

- V - *Scriptura*
- VI - *Quaestiones Disputationes*
- VII - *Quodlibetates*
- VIII - *Contra Gentiles*
- IX - *De anima*, *Theologiae*
- X - *Scriptura Commentaries*
- XI - *Dionysiaci*, *2. Prothian Commentaries*
- XII - *Aristotelian Commentaries*
- XIII - *Opuscula*

SORIPTUM

I. Available in the Vives edition (ca. 1570). Vandenhoeck's edition reprints Books I and II from the Piana edition and Books III and IV from the edition of H. F. Moos. The latter is not critical but some Has. have been used to make certain corrections.

This work is presented in some catalogues as Expositum, Scriptio, Comentarium, Lectio, Interpretatio, but Scriptio seems to prevail. The Commentary on the Extenses was the work per excellenciam by which a medieval scholar acquired academic standing. Peter Lombard was the Magister, the Commentary was the scriptio per excellenciam.

Medieval authors had little regard for literary forms. This was part of the spirit of the age, sic. A new law had to be presented as coming from older times. A new idea had to be presented as part of an older tradition, even though the author had to turn the old meaning upside down to put his own ideas across. By the fourteenth century, the Scriptio had scarcely any connection with what Peter Lombard had originally said.

Two important students: E. Morieux, O.P.,
 'Sentences', article in the P.E.G., Vol. 14, part 1,
 cols. 1860-1884 and F. Stenzlauer, Reportorium Com-
 mentarium in Sententias Petri Lombardi, Wurzburg,
 1947, 2 vols.

II. As a preliminary to our discussion, we must answer
 two questions: (1) what are the Sentences of Peter Lombard,
 and (2) what was the position and function of the
Lectures on the Sentences in a mediæval university.

The first question of 'Peter Lombard' in
P.E.G. by J. de Schellinck, S.J., Vol. XII, cols. 1941-
 2019 and H. Grabmann, Die Geschichte der scholastischen
 Metaphysik, Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1909, Vol. II,
 pp. 859ff. (Father Grabmann reported that this remains
 the best of all Grabmann's writings.)

Peter Lombard was a native of Novara in Lombardy.
 He was born c. 1100. He came to Paris in 1130,
 taught at the School of Notre Dame. In 1159 he was made
 Bishop of Paris and died in 1160.

Peter Lombard's authentic works are: (1) the
Commentarium in psalmos Davidicis (sometimes called the

Glossae; (II) the Collectanea in omnes Pauli epistolam apistarum (sometimes called Glossatura major, or Majoria Glossae apistarum or Glossa continua) (Father Eichmann remarked that when you see a Glossa quoted in the later Middle Ages to the epistles of St. Paul, you should not look for the ordinary Glossa of Strabo but for Isidorus's Glossae, Wigs., Ed., Vols. 191 and 192); (III) the homines; (IV) the IV Libri Sententiarum.

The IV Libri Sententiarum were completed in 1161 or 1163. The most influential work of the Middle Ages, known in the twelfth century, manuscripts were scattered over Europe. Glosses, indices, verifications, etc., were made of it. It was the text of theology of the theological faculty at Paris. In 1215 at the Fourth Council of the Lateran, express mention was made of it in a dogmatic canon. At that time Peter was already the Magister. All 13th, 14th and 15th century theologians take Isidorus as their basis, though they do get away from this latter as time goes on, they still write under his patronage. Tatius and Rapoldus (1630) in the seventeenth century wrote commentaries. Bertrandus began to use the Summa Theologiae of St. Thomas, followed by Bellarmine and Suarez, but the Summa has never

obtained the status of the Sentences in the Middle Ages.

The IV Libri Sententiarum is edited by Hugues, Paris, Vol. 1928. The best edition is the Quaracchi Petri Lombardi IV Libri Sententiarum studia et cura P.P. Collerii & Bonaventurae in lucem editi, 2 vol., Quaracchi, 1916. Cf. de Ghellinck's article, col. 1973. Father Eichmann recommended a thorough acquaintance with the work, its contents and method, cf. de Ghellinck's article, cols. 1947-1952. Peter Lombard's work, in itself is not important for the study of philosophy, cf. de Ghellinck's article, cols. 1953-1960.

Sententiae was a technical term designating theological works which flourished in the 11th and 12th centuries. Cf. Cleroux' article, cols. 1060-1069. The essential feature in the collection under definite headings of the contents of the Fathers, i.e. it was the first elaboration of a theological system. Peter Lombard's collection was not the first of its kind nor the best. Its success is a mystery to historians. Cf. de Ghellinck's article for a comparison with other authors, col. 2016 ff. Its success seems to lie in the fact that it avoids a definite position on conflicting issues. It is a neutral,

moderate, average text book. Anyone could lecture from it without having to espouse definite opinions on controversial issues or could give his own interpretation to Lombard's neutral treatment. Add to this certain favorable circumstances under which the book appeared, e.g. Lombard's influential disciples, he was Bishop of Paris, the official approbation accorded him by the Fourth Council of the Lateran. Cf. Denzinger /431,432 "nos sales sacre approbante Concilio, credimus et confitemur cum Petro Lombardo..."

III. Organization of studies at the University of Paris:

Our sources are scarce. There are no documents which relate the existing statutes. We are dependent on incidental remarks and statutes which were in vogue during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Historians act on the principle that later statutes presuppose a tradition, but we must beware of the danger of reading history backwards. For later statutes of Paris, cf. Chartularium, Vol. II, /1186 and /1189 for years 1330-46. The best survey is P. Glorieux, Répertoire des matières sur la théologie de Paris au XIII^e siècle, Paris, Vrin, 1933, 2 vols. Cf. also H. Denifle, O.M., 'Quel livre servait de base à l'enseignement des maîtres en théologie?',

Berthe Thesle, 1924, pp. 149-161; T. Hirschonet, CfP,

"Chronologie des écrits scripturaires de saint Thomas d'Aquin", Revue Thomiste, 1929, pp. 63-69; A.G. Little and

V. Peletier, S.J., Oxford Theology and Theologians C, A.D. 1225-1302, Oxford, 1952.

The Parisian students of theology were required to take an arts course. The length of the course is unknown and was not rigidly outlined nor of uniform duration. St. Thomas made his early studies in Cologne (1244-52; 8 years). Some historians think he taught during this time, *i.e.*, as a magister formatus he assisted St. Albert. Seven years were required in the statutes of 1255. At mid-century it may have been five years. The bacalauréat was received after an examination before seven masters.

Religious students were appointed to go on in theology at Paris from the studium generale of their own order. The Dominicans and Franciscans both had schools of theology and the chosen student would enter the school of his own order. It does not seem that they were allowed to go from one school to another. On the recommendation of St. Albert and Cardinal Hugh of Saint Cher, St. Thomas was appointed to Paris. His Master was Brunet of Bergerac.

A Bachelor was a kind of honor student who assisted the Master in giving cursory lectures, i.e., he would run through the text in a cursory fashion, e.g. in grammar, Preaching in Canon Law, Creed, etc. This function was opposed to the Lectura ordinaria in Holy Scripture and the quæstiæ disputatae, both of which were the work of the Master.

For the first two years, the Biblical Bachelor gave the cursus on Holy Scripture, i.e., cursory comments, no theological discussion (E.B.—the students had no books of their own). Two years are specified in the statutes of 1356, one year in 1320. What St. Thomas did we do not know. There is some doubt whether religious candidates even fulfilled this requirement. Some sources claim that Thomas immediately became a baccalaureus contentorium.

The next step in this honor course was to become a baccalaureus contentorium, i.e., he gave the cursus in systematic theology, i.e., the Sentences of Peter Lombard. How long did this last? Some sources say two years. This would be quite a task but it could be done if the course were cursory enough. In the fourteenth century statutes only one year (nine months) was required and we know that

the mendicant orders stressed the biblical lectures. With regard to St. Thomas only guesses are possible. Mandanet thinks Thomas' Scriptum was lectures given in class. Father Baumgarten does not agree with this.

What was the nature of these lectures? Pelletier and Chenu use documents which contain the actual notes of students taken during such lectures and they contain only a mere enumeration of the problems that come up for discussion. They seem to have been an expositio textus and an enumeration of theological problems with a rough, sketchy solution involving many definitions and distinctions, in other words, a very material approach. The student would then be prepared for a future quæstio disputata when the Master would give a detailed and definite solution. Cf. Chartularium, p. 470, where Roger Bacon complains that the Rectoralium was overstepping his duties when no disputes and gives a definite solution.

The lectures on the Sententiarium were held every day except Sundays, holidays and "dies non legibiles", i.e. days on which a quæstio disputata was held. In the daily program the Master lectured on Holy scripture at the hour of Prime, the Sententiarium at the hour of Terce.

The third and last stage of the honor course was the Paganarium Forumatus when the student could take an active part in the disputatio, i.e., either as questioner or respondent.

Mastership crowned the course. The candidate had to be thirty-five years old to achieve this office.

There is a good treatment of this part of St. Thomas' career in the D.T.C., Thomas d'Aquin, Vol., by P. A. Walsh, imp. ools. 621-625.

IV. The Doctorate

A. Chronology

According to Stolany of Lucca, Thomas went from Naples directly to Cologne where he studied under Albert (but in 1244 Albert was at Paris and did not go to Cologne until 1249), then came to Paris in 1250 when 30 years old, read the Sentences between the ages of 25 and 30, received his Licentiate, i.e., made a Master,

According to William of Tocco: after his studies at Cologne, "post baco", Albert and Cardinal Righ recommended Thomas for Paris. There Thomas "ad legendum Sententias et parvulas", was made a Bacheloarus, wrote the Scriptum while a Bacheloarus and at the beginning of his Mastership. We know that he received his mastership in 1256 so he must have written the Scriptum during the

time he was a Baccaureus up to 1207.

According to Bernard Guidonis, Thomas was eleven years at Paris, was made Baccaureus when 27 years old, Int. o. 1252.

Therefore the unanimous testimony of these catalogues was that Thomas wrote the Scriptum de Sententiis and at the beginning of his mastership, Int. o. 1252-1257. They also say that Thomas never was a Cursores Biblio at Paris.

Mandonnet gives 1254-1256 as the dates of the Scriptum when Thomas was a Sententiarius. He assigns 1252-1254 as the period when Thomas was Cursores Biblio. Mandonnet seems to set too absolute a chronology. The sources are not clear about the early years at Paris. Mandonnet's chronology would leave no time for Thomas to be a Baccaureus formatus. This tendency to give an absolute chronology is not warranted by the sources.

Tocino's remarks prove that the Scriptum was not class notes. Usually the relationship between lectures and the written Scriptum is exaggerated today.

Cf. A. Doudal, 'Saint Thomas, a-t-il disputé à Rome la question des "attributs divins?", Bulletin Thomiste, 10 (1923), notes et documents., pp. 171-183,

for an internal criticism of the relationship between the Fourth Book of the Sentences and Quodlibet I. The former is shown to be more advanced than the latter. Since only a Master could do a Quodlibet, Coeze's chronology comes correct and Mendonnet is wrong.

B. Cf. A. Hayen, S.J., 'Saint Thomas a-t-il écrit deux fois son Commentaire sur le livre des Sentences?' in Mémoires de Théologie Anglaise et Médiévale, IX, 1957, pp. 219-256. Did Thomas edit his commentary twice? Is our text the first or second edition? Itolomy of Lincoln says that Thomas wrote on the first book of the Sentences at Rome. Mendonnet (cf. Des écrits authentiques, pp. 244-246) says our edition is the old one. He thinks Thomas may have begun a new commentary, but on finding the form of the Sentence Commentary too confining, gave up the work in favor of an entirely new opus of his own. Mendonnet thinks that if any portions of the new commentary had been in circulation, Thomas would have recalled them. This would at once account for Itolomy's testimony of the existence of a new commentary and the fact that no manuscripts have de facto come down to us. Most critics do not think Hayen has proved his point even regarding the first book. It is most probable that our text of the third book was revised. Cf. G.W. Knott, Summato.

di San Tommaso del Commento al III libro delle Sentenze*, Divus Thomas (Piacenza), 1933, pp. 660-665. The autograph is different from the textus receptus but the differences are slight, e.g. a reorganization of two distinctions, 1,2, 22 and 38. The latter is an early attempt to trace the outlines of a moral philosophy and theology with a decidedly Aristotelian viewpoint.

Q. The Integrity of the Text

There is reason to suspect two interpretations:

1. In I Sent., q.2, n.1, n.3; cf. A. Bondi, O.P., "Saint Thomas et la dispute des attributs divins (I Sent., q.2, n.3) Authenticité et Origine", Archivum Systematis Prædictorum, VIII, 1930, pp. 203-262. Here are the three elements of Father Bondi's proof:

- (a) The problem is already dealt with in art. 2, though in a summary way. Art. 3 is so thorough that it is out of line with the usual brevity of the scriptum.
- (b) Hannibal de Romualdus wrote a commentary on the Sentences that has been attributed to St. Thomas—the Vives edition, Vol. 30, prints this text and attributes it to St. Thomas. Hannibal was a good student and good friend of Thomas. His work seems to be little more than a

summary of Thomas, but his work is a good term of comparison. Mennibal omits article 3, therefore it would seem not to be a part of Thomas' Scriptum.

(e) Two Manuscripts, especially the Vat. Lat. 706, have marginal notations indicating that this article is a discrepant disputation held in Rome and later inserted into the Scriptum. Thomas himself seems to have made this insertion. N.B.,--this article contains a basic Thomistic text on analogy. It is a genuine Thomistic writing but should not be quoted as an early work. It belongs to the mid-sixties.

2. In I Sent., Prologus, q. 1, art. 3, col. 28 Chenu has raised a doubt about this passage, cf. Bulletin Thomiste, 1937, p. 103. The long passage beginning with "Vel dicendum" (ed. Mandoumet, p. 10) is absent in some manuscripts. Moreover, the doctrine in this passage on the probabiliteratio scientiarum does not fit the doctrinal development at this time. It seems to be an interpolation.

The text of the Scriptum is doubtful in some places. This should not deter anyone from using it, but it does point out the need of reliable texts.

D. The Organization of the Scriptum

To through the table of contents of Peter Lombard and then the table of the scriptum to see the whole field of a medieval theologian's interest. Cf. P. Philippe, O.P., "Plan des Sentences de P. Lombard d'après S. Thomas", Bulletin Thomiste, VII, (1931-33), pp. 131-156". Today there is a practice of approaching the scholastic in a piecemeal way rather than organically.

The text of Peter Lombard was not divided into distinctions. These were added at the turn of the twelfth century when this book became a theological handbook. Within the framework of the distinctione, St. Thomas proceeded in the classic, scholastic manner,

(1) Divisio textus: the structure of the text is first explained. This is the textual commentary. We frequently fail to read these commentaries and hence do not appreciate St. Thomas' organizational power. Here we can see the seeds of the Summa. In the later thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the divisio textus disappears.

(2) Statement and distinction of questions: "Hic queritur" or "hic questionatur", what does this mean? Is it an original approach of the author or is it a current problem discussed in the schools? The second meaning is

the worrest one. Thus the number and phrasing of questions is nearly the same in Albert, Bonaventure, Thomas. Now and then a new question arises, or a different wording is used, but substantially the questions are the same. Here St. Thomas follows the custom of the schools. He are never so close to what is going on in the schools. In the Bonum, Thomas is more aloof. I.e., the manuscripts contain only divisions into questiones, i.e., what we call articles.

(3) Expositio textus: In Bonaventure this is called "alibi circa textum" which seems more accurate. Both designations were added later. The expositio contains further notes illustrating the text, i.e., matter not considered important enough to be treated as a separate question. This means that a given problem had no place in the main discussion, i.e., it was not a question belonging to the stock-in-trade of the schoolmen. Cf. In II Sent., 4, 44 (at. Blumentritt, p. 1133 ff) where an expositio develops into a full-fledged article, but examples of this are rare.

E. How to Study the Scriptum

(1) The scriptum is the point of departure of Thomas' career. It shows his relationship to contemporary thought, i.e., his thought expressed within an established framework. The scriptum is the first basis of any comparative

study. Thomas, de facto, treated many of these problems over and over again. Rarely did he contradict a former position. Though it is true that no man at 30 writes his last word on a subject, still Thomas' progress seems to consist in a greater penetration, a knowledge growing deeper and vaster, a more refined formulation, a greater skill at hitting the precise point rather than a mere material increase in knowledge. So the Scriptum should not be quoted merely as a parallel passage.

(2) The Scriptum contains many hints to contemporary teaching. When you approach a problem, first find where it is treated in the Scriptum, then find the parallel treatment in Albert and Bonaventure. From the tabulae at the end of each article in the Quaracchi edition, you can find your way to many other medieval writers on the problem dealt with in the article.

Father Neumann urges a study of questions and not of propositions taken out of context. This is the way to learn what in Thomas is traditional doctrine, new sources and his own personal contribution.

Cf. T. Delville, O.P., "L'inspiration propre du traité de Dieu dans le Commentaire des Postulats de S. Thomas", Bulletin Thomiste, (notes et comm.) VIII,

1958, pp. 119-128; for the difference between the notion of God in the Scripture and the Quaest. In the former God is presented as creating the world as a participation in His own perfection. In the latter, the notion of God as efficient cause is stressed. These two approaches affect Thomas' deconstruction of God's existence. The quaest. gets more attention in the Scripture (creation, divine Ideas, etc.). The theology of Augustine is more influential in the Scripture than in the Quaest. Theologica.

QUAESTIONES DISPUTATAE

General References

- (1) P. Mandonnet, O.P., Chronologie des questions disputées de S. Thomas d'Aquin, Revue Thomiste, Vol. 28, new series Vol. 1, (1918), pp. 266-287, pp. 342-371.
- (2) P. Mandonnet, O.P., the Introduction to his edition of the Quaestiones Disputatae, Vol. I, Paris, Lethielleux, (1925), pp. 1-24.
- (3) P. Syrave, O.P., Le problème chronologique des questions disputées de S. Thomas d'Aquin, Revue Thomiste, Vol. IX, (1926), pp. 154-159.
- (4) N. Grabmann, Die Werke des heiligen Thomas von Aquin, Münster, (1931), pp. 276-281.
- (5) F. Pelster, S.J., Zur Datierung der *quaestio disputata De spiritu et animalibus creaturis*, Gregorianum, Vol. VI, (1922), pp. 243-247.
- (6) F. Pelster, S.J., La *quaestio disputata de Anima* "De unione verbi incogniti", Archives de philosophie, Vol. III, coh. 2, (1925), pp. 190-245.
- (7) F. Pelster, S.J., Les manuscrits de Lombardus de Bologne, C.I.F., Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, Vol. IX, (1937), pp. 410 sq.
- (8) C. Verboekhoven, Les sources et la chronologie du Commentaire de S. Thomas d'Aquin au *De anima* d'Aristote, Revue philosophique de Louvain, Vol. 45, (1947), pp. 285 sq.
- (9) P. Glorieux, Les questions disputées de S. Thomas et leur suite chronologique, Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, Vol. 4, (1938), pp. 5-53.
- (10) Arthur Lentzgraf and George Leocade, The Questions of Cardinal Stephen Langton (III), pp. 115-184.
The last part of this article is instructive on the relationship between the "lectio" and the "disputatio" at the end of the twelfth century.

- (11) A. Dondaine, O.P., Le problème de l'attribution du
Tractatus de Potentia, du Ms. 784
de la B.U. Nat. Louis, Bulletin
Thomiste, Vol. VIII (1931-33), pp.
109*-118*.
- (12) A. Dondaine, O.P., S. Thomas n'a-t-il disputé à Rome la
question des attributs divins (De Senti.
q. 1, q. 2), Bulletin Thomiste, Vol.
VIII (1931-33), pp. 171*-182*.
- (13) M. Bouygues, D.J., L'idée corporative du De Potentia de S.
Thomas, Revue de Philosophie, Vol. II,
(1931) pp. 128-131; 247-266.
- (14) Beatrice H. Zedler, The Inner Unity of the De Potentia, The
Modern Schoolman, Vol. XXV, (Jan. 1948),
pp. 91-106.
- (15) P. Asteroz,
 Par l'état des manuscrits des questions
 disputées de S. Thomas d'Aq., Divus
Thomas (Florence), Vol. XXXVIII, (1935)
pp. 151-159.
- (16) Gerhard von Hartling, Wo und wann verfasste Thomas von Aquin
die Schrift "De potentia creatura"?
Historisches Jahrbuch, vol. 8, (1884),
pp. 163 ss.
- (17) O. Lettin, O.S.B., La date de la question disputée "De malo"
de S. Thomas d'Aq., Revue d'Histoire
Ecclesiastique, Vol. XCIV, (1929), pp.
370-390.
- (18) P. Synave, O.P., La réputation des vices divines naturel-
lement d'après S. Thomas, Belanges
Namurien, Vol. I, pp. 387-71. (De Vent.
 q. XIV, c. 10, dated 21-13th March, 1268;
 see p. 384.)
- (19) J. Koch,
Ueber die Reihenfolge der questiones
disputatae des heiligen Thomas von Aquin,
Fallmorphologische Jahrbuch, Vol. 37, 1924,
pp. 359-387.

The historical development of the Disputatio Disputata

The scholastic exercise which came to be known later as the "disputatio", seemed to have been originally associated with the "lectio".

Father Kachmann, in his course of lectures in 1948-49, explains the historical development of the "disputatio" as follows. The twelfth century saw the slow introduction of Peter Lombard. The reading of this textbook provoked questions. The professor's answers probably provoked new questions until there arose detached questionnaires. This explanation accounts for many of the writings of the late twelfth century. Abelard's Si et Non presents a series of problems and the contradictory patristic opinions. But the human mind wants one answer, the concrete tie up with tradition. Consequently the exact meaning of the authorities has to be determined and reconciled with the one opinion adopted (*auctoritas habet corrum usum*). These two movements converged to produce the "disputatio", namely, (1) questionnaires provide the matter, (2) the Abelardian pro and con provide the form of the dispute. The reconciliation or "reductio ad unum" of seemingly conflicting authorities is the original aim of the "disputatio". We do not know exactly when the "disputatio" became a regular scholastic exercise, perhaps in 1210 by Simon of Tournai.

George Lecombe and Artur Landgraf, in the article mentioned above, (pp. 162 sq.) have this to say about the development of the "disputatio".

The Paris of the last quarter of the twelfth century

was a period of vigorous intellectual life. Aristotle was making his way into the West; his logic was putting order into theological science; the fresh translations from Greek and Arabic were even suggesting new problems to the young minds who thronged the schools. They passed from one master to another, discussing the triune God in the crossways, disputing in taverns, making common property of what was individual opinion.

Instruction was given by means of the lectio, the daily explanation of the scripture, or, at a date closely following their composition, of the Sentences, the Historia, and the Magna Glossatura; the master followed the Lombard step by step, adding, as the scriptural text suggested, the new questions which were current in the schools; here and there a point which needed further elucidation was indicated for the disputatio. We may perhaps suppose that this exercise followed each lecture, though there is no proof. Whenever it took place, the advanced students took sides on the proposed question, giving the pros and cons suggested by the master's lecture, but throwing into the debate all their knowledge acquired in and out of the schools. When the debate had gone far enough, the master summed up, "determined", often giving practical suggestions how a given argument could be turned. The report of this exercise was made by a bachelor; a collection of such reports by Geoffrey of Poitiers, we think, has given us the *Quaestiones* of Langton contained in the St. Victor MS. We can see likewise that the same bachelor having to make a report of two exercises which treated the same matter and followed each other almost without

interval, was tempted to utilize many of his notes, incorporating sections of the disputatio into his report on the commentary and vice versa.

To judge by the volume of Langton's gloss on the Magna Clematura, it is very doubtful if the master finished the explanation of it in a year, or even in two years. Since this commentary was a school exercise, the normal procedure was to begin again with Romans after he had run through the rest of the Epistles, finishing with Hebrews.

In the meantime the constant ventilation of questions in the schools, the mental growth which necessarily came to a master from the continual exercise of his reasoning power, the fresh material furnished by the translations from the East necessarily gave him a different appreciation of the subject-matter of his course. Yet like every teacher he would save as much as possible from his old lectures. We can well picture Langton looking over his notes after a term of years; here a question would seem antiquated, there a fresh problem would be suggested by the text, here the expression he had given to his ideas still represented his thought, thore experience had taught him that in the solution of problems lines cannot be drawn so hard and fast, or again he might have taken an entirely different view of certain questions. If St. Augustine could write a Liber Retractionum, why refuse such a mental growth to Langton or other Parisian masters? Utilizing as much as possible from his old lectures, such giving us a substantial identity of form, he would introduce changes of greater or lesser consequence according to

the rapidity of his own evolution, or that of the times, from a few phrases to an entirely new question.

In turn these revised lectures were delivered to a fresh student body, perhaps to another generation of young clerics, who were undergoing other influences, and were perhaps more dialectical than their predecessors. Viewing the old problems from a new angle they might influence the master's determination, forcing him to depart from the text of preceding years."

For the historical development of the *disputatio*, it will also be profitable to consult Mandorle (who is not completely reliable in this matter) and Glorieux.

The probable nature of the "disputatio" in St. Thomas' time.

There were seemingly two principal types of disputations, the *disputatio simplex* (with which we are concerned here) and the *disputatio solemnis* (one form of which produced the "*quaestio de quolibet*" or the "*quodlibet*"). The "*disputatio simplex*" resulted in the writings which were called "*quaestiones disputatae*".

The ordinary disputation was a school exercise to help advanced students in forming and giving expression to their opinions. It was similar in intent to our seminars.

The choice, sequence, length and number of the subjects for the disputations were determined by the Master (in contradistinction to the "*disputatio solemnis*"). During the school year the Master was obliged "*plurimes disputare ordinarie*" (as opposed to "*extraordinarie*", i.e., *quodlibets*). The number of disputations was not determined and seemingly a few disputations would satisfy

the requirements. St. Thomas seemingly introduced regular and frequent disputations (Mandement). St. Albert, Bonaventure, etc., all held similar disputations. When one Master held his disputation, all other lectures were called off in order to give everybody an opportunity to attend (Glorieux). The Bachelors of the faculty had to attend these disputations, while others were free to come or to stay away. The Parisian clergy and prelates liked to attend these disputations which are called "le tournois des clercs".

The disputation started with a "lectio brevis" on Holy Scripture in order to give late-comers an opportunity of getting there. The disputation took place between the Master's bachelo-
laureus and the bachelo-
laureus of other Masters. The Master's bachelo-
laureus sustained a thesis and responded to objections put by the others. This part of the disputation is called "le jouteau de bachelier". As regards this part of the disputation, it is to be noted that perhaps more than one question was proposed in the course of one session. Again, the Master's bachelo-
laureus who defended a certain thesis was a bachelo-
laureus formatus (one who had commented on the Sentences). The Master seemingly directed all this discussion.

In the next part of the disputation, the Master took over and gave his "determinatio" of the whole matter. He ordered, formulated, eliminated and added objections. Then he gave a doctrinal exposé, fitting the problems into a synthesis. Finally he answered objections.

Mandonnet thought that these two parts of the disputation took place on successive days. However the current opinion is that these two exercises took place on the same day.

We may draw some conclusions from this description of a disputation. The "Quaestiones Disputatae" are not "reportations" of the bachelors, but are the written account of the "determinatio" of the Master. We are not sure just how far these written accounts accord with the actual verbal "determinatio" of St. Thomas. Occasionally objections were incorporated into the written account, objections which were asked by the bachelors (cf. de Malo, q.4, a.2, ad. 18). But we cannot conclude by any means that all objections were raised by the bachelors.

The literary form of the Quaestiones Disputatae of St. Thomas

The Quaestiones Disputatae of St. Thomas consist of four parts: (1) the statement of a problem in the form of a disjunction, (2) the arguments for both members of the disjunction, (3) the solution, embodying one series of arguments, (4) the answers to the arguments against the position adopted.

As noted elsewhere, the articles of the Summa Theologica are merely abbreviated "Quaestiones disputatae". Hence everything we have said about the nature of an article in the Summa, e.g., comparison with Gothic architecture, nature of so-called "objections", etc., is valid here.

The List of authentic Questions Disputatae of St. Thomas

Mandonnet divides the *Quaestiones Disputatae* into *quaestiones seriales* and *quaestiones non-seriales*. We shall list these two groups with the number of articles in each indicated after the title.

Quaestiones seriales:-

- de Veritate, 253 (there is some justification for *de Veritatisibus*)
- de Potentia, 83
- de Spiritualibus Creaturis, 11
- de Anima, 81
- de Virtutibus, 36
 - in communi, 13
 - de Caritate, 13
 - de Correctione Fratrum, 3
 - de Spe, 4
 - de Virtutibus Cardinalibus, 4
- de Unione Verbi Incarnati, 5
- de Malo, 101

Quaestiones non-seriales:-

- de Attributis Divinis (now is found in the first book of the *Scriptum*; see the article of A. Dondaine)
- de Sensibus Sacras Scripturas (now in Quodl. 7, art. 14-16)
- de Opero Manuall Religiosorum (now in Quodl. 7, art. 17-18)
- de Pueris in Religiosum Admittendis (now in Quodl. 3, art. 11-14) (or in Quodl. 4, art. 23-24)

The *quaestiones non-seriales* are just as truly *quaestiones disputatae* as are the *quaestiones seriales*.

The quæstio disputata "de Beatisudine" is called a reportatio by Mandonnet at the end of his article in 1918. However, Father Dondaine proved in 1932 that this quæstio was not a work of St. Thomas.

Printed editions of Quæstiones Disputatas

There is no critical edition of the *Quæstiones Disputatas*. The following are the printed editions, other than the "Opera Omnia".

P. Mandonnet, O.P., *Quæstiones Disputationes nova editio*, Paris, Lethielleux, 1935, 3 volume s.

P. Mandonnet, O.P., *Quæstiones Disputationes et Compositiones Quadrilibetorum*, Turin, Marietti, 1937, 3 volumes.

L. W. Koeler, S.J., *Treatatus de spiritualibus creaturis*, editio critica, (Textus et Documenta Series philosophica, 13) Rome, (Univ. Oregon.), 1938, XVI - 152 p.p.

N.B. - This edition is fairly well done, but is not critical.

The Bulletin Thomiste publishes doubtful texts and possible corrections every year. Desprez's work on the *Quæstiones Disputationes* of St. Thomas has some good points. In general the Marietti and Paris editions are reliable but contain a multitude of texts which are doubtful. Even in critical editions we cannot be absolutely sure of the reading. The Leccina edition of the S.C.G. shows (in one or two instances) how the typescript absolutely corrupts the autograph of St. Thomas. Unfortunately we have few autographs of St. Thomas.

The unity of the Questiones Disputatae

The problem is: Did St. Thomas plan the unity of the questions, the unity of individual works, e.g., de Veritate?

Mandonnet in his article of 1913 holds for the unity of all the questiones disputatae. First must come the "de Veritate", then the De Potentia, etc. This theory, of course, determines the chronological order but is entirely too aprioristic in Father Lechmann's opinion who does not think that you can solve historical questions with metaphysical theories.

Father Bouyges thinks that the unity of the De Potentia comes from its refutation of Avicenna's theory of divine emanation. Beatrice H. Zedler tries to prove in detail this historical unity, proposed by Father Bouyges, from a detailed study of the De Potentia.

Father Lechmann thinks that the approach of Bouyges and Zedler to the problem of unity is valid in some cases but not in all. For instance this method could hardly be applied to the following questions of the De Malo; q.5 - original sin; q.6 - free will; q.7 - venial sin.

The current theory is that a group of questions, more or less loosely connected, were published under the title of the first question. From the collections of manuscripts we find five different publishings of the Questiones Disputatae in St. Thomas' life: (1) De Veritate, (2) De Potentia, (3) De Malo, (4) De Virtutibus (which always includes De Unione Verbi Incarnati),

(8) In Spiritualibus Creaturis. For a full treatment of this theory, consult the article by Father Astors.

The Chronology of the Questiones Disputatae

The chronology of the *Questiones Disputatae* is a very doubtful question. The manuscript tradition has not been completely exploited. We shall introduce our study of the chronology by a consideration of the evidence of the catalogues.

1) Ptolemy of Lusca

De Veritate	1266-59, Paris
De Anima	1261-64, Italy
De Spiritualibus Creaturis	1265-71, Italy
De Malo	1265-71, Paris
De Virtutibus	1265-71, Paris
De Potentia	1271-74, Paris

The older biographers accepted Ptolemy's statements as true, but present day scholars discount them.

2) Bartholomeus of Capua

"De questionibus disputatis, partes tres. Unam disputavit Parisius, scilicet De Potentia; aliam in Italia, scilicet De potentia Dei, et ultra; aliam secunda vice Parisius, scilicet De virtutibus et ultra."

Nicholas Trivet

*

"Scripsit etiam primam partem de Questionibus disputatis de Veritate et ultra, quae Parisius disputavit. Item secundam partem de Questionibus disputatis de potentia Dei et ultra, quae in Italia disputavit. Item et tertiam partem de Questionibus

disputatis quarem Iuditum est de Virtutibus, quas disputavit
cum secundo Parisiis legeret".

Grobmann's first Prague catalogue -

"Item de questionibus disputatis partes tres. Unam
disputant periculum de veritate; aliam in ytalia scilicet de
potentia dei et ultra; aliam secunda vice Parisius, scilicet de
Virtutibus et ultra."

Grobmann's second Prague catalogue -

"Item primam partem de questionibus disputatis scilicet
de fide et veritate et ultra quas disputavit parisius.

Item secundam partem de questionibus disputatis scilicet
de potentia dei et ultra quas disputant in ytalie.

Item tertiam partem de questionibus disputatis scilicet
de virtutibus et ultra quas disputavit secunda vice parisius."

Scholars today accept the statements of these catalogues
as more reliable. Present day scholars say that "et ultra" meant
that the author had before his eyes an edition in which the first
question was "De Veritate" followed by the rest in a certain order.
Everybody at that time was acquainted with that particular edition.

5) The Tabula of Béano

"Questiones de veritate; de potentia Dei; de spirituali-
bus creaturis; de anime; de virtutibus; de malo."

The Cod. Vat. lat. 736 (13-14th century; see A. Pelzer, *Codices Vaticani Latini 114 ff.*)

De veritate	fol. 1r
De potentia Dei	fol. 214r
De spiritualibus creaturis	fol. 261v
De anima	fol. 270v
De virtutibus in communione	fol. 303r
De caritate	fol. 315v
De correctione fratrum	fol. 327v
De spe	fol. 330v
De virtutibus cardinalibus	fol. 333r
De unione verbi Incarnati	fol. 338r
De malo	fol. 343v - 400v

Stationer's list of the University of Paris (1275-86; see Denifle-Chatelain, *Charters of the University of Paris*, Vol. I, p. 646)

De veritate
De potentia Dei
De spiritualibus creaturis
De anima
De virtutibus
De malo

E. Axtens, in the article referred to above, says that there is a Parisian University exemplar which has the *De Anima*, the *De Virtutibus* and the *De Unione* together.

From these sources, listed here under number three, Father Eichmann deduced the following grouping of "questiones."

(De Veritate

(De Potentia

(De Spiritualibus Creaturis

(De Anima

(De Virtutibus

(De Malo

4) Father Eschmann's chronology of the Questions

The De Veritate was certainly written in the first Parisian period, 1256-59.

The De Potentia was certainly written in the first Italian period, 1259-62 (Dec.)

The De Unione Verbi Incarnati was certainly joined to the De Virtutibus.

Difficulty still remains in determining the chronology of the De Spiritualibus Creaturis, and especially of the De Anima and of the De Malo.

In the determination of the De Spiritualibus Creaturis, we call attention to a point originally raised by von Hertling in the article referred to above. He notes that in a.9, ad 10 st. Thomas refers to the river "Sequana" (the Seine). This reference seems to indicate that this disputation was held at Paris.

Glorieux, in his article of 1932, approves of the reading "Sequana". However he doubts whether this reference proves the Parisian origin of the De Spiritualibus Creaturis. Perhaps this work was composed in Italy and edited in Paris. This possibility becomes more probable if we recall that Thomas was recalled from Rome to Paris in the middle of a school year. Fr. Pelster, in his article of 1925, proves that the reading "Sequana" is correct, but asserts

that some manuscripts have other readings.

In the determination of the *De Anima*, Glorieux, in his article of 1932, says that the *De Anima* seems to be a completion and restatement of the *De Spiritualibus Creaturis*. Seven of the eleven questions of the *De Spiritualibus Creaturis* are re-treated in the *De Anima*.

Father Beckmann is of the opinion that the *De Spiritualibus Creaturis* was composed in Italy. It was begun in a seminar in September of 1268. Thomas broke this treatment off and went to Paris, arriving there in January 1269. At Paris Thomas started in on the same subject but from a different angle. This new treatment was the *De Anima*. The Averroistic controversy is emphasized more in the *De Anima* because this controversy was then a live issue at Paris.

Father Lottin, in his article of 1928, thinks that the *De Malo* must come between the prima pars and the prima secundae pars of the *Summa* (1269-70). However we know that the *tertia pars* was begun at Paris. Therefore this chronology seems to be impossible. Father Lottin's conclusion is based on intrinsic evidence, a comparison of doctrine. Glorieux thinks there are strong reasons for putting the *De Malo* in the second Parisian period.

Mandonnet's theory and Father Beckmann's criticism

This theory of Mandonnet is no longer held by the experts. Mandonnet's theory rests on three points:-

- 1) Mandonnet accepts the topographical and chronological indication

of Bartholomew of Capua. Bartholomew says that the "de Veritate" was held in Paris, that the "de Potentia et ultra" were held in Italy, that the "de Virtutibus et ultra" were held in Paris.

Criticism:- Most critics accept this point. However, the whole difficulty consists in determining what "et ultra" means. Moreover it should be noted that the Stationer's List of the U. of P., the tabula of Stams, and some MSS. suggest for the second Parisian period De Anima, De Virtutibus, De Malo. If this ordering is correct, why didn't Bartholomew say "de Anima et ultra". Thus far only a few manuscripts have verified the ordering of Bartholomew of Capua.

2) The *Quaestiones Disputatae* are reproductions of St. Thomas' activity as a teacher. Consequently every article would be the topic of one discussion in school. Therefore the articles follow the same order as did the discussion in school.

Criticism:- This assumption is not proved. Does each and every article form the matter of one discussion in school? Or did Thomas modify these discussions, adding objections and even articles? Is the order of the articles the same as the order of the disputations?

3) St. Thomas held disputationes regularly and at stated intervals. Thus the *de Veritate* (certainly 1256-59) contains 263 articles. The school year has 48 weeks. Therefore St. Thomas held two disputationes a week during his first Parisian period. Later on St. Thomas slowed down to one disputation every two weeks, thus

giving 20 to 21 disputes a year. Since the De Virtutibus must go into the second Parisian period, the de Malo must go into the Italian period.

Criticism:- Didn't St. Thomas ever have a cold? Did St. Thomas break off in the middle of a treatise before one class, and resume the treatise before another class? For example, St. Thomas at the end of the school year in 1261 at Arvito had arrived at De Pot, q.5, a.8. Then he resumed his disputationes on the De Pot. q.6, a.9 at Anagni before a new group of students in the fall of 1261. Again in 1265, St. Thomas finished the q.4 of de Malo (de peccato originali) at Arvito, and resumed the same year before Dominican novices at Rome with q.5 (de peccato peccati originalis). Again, we may ask why St. Thomas stopped his disputationes at Naples in 1272. The answer seems to be that Mandronnet ran out of articles.

It should be noted, however, that this principle of Mandronnet's may serve sometimes as an auxiliary guide in determining a chronology, e.g., Glorieux uses it to confirm the fact that the De Spiritibus Creaturis was given from September to December of 1268, a period of eleven weeks, allowing of one article a week.

Glorieux's opinion and Father Eschmann's Criticism (1945)

In Glorieux's opinion there are strong reasons for putting the De Malo in the second Parisian period. In this

connection the chronology of the De Malo would be a help in dating the IaIIae of the Summa for which the De Malo was a preparatory study. This transfer of the De Malo from the Italian period to the second Parisian period necessitates a thorough revision of other parts of the chronology. It seems probable that the De Unione Verbi Incarnati was written after the parallel passages in the IIIa of the Summa.

Glorieux thinks that St. Thomas did not begin his disputationes in Italy until he was in Rome in 1265. There are no convincing reasons why St. Thomas did not begin his disputationes on the De Potentia earlier than 1265. This possibility seems more likely since the De Potentia is made up of different sections, seemingly lacking logical coherence.

Glorieux makes a point when he says that the psychological and moral disputationes pertain to the second Parisian period. Seemingly these disputationes were held in a place where the Averroistic controversy was raging, and were probably a preparation for the IaIIae, and perhaps parts of the IaIIae. The Questiones Disputatae, according to Glorieux, were part of the plan according to which the Summa developed in St. Thomas' mind. Consult Glorieux' article, referred to above, both for a development of this point, and for the literature on the subject. Of special note is that article by Father Synave, which is a model of textual comparisons (although overdone when it comes to assigning definite dates to articles.)

Conclusion

The *Quaestiones Disputatae* are basic and essential for an understanding of the doctrine of St. Thomas since frequently (but not always) the detailed discussion of the *quaestiones Disputatae* are the ground work for the *Summa Theologiae*.

The *Quaestiones Disputatae* (also the *Summa*) are the scholastic method. St. Thomas looked on this method as one of the best for learning and understanding.

Different chronologies for the *Quaestiones Disputatae*

De veritate 1256-59 These dates are admitted by all. Mandonnet and Synave go on to assign definite dates to definite articles.

<i>De spiritualibus creaturis</i>	1256-60	Grabmann
	1256-60	Koeler
	1267 (end) - 1268 (end)	Verbeke
	1268	Glorieux
	1269	Mandonnet, Synave

<i>De potentia</i>	1269-65	Mandonnet
	1265-66 (67?)	Grabmann
	1265-68	Synave, Glorieux

<i>De anima</i>	1265-66	Synave
	1266	Grabmann
	1269	Glorieux
	1268-70	Mandonnet
	1270	Pelster

<i>De unione verbi incarnati</i>	1268	Mandonnet
	1270-72	Glorieux
	1271-73	Synave
	1272	Pelster

<i>De malo</i>	1263-68	Mandonnet
	after 1267	Verbeke
	1269	Grabmann
	1269-70	Lottin
	1269-71	Synave
	1270-71	Glorieux, Salman

<i>De virtutibus</i>	1269-72	Grabmann
	1270	Glorieux
	1270-72	Mandonnet
	1271-72	Synave

VII-22

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------|----------|
| De opere manuali | 1250-56 | Destres |
| | 1257 | Synave |
| De pueris in religionem | 1271 | Destres |
| De Consibus saeculae scripturae | 1280 | Synave |
| De attributis divinis | 1286-07 | Dordaine |

QUESTIONNES QUODLIBETALES

VIII-1

General References for this section:

- (1) P. Glorieux, La litterature quodlibetique de 1260 à 1320, I, Bibliothèque Thomiste, Vol. 5, Le Saulchoir-Paris, Vrin, 1926.
- (2) P. Glorieux, La litterature quodlibetique, II, Bibliothèque Thomiste, Vol. 21, Le Saulchoir-Paris, Vrin, 1936.
- (3) P. Glorieux, Le quodlibet XII de S. Thomas, Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques, Vol. 16 (1926), pp. 20-46.
- (4) P. Glorieux, Un recueil scolaire de Godefroid de Fontaines, Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, Vol. 3 (1931), pp. 37-53.
- (5) P. Glorieux, Les quodlibets VII-XI de S. Thomas d'Aquin, Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, Vol. 13 (1946), pp. 282-303.
- (6) P. Glorieux, Le plus beau Quodlibet de S. Thomas est-il de lui? Mélanges de science religieuse, Vol. 3 (1946), pp. 235-269. This article concerns quodlibet 9.
- (7) P. Mandonnet, O.F., S. Thomas d'Aquin créateur de la disputation quodlibétique, Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques, Vol. 16 (1926), pp. 477-506; Vol. 16 (1927), pp. 8-38.
- (8) F. Polster, S.J., Beiträge zur Chronologie der Quodlibeta des heiligen Thomas von Aquin, Gregorianum, Vol. 5 (1927) pp. 505-538; Vol. 10 (1929) pp. 62-71, pp. 327-403; Vol. 9 (1928) pp. 503-538.

- (9) F. Pfeiffer, S.J., Recherches sur la chronologie des modilités, Thibaut de Merton et Thomas d'Aquin, (Cahiers d'Etudes Thomistes, Gregorianum, Vol. 10, (1929), pp. 60-81).
- (10) F. Pfeiffer, S.J., Wann ist das zwölftes modilite des heiligen Thomas von Aquin entstanden? Gregorianum, Vol. 5, (1944), pp. 278-286.
- (11) F. Pfeiffer, S.J., Litterarhistorische Probleme der modilité des heiligen Thomas von Aquin, Gregorianum, Vol. 28, (1947) pp. 78-100; Vol. 29, (1948) pp. 62-87.
- (12) P. Synave, O.P., L'ordre des modilités VIII-XI et XII, Thomas d'Aquin, revue Thomiste, Vol. 9, (1926), pp. 43-61.
- (13) P. Synave, O.P., La révocation des verités divines, metaphysique d'après Thomas d'Aquin, Mélanges Menonnet, Vol. I (Paris 1930) p. 383; Bulletin Thomiste, Vol. I, (1934) pp. 33-60; Vol. III, (1934-35) pp. 114-122.
- (14) A. R. Mette, O.P., La chronologie relative du modilite VII et du commentaire sur le livre des sentences, Notes et Communications, Bulletin Thomiste, Vol. I (1931-33), pp. 39-45.
- (15) A. R. Mette, O.P., La date extrême du commentaire de St. Thomas sur les sentences; Notes et Communications, Bulletin Thomiste, Vol. I, (1931-33), pp. 49-51"; Bulletin Thomiste, Vol. IV, (1934-36), pp. 143-44.
- (16) P. Castagnoli, C.M., Le dispute modilitaire VIII-XI et XII, Thomas d'Aquin, Revue Thomiste (1928), Vol. 31 (1928), pp. 277-90.

- (17) E. Anters, Sur un état des manuscrits des questions quodlibétiques de S. Thomas d'Aquin, Revue Thomiste, Vol. 19, (1936), pp. 500-530.
- (18) E. Anters, Pour l'état des manuscrits des questions quodlibétiques de S. Thomas d'Aquin, Divus Thomas (Pisa.), Vol. 41 (1938), pp. 295-301.
- (19) T. Denan, O.P., Réalisezissements sur quodlibet VIII, IX, Divus Thomas (Pisa.), Vol. 39, (1936), pp. 49-61.
- (20) P. Festros, O.P., Les disputes quodlibétiques de S. Thomas d'après la tradition manuscrite, Mélanges Thom., pp. 49-105.

The Nature of a Quodlibet:

As we have said in the discussion on the *Quaestiones Disputationes*, there were two types of disputations, the *disputatio simplex* and the *disputatio solennis*. The *solennis* account of the *disputatio solennis* constitutes the *quodlibet* (variously called *quaestio de quolibet*, *disputatio de quilibet*, *quodlibet*, *communis disputatio*, *communis disputatio de quilibet*, *generalis disputatio*, *generalis disputatio de quilibet*).

The *disputatio solennis* was a medieval scholastic exercise which became so popular that it seems to have survived in our language until the present day, e.g.

quibble, quillet. In this exercise the university did not consider the highly technical questions of the *Quæstiones Disputatae*, but rather the problems of the common people. The very title suggests a discussion on practically any subject insofar as it pertained to a certain faculty, e.g., theologians, jurists, experts in medicine, etc. The quodlibet was often confined to the faculty of theology, in the sense that only the Master of Theology was entitled to hold *disputationes de quodlibet*.

A Dominican general of the fourteenth century described this exercise as "quodlibet est de quolibet a voluntate cuiuslibet". In other words, anybody (teachers, students, prelates, ordinary city folk, etc.) could take part in these discussions. Consequently the quodlibets manifest the interests and occupations of the medieval mind, and this fact constitutes the very great importance of the quodlibets. On the other hand, the quodlibets cannot compare with the *Quæstiones Disputatae* in depth and penetration of thought.

These *disputationes solemnies* were held twice a year, during the second week of Advent (In Nativitatem) and between the third Sunday and Palm Sunday of Lent.

(De Ianchate). These disputations were solemn scholastic functions, and most Masters held such a disputation at least once in order to establish a reputation. However, nobody was forced to hold such a disputation. Gerard of Abbeville held 20, Henry of Ghent 16, Thomas Aquinas 12. Such an exercise was a tremendous test of the Master's wide knowledge and dialectical skill.

A very interesting problem connected with the quodlibeta is whether the disputation was held in one or in two sessions. Glorieux thinks that every disputation (whether solennis or simplex) was held in two sessions. The first session consisted of the objections and discussions of the students, etc., the second session was the "determinatio" of the Master. Consequently he thinks that our present day texts are usually accounts of the determination of the Master at the second session.

Pelster thinks that disputations could be held at one session. Hence he thinks our written accounts are the narration of everything that happened at that one session. Father Bachmann prefers Pelster's view.

The question of the ordering and grouping of the Quodlibeta is very interesting. Usually the Master

VIII-6

arranged and ordered the questions asked under very general classifications, e.g., de Deo, de Angelis, de Noninibus, de Rebus Mivinis et Humanis. St. Thomas seems to have been content with this very general classification in his first six quodlibets. However, in the quodlibets from 7 to 12, St. Thomas seems to have arranged and ordered the subject matter in more detail (cf. 7, 8, 9). In general, the introductory titles of quodlibets may be an indication of the authorship.

The Quodlibets of St. Thomas

There are 130 known manuscripts of the quodlibets, whose genealogy and validity are known.

In most of the catalogues there is mention of eleven quodlibets. The Tabula of Stubs, however, says: "Item scripta duodecim quodlibet". We find no edition of even eleven quodlibets made during St. Thomas' lifetime. However we do find editions, made before St. Thomas' death, consisting of 1, 2 or 3 quodlibets from the first six (e.g. 1, 2 and 3; 4 and 5; 5, 6). The first editions of the quodlibets after St. Thomas' death contained 1-6.

As we noted in the *Quaestiones Disputatae, De Ingressu Puerorum in Religionem* came to be included in

quodlibet 4, qq. 35-36. This work seems to be a quæstio disputata against Gerard of Abbeville, held during the Lent of 1271.

In the very first editions of the quodlibeta we find a quodlibet of John Peckham included.

Quodlibeta 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 were gradually added. Hence the quodlibeta 7-11 were never edited by St. Thomas as a group or as separate pieces. Hence these quodlibets have caused doubts on many scores. The quodlibets 1-6 were somehow or other edited by Thomas. Again, the quodlibets 1-6 are usually ordered in the same way, while the quodlibets 7-11 are found in at least four different orders (7, 9, 10, 11, 8 is the best order according to Cleriau). The order of quodlibets 7-11 in the printed texts is based on the Parisian exemplar.

The quæstio de opere manuī came to be included in quodlibet 7, q. 17, 18. This work seems to be a quæstio disputata against Williel. of St. Nazur in the fifties.

The quæstio de censibus sacre scripturee came to be included in quodlibet 7, q. 14-16.

Quodlibet 12 was probably added about 1310-1320. It does not seem to be a finished work. 39 questions are

sketched in outline. This quodlibet is often called a *repertatio*. Synave and Grabmann call it "un recueil de notes brèves", an abbreviation. There seems to be no doubt of its authenticity. It is interesting for the range and variety of its speculative reasoning. It seems to be close to the events of Parisian Averroism, namely, the condemnation of some of the Averroistic themes in 1270.

The authenticity of quodlibet 9 is very doubtful. Consult Glorieux, Feister, Isaac.

The Chronology of the Quodlibets of St. Thomas:

(1) The catalogue of Nicholas Trivet is the only catalogue which gives some detailed information about the quodlibets. He says, "Item, Disputationes undecim de quodlibet, quarum sex Parisiis, et quinque determinavit in Italia". This statement of Nicholas was the basis of the chronology of the quodlibets right up to 1900. Up to this time, everybody assumed that the first six quodlibets were held during the first Parisian period, the next five quodlibets were held during the first Italian period (since the second Italian period, 1272-4, was too short).

(2) Denifle discovered some manuscripts which placed some of the Quodlibets of the supposed first Parisian period in the second Parisian period. This manuscript evidence has gradually been confirmed by internal evidence.

(3) In 1927 Mandonnet published his new theory on the Quodlibets. The evidence of Nicholet of Trivet was abandoned. The Quodlibets 7-11 were assigned to the first Parisian period, the Quodlibets 1-6 were assigned to the second Parisian period. Mandonnet's argument was of an intrinsic character. P. Castagnoli contested this opinion in 1928, but most scholars accept Mandonnet's general idea, although they disagreed over exact dates.

(4) Since Glorieux in his book on Quodlibets (1925) begins with Gerard of Abbeville in 1262, Mandonnet supposed Thomas to be the creator of quodlibets. However, Father Baumann, in his notes of 1945 remarks that this is incorrect since Glorieux has uncovered quodlibets from 1250.

(5) Folster doubts about the 11th quodlibet and places it in Italy in 1265. Castagnoli puts quodlibets 7-11 in Italy. Father Baumann does not know whether quodlibets 7-11 belong to Italy or to Paris or to both. He does not think there is enough evidence to decide the question.

(6) For quodlibets 1-6 and 12, Father Eschmann recommends the chronology of Mandonnet and Glorieux. In some of these cases we can determine the absolute chronology since quodlibets 2, 3 and 5 are exactly dated in some way, and quodlibet 4 is fairly well dated because of the addition. This group is important in dating the other works of St. Thomas.

Quodlibet 1	Easter 1269	Mandonnet, Synave, Glorieux, Lottin
	Christmas 1269	Pelster
Quodlibet 2	Christmas 1269	Mandonnet, Synave, Glorieux
	Christmas 1270	Pelster
Quodlibet 3	Easter 1270	Mandonnet, Synave, Glorieux, Pelster
Quodlibet 4	Christmas 1270	Synave
	Easter 1271	Mandonnet, Glorieux, Pelster
Quodlibet 5	Christmas 1271	Mandonnet, Synave, Glorieux, Pelster
Quodlibet 6	Easter 1272	Mandonnet, Synave, Glorieux, Pelster
Quodlibet 7	Christmas 1255	Glorieux
	1256	Pelster
	Christmas 1256	Mandonnet, Notte
	Christmas 1257	Synave
Quodlibet 8	Christmas 1254 (?)-56	Glorieux
	Christmas 1256	Synave
	Christmas 1257	Mandonnet
	1258-59	Pelster

VILLI-11

Quodlibet 9 (before) 1256-57	Glorieux
Easter 1258	Mandonnet, Synave
1259	Polyester
Quodlibet 10 1256	Glorieux
Christmas 1258	Mandonnet, Synave
Quodlibet 11 Easter 1258	Mandonnet, Synave
1256	Polyester
Quodlibet 12 Christmas 1270	Mandonnet, Glorieux
Easter 1271	Synave
1272-73	Polyester

The Summa Contra Gentiles

The text: The Summa Contra Gentiles is the best edited text of St. Thomas we possess. For a critical study of the Leonine edition of this work, consult the prefaces which appear in the large volumes of the Leonine edition. These studies occupy the first rank in literary criticism of Mediaeval texts. They are especially enlightening from a Palaeographical viewpoint. Our ordinary Palaeography manuals stress the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries, but for Thomistic students it is the late 13th and 14th centuries that are important. The Leonine prefaces compensate for this omission. It is to be regretted that they are not written in a more readable Latin style.

The Summa Contra Gentiles offers a unique occasion for studying the actual composition of a Thomistic work since the Leonine commission had in its possession not only a reconstructed apograph but also a good portion of St. Thomas' own autograph. An examination of the autograph reveals the care with which Thomas corrected whole chapters, sentences, even the smallest words. "Deletiones, transpositiones, rescriptiones, additiones, quae fere innumeræ constitutionem consummatae litteras praecesserunt, dum laborem immensum manifestant, aditum nobis praebent ad contemplationem intimæ operationis illius mentis angelici." (cf. Praefatio, Summa Contra Gentiles, edit. Leon., Vol. XIII, p. V)

The following example will show how even the carefully edited reconstruction of the apograph differs from the autograph. In

Book I, chapter 42, the autograph reads, ".... esse proprium unicuiusque est tantum unum sed ipse Deus est....", while the apograph reads, ".... esse abstractum est unum tantum sicut albedo...." The error is obviously due to the first scribe. Fortunately such examples are rare; for an account of other differences, cf. F. Pelster, S.J., "L'édition Leonine de la Somme contre Gentiles," Revue Neoscolastique de Philosophie, Louvain, XXII, 1920, pp. 217 - 245.

The Occasion of the Summa Contra Gentiles: The tradition which has generally been accepted is that St. Thomas wrote this work at the request of St. Raymond of Penafort as a handbook for Dominican missionaries in Spain who had to deal with heretical doctrines originating among Arabian philosophers and theologians. The sole support of this theory is the Commentarium de Gestis Regis Argonum Jacobi I, written in 1313 by Peter Marsilius, O.P. (Cf. the Preface quoted above, p. VI. N.B. The Leonine editors accept this theory.) We will see the development of this theory later.

The Title: The title of this work is not uniformly given in the sources. The Official catalogue calls it Opus contra Gentiles; in the University of Paris lists it is the Summa Contra Gentiles; the Catalogue of Nicolas of Tревет calls it simply Contra Gentiles; the Catalogue of Henry of Hereford, De Veritate Fidei Contra Gentiles; the Catalogue of Ptolemaeus of Lucca, Librum contra Gentiles. The title of our printed editions seems to be an abbrevia-

abbreviation of Summa de Veritate Fidei contra Gentiles. It is to be noted that not one single document calls it the Summa Philosophica or Apologetica. This investigation into the title is important because it gives us a clue to the contents, purpose and method of the work.

The Intention of the Author:

Assumpta igitur ex divina pietate fiducia sapientia
sapientis officium prosequendi, quamvis proprias vires ex-
cedat, propositum nostrae intentiones est veritatem quam fides
Catholica profitetur, pro nostro modulo manifestare, errore
eliminando contrarios. (Summa Contra Gentiles, Bk. I, chap. 2)

The principal intention is to manifest the truth of Catholic Faith. In this the work in no way differs from the Scriptum or the Summa Theologiae. The difference lies in the stress put on the elimination of error. The primary office of the theologian is the teaching of Catholic truth, the secondary office is the refutation of error. In this twofold division we see the basis for distinguishing the Summa Theologiae from the Summa Contra Gentiles. In it we can also see why different methods were used in each work.

Regarding the refutation of error, St. Thomas points out two difficulties. First, the errors of the Gentiles are not as well known to us as they were to the early Fathers of the Church who had either been Gentiles themselves or at least were conversant with their doctrines. Secondly, certain Gentiles, in particular the Mohammedans and pagans, do not agree with us on the authority to be accorded the Holy Scriptures and so we are forced to meet them on the ground of reason alone. But this in-

volves another difficulty, for reason is deficient in what pertains to faith. In the face of these problems, St. Thomas decides on the methods proper to such an undertaking.

The Method of this Work:

Est autem in his quae de Deo confitemur duplex veritatis modus. Quaedam namque vera sunt de Deo quae omnem facultatem humanae rationis excedunt, ut Deum esse trinum et unum. Quaedam vero sunt ad quae etiam ratio naturalis pertingere potest, sicut est Deum esse, Deum esse unum, et alia huiusmodi; quae etiam philosophi demonstrative de Deo probaverunt, /3. ducti naturalis lumine rationis. (Summa Contra Gentiles, Bk. I, ch.

Thus, there are two kinds of Catholic truth: what is somehow accessible to reason and what is in no way open to reason. Since this work aims at teaching Catholic truth to those who do not accept the authority of Scripture, recourse must be had to natural reason. Even though this means cannot attain to strictly revealed truth, yet it can be shown how certain errors are eliminated by purely rational investigation and also how demonstrated truth concords with Christian faith. After this, those truths which exceed human reason will be declared and the opinions of adversaries will be refuted. This work, then, will be divided in the following manner:

1. Christian Philosophy: "per viam rationis prosequi ea quae de Deo ratio humana investigare potest."

Book I: "de his quae Deo secundum seipsum convenient."

Book II: "de processu creaturarum ab ipso."

Book III: "de ordine creaturarum in ipsum sicut in finem."

2. Christian Revelation: "(illa veritas) quae rationem excedit."

Book IV: "solventes rationes adversariorum, et rationibus probabilibus, et auctoritatibus, quantum Deus dederit, veritatem fidei declarantes." (Cf. Summa C.G., Book I, chap. 9)

N.B. Despite its method, this book remains a theological treatise, "manifestare veritatem quam Catholica fides profitetur."

Who are the Gentiles?

The Gentiles are obviously the Greek and Arabian philosophers and theologians whose errors are refuted during the course of the work. But is this work directed precisely against them or is it rather directed against their disciples who were at that very time teaching at the University of Paris? The answer to this question determines the nature and method of the book. If the first alternative is correct, then the St. Raymond of Penafort tradition appears more probable. If the second alternative is correct the Penafort tradition is false. It has been claimed that Pope Alexander IV commissioned this work as he had commissioned St. Albert to write his De Unitate Intellectus in 1256. There is no documentary evidence to support such a claim. It is a fact that the Pope was preoccupied with the troubles at Paris. It is also a fact that together with Papal condemnations of Aristotle during the 13th century, there went constant Papal efforts to have Aristotelian writings purged of error so that they might be assimilated into Christian teaching.

Father M. Gorce, "La Lutte Contre Gentiles à Paris," Mélan-

ges Mandonnet, I, Paris, 1930, pp. 223-243, maintains that St. Thomas' work was directed against a definite group of "Latin Averroists" at Paris. He also rejects the Penafort tradition and ridicules the notion of simple missionaries pouring over the profundities of the Summa before preaching to their neophytes. Grabmann takes the opposite view because there is one piece of documentary evidence to support it, i.e. the Commentarium of Peter Marsilius. (Cf. M. Grabmann, "Guglielmo di Woerbeke, il traduttore delle opere di Aristoteli?" Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae, XI, Rome, 1946, pp. 41 ff. Father Eschmann passes Grabmann's criticism off with the remark that he (Grabmann) would prefer one document to a thousand pieces of internal criticism.

With regard to Gorée's first contention, however, it does seem that he goes too far. Father Bachmann thinks that it is stretching things to affirm the existence of a definite group of "Latin Averroists" during the 50's. This is also the opinion of Father D. Salmon, O.P., "Sur la lutte Contra Gentiles de saint Thomas," Divus Thomas, Piacenza, 1937, pp. 488-509. Salmon does not think the S.C.G. was even directed against Christian thinkers. The truth of the matter seems to lie between the opinions of Gorée and Salmon. In other words, the Penafort tradition is not true, nor is there an attack on a well defined school of "Latin Averroists". Rather, the S.C.G. is an effort to separate Aristotelianism from the interpretations of Avicenna and Averroes and make his doctrine available and useful to Christian thinkers. Even though

there was no organized "Averroist" school at Paris at this time, there were the initial stirrings of the movement. There must have been some reason for the Papal commission of Albert's De Unitate Intellectus in 1256.

Thomas' S.C.Q. differed from some earlier attempts of the Faculty of Arts at Paris to "purge" Aristotle in the sense of mutilating him. Thomas does three things: 1. He teaches Christian truth; 2. He refutes error; 3. He makes good use of Aristotle in doing both.

Chronology:

1. According to Ptolemy of Lucca, the S.C.Q. was written during the reign of Urban IV (1261 - 1264) in Italy.
2. Antonius of Brescia testified at the canonization trial of St. Thomas that the S.C.Q. was written at Paris on "chartas." At least this latter fact is wrong because the autograph is on large sheets, although "chartas" are used for the notes.
3. A compromise between these two witnesses would seem to be the closest chronology we can arrive at, i.e. the work was begun in Paris and finished in Italy. The extreme dates are 1256 - 1264.
4. Some attempts have been made to narrow down the dates:
 - a. Synave, "La revelation de la verite naturelle?" Mélanges Mandonnet, I, Paris, 1930, pp. 331 ff., especially p. 362, says,

that the terminus a quo is 1258. Father Eschmann objects to Synave's naive way of postulating exact chronology.

b. Mandonnet: 1258 - 1260

c. Grabmann objects to Mandonnet's terminus ad quem and claims that the writing went on after 1260 in Italy.

d. Sometimes Peter Calo's charming story of St. Thomas at the table of King Louis is used as evidence for dating the S.C.G. but it is a vain attempt. If to anything, the story has reference to the Summa Theologiae.

5. In conclusion: no convincing evidence has been produced for an absolute date. The important point is that this work comes between the Scriptum and the Summa Theologiae. N.B. The S.C.G. comes before any Aristotelian commentary.

Some Concluding remarks:

With the Summa Theologiae, this is St. Thomas at his best. It marks the transition from the Scriptum to the Summa Theologiae. It is a smaller summa and lends itself to be read from start to finish. It does not use the usual scholastic method. Certainly it has to do with the modernistic movement in Mediaeval thought. St. Thomas works to make sense out of Aristotle and to refute the

Arabian commentators. In fact, this work should be regarded as his first commentary on Aristotle. The Aristotelian commentaries are the continuation and fulfillment of what was begun here. This is one place where the argument "post hoc ergo propter hoc" is valid. The S.C.Q. silently asks for the Commentaries. Later the two efforts will be integrated in the Summa Theologiae.

SUMMA THEOLOGIAE

General References:

- (1) Grabmann, Die Werke des hl. Thomas von Aquin, Münster, (1931), pp. 272-5.
- (2) Grabmann, Commentatio historica in prologue Summa theologiae S. Thomae Ac., Angelicum, Vol. III (1930) pp. 146-168.
- (3) Grabmann, Einführung in die Summa theologiae des hl. Thomas, 2nd. Aufl., zweite Aufl., Freiburg, Herder (1933).

Grabmann, Introduction to the Theological Summa of St. Thomas, tr. J. J. Young, St. Louis, Herder (1930)

B.B.--This book is one of the best introductions to the Summa of St. Thomas. It attempts to define the character of the Summa in the words of St. Thomas himself.

- (4) H.D. Cheau, O.P., Le plan de la Summa, Revue Thomiste, Vol. 46 (1939), pp. 95-107.

This is the best article on the general plan of the Summa.

- (5) Mandenat, O.P., Chronologie et œuvre de la vie et des écrits de saint Thomas, REVUE DES SCIENCES PHILOSOPHIQUES ET THÉOLOGIQUES, Vol. 7, (1920), pp. 151 sq.

- (6) O. Lettie, O.S.B., La date de la question disputée "de Malo" de saint Thomas d'Aquin, REVUE D'HISTOIRE ECCLÉSIASTIQUE, Vol. 54 (1928) pp. 378-388.

(7) R. Glorieux, Pour la chronologie de la Summa. Mélanges de science religieuse, Vol. 2 (1946) pp. 59-98.

(8) G. Verbeké, Les sources et la chronologie de Commen-
teur de s. Thomas d'Aquin en
les Autres d'Avicente. Revue
philosophique de Louvain, Vol. 43
(1947), pp. 337 sq.

The Title of the Summa:

In the documents, the title of this work is Summa, Summa Theologica, Summa Theologiae Totius. The title Summa Theologica is not intrinsically wrong, but it is not historically correct.

Many other medievalists wrote Summae. The medieval ambition was to write a Summa. Summa means not so much a compendium (although it also means that), but rather the presentation in one complete work of the entire knowledge of one field in a complete and unique fashion. The Summa, therefore, endeavored to present in one work the organized fullness of a sciences, it was an encyclopedic organized as a unit. Grabmann showed that at the end of the twelfth century Summae started to replace Sententiae (commentaries on more or less loosely connected sentences; rearrangement of glossae). The Summa reveals the desire for organized and related structure, the tendency to construction and the wave of geometrization enthusiasm prevalent in all fields.

There were all kinds of Summae. Thus we find Summa de Bono, Summa aurea, Summa de Creaturis, etc. St. Thomas' must be first of all considered as an architectonic masterpiece. Every part of the Summa must be seen in connection with the whole.

The Summa of St. Thomas is in the intellectual field what the Gothic cathedral is in the architectural field. Such a comparison can be a big help in studying the technique of the Summa. This technique consists in writing questions (what we call today the articles), each of which seems to be a self-sufficient unit (even more so than the present day chapters of a book) and yet remains part of a whole. This trait is also characteristic of Gothic architecture; we are impressed with the unity of the whole cathedral, and yet the particular structures within the whole (e.g., a chapel) retain their independence. Similarly in the Summa, every question (our present day article) is independent in itself, and yet related to the whole. This technique allows of such repetition, re-affirmation of general motif, etc. St. Thomas never builds up a doctrine according to our present-day "monograph" methods. He splits up a doctrinal point into a number of concrete questions which must be answered "yes" or "no". Then he goes to work on each question independently.

Thus the Church has a logic of its own, even though it appears to us as without our present-day logic, seems to digress, etc. For an example of this technique, let us consult In Iiis, q. 1. The object of this question is to show that every human action is for an end and that the whole of human life is a unit because all human actions tend to one end. But some articles seem to interrupt this scheme, e.g. the second article shows that the principle "agere propter finem" is verified throughout all nature, the eighth article considers whether the whole universe fits into a unit because of a dynamic end. Such articles do not fit into the logic of a monograph, but they do fit into St. Thomas' logic. For Thomas such articles are not notes or digressions but fit into his plan. Every article for Thomas must be completely rounded out.

The Prologue to the Summa Theologiae:

The object of the Summa is again Catholica veritas (just as it was for the Q. & A.). This time, however, Catholica veritas is treated ad expositum inscriptionem. Who are the inscriptores? They are opposed to the propositi. The propositi are the beginners preparing for their masterships. The inscriptores

are those studying theology according to the text of Peter Lombard. The docto^r catholice veritatis is the professor or master.

Hence the Summa is intended to be a handbook for the incipientes and to replace in every way the Sententiae of Peter Lombard. Yet St. Thomas could not have intended to replace the Sentences of Peter Lombard in all ecclesiastical studies as this procedure would have been too drastic and revolutionary. As a matter of fact, the Sentences of Peter Lombard remained the standard handbook of theology for about 200 years after St. Thomas' time. Moreover St. Thomas himself on two later occasions (once seemingly about 1260) started a new commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Finally, St. Thomas had no authority for such a general ecclesiastical reformation. What kind of reformation, then, was St. Thomas attempting? Between 1255-57 St. Thomas was director of studies of the Order in the monastery of St. Sabina on the Aventine in Rome. Hence the Summa was probably intended for the Dominican novices who were studying theology (as a matter of fact, St. Thomas calls the incipientes, novitiis; this is a specifically monastic term and even today means in the Dominican Order what other orders term novices). Therefore the Summa was a reform

of theological studies within the Dominican order, and St. Thomas had authority for such a reformation. This explanation is also confirmed by all the chronological data about the prior's part of the Summa which points to the years 1264-67 at Rome as the starting point of the Summa (which was probably begun after St. Thomas gave up on an attempted revision of the Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard).

In the prologue St. Thomas also criticises the handbooks of theology of his day. These handbooks, he says, are repetitious, are not constructed in the right order for those who are learning, etc. Their main defect, he says, is their dependence on librorum expositio, that is on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. The Sentences had become insufficient for the assimilation of all the new knowledge. A good example of this insufficiency is manifested in its moral treatises. Sin was treated under original sin in the treatise on creation. The virtues were treated under the virtue of Christ in the treatise on redemption. Hence there was no proper place for moral considerations in an exposition on the Sentences. After Aristotle's Ethica became known, a fuller treatment of moral matters became necessary. Consequently long digressions had to be added.

to the commentaries on the Sentences. To verify this heterogeneous character of the commentaries on the Sentences, consult St. Thomas' own commentary.

This prologue of St. Thomas to the Summa is outstanding for its clarity and simplicity. Compare by way of contrast St. Thomas' prologue to the Scriptum. This prologue to the Summa is also valuable as a medieval criticism of medieval didactic teaching methods.

The Plan of the Summa.

In the plan of the Summa is clearly stated in the prologue to the second question of the first part, the principal aim of the Summa is to impart the knowledge of God, first as He is in Himself, secondly as He is the origin and end of all things, especially rational creatures. Consequently, "primo trahabimur de Deo, secundo de causa materialis creaturarum in Natura, tertio de Christo qui, secundum quod homo, via patitur tendit in Deum."

(It is recommended that the student read carefully the prologue to the prima pars, prima secundae, secunda secundae, tertiae, and then to their various subdivisions.)

Piñoloy of Lugo and Bernard Gualdoni divide the Summa as follows: prima pars-pars naturalis; secunda pars-pars moralis; tercias pars-pars sacramentalis. Today

some would divide the Summa as follows: prima et secunda partem—dogmatical theology; secundam partem—moral theology. Such divisions of the Summa are misleading and wrong. (Vatican Council's statement about the prologue to I, q. 86, where it says, "Ita Ideo in secunda parte hujus operis de eius tractatur, ut quae consideratione sit de morali materia?"). There is a need of re-thinking the system of theology.

That Summa is laid out in two parts, the first part treats of the creation from God and the return to God. This item is neo-platonic but is used by St. Thomas merely as a instrument and purified of all heretical implications. Thus this comes to an exposition of the science of theology, which has intelligible unity, that is, one object but with two aspects (removal from God and movement to God). The second part treats of the Incarnation. The Incarnation makes man's movement to and from God as the means (freely willed by God) of our return to God. Therefore the Incarnation enters into theology not by intrinsic necessity but by the extrinsic and conditional aspect of the later historical fact.

B. Difficulty: In the secound part St. Thomas treats of grace, the theological virtues, gifts of the Holy Ghost, etc.

Non omni ratione tantum ut datur talibus before he creates or
Creates (tertia pars), in other words, non s. It is possible
to speak of Christ's pre-existence (secunda pars) before
speaking of Christ (tertia pars).

Answ.: As answer was first mentioned by Aquinas, Christ
is judgment, second reason since when Christ is God, then as
such, because the object of judgment was just, whose parts
were fit to be considered, hence this whole.

MacDonald says that this answer is more ingenious
than true. The object of theology is nothing but and from
God. Hence creation supplies the static for the dynamic.
Moreover, theology is a science, and consequently has an
intelligible message. But Christ, as the result of a free
decree of God, has no existence as an external fact.

Korobkoff (Theology Simplified, p. 1) says that
moral theology consists of all those intrinsically useful for
the moral development, for the tendency toward God. These
cannot be found in the nature of man. Therefore "per se"
(in the absolute sense) theology is finished and completed
in the person and accounts. However, in the present order
God decided to send Christ for our redemption, to institute
marriage, etc. This historical fact is considered
in the fourth part.

Hochmann thinks that this answer is much better because it fits the ground plan of the Summa, namely, the exitus and redditus to God (which latter is broken up into a condition by intrinsic means, i.e., esse, similitudo, and by extrinsic means, id).

3. The most important and original accomplishment of the Summa is the seconda pars. Here for the first time, even, the classicum rationalis, receives definiteness in the world of theology. The seconda pars is the birth of Christian humanism, a concept due exclusively to Thomas. The Thomistic reorganization of theology (especially in the seconda pars) brings into being Christian humanism, consequently the prologue to the Summa is not a mere pointing out of secondary difficulties in handling theology, contemporary with Aquinas.

4. Father Jheronimus has written the best article about the general plan of the Summa in the article referred to above. Father Jheronimus stresses the Thomistic synthesis of the abstract, intelligible essence of theology with the historical, contingent fact of Christ's incarnation.

5. The Summa is an unfinished work. The break was completed by the Supplement due to the medieval horizon of a Thomas. Peter of Avignon and Reginald of Pityens have been suggested

as the author of the Supplement, Eichmann thinks that the Supplement is too sloppily and hastily constructed to be attributed to either Peter or Reginald. The Supplement consists of pieces cut out of the four books of the Scripturam. The pieces which had been already treated in the prima and secunda or which would not fit into the general plan, were eliminated and then the rest were fitted together. The Supplement is not a very intelligent piece of work, nor is it a useful idea. It is a scissors and paste job. We do not know exactly who wrote the Supplement. One should never quote the Supplement, but should go directly to the Scripturam. Father Eichmann does not see why they publish the Supplement.

6. The method of a Thomistic question (our present day article), "severe questiones" is to raise a problem (cf. Cosma, In Metaphys., book 3, locc. 3, n. 368). "Lamentatio" is about the same as "dubitatio". There are four types of questions: quid est, propter quid est, an est, quid est (cf. Ioneguzzi, Verbum, Theological Studies, Sept. 1966, p. 361). You will never find these four types of questions in the Summa as such. The word "utrum" is said by Aristotle to be the proper formulation of a question (cf. Topics, 104b

26-37) and expresses opposition (cf. Metaph. 1066 b 32 sq.) The questions in the Summa are of this type and are true problems. Consequently you will not find in St. Thomas "what is the definition of law, of virtue, etc.?" Such questions have no place in Thomas' plan. A seeming exception to this rule is the proemium to Iesas, q. 50, where Thomas says that he will treat "de definitione virtutis" in the fourth article. However, this is loose terminology according to Father Kirschbaum, and when Thomas comes to the fourth article he places the question correctly as "utrum convenienter definitio virtutis sit, . ." The great advantage of such a method is that it presents definite, graspable, concrete questions.

Now let us consider some examples of this technique. First, why has post-Thomistic ethics been so rationalistic? The ancient Greeks said that conduct was to be guided according to reason. Thomas, too, frequently says "agere secundum rationem", but by "ratio" he means something much different than the ancients did. However, Thomas never explicitly says what "ratio" means for him. Why not? Because such a discussion of "ratio" would not fit into his general method. He had to treat the problem "in signo

"exercito" rather than in "signo signata". Thus in IaIIa, q. 90, Thomas gives substantially the definition of law, but he never defines it explicitly.

Again, the first part of the secunda pars talks about "sema" as the "imago Dei". He does not reintroduce this important topic, however, later on in his works.

The two longest questions in the Summa are on the Old Testament (IaIIa, q. 200) and the rites of the Mass (IIIa, q. 80).

Why does not St. Thomas treat a point completely when he deals with it? Why is it necessary to collate other places? The reason is that the Summa is a medieval textbook which was meant to be read aloud to the students who were to try to remember as much as possible. You should read the whole Summa from cover to cover, since everything depends on everything else. When you read an article, you may have a lot of difficulties which are not answered in this article. Continue to read ahead. You may have to read much further, but if you continue you will get your answer.

An article in the Summa is an abbreviated question disputata. According to Aristotle, the discussion of a problem should start off with a question, introduced by "utrum", which is the only form unacceptable of discussion.

Since doubt is the first step on the road to science and certitude, one should look for reasons to doubt. Thomas follows Aristotle in this procedure (cf. Corn, In Metaphys., book 3, lect. 3, n. 341).

There are four points in every question: (i) the question is always stated in the form of an alternative (utrum), constituted by the two parts of a contradiction, or, less frequently, by two contraries; (ii) arguments are presented in favor of the first part of the alternative. Then arguments are presented in favor of the second part of the alternative; (iii) the determinatio is given (present-day solutio); (iv) the refutation of the arguments not according with the solution is given.

As regards the first point, the posing of the question, we have said sufficient above.

As regards the second point, the arguments pro and con, the arguments are introduced by the words "ad priorem sic proceditur". These words can best be translated as: in regard to the first point, the procedure (the discussion, the way to engage in a discussion) is like this. The arguments (usually 3 or 4 in number) advanced for the first position are called "arguments in contrarium". These "arguments in contrarium" are not objections in our modern

sense of the term. These "argumenta in contrarium" are simply reasons for one part of the alternative. Sometimes St. Thomas himself calls these "argumenta in contrarium", "objectiones". However, the word "objectione" (objicere) in St. Thomas means "to reason", "to argue" and is synonymous with "procedere" and "disputare". The words "obviare", "instantia" in St. Thomas mean "to object" in our modern sense of the term. For examples of "objicere", consult Cosm., In Metaphys., III, 12, n.387; III, 16, n. 515; VII, 12, n. 1638; X, 7, n. 2060. For examples of "obviare", consult De Pot., 3, 14 ed 2 and S. C. Q., 3, 60, second argument. Finally, it stands to reason that the "argumenta in contrarium" cannot be objections, for how can you object against a position before it has been stated? After the "argumenta in contrarium", there is usually one argument in favor of the second part of the alternative.

As regards the third point, the "determinatio". The "determinatio" (present-day "corpus") is the real argument and explanation for the position held by St. Thomas. In the manuscripts we find that the "determinatio" is usually introduced as follows: "Respondeo. Dicendum quod, . ." This may be translated as "here is the solution".

The "determinatio" sometimes proceeds "modo demonstrativo", sometimes "modo disputativa". In the "determinatio" St. Thomas usually reduces his problem to root principles which perhaps are not fully discussed.

As regards the fourth point, the answers to the "argumenta in contrarium", the "argumenta in con- trarium" of St. Thomas grow out of the state of the question as he found it. Hence Thomas' answers frequently develop the doctrine found in the "determinatio". Thus two elements can be found in these answers: first, Thomas may give the reasons on account of which the doctrine in the "determinatio" was presented; second, Thomas may elaborate the doctrine of the "determinatio" and present a synthesis of his doctrine.

In conclusion, it should be urged that the articles of St. Thomas are to be read as they stand, from start to finish. To read the "corpus" first, then to look at a few "difficulties" is a good way to mis- understand St. Thomas. The "argumenta in contrarium" give you the right approach to the question and are a sort of "status questionis". We might take the

"argumenta in contrarium" as antithesis, the "corpus" as thesis, the "answers" as synthesis. When reading the Summa be sure to compare parallel passages in St. Thomas and look up similar questions in Albert, Bonaventure, etc. Such a procedure will help you understand what the state of the question was.

In passing, we might profitably say a few words about the articles of Bonaventure and of Albert the Great. First, there was a long series of arguments against. Second, there was a long series of arguments pro. Third, there was a "determinatio", which frequently was not much more than an election of one series of arguments with some added explanations. Fourth, there were answers to the rejected arguments.

7. The Language of the Summa:

St. Thomas is one of the great Latinists. His language is clear, simple, precise and adequate. If we look at the autograph of St. Thomas, we see how laboriously he worked at individual words (*autem* vs. *vero*), etc. To appreciate how personal Saint Thomas' style is, compare it with that of Bonaventure or Albert. Very little work has been done in this field. Consult the

remark of H.O.Taylor in The Medieval Mind (Vol. II, pp. 176-814) on Thomas' Latin.

The Chronology of the Summa: The extrinsic criteria for the chronology of the Summa are inadequate. Ptolemy of Lucca says that Thomas wrote the Summa during the time of Clement IV (February 2, 1265 to November 1268). Immediately thereafter he remarks: "Istius ergo Summae tres partes quasi scripsit tempore Pontifices et vacacionis sequentis, quod fuit spatium duorum annorum et novem mensium." Here Ptolemy of Lucca extends the time of composition of the theological Summa over the pontificate of Clement IV and the following vacancy, which lasted from November, 1268, to September 1, 1271. Later on, when treating of the pontificate of Gregory X, Ptolemy supplements: "Hic Doctor tempore huius Pontificis Gregorii X scripsit ultimam partem Summae, quae Sacramentalis vocatur, quia de sacramentis ibidem agitur et de Incarnatione Verbi, in quo articuli fidei continentur secundum ipsius humanitatem, sed non complevit morte praeventus." This allows all told an interval extending from 1265 until about the time of the saint's death.

Hence we must have recourse to inner criticism, also, in determining the chronology of the Summa.

(1) Mandonnet's chronology (cf. article above)

1267-68 Ia
 1269-70 IaIIae
 1271-72 IIaIIae
 1272-73 IIIa

Eschmann says that Mandonnet has no reason for making the terminus a quo 1267 rather than 1265.

(2) Lottin's chronology (cf. article above). Lottin presents a fairly convincing argument that the IaIIae was written after the De Malo. The difficulty in this hypothesis is that the whole IIaIIae and part of IIIa were written in 5-8 months, an incredible physical feat.

Ia - closer to 1265 than to 1269
 IaIIae - at the earliest 1272 or possibly after 1273
 IIaIIae -
 IIIa -

(3) Grabmann's chronology (cf. book above)

Ia - 1267-68
 IaIIae - } 1269-70
 IIaIIae - }
 IIIa - 1272-73

(4) Glorieux' chronology (cf. article above)

Ia - begun in 1267, certainly before November 1268 (see below) in Italy.
 IaIIae - from April to the end of summer, 1270.
 Perhaps begun in Italy, probably in Paris.
 IIaIIae - from Easter 1270 to Christmas 1271 - Paris.

IIIa - from beginning of school year 1271 (Paris)
 to September 1273 (Italy).

The date, November 1268, is determined by the reference to Simplicius' commentary on the De Anima in Ia, q. 79, s-4. See the article by G. Verbeke listed above.

(5) Eschmann's chronology:

We can roughly determine the time as 1265-70. Any further determination is only probable. The main difficulty is the date of the Iallae. The Iallae seems to be after the De Malo, and concurrent with the De Virtutibus. It seems to be fairly certain that parts of the De Malo were written before the Iallae.

General References for this section:

- (1) P. Mandonnet, O.P., Chronologie des écrits scripturaires de St. Thomas d'Aquin, Revue Thomiste,
Vol. 32 (1928) pp. 27-46 - conditions of ordinary lectures
Vol. 33 (1928) pp. 116-155 - consideration of each commentary of St. Thomas
Vol. 34 (1929), pp. 53-69 - number of lectures
Vol. 34 (1929), pp. 132-145 - study of the glosses of St. Thomas
Vol. 34 (1929), pp. 489-519 - methods of exposition of Holy Scripture at the University of Paris.

N.B.--these articles are a very rich source of general information on the whole organization of studies at Paris.

- (2) P. Lynave, O.P., Les commentaires scripturaires de St. Thomas d'Aquin, La Vie Spirituelle, Vol. 9, July 1923, pp. 455-469.

- (3) C. Spicq, O.P., Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au Moyen Age, Bibliothèque thomiste, Vol. 26, Paris, 1944, pp. 298-316.

- (4) Dr. Martin Grabmann, Die Werke des hl. Thomas von Aquin, (Beiträge, Band 22, Heft 1, 2) Münster, 1931, pp. 241-60.

- (5) Dr. Gallus W. Kesser, O.P., Das Wesen des Thomismus, (Thomistische Studien, Band 5), 3rd edition, Freiburg, 1949, pp. 37-40.

General Introduction:

In discussing Saint Thomas' commentaries on Holy Scripture, we must distinguish between a lecture and an

expositio. A lectura is a reportatio of one of St. Thomas' students or secretaries. An expositio was written by St. Thomas himself.

Any commentary on Holy Scripture attributed to Saint Thomas and which is not considered in this section is considered by Father Eschmann to be spurious.

Father Mandonnet's Theory:

(as presented by Father Eschmann and as reported by Father Nash)

1. Father Mandonnet's chronological table of the scriptural commentaries:

	<u>Old Testament</u>	<u>New Testament</u>
Paris (1256-1269)	Isaies--Expositio 1256-57	St. Matthew - Lectura 1257-63
Italy (1269-Nov. 1269)	Canticus--Expositio (lost) Lamentat. Jer. --Expositio Propheta Jer. --Expositio 1267-68	Epistles of St. Paul 1269-63 St. Thomas' first comm. on Epistles In editions: from I Cor. xi on Glossae (Octava aurea) 1263-68
Paris (1269-1272)	Job--Expositio 1269-70	St. John--Lectura 1270-1272 Expositio Ch.I-V incl.
Naples (1272-1273)	Psalms 1-54--Lectura	Epistles of St. Paul --Expositio St. Thomas' second comm. on Epistles In editions: Rom. and I Cor.i-vii, v.14

B. Basis of Father Mandonnet's conjectures:

(a) Lecturing on the Sacred Scriptures was a primary duty of a Master of Theology in Paris, at least as conceived by St. Thomas. Therefore St. Thomas' commentaries on Holy Scripture extend over his whole academic career.

(b) It was customary for a Master of Theology to comment on a book of the Old Testament and on a book of the New Testament "ordinatio".

(c) The fact that St. Thomas has commented on these and no other books of Holy Scripture is confirmed by tradition, especially by the catalogues.

(d) Only in regard to a few exegetical works can we establish a fairly certain chronology. For example:

St. Paul--Romans) These commentaries are probably,
I Cor. 1-x) though not necessarily, late
Psalms 1-54) because they are unfinished.

Comm. in Isaiam	- Since this work is in the manner of a verbal gloss, it is probably of an early period.
-----------------	--

(e) Mandonnet says that a chronological scheme is to be worked out like a puzzle, by fitting the works into the "time-blocks".

(f) The most striking feature is the distinction between an expositio and a lectura noted above. Thomas had a good secretary in Reginald of Piperno. Thomas was very practical

in the organization of his work and saw the need of a trained secretarial staff. As a general rule, the lectures do not have the same authority as the expositions. Still nothing forbids us from using the lectures as genuine Thomistic works (unless a lecture should contradict an exposition--which would be a very rare occurrence).

St. Thomas' Method of Exegesis:

(1) Father Bachmann's opinion as reported by Father Hultenius:

Exegetical work was one of the most important duties of St. Thomas. Exegesis comprises about one fourth of St. Thomas' writings. Holy Scripture is frequently used by St. Thomas as a decisive authority. Thomas' philosophy is clearly related to Holy Scripture, e.g. Exodus III, 14. Nowhere is St. Thomas so characteristically medieval as in his exegesis of Holy Scripture and in his proofs from Holy Scripture. Modern times have clearly outgrown and surpassed the medieval method of exegesis. Yet a Thomist must appreciate this medieval type of exegesis if he is to understand Thomas' philosophical, as well as theological, articles.

(2) References:

(a) E. Gilson, Note pour l'explication de quelques raisonnements scripturaires unités au moyen age. Revue d'Histoire

Franckeaine, (1926) pp. 350-60.

Gilson discusses the technique and structure of medieval reasoning based on Holy Scripture. Although his examples are taken from St. Bonaventure, the general theory is also applicable to St. Thomas. Although the medieval scholar's use of scripture seems strange to our minds, he did not quote Holy Scripture as a mere decoration for an argument, e.g., of. *Ilalae*, q. 188, a. 2, ad 3 which quotes Ecclesiasticus 30, 24 and Apoc. 28, 17. Gilson on page 360 gives a general warning that we must not ignore such texts as though they were an insignificant artifice.

This note of Gilson's divides the medievalist's use of scriptural proofs into three kinds:

I - Le Raisonnement par Concordance Scripturaire: This type of argumentation was a chain of scriptural quotations which have in common an idea or a word and arranged so that they establish by their consequences the truth one desires to prove. This chain of quotations could be explicit (and then is easily seen) or implicit (and then demands an extensive knowledge of Scripture for its appreciation). In any event, since the entire chain of arguments is taken from the bible, the argument was considered valid.

III--L'Interprétation des Noms Hebreux: This type of reasoning consists in taking Hebrew words (almost always taken from the bible, frequently proper names) and giving them their meaning (e.g. Jacob--luctator) for purposes of argumentation. This type of argumentation is frequently blended with the above type.

III--L'Interprétation des Noms Latins: Plato (Cratylus, 435, d) said that words represent the essences of things. Consequently if one comprehends the words, one also comprehends things. This doctrine is found in some form in Aristotle, Plotinus, Varro, etc. However, medieval scholars found much of this doctrine probably in Isidore of Seville.

En réalité, la règle, pour tout penseur médiéval, est que lorsque deux mots se ressemblent, les choses qu'ils désignent se ressemblent, de sorte que l'on peut toujours passer de l'un de ces mots à la signification de l'autre. D'innombrables raisonnements médiévaux reposent sur ce principe et ne relèvent d'aucune autre logique; la difficulté qu'éprouvent les historiens à croire qu'un tel procédé n'a jamais pu être pris au sérieux tient à l'oubli du principe sur lequel il se fonde: il n'y a pas d'absurdité à conclure d'un mot à la chose que désigne un mot semblable, lorsqu'on croit que la nature des choses a primitivement déterminé l'attribution des mots.

- (b) H. Gilson, De quelques malentendus scripturaires
usités au moyen âge, Les Idées et les Lettres, Paris,
 Librairie philosophique J. Vrin (1932), pp. 155-169.

This is the same article as above.

- (c) A. Gerdeil, Les procédés exégétiques de Saint Thomas,
Revue Thomiste, (1903), pp. 423-457.

Gerdeil defends St. Thomas against four modern criticisms: (1) ignorance of Greek and Hebrew; therefore no verification of translation; (2) metaphorical interpretations; (3) preconceived dogmatic views; (4) dialectical method of interpretation based on abstract and logical resemblance. In regard to the first point, Gerdeil answers that Thomas was careful about his translations (cf. pp. 430-6). Gerdeil comments on Thomas' knowledge of Greek and his philological carefulness, outstanding for that time.

- (d) F. Albert Blanche, O.P., Le sens littéral des écritures
 d'après Saint Thomas d'Aquin, *Revue Thomiste* (1906), pp.
 192-212.

This is a discussion of the "sensus litteralis" in St. Thomas. Thomas thinks that there is a multiplicity of literal senses [cf. old Victorine symbolic interpretation], that "vi verborum" there are many significations. "Hoc ad

dignitatem sacrae Scripturae pertinet", that where ever there is truth, it is to be found in Holy Scripture. The only condition is that these truths must be capable of being accommodated (*aptare*) to the words of Holy Scripture. This opinion distinguishes Thomas very sharply from modern exegetes.

(e) M.-D. Chenu, O.P., La théologie comme science au XIII^e siècle, Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge, Vol. 3 (1987), pp. 39-71.

Roger Bacon complained of "modern" theological methods. Exegesis, he said, was no longer a simple exposition but an independent way. Chenu claims that in the *Is.*, q. 1, a.10, Thomas went beyond this older method of mere exposition. Chenu thinks that in all such texts (as in De Pot., q. 4, a. 1) we are faced with the residue of an older tradition which existed before Thomas' time. Consequently the Thomistic terms cannot be taken at their face value [even though the Thomistic terms are very similar to the traditional language]. In the older exegesis the "doctrine sacra" was not distinct from the "pagina sacra". In Thomas the "doctrine sacra" is distinct from the "pagina sacra": Holy Scripture is the source of theology but it is not theology. The problems raised by these questions are very

difficult. It is quite possible that Thomas' terminology lagged behind his thought.

Expositio in Isaiam prophetam:

(1) References:

- (a) Jean Dumetet, Le Commentaire de Saint Thomas d'Aquin sur Isaie d'après la Tradition Manuscrite (Etudes Critiques sur les Oeuvres de Saint Thomas d'Aquin d'après la Tradition Manuscrite, pp. 161-224), Bibliothèque Thomiste, No. XVIII, Paris, Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1938.
- (b) Etienne Axters, O.P., Frère Jacobin fâché a-t-il été un faussaire? ou l'heure et le malheur d'un autographie, Angelicum, (1938), pp. 302-517.
- (c) Printed editions from the autograph (Cod. Vat. lat. 9850)
 - (i) S. Thomae Aquinatis Doctoris Angelici super Isaiam Prophetam quae ex Autographo supersunt edidit et dicavit Bartholomeus Romillio Pontifici Maiori Mediolanensem Petr. Antonius Uocellinus S.T.D., Mediolani, Ex typographia Boniardo, Polianae, 1847.
 - (ii) S. Thomae Aquinatis Doctoris Angelici Ord. Praed. in Isaiam prophetam, in tres psalmos David, in Doctum de hebdomadibus et de Trinitate expositiones. Accedit anonymi liber de fide sanctae Trinitatis a S. Thome examinatus in

opusculo contra errores Graecorum uno cum ipso opusculo et altero contra Graecos, Armenos, et Mazacenos. Omnia quae superiunt ex autographis, caetera vero ex optimis codicibus et editionibus. P.A. Vecelli. Roma, ex typographia polyglotta S. C. de propaganda fide, 1880.

N.B.--Knochmann says that these editions are very poor and inadequate. The autograph (Cod. Vat. lat.) contains besides the homilia on Iesuas, the S.C.G., the expositio in librum Boethii de Trinitate, and three parallel 52-54.

(1) Chronology:

(a) Knochmann--This commentary is in verbal gloss and is very literal. Hence it appears to be the work of a "baccularius". Therefore it is an early work.

(b) Mendoncst, pp. 180-4

1250-59

(c) Despres, pp. 198-201

either 1269-78

or 1272-74

(3) Collationes:

The "collationes" are indentations of matter, suitable for small discourses. The theme is indicated by a word, and the divisions (and sometimes subdivisions) are indicated by a sentence, sometimes with scriptural

texts appended. These "collationes" appear in our printed editions, introduced by the phrase "Nota super illo verbo" (or something similar).

Neatres maintains that these "collationes" were added by Jacobinus Astensis, and he lists them in his article. They account for about an eleventh of the entire work.

Fr. Axters maintains that these "collationes" are the work of St. Thomas himself.

Lectura in Mattheum:

(1) References:

(a) Welster, Hochtheitsfragen bei den exegetischen Schriften des heiligen Thomas von Aquin.

I. Hat Thomas eine Expositio ad litteram zu den vier Evangelien verfaast? Biblica 3 (1922) pp. 328-338.

II. Die Lectura in Ev. Matthaei. Biblica 4 (1923) pp. 300-311.

(b) This work, along with the Commentaries on Isaies, Jeremias, Lamentations of Jeremias, was edited for the first time in a printed edition by Bartholomew Spina, O.P., in 1527, who explained of "the bad manuscripts, torn and worn out by time". This text is in our present day editions.

(2) The reportator is one, or perhaps two students of Thomas (other than Wigand of Piperno); perhaps he is Peter of Andria, perhaps Dodegar of Bassanum. This work is always qualified as "defective" in the catalogue of Bartholomew of Capua and in those stemming from it. Concerning the authenticity of the various parts of this work, consult Pelster; perhaps only first fifteen chapters are Thomas.

(3) Chronology:

Mandonnet, 1256-59

Synave, 1256-59

Pelster, 1265-66

Kochmann does not agree with Mandonnet and Synave because the work includes philosophical digressions with references to the Politics of Aristotle, which was seemingly translated about 1260.

Expositio in Canticum Cantorum

(1) References:

(a) M. Vreda, Zwei Beiden den hl. Thomas von Aquin zugeschriebenen Kommentare zum Hohenliede, Berlin, 1903.

(b) W. Schuspp, O.P., Hat der hl. Thomas einen Kommentar zum Hohenliede geschrieben? Divum Thomas, Wien, Vol. 8, (1921), pp. 47-65.

(c) A. Vaccari, S.J., L'editio princeps del commento di
Tommaso sulla Cantica e la chiave di un problema letterario,
Biblica, Vol. 5, 1924, pp. 193-191.

(2) Bartholomew of Capua and the other catalogues definitely assert that Thomas wrote a commentary on the Canticle of Canticles. However, this original commentary of St. Thomas is lost.

(3) In our current editions we find two versions. The first version begins "Salomon inspiratus. . ." Sixtus of Sienna says (Bibliotheca sancta, Veretile, 1566, p. 478) that Thomas dictated this version to the monks of Fossanova on his death bed down to the words, "Veni dilecte filii, egredimini in hortum", at which point he died. A. Touron (La vie de St. Thomas d'Aquin, Paris, 1727, p. 686) says Thomas dictated the entire version on his death bed. As a matter of fact, this version is found in ms. of the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries, and perhaps is by Haymo of Halberstadt.

The second version begins with the words "Sonet vox tua. . ." This version is probably by Oiles of Rome (beginning of 14th century). Mandronