



**\* This paper was written at the IRHT in Paris as part of Monica Brinzei's ERC program THESIS on latemedieval Sentences commentaries. I thank W.O. Duba for his comments**

Chris Schabel

**► To cite this version:**

Chris Schabel. \* This paper was written at the IRHT in Paris as part of Monica Brinzei's ERC program THESIS on latemedieval Sentences commentaries. I thank W.O. Duba for his comments. Pascale Bermon; Isabelle Moulin. Commenter au Moyen Âge, Vrin, pp.243-265, 2020, 978-2-7116-2925-1. hal-03175784

**HAL Id: hal-03175784**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03175784>**

Submitted on 22 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.

## ERC project 771589

Were There *Sentences* Commentaries?

Chris Schabel\*

*Terminology*

A search through the Universal Short Title Catalogue (USTC), WorldCat, Google Books, the SIEPM website,<sup>1</sup> and other online sources for *incunabula* and early printed books revealed that by 1500 what we now call "*Sentences* commentaries" or "commentaries on the *Sentences*" by 26 authors had been printed in whole or in part close to 100 times.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, according to these online sources, only ten printings by a mere three of these authors are entitled something like "commentaries": the Franciscan Richard of Mediavilla's *Commentum* was first published in 1473 and then four more times before 1500, the Franciscan Bonaventure's *Commentarius* came out twice in 1477 and then once more before the end of the century, and the Augustinian Giles of Rome's *Commentum* was printed in 1482 and again in 1492. I have only been able to actually see four of these ten works, and – despite the attempts at precision of the databases mentioned above – in each case the word *commentum* or *commentarius* is in fact nowhere to be found: Richard's 1477 Venice printing simply calls the work *Super quarto Sententiarum*, and the edition of Bonaventure's commentary from the same year and city is actually just *Super secundo Sententiarum*. Likewise, neither of Giles of Rome's *Commenta* contains the word *commentum* in the title in the book itself. Another alleged example, the 1481 Speyer printing of Franciscan Peter of Aquila's *Commentarius in IV libros Sententiarum*, does not seem to exist and is probably an error for the popular *In quatuor libros Sententiarum* published in Speyer the previous year, 1480.<sup>3</sup> I suspect that the other six incunabula listed as *commenta* or *commentarii* do not in fact have this term in their titles.

---

\* This paper was written at the IRHT in Paris as part of Monica Brinzei's ERC program THESIS on late-medieval *Sentences* commentaries. I thank W.O. Duba for his comments.

<sup>1</sup> See for example the following websites: <http://www.ustc.ac.uk/>; <https://www.worldcat.org/>; <https://books.google.com/>; <http://capricorn.bc.edu/siepm/books.html#14> (the product of the work of Jean-Luc Solère. Together these cites supercede Ludwig Hain, *Repertorium Bibliographicum in quo libri omnes ab arte typo-graphica inventa usque ad annum MD. typis expressi, ordine alphabetico vel simpliciter enumerantur vel adcuratius recensentur*, 2 vols., Stuttgart: J.T. Gotha, 1826-1836, and supplements (available on Google Books).

<sup>2</sup> In rough chronological order according to first printing as follows: Thomas Aquinas OP (13th century); John Duns Scotus OFM (14th); Richard de Mediavilla OFM (13th); Alexander of Hales OFM (13th), John de Fonte OFM (13th), Francis of Meyronnes OFM (14th), Bonaventure OFM (13th), John Bassol OFM (14th), Peter of Aquila OFM (14th), Henry of Gorkum (15th), Pierre d'Ailly (14th), Giles of Rome OESA (13th), Gregory of Rimini OESA (14th), William of Ockham OFM (14th), John Capreolus OP (15th), John Baconthorpe OCarm (14th), William of Vaurouillon OFM (15th), Gerard of Zutphen (15th), Thomas of Strasbourg OESA (14th), Landolfo Caracciolo OFM (14th), Alphonsus Vargas of Toledo OESA (14th), Thomas of Arras (14th) (according to the USTC), Hannibaldus of Hannibaldi OP (13th), Peter of Palude OP (14th), Nicholas of Orbellis OFM (15th), Robert Holcot OP (14th).

<sup>3</sup> Although not called a "commentary," the alleged 1484 Rome printing of the Catalan Carmelite Francis Bacon's work is most likely a confusion of John Bacon[thorpe]'s 1484 *Paris* printing, edited by Francis of Medici. The phantom printing of Francis Bacon is listed in Friedrich Stegmüller, *Repertorium commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, 2 vols., Würzburg: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1947, vol. 1, p. 97; two manuscripts of the work, Paris, BnF lat. 15374, and another in the Observant Carmelite convent in Rome, via Sforza Pallavici, 10, do exist. I have seen the latter, but it is difficult to access. Paul Oskar

After 1500, a number of other "medieval" authors had their "*Sentences* commentaries" printed, fifteen of them by 1600,<sup>4</sup> bringing the total to 41, seven from the thirteenth century, 26 from the fourteenth, and eight from the fifteenth, with eighteen by Franciscans, seven by Dominicans, seven by seculars, five and a half by Augustinians, two by Carmelites, one by a Carthusian, and a half a commentary by a Cistercian (see just below). In addition, new works by the likes of Paolo Cortesi (1504), John Major (1509), Guy Brianson (1512), Adrian of Utrecht (1516), Jacques Almain (1516), Peter Tartaretus (1520), and Juan de Celaya (1520) were printed, a tradition that continued in later decades. These are not yet called "commentaries" either, although the USTC incorrectly adds "commentaria" to Celaya's title *In tertium volumen Sententiarum*. I have extensive personal experience with the 1511 Paris edition of the *Commentaria* of "Dionysius the Cistercian" and the 1596 Rome printing of the Franciscan Peter Auriol's *Commentariorum*. In the former case, actually a mixed text of the Cistercian Conrad of Ebrach and the Augustinian Dionysius of Modena, which the USTC mistakenly assigns to Denys the Carthusian, the actual title in the book itself is simply *Liber in quatuor Sententiarum*, with no "Commentaria" at all.<sup>5</sup> In the latter instance, however, Auriol's work really is called "Commentariorum." This is also true for the 1564 print of the Augustinian Thomas of Strasbourg and the 1571 edition of the Dominican Durand of Saint-Pourçain, both from Venice.

It seems that in the second third of the sixteenth century titles associated with the word "commentary" were first applied to works on the *Sentences*, probably beginning with Durand's 1539 Paris *Commentariorum*. Perhaps this unprecedented use of the term for medieval *Sentences* commentaries resulted from the new practice of lecturing on medieval commentaries. These supercommentaries, for example on the *Sentences* commentaries of Durand himself or of the Franciscan John Duns Scotus, really were commentaries. In the 1550s Domingo de Soto's work on the Dominican Thomas Aquinas was thus also printed with the title *Commentariorum*.<sup>6</sup> By 1600 it had become routine to call the medieval works on which these second-scholastic supercommentaries were based "commentaries on the *Sentences*." In French and English something equivalent to the term "commentary on the *Sentences*" was employed by the end of the seventeenth century, and in German at least by the end of the eighteenth century. It is, therefore, an early-modern invention.

Historians often employ terms of convenience that have little or no basis in the reality of the period they study. In a sense, inquiring about commenting on the *Sentences* in the Middle Ages is like asking why Greeks in Constantinople called themselves "Byzantines," or why medieval people thought their age was in the "Middle." In the same way, it would be strange to give a talk

---

Kristeller, *Iter Italicum VI*, Leiden: Brill, 1991, p. 157b, labels it "II Pers 4" (paper, 15th century, 292 folios, 2 columns).

