

ERC-project n° 771589

## INTRODUCTION

MONICA BRINZEI

In 2007, when I first met Paul J.J.M. Bakker and Russell L. Friedman, preparing my PhD dissertation on Pierre d'Ailly, who lectured on the *Sentences* at Paris in 1377-78, I was looking for an answer to this question: What do we know about the *Sentences* commentaries from the decades before and after Pierre d'Ailly? Investigating *Sentences* commentaries from the later fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth entails venturing into *terra incognita*, because the vast majority of the surviving works written after the Black Death still remain in manuscript. The idea of a colloquium on this topic was thus immediately embraced in the hopes of shedding new light on the doctrines defended by advanced bachelors of theology at the late medieval universities and mendicant *studia*.

“Philosophical Psychology in Late-Medieval Commentaries on Peter Lombard’s *Sentences*” became the specific target of the XIVth Colloquium of the Société Internationale pour l’Etude de la Philosophie Médiévale held in Nijmegen on 28-30 October 2009. The proceedings of the colloquium published in this volume bring together new evidence for how the corpus of late medieval *Sentences* commentaries, especially from the second half of the fourteenth century, contributed to the development of philosophical psychology within the discipline of theology. The relation between the faculties of the soul, the limits of knowledge, hylomorphism, intuitive and abstractive cognition, the experience of the beatific vision, divine foreknowledge, the knowability of species, there are some examples of the issues examined in this book. The wealth of new information presented here stems from the interpretation of previously unexplored sources. This volume also demonstrates that lectures on Peter Lombard’s textbook from this period provided a variety of *loci* throughout the books of the *Sentences* for approaching philosophical topics, from the *principia* (Denys of Montina), the prologue (Alfonsus Vargas of Toledo, Hugolino of Orvieto, John Regis, Francis Toti of Perugia), book I (Gregory of Rimini, John of Mirecourt, Pierre Ceffons, Hugolino of Orvieto, Pierre

d'Ailly, Peter of Candia, the Vienna Group, John Capreolus, Henry of Gorkum, Denys the Carthusian), book II (Pierre Ceffons, Peter of Candia, Guillaume de Vaurouillon, Gabriel Biel), and book III (Heymericus de Campo). This diversity, within huge works on theology contrued broadly, constitutes a tradition parallel to that found in commentaries on Aristotle's *De anima* in the late Middle Ages.

The actual colloquium opened with an historical session organized around three papers. First, in "Sentences Commentaries After 1350: A Framework for the Study of Their Tradition," Phillipp W. Rosemann (then University of Dallas, now Maynooth) listed seven points common to the commentaries after 1350 concerning topics, technical vocabulary, structure, contents, and so on. Next, Claire Angotti's (University of Reims) "Les commentaires des *Sentences* de la deuxième moitié du XIVe siècle dans les bibliothèques parisiennes" traced the reception of the commentaries from after 1350 in medieval Parisian libraries (Collège de la Sorbonne, Collège de Navarre, the Abbey of Saint-Victor). The historical session concluded with William J. Courtenay (University of Wisconsin), "James of Eltville, O.Cist., His Fellow *sententiarii* in 1369-1370, and His Influence on Contemporaries," presenting the case-study of the Cistercian James of Eltville, associated with the *via moderna*, characteristic of the *Sentences* commentaries of the last decades of the fourteenth century. None of the papers from this session is included in this book, either because advances in the field have made the material obsolete (e.g., via Rosemann's publication of volumes 2-3 of *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, Leiden 2010-2015) or because thematically the essays fit better elsewhere (for example, in a forthcoming volume on James of Eltville for Brepols' collection *Studia Sententiarum* in connection with the editing project dedicated to this author). Similar reasons explain the absence of the contribution of Monica B. Calma (IRHT, Paris), which established a parallel between James of Eltville and John Regis on the topic of the evident knowledge, Vesa Hirvonen's (University of Eastern Finland, Joensuu) paper entitled "Gabriel Biel on Mental Disorders in His Commentary on the *Sentences*," which presented how mental illness was approached in the context of the sacraments, and Stephen F. Brown's (Boston College) "Abstractive Cognition According to Peter of Candia," which is growing into a book on Peter's *Principia* that will be published in the *Studia Sententiarum* collection.

The present volume is divided into three parts on thematic grounds. The first, entitled *Human Cognition*, gathers three papers on fundamental epistemological issues treated in the commentaries after Gregory of Rimini, who lectured on the *Sentences* at Paris in 1343-44: intuitive knowledge of the sensible particular, the theory of evident knowledge, and the doctrine of *complexe significabile*.

After his PhD was published as a book in 2008 (*La teoria della scienza nel XIII secolo. I commenti agli Analitici secondi*, Firenze), Amos Corbini (then University of Trento, now Torino) has expanded his interest in the medieval doctrine of scientific knowledge and focused on some key authors from the fourteenth century. The center of his attention has been the Cistercian Pierre Ceffons, on whom Corbini had already published various articles, including in volume 15 of this *Rencontres* series (2012).<sup>1</sup> In that same volume, Russell L. Friedman questioned Damasus Trapp's confusing interpretation of "aegidianism" and "ultra-aegidianism" in the latter's pioneering studies on the Augustinians Gerard of Siena and Michael of Massa.<sup>2</sup> In the present collection, Corbini tests Trapp's hypothesis of a close doctrinal dialogue between Augustinians and Cistercians just before 1350. Corbini seems to arrive at similar doubts after analyzing in detail the issues of intuitive knowledge and the *complexe significabile*, in which the Augustinian Hugolino of Orvieto and the Cistercian Pierre Ceffons do not share the ideas of the Augustinian Gregory of Rimini or the Cistercian John of Mirecourt. Even in the case of the Augustinian Alfonsus Vargas of Toledo, who is known to have introduced four types of intuitive knowledge, Corbini clearly points out that he is more influenced by the earlier Oxonian Franciscan Walter Chatton than by the Parisian Augustinian Rimini. Regarding the thesis of the *complexe significabile* as *nihil*, Ceffons offers interesting testimony concerning the reception of this doctrine, but he does not adopt any definitive position, ostensibly being too afraid of possible condemnation. Cistercians and Augustinians developed similar interests in the theory of knowledge, but, as Corbini clearly demonstrates, this was not on the basis of a dialogue or a doctrinal exchange, as

---

<sup>1</sup> A. CORBINI, "Pierre de Ceffons et l'instruction dans l'ordre cistercien: quelques remarques", in *Philosophy and Theology in the Studia of the Religious Orders and at Papal and Royal Courts*, ed. K. EMERY, Jr., W.C. COURTENAY, and S.M. METZGER (Rencontres de Philosophie Médiévale 15), Turnhout 2012, 549-74.

<sup>2</sup> R.L. FRIEDMAN, "How 'Aegidian' Were Later Augustinian Hermits Regarding Intellectual Cognition? Gerard of Siena, Michael of Massa and the Object of the Intellect", in *Philosophy and Theology in the Studia of the Religious Orders and at Papal and Royal Courts*, ed. EMERY, COURTENAY, and METZGER 427-79.

Trapp would suggest, but more because this was a general trend among the *sententiarii* or, as Corbini claims, there “were compulsory reactions” in the reception of certain topics.

In his research at CNRS-Tours, Aurélian Robert has focused on the progressive rediscovery of atomism at the end of the Middle Ages. The point of departure of his paper in this volume is the view that the problem of the human intellect’s knowledge of substances is a philosophical question that links early modern philosophers and medieval authors. Various definitions can be identified in the early modern era (Descartes: pure intellectual knowledge; Locke: complex collection of ideas of qualities; Hume: a fiction; Berkeley: a nothing) and, looking back at the context of the medieval disputes, Robert notes a broad interest in the problem of the knowability of substances and of the possibility of forming concepts of substances in the thirteenth century. A disputed issue in the Faculty of Theology, the topic also fascinated masters from the Faculty of Arts (see the examples of commentaries on *De anima* and the *Metaphysics*). The main *fora* in *Sentences* commentaries for discussing the possibility of direct or indirect (*via species*, treating also the nature of such *species*) knowledge of substances were the Prologue and distinction 3 of the first book, dealing with the possibility for a creature to know God. The principal doctrinal directions are the *via Scoti* (there is no direct representation of substances for the human intellect, which needs a species or a concept that is formed based on intuitive knowledge of singulars) and the *via Thomae* (the first object of the intellect is the quiddity of material substances). From these two, Robert also lists some derivative theories, such as that of Hervaeus Natalis (a kind of *via media*, since it combines the two previous ones) and that of John of Jandun (a *preparatio* of the intellect by a *species accidentium*). Scotus’ perspective was simplified by William of Ockham, who introduced the impossibility of cognizing substances *in se*. According to Robert, it is also important that Ockham and Gregory of Rimini added to Scotus’ view the idea that the human intellect can have knowledge of its own soul. Rimini seems to be the main source for the commentaries from after 1350 and in this respect the analysis of some relevant cases from the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, like the commentaries of Pierre d’Ailly, Gabriel Biel, Marsilius of Inghen, Guillaume de Vaurouillon, John Capreolus, John of Lutrea, and Bartholomew of Usingen, lead Robert to the conclusion that there was a decline in interest in the distinct representation of material substances. At the same time, it is possible to deduce from this decline that the discussion on the

knowability of substance became more epistemological and less theological. An echo of this epistemological aspect also seems to be found in its reception in modern philosophy.

Thus far Jeffrey Witt's (Loyola University Maryland) main contribution to the domain of *Sentences* commentaries has been the database Lombardpress.org. His keen interest in developing innovative tools for research is enriched by his preoccupation with medieval theories of knowledge. In this context, Witt's contribution to this volume introduces the reader to an unexplored master from the last decade of the fourteenth century, Peter of Plaout, who read the *Sentences* in 1392-1393. After a biographical presentation of this author, Witt's ambition is to "begin the challenge of analyzing philosophically" Plaout's commentary by focusing on the topic of intuitive cognition. Plaout's position seems to be a valuable contribution to the reception of the theory initiated by John Duns Scotus, since Plaout combines two doctrines: the thesis of the necessity of a mediating species in all types of knowledge and the thesis inspired by Ockham's tenet that direct knowledge of the object depends on its real existence. Thus, for Plaout, existential certitude about a sensible object is inextricably linked with intuitive cognition of that object. An interesting detail in the presentation of Plaout's understanding of intuitive cognition is his debate with Henry Totting of Oyta (*Sentences* lectures 1377-1378), since Plaout cannot accept Oyta's claim that a concept is called representative (*representativus*) according to its nature or its specific condition. Plaout finds it unacceptable for an identical concept to correspond to or represent singular objects that are different in number. In his conclusion, Witt stresses that Plaout's attitude in the debate over intuitive cognition is not a repetition of previous doctrinal positions, but rather a new line of interpretation, combining different classical theses.

II. The second section of this volume is dedicated to the problem of the soul as viewed through the lens of some *Sentences* commentaries, mostly from the fifteenth century.

*Sentences* commentaries have consistently played a key role in Maarten Hoenen's (University of Basel) publications. Hoenen's essay in this volume is based on the recent discovery in Bernkastel-Kuel, St. Nikolaus Hospital, Cod. Cus. 24 of a *Super Sententias* attributed to Heymericus de Campo and composed according to a "remarkable design." Actually, this text is not a real commentary, but an abbreviation that Heymericus made in order to gather the authorities found in Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. This is the conclusion that Hoenen reaches after examining the history of the practice of abbreviating the

*Sentences*. Comparing Heymericus' text with other products of the same genre, namely the abbreviations of Johannes de Fonte, Burkhard of Horneck, Jerome Dungersheim, and Henry of Gorkum, Hoenen clearly identifies two distinct ways of abbreviating the *Sentences*: (1) outlining the structure and the division of Lombard's text, mostly for scholarly purposes, and (2) collecting and reporting the quotations from Lombard; Heymericus' abbreviation belongs to the second category. This is also clear from the second part of the paper, where Hoenen focuses on the problem of the soul, one of the most popular issues in the abbreviations or the summaries made of the *Sentences*. Heymericus seems to update Lombard's text according to the Aristotelian standard (the soul as first act of the body) and, in distinctions 21 and 22, where one finds discussions of the dual nature of Christ (human and divine), he endeavors to present a very precise position in order to avoid confusion. Following the paper, Appendix 1 offers an edition of distinctions 5, 21, and 22 from Cod. Cus. 24 and Appendix 2 presents the relation between the abbreviated commentaries and the *Articuli* that indicated what path to follow in Christological issues that were confusing in Peter of Lombard.

Following the publication of an imposing volume resulting from his PhD dissertation, *Deus ut tentus vel visus. Die Debatte um die Seligkeit im reflexiven Akt (ca. 1293-1320)*, Leiden 2011, Thomas Jeschke (Thomas-Institut, Cologne) proposes an original approach to the topic of the relation between the soul and its faculties. After an introduction that establishes the *status quaestionis*, listing the ongoing research projects and showing the limits of the main lines of interpretation (Perler, King, De Boer), Jeschke offers an alternative: explaining through the lens of two fifteenth-century authors (Denys the Carthusian and John Capreolus) a fourteenth-century problem related to the difference between the potencies of the soul. Without claiming any ambition to replace the standard narratives, Jeschke asserts that this fifteenth-century perspective can reveal new aspects of the history of the inner structure of the soul, possibly modifying the general idea that the Thomist position was the mainstream view, with an Ockhamist minority. The choice of these particular authors is due to shared traits in their texts: the *Sentences* commentary of Denys the Carthusian and the *Defensiones theologiae divi Thomae Aquinatis* of John Capreolus were both composed outside the university milieu for a specific public, each of them originating from private and personal study. Therefore, they may provide valuable information about the reception of the doctrine from the thirteenth and fourteenth

centuries without the filter of an academic tradition. Besides presenting the Thomist positions in Denys and Capreolus, Jeschke enriches our knowledge by bringing to our attention several other authors from the fifteenth century: Henry of Gorkum, Gerardus de Monte, Lambert of Heerenberg, John Versor, Nicholas of Orbellis, and Gabriel Biel. Based on the example of this group from the fifteenth century, Jeschke succeeds in illuminating a variety of positions regarding the relation between the soul and its properties: Thomism, anti-Thomism, nominalism, and the Scotist camp, completely ignored by the supporters of the view that there was only mainstream Thomism with a few Ockhamists.

The next paper, “The Human Soul: Definitions and *Differentiae* in Late-Medieval *Sentences* Commentaries,” is the product of a collaboration at the University of Fribourg between William Duba and Olivier Ribordy. The essay traces how the thesis of *anima forma corporis*, usually analyzed in the context of the discussion concerning the distinction between the powers of the soul, was received in various ways by some *sententiarum* from the last decades of the fourteenth century and the fifteenth century. The authors under consideration, Pierre d’Ailly, Gabriel Biel, Peter of Candia, Guillaume de Vaurouillon, and Denys the Carthusian, have been selected because they were all inspired by comment 5 of Averroes’ commentary on *De anima*, where the Commentator rejects Alexander of Aphrodisias’ view concerning a single intellect composed of various elements. Pierre d’Ailly, from whom we do not have a commentary on book II of the *Sentences*, deals with the subject in his treatise *De anima*, where he follows Buridan very closely. Gabriel Biel in turn comments on Pierre d’Ailly’s text and we can identify continuity in this line of interpretation. It is with Peter of Candia and Guillaume Vaurouillon that we notice a change, especially since they introduce a new concept of matter, which can be also identified earlier in Nicholas Bonet, and which considers matter as applying to angels and intellective souls. Under the impact of this new idea of matter, it is possible to see how for Vaurouillon *anima forma corporis* can be interpreted as *anima forma humanitatis*. The article ends with the position of Denys of Carthusian, who tries to save Aristotle from the accusation that philosophy is totally contrary to the faith. Denys proposes a ‘right answer’ to the doctrine of the eternity of the world by introducing in the discussion on intellective soul some passages from the pseudo-Aristotelian *De secretis secretorum* and *Liber de pomo*.

## KENT

III. The third part of the volume contains three essays that reveal how philosophical psychology applies to more properly theological issues in *Sentences* commentaries.

Recently John Slotemaker (Fairfield University, Connecticut) published in collaboration with Jeffrey Witt *A Companion to the Theology of John Mair*, Leiden 2015, and *Robert Holcot*, Oxford 2016. His paper in this volume is a continuation of his research developed during his studies for his PhD, defended in 2012 at Boston College. Slotemaker proposes the case study of question 4 of book I of the *Sentences* of Pierre d'Ailly in order to emphasize the way that philosophical psychology is employed in theology, especially on the topic of the vestige or image of the Trinity in the human intellect. The analysis of Pierre d'Ailly is preceded by an introduction to the doctrinal context in Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, William of Ockham, and Gregory of Rimini. The clear conclusion that Slotemaker reaches is that, although Gregory was very often used as an indirect source by d'Ailly in the context of the *imago trinitatis*, he prefers to follow Ockham's text and to repeat *verbatim* some of his arguments.

Severin Kitanov (Salem State University) published his PhD dissertation in 2014 under the title *Beatific Enjoyment in Medieval Scholastic Debate: The Complex Legacy of Saint Augustine and Peter Lombard* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books). Kitanov's contribution to this volume is a testimony to his expertise on the topic of the beatific vision, proposing an investigation of question 2 of Peter of Candia's *Sentences* commentary. Beginning with a rich introduction on the pivotal role of the will in the medieval discussion, the paper emphasizes the utility of Candia's *Sentences* commentary as a 'treasure-house' for anyone interested in late scholastic psychology. In question 2, article 3, part 3, Candia explains the state of the will in the condition of the beatific vision. More precisely, Candia claims that there is a continuity between the state of the will in the present life and the state of the will in heaven, and this continuity has been assured by the fact that the will enjoys God contingently whether *in via* or *in patria*. In support of this view, Kitanov provides his reader with extensive and useful passages of Latin texts and clearly makes visible the dialogue that Candia established in promoting his position with Thomas



Aquinas, Peter Auriol, and John of Ripa. In this last case, we notice that Candia provides a new example of the reception of Ripa in the last decades of the fourteenth century.

The last paper in the volume completes an extensive investigation conducted over the past few years by Christopher Schabel (University of Cyprus) concerning the *Sentences* commentaries of the ‘Vienna Group’. The doctrinal aspect of this essay is the knowability of the future and how human free will interacts with the divine will. Henry of Langenstein and Henry Totting of Oyta played a capital role in the *translatio doctrinae* between the University of Paris and the University of Vienna, since they were the main founding fathers of this new university and their *Sentences* commentaries became a common source for the new generation of theologians at Vienna. Based on the edition of the question on divine foreknowledge from all the representatives of the Vienna Group, Schabel identifies the internal mechanism that produces the general trend in Vienna concerning the human will. According to this trend, the Viennese sustain that the human will will not obey out of necessity, because God’s will does not act out of necessity. Concerning the methodology, the Viennese are well accustomed to the copy-paste method and combine arguments until a stable position is forged. As Schabel concludes, the theologians from Vienna are not original, but they are constant in promoting a final doctrinal solution. The remarkable aspect that becomes apparent from their verbatim reproduction of arguments is that they are cognizant of a number of famous ideas that were in circulation in Paris or Oxford, those of John Duns Scotus, Peter Auriol, Gregory of Rimini, William of Ockham, Adam Wodeham, Richard Kilvington, Thomas Buckingham, and Thomas Bradwardine. Access to the Latin text is given in Appendices found at the end of the article. The elegant critical edition is accompanied by a chart that indicates the common arguments borrowed by one theologian from another.

The volume ends with my *Epilogue*, which proposes a personal view about what is still to be investigated in the corpus of the *Sentences* composed in the last decades of the fourteenth century.

It is now the moment to recall this volume’s origins. The colloquium from which these proceedings stem was co-organized with the support of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Radboud University of Nijmegen represented by Paul J.J.M. Bakker, and Katholieke Universiteit Leuven represented by Russell L. Friedman. The

conference received generous financial support from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) (grant nr. 276–20–004). Funding was also graciously provided by the KU Leuven's Special Research Fund (project OT/06/06). The organizers also received much support from Brepols Publishers. ERC-n° 313339 project THESIS has contributed to the final stages of this project, allowing Monica Brinzei and Christopher Schabel to invest some of their research time to edit the contributions and bring the volume to publication. We also thank Kent Emery, Jr., and his associates for their assistance and patience.

The conference was designed to encourage a dialogue between different generations of scholars. The authors delivering papers were confronted with a scientific board consisting of some *respondentes* who, at the end of each session, made suggestions and comments while indicating the innovative aspects of each contribution. Thus the valuable interventions of, especially, Russell Friedman, Timothy Noone, Pasquale Porro, and Carlos Steel contributed to the development of the written papers.

Special thanks are also addressed to Paul Bakker and Russell Friedman, the original promoters of the idea of this colloquium. Their names are missing from the front cover of the volume, since unfortunately they were overwhelmed with other duties. Despite this regrettable situation, the reader will find both their names quoted often within the volume as a sign of recognition of their role in increasing our knowledge of *Sentences* commentaries.

Since 2009 various events, personal and professional, interfered in the process of the production of this volume and delayed its publication. This colloquium was conceived as a means of identifying and encouraging promising young scholars interested in bringing out of the shadows the unexplored texts of *Sentences* commentaries from the late Middle Ages. The goal of the exchange between newcomers and advanced specialists on this topic was to benefit the young scholars. Unfortunately, this dialogue was not immediately followed by a publication that would support the applications of some candidates for permanent positions. Some of the young participants have been luckier than others and obtained permanent positions in the interim: Claire Angotti, a post-doc at the CNRS at the time of the colloquium, became a permanent Maître de Conference in Medieval History at the University of Reims; John T. Slotemaker defended his PhD and became an Associate Professor at Fairfield University; Jeffrey C. Witt followed John Slotemaker in

his PhD defense and became an Associate Professor at Loyola University Maryland; Monica B. Calma, one of the organizers, became Monica Brinzei and obtained in 2012 a generous THESIS-ERC starting grant, which has the ambition to push the frontiers of our knowledge of *Sentences* commentaries from after 1350; Ueli Zahnd, a participant in the audience, completed his PhD and obtained a position at the University of Basel. Let us hope that the publication of this volume will contribute to the fortunes of William B. Duba, Olivier Ribordy, and Thomas Jeschke.

Paris, February 2016

Monica Brinzei