



HAL
open science

**OCKHAM, THE PRINCIPIA OF HOLCOT AND
WODEHAM, AND THE MYTH OF THE TWO-YEAR
SENTENCES LECTURE AT OXFORD
ERC-DEBATE-PROJECT-771589**

Chris Schabel

► **To cite this version:**

Chris Schabel. OCKHAM, THE PRINCIPIA OF HOLCOT AND WODEHAM, AND THE MYTH OF THE TWO-YEAR SENTENCES LECTURE AT OXFORD ERC-DEBATE-PROJECT-771589. Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales (Recherches de Theologie et Philosophie Médiévales), 2020. hal-03175657

HAL Id: hal-03175657

<https://hal.science/hal-03175657>

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.

OCKHAM, THE *PRINCIPIA* OF HOLCOT AND WODEHAM, AND THE MYTH OF THE TWO-
YEAR *SENTENCES* LECTURE AT OXFORD

ERC-DEBATE-PROJECT-771589

Chris Schabel

Abstract

Recently William Duba and I showed that lectures on the *Sentences* at the University of Paris in the early fourteenth century took only one academic year, not two as previously thought, and we questioned whether they had ever taken two years. Here I argue that there is no positive evidence for two-year lectures at the University of Oxford before the mid-1330s, when statutes make clear that they were lasting just one year. Moreover, supposing a one-year lecture better accounts for the known data of the alleged instances of biennial readings by Robert Holcot, Adam Wodeham, and William of Ockham. Indeed, the evidence that Holcot and Wodeham provide for the early Oxford adoption of principal debates, an exercise that appeared at Paris in the 1310s, reinforces the conclusion that Oxford lectures had a duration of only one year. Perhaps the belief in a biennial lecture on the *Sentences* in the golden age of Oxford theology is merely a consequent following from a false antecedent via an invalid consequence: ‘In this period at Paris *Sentences* lectures took two years, *ergo* at Oxford they took two years’.

In this journal William Duba and I recently presented evidence from the *Sermo finalis* of the Dominican Remigio dei Girolami entailing that, by the end of the thirteenth century, lectures on the four books of Peter Lombard’s *Sentences* in the Faculty of Theology at the University of Paris were delivered in only one academic year, not two as was previously assumed, and we put into doubt the assertion that such lectures had ever spanned two years at Paris.¹ We did not apply our conclusion to the mendicant *studia* outside the universities or to other universities, since there is sufficient evidence that reading the *Sentences* in some other contexts, such as Dominican *studia* in Italy around 1300 or the

¹ W. DUBA – C. SCHABEL, “Remigio, Scotus, Auriol, and the Myth of the Two-Year *Sentences* Lecture at Paris,” in: *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales* 84 (2017), pp. 143–179.

University of Vienna around 1400, required two or more years.² Here I take my sickle into the field of others, the most important place for advanced theological instruction outside Paris down to the Black Death and perhaps even the Great Schism, the University of Oxford, where the virtually unanimous opinion of specialists is that at least some *Sentences* lectures took two years in the early fourteenth century. In fact, nowhere in the statutes or in any other text of the period does it state that such lectures took two years. Ironically, it turns out that the main positive evidence for the two-year theory for Oxford in these years is found in the *Sermo finalis* of the Dominican Robert Holcot, and, more ironically, a fresh look at this sermon actually reveals that Oxonian *Sentences* lectures were given in just one year, as at Paris.

This paper reinterprets the data for Holcot and the Franciscan Adam Wodeham and then argues that they were *socii* who engaged in some form of principial debates as bachelors of the *Sentences* at Oxford in 1331–1332. Afterwards, it shows that there is no reason to think that the Franciscan William of Ockham lectured on the *Sentences* at Oxford over a two-year period either.

1. Robert Holcot's *Sermo finalis*

In 1949, Joseph Wey published Robert Holcot's *Sermo finalis*, delivered at the end of his Oxford lectures on the *Sentences* and introducing the incoming Dominican *sententiarium*,

² For the Dominicans in Italy, M.M. MULCAHEY, "Education in Dante's Florence Revisited: Remigio de' Girolmani and the Schools of Santa Maria Novella," in: R.B. BEGLEY – J.W. KOTERSKI (eds.), *Medieval Education*, New York 2005, pp. 143–181, argues that *lectores*, as opposed to *cursores*, lectured on one book of the *Sentences* per year. W.J. COURTENAY, "From Dinkelsbühl's *Questiones Communes* to the Vienna Group Commentary. The Vienna 'School', 1415–1425," in: M. BRINZEI (ed.), *Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the Sentences at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth Century*, Turnhout 2015, pp. 267–315, gives the evidence for a two-year reading at Vienna. As COURTENAY notes in "Arts and Theology at Paris, 1326–1340," in: S. CAROTTI – C. GRELLARD (eds.), *Nicolas d'Autrécourt et la faculté des arts de Paris (1317–1340). Actes du colloque de Paris 19–21 2005*, Cesena 2006, pp. 15–63, at p. 41, a papal letter to the chancellor of Paris suggests that Paul Conilli lectured on the *Sentences* for four years: ASV, Reg. Vat. 139, ff. 223v–224r, no. 989, 16 March 1346 (= *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, ed. H. DENIFLE and A. CHATELAIN, 4 vols., Paris 1889–1897 [= CUP], vol. II, no. 1121): "[...] dilectus filius Paulus Conilli, alias dictus de Narbona, bacallarius in sacre theologie facultate, in quarto anno lecture Sententiarum existens [...]" Since, however, Paul did not participate in the 1344–1345 principial debates, Paul had already lectured in 1342–1343, and Pope Clement VI was urging his promotion, it could be that the chancery merely meant that it was four years since his lectures. Still, there were exceptions, but only in extraordinary circumstances, such as following the Black Death, when qualified bachelors were lacking; see C. SCHABEL, "The Genre Matures. Parisian *Principia* in the 1340s, from Gregory of Rimini to Pierre Ceffons," in: M. BRINZEI – W.O. DUBA (eds.), *Principia on the Sentences*, Turnhout, forthcoming.

Roger Gosford. In the sermon, Holcot tells his audience that “this year in the house of the Preachers two ran together in reading the *Sentences*,” naming the other Dominican, according to the edition, as “Granton,” who had permission from the university to finish his lectures early, whereas Holcot had to put in his time.³ Given the available knowledge about the Oxford Friars Preacher at the time, it was understandable that “Granton” was read as a variant of “Crathorn,” that is, William Crathorn, a known Dominican contemporary. In 1970 and 1972 Heinrich Schepers brought out a splendid two-part article on Crathorn and his relationship with Holcot, in which he established that Crathorn began his own lectures on the *Sentences* in 1330, based on a reference to a solar eclipse that occurred *isto anno* on 16 July, which corresponds to a known eclipse from that summer. Schepers also found that, after beginning his lectures on the Bible, Crathorn attacked Holcot, who then replied in his so-called *Sex articuli*, opposing “the principal conclusion” that Crathorn “has tried to prove for a biennium now.” The *Sex articuli* include references to Holcot’s *socii*, in this context normally a technical term for colleagues lecturing on the *Sentences* at the same time, so Holcot’s *Sex articuli* were thus linked to Holcot’s *Sentences* lectures. For Schepers, the above data entailed that both Crathorn and Holcot read the *Sentences* over two years, from 1330 to 1332, but Crathorn finished early, started his Bible lectures immediately, and attacked Holcot, and then Holcot responded in the *Sex articuli* at the end of his two-year stint.⁴

In his groundbreaking *Adam Wodeham* from 1978, William J. Courtenay expressed various objections to Schepers’s scenario. For one, Courtenay maintained that it was “against common practice” to have two Dominicans *begin* reading the *Sentences* at the same time. Second, Schepers assumed a *standard* two-year lecture series, and even

³ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Sermo finalis*, ed. J.C. WEY, “The *Sermo Finalis* of Robert Holcot,” in: *Mediaeval Studies* 11 (1949), pp. 219–223, at p. 221: “Et licet de domo Praedicatorum isto anno in lectura Sententiarum cucurrerunt duo simul, ille tamen alius discipulus, qui Granton nominatur, usus favore, quia gratiam universitatis de cito terminandis lectionibus habuit, citius praecurrit... Ego autem communi potitus iustitia, laboribus non perperci, statutum [statum *ed.*] tempus implevi... Unde cursum consummavi.” As we shall see below, at and around n. 10, Tachau would later read *Grafton* rather than *Granton*.

⁴ H. SCHEPERS, “*Holcot contra dicta Crathorn* I. Quellenkritik und biographische Auswertung der Bakkalareatsschriften zweier Oxforder Dominikaner des XIV. Jahrhunderts,” in: *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1970), pp. 320–354, and “*Holcot contra dicta Crathorn* II. *Das Significatum per propositionem*. Aufbau und Kritik einer nominalistischen Theorie über den Gegenstand des Wissens,” in: *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 79 (1972), pp. 106–136, at part I, pp. 325, 340, 344–350, 353, and part II, p. 108, citing Holcot: “Unde principalis conclusio, quam iste iam per biennium nisus est probare, est ista [...]”

granting for the sake of argument that Holcot read for two years, Courtenay saw no reason to assume that Crathorn also read for two years, since “a biennial reading seems to have become the exception rather than the rule by 1330.” Courtenay hypothesized instead that Crathorn read only in 1330–1331, finishing after one year, and that Holcot lectured in 1329–1331, which entailed that the *Sex articuli* were written somewhat later.⁵ Indeed, for Courtenay, at that time “lectures on the *Sentences* as *baccalarius sententiaris* were usually completed in one academic year, but they might be stretched over a biennium.” The documents that Courtenay cited in the supporting note stipulate, however, without any comment suggesting a recent change, a one-year lecture among Oxford Franciscans in 1336 and at Balliol College in 1340.⁶ A few years later, in his broader *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England*, Courtenay pushed the date back to 1325, but still cautiously allowed for exceptions: “By the second quarter of the century lectures on the *Sentences* were usually completed in one year (a change that took place at Paris as well).”⁷ Still, in 1992 he specified that lectures on the *Sentences* “as late as the early 1330s occupied an academic biennium for Dominicans and possibly for other mendicants,” excluding the seculars, because he assigned the lectures of Richard FitzRalph (1328–1329) and Thomas Bradwardine (1332–1333) to single academic years.⁸ Courtenay thus remained under the spell of the two-year evidence for the Dominicans Crathorn and Holcot.

In her introduction to the 1995 edition of Holcot’s questions on future contingents, Katherine H. Tachau was armed with new information about the Dominicans at Oxford, showing that in his *Sermo finalis* Holcot was not referring to William Crathorn when he said that another Dominican had read with him but finished early, but rather to John Grafton (or Crafton), and she pointed out that “Grauton” is an equally valid reading as

⁵ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, pp. 97–99. On p. 50, n. 23, however, Courtenay remarked: “Exceptions to the rule of one *sententarius* per order per year were rare, but they did occur. The Dominicans Robert Holcot and William Crathorn read the *Sentences* at Oxford in the academic year 1330–31.”

⁶ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 49 and n. 21.

⁷ W.J. COURTENAY, *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England*, Princeton 1987, p. 42.

⁸ W.J. COURTENAY, “Theology and Theologians from Ockham to Wyclif,” in: J.I. CATTO – R. EVANS (eds.), *The History of the University of Oxford. Volume II. Late Medieval Oxford*, Oxford 1992, pp. 1–34, at pp. 4 and 20.

Wey's "Granton," since the manuscripts merely have "Grã."⁹ For the present writer, this effectively removed all the positive evidence for the two-year *Sentences* lectures on the part of Crathorn or Holcot, since Crathorn could have read the *Sentences* in 1330–1331,¹⁰ followed by Holcot and John Grafton in 1331–1332, with Grafton finishing early. Yet the idea of the two-year lecture was so entrenched that, in revisiting the whole issue, Tachau cited (and followed) Courtenay as holding that "at Oxford a biennial reading of the *Sentences* was still the norm for mendicant bachelors awaiting promotion to lecturing on the Bible in the early 1330s, and at least two of Crathorn's fellow bachelors, the Franciscan Adam Wodeham and Holcot himself, read the *Sentences* over two academic years."¹¹ I will return to Wodeham later, but, as for Holcot, Tachau wrote that in the *Sermo finalis* the *Sentences* lectures are compared to a "two-year courtship," so "Holcot tells us explicitly that (a) bachelors are required to lecture on the *Sentences* for two years, and that (b) in the academic year in which he had finished his own two-year course of lectures, the Dominicans had two lecturers."¹² Tachau then applied the general rule that the mendicants read over two years but staggered their lectures (as was mistakenly thought to have been the case earlier at Paris), and produced the following chart:¹³

1330–1331: William Crathorn OP's 1st year as *sententiarus*

1331–1332: Crathorn's 2nd and Robert Holcot OP's 1st year as *sententiarus*

1332–1333: Holcot's 2nd and John Grafton OP's only year as *sententiarus* (and Adam Wodeham OFM's 1st as *sententiarus* and Crathorn's year as *biblicus*)

⁹ K.H. TACHAU, "Introduction," in: ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Seeing the Future Clearly: Questions on Future Contingents*, ed. EADEM – P.A. STREVELER, with W.J. COURTENAY – H.G. GELBER, Toronto 1995, pp. 11, 14–16. The discovery was already announced in K.H. TACHAU, "Looking Gravely at Dominican Puns: The 'Sermons' of Robert Holcot and Ralph Friseby," in: *Traditio* 46 (1991), pp. 337–345, at p. 341 and nn. 19–20, but she refers to her introduction to the edition, which had already been written.

¹⁰ The few references to Richard FitzRalph as master or doctor in Crathorn's *Sentences* questions, which would in the case of "doctor" postdate FitzRalph's promotion at some time between 24 May and 27 September 1331 (*pace* COURTENAY *Adam Wodeham*, pp. 75–76, FitzRalph is still called "Magistro Ricardo, nato Radulphi, Sacre Theologie Baculario" on that date: *The Register of John de Grandisson, Bishop of Exeter (A.D. 1327–1369). Part II, 1331–1360*, ed. C. HINGESTON-RANDOLPH, London 1897, p. 616), do not indicate that Crathorn was also lecturing in 1331–1332 if the questions were revised even slightly after the lectures. Besides, not all manuscripts have "doctor" and the critical edition opts for "magister": TACHAU, "Introduction," pp. 9–10, esp. n. 24; H.G. GELBER, *It Could Have Been Otherwise. Contingency and Necessity in Dominican Theology at Oxford, 1300–1350*, Leiden 2004, p. 91, n. 103.

¹¹ TACHAU, "Introduction," p. 10.

¹² TACHAU, "Introduction," pp. 12 and 17.

¹³ TACHAU, "Introduction," p. 27.

1333–1334: Holcot’s year as *biblicus* (and Wodeham’s 2nd as *sententiarius*)

Tachau’s reconstruction has since become the *opinio communis*.¹⁴

Without the assumption of a two-year lecture, however, the evidence of the *Sermo finalis* turns out to be an illusion. There is no mention of a specific time span in the courtship metaphor. Regarding John Grafton, as we have seen, Holcot says, “this year (*isto anno*) in the house of the Preachers two ran together in reading the *Sentences*.” If anything, the implication of *isto anno*, at least *prima facie*, is that Holcot is talking about one year. When he goes on to say that Grafton “had a grace from the university to finish his lectures quickly,” whereas Holcot “fulfilled his time,” again the most obvious interpretation is that Grafton finished earlier that year, although not in the process of a two-year lecture.¹⁵ In fact at Paris, where lectures took one year, Courtenay himself has recently shown that there are several examples from the early 1330s of more than one bachelor from the same mendicant order lecturing on the *Sentences* in the same single year, and in at least one case, that of the Franciscan Pasteur de Sarrat (Pastor de Serrescuderio), Pope John XXII urged that he be able to finish his lectures early in the 1332–1333 academic year to make way for Arnaud de Clermont.¹⁶

When Holcot remarks in his *Sermo finalis* in June that “last year (*anno praeterito*) I gave a pledge (*dedi fidem*) to do the course,” if one does not assume a two-year lecture, the obvious reading is that a year ago Holcot had agreed or accepted to lecture on the *Sentences* and was in the process of preparing for it.¹⁷ Then, in introducing the next Dominican bachelor who would succeed him as *sententiarius*, Holcot says of Roger Gosford: “Here is the cursor whom you will have in the coming year (*anno futuro*), God granting,” and once again the simplest interpretation is that Gosford will take over in the

¹⁴ E.g., H.G. GELBER – J.T. SLOTEMAKER, “Robert Holcot,” in: E.N. ZALTA (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2017 Edition); J.T. SLOTEMAKER – J.C. WITT, “Adam de Wodeham,” in: E.N. ZALTA (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2017 Edition).

¹⁵ See above, note 4.

¹⁶ W.J. COURTENAY, “Parisian Theologians in the 1330s,” in: *Vivarium* 57 (2019), pp. 102–126, at pp. 106–111.

¹⁷ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Sermo finalis*, ed. WEY, p. 220: “anno preterito fidem dedi de faciendo cursus”; COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 97, actually considered this as one of the two possible interpretations. Noting a double-entendre, TACHAU, “Looking Gravely at Dominican Puns,” p. 340, renders it thus: “last year I swore to run a race in the [afore]said contest.”

fall and lecture on the *Sentences* for the one required year, otherwise why specify *anno* at all, if the lectures lasted for two years?¹⁸

Finally, there are solid internal grounds to date the *Sermo finalis* to 1332 and not to 1333. In teasing Roger Gosford and likening him to a dog, the traditional pun for Dominicans, Holcot says:

But certainly this future cursor is such a stout and fat dog that, if the men of Derham had had him yesterday, when it was [the feast of] Corpus Christi, eating him for paschal bread they would have said [Exodus 16:15]: *This is the bread that the Lord has given us to eat*, because they prefer dog to lion, according to Ecclesiastes 9[.4]: *A living dog is better than a dead lion.*¹⁹

In 1333, the feast of Corpus Christi fell on 3 June, but 4 June would have been too early for a *Sermo finalis*, since the vacation did not begin until late June. In 1332, however, Corpus Christi was celebrated on 18 June, and Friday 19 June fits the Oxford university calendar perfectly.²⁰ Robert Holcot finished his lectures on the *Sentences* on 19 June 1332, and the default view should thus be that he read over one year, in 1331–1332.

2. Adam Wodeham's Year as Sententiarius

Neither is Adam Wodeham an exception to the one-year rule at Oxford, and the evidence in fact suggests that he was the (or at least a) Franciscan *socius* of Holcot in 1331–1332. We know from the colophon to Wodeham's IV *Sentences* in Vat. lat. 1110 (f. 135v) that

¹⁸ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Sermo finalis*, ed. WEY, p. 223: "Hic est ergo cursor quem anno futuro habebitis deo dante."

¹⁹ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Sermo finalis*, ed. WEY, p. 223: "Sed certe cursor iste futurus est fortis canis et pinguis, in tantum quod si homines de Derham eum pridie, quando agebatur de corpore Christi, habuissent, eum pro pane paschali comedentes dixissent: *Iste est panis quem dedit nobis Dominus ad vescendum*, quia ipsi mallent canem quam leonem, iuxta illud Eccl. 9: *Melior est canis vivus leone mortuo.*" Wey's note 78 explains that Derham is elsewhere mentioned as a tenement in the parish of St Ebbe's that belonged to the university. Given that on the previous page, p. 222, Holcot mentions that Gosford "mihi non in tenementis quae quasi ad firmam tenui, sed in scolis Praedicatorum, quae mihi hereditarie debebantur, succedet," it is doubtful, *pace* TACHAU, "Looking Gravely at Dominican Puns," p. 340, n. 14, that this is a reference to Gosford running "in the pride of Durham," i.e., in the "retinue of Richard de Bury, Bishop of Durham," as Holcot would.

²⁰ COURTENAY, *Schools and Scholars*, pp. 11-12.

he read the *Sentences* at Oxford in 1332: *qui legit Oxonie anno Domini MCCCXXXII*. If the colophon refers to the conclusion of a biennial lecture, then it means 1330–1332; if the end of a one-year series, then 1331–1332; if the middle of two years, 1331–1333; if the start of one year, then 1332–1333; if the start of two years, 1332–1334. As we have seen, Tachau argued for 1332–1334, with 1331–1333 for Holcot, the current *opinio communis*. In his book on Wodeham, Courtenay described at length the investigation of pioneering Polish scholar Konstanty Michalski, who had assigned the date of Wodeham’s *Sentences* lectures as 1330–1332, yet the cautious Courtenay eventually encapsulated Michalski’s interpretation of the Vat. lat. 1110 colophon as follows: “Wodeham thus read in 1330–32 (if one believes it was a biennial reading) or 1331–32 (if one believes he read only for one academic year).”²¹

For the most part, Courtenay seems to have supported the biennial reading on the basis of tradition, but he continued to have such reservations. At one point, however, he presents two arguments in favor of two years in the case of Wodeham. First, “[e]ven supposing Wodeham read on all legible days and during vacations as well, it would be difficult to fit his [Oxford] commentary into a year.”²² This is an old and common argument in favor of the two-year lecture at Paris as well, but it is weak. In our article on the myth of the two-year lecture at Paris, Duba and I showed that there were about 130 *lectiones* in the average nine-month *lectura* on the *Sentences* in the fourteenth century, which seems about right when you account for Sundays, feast days, Christmas and Easter breaks, and so on.²³ Most modern university instructors are familiar with the normal 75-minute lecture, which would mean 162.5 lecture hours in the fourteenth-century classroom. Given that medieval attention spans were longer than those of our students, one could easily conceive of a daily 150-minute lecture, like a modern seminar, which would total 325 hours. Recently I gave a series of three 75-minute lectures, reading slowly in a foreign language, French, and each lecture consisted of the equivalent of about 25

²¹ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, pp. 14–15. On p. 9, n. 1, Courtenay lists the places where Michalski treats Wodeham, all but one reprinted in K. MICHALSKI, *La philosophie au XIV^e siècle. Six études*, ed. K. FLASCH, Frankfurt 1969 (collected studies from 1922–1937).

²² COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 20.

²³ DUBA – SCHABEL, “Remigio, Auriol, Scotus,” pp. 175–176. For a fourteenth-century academic calendar for Paris, see CUP II, pp. 709–716, no. 1192.

modern book pages. At that slow rate, one could still read 3250 pages in a medieval academic year of 75-minute lectures, or 6500 pages for 150-minute lectures. In short, there was plenty of time, and this is why some sets of fourteenth-century questions on the *Sentences* stemming from lectures given in only one academic year are so long.

Courtenay's second argument would seem to be more decisive:

A biennial reading is confirmed by Wodeham himself when in book III, referring to the opinions of a *socius* cited in book I, he states that those opinions (and thus his own lectures on book I) were given in *anno praeterito*. Since the calendar year in fourteenth-century England extended into March, Wodeham would not have phrased himself thus if those opinions had been given in the fall semester in the academic year in which he lectured on book III.²⁴

That is to say, the English year began on 25 March and ended on 24 March, so it would be odd before 25 March to refer to the previous October as "last year," since it would be the equivalent of someone today saying in December that an event that occurred in July happened "last year."

One can respond in two different ways. First, although it is usually assumed that at Oxford in this period bachelors of theology read the four books of the *Sentences* in the sequence I-II-III-IV, at Paris it was still I-IV-II-III, and John Slotemaker and Jeff Witt have argued on the basis of internal references that Holcot at least read book IV before book III.²⁵ It is thus quite likely that Wodeham also read book III last, meaning that he began that book in May, which would make a reference to early in the previous October as "last year" far less awkward, just as now in February we would refer to the previous July as "last year."

Second, and more importantly, Courtenay himself notes elsewhere a basic ambiguity with the term *socius* in Oxford as opposed to Paris: since in Oxford bachelors read the

²⁴ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 20.

²⁵ J.T. SLOTEMAKER – J.C. WITT, *Robert Holcot*, Oxford 2016, pp. 262-264. Without details, COURTENAY, *Schools and Scholars*, p. 8, n. 10, had noted this as well, but argued that this question for book III was written after the lectures and inserted later. For other reasons, I will suggest below that it was inserted later but composed during the lectures on book III. For Paris, see DUBA – SCHABEL, "Remigio, Auriol, Scotus," pp. 150–159 and passim.

Sentences before lecturing on the Bible, not after, they continued to hold regular classes after their *Sentences* lectures and to debate with the bachelors of the *Sentences*,²⁶ who could and certainly did cite their senior colleagues lecturing on the Bible as *socii* and vice-versa, as when in his *Sex articuli* Robert Holcot the *sententiarius* cites William Crathorn the *biblicus* as his *socius*: *Contra tres primos articulos, arguit quidam socius reverendus in sua prima lectione Super Bibliam*.²⁷ Courtenay need not have expressed himself so cautiously when he wrote thus: “It is also possible that the term *socius* applies more broadly to those bachelors who were not yet *baccalarii formati* and who could attack the opinions of other bachelors, whether they were reading the *Sentences* or reading on the Bible.”²⁸ The bachelor in question was a Benedictine, whom Wodeham in the second question of his entire *lectura* described as *socius iste* who had proven (*probavit*) something against FitzRalph. The Benedictine could easily have been a bachelor of the Bible when Wodeham first cited him, perhaps even one whose attack against FitzRalph had happened earlier, in his *Sentences* lectures. In book III Wodeham now describes this same Benedictine as *quidam bacalarius*, not *socius iste*, who gave his arguments *anno praeterito*.²⁹ Thus the Benedictine’s arguments could indeed just as easily have been given initially the previous academic year, rather than the beginning of the current academic year, then Wodeham could have responded at the start of his lectures on the *Sentences*, and the dialogue could have continued from there. Recall how, while reading the *Sentences*, Holcot refers to the attempts of his senior Dominican *socius* Crathorn, then lecturing on the Bible, to prove something for two years.

A further objection might arise on the basis of a claim made by Tachau, namely that when, in his questions on book II, Wodeham refers to the first lecture on the Bible of “Grafton,” this is the Dominican John Grafton, whom we know to have been a *socius* of Holcot reading the *Sentences* in the same year, the only year, in my view.³⁰ This would

²⁶ COURTENAY, *Schools and Scholars*, p. 43, summarizing his own work and that of Schepers.

²⁷ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Sex articuli*, a. 1, ed. F. HOFFMANN, *Die Conferentiae des Robert Holcot O.P. und die akademischen Auseinandersetzungen an der Universität Oxford 1330–1332*, Münster 1993, p. 67.4–5.

²⁸ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 89. See also TACHAU, “Introduction,” pp. 25–26.

²⁹ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, pp. 90–91, quoting Vat. lat. 955, f. 13r: “[...] sicut probavit iste [monachus niger] contra Magistrum Hybernicum [...]” and Paris, Mazarine 915, f. 170v: “[...] sicut fecit anno praeterito quidam bacalarius [...]”

³⁰ TACHAU, “Introduction,” p. 20, n. 55, and passim.

appear to entail that Wodeham lectured after Grafton, and hence after Holcot, or that their lecture series lasted two years and overlapped.

