibaldus of Hannibaldi, Peter of Tarantaise (printed 1652); Peter of Palude, Robert Holcot, Hervaeus Natalis, Durand of Saint-Pourçain, Thomas Sutton (anti-Scotus); (15th) John Capreolus OP

Seculars (7): (14th) Thomas Buckingham, Pierre d'Ailly, Marsilius of Inghen, Thomas of Arras (according to the USTC); (15th) Henry of Gorkum, Gerard of Zutphen, Gabriel Biel

Augustinians (6): (13th) Giles of Rome; (14th) Gregory of Rimini, Thomas of Strasbourg, Alphonsus Vargas of Toledo, Dionysius de Modena, Gerard of Siena

Carmelites (2): (14th) John Baconthorpe, Michael Aiguani

Cistercians (1): (14th) Conrad of Ebrach

Carthusians (1): (15th) Dionysius the Carthusian

Modern Editions of Medieval Questions on the *Sentences* (One Volume or More), with Dates for Main Lecture Series

Gandulf of Bononia (1160–1170), *Magistri Gandulphi Bononiensis Sententiarum libri quatuor*, ed. J. W. von Walter, Wien: Haim, 1924.

Stephen Langton (1206–1207), *Glose in quattuor libros Sententiarum*, ed. A.-M. Landgraft, Münster, 1952.

Alexander of Hales (1220), *Glossa in quatuor libros sententiarum Petri Lombardi*, ed. Quaracchi, ed. Rome: Collegi S. Bonaventurae, 4 vols, 1951–1957 (Bibliotheca franciscana scholastica Medii aevi, 12–15).

Richard Fishacre (1241–1245), *In secundum librum Sententiarum*, Prol., dist. 1–20, ed. J. Long, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2008; *In tertium librum Sententiarum*, Prol., dist. 1–22, ed. A. Eichinger, H. Kraml & G. Leibold, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2011; *In tertium librum Sententiarum*, dist. 23–40, ed. K. Rodler, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2003.

Albert the Great (1243–1244), *Opera omnia: Commentarii in I Sententiarum (dist. 1–25)*, ed. S. C. E. Borgnet, vol. 25; *Commentarii in I Sententiarum (dist. 26–48)*, ed. S. C. E. Borgnet, vol. 26; *Commentarii in II Sententiarum*, ed. S. C. E. Borgnet, vol. 27; *Commentarii in III Sententiarum*, ed. S. C. E. Borgnet, vol. 28; *Commentarii in IV Sententiarum (dist. 1–22)*, ed. S. C. E. Borgnet, vol. 29; *Commentarii in IV Sententiarum (dist. 23–50)*, ed. S. C. E. Borgnet, vol. 30, Paris: L. Vivès, 1893–1894.

Bonaventure (1253–1254), *Commentaria in IV libros Sententiarum*, ed. Collegium S. Bonaventure, Firenze: Quaracchi, 1882–1889 (*Opera omnia*, vol. 1–4).

Thomas Aquinas (1253–1254), *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum*, books I–II, ed. P. Mandonnet, 2 vols, Paris: Lethielleux, 1929; book III, ed. M. F. Moos, Paris: Lethielleux, 1956; book IV, dist. 1–22, ed. M. F. Moos, Paris: Lethielleux, 1947; book IV, dd. 23–50, *Opera Omnia 7.2*, Parma: Leonine, 1858; *Les débuts de l'enseignement de Thomas d'Aquin et sa conception de la "Sacra Doctrina": avec l'édition du prologue de son Commentaire des "Sentences"*, ed. A. Oliva, Paris: Vrin, 2006.

Robert Kilwardby (c. 1255), *Quaestiones in librum primum Sententiarum*, ed. J. Schneider, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1986; *Quaestiones in librum secundum Sententiarum*, ed. G. Leibold, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1992; *Quaestiones in librum tertium Sententiarum*, ed. E. Gössmann, vol. 1, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1982; *Quaestiones in librum tertium Sententiarum*, ed.

- G. Leibold, vol. 2, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1985; *Quaestiones in librum quartum sententiarum*, ed. R. Schenk, vols 1–2, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1992–1993.
- Walter of Bruges (1261–1265), *Le questioni sull'Eucaristia di Gualtiero di Bruges O. F. M. (1225–1307)* (IV, dist. 8–13), ed. P. de Mattia, Roma: Pontificia Università Lateranense, 1962.
- William of Mare (1274–1275), *Scriptum in primum librum Sententiarum*, ed. H. Kraml, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1989; *Scriptum in secundum librum Sententiarum*, ed. H. Kraml, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1995; *Scriptum in tertium et quartum librum Sententiarum*, ed. H. Kraml, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2011.
- Giles of Rome (early 1270s), *Reportatio lectionum super libros I–IV Sententiarum. Reportatio Monacensis. Excerpta Godefridi de Fontibus*, ed. C. Luna, Firenze: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2003.
- Peter John Olivi (1290), *Quaestiones in secundum librum Sententiarum, QQ. 1–48*, ed. B. Jansen, Firenze: Quaracchi, 1922; *Questiones in secundum librum Sententiarum, QQ. 49–71*, ed. B. Jansen, Firenze: Quaracchi, 1924; *Quaestiones in secundum librum Sententiarum, QQ. 72–118*, ed. B. Jansen, Firenze: Quaracchi, 1926; *Quaestiones de novissimis: ex summa super IV sententiarum*, ed. P. Maranesi, vol. 1, Grottaferrata: Quaracchi, 2004.
- John of Paris (1293–1294), *Commentaire sur les Sentences: 'Reportatio'. Livre I–II*, ed. J.-P. Muller, vols 1–2, Rome: Pontificum Institutum S. Anselmi, 1961–1964.
- James of Metz (1300–1301), *Dominican Theology at the Crossroads. A Critical Edition and Study of the Prologue to the Commentaries on Peter Lombard's Sentences by James of Metz and Hervaeus Natalis* (Prol. Redactio prima q. 5, add, redactio secunda q. 1–6), ed. M. Olszewski, Münster: Aschendorff, 2010.
- Hervaeus Natalis (1302–1303), *Dominican Theology at the Crossroads. A Critical Edition and Study of the Prologue to the Commentaries on Peter Lombard's Sentences by James of Metz and Hervaeus Natalis* (redactio prima, q. 1, 5; redactio secunda q. 1–7), ed. M. Olszewski, Münster: Aschendorff, 2010.
- John Duns Scotus (1302–1303), *Lectura in librum primum Sententiarum. Prologus et Dist. 1–7*, ed. C. Balic, M. Bodewig, S. Buselic, P. Capkun-Delic, B. Hechich, I. Juric, B. Korosak, L. Modric, S. Nanni, I. Reinhold, O. Schäfer, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1960 (*Opera Omnia*, t. 16); *Lectura in librum primum Sententiarum. Dist. 8–45*, ed. C. Balic, C. Barbaric, S. Buselic, P. Capkun-Delic, B. Hechich, I. Juric, B. Korosak, L. Modric, S. Nanni, S. Ruiz de Loizaga, C. Saco Alarcón, O. Schäfer, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1966 (*Opera Omnia*, t. 17); *Lectura in Librum secundum Sententiarum. Dist. 1–6*, ed. L. Modric, S. Buselic, B. Hechich, I. Juric, I. Percan, R. Rosini, S. Ruiz de Loizaga, and C. Saco Alarcón, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1982 (*Opera Omnia*, t. 18); *Lectura in Librum secundum Sententiarum. Dist. 7–44*, ed. Commissio Scotistica, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1993 (*Opera omnia*, t. 19); *Lectura in librum tertium sententiarum. Dist. 1–17*, ed. B. Hechich, B. Huculak, J. Percan, S. Ruiz de Loizaga, C. Saco Alarcón, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 2003 (*Opera Omnia*, t. 20); *Lectura in librum tertium sententiarum. Dist. 18–40*, ed. B. Hechich, B. Huculak, J. Percan, S. Ruiz de Loizaga, C. Saco Alarcón, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 2004 (*Opera Omnia*, t. 21); *Ordinatio I. Prol.*, ed. C. Balic, M. Bodewig, S. Buselic, P. Capkun-Delic, I. Juric, I. Montalverne, S. Nanni, B. Pergamo, F. Prezioso, I. Reinhold, O. Schäfer, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1950 (*Opera Omnia*, 1); *Ordinatio I. Dist. 1–2*, ed. C. Balic, M. Bodewig, S. Buselic, P. Capkun-Delic, I. Juric, I. Montalverne, S. Nanni, B. Pergamo, F. Prezioso, I. Reinhold, and O. Schäfer, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1950 (*Opera Omnia*, 2); *Ordinatio I. Dist. 3*, ed. C. Balic, M. Bodewig, S. Buselic, P. Capkun-Delic, B. Hechich, I. Juric, B. Korosak, L. Modric, I. Montalverne, S. Nanni, B. Pergamo, F. Prezioso, I. Reinhold, O. Schäfer, Città del Vaticano: Typis

Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1954 (*Opera Omnia*, 3); *Ordinatio I. Dist. 4–10*, ed. C. Balic, M. Bodewig, S. Buselic, P. Capkun-Delic, B. Hechich, I. Juric, B. Korosak, L. Modric, S. Nanni, I. Reinhold, O. Schäfer, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1956 (*Opera Omnia*, 4); *Ordinatio I. Dist. 11–25*, ed. C. Balic, M. Bodewig, S. Buselic, P. Capkun-Delic, B. Hechich, I. Juric, B. Korosak, L. Modric, S. Nanni, I. Reinhold, O. Schäfer, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1959 (*Opera Omnia*, 5); *Ordinatio I. Dist. 26–48*, ed. C. Balic, M. Bodewig, S. Buselic, P. Capkun-Delic, B. Hechich, I. Juric, B. Korosak, L. Modric, S. Nanni, I. Reinhold, O. Schäfer, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1963 (*Opera Omnia*, 6); *Ordinatio II. Dist. 1–3*, ed. C. Balic, C. Barbaric, S. Buselic, B. Hechich, L. Modric, S. Nanni, R. Rosini, S. Ruiz de Loizaga, C. Saco Alarcón, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1973 (*Opera Omnia*, 7); *Ordinatio II. Dist. 4–44*, ed. B. Hechich, B. Huculak, J. Percan, S. Ruiz de Loizaga, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 2001 (*Opera Omnia*, 8); *Ordinatio III. Dist. 1–17*, ed. B. Hechich, B. Huculak, J. Percan, S. Ruiz de Loizaga, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 2006 (*Opera Omnia*, 9); *Ordinatio III. Dist. 26–40*, ed. B. Hechich, B. Huculak, J. Percan, S. Ruiz de Loizaga, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 2007 (*Opera Omnia*, 10); *Ordinatio IV. Dist. 1–7*, ed. Hechich, B. Huculak, J. Percan, S. Ruiz de Loizaga, W. Salamon, G. Pica, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 2008 (*Opera Omnia*, 11); *Ordinatio IV. Dist. 8–13*, ed. B. Hechich, J. Percan, S. Recchia, S. Ruiz de Loizaga, W. Salamon, G. Pica, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 2010 (*Opera Omnia*, 12); *Ordinatio IV. Dist. 14–42*, ed. H. Hechich, J. Percan, S. Recchia, S. Ruiz de Loizaga, W. Salamon, G. Pica, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 2011 (*Opera Omnia*, 13); *Ordinatio IV. Dist. 43–49*, ed. B. Hechich, J. Percan, S. Recchia, S. Ruiz de Loizaga, G. Pica, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 2013 (*Opera Omnia*, 14); *Reportatio IA*, Prol., dist. 1–21, ed. et trans. A. B. Wolter & O. V. Bychkov, *John Duns Scotus. The Examined Report of the Paris Lecture: Reportatio I-A*, vol. 1, St Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2004; *Reportatio IA*, Prol., dist. 22–48, ed. et trans. A. B. Wolter & O. V. Bychkov, vol. 2, St Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2008; *Prologues of Reportatio IA, Reportatio IB, Reportatio IC, Additiones Magnae*, ed. K. Rodler, *Die Prologe der Reportata Parisiensia des Johannes Duns Scotus*, Innsbruck: Studia, 2005.

John of Sterngassen (between 1307 and 1323), *Johannes von Sterngassen OP und sein Sentenzenkommentar*, ed. W. Senner, vols 1–2, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995.

Durand of Saint-Pourçain (1309–1310), *Scriptum super IV libros Sententiarum: Distinctiones 4–17 libri primi*, ed. M. Perrone & F. Retucci, Leuven: Peeters, 2017; *Scriptum super IV libros Sententiarum: Distinctiones 1–5 libri secundi*, ed. F. Retucci, Leuven: Peeters, 2012; *Scriptum super IV libros Sententiarum: Distinctiones 22–38 libri secundi*, ed. F. Retucci & M. Perrone, Leuven: Peeters, 2013; *Scriptum super IV libros Sententiarum: Distinctiones 39–44 libri secundi*, ed. M. Perrone, Leuven: Peeters, 2014; *Scriptum super IV libros Sententiarum: Distinctiones 1–7 libri quarti*, ed. G. Guldentops & G. Pellegrino, Leuven, 2014; *Scriptum super IV libros Sententiarum: Distinctiones 43–50 libri quarti*, ed. T. Jeschke, Leuven: Peeters, 2012.

Peter Auriol (1317–1318), *Scriptum super primum Sententiarum* (Prol.-d. 1; dd. 2–8), ed. E. M. Buytaert, vol. 1–2, St Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1952–1956.

William of Ockham (1318–1319), *Scriptum in librum primum Sententiarum. Ordinatio* (Prol.-d. 1; dd. 2–3; dd. 4–18; dd. 19–48), ed. G. Gál, S. Brown, G. J. Etzkorn & F. E. Kelley, vol. 1–4, St Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1967–1979; *Quaestiones in librum secundum Sententiarum (Reportatio)*, ed. R. Wood & G. Gál, St Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1981; *Quaestiones in librum tertium Sententiarum (Reportatio)*, ed. G. J. Etzkorn & F. E. Kelley, St Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1982; *Quaestiones in librum quartum Sententiarum (Reportatio)*, ed. R. Wood, G. Gál & R. Green, St Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1984.

John of Reading (1319–1323), *Theology and Science in the Fourteenth Century: Three Questions on the Unity and Subalternation of the Sciences from John of Reading's Commentary on the Sentences*, ed.

- S. J. Livesey, Leiden: Brill, 1989; *Scriptum in primum librum sententiarum* (Dist. 1: q. 1–6), ed. F. Florentino, Paris: Vrin, 2011.
- Peter of Navarre (c. 1320), *In primum Sententiarum scriptum* (Prol.-d. 18; dd. 19–48), ed. P. Saguéz Azcona, vol. 1–2, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones, 1974.
- Francis of Marchia (1319–1320), *Francisci de Marcia sive de Esculo Commentarius in IV libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi* (*Reportatio*: Principia, Prol.; book I, dd. 1–10; book I, dd. 11–28; book I, dd. 29–48), ed. N. Mariani, vol. 1–4, Grottaferrata: Editiones Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, 2003–2009; *Reportatio IIA (Quaestiones in secundum librum Sententiarum)* (qq. 1–12; qq. 13–27; qq. 28–49), ed. T. Suarez-Nani, W. O. Duba, E. Babey, G. Etzkorn & D. Carron, vol. 1–3, Leuven: Presses Universitaires de Louvain, 2008–2013.
- Walter Chatton (1321–1323), *Reportatio et Lectura super Sententias: Collatio ad librum primum et Prologus*, ed. J. C. Wey, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1989; *Reportatio super Sententias* (book I, dd. 1–9; book I, dd. 10–48; book II; books III–IV), ed. J. C. Wey & G. J. Etzkorn Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, vol. 1–4, 2002–2005; *Lectura super Sententias. Liber I* (dd. 1–2; dd. 3–7; dd. 8–17), ed. J. C. Wey & G. J. Etzkorn, vol. 1–3, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2007–2009.
- Adam Wodeham (1329–1332), *Lectura secunda in librum primum Sententiarum* (Prol.-d. 1; d. 2–7; d. 8–26), ed. G. Gal & R. Wood, vol. 1–3, St Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1990.
- William of Brienne (1330–1331), *Principia*, ed. W. Duba, *The Forge of Doctrine. The Academic Year 1330–1331 and the Rise of Scotism at the University of Paris*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2017.
- Robert Holcot (1330–1332), *Seeing the Future Clearly: Questions on Future Contingents* (II, Q. 2), ed. P. A. Streveler & K. Tachau, Toronto: Pontifical Institute, 1995.
- Roger Roseth (mid. 1330s), *Lectura super Sententias*, qq. 3–5, ed. O. Hallamaa, *Science in Theology. Studies in the Interaction Between Late Medieval Natural Philosophy, Logic, and Theology*, Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 2005.
- Peter of Aquila (1336–1337), *Commentaria in 4 libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi*, ed. C. Paolini, Levanti: Conv. SSmae Annuntiationis, 1907–1909.
- Gregory of Rimini (1343–1344), *Gregorii Ariminensis OESA Lectura super primum et secundum sententiarum* (Prologus, dist. 1–6), ed. A. D. Trapp, V. Marcolino, W. Eckermann, M. Schulze, M. Santos-Noya, W. Simon & W. Urban, vol. 1, Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 1981; *Lectura super primum et secundum sententiarum* (book I: dist. 7–17), ed. V. Marcolino, M. Santos-Noya, W. Simon & V. Wendland, vol. 2, Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 1982; *Lectura super primum et secundum sententiarum* (book I: dist. 19–48), ed. V. Marcolino, W. Simon, W. Urban & V. Wendland, vol. 3, Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 1984; *Lectura super primum et secundum sententiarum* (book II: dist. 1–5), ed. A. D. Trapp, M. Santos-Noya & M. Schulze, vol. 4, Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 1979; *Lectura super primum et secundum sententiarum* (book II: dist. 6–18), ed. A. D. Trapp, Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 1979, *Lectura super primum et secundum sententiarum* (book II: dist. 24–44), ed. V. Marcolino, W. Simon & V. Wendland, vol. 6, Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 1980.
- Hugolino of Orvieto (1348–1349), *Commentarius in quattuor libros Sententiarum* (Principium I, Prologus, dist. 1), ed. W. Eckermann, vol. 1, Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1980; *Commentarius in quattuor libros Sententiarum* (book I: dist. 3–48), ed. W. Eckermann, vol. 2, Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1984; *Commentarius in quattuor libros Sententiarum* (book II: Principium II, dist. 1–44), ed. W. Eckermann, coop. V. Marcolino, vol. 3, Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1986; *Commentarius in quattuor libros Sententiarum* (book III: Principium III, dist. 1–37, book IV: Principium 4, dist. 1–50), ed. W. Eckermann, coop. V. Marcolino, vol. 4, Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1988.

- John of Ripa (c. 1354–1355), *Questio de gradu* (principia), ed. A. Combes & P. Vignaux, Paris: Vrin, 1964; *Lectura super primum Sententiarum: Prologi et questiones 1 et 2*, ed. A. Combes, Paris, 1961; *Lectura super primum sententiarum: Prologi questiones ultimae*, ed. A. Combes & F. Ruello, Paris: Vrin, 1970.
- John Hiltalingen of Basel (1365–1366), *Lectura super quattuor libros Sententiarum, super primum librum* (book I: Principium I, Qu. 1–3), ed. V. Marcolino, coop. M. Brinzei, C. Oser-Grote, vol. 1, Würzburg: Augustinus bei Echter, 2016; *Lectura super quattuor libros Sententiarum, super primum librum* (book I: Qu.: 4–35), ed. V. Marcolino, coop. M. Brinzei & C. Oser-Grote, vol. 2, Würzburg: Augustinus bei Echter, 2017; *Lectura super quattuor libros Sententiarum, super secundum librum* (book II: Principium II, Qu. 1–28), ed. V. Marcolino, coop. M. Brinzei & C. Oser-Grote, vol. 3, Würzburg: Augustinus bei Echter, 2018 (add vol 4).
- Gottschalk of Nepomuk (1367–1368), *Prologue*, ed. A. Baumgarten, *Godescalc de Nepomuk, Teologia ca dispozitie stiintifica. Prolog la Comentariul la cartea Sentintelor*, Iasi: Polirom, 2016.
- Henry of Langenstein (1371–1372), *Der Sentenzenkommentar des Heinrich von Langenstein. Lateinische textkritische Ausgabe* (books II–IV), vol. I–IV, ed. R. Damerau, Marburg, 1979–1980.
- Pierre d’Ailly (1377–1378), *Questiones super primum, tertium et quartum librum Sententiarum. Principia et questio circa prologum*, ed. M. Brinzei, vol. 1, Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.
- Marsilius of Inghen (1392–1396), *Quaestiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum: Super primum, quaestiones 1–7*, ed. M. Santos-Noya, Leiden: Brill, 2000; *Super primum, quaestiones 8–21*, ed. M. Santos-Noya, Leiden: Brill, 2000; *Super Primum, quaestiones 22–37*, ed. M. Hoenen & M. Erne, Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Antonius of Carlenis (1439–1440), *Four Questions on the Subalternation of the Sciences*, ed. J. Livesey, Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1994.
- Paul of Venice (c. 1402), *Super primum Sententiarum Johannis de Ripa Lecturae Abbreviatio, Prologus*, ed. F. Ruello, Firenze: Olschki, 1980; *Super primum Sententiarum Johannis de Ripa lecturae abbreviatio. Liber I*, ed. F. Ruello, Firenze: Olschki, 2000.
- Denys the Carthusian (c. 1422), *Opera Omnia: t. 19–25, cura e labore monachorum sacri ordinis Cartusiensis*, Montreuil-sur Mer-Tournai: Parkminister, 1902–1913.
- John Eck (c. 1500), *In primum librum sententiarum annotatiunculae D. Iohanne Eckio Praelectore, anno ab Christo nato 1542, per dies caniculares, quos alioqui a studiis gravioribus feriari solebat*, ed. W. L. Moore, jr., Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Giles of Viterbo (c. 1515), *The Commentary on the Sentences of Petrus Lombardus*, ed. D. J. Nodes, Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Electronic editions or fragments of editions can be accessed at the www.thesis-project.ro (Alfonso Vargas Toletanus, Denis of Modena, Michael Aiguani of Bononia, Andrea of Novocastro, Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl) and www.lombardpress.org.*

Secondary Literature

- B. C. Bazán (1985), ‘Les questions disputées, principalement dans les facultés de théologie’, in B. C. Bazán, J. F. Wippel, G. Fransen & D. Jacquart (eds), *Les questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les facultés de théologie, de droit et de médecine*, Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 13–149.

- M. Brinzei & C. Schabel (2014), 'The Past, Present, and Future of Late Medieval Theology: The Commentary of Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl', in P. W. Rosemann (ed.), *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Volume 3*, Leiden, Boston: Brill, pp. 174–266.
- M. Brinzei (2014), 'Enquête sur la tradition manuscrite du commentaire des *Sentences* du cistercien Jacques d'Elville', in *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale*, 56, pp. 247–62.
- S. F. Brown (1976), 'Peter of Candia's Sermons in Praise of Peter Lombard', in R. S. Almagno (ed.), *Studies Honoring Ignatius Charles Brady Friar Minor*, St Bonaventure, NY: The Franciscan Institute, pp. 141–76.
- D. Calma (ed., 2016), *Neoplatonism in the Middle Ages. New commentaries on 'Liber de Causis' and 'Elementatio Theologica'*, vol. I–II, Turnhout: Brepols.
- M. Calma (2009), 'La connaissance philosophique de la Trinité selon Pierre d'Ailly et la fortune médiévale de la proposition *Monas genuit monadem*', in *Przeglad Tomistyczny*, 15, pp. 121–47.
- M. Calma (2012), 'Jean de Mirecourt et les échos de la philosophie anglaise à l'Université de Paris au XIV^e siècle', in *Universalità della Ragione. Pluralità delle Filosofie nel Medioevo. XII Congresso Internazionale di Filosofia Medievale, Palermo, 17–22 settembre 2007*, vol. II.1, ed. A. Musco et al., Palermo: Officina di Studi Medievali, pp. 471–80.
- M.-D. Chenu (1932), 'Maîtres et bacheliers de l'Université de Paris v. 1240. Description du manuscrit Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 15652', in *Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du XIII^e siècle*, Paris: Vrin, pp. 11–39.
- W. J. Courtenay (2009), 'Johannes de Fonte's *Conclusiones in libros Sententiarum*. The Wolfenbüttel Manuscripts', in J. Meirinhos & O. Weijers (eds), *Florilegium Mediaevale. Etudes offertes à Jacqueline Hamesse à l'occasion de son éméritat*, Louvain-la-Neuve: FIDEM, pp. 109–27.
- V. Doucet, OFM (1954), *Commentaires sur les Sentences. Supplément au Répertoire de M. Frédéric Stegmüller*, Firenze: Quaracchi.
- W. O. Duba (2017), *The Forge of Doctrine: The Academic Year 1330–1331 and the Rise of Scotism at the University of Paris*, Turnhout: Brepols.
- M. Dunne (2001), 'A Fourteenth-Century Example of an *Introitus Sententiarum* at Oxford: Richard FitzRalph's Inaugural Speech in Praise of the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard', in *Mediaeval Studies*, 63, pp. 1–30.
- K. Emery, W. J. Courtenay & S. M. Metzger (eds, 2012), *Philosophy and Theology in the 'Studia' of the Religious Orders and at Papal and Royal Courts: Acts of the XVth Annual Colloquium of the Société Internationale pour l'Étude de la Philosophie Médiévale, University of Notre Dame (8–10 October 2008)*, Turnhout: Brepols.
- G. Evans (ed., 2002), *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Volume 1: Current research*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- A. Even-Ezra (forthcoming), 'Seeing the Forest beyond the Trees: A preliminary Overview on a Scholastic Tree-visualisation Habit'.
- R. Friedman (2002), 'The *Sentences* Commentary, 1250–1320. General Trends, the Impact of the Religious Orders, and the Test Case of Predestination', in G. Evans (ed.), *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Volume 1: Current Research*, Leiden, Boston: Brill, I, pp. 41–128.
- J.-F. Genest & P. Vignaux (1988), 'La bibliothèque anglaise de Jean de Mirecourt: "subtilitas" ou plagiat?', in O. Pluta (ed.), *Die Philosophie im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert. In memoriam Konstanty Michalski (1879–1947)*, Amsterdam: Bochner.

- O. Hallamaa (2010), 'On the Limits of the Genre: Roger Roseth as a Reader of the *Sentences*', in P. W. Rosemann (ed.), *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Volume 2*, Leiden, Boston: Brill, pp. 369–404.
- M. J. F. M. Hoenen (forthcoming), 'Heymericus de Campo (+1460) reads Peter Lombard: Late-Medieval Abbreviations of the *Libri Sententiarum*', in M. Brinzei & C. Schabel (eds), *Philosophical Psychology in late Medieval Commentaries on Peter Lombard's Sentences. Acts of the XIVth Annual Symposium of the S.I.P.E.M. (Nijmegen 28–30 Octobre 2009)*, Turnhout: Brepols.
- N. Palmer (1998), *Zisterzienser und ihre Bücher. Die mittelalterliche Bibliotheksgeschichte von Kloster Ebrach im Rheingau*, Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner.
- P. W. Rosemann (2007), *The Story of a Great Medieval Book: Peter Lombard's Sentences*, Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- P. W. Rosemann (ed., 2010, 2015), *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Volume 2–3*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- R. Schönberger & B. Kible (eds, 1994), *Repertorium edierter Texte des Mittelalters aus dem Bereich der Philosophie und angrenzender Gebiete*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- C. Schabel (2014), 'Dominican Anti-Thomism: James of Metz's Question on Divine Foreknowledge, with a Rebuttal from the *Correctorium Iacobi Metensis*', in *Przeegląd Tomistyczny*, 20, pp. 35–72.
- C. Schabel (2015a), 'Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the Filioque at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth Century', in M. Brinzei (ed.), *Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the Sentences at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth Century*, Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 15–83.
- C. Schabel (2015b), 'The *Questiones libri Physicorum* by Franciscus Marbres (alias Johannes Canonicus). Part I: Author, Text and Reception', in *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale*, 57, pp. 171–255.
- C. Schabel (forthcoming), 'Were There *Sentences* Commentaries?', in O. Boulnois, I. Moulin & P. Bermon (eds), *Commenter au Moyen Âge*, Paris: Vrin.
- J. T. Slotemaker (2015), 'Henry of Gorkum's *Conclusiones Super IV Libros Sententiarum*: Studying the Lombard in the First Decades of the Fifteenth Century', in P. W. Rosemann (ed.), *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Volume 3*, Leiden, Boston: Brill, pp. 143–73.
- N. Spatz (1992), '*Principia*. A Study and Edition of Inception Speeches Delivered before the Faculty of Theology at the University of Paris, ca. 1180–1286' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Cornell University, 1992).
- F. Stegmüller (1947), *Repertorium commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, 2 vols, Würzburg: Schöningh.
- D. Trapp (1956), 'Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century: Notes on Editions, Marginalia, Opinions and Booklore', in *Augustiniana*, 6, pp. 146–274.

Abstract

Rarely 'commentaries' in the strict sense, texts deriving from lectures on the *Sentences* in theological faculties and mendicant *studia* are linked to Peter Lombard's original. Sets of questions on the *Sentences* present special challenges to the modern editor, due to the daunting size of many of the texts, the frequently intimidating number of manuscripts in which these writings are preserved, the common existence of multiple redactions, and their structural complexity. Moreover, the popularity of the genre and some authors' tendency to recycle material without attribution considerably complicate the task of compiling an accurate *apparatus fontium*, since these texts were composed within a dense tradition much of which

is lost or remains in manuscript. This paper outlines these obstacles and provides catalogues of early prints and modern editions of questions on the *Sentences*.