<sup>4</sup> Again in rough chronological order according to first printing: Marsilius of Inghen (14th), Gabriel Biel (15th), Stephen Brulefer OFM (15th), Hervaeus Natalis OP (14th), Thomas Buckingham (14th), Durand of Saint-Pourçain OP (14th), Michael Aiguani, OCarm (14th), Dionysius the Carthusian (15th), Adam Wodeham, OFM (14th), Andrew of Novocastro, OFM (14th), "Dionysius the Cistercian" (a mixed text of the Cistercian Conrad of Ebrach and the Augustinian Dionysius de Modena: see just below) (14th), William Rubio, OFM (14th), Antonius Andreas, OFM (14th), Peter Auriol, OFM (14th), Gerard of Siena, OESA (14th). One could also mention the 1652 printing of the work of Peter of Tarantaise OP (13th) and the 1517 printing of the critique of Scotus' commentary by Thomas Sutton OP (14th).

<sup>5</sup> See the USTC record: <http://ustc.ac.uk/index.php/record/143744>. On Conrad and Dionysius, see the update in Chris Schabel, Monica Brinzei, and Mihai Maga, «The Golden Age of Theology at Prague: Prague *Sentences* Commentaries, ca. 1375-1381, with a Redating of the Arrival of Wycliffism in Bohemia», *Historia Universitatis carolinae Pragensis* 55 (2015), [forthcoming](#).

<sup>6</sup> On second-scholastic *Sentences* commentaries, see especially Lidia Lanza and Marco Toste, «The *Sentences* in Sixteenth-Century Iberian Scholasticism», in *Mediaeval Commentaries* [note 1], vol. 3, pp. 416-503.

on why Peter Lombard divided his textbook in systematic theology into "distinctions," since, of course, he didn't.

People in the later Middle Ages referred to what we call *Sentences* commentaries in a variety of ways, but never as "*Sentences* commentaries," as far as I can see. One reads frequent citations of the *Scriptum* on the *Sentences* of various theologians, for example Aquinas. Sometimes we find references to someone's *Ordinatio*, *Reportatio*, or even *Reportationes*, as we do for Scotus. On occasion we come across the term *Quaestiones* to refer to these works, for instance with the secular theologian Pierre d'Ailly. Most often, however, we merely have the number of the book and the word *Sententiarum*, with or without the word *liber* and with or without a preposition like *in* or *super*: *primus Sententiarum*, *super quarto* or *super quartum Sententiarum*, *in tertium librum Sententiarum*, and so on. These titles are the ones found in medieval library catalogues, colophons of medieval manuscripts, and in early printed books.

Of course, medieval authors knew what a commentary was and used the term *commentum*, even within their *Sentences* commentaries, when they referred to other works. For example, in his *Sentences* commentary the aforementioned Conrad of Ebrach, one of my current research subjects, who taught at Bologna and Prague in the 1360s and 1370s, cites the *Commentum* of the Dominican Albertus Magnus on the *Physics* and the *Commentum* of Robert Grosseteste on the pseudo-Dionysian *On Divine Names*.<sup>7</sup> Naturally bachelors of the *Sentences* almost always called Averroes the *Commentator* and sometimes cited his work according to the *commentum*. Thus there is no doubt that these authors distinguished what they were doing from what Albert, Grosseteste, and Averroes were doing. There were no *Sentences* commentaries in the Middle Ages.

### *Reading the Sentences*

Nevertheless, there is one frequently employed title that is particularly pertinent to our discussion: *Lectura*, because it stems from the verb *lego*, which has a number of possible translations, but which is usually rendered in our context as "to read" or "to lecture," even if we find statements that so-and-so "wrote a *lectura* on the *Sentences*." *Lego* is the root word that we encounter in, for instance, papal letters or decisions of general chapters, when they assign someone *ad legendum Sententias* or describe someone as *actu legens Sententias*.<sup>8</sup> So turning to the essence of the question "Were there *Sentences* commentaries?" we can rephrase it thus: to what extent was what they termed "reading the *Sentences*" what we would call "commenting on the *Sentences*"?

To respond to this modified question, let's look first at the nature of the *Sentences*.<sup>9</sup> Peter Lombard's four books are frequently just a *florilegium*, a collection of authoritative quotations on issues that are then decided by reason. In short, it's often a glorified "*sic et non*" plus a decision, hardly an ideal text on which to comment, compared to the Bible or Aristotle. Moreover, almost a century elapsed between the composition of the *Sentences* and its becoming entrenched as the textbook in systematic theology at the universities and mendicant *studia*, so in many ways it was already outdated. Perhaps this was a great advantage, since it was no longer

<sup>7</sup> See the question and citation list in Monica Brinzei and Chris Schabel, «Les Cisterciens de l'université. Le cas du commentaire des *Sentences* de Conrad d'Ebrach (†1399)», in Anne-Marie Turcan *et al.* (eds.), *Les Cisterciens et leurs bibliothèques*, Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming.

<sup>8</sup> See for example numerous entries in *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, ed. Heinrich Denifle and Emile Chatelain, Paris: Delalain, 1889-1897.

<sup>9</sup> Petrus Lombardus, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, 2 vols., ed. Ignatius Brady, Grottaferrata (Spicilegium Bonaventurianum 4): Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1971.

innovative and dangerous.<sup>10</sup> Lombard made very little use of Aristotle, not surprisingly, but a century later not only had much more Aristotle become available, but theologians, first the seculars and then the mendicants, were beginning to receive systematically a thorough training in the Philosopher's works. Even on the strict level of Christian theological authority, Anselm of Canterbury plays little explicit role in the *Sentences*, but in the second half of the thirteenth century he was a towering figure, and for good reason. Important works written after the *Sentences* also took their place, for example Richard of St Victor's *De Trinitate*. By the time Aquinas had finished his *Scriptum*, one could rightly ask what essential role Lombard's *Sentences* could still play.

The answer depends on a number of factors. For a top Parisian bachelor of theology who was revising his *Sentences* lectures into written form, giving actual citations of Lombard's opinion could be an exceedingly rare occurrence, often confined to the opening and closing arguments or even just a perfunctory *divisio textus* tacked on to the beginning of questions. Indeed, the relative disappearance of the Master happened quite early, as the late Francesco del Punta said in his paper on medieval commentaries in the acts of the 1997 SIEPM congress in Erfurt. Del Punta described Giles of Rome's procedure in book I of his commentary from the early 1270s as follows:

[T]he interest of the commentator lies not so much in the text (which becomes only a pretext for independent theological argumentation), but much more in the opinions of his contemporaries or of his immediate predecessors. His aim is no longer to explain but to refute and to persuade.<sup>11</sup>

That is, to put it in del Punta's terms, the commentary on the *Sentences* was a *disputatio*, not an *expositio*.<sup>12</sup>

For most leading theologians, Lombard seems to have provided some stock quotations and a structure, nothing more. Regarding the former, one finds numerous references to what Augustine said as contained in *littera*, which became a shorthand way of mentioning an authoritative passage without a precise reference or a full quotation. For the latter, *Sentences* commentaries usually followed Lombard's sequence of topics: the Triune God, the divine attributes, creation, angelology, anthropology, grace, sin, the incarnation, the virtues, the sacraments, and last things. For certain authors, however, Lombard provided neither quotations nor a full structure.

The nature and evolution of *Sentences* commentaries has been treated numerous times, and del Punta himself cited Murdoch and Sylla, Kenny and Pinborg, and William Courtenay. Since little or nothing of what I will say is new or controversial,<sup>13</sup> regarding what follows I ask the

<sup>10</sup> The Lombard received a tremendous boost of support from Lateran IV, of course, and starting at least with Bonaventure the main shortcomings in his book were being catalogued, on which see Claire Angotti, «Les listes des *opiniones Magistri Sententiarum quae communiter non tenentur*: forme et usage dans la *lectio* des *Sentences*», in *Mediaeval Commentaries* [note 1], vol. 3, pp. 79-144.

<sup>11</sup> Francesco del Punta, «The Genre of Commentaries in the Middle Ages and its Relation to the Nature and Originality of Medieval Thought», in Jan A. Aertsen and Andreas Speer (eds.), *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter?: Akten des X. Internationalen Kongresses für Mittelalterliche Philosophie der Société Internationale pour l'Étude de la Philosophie Médiévale*, Berlin (Miscellanea Mediaevalia 26): 1998, pp. 138-151, at 145.

<sup>12</sup> Del Punta, «The Genre of Commentaries in the Middle Ages», p. 145.

<sup>13</sup> Indeed, after I thought I had completed this paper, I remembered that in 2006 Russ Friedman and I were collectively called on to do something similar, coming to strikingly similar conclusions as well: Chris Schabel, «Reason and Revelation in the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard and the Commentary Tradition», in *Pietro Lombardo. Atti del XLIII Convegno storico internazionale, Todi, 8-10 ottobre 2006*,

reader's forgiveness for restricting myself to employing examples from my own work, unless otherwise noted, in order to be at least a tiny bit original.

### *Extreme Examples*

In 1340, toward the end of his career, the Carmelite Guy Terrena completed his huge commentary on Gratian's *Decretum*, a commentary in the classic sense, an explanation of Gratian's text entitled *Commentarium* in the manuscripts.<sup>14</sup> Within this giant commentary – 2000 to 3000 pages – Guy inserted nine or ten questions, most notably five consecutive questions on divine knowledge and power. One of the five corresponds to a question in Guy's *Quodlibet* VI from two decades earlier, and parts of another match a section of a question in his first *Quodlibet*, from way back in 1313. Yet it is quite probable that this recycled material and the rest of the five questions originate in Guy's *Sentences* lectures, delivered at Paris around 1310, which do not survive in written form. How do I know? I don't, but my guess is based on two pieces of evidence: first, Guy mentions the Master seven times in only about 1000 lines of text, specifying what he says in distinctions 35, 38, 42, and 43; second, as these citations indicate, Guy treats divine knowledge, foreknowledge, predestination, and power more or less in the same order as one would in a *Sentences* commentary. Yet one cannot be certain that these are ultimately questions on the *Sentences*, because Peter Lombard's textbook was cited on occasion in other genres in philosophical theology – for example true *quodlibeta* and ordinary questions – and this sequence of topics is sensible even without the *Sentences* as a model. In any case, except for a few passing references, these questions do not constitute commentary on the Lombard, which is why Guy had no difficulty making them part of both his *Quodlibeta* and his *Decretum* commentary.

The Franciscan Gerald Odonis, active in the 1320s, included in books II-IV of his *Sentences* commentary 28 questions that had already formed part of his commentary on the *Ethics*, with another dozen that have more loose parallels there.<sup>15</sup> Unlike his questions on the *Sentences*, however, Odonis' work on the *Ethics* is actually called in the manuscripts a *Sententia et expositio* of Aristotle's text, *cum quaestionibus*, an accurate description. That is, these questions worked just as well within a true commentary explaining Aristotle as they did in a so-called *Sentences* commentary, because the latter required no explicit link to Peter Lombard's text. This is why Odonis could also include in his *Sentences* commentary ten other previously "published"

---

Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 2007, pp. 433-457, and Russell L. Friedman, «Peter Lombard and the Development of the *Sentences* Commentary in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries», pp. 459-478. The only real innovation in the present paper is that, while in basically rejecting the idea that these texts are truly commentaries on the *Sentences*, Friedman still assumed that the authors themselves employed that label, whereas I now deny this as well.

<sup>14</sup> For the following on Guy, see Chris Schabel, «Guy Terrena on Predestination in His Commentary on the *Decretum*», in Alexander Fidora (ed.), *Guido Terreni, O. Carm. (†1342): Texts and Studies*, Barcelona/Madrid: FIDEM, 2015, pp. 83-105 and 325-388, and the remainder of the text in Chris Schabel, «Early Carmelites Between Giants: Questions on Future Contingents by Gerard of Bologna and Guy Terrena», *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales* 70 (2003), pp. 139-205.

<sup>15</sup> For the following on Odonis, unless noted, see Chris Schabel, «The *Sentences* Commentary of Gerardus Odonis, OFM», *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 46 (2004), pp. 115-161; Sander W. de Boer, «Gerard of Odo on the Atomistic Structure of *Continua*. A Discussion and Edition of a Tract Found in Ms. Madrid Biblioteca Nacional 4229», *Documenti e Studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 23 (2012), pp. 387-427; and the following in William Duba and Chris Schabel (eds.), *Gerald Odonis, Doctor Moralis and Franciscan Minister General. Studies in Honour of Professor L.M. de Rijk*, Leiden-Boston: E.J. Brill, 2009 (= *Vivarium* 49.2-3): Camarin Porter, «Gerald Odonis' Commentary on the *Ethics*: A Discussion of the Manuscripts and General Survey», pp. 95-148; Paul J.J.M. Bakker and Sander W. de Boer, «*Locus est spatium*. On Gerald Odonis' *Quaestio de loco*», pp. 149-184, and Chris Schabel, «Gerald Odonis on the Plurality of Worlds», pp. 185-201.

philosophical questions, mostly on natural philosophy, including his famous *De continuo*, where he puts forth his atomist theory. He liked this text so much that he inserted slightly different versions in two places, in distinction 37 of book I and in book II, but not early in the book, where one might expect it, but at the very end, where Peter Lombard asks, "Does the power to sin in us come from God or from us?" Regarding his question *De loco*, its natural place, so to speak, judging from the content and citations, would not be in book II of the *Sentences*, but in a commentary on book IV of the *Physics*, which is mentioned a dozen times, in addition to three references to the commentaries of Averroes and Aquinas on that book and a few citations of other books of the *Physics*. The Master is not cited at all.

John Murdoch commented long ago on Odonis' recycled physical questions,<sup>16</sup> which have now been edited by Sander de Boer and Paul Bakker. I have published a related question that so far has not been found outside Odonis' *Sentences* commentary, in the same distinction 44 of book II in which Odonis inserted his *De continuo*: "Is it possible that there are actually many worlds?" Again, we find a dozen references to Aristotelian works, a citation each of Boethius and Augustine, but no mention of the Master of the *Sentences*, and there is no structural relation to the textbook either, since the topic is not our ability to sin. The only justification is that book II in general does talk about creation. This is the excuse for Odonis' discussion of projectile motion in distinction 14 of book II, although here he is reacting to the Franciscan Francis of Marchia's parallel discussion in the first question of book IV, where Marchia presents his famous theory of *virtus derelicta*:<sup>17</sup> when we throw a rock or shoot an arrow, we leave behind a force that dissipates over time, which carries the object a certain distance after contact is severed. Marchia's treatment is indeed connected with the power of the sacraments, treated in book IV, but his idea was received and developed not only outside this context, but outside theology altogether, most notably in John Buridan's and Nicole Oresme's scientific writings.

By putting creation in book II, Lombard thereby provided a forum for dealing with any issue in natural philosophy. The secular theologian Henry of Harclay had put forth his own atomist theory in an Oxford ordinary question from the 1310s, and the Franciscan Landolfo Caracciolo had no problem refuting this theory in his commentary on II *Sentences*.<sup>18</sup> This is where, around 1317, Peter Auriol asked the basic Aristotelian question "What is place?" He gave a somewhat un-Aristotelian answer, but it had nothing to do with Peter Lombard. Neither did Caracciolo's

---

<sup>16</sup> John E. Murdoch, «From Social into Intellectual Factors: An Aspect of the Unitary Character of Late Medieval Learning», in John E. Murdoch and Edith D. Sylla (eds.), *The Cultural Context of Medieval Learning. Proceedings of the First International Colloquium on Philosophy, Science, and Theology in the Middle Ages – September 1973*, Dordrecht/Boston (Boston Studies in the History of Science 26; Synthese Library 76): Reidel, 1975, pp. 271-348, at 276.

<sup>17</sup> See the various texts in Chris Schabel, «Francis of Marchia's *Virtus derelicta* and the Context of Its Development», in Russell L. Friedman and Chris Schabel (eds.), *Francis of Marchia – Theologian and Philosopher. A Franciscan at the University of Paris in the Early Fourteenth Century*, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006 (= *Vivarium* 44.1), pp. 41-80; Chris Schabel, «La virtus derelicta di Francesco d'Appignano e il contesto del suo sviluppo», in Domenico Priori (ed.), *Atti del 3° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto: Centro Studi Francesco d'Appignano, 2006, pp. 125-154; and Euphrosyne Katsoura, Constantia Papamarkou, and Chris Schabel, «Francis of Marchia's Commentary on Book IV of the *Sentences*. Traditions and Redactions, with Questions on Projectile Motion, Polygamy, and the Immortality of the Soul», *Picenum Seraphicum* 25-27 (2006-08), pp. 101-166.

<sup>18</sup> Henry of Harclay, *Ordinary Questions XV-XXIX*, q. 29, ed. Mark G. Henninger and trans. Raymond Edwards and Henninger, Oxford (Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi 18): Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 1008-1097; Chris Schabel, «Flowcharts, Diagrams, and Missing Links: Landolfo Caracciolo vs. Henry of Harclay on Indivisibles», in William O. Duba, Russell L. Friedman, and Chris Schabel (eds.), *Utrum, igitur, etc. Studies in Late Medieval Intellectual History in Honor of William J. Courtenay*, Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.

and the Augustinian Gerard of Siena's responses to Auriol from a couple years later.<sup>19</sup> Sometimes the context was theological and even Lombardian, but the core of the discussion departed considerably. For instance, when Gerard of Siena asks in book II, "Is the empyrean heaven the appropriate place for angels and beatified humans," the authorities that the Master cited and the authority of the Master himself play a role in setting up the question, but the main issue turns out to be whether this heaven is a natural body.<sup>20</sup> The result is an interesting blend of a little pre-1160 theology and a lot of post-1250 cosmology, not really a commentary on the Lombard, but rather using him and his sources as a point of departure for what Gerard considered the more interesting scientific issue.

Some of the most common issues treated in the commentary tradition could have little to do with the *Sentences*. Commentaries on book II routinely started with a question related to the eternity of the world. Around 1300, two Dominicans, William of Peter Godino and James of Metz, both began with an explicit reference to what they were doing: "Regarding the beginning of book II," but there is nothing of the Lombard in what follows, in the questions "whether the world can have been from eternity" and "whether a creature could have existed from eternity" respectively. Rather the background was Aristotelian, with contributions from Maimonides, Averroes, and, for these Dominicans, Aquinas.

Many scholars have remarked that one of the most interesting cases of separation from Peter Lombard's text is in the Cistercian Pierre Ceffons' *Sentences* commentary from the late 1340s, large parts of which I am currently editing with Fritz Pedersen.<sup>21</sup> The Danish authority on medieval astronomy and I recently published a question that the sole manuscript assigns to distinction 1 of book II. Referring to the Black Death, Ceffons asks: "Is the general death that is happening now natural or beyond the course of nature?" While there is absolutely no Lombard here, Ceffons does offer us a long Ovid quotation in verse and the complete texts of relevant astrological prognostications by Levi ben Gerson and (the Pseudo?) Jean de Murs. Professor Pedersen has just sent me his initial transcription of fifty pages from the preceding questions on the heavenly spheres, where one runs into citations of the likes of Ptolemy and John of Sacrobosco, in addition to more Ovid in verse, but not a word about Peter Lombard.

Perhaps one will object that the Black Death, astrology, and diagrams of eclipses are related more to book II than to the other three books, and maybe this is what del Punta meant when he stated: "True, a *quaestio* in a commentary never completely frees itself from its ties, however remote, to the text, as the *quaestio disputata* does."<sup>22</sup> Yet it is difficult to see how Ceffons could ask early on in book III "whether it is licit for Christians to make war" and "whether it is licit to fight on feast days," unless perhaps these questions are somehow related to the virtues, treated at the end of that book, as opposed to the Christology of most of book III. As far as I can see, the only remaining tie to the *Sentences* in these questions is the fact that they are, *de facto*, in a

<sup>19</sup> Chris Schabel, «Place, Space, and the Physics of Grace in Auriol's *Sentences* Commentary», *Vivarium* 38 (2000), pp. 117-161; Chris Schabel, «The Reception of Peter Auriol's Doctrine of Place. With Editions of Questions by Landulph Caracciolo and Gerard of Siena», in Tiziana Suarez-Nani and Martin Rohde (eds.), *Représentations et conceptions de l'espace dans la culture médiévale. Colloque Fribourgeois 2009*, Berlin/Boston (Scrinium Friburgense 30): Walter de Gruyter, 2011, pp. 147-192.

<sup>20</sup> Elpida Lazari and Chris Schabel, «Cosmology and Theology in Gerard of Siena's Question on the Empyrean Heaven», *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales* 81 (2014), pp. 95-135.

<sup>21</sup> For the following on Ceffons, see Chris Schabel and Fritz S. Pedersen, «Miraculous, Natural, or Jewish Conspiracy? Pierre Ceffons' Question on the Black Death and Astrology, with Texts by Gersonides and Jean de Murs/Firmin de Beauval», *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales* 81 (2014), pp. 137-179 and the question list I have prepared for publication in «Pierre Ceffons' Commentary on the *Sentences*». Thus far I have transcribed the four *Principia* and Pedersen has transcribed the astronomical and cosmological questions in book II.

<sup>22</sup> Del Punta, «The Genre of Commentaries in the Middle Ages», p. 149.



*Sentences* commentary and not part of a report of a quodlibetal session. Ceffons' explicit justification for the inclusion of a question can be entertaining: "Because I was asked, if I knew anything about insolubles, whether I would treat them here, in this *Lectura* on book II of the *Sentences* I ask whether Augustine or even Master Peter Lombard or any other theologian of the faith could be led to an absurdity by an insoluble." When Ceffons begins questions "Concerning distinction so-and-so," we often find a blank space instead of a distinction number, as if Ceffons could not decide where to put the question.

Book IV, on the sacraments and last things, allowed one to talk about anything connected to everyday life inside and outside the Church in addition to everyone's life after death. As far as I can tell, Peter Lombard mentions the pope just once, but lengthy discussions of papal power were fair game in book IV. With so many distinctions on marriage, it is no wonder that commentaries on book IV are an excellent source for certain perspectives on sex in the Middle Ages.<sup>23</sup> If one did not want to follow Guy Terrena in writing a commentary on the *Decretum*, book IV was also the place to display one's knowledge of canon law. The scribe of one manuscript of book IV of Caracciolo's *Sentences* commentary, with one last burst of energy after his lengthy task, counted not only the 179 questions and 917 conclusions and propositions, but also the 85 *casus* that Caracciolo discusses in this his most popular book.<sup>24</sup>

Most of the time, however, it is as del Punta stated, in a way: the majority of questions are asked in a sequence corresponding roughly to that of Lombard's *Sentences*, even if the number of questions in a "complete" commentary could range from as many as a thousand smallish ones to as few as five giants ones, in the case of the Franciscan Roger Rosetus. As many scholars have noted, perhaps the two most salient trends in *Sentences* commentaries in the fourteenth century are the vast increase in the amount of science and mathematics, alluded to above, and the vast reduction in the number of questions asked, a trend that accelerated at Oxford in the 1320s and spread to Paris in the 1340s and the new universities afterwards.<sup>25</sup> What did not change was the place of Peter Lombard's text, which was already just window dressing and a reservoir for quotations.

### *Test Cases*

Let us take a more systematic and chronological approach with a couple of issues. It will have become apparent that I am not at all interested in glosses on the *Sentences* composed before the Franciscan Alexander of Hales added the distinctions division and, with the Dominican Hugh of Saint Cher, helped make it the university textbook in systematic theology. That is, I don't care about instances when authors *chose* to write on the *Sentences*, although these works probably are commentaries rather than independent works of systematic theology. Rather I care about what they did when reading the *Sentences* was a requirement, from the

<sup>23</sup> As I tried to do in Chris Schabel, «Francesco d'Appignano sulle Donne, il sesso e il matrimonio», in Domenico Priori (ed.), *Atti del 4° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto: Centro Studi Francesco d'Appignano, 2008, pp. 197-217.

<sup>24</sup> Chris Schabel, «The Commentary on the *Sentences* by Landulphus Caracciolus, OFM», *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 51 (2009), pp. 145-219, at 157 and 219.

<sup>25</sup> See Olli Hallamaa, «On the Limits of the Genre: Roger Roseth as a Reader of the *Sentences*», in *Mediaeval Commentaries*, vol. 2 [note 1], pp. 369-404; various works by John E. Murdoch, e.g., «*Mathesis in philosophiam scholasticam introducta*: The Rise and Development of the Application of Mathematics in Fourteenth Century Philosophy and Theology», in *Arts libéraux et philosophie au moyen âge*, Paris: Vrin, 1969, pp. 215-254; the research of William J. Courtenay, for example, *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987, pp. 251-264; and observations and statistics in Paul J.J.M. Bakker and Chris Schabel, «*Sentences* Commentaries of the Later Fourteenth Century», in *Mediaeval Commentaries* [note 1], vol. 1, pp. 425-464, at 426-434.

1240s on. There are three issues on which I have looked at between 50 and 100 *Sentences* commentaries down to about the Council of Florence, one on divine foreknowledge and two involving the contemporary Greeks.<sup>26</sup>

Aquinas devoted one article of distinctions 38-39 of his commentary on *I Sentences* to divine foreknowledge of future contingents: in just seven pages, he did cite Aristotle and Boethius, but not Lombard.<sup>27</sup> Fifty years later the topic had ballooned to more than forty pages in Scotus, but again, after the *tractat Magister* in the first line, Lombard disappears. Throughout the fourteenth century, the problem maintained and even increased its portion of commentaries on book I, but usually Lombard is either ignored entirely, mentioned in the first line alone with the number of the distinction, or at most raised to the *Ad oppositum* position: *Ad oppositum est Magister in littera*. There are some exceptions, however, for example when Lombard's authority is used along with that of others against a dangerous position, or seemingly just out of genuine respect for his doctrine, as the Carmelite Paul of Perugia seems to do in the 1340s. So while in 65 pages the Franciscan Peter of Candia does not mention the Master in his commentary from around 1380, 65 years earlier his confrère Peter Auriol cited Peter Lombard almost twenty times in his 100-page discussion. Granted, all but six of these references occur in the *divisiones textus* for distinctions 38 and 39, and Auriol focuses much more attention on Aquinas, Scotus, Augustine, and Aristotle, eight of whose works Auriol cites over 30 times here. But the half-dozen citations of Lombard in Auriol's actual discussion are significant. The reason Auriol mentions him so often in this context is not because Lombard is the author of the text on which Auriol is lecturing, but because Lombard's own doctrinal presentation was influential and Auriol was opposed to it. Thus Lombard gets a rare rubric: "The opinion of many, and it appears to come from the statements of the Master *in littera*." In replying to Aquinas, our Franciscan says at one point: "But although this way of speaking seems to be that of the Master of the *Sentences*, and people commonly speak thus, nevertheless it cannot stand for many reasons." Peter Lombard was a theologian who might have had an impact on some doctrinal issues even had his *Sentences* not become the textbook, and the problem of divine foreknowledge of future contingents is one of them.

Most, but by no means all, university theologians touched on the quarrel with the Greeks over the Latin use of unleavened bread in the sacrament of the Eucharist, the subject of distinctions 8-13 of book IV.<sup>28</sup> Unfortunately, one may have to skim through a theologian's entire treatment of the Eucharist in order to find a discussion of the issue, which could take up as much as ten pages, but was occasionally completely absent. The reason for the search is that Peter Lombard does not deal with this topic, even though it was already contentious in the twelfth century.

Luckily, Lombard does confront the *Filioque* controversy in a specific place: distinction 11

<sup>26</sup> I have used these examples before with another purpose in mind in Schabel, «Reason and Revelation in the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard and the Commentary Tradition».

<sup>27</sup> For divine foreknowledge, I used available early modern printings and critical editions of entire works and my own editions of single questions. For the works cited below, see the critical editions of Aquinas (Mandonnet) and Scotus (Vatican), the online edition of Peter of Candia (Kringos and Schabel: <http://www2.ucy.ac.cy/isa/Candia/SentI-6-2.htm>), and Chris Schabel, «Peter Aureol on Divine Foreknowledge and Future Contingents: *Scriptum in Primum Librum Sententiarum*, distinctions 38-39», *Cahiers de l'Institut du moyen-âge grec et latin* 65 (1995), pp. 63-212, and Chris Schabel, «The *Sentences* Commentary of Paul of Perugia, O.Carm. With an Edition of His Question on Divine Foreknowledge», *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales* 72 (2005), pp. 54-112.

<sup>28</sup> Chris Schabel, «The Quarrel over Unleavened Bread in Western Theology, 1234-1439», in Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel (eds.), *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204-1500*, Leuven (Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales – Bibliotheca 11): Peeters, 2011, pp. 85-127.

of book I, making it relatively easy to find what you're looking for – except, of course, after the 1320s when theologians sometimes asked only one giant question on the Trinity. The secular theologian Henry of Langenstein<sup>29</sup> is in the middle, since he asks more than one question, but not one for each distinction. His coverage of the *Filioque*, from the early 1370s, is found in his question "is there any production in the divine by which neither the essence nor the Holy Spirit produces or is produced?" with which Langenstein deals with distinctions 4-13 of book I. Langenstein mentions Lombard a couple of times, because this is a good example of a context where the Master gathered authorities (in the case of the Greeks, mostly pseudo-authorities) that later authors repeated with the words, "*ut in littera*." Yet the most important Greek *auctoritas* in later treatments, a passage from *On the Orthodox Faith* of John of Damascus, is not in the *Sentences*, and the bulk of these discussions, especially after Aquinas, are devoted to a philosophical debate over controversial aspects of the question in which Lombard plays no role. To the extent that there is commentary on anyone, it concerns ambiguous statements of Anselm, absent in the *Sentences* themselves, and of Augustine, which are there, but in a different distinction and context. Lombard only returns again at the end for stock refutations of the Greek pseudo-authorities.

Granted, this is not the case at the very beginning of the *Sentences* as a textbook. The Cistercian Guy de l'Aumône,<sup>30</sup> who read the *Sentences* at Paris around 1250, and whose treatment is a blend of those of Albertus Magnus and the Franciscan Eudes Rigaud from the 1240s, first gives a brief, five-line *divisio* of Lombard's text following the lemma *Hic dicendum est Spiritum Sanctum etc.* Then Guy asks some small questions before returning to Lombard's text at the lemma *Graeci tamen*. Here, however, instead of commenting on the *Sentences*, Guy inserts some important Greek quotations not in the textbook, from the Damascene and the pseudo-Dionysius, before simply stating, "the Master puts other arguments of the Greeks in the text concerning councils and anathema. But *ad oppositum* there are many *auctoritates*, and enough are to be had in the text." And finally the *responsio* and refutations of the Greek *auctoritates* are not in Lombard. Toward the end of the distinction, however, Guy has three more *lemmata* that do contain a little commentary: in the first he explains and accepts Lombard in two lines, in the second he asserts that Lombard's argument doesn't work without tweaking, and in the third he more or less states that the reasoning of the *Sentences* no longer applies to contemporary Greeks. The remainder of the distinction departs again from Lombard, based primarily and explicitly on Anselm.

A quarter century later things had changed. In the 1270s, the Franciscan Matthew of Aquasparta<sup>31</sup> begins with the lemma for distinction 11, *Hic est dicendum Spiritum*, but aside from the fact that a couple of the sixteen Greek quotations and arguments are also found in the textbook, in addition to one remark that "the Master adduces passages from Greek doctors *in littera*," Peter Lombard is absent from the nine-page question. More importantly, Aquasparta adds another question, "Given that the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Son, as the Greeks say, would He be distinguished from the Son?" Russell Friedman, who co-edited these questions with Fritz Pedersen and myself, has shown that this issue stems from a reaction to

<sup>29</sup> Chris Schabel, «Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the *Filioque* at Vienna on the Eve of the Council of Florence», in Monica Brinzei (ed.), *Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the Sentences at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth Century*, Turnhout (Studia Sententiarum): Brepols, forthcoming.

<sup>30</sup> Chris Schabel, «Cistercian University Theologians on the *Filioque*», *Archa Verbi* 11 (2014), forthcoming.

<sup>31</sup> Chris Schabel, Fritz Saaby Pedersen, and Russell L. Friedman, «Matthew of Aquasparta, OFM, and the Greeks», in Kent Emery Jr., Russell L. Friedman, and Andreas Speer (eds.), *Medieval Philosophy and Theology in the Long Middle Ages: A Tribute to Stephen F. Brown*, Leiden (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 105): Brill, 2011, pp. 813-853.

Thomas Aquinas in the 1260s.<sup>32</sup> This is a more philosophical problem, on the nature of relations, and it is no surprise that the Lombard is not involved, although an *expositio* of Anselm is again important.

Another quarter century later we find further development in the procedure of James of Metz, from around 1300.<sup>33</sup> First, we see a specific instance of a general shift that Friedman has described,<sup>34</sup> from the argument-centered question of Aquasparta to the position-centered question of Metz. Aquasparta gives sixteen arguments for the opposing position of the Greeks, then seventeen for the Latins, his *responsio* of less than two pages, and then the refutation of the sixteen arguments *in contrarium*. Metz, in contrast, has only two opening arguments, then he presents as a unit an opinion that he describes as "less true," before offering the "truer" opinion, refuting the specific arguments of the "less true" opinion, and responding to the opening arguments. Second, Metz completely skips the *de facto* question "Does the Holy Spirit proceed from the Father and the Son?" and jumps directly to the counter-factual question, "Would the Holy Spirit be distinguished from the Son if He did not proceed from Him?" The less true opinion is that of the Franciscans and other opponents of the Dominicans, while the truer opinion is that of Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and the Dominican school in general. The position-centered approach and the focus on more recent doctrinal debates have the effect of eliminating all explicit trace of Peter Lombard in the discussion. The only *auctoritates* in the text are from Anselm, and to the extent that this is an *expositio*, it is an *expositio* of Anselm, not just because he is Anselm, but because both sides were using the same passages in their own defense.

In 1300, the basic distinctions arrangement that Alexander of Hales introduced was still standard, providing at least a structural link with the Lombard, often introduced with the lemma. In the course of the fourteenth century, however, even this structure was often abandoned, and when the questions were still linked to distinctions, they frequently grew in size, covering several distinctions at once and/or skipping distinctions altogether. The result of this "selectivity," as several scholars have noted, is that some *Sentences* commentaries consisted of just a handful of questions, each of which became practically an independent treatise up to a hundred or more pages long. Many theologians at Oxford in the 1330s and later at Paris, for example Peter of Candia, did not discuss the *Filioque* at all.

There seems to have been a conservative reaction to this in the fifteenth century, usually associated with Jean Gerson. It is interesting to see how the above-mentioned treatment of Henry of Langenstein from around 1370, buried in the fourth question of the mere six he asked for book I, was received in Vienna in this period. In preparation for lectures delivered around 1400, Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl began by copying Langenstein's general question, which included a few pages on the counter-factual issue of whether the Holy Spirit would be distinct from the Son without the *Filioque*. In a process that took at least three steps, material on the *de facto* *Filioque* issue was added, the counter-factual and *de facto* discussions were removed from the larger question, and most Viennese theologians of the early fifteenth century thereby

---

<sup>32</sup> The standard history of related Trinitarian issues in this period is Russell L. Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions at the Medieval University. The Use of Philosophical Psychology in Trinitarian Theology among the Franciscans and Dominicans, 1250–1350*, 2 vols., Leiden (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 108): Brill, 2013.

<sup>33</sup> I have edited all redactions of Metz' question in preparation for Chris Schabel, «James of Metz's Lectura on the Sentences», in a Festschrift for Kent Emery Jr. edited by Alfredo S. Culleton, Roberto H. Pich, and Andreas Speer (Brill, Leiden), although I am preparing to publish the questions separately.

<sup>34</sup> Russell L. Friedman, «The *Sentences* Commentary, 1250–1350. General Trends, the Impact of the Religious Orders, and the Test Case of Predestination», in *Mediaeval Commentaries* [note 1], vol. 1, pp. 41–128, at 84–100.

recreated a distinction 11 as one might find a century earlier. In order to make a separate question, they had to add preliminary arguments, and Peter Lombard thus returned: "*Ad oppositum*, the Holy Spirit proceeds from both, namely from the Father and the Son, as is clear through the Master in book I, distinction 11."<sup>35</sup>

### *Lombard's Lingering Influence*

Still, the fact that this could be added on to a discussion that was largely independent of Lombard underscores how unessential the role of the textbook was for most theologians when composing their questions on the *Sentences* in written form. There were, however, three ways in which the *Sentences* retained a more prominent presence in the fourteenth-century "commentary" tradition. The first I have already mentioned in passing, the occasional insertion of the Lombardian lemma at the start of questions, sometimes with a few lines describing the *divisio textus*.<sup>36</sup> Before distinction 11, Albertus Magnus, Aquinas, Bonaventure, Giles of Rome, and others have brief *divisiones textus* of the Lombard. Aquinas concludes the distinction with a short *expositio*, so that his *divisio* and *expositio* together amount to about 400 words. Bonaventure ends with four *dubia* concerning the Lombard's text, constituting about 800 words together with the *divisio*. (Parenthetically, Bonaventure is thus extreme as a *commentator*, yet he is still *author* of five times as many words in this distinction.) In the fourteenth century, the *divisiones textus* were usually eliminated entirely, but there are exceptions, a couple of them substantial: Durand of Saint-Pourçain gives the Lombard about 300 words in distinction 11, and his rough contemporary, Peter Auriol, has a *divisio* of over 700 words. Still, these bits of Lombard description are rare, they seem to be mostly confined to book I for all these authors, and Auriol's and maybe even Durand's were composed outside Paris, perhaps in part for less advanced audiences. Moreover, Durand and Auriol were extremely ambitious, and we may interpret their procedure in book I as a conscious attempt to rival and even replace the leading doctors of their orders, Aquinas and Scotus respectively.<sup>37</sup> Even if the total amount of Lombard commentary in Auriol's giant *Scriptum* on book I amounts to much less than 5% of Auriol's text, if you add it all up it probably reaches 25% of the size of Lombard's own work. This is almost an *expositio*.

The second way in which Lombard remained prominent is that there were, in fact, *expositiones litterales* or *lecturae textuales* of the *Sentences*, even in the fourteenth century, albeit usually anonymous. The examples best known to me are those of the Dominican James of Lausanne, the Augustinian John Klenkok, and the secular Henry Totting of Oyta. These works go well beyond the Lombard, but nevertheless they have more of a claim to being commentaries on the *Sentences*, to the degree that Klenkok's biographer can speak of the Augustinian's "obsession with the literal text."<sup>38</sup> Yet these writings are also exceptions to the rule: each was composed outside Paris, with Oyta's being the first surviving *Sentences* commentary from the University of Prague, dating to around 1370; and Lausanne, Klenkok, and Oyta all went on to compose independent *Quaestiones* on the *Sentences*, in Lausanne's and Oyta's cases at Paris. In the case of Oyta, moreover, Ueli Zahnd's recent analysis shows his *Lectura textualis* to be more

<sup>35</sup> Schabel, «Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the *Filioque*».

<sup>36</sup> I employ early modern printings and critical editions of entire works for the *divisiones textus*.

<sup>37</sup> Durand's *Sentences* commentary is finally being edited critically; see the status quaestionis in Andreas Speer, Fiorella Retucci, Thomas Jescke, and Guy Guldentops (eds.), *Durandus and His Sentences Commentary: Historical, Philosophical and Theological Issues*, Leiden (Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales – Bibliotheca 9), Leuven: Peeters, 2014. Sadly, Auriol's lags behind: see Russell L. Friedman's webpage on Auriol: <http://www.peterauriol.net/>.

<sup>38</sup> Christopher Ocker, *Johannes Klenkok: A Friar's Life, c. 1310-1374*, Philadelphia (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 83.5): American Philosophical Society, 1993, p. 29.

dependent on Aquinas and Scotus (and even Hugh of St Victor) than on the Lombard himself.<sup>39</sup>

The circumstances of Lausanne's, Klenkok's, and Oyta's *expositiones litterales* lead us to yet a third way in which Lombard's *Sentences* stayed current, perhaps the most important way. For beginning theological students there was always a need for an explanation of the text, actual commentary on the *Sentences*, albeit in oral form. The mendicant orders required that the *Sentences* be read at many convents, even in Nicosia.<sup>40</sup> When promising mendicants were sent to Paris for further study, they had already had the *Sentences* explained to them, and they were ready to hear advanced lectures from their Parisian *Sententiarius*. Afterwards, they would themselves explain the Lombard in the convents, except for the best students, who were often sent to the important *studia* at places like Toulouse or Bologna to give more independent *Sentences* lectures. Finally, by the time the elite arrived at Paris as *Sententiarii*, they had heard low- and high-level lectures and given something in between, so basic commenting on Lombard would have been superfluous. Secular theologians may not have had so much experience, and this may be another explanation for why so few secular *Sentences* commentaries survive for the first century: secular bachelors were not yet seasoned theologians.<sup>41</sup>

The chance survival of raw *reportationes* from Parisian bachelors demonstrates that even at Paris the link to the Lombard was not severed in the lectures themselves. William Duba has found that in his *reportatio* from 1330, the Franciscan William of Brienne makes sure that he covers every distinction of the *Sentences*, although he skims through large sections.<sup>42</sup> Peter Plaout's *reportatio* showed Glorieux how theologians at the end of the century implemented the new statutes requiring bachelors to give attention to books II-IV: at the end of his daily lecture Plaout gave a series of perfunctory *puncta* corresponding to the Lombard's text, allowing Plaout to devote most of his time to speculate on what he wanted, when he wanted.<sup>43</sup> Most of the time, these *puncta* or quick skimmings of Lombard have dropped out of the written record as unwanted *minutiae*, but they were there in the oral presentations.

### Conclusion

The *Sentences* commentary was by far the most significant single genre of writing in systematic theology from the mid-thirteenth century down to the end of the Middle Ages, far ahead of *summae*, *quodlibeta*, and ordinary and other disputed questions.<sup>44</sup> Yet not all *Sentences* commentaries were the same. Let us recall the words of Bonaventure quoted by Olivier Boulnois to open the conference on which this volume is based:

There are four ways to make a book. One person writes the words of another, not adding or changing anything, and he is merely called a scribe. One person writes the words of another and adds to them, but not his own, and he is called a compiler. One person writes

<sup>39</sup> Ueli Zahnd, *Wirksame Zeichen? Sakramentenlehre und Semiotik in der Scholastik des ausgehenden Mittelalters*, Tübingen (Spätmittelalter, Humanismus, Reformation 80): Mohr Siebeck, 2014, pp. 262-279.

<sup>40</sup> *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, vol. 3, no. 1394.

<sup>41</sup> Assuming that seculars were required to do so from the 1240s. On the mendicant studia system and the *Sentences*, see the studies in Kent Emery Jr., William J. Courtenay, and Stephen M. Metzger (eds.), *Philosophy and Theology in the Studia of the Religious Orders and at Papal and Royal Courts*, Turnhout (Rencontres de philosophie médiévale 15): Brepols, 2012.

<sup>42</sup> William O. Duba, *The Forge of Scotism*, Turnhout (Studia Sententiarum): Brepols, forthcoming.

<sup>43</sup> Paul Glorieux, «L'année universitaire 1392-1393 à la Sorbonne à travers les notes d'un étudiant», *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 19 (1939), pp. 429-482, at pp. 461-466.

<sup>44</sup> I have argued thus in Chris Schabel, «Reshaping the Genre: Literary Trends in Philosophical Theology in the Fourteenth Century», in Spencer E. Young (ed.), *Crossing Boundaries at Medieval Universities*, Leiden/Boston (Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 36): Brill, 2011, pp. 51-84.

both the words of another and his own, but those of another are the main words and his own are included for clarification, and he is called a commentator, not an author. One person writes both the words of another and his own, but his own are the main words and those of another are included for confirmation, and such a person must be called an author. The Master, who posit his opinions and confirmed them with the opinions of the Fathers, was such a person, so he truly must be called the author of this book.<sup>45</sup>

This passage on the characterization of Peter Lombard as author of the *Sentences* is interesting for several reasons. First, it is part of a Prologue, which in Lombard takes up a mere two pages, but in the fourteenth century frequently requires an entire volume or more in a critical edition, in which theologians usually treated the nature of theology with very little connection to the textbook, even structurally.<sup>46</sup> Second, although I have labeled the *Sentences* as largely a kind of *florilegium*, nevertheless Bonaventure himself considers the Master to be an author. Third, compared to the textbook itself, then, Bonaventure's own *Sentences* "commentary" is even more the work of an "author," namely Bonaventure himself. Fourth, while we find what we call *Sentences* commentaries produced by theologians fitting into each category as far as the words are concerned, scribe, compiler, commentator, and author, there is reason to consider each one the work of an author vis-à-vis the intent of the producer. Around 1320, the Carmelite John Baconthorpe and the Franciscan Aufredo Gonteri Brito incorporated into their *Sentences* commentaries entire questions from the seculars Thomas Wylton and Henry of Harclay respectively, but rather than mere scribes (assuming they were not dictating), Baconthorpe and Gonteri chose their texts for doctrinal reasons.<sup>47</sup> In his Prague *Lectura textualis* from ca. 1370, Henry Toting of Oyta put together questions with the words of Aquinas, Scotus, and Hugh of St Victor, but this was no simple compilation, but a deliberate use of others' words to present the main alternatives only to choose a different solution, which was to be what Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl would do at Vienna three decades later with the words of several earlier scholastics.<sup>48</sup> Numerous Dominicans from the late thirteenth to the early fifteenth centuries could be said to have explained Aquinas in their *Sentences* commentaries, either via verbatim quotation, paraphrase, or presentation of his ideas, but rather than commentators per se, we should view them as defenders of a certain interpretation in the struggles within the Order of

---

<sup>45</sup> Bonaventura, *Commentarius in libros Sententiarum*, Prologus, q. 4, conc., *Opera Omnia* I, pars 1, Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1887, pp. 14b-15a: "... quadruplex est modus faciendi librum. Aliquis enim scribit aliena, nihil addendo vel mutando; et iste mere dicitur scriptor. Aliquis scribit aliena, addendo, sed non de suo; et iste compilerator dicitur. Aliquis scribit et aliena et sua, sed aliena tanquam principalia, et sua tanquam annexa ad evidentiam; et iste dicitur commentator, non auctor. Aliquis scribit et sua et aliena, sed sua tanquam principalia, aliena tanquam annexa ad confirmationem; et talis debet dici auctor. Talis fuit Magister, qui sententias suas ponit et Patrum sententiis confirmat. Unde vere debet dici auctor huius libri."

<sup>46</sup> The evolving size, structure, and content of Prologues is treated in Friedman, «Peter Lombard and the Development of the *Sentences* Commentary in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries».

<sup>47</sup> Chris Schabel, «Parisian Secular Masters on Divine Foreknowledge and Future Contingents in the Early Fourteenth Century, Part II: Thomas Wylton's *Quaestio ordinaria* 'Utrum praedestinatus possit damnari'», *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales* 78 (2011), pp. 417-479; William Duba, Russell L. Friedman, and Chris Schabel, «Henry of Harclay and Aufredo Gonteri Brito», in *Mediaeval Commentaries* [note 1], vol. 2, pp. 263-368.

<sup>48</sup> Zahnd, *Wirksame Zeichen?*, pp. 262-279; Monica Brinzei and Chris Schabel, «The Past, Present, and Future of Late-Medieval Theology: The Commentary on the *Sentences* of Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl, Vienna, ca. 1400», in *Mediaeval Commentaries* [note 1], vol. 3, pp. 174-266

Friars Preacher or as defenders of their Teaching Doctor against the attacks from without.<sup>49</sup> The most famous *Sentences* commentaries, like those of Scotus, Auriol, the Franciscan William of Ockham, and the Augustinian Gregory of Rimini, are boldly independent, their authors *par excellence* consciously setting themselves against their contemporaries and immediate university predecessors, often even to the extent that, as in the case of the Franciscan Francis of Marchia, the use of Scripture and the Fathers is reduced to a minimum and arguments alone decide the questions.<sup>50</sup> That is to say, in contrast to the textbook, in the so-called commentary tradition reason frequently overtakes revelation.<sup>51</sup>

What all these different types of *Sentences* commentary have in common, even Oyta's so-called *Lectura textualis*, is that they are not commentaries on Peter Lombard's words, and to the extent that the words of others are copied, paraphrased, or just explained, they are not those of the Master, but mainly those of earlier bachelors of the *Sentences* or masters of theology. Lombard provided *auctoritates* and, with Alexander of Hales' assistance, a structure, but within a couple of decades this textbook became what a textbook in a humanities class is in a modern university. The degree of dependence of the lectures on the textbook varies with the level of the students and the experience of the professor.

So let's return to the initial question: "Were there *Sentences* commentaries?" From the perspective of an intellectual historian interested in every aspect of medieval education, yes, there were, although we don't know that much about them. Their mostly oral nature is reflected mainly in the form of abridgements of Lombard of manuscripts of his textbook that contain anonymous marginal notes from the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries.<sup>52</sup> But from the perspective of the elitist historian of medieval philosophy, or of medieval ideas, the answer is probably, "no, not really." This type of historian is not only uninterested in literal commentaries, but also ignores the *Sentences* commentaries that are overly derivative of other *Sentences* commentaries.<sup>53</sup> *Ad propositum*, as concerns the written products of the leading one or two hundred *Sententiarii*, one can do no better than paraphrase Francesco del Punta: they did not compose *expositiones* on the *Sentences* – no dialogue between the reader and the text – but rather *disputationes* linked to the basic arrangement of the textbook.

---

<sup>49</sup> Monica Brinzei and Chris Schabel, «Thomas Aquinas as Authority and the *Summa* as *Auctoritas* in the Late Middle Ages», in Lidia Lanza, José Mehrinos, and Marco Toste (eds.), *Summistae: The Commentary Tradition on Thomas Aquinas's Summa Theologiae (15th-18th Century)*, Leiden: Brill, forthcoming.

<sup>50</sup> Chris Schabel, «Francesco d'Appignano on the Greeks, or Doing Theology without the Bible», in Domenico Priori (ed.), *Atti del VI Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto: Centro Studi Francesco d'Appignano, 2013, pp. 206-221.

<sup>51</sup> This is the conclusion I argued for in Schabel, «Reason and Revelation in the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard and the Commentary Tradition».

<sup>52</sup> See now Franklin T. Harkins, «*Filiae Magistri*: Peter Lombard's *Sentences* and Medieval Theological Education "On the Ground"», in *Mediaeval Commentaries* [note 1], vol. 3, pp. 26-78.

<sup>53</sup> For example, in the standard survey, Friedman's «The *Sentences* Commentary, 1250-1320» [note ?], it is instructive to note the commentaries that our colleague explicitly refuses to treat, among them the literal commentary of James of Viterbo and the derivative commentary of the Cistercian Humbert of Preuilly (p. 57, n. 36) and the literary and second but still somewhat derivative commentary of James of Lausanne (pp. 68-69, n. 74), while he is also dismissive of the Franciscan Alexander of Alessandria's derivative first of his two attempts (p. 74).