There are again at least two possible responses to this objection. First, Wodeham may not refer to the Dominican John Grafton at all. Before Courtenay learned about John Grafton, he pointed out that there were at least two other theologians named Grafton active at Oxford around that time, a Franciscan named Edmund and an Augustinian Hermit named Hugh. True, Courtenay found the Franciscan Edmund Grafton to be an unlikely candidate for the Grafton to whom Wodeham refers, because Wodeham already had a Franciscan *socius* in William of Chitterne.³¹ Still, Chitterne need not have been reading the *Sentences* along with Wodeham, since Chitterne could instead have been Wodeham's and Holcot's senior Franciscan *socius*, reading the Bible, as Crathorn was when in his *Sex articuli* Holcot battled both Chitterne and Crathorn.³² This would allow for Edmund Grafton to be a fellow Franciscan *sententiarius* with Wodeham.

Second, even if Wodeham was referring to the Dominican John Grafton, recall that this is precisely the theologian who finished his *Sentences* lectures early and began his Bible lectures. Wodeham and John Grafton could easily have debated as fellow *sententiarii* for the first few months of the academic year and then, especially if Wodeham read I-IV-II-III, John Grafton could have continued to argue against Wodeham in his first Bible lectures, leaving enough time for Wodeham to reply in his book II starting in March. This would also explain why in reflecting on the start of the academic year Wodeham refers vaguely to the Carmelite *socius* and yet singles out the Dominican by name, Grafton: there were two Dominican *sententiarii* at the start of that academic year, Holcot and Grafton.³³

There is, finally, another advantage to confining Wodeham's Oxford *Sentences* lectures to one year. At the start of book III, which was most likely his final book, Wodeham remarks: *Circa istum librum tertium, quia alias Londoniae toto anno*

³¹ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, pp. 106–109. Pace TACHAU, "Introduction," p. 15, n. 40, Courtenay had not "successfully ruled out Edmund," nor did he claim to have done so.

³² SCHEPERS, "*Holcot contra dicta Crathorn I*," p. 342, identified Chitterne as Holcot's other opponent in the *Sex articuli*, but Hoffmann failed to take note of this in his edition of ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Sex articuli*, a. 4, ed. HOFFMANN, p. 110.1, thinking instead that it was perhaps Walter Chatton. More on this below.

³³ See n. 96 below for the quotation.

*pertractavi quaestiones 13 primarum distinctionum, ideo nunc incipio a distinctione 14...*³⁴

The problem until now has been that, assuming a two-year lecture, perhaps in the sequence I-II-III-IV, it seemed that Wodeham was saying that he broke up his Oxford series to go to London for “a whole year,” which appeared to be a bizarre thing to do.³⁵ On my scenario, there is no trouble: Wodeham first lectured at London at some point, where one year was devoted to distinctions 1–13 of book III, and then, coming to Oxford, toward the end of his one-year lecturing, running out of time, as was common, he found an excuse to skip those first distinctions of book III and start at distinction 14. In any case, Rega Wood and Gedeon Gál have redated the London lectures to the 1320s, placing Wodeham’s Norwich lectures in between the London and Oxford series, between 1329 (Guiral Ot’s election as Franciscan Minister General on 10 June) and 1332 (when Wodeham was lecturing at Oxford).³⁶ These dates allow for Norwich lectures in 1329–1330, 1330–1331, or even 1329–1331.

If Adam Wodeham read the *Sentences* at Oxford over one academic year, then it is all but certain that he read in 1331–1332, because Courtenay once wrote convincingly that “it is all but certain that Holcot is the Dominican *socius* of Wodeham.”³⁷ If we assume that Wodeham and Holcot were exact contemporaries reading the *Sentences* over one year, 1331–1332, it turns out that we can also make better sense of their *prima facie* complex interaction. Courtenay had half of the key to the solution, finding that Wodeham seems to cite Holcot’s positions “both in [Holcot’s] *Sentences* commentary and in [Holcot’s] *Quodlibeta*,” and, crucially, that Holcot quotes Wodeham’s Oxford *lectura* verbatim, “but only in [Holcot’s] *Quodlibeta*.”³⁸ Courtenay’s characterization of these works of Holcot as *Quodlibeta*, while traditional, is surely incorrect, and this is the other half of the key.

3. Robert Holcot’s Determinationes

³⁴ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 194.

³⁵ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, pp. 166–171. Wodeham’s remark also suggests that, like Italian Dominicans, English Franciscans sometimes read one book per year outside the university context.

³⁶ R. WOOD – G. GÁL, “Introduction,” in: ADAM DE WODEHAM, *Lectura secunda in librum primum Sententiarum*. Vol. I. *Prologus et distinctio prima*, ed. R. WOOD – G. GÁL, St. Bonaventure, NY, 1990, pp. 30*–38*.

³⁷ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 104.

³⁸ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, pp. 101–102.

Robert Holcot left his works in philosophical theology in a chaotic state. There are various redactions of his questions on the *Sentences* and what exactly constitutes his *Quodlibeta* is rather mysterious. The famous editor Josse Bade – or Jodocus Badius Ascensius – published Holcot’s questions on the *Sentences* in Lyon in 1497, noting that the manuscripts disagreed on the contents.³⁹ Among the other materials that Badius included were fifteen questions he labelled “*Determinationes*,” and *Determinationes* II and IV are the allegedly quodlibetal questions where Courtenay finds Holcot quoting Wodeham.

For his part, Badius has this to say about the *Determinationes*: “Here follow the *determinationes* of some questions by the same Master Robert Holcot, which, although several are half finished, they should not be overlooked, as we said in our letter.”⁴⁰ In his letter, on the first page of the volume, after mentioning the *Sentences* questions and the *De imputabilitate peccati*, he adds that, “furthermore, *determinationes* of some questions under the name of the same Holcot were found in only one place,” and for this reason Badius’s colleague Master Johannes Trechel or Trechsel, a German printer in Lyon, recommended omitting them from the edition, since they were also “unfinished and mutilated.” Badius decided to have Trechel print them anyway, despite the failure to find more complete witnesses.⁴¹ In his introduction to the *Determinationes*, Badius admits

³⁹ For example, Badius comment before question 2 of book I of the work: “*Questio secunda, quam non omnes codices habent*” (unfoliated). COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 155, n. 119, asserts that the Augustinian Hermit Augustine of Regensburg was the editor of the 1497 edition of Holcot’s works, and others have followed this claim, e.g., SLOTEMAKER – WITT, *Robert Holcot*, p. 327, n. 1, who even assign the introductory letter to Augustine, despite the *intitulatio*: “Jodocus Badius Ascensius.” Badius’s introductory letter indicates he himself was the editor, but he makes a point of giving credit to Augustine for being of crucial assistance in re-examining the text. On this, see also MICHALSKI, *La philosophie au XIV^e siècle*, p. 216.

⁴⁰ BADIUS, Introduction to *Determinationes*, in: ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Opera*, ed. Lyon 1497 (unfoliated): “*Sequuntur determinationes quarundam questionum eiusdem magistri Roberti Holcot, quas, licet nonnullae earum semiplene sint, pretermittas tamen, ut in epistola nostra diximus, non oportuit.*”

⁴¹ BADIUS, Introductory Letter, in: ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Opera*, ed. Lyon 1497 (unfoliated): “*Invenite preterea sunt uno dumtaxat loco quarundam questionum determinationes sub nomine eiusdem Holcot consignate, quas ideo pretermittendas Trechsel noster iudicavit quod imperfecte atque mutile usque adeo essent ut inventu rarissimi sint qui eas reserpiendas susceperint. Docta siquidem ingenia maluerint novas excogitare quam sub alieno nomine fere deperditas instaurare. Inertia autem atque imperita, tam etsi forte amore lucelli impar onus non reiecerint, tamen indigna censuit quibus tantum munus committeret. Quocirca (ut meminimus) pretermittendas duxit donec complures viri boni quos super ea re consulimus dicerent aureum esse quicquid in eis contineretur. Quo responso quasi omine quodam accepto, intellexit extemplo nihil etiam in eiusmodi fragmentis contemnendum. Aurearum etenim rerum non tantum solide atque integre partes, sed vel minutissima queque fragmentula colligi solent. Quapropter istec omnia lecturos exoratos eius nomine velimus, ut boni equique consulant et pro tot aureis donis, si non aurum, at argenti, quantum*

that some think that Holcot's disciples collected these questions, or that they were dictated by Holcot in some public forum, but that when others wanted them in writing, he failed to polish and perfect them.⁴²

In sum, Badius found one manuscript with assorted questions in an unpolished state, which he apparently labelled "*Determinationes*" without any precise technical meaning. Yet given Badius's reputation, we can probably trust that his printing is as close as possible to the manuscript, correcting minor errors of grammar, orthography, and perhaps sense. After Badius moved to Paris, the 1497 edition was reprinted in Lyon in 1505, 1510, and 1518, and an analysis of the minor differences in the four printings for *Determinatio II* shows that each printing was based on the previous one, such that the entire printed tradition equals one manuscript witness.

The reason scholars have called the *Determinationes* quodlibetal is that manuscript Cambridge, Pembroke College 236, contains versions of *Determinationes* II-XI, XIII, and XV dumped in a section that they have termed Holcot's *Quodlibeta*, which "quodlibetal" questions Slotemaker and Witt have numbered 1–99, along with 5 other questions added to the end of their catalogue.⁴³ As far as I can tell, however, the label "*Quodlibeta*" in Pembroke 236 is found only in the upper margin of the first folio in two post-medieval hands, at the *beginning* of the questions on the *Sentences*, which occupy the first 141 folios.⁴⁴ After that, Pembroke 236 is a Holcot junkpile, literally a gathering of *quodlibeta*, anything whatever, where all sorts of texts have ended up, tossed there by Holcot himself or his followers. Moreover, no two of the three main witnesses to the so-called

iustum est, reponant. Neque propterea succenseant siqua adhuc imperfecta offenderint, perfectiora siquidem reperire non potuimus. Quod si quisquam ea pleniora habeat, non negligentie nostre (que si cum homines simus nulla esse non potuit, parva tamen admodum fuerit) irascatur, sed misero fato nostro, qui quod anxie indagavimus nancisci non potuimus, clementer condoleat." See also MICHALSKI, *La philosophie au XIV^e siècle*, pp. 219–220.

⁴² BADIUS, Introduction to *Determinationes*, in: ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Opera*, ed. Lyon 1497 (unfoliated): "Verumtamen non desunt qui eas a discipulis Holcot collectas putent, aut ab ipso inter profitendum in gymnasio publico dictatas, cum alii etiam scriptas ab eo velint, postmodum, quod neglexisse videtur, recognoscendas et perficiendas, verum utcunque id sese habeat, boni equique consulas, lector optime, et pro tua utilitate audacious susceptum munus benignius amplectare." See also MICHALSKI, *La philosophie au XIV^e siècle*, p. 220.

⁴³ SLOTEMAKER – WITT, *Robert Holcot*, pp. 268–274. For a succinct discussion of the problem of and the various opinions on Holcot's *Quodlibeta*, those of Michalski, Schepers, Gillespie, Gelber, and Tachau, see R. KEELE, "Oxford *Quodlibeta* from Ockham to Holcot," in: C. SCHABEL (ed.), *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages. The Fourteenth Century*, Leiden 2007, pp. 651–692, at pp. 680–684.

⁴⁴ MICHALSKI, *La philosophie au XIV^e siècle*, p. 220, is confused about where the labels are in Pembroke 236 and what the incipit is, listing instead that of Henry Totting of Oyta's *Sentences* questions.

Quodlibeta have the same contents or sequence, the other manuscripts being London, British Library, Royal 10.C.VI, and Oxford, Balliol College 246. Balliol 246 contains only *Determinationes* II–VII and XIII, and the codex that provides the most details about the original structure and contents of the actual quodlibetal disputations, Royal 10.C.VI, preserves only one of these *Determinationes*, number XV, and not in the section of the manuscript containing the *Quodlibeta*, but as part of book III of the *Sentences*, as we shall see presently. It turns out that *Determinatio* I, absent in these manuscripts, is not even by Holcot, but by the contemporary Oxford Franciscan Roger Roseth.⁴⁵

My opinion is that none of the other *Determinationes* is quodlibetal. In what follows I will show that at least some of them are certainly not quodlibetal, that they and some other alleged quodlibetal questions most likely originated from Holcot's year as *sententiarius*, and, in later sections, that *Determinationes* II and IV reflect contemporary exchanges between Holcot and Wodeham while they lectured on the *Sentences* in 1331–1332. Here are the pertinent *Determinationes*:

Determinatio II: *Utrum viae vivendi quas Christus docuit sint meritoriae vitae aeternae*

Determinatio IV: *Utrum viator existens in gratia ordinate utendo et fruendo posset vitare omne peccatum*

Determinatio XI: *Utrum Deus sit causa effectiva omnium aliorum a se*

Determinatio XV: *Utrum doctrina evangelica beati Matthaei de Christo sit generaliter tota vera*

In the Royal 10.C.VI copy of the question that corresponds to *Determinatio* XV in the 1497 edition and to the alleged quodlibetal question 14 in Pembroke 236, *Utrum doctrina evangelica beati Matthaei de Christo sit generaliter tota vera*, in the *divisio quaestionis* Holcot says concerning his second article: "I will recite the arguments of a certain *socius* with which he *replicavit* against me in many ways in his first lecture on the Bible." Just below, at the start of article 1, Holcot remarks: "Elsewhere in a certain disputation de

⁴⁵ The discovery goes back to MICHALSKI, *La philosophie au XIV^e siècle*, p. 74, but see now O. HALLAMAA, "On the Limits of the Genre: Roger Roseth as a Reader of the *Sentences*," in: P.W. ROSEMANN (ed.), *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Volume 2*, Leiden 2010, pp. 369–404, esp. p. 370, n. 6.

quolibet this year I held the negative side of this article.”⁴⁶ The Lyon edition and the Pembroke 236 witness do not have the reference to the first Bible lecture of the *socius*, nor do they mention the *quodlibet*, although Lyon does refer to a disputation. It is unlikely that the references to the *socius*’s Bible lecture and the quodlibetal disputation were added after the fact (in Royal 10.C.VI), but instead they were probably removed (in Pembroke 236 and Lyon). In any case, *Determinatio XV* is not quodlibetal, since it cites a quodlibetal disputation as if it were in a different genre.

If *Determinatio XV* is not a quodlibetal question, then what is it? In Pembroke 236, although some scholars list the question as quodlibetal in that manuscript, *Determinatio XV* is among what seem to be questions from Holcot’s bachelor lectures on Matthew. If we follow Pembroke 236, *Determinatio XV* could then be Holcot’s first question on Matthew in a lecture series that began on 10 February, probably in 1333 or 1334, when it fell on Wednesday and Thursday respectively.⁴⁷ In this case, however, the specific reference to the *socius*’s Bible lecture would appear out of place, since Holcot would be writing in the same genre.

It is more likely that *Determinatio XV* is from Holcot’s *Sentences* lectures. In the other witnesses to the text, Royal 10.C.VI, Oxford, Balliol College 71, and Oxford, Oriel College 15, *Determinatio XV* is the second question of book III of the *Sentences*. Book III has four questions in Royal 10.C.VI, Balliol 71, and Oriel 15, but in the dozens of other witnesses to Holcot’s *Sentences* questions that are not mere fragments (except where the sequence has been disturbed and questions belonging thematically to books II and IV have been reassigned to book III) there is only one question for book III: *Utrum Filius Dei incarnari potuit*.⁴⁸ Yet the number of manuscripts containing a given section of any medieval work is not necessarily an accurate indication of its original structure, and Royal 10.C.VI, Balliol

⁴⁶ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Determinatio XV*, divisio quaestionis, London, British Library, Royal 10.C.VI, f. 85vb: “Secundo recitabo rationes cuiusdam socii quibus contra me multipliciter replicavit in lectione sua prima ad bibliam, proper quas rationes materiam istam quam tracto, nisi ipse fuisset, ista vice nullatenus tetigissem. Tertio dico ad rationes principales. Quantum ad primum, alias in quadam disputatione de quolibet isto anno tenui partem negativam illius articuli, videlicet quod [...]”

⁴⁷ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, pp. 99-100 and n. 219, discusses the possible dating, based on Holcot’s opening sermon of his Matthew lectures in Royal 10.C.VI. See also W.J. COURTENAY, “The Lost Matthew Commentary of Robert Holcot, O.P.,” in: *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 50 (1980), pp. 103–112.

⁴⁸ SCHEPERS, “*Holkot contra dicta Crathorn I*,” pp. 333–336.

71, and Oriel 15 are in other ways uniquely authoritative witnesses to the *Sentences* lectures.

Of the 50 known witnesses preserving at least part of Holcot's *Sentences* questions,⁴⁹ only six more or less complete copies (plus one fragment) are in England, including Pembroke 236, and given that Holcot was active in England, these English codices deserve special attention, above all Royal 10.C.VI, Balliol 71, and Oriel 15. These three manuscripts are the only ones that contain the full text of what the Lyon edition has as the second question of book I, *Utrum <obiectum actus credendi> sit ipsum complexum vel res significata per complexum*. Royal 10.C.VI and Oriel 15 (the only witnesses to the *Sermo finalis*) place the complete question after the *Sentences* questions, as does Balliol 71, but Balliol 71 contains two copies of the question, the first of which is question 2 of book I, as in Lyon. Lyon, in contrast, contains only the first eighth of this question, as do at least seven manuscripts, always as question 2 of book I.⁵⁰ It seems that the short version of this question was inserted later in the tradition to which these witnesses belong, since if it were question 2 then an internal citation in the *Sex articuli* to question 3 of book I would be inaccurate.⁵¹ The *Sex articuli* are contained in at least 30 witnesses, including three that have the short version of question 2 of book I. I will discuss the nature of the question on the object of the act of believing below in section 5.

⁴⁹ The Lyon 1497 print, the 48 manuscripts listed in TACHAU, "Introduction," pp. 36–38, and one described in J.T. SLOTEMAKER, "Robert Holcot's Commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard: Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, MS A.XI.36," in: *Manuscripta* 60 (2016), pp. 93–101.

⁵⁰ Edited in O. GRASSI, "Il *De obiecto actus credendi* di Roberto Holcot. Introduzione e edizione," in: *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 5 (1994), pp. 487–521, at pp. 498–521. At p. 487, following SCHEPERS, "*Holcot contra dicta Crathorn I*," pp. 333–335, Grassi lists five manuscripts that have the truncated version, to which should be added two manuscripts described in P. FARAGO-BERMON, "Les manuscrits conservés à Paris des *Quaestiones super libros Sententiarum* de Robert Holcot," in: *Przegląd Tomistyczny* 19 (2013), pp. 143–176, at p. 145 (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14576), and SLOTEMAKER, "Robert Holcot's Commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard: Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, MS A.XI.36," pp. 98–99.

⁵¹ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Sex articuli*, introductio, ed. F. HOFFMANN, p. 66.16–18: "Quintus articulus fuit dictus in materia de fruitione q. 3 Super primum et fuit talis: Casu possibili posito homo potest licite et meritorie frui creatura." In the apparatus fontium, Hoffmann directs the reader to book I, q. 4, following the Lyon numbering, but in most witnesses it is q. 3, as Holcot himself says. Despite the admittedly dense presentation of the redactions in SCHEPERS, "*Holcot contra dicta Crathorn I*," pp. 333–335, a work that Hoffmann cites in his bibliography, Hoffmann only lists (and uses in his edition) 8 witnesses to the text of the *Sex articuli*, although in his earlier *Die theologische Methode des Oxforder Dominikanerlehrers Robert Holcot*, Münster 1972, p. 431, he includes three others. Among the codices Hoffmann does use are five of the six English manuscripts, perhaps forgetting that he had listed Balliol 71 in his 1972 publication.

If we take Royal 10.C.VI (R), Balliol 71 (B), and Oriel 15 (O) as our guide, then the end of book II through the start of book IV looks like this:

II, q. 5 (R 64va–76rb; B 76rb–87vb; O 164ra–171vb): *Utrum stellae sint creatae ut per motum et lumen sint in signa et tempora...* **Explicit liber secundus.**

III, q. 1 (R 76rb–85va; B 88ra–96vb; O 171vb–177va): *Utrum Dei Filius potuit incarnari.*

III, q. 2 (R 85va–89rb; B 97ra–100va; O 177vb–180ra): *Utrum doctrina evangelica beati Matthaei de Christo sit generaliter tota vera [= Determinatio XV]*

III, q. 3 (R 89rb–vb; B 100va–101ra; O 180ra–b): *Utrum beatus Matthaeus gaudeat iam in caelo de conversione sua a teloneo ad episcopatum.*

III, q. 4 (R 89vb–98vb; B 101ra–110rb [102–103 *desunt*]; O 180rb–185vb): *Utrum Filius Dei assumpsit naturam humanam in unitate suppositi...* **Explicit tertius liber.**

IV, q. 1 (R 98vb–108va; B 110rb–120ra; O 185vb–191vb): *Utrum cum omni sacramento debito modo suscepto recipienti sacramentum informans gratia conferatur.*

Of these six questions, only one is contained in other witnesses as part of the *Sentences*, the first question of book III, *Utrum Dei Filius potuit incarnari*, which is in almost the entire tradition. Yet there is something strange about this question: as we shall see, it has the structure and nature of the *Sex articuli*, unlike the other *Sentences* questions, and it is not always in the same place. There is thus reason to believe that book III, question 1, was added later.⁵² If so, then there would be a simple explanation for the absence of the other five questions in the rest of the tradition: they were omitted by mistake because the quires were missing. Alternatively, because there is evidence that Holcot read the four books in the sequence I-IV-II-III, it is possible that the rest of the tradition simply stops before the final question of book II, in which case the current book III, question 1 as well as first question in book IV in Royal 10.C.VI, Balliol 71, and Oriel 15 were inserted later. I will return to these two questions later.

There are other witnesses to some of these five questions, however. Question 5 of book II in Royal 10.C.VI, Balliol 71, and Oriel 15, the question on the stars, *Utrum stellae sint creatae ut per motum et lumen sint in signa et tempora*, circulated separately in

⁵² For other reasons, this is also suggested in COURTENAY, *Schools and Scholars*, p. 8, n. 10,

Oxford, Bodleian, e Mus. 167, ff. 19v–41r; it immediately follows the *Sentences* questions in Oxford, Corpus Christi College 138, ff. 118v–122r; Pembroke 236, ff. 117ra–132ra; and Köln, Historisches Archiv der Stadt, GB 4^o 186, ff. 115r–130r; it is inserted awkwardly between books I and II in Erfurt, Universitätsbibliothek, CA 2^o 105, ff. 33va–49ra; and it is probably in other witnesses to Holcot’s *Sentences*.⁵³ Thus five of the six English manuscripts containing the *Sentences* questions (Oxford, Merton College 113, does not have it) place the question on the stars among or adjacent to the questions on the *Sentences*, none of them includes it among the quodlibetal questions, and although Slotemaker and Witt list it as quodlibetal question number 1 in Pembroke 236, the text actually begins in that manuscript in this way:

In distinction 15 of the second book of the *Sentences* the Master deals with the work of the fourth day of the creation of the world, declaring how on the fourth day God arranged the main lights and stars so that they would go around the Earth and illuminate it and be in signs and times and days and years. And because both the planets and the fixed stars are called by the common name ‘stars’, therefore concerning this distinction I ask...⁵⁴

Immediately following the question on the stars in Pembroke 236 is the alleged quodlibetal question number 2 (ff. 132ra–134vb), *Utrum Filius Dei assumpsit naturam humanam in unitatem suppositi*, which Tachau declares is also contained in the beginning of the Padova, Biblioteca Antoniana 226 (ff. 1r–3v) witness to the *Sentences* questions. Given that the previous question in Pembroke 236 is also explicitly tied to the *Sentences*, it is understandable that Hester Gelber had no hesitation in following the other witnesses,

⁵³ L. THORNDIKE, “A New Work by Robert Holcot (Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS 138),” in: *Archives internationales d’histoire des sciences* 10 (1957), pp. 227–235; J. VENNEBUSCH, “Bemerkung zum *Tractatus de stellis* des Robert Holcot,” in: *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 20 (1978), p. 75; online catalogue for Erfurt; TACHAU, “Introduction,” pp. 39–40. On this question, see especially K.H. TACHAU, “Logic’s God and the Natural Order in Late Medieval Oxford: The Teaching of Robert Holcot,” in: *Annals of Science* 53 (1996), pp. 235–267, at pp. 255–267.

⁵⁴ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *In II Sententiarum*, q. 5 (d. 15), Pembroke 236, f. 117ra: “Distinctione 15^a secundi libri *Sententiarum* agit Magister de opere quartae diei creationis mundi, declarans quomodo Deus die quarta ordinavit caelum per luminaria maiora et stellas ut circuissent terram et illuminarent eam et essent in signa et tempora et dies et annos. Et quia tam planetae quam stellae fixae communi nomine ‘stellae’ nuncupantur, ideo circa illam distinctionem quaero istam pro materia praetacta quaestionem: utrum stellae sint creatae ut per motum et lumen sint in signa et tempora.” Cf. SLOTEMAKER – WITT, *Robert Holcot*, p. 2, where they assign the question on the stars to Holcot’s period as regent master.

Royal 10.C.VI, Balliol 71, and Oriel 15, and thus labelling her edition of article 1 “*Roberti Holcot in tertium librum Sententiarum*, q. 4, a. 1.”⁵⁵

The two remaining questions from book III in Royal 10.C.VI, Balliol 71, and Oriel 15, numbers 2 and 3, *Utrum doctrina evangelica beati Matthaei de Christo sit generaliter tota vera* and *Utrum beatus Matthaueus gaudeat iam in caelo de conversione sua a teloneo ad episcopatum*, are included among the questions on Matthew in Pembroke 236 (ff. 149ra–152ra), with the number 3 also in Balliol 246 (ff. 205rb–206ra). These two questions thus probably originated in one lecture series and were incorporated into the written record for another, but given Pembroke 236’s (and Balliol 246’s) tendency to simply gather as many questions as possible, it is likely that they came from the *Sentences* lectures, as Royal 10.C.VI, Balliol 71, and Oriel 15 have it.

The foregoing discussion suggests (and Tachau’s manuscript discussion supports this) that most of the continental codices and the Lyon edition do not reflect the more complicated reality in Holcot’s homeland, where manuscripts often did not survive the English reformation, although only a full philological analysis of the entire tradition will tell us more about where the English and continental manuscripts fit.⁵⁶

More importantly, if, as it seems, *Determinatio XV, Utrum doctrina evangelica beati Matthaei de Christo sit generaliter tota vera*, belongs among the questions from Holcot’s lectures on III *Sentences*, then, given that he read book III last, Holcot’s remark that “elsewhere in a certain disputation *de quolibet* this year I held the negative side of this article” entails that Holcot had participated in quodlibetal disputations during the Lent break while still reading the *Sentences* and suggests that he was the *opponens*. Despite the occasional lack of distinction in the literature between determining quodlibetal

⁵⁵ H.G. GELBER, “Robert Holcot, Obligational Theology, and the Incarnation,” in: W.O. DUBA – R.L. FRIEDMAN – C.D. SCHABEL (eds.), *Studies in Later Medieval Intellectual History in Honor of William J. Courtenay*, Leuven 2017, pp. 357–391, edition on pp. 377–391. While on p. 364, n. 23, Gelber rightly lists Balliol 71 as containing the question, later, on p. 376, she wrongly asserts that only Oriel 15, Pembroke 236, and Royal 10.C.VI have the question, and she employs those three for her edition of article 1. Gelber does not mention the Padua copy, for which see TACHAU, “Appendix 2,” in ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Seeing the Future Clearly*, p. 198, n. 8, where her list of witnesses omits Royal 10.C.VI and gives incomplete foliation for Oriel 15 and Balliol 71.

⁵⁶ One should not be surprised if such a study validates the decision of Tachau, Streveler, Courtenay, and Gelber to employ four of the six English manuscripts – including Royal 10.C.VI and Oriel 15 – and only one continental witness in their partial edition of Holcot’s II *Sentences*, question 2. See TACHAU, “Introduction,” pp. 38–46, and the edition in ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Seeing the Future Clearly*, ed. TACHAU – STREVELER, with COURTENAY – GELBER, pp. 112–195.

questions and participating in quodlibetal disputations,⁵⁷ such participation was not only allowed at this stage, but encouraged and probably required. The Oxford statutes first stipulated that students in theology hear lectures on the Bible for a certain number of years before being permitted to oppose in disputations. Since the *opponens* who began the dispute chose the side he would support, one had to wait longer before being allowed to respond, because the *respondens* had to defend the remaining side and perhaps against more than one *opponens*. Only afterwards would one be admitted to read the *Sentences*. For a time the rules were different for seculars and regulars, but it is certain that all *sententiarii* already had experience in such public disputations and continued to participate.⁵⁸

This does not mean, however, that bachelors of theology were able to determine quodlibetal questions at Oxford, for as Courtenay put it, “a quodlibetic dispute belonged to a master, and bachelors could only participate by opposing or responding.”⁵⁹ Thus *Determinatio XI*, the alleged quodlibetal question number 92 in Pembroke 236, *Utrum Deus sit causa effectiva omnium aliorum a se*, which appears to give information indicating the current year as 1332,⁶⁰ cannot be quodlibetal because Holcot was not yet a master and the written question does not have the structure of a bachelor’s participation. For the same reason, *Determinatio IV*, the alleged quodlibetal question 57 in Pembroke 236, *Utrum viator existens in gratia ordinate utendo et fruendo posset vitare omne peccatum*, cannot be a magisterial *quodlibet* because it is quoted in Adam Wodeham’s Oxford questions on the *Sentences*, as Courtenay has found. The other Holcot question that Courtenay discovered to be involved in an exchange with Wodeham is *Determinatio II*. As we shall see, *Determinationes II, IV, and XI* are probably all

⁵⁷ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, pp. 99–100, says that Holcot had to have finished his Bible lectures first, and TACHAU, “Introduction,” p. 26, suggests the same; GELBER, *It Could Have Been Otherwise*, pp. 94–95, esp. n. 114, implies that any participation in quodlibetal debates was restricted to masters.

⁵⁸ A.G. LITTLE, *The Grey Friars in Oxford. Part I: A History of the Convent. Part II: Biographical Notices of the Friars*, Oxford 1892, pp. 40–41 and 44–46; H. RASHDALL, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages. Volume III: English Universities, Student Life*, revised by F.M. POWICKE and A.B. EMDEN, Oxford 1936, pp. 158–159; J.A. WEISHEPL, “Ockham and the Mertonians,” in: J.I. CATTO (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford. Volume I: The Early Oxford Schools*, Oxford 1984, p. 607–658, at p. 642; COURTENAY, *Schools and Scholars*, pp. 41–42, 49, 59; TACHAU, “Introduction,” p. 4.

⁵⁹ COURTENAY, *Schools and Scholars*, p. 45.

⁶⁰ See SCHEPERS, “*Holcot contra dicta Crathorn I*,” pp. 350–351, and COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 99, n. 220, for the date, but this is problematic; see the next section.

connected to Holcot's year as *sententiarius*, but for the moment my focus is on *Determinatio II, Utrum viae vivendi quas Christus docuit sint meritoriae vitae aeternae*, the supposed quodlibetal question 52 in Pembroke 236.

4. Robert Holcot's *Determinatio II, a Principium on the Sentences*

I have prepared an edition of *Determinatio II* from the three known witnesses: Pembroke 236, Balliol 246, and the Lyon edition, which contains a longer version of the question than the already lengthy text in Pembroke 236 and Balliol 246. To make a long story short, for this question the version (or slightly differing versions, at times) in the Pembroke 236 and Balliol 246 manuscripts appears closer to a *reportatio* of Holcot's text. Holcot then seems to have begun to redact this question into something much larger, but left off before he finished, resulting in a text that Badius – talking about the *Determinationes* in general – rightly described as unpolished and unfinished.⁶¹

Hester Gelber claimed that *Determinatio II* could be question 16 from Holcot's first *Quodlibet*, while Tachau considered this unlikely, partly because of its unusual length and the nature of its quoting from Adam Wodeham, suggesting instead that it is probably either from Holcot's lectures on Matthew or his third *Principium on the Sentences*.⁶²

Structurally, *Determinatio II* differs from the published quodlibetal questions on future contingents, for example, and is closer to the one on the same topic in the questions on the *Sentences*, book II, question 2.⁶³ In the *Sentences* question on future contingents, as he often does, Holcot begins with a series of ten large responses *ad principale*, which are subdivided into arguments, against his own position. Afterwards there are ten articles loosely corresponding to the ten umbrella responses. In *Determinatio II*, there are four such umbrella responses *ad principale* and four articles, the last of which addresses the opening arguments.

⁶¹ In the context of Pascale Bermon's project (with Christophe Grellard) to edit Holcot's so-called *Quodlibeta*, and working under the aegis of Monica Brinzei's ERC project DEBATE on *Principia*. The question will be published elsewhere, and I refer the reader to that publication for more detailed discussion.

⁶² TACHAU, "Introduction," pp. 19–20.

⁶³ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Seeing the Future Clearly*, ed. TACHAU – STREVELER, with COURTENAY – GELBER, pp. 112–195.

In responding to the opening arguments in *Determinatio* II, Holcot makes the point that these can be true at the same time: “God wills eternal life for someone and yet He is able never to have willed eternal life for that person, and He is able never to have been that person’s debtor,” at which point Pembroke 236 adds, “as is clear with contingents,” but Balliol 246 has “as *will be clear* when, *God granting*, future contingents *will be treated*,” and here the Lyon edition agrees with Balliol 246, but using *dicetur* rather than *tractabitur*.⁶⁴ To what coming treatment of future contingents is Holcot referring? Holcot’s largest and most comprehensive treatment of future contingents is in question 2 of book II in most manuscripts of his *Sentences* lectures, of which Tachau, Streveler, Courtenay, and Gelber have provided a partial edition. Holcot’s only other substantial discussion is in what Tachau, Streveler, Courtenay, and Gelber edited together as questions 1–3 and 8 of Holcot’s third *Quodlibet*. Of these four quodlibetal questions, only number 8 is lengthy, since questions 1–3 combined amount to a total of just a little over 400 lines, whereas number 8 weighs in at almost 750 lines. This is dwarfed by the *Sentences* question, which in the critical edition takes up over 1800 lines, omitting roughly 500 lines, such that the complete *Sentences* question is twice as long as all four quodlibetal questions combined.⁶⁵

If Gelber were correct that *Determinatio* II is part of Holcot’s first *Quodlibet*, then the future-tensed reference would be to the third *Quodlibet*. This is unlikely. Holcot could not have known in his first *Quodlibet* that he would be asked about future contingents in his third *Quodlibet*. Nor can this be a reference in hindsight based on a later revision, because Holcot would not have said that he would address the issue in the future *Deo dante*, because he would have already done so *de facto*. This kind of future reference is rather rare for such an unpredictable genre as a quodlibetal disputation, although it is more normal when the author is in control of the material, for example in *Sentences* lectures

⁶⁴ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Determinatio* II, ed. SCHABEL: “Et ista stant simul: vult sibi vitam aeternam, et tamen potest numquam sibi voluisse vitam aeternam et potest numquam fuisse suus debitor.” Pembroke 236, f. 164vb: “sicut patet de contingentibus”; Balliol 246, f. 222va: “sicut patebit quando tractabitur, Deo dante, de <futuris> [suis] contingentibus”; ed. Lyon 1497 (unfoliated): “sicut patebit quando dicetur, Deo dante, de futuris contingentibus.”

⁶⁵ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Seeing the Future Clearly*, ed. TACHAU – STREVELER, with COURTENAY – GELBER, pp. 59–111 (quodlibetal questions) and 112–195 (*Sentences* question).

or ordinary disputations.⁶⁶ Moreover, it is unlikely that Holcot would ignore completely his huge question on future contingents from his *Sentences* commentary, 84 pages in the incomplete critical edition, where article 7 contains precisely the discussion presaged in *Determinatio* II, beginning thus: “I say here, as is commonly said, that a proposition about the future is true, yet in such a way that it is able never to have been true.”⁶⁷

The failure to mention his *Sentences* treatment would also be a problem if we identified *Determinatio* II as a question from Holcot’s bachelor lectures on Matthew. *Determinatio* II is not among the other alleged questions on Matthew in Pembroke 236, and there are just two quotations of Matthew in the lengthy *Determinatio* II, one of them wrongly ascribed to Mark in Pembroke 236 and Balliol 246. In contrast, even in the shorter Pembroke-Balliol version, aside from a few references to Romans, Augustine, Anselm, Hugh of Saint-Victor, and the *Decretals* (thirteen for all of these in total), Holcot cites Aristotle seven times (five times the *Ethics*) and there are no fewer than fifteen citations of the *Magister Sententiarum*, including six to book II and five to book III.

The length, structure, future-tensed internal reference to a *Sentences* question, and numerous citations of the Master of the *Sentences* thus indicate that *Determinatio* II is connected to Holcot’s *Sentences* lectures. Recall that Tachau suggested that *Determinatio* II could be one of Holcot’s *principia*.⁶⁸ In the second quarter of the fourteenth century, before normal classes began in October, the bachelors of the *Sentences* at the University of Paris would take turns each legible day giving a sermon in praise of theology or Peter Lombard or his *Sentences*, protest that they did not mean to say anything heretical or erroneous in what followed, and then treat a question in which they defended a thesis that they had already distributed in writing to their fellow bachelors, their *socii*. While answering his chosen question with his thesis of choice, each *sententiarius* was supposed to attack one or more of the theses of his associates, to make it challenging for the bachelors and interesting for the audience, since the Faculty of

⁶⁶ On *quodlibeta*, see P. GLORIEUX, *La littérature quodlibétique de 1260 à 1320*, 2 vols., Kain 1925 and Paris 1935; and C. SCHABEL, *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols., Leiden 2006–2007.

⁶⁷ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *In II Sententiarum*, q. 2, a. 7, ed. ed. TACHAU – STREVELER, with COURTENAY – GELBER, p. 146.758-759: “Dico hic, sicut communiter dicitur, quod propositio de futuro est vera, sic tamen quod potest numquam fuisse vera.”

⁶⁸ The following paragraph summarizes what I have written elsewhere. On the genre of *principia* on the *Sentences*, see now M. BRÎNZEI and W.O. DUBA (eds.), *Principia on the Sentences*, Turnhout, forthcoming.

Theology suspended all other activities to attend the debates. Insofar as it included both sermons and debated questions, the *principia* genre seems to have originated at Paris in the 1310s and soon spread to Oxford.

Tachau suspected that Holcot's *Determinatio* II was a *principium* because it is aimed squarely at a *socius*, Adam Wodeham, and another contemporary, Richard FitzRalph. There is better evidence confirming her intuition. In the longer Lyon version of *Determinatio* II, where the *incunabulum* actually introduces the question with *Sequitur quaestio secunda principalis*, immediately following the opening arguments and the argument *ad oppositum* and before the *divisio quaestionis* Holcot makes the following remark:

In this question I uphold the common *protestatio*, which I wish to make, that although I could easily fall into any error through ignorance or not thinking things through (*indeliberatio*), nevertheless I do not want to go along with defending any error stubbornly.⁶⁹

This is a classic and distinctive *protestatio* of a bachelor in a principal question. Although such *protestationes* rarely survive, the rules stipulated that after the principal sermon and at the start of the principal question, the bachelor of the *Sentences* was required to declare to his audience that he did not intend to defend any error or say anything heretical in what followed. I have found no such *protestatio* in the other thirteen *Determinationes* (excluding the question by Roseth) or indeed anywhere else in Holcot's oeuvre. There are other indications of caution in Holcot's question that also suggest a principal context, for example remarking after a giving a series of six *conclusiones* or theses – perhaps not coincidentally a common number in later principal debates at Paris – “These theses have been recited *probabiliter*, but without assertion, until something

⁶⁹ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Determinatio* II, ed. Lyon (unfoliated): “In ista quaestione suppono protestationem communem, quam volo facere: quod licet per ignorantiam vel indeliberationem in quemvis errorem faciliter labi possem, tamen in nullo errore pertinaciter defendendo volo consentire.”

more likely comes to mind concerning these matters.” The arguments against his theses also include a cryptic reference to *argumentum eiusdem valentissimum*, as if in debate.⁷⁰

Determinatio II thus started as one of Holcot’s *principia*, in which he reacted to Adam Wodeham and referred to his own coming discussion on future contingents. Although a version of this principal question stemming from a *reportatio* circulated, it was not included in the manuscripts of the questions on the *Sentences*. Eventually Holcot began to revise the question into something much more substantial, perhaps with his original notes, and hence the *protestatio*, but he did not get very far and the expanded but still unpolished question perhaps remained in one manuscript, which Badius had printed in Lyon in 1497.

5. Robert Holcot’s *His Principia on the Sentences*

Could we identify more of Holcot’s *principia*, for example in the other *Determinations*, especially *Determinatio* IV, in which Holcot is involved in another exchange with Wodeham? Tachau reminded her readers that *principia* frequently survive in significantly fewer manuscripts and often separately from the *Sentences* questions in general,⁷¹ so it is not unusual that Holcot’s *principium* in *Determinatio* II survived in just three witnesses apart from the *Sentences* questions. In written form, a *principium* can be impossible to identify, even if it is placed as the first question for a given book of the *Sentences*, because it can be indistinguishable from normal questions if it is shorn of its *protestatio*, references to *socii*, internal references, and so on, as in the case of the Pembroke 236 version of *Determinatio* II. In the 1320s, 1330s, and 1340s at Paris, moreover, there are several examples of materials from principal debates with *socii* being relocated and incorporated elsewhere in the *Sentences* questions, whether in the pertinent thematic

⁷⁰ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Determinatio* II, a. 1, pars 1, ed. Lyon (unfoliated): “Istae conclusiones sunt probabiliter, sed sine assertione, recitatae, donec aliquid verisimilius de eisdem occurrat.” “Istud est argumentum eiusdem valentissimum, nec tamen probat ulterius falsitatem consequentis.” Compare the description of the *protestatio* in COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 174: “a statement made by the candidate assuring the faculty that his subsequent lectures would not contain definitive pronouncements but rather probable arguments, *non assertive*, appropriate for the scholastic exercise.”

⁷¹ TACHAU, “Introduction,” pp. 21–22. Examples are the *principia* of Walter Burley, Paris ca. 1316, and the Franciscan Francis of Marchia, Paris 1319–1320, on which see the paper by W.O. DUBA in BRÎNZEI – DUBA, *Principia on the Sentences*.

place or not.⁷² In addition, aside from the four *principia*, the Parisian bachelor of the *Sentences* could attack his colleagues and other contemporaries in his final lecture, so debates with *socii*, even if they were not simply added to the written version, do not automatically indicate *principia*.⁷³

In fact, at Oxford there appear to have been even more official opportunities to confront *socii*, since the statutes merely state that one “shall not reply (*replicet*) more than once per term beyond the *introitus* (= *principia*) of the books and their *cessationes*, since *introitus* and *cessationes*, as well as the recitation of passages (*locorum*) pertinent to the proper material... do not count as *replicationes*,” which Andrew G. Little interpreted as follows, assuming, parenthetically, a one-year *Sentences* lecture over three terms: “He was not to raise doubtful points or attack the conclusions of another, more than once a term, except at the first and last lectures on each book of the *Sentences*.”⁷⁴ In brief, there were at least eight and perhaps eleven opportunities for a bachelor of the *Sentences* at Oxford to attack his *socii*, he could remove all references to his *socii* in the written version of these *lectiones*, he could move these battles elsewhere in the written version of the normal questions on the *Sentences*, or he could detach these confrontations altogether, so that where they did not disappear they circulated separately from the written questions on the *Sentences*.

Which *principium* is *Determinatio* II? As mentioned above, in Holcot’s day, Parisian lectures on the *Sentences* followed the sequence I-IV-II-III, Tachau supported I-II-III-IV for Holcot, and John Slotemaker and Jeff Witt later adjusted this to I-II-IV-III based on internal references in book III to book IV in the past tense.⁷⁵ If Holcot’s main treatment of future contingents is early in book II, then the future-tensed reference in *Determinatio* II would

⁷² Examples are the Franciscan Guiral Ot, Paris 1327–1328; the Augustinian Thomas of Strasbourg, Paris 1333–1334; the Augustinian Gregory of Rimini, Paris 1343–1344; and the Augustinian Alphonsus Vargas of Toledo and the Carmelite Paul of Perugia, Paris 1344–1345: the paper by DUBA in BRINZEI – DUBA, *Principia on the Sentences*, and SCHABEL, “The Genre Matures.” Virtually all of the above ways in which *principia* could circulate are already listed in one paragraph in MICHALSKI, *La philosophie au XIV^e siècle*, p. 155.

⁷³ A good example is edited by Schabel and Duba and discussed at length in W.O. DUBA, “Masters and Bachelors at Paris in 1319: The *lectio finalis* of Landolfo Caracciolo, OFM,” in: A. SPEER – T. JESCHKE (eds.), *Schüler und Meister*, Berlin 2016, pp. 315–365.

⁷⁴ LITTLE, *The Greyfriars at Oxford*, p. 46 and n. 6: “[N]on replicet pluries quam semel in termino, ultra introitus librorum, et cessationes eorumdem; introitus enim et cessationes librorum, ac recitatio locorum ad materiam propriam pertinens, [...] pro replicationibus minime computantur.”

⁷⁵ SLOTEMAKER – WITT, *Robert Holcot*, pp. 262–264.

seem to rule out its being a *principium* for book III, which is what Tachau proposed, or for IV, for that matter, unless Holcot read I-IV-II-III. Trapp and Courtenay suggest that the *protestatio* accompanied the first *principium*, but Jean de Mirecourt's second *principium* from early 1345 suggests that the *protestatio* may have been repeated for each book.⁷⁶

Tachau and Gelber already have a candidate for the first *principium*, however: *Utrum <obiectum actus credendi> sit ipsum complexum vel res significata per complexum*.⁷⁷ As discussed above, this question is contained complete in Royal 10.C.VI, Balliol 71, and Oriel 15, in which manuscripts it is placed after the *Sentences* questions, although in a second full copy in Balliol 71 and in fragmentary form in a few manuscripts and the Lyon edition it is question 2 of book I. Yet the same basis for calling this question a *principium* equally indicates a question for the prologue, for Oriel 15 explicitly calls it the *prologus* in five places, remarking that the question *statim post sermonem primum loco prologi poneretur* and *immediate post sermonem in principio poneretur*. These phrases appear to be instructions about where the question should be inserted rather than a statement about where it originated, the *principio* meaning here “in the beginning.” Recall also that the insertion of this question disrupts the internal reference in the *Sex articuli* to a later question in book I. At any rate, “Whether the object of the act of believing is the *complexum* itself or the thing signified by the *complexum*” is a natural topic for a prologue and the question contains no dialogue with *socii*, since Holcot's interlocutors are Walter Chatton, Peter Auriol, Richard Campsall, and William of Ockham.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ IOHANNES DE MERCURIA, *Principium II*, Lilienfeld, Stiftsbibliothek 148, f. 151rb: “Pro solutione istius quaestionis, praemissis protestationibus consuetis.” D. TRAPP, “CIm 27034: Unchristened Nominalism and Wycliffite Realism at Prague in 1381,” in: *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 24 (1957), pp. 320–360, at p. 340; COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 174. The *protestatio* is not repeated in the *principia* of Pierre Ceffons, the longest and most detailed *principia* of which I know: SCHABEL, “The Genre Matures.”

⁷⁷ TACHAU, “Appendix 2,” p. 197, GELBER, *It Could Have Been Otherwise*, p. 345, and comments in GRASSI, “Il ‘De obiecto actus credendi’ di Roberto Holcot,” pp. 490–491.

⁷⁸ For the Oriel 15 notes, see GELBER, *It Could Have Been Otherwise*, p. 345, n. 75, GRASSI, “Il ‘De obiecto actus credendi’ di Roberto Holcot,” p. 488, n. 4, and ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Prologus*, ed. GRASSI, p. 521.541–542: “Explicit Prologus in opus Holcoth qui immediate post sermonem in principio poneretur.” This question seems to have been written in two stages. It began with six opening arguments, which Holcot begins to answer after giving his opinion, but after responding to the first three after only 66 lines, the short version ceases, and in the long version Holcot suddenly adds an objection that leads to the remainder of the question, almost 500 more lines. The last three opening arguments are never addressed.

Following Joseph Wey,⁷⁹ Tachau has identified as Holcot's *principium* for book II *Determinatio XI, Utrum Deus sit causa effectiva omnium aliorum a se*, which seems to contain an *anno mundi* date corresponding to 1332⁸⁰ and is preserved in the 1497 printing and Pembroke 236, both of which link *Determinatio XI* to book II of the *Sentences*. The basis for Wey's assertion is that in the Lyon edition *Determinatio XI* begins with *Circa principium secundi libri*, although in Pembroke 236, where the text is the alleged quodlibetal question 92, *Determinatio XI* is simply identified in the margins as *quaestio de secundo libro*, but not as a *principium*.⁸¹ Thus the evidence for this question's being principal relies solely on the interpretation of the Lyon incipit.

Here, however, the evidence is much weaker than it first appears. A number of sets of questions on book II of the *Sentences* in particular, in one or all manuscripts, begin with the exact same words, *Circa principium secundi libri*, although they are demonstrably not *principia*: by the Parisian Dominicans William Peter of Godino and James of Metz around 1300 and Durand of Saint-Pourçain from around 1310, all before the principal genre really begins, by the Parisian Franciscans Francis of Marchia and Francis of Meyronnes

⁷⁹ In a personal communication, Wey suggested to Courtenay that *Determinatio XI* could be Holcot's second *principium*: COURTENAY, *Schools and Scholars*, p. 45, n. 53. By late 1982 Wey had become rather certain in a personal communication to Gelber: GELBER, *It Could Have Been Otherwise*, pp. 93–94, n. 107; TACHAU, "Introduction," p. 21, n. 58, and "Appendix 2," p. 197.

⁸⁰ Contrary to the claim in GELBER, *It Could Have Been Otherwise*, pp. 93–94 and n. 107, repeated in, e.g., J.T. SLOTEMAKER, "Robert Holcot the Homilist: A Sermon Index for Cambridge, Peterhouse 210," in: *Archa Verbi* 11 (2014), pp. 73–123, at p. 76 and n. 19, there is no 1332 date anywhere and there is only one manuscript – and, *pace* Slotemaker, MICHALSKI, *La philosophie au XIV^e siècle*, pp. 222–223, discovered the information, passed on by SCHEPERS, "*Holcot contra dicta Crathorn I*," pp. 350–351. We read in *Determinatio XI*, a. 4, in Pembroke 236, f. 216va: "Cuius oppositum tenet fides praedicans durationem mundi esse iam 6531 annorum," while the Lyon edition has "iam fere MDXXXII annorum," probably an error for 6532. Putting aside the disagreement between the only two witnesses, this dating style is problematic: the number is given here not as a date but as a duration, and the calculation depends on which precise date the author employed for the beginning of the world, e.g., 18 or 25 March, and on whether he associated Christ's birth with 1 BC or 1 AD. (I thank Philipp Nothaft for this clarification.) If the year was 1332, then even if Wodeham lectured in the sequence I-IV-II-III, the first question for book II would have been delivered orally before March 25, the beginning of the year in England at the time, meaning that early March 1332 would have been 1333 on our reckoning, which would be problematic for my view that he lectured in 1331–1332. Nevertheless, the text as we have it is not a raw *reportatio*, so if it were redacted even a couple of weeks (or a couple of months, if he read I-II-III-IV or I-II-IV-III) later, it would have been 1332 in England as well. Alternatively, combining Pembroke and Lyon, "fere 6531" could be what Holcot wrote, meaning "almost 1332," which would fit early March 1332 New Style perfectly. At any rate, the date is unclear.

⁸¹ TACHAU, "Introduction," p. 21 and n. 58, further remarking that the editors made an error in calling it a *Determinatio*, just as they had in printing a question by Roger Roseth as *Determinatio I*, but we have seen that Badius had simply found one witness to these questions, attributed to Holcot, but in a chaotic state, and decided to print them all.

from about 1320, by the above-mentioned Oxonian Franciscan Roger Roseth from around 1335, and later by the Cistercian James of Eltville, Paris 1370, the Carmelite Arnold of Seehusen, Vienna ca. 1400, and others.⁸²

Thus when Holcot begins in the Lyon version, *Circa principium secundi libri, in quo arguitur* (an error for *agitur*) *de causalitate Dei respectu creaturae, quaero istam quaestionem*, it could be that *Utrum Deus sit causa effectiva omnium aliorum a se* was simply the first question from Holcot's lectures on book II and was left out of the *Sentences* tradition, as was the case at the end of book II for the question on the stars in most manuscripts. After all, "Whether God is the effective cause of all things other than Himself" is exactly what one would ask to open lectures on book II. It also begins in article one with the opinion of Ockham, while article four focuses on Scotus and Aquinas. There is nothing characteristically principial here.

For the *principium* for book III, Tachau suggests either *Determinatio* II itself or *Utrum Filius Dei assumpsit naturam humanam in unitate suppositi*, i.e., the fourth question for book III in Royal 10.C.VI, Balliol 71, and Oriel 15, presumably because of its topic and the fact that it is outside the main tradition.⁸³ *Determinatio* II cannot be the *principium* for book III, since it has the future reference to the question on future contingents from book II. I have argued above that the reason book III, question 4, is missing from the main tradition is accidental, and I see no reason to identify it as a *principium*. Indeed, we have better candidates for the *principium* for book III: both the first question of book III and the *Sex articuli* exclusively involve debates with *socii* and have been associated with book III. In the case of the *Sex articuli*, previous scholars have made the connection with book

⁸² For Metz and Godino, see the editions in J.W. PECK, SJ – C. SCHABEL, "James of Metz and the Dominican Tradition on the Eternity of the World, ca. 1300," in: *Medioevo* 40 (2015), pp. 265–330, at pp. 298.1 and 321.1 respectively. For Durand, see DURANDUS DE SANCTO PORCIANO, *In Sententias commentaria* II, d. 1, q. 1, ed. Venice 1527 (redaction C), f. 126ra. For Marchia, see FRANCISCUS DE MARCHIA, *Reportatio IIA (Quaestiones in secundum librum Sententiarum)*, qq. 1-12, q. 1, ed. T. SUAREZ-NANI – W. DUBA – E. BABEY – G.J. ETZKORN, Leuven 2008, p. 1.3–4 (but see SUAREZ-NANI – DUBA, "Introduction," pp. xlvi–lv, for evidence that this first question is related to the surviving second *principium*). For Roseth, see ROGER ROSETH, *Lectura super Sententias, Quaestiones, 3, 4 & 5*, q. 3, ed. O. HALLAMAA, Helsinki 2005, p. 65.4. For Eltville, see M. BRİNZEI, "When Theologians Play Philosopher: A Lost Confrontation in the *Principia* of James of Eltville and His *Socii* on the Perfection of Species and Its Infinite Latitude," in: EADEM – C. SCHABEL (eds.), *The Cistercian James of Eltville (†1393). Author in Paris and Authority in Vienna*, Turnhout 2018, pp. 43–77, at p. 44 and n. 4. For Seehusen, see F. STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium Commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, vol. I, Würzburg 1947, p. 41.

⁸³ TACHAU, "Appendix 2," p. 198 and n. 8.

III for the wrong reason: on the basis of Holcot's reference to what the Dominican William Crathorn (identified in marginalia and by Crathorn's texts) tried to prove for a biennium, the *Sex articuli* were known to have been composed two years after Crathorn began his *Sentences* lectures in the early fall of 1330, and once it was decided that Holcot read over the biennium 1331–1333 and presumably in the sequence I-II-III-IV, the conclusion was that Holcot wrote the *Sex articuli* in the summer of 1332 just after completing his lectures on book II in the spring of 1332 and just before beginning his lectures on book III in the fall of that same year.⁸⁴ I have argued instead that Holcot lectured on all four books in 1331–1332, but that he concluded with book III in the spring of 1332, around the time that the *Sex articuli* and book III, question 1, must date.

The only structural difference between the *Sex articuli* and current question 1 of book III is that the *Sex articuli* are incomplete, lacking an introductory section and leaving two of the articles unanswered, so that *Quattuor articuli* would be a more accurate title, whereas book III, question 1, contains eight articles. Both texts consist of articles on topics about which Holcot and *socii* have already disagreed during the course of the year. The apparent reason for Hoffmann's publication of the *Sex articuli* alone, without book III, question 1, is that Hoffmann was interested in the Dominican William Crathorn, Holcot's opponent in the first three of the four articles covered in the *Sex articuli*, and not in Holcot's opponent in the fourth and final article of the *Sex articuli* and throughout the eight articles of book III, question 1, the Franciscan William Chitterne.⁸⁵

Both texts survive in the majority of the manuscripts containing Holcot's *Sentences* questions. The *Sex articuli* are usually placed toward the end of book IV of the *Sentences* questions in the manuscripts, but sometimes they are appended to the *Sentences* questions. The other set is usually positioned as the only question for book III, but I have suggested above that it was perhaps not originally included in the written version, but inserted there later. Book III, question 1, asks *Utrum Filius Dei incarnari possit*, a title that can only be linked to book III, although very little in the eight articles that follow in the

⁸⁴ See in particular GELBER, *It Could Have Been Otherwise*, pp. 296–297.

⁸⁵ Hoffmann fails to name Chitterne, despite Schepers's earlier correct identification, with Hoffmann instead suggesting Walter Chatton: SCHEPERS, "*Holkot contra dicta Crathorn I*," p. 342; HOFFMANN, "Einführung," in: ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Sex articuli*, p. 43.

debate against Chitterne have anything to do with the Incarnation or book III. Building on Schepers, Tachau, Gelber, and Slotemaker and Witt, we can trace the debate between Holcot and Chitterne as follows.⁸⁶ In the introduction to the last of the four articles actually treated in the *Sex articuli*, Holcot states that the debate began in book I, question 3: *Utrum viator teneatur frui solo Deo*. In book IV, question 7, *Utrum peccator possit satisfacere Deo pro peccato mortali*, Holcot presents arguments in the present tense that he rehearses in the imperfect tense in book III, question 1, which Slotemaker and Witt use as proof that Holcot lectured on book IV before book III. Finally, arguments in book III, question 1, seem to succeed arguments in the *Sex articuli*. So we appear to have this sequence: book I, question 3; book IV, question 7; *Sex articuli*; book III, question 1.

If Holcot read I-II-IV-III, then the *Sex articuli* could derive from the *principium* for book III and the current book III, question 1, from the *lectio finalis* of book III and the entire lecture series, or the *Sex articuli* could come from the last *lectio* for book IV and book III, question 1 either from the *principium* or the last lecture for book III. Since, however, it is more likely that Holcot read I-IV-II-III, the *Sex articuli* could originate at the end of book IV, the beginning or end of book II, or the beginning of book III, meaning anywhere from the end of February to the beginning of May 1332, all of which fit the biennium remark if Holcot was referring to academic years. Perhaps we should take the placement of the *Sex articuli* in most manuscripts seriously as somewhere toward the end of book IV, identifying them with one of the other opportunities for *replicationes* during the academic year.

Whatever the case, there is no reason to think that these *articuli* were unusual, purely written works, separate from the normal activities of an Oxonian *sententiaris*. They originated as *replicationes* delivered orally at the start or end of each of the four books of the *Sentences* and or at one other time during each term, according to the statutes, directed at *socii* who had objected to what the bachelor had declared earlier that year. As we have seen, at Oxford these *socii* need not have been fellow *sententarii*: Holcot's

⁸⁶ SCHEPERS, "Holcot contra dicta Crathorn I," p. 342; K.H. TACHAU, "Robert Holcot on Contingency and Divine Deception," in: L. BIANCHI (ed.), *Filosofia e teologia nel trecento: Studi in ricordo di Eugenio Randi*, Turnhout 1994, pp. 157–196; GELBER, *It Could Have Been Otherwise*, pp. 293–306; SLOTEMAKER – WITT, *Robert Holcot*, pp. 261–264.

main opponent in the *Sex articuli* was a senior Dominican confrère reading the Bible, William Crathorn, and the other opponent, the Franciscan William Chitterne, could also have been a *biblicus* rather than a *sententiarius*. Finally, these written *articuli* need not constitute a complete record of what happened in those principal or final lectures or other *replicationes*, but only what Holcot considered worth recording.

Finally, Tachau has two candidates for the *principium* for book IV: *Determinatio IV, Utrum viator existens in gratia ordinate utendo et fruendo posset vitare omne peccatum*, preserved in the Lyon edition, Pembroke 236 (ff. 173rb–175rb), and Balliol 246 (ff. 234ra–236rb), and the question *Utrum cum omni sacramento debito modo suscepto recipienti sacramentum informans gratia conferatur*, which, as we have seen, is the first question for book IV in Royal 10.C.VI, Balliol 71, and Oriel 15.⁸⁷ The second option presumably has the advantage of being the first question for book IV in those witnesses, but it is a typical topic for a normal question at beginning of book IV, which I have suggested above may be missing from the main tradition by accident, and I do not see any other reason to call it a *principium*. *Determinatio IV*, on the other hand, is contained in the same witnesses as *Determinatio II*, which has the best claim of all questions to being a *principium*. Moreover, given that bachelors often chose the same topic for more than one of their *principia*, it is significant that *Determinatio IV*, “Whether a wayfarer existing in grace can avoid all sin in using and enjoying in a well-ordered manner,” is thematically close to *Determinatio II*, “Whether the ways of living that Christ taught are meritorius of eternal life.” Finally, *Determinatio IV* begins by discussing the opinion of “*quidam modernus*,” who turns out to be the contemporary Adam Wodeham.

6. *The Principial Exchanges between Robert Holcot and Adam Wodeham*

The above discussion, unfortunately, still leaves plenty of room for manoeuvre regarding *Determinationes II* and *IV*, the questions in which Robert Holcot is involved in exchanges with Adam Wodeham. Although I think that Holcot and Wodeham read in the sequence

⁸⁷ TACHAU, “Appendix 2,” p. 199 and nn. 10–11, although not listing the Balliol 246 copy of *Determinatio IV* or the Royal 10.C.VI copy of the other question.

I-IV-II-III, the evidence for this is not overwhelming. It is doubtful that the *protestatio* in *Determinatio* II entails that it is Holcot's first *principium*, since Mirecourt shows that a *protestatio* could have been repeated in later *principia*, in which case *Determinatio* II, "Whether the ways of living that Christ taught are meritorius of eternal life," could be the *principium* for book II or IV, if book IV preceded book II. It is unclear why Tachau considers *Determinatio* IV, "Whether a wayfarer existing in grace can avoid all sin in using and enjoying in a well-ordered manner," to be a candidate for the *principium* for book IV, since it seems that it could just as easily apply to book II. Two things are certain, however: Holcot focused on the theme of grace and merit, which dominates *Determinationes* II and IV and he engaged in an exchange with Wodeham on that topic and in those questions.

The current first question in all non-fragmentary witnesses to Holcot's *Sentences* question is *Utrum quilibet viator existens in gratia assentiendo articulis fidei mereatur*, "Whether every wayfarer existing in grace gains merit by assenting to the articles of faith." The second opening argument and its refutation concern *Utrum viator plus posset mereri de praemio quam Deus posset sibi dare* and the fourth and its refutation concern *An sit dare summum gradum meriti viatori alicui possibilem*, the two main issues of *Determinatio* II. My hypothesis is that Holcot chose merit as his principal theme for the year. In Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 905 (and perhaps other witnesses), this first question of book I is even introduced with *Circa principium Sententiarum*, which is a less common phrase for the start of book I than it is for book II.⁸⁸ In fact, the next question in most witnesses, *Utrum voluntas creata in utendo et fruendo sit libera libertate contradictionis*, continues with material on the same theme.

Let us see whether the above discussion accords with what we know about the exchanges between Holcot and Wodeham. According to Courtenay's reconstruction, there are two exchanges between Holcot and Wodeham:⁸⁹

Exchange 1:

(1) Wodeham's *Ordinatio, Prologus*, question 1 (*Utrum, secundum quod tactum est in collatione, studium sacrae theologiae sit meritorium vitae aeternae*) is quoted in and therefore precedes

⁸⁸ FARAGO-BERMON, "Les manuscrits conservés à Paris," p. 160.

⁸⁹ See the passages quoted in the notes in COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, pp. 101–105.

(2) article 1 of Holcot's *Determinatio* II (*Utrum viae vivendi quas Christus docuit sine meritoriae vitae aeternae*).

Regardless of whether Holcot's *Determinatio* II is his *principium* for book I, II, or IV, this exchange is easily accommodated by any scenario that takes Holcot and Wodeham to be *socii* reading the *Sentences* over a one-year period: Wodeham opened in what is currently called his *Prologus*, question 1, in October 1331, and Holcot replied either immediately (if *Determinatio* II is the *principium* for book I) or in early January or early March 1332 (if *Determinatio* II is the *principium* for book II or IV).

Exchange 2:

- (1) Holcot's I *Sentences*, question 2 (*Utrum voluntas creata in utendo et fruendo sit libera libertate contradictionis*), principal argument 13 is alluded to and precedes in
- (2) Wodeham's *Ordinatio*, *Prologus*, question 2 (*Secundo, pro complemento distinctiori materiae tactae in dubiis nondum solutis, quaero utrum studium Sacrae Scripturae impositum alicui in foro paenitentiae pro omissione contraria sit meritorium*): *probavit secundus socius [Praedicator]* [= Holcot], which in turn is alluded to and precedes
- (3) Holcot's *Determinatio* IV (*Utrum viator existens in gratia ordinate utendo et fruendo posset vitare omne peccatum*): *quidam modernus* [= Wodeham], which in turn is alluded to and precedes
- (4) Wodeham's *Ordinatio* II, question 6, article 2 (*Utrum viator existens in gratia ultra omnem gratiam habitam vel habendam possit proficere ad maiorem per instantaneas causationes actuum volendi omnia pro futuro peccata venialia devitare*): *probat hoc et tenet socius quidam* [= Holcot] *cuius conclusionem improbavi in lectione mea prima*).

This exchange is more complicated, but let us try to accommodate it with the hypothesis that Holcot and Wodeham read together over one academic year. In October 1331 Holcot began the exchange in principal argument 13 of I *Sentences*, question 2, which continues the same theme as in his first question. Wodeham quickly replied in what is now called his *Prologus*, question 2, which explicitly continues the same theme as in his first question. What happens next depends on whether Holcot and Wodeham read I-II-IV-III or I-IV-II-III. If I-II-IV-III, then Holcot followed in early January 1332 in *Determinatio* IV,

which would be his *principium* for book II, and then Wodeham responded soon afterwards in his *Ordinatio* II, question 6, article 2. If they read I-IV-II-III, as is more likely, then Holcot followed in early January in *Determinatio* IV, which would be his *principium* for book II, and Wodeham responded in March in his *Ordinatio* II, question 6, article 2. The sequence I-IV-II-III would also fit Courtenay's remark that in his book II Wodeham refers (back) to the book IV of his *socii*.⁹⁰ Obviously much more work needs to be done editing the pertinent questions of both Holcot and Wodeham for additional evidence about what occurred and when during the academic year 1331–1332, although given authorial revisions we may never achieve beatific clarity.

One thing is for certain: all of Wodeham's questions involved in the above exchanges are linked to his own *principia*. As mentioned, the Wodeham material that Holcot quotes in *Determinatio* II is from the first question of Wodeham's Oxford *Ordinatio* for book I. This is currently called a question of the prologue, but the full title in the manuscripts, *Utrum, secundum quod tactum est in collatione, studium sacrae theologiae sit meritorium vitae aeternae*, allows us to identify it readily as his first *principium*, certainly on the basis of the reference to the *collatio* or principal sermon, and perhaps also from the topic of meriting eternal life, uncommon for a prologue but matching Holcot's own. Moreover, Courtenay notes that Wodeham later cites this question as his first *principium*.⁹¹

In the longer exchange, Wodeham first replies in his so-called prologue, question 2, which the manuscripts link explicitly to doubts not yet solved in the previous material, which we have just identified as (at least part of) the first *principium*: *Secundo, pro complemento distinctiori materiae tactae in dubiis nondum solutis, quaero utrum studium Sacrae Scripturae impositum alicui in foro paenitentiae pro omissione contraria sit meritorium*.⁹²

Holcot followed up in his *Determinatio* IV in January, and then Wodeham responded in the so-called II *Sentences*, question 6, article 2, which is either Wodeham's *principium* for book IV also given in January or his *principium* for book II given later in March. Various

⁹⁰ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 176.

⁹¹ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, pp. 176, 187.

⁹² COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 187. Courtenay also notes (p. 177) that this question "is basically a continuation of the material of question 1," which he identifies as principal.

clues point to this question being as (at least part of) a *principium*, besides the exchanges with *socii*. First, the incipit of distinction 17, question 6, of book I, on our topic of merit and grace, is thus: *Sexto circa distinctionem 17 primi libri et principium libri tertii quaero utrum omnis bonus motus voluntatis meritoriae augmentativus caritatis ad quem homo tenetur debeat vel possit ex caritate procedere collata ex merito redemptoris*, attaching it to the *principium* on book III, while in the question’s explicit Wodeham writes: *Residuas quaestiones huius materiae de augmentatione formarum quaere in principio secundi statim post collationem in secundum*, which thus mentions the *collatio* on the second book.⁹³ *In principio secundi* may mean “the beginning of book II,” for when we turn to the first questions on book II, all on a related topic, question 5, the one before Wodeham’s response to Holcot, is tied to the *principium* for book IV, despite the mention of the first distinction of book II: *Quinto <quaero> circa distinctionem primam secundi et principium quarti utrum, praesupposita gratia baptismali, viator per merita sua possit pertingere ad gratiam maximam viae sibi possibilem*.⁹⁴ The *divisio quaestionis* confirms its nature as a *principium*, even referring back to the first lecture, i.e., the first *principium*.⁹⁵ The next question, the one that quotes from Holcot, continues with the same general theme and continues the debate with the *socii*, although without any explicit tie to *principia*: *Sexto quaero utrum viator existens in gratia, ultra omnem gratiam habitam vel habendam, possit proficere ad maiorem per instantaneas causationes actuum volendi omnia pro*

⁹³ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, pp. 190–191 (correcting Courtenay’s *augmentativus*).

⁹⁴ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 193. Vat. lat. 869 has a *principium* for book II supposedly by Wodeham, *Utrum Deus ab aeterno novit res producibiles libere*: COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, pp. 175 and 215.

⁹⁵ ADAM DE WODEHAM, *Super quatuor libros Sententiarum II*, q. 5, ed. Paris 1512, f. 99vb: “In ista quaestione primo repetam positionem et positionis meae primae lectionis primi libri rationes cum 9 argumentis trium sociorum in contrarium, scilicet Carmelitae, Breicen. [= Skelton], et Grascon [= Grafton]. Secundo reducam rationes positionis meae contra duos primos socios et incidenter contra quartum dicentem quod nullus auget meritum vel gratiam nisi per opera supererogationis et strenuitatis. Tertio ponam contra me media aliqua quae possunt fieri pro illo socio ultimo et media quaedam secundi similiter contra me, licet ipsemet ad ista responderit, et ponam responsionem quam de ea concepi in sua prima lectione. Quarto arguam contra illam responsionem. Quinto <respondebo> [respondendo] argumentis tertii articuli. Sexto ad argumenta respondebo primorum duorum sociorum principalia. Septimo reducam alia argumenta contra me quae scripsit contra rationem meae primae lectionis et solvam illa. Octavo respondebo argumentis principalibus articuli primi socii tertii contra me.” The printed version matches the manuscripts; cf. TACHAU, “Introduction,” p. 20, n. 5.

futuro peccata venialia devitare.⁹⁶ The debate continues in the following questions, and at least some of this is principal, even if not all of it is.

The best way to explain all of this is that throughout a single academic year, 1331–1332, Holcot and Wodeham continued their discussion in their *principia*, even if it perhaps carried over into their regular lectures. The very structure of principal debates required that all the participating bachelors be on the same page, almost literally, so that they had to be dealing with the same material at the same time. Courtenay himself says as much:

This reading of the *Sentences* at Oxford... occupied nine months of the academic year: October to July, during which there were to be four principal debates at designated intervals. The bachelors for the year gave their *principia* in a set sequence.⁹⁷

If, on the other hand, there were exceptions to this rule, or if Oxford lectures on the *Sentences* “as late as the early 1330s occupied an academic biennium for Dominicans and possibly for other mendicants,”⁹⁸ it would have significantly complicated the whole exercise. It is much simpler to assume that all *principia* and all lectures were given in one year, even if, in the end, we may not be able to reconstruct the debates and lectures in every detail, due to revisions and the hazards of survival.

To recap, the evidence from Robert Holcot and Adam Wodeham suggests that principal debates of some sort were being held at Oxford, which debates took place during a single academic year of lecturing on the *Sentences*, and that Wodeham and Holcot were *socii* in 1331–1332, their only year of reading the *Sentences*.

Conclusion: William of Ockham

Was the two-year lecture ever in force in Oxford in the fourteenth century? The recent authoritative books on John Duns Scotus from Oxford and Cambridge University Presses

⁹⁶ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 193.

⁹⁷ COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham*, p. 175, citing Little and Rashdall.

⁹⁸ COURTENAY, “Theology and Theologians from Ockham to Wyclif,” p. 4.

are in agreement, without discussion, that Scotus read the *Sentences* at Oxford in 1298–1299, specifically from October 1298 to June 1299, according to the statutes.⁹⁹ There is no mention of a two-year reading here. We should thus be suspicious of the *opinio communis* that William of Ockham lectured on the *Sentences* at Oxford in the *biennium* 1317–1319. Courtenay summarizes the *status quaestionis* in the 1999 *Cambridge Companion* to Ockham, reprinted in 2008, with caution bordering on the contradictory:

In the autumn term of 1317, Ockham began his lectures on the *Sentences* at Oxford, which occupied his attention across the *biennium* 1317–19. Only his *Reportatio* on books II–IV and the citations by John of Reading from the first three distinctions of Ockham’s lecture on Book I remain from what he presented there. If there is some uncertainty as to whether he only read at Oxford or read first at London (1317–18) and then at Oxford (1318–19 or 1318–20), there is no room for dispute regarding the dates. Ockham’s *Reportatio* shows he knew William of Alnwick’s *Quodlibeta* (1316–17) and Peter Auriol’s Parisian *Scriptum I* (1316–17) but was not yet aware that Auriol had incepted as master of theology (by October 1318).¹⁰⁰

In the first installment of this article, dealing with Paris, William Duba and I redated Auriol’s Parisian lectures to 1317–1318, but this does not change the date of the *Scriptum I*, which may have been completed in Paris, but was at least partly composed at Toulouse. Courtenay’s sources are the introduction to the first volume of Ockham’s *Ordinatio* on book I, edited by Gedeon Gál with Stephen F. Brown in 1967, and the introduction to the *Reportatio* on book IV, edited by Rega Wood and Gál with Romualdo Green in 1984. In 1967 the editors held that Ockham’s *Sentences* lectures fell within the period 1317–1319 (*inter annos 1317–1319 circumscribi potest*), but without asserting clearly that he read in both years. For the *terminus ante quem* of the *Ordinatio I*, they pointed out that Auriol is not called a doctor in the earlier and incomplete redaction in Firenze, BNC, Conv. soppr.

⁹⁹ R. CROSS, *Duns Scotus*, Oxford 1999, p. 4; cf. T. WILLIAMS, “Introduction,” in: IDEM (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Duns Scotus*, Cambridge 2003, pp. 1–14, at p. 3.

¹⁰⁰ W.J. COURTENAY, “The Academic and Intellectual Worlds of Ockham,” in P.V. SPADE (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion of Ockham*, Cambridge 1999, pp. 17–30, at pp. 22–23, reprinted with updates in W.J. COURTENAY, *Ockham and Ockhamism. Studies in the Dissemination and Impact of His Thought*, Leiden 2008, pp. 91–105, at pp. 97–98.

A.3.801, but that he is in the later redactions. Since from Avignon on 14 July 1318 Pope John XXII wrote to the chancellor of Paris to promote Auriol to master, and this had been carried out by November, Auriol must have been licensed and incepted before the start of normal lectures in October, suggesting that Ockham's lectures on book I probably took place *at the latest* in the fall of 1318. Another key piece of information is that Ockham was among the Franciscans presented to the bishop of Lincoln on 19 June 1318 for the license to hear confessions, and since Oxford is within the diocese of Lincoln Ockham was probably already residing in Oxford and must have planned to be in Oxford during the 1318–1319 academic year in order to need this license, but the editors could not determine whether he was already lecturing on the *Sentences* at Oxford or would begin to do so in the fall.¹⁰¹

In 1984 Gál and Wood tweaked this story a bit, specifying that a presentation copy of Auriol's *Scriptum* I was completed on 19 May 1317 and redacted in Toulouse ca. 1316, and, more importantly, interpreting the 1967 introduction as supporting Ockham's reading the *Sentences* in 1317–1319. Adopting Anneliese Maier's view that Franciscans who lectured on the *Sentences* at Oxford must have done so elsewhere previously, Gál and Wood now accepted Maier's argument that put Ockham lecturing outside Oxford for the 1317–1318 academic year, probably in London, although they disagreed with Maier on some details. For Gál and Wood, Ockham read all four books twice, the *Reportatio* II–IV derive from the first series, and, *sine dubio*, the *Ordinatio* I stems from lectures given at Oxford in 1318–1319, rendering any *Reportatio* I “*superflua*.”¹⁰²

Courtenay countered, first, that before 1336 there is no evidence of a statutory obligation for a Franciscan to read the *Sentences* first outside a university before doing so at Paris or Oxford, and, second, that if Ockham had lectured in London in 1317–1318 he would not have been in Oxford before September 1318, which seems to contradict

¹⁰¹ G. GÁL – S.F. BROWN, “Introductio,” in: GUILLELMUS DE OCKHAM, *Scriptum in librum primum Sententiarum (Ordinatio). Prologus et distinctio prima* (Opera theologica I), St Bonaventure, NY, 1967, pp. 35*–36*.

¹⁰² R. WOOD – G. GÁL – R. GREEN, “Introductio,” in: GUILLELMUS DE OCKHAM, *Quaestiones in librum quartum Sententiarum (Reportatio)* (Opera theologica VII), St Bonaventure, NY, 1984, pp. 14*–18*. See also W.J. COURTENAY, “Ockham, Chatton, and the London *Studium*: Observations on Recent Changes in Ockham's Biography,” in: W. VOSSENKUHL – R. SCHÖNBERGER (eds.), *Die Gegenwart Ockhams*, Wienheim 1990, pp. 327–337, at p. 328 for Maier's view, expressed in various writings from 1940 to 1968.

the 19 June request for the license to hear confessions.¹⁰³ Whether or not there was a statute, however, it seems that Franciscan practice was to have a theologian read the *Sentences* elsewhere first. Nevertheless, this does not mean that Ockham did so in 1317–1318, that the *Reportatio* II–IV stems from lectures outside Oxford, or that Ockham was reading the *Sentences* at all in 1317–1318, rather than residing at least part of the time in Oxford in preparation for his lectures.

Thus the only reason to think that Ockham lectured on the *Sentences* over a biennium at Oxford, in 1317–1319 or, as Courtenay also suggested, in 1318–1320, is the assumption that bachelors of theology read the *Sentences* for two years in Oxford at that time. The reasoning is circular, and the phenomena can just as easily if not more easily be explained by positing that Ockham lectured on all four books from October 1317 to June 1318, which dates Gál supported “*magna cum probabilitate*” for the extant *Reportatio* II–IV, and that Ockham quickly began revising his book I into an *Ordinatio*. This is not the only possible scenario, but even if the single year is not 1317–1318, I see no reason to posit a two-year reading for Ockham.

Dispensing with the myth of the two-year *Sentences* lecture at Paris in the early fourteenth century had some other consequences for our knowledge of the careers and interactions of a few Franciscans and Dominicans active before 1318. The repercussions for the study of Oxford theology are potentially more profound, especially for the period of feverish activity in the early 1330s. Approaching old issues from this new perspective, there is much work to be done.

¹⁰³ COURTENAY, “The Academic and Intellectual Worlds of Ockham,” p. 29, n. 13; reprint [p. 97, n. 13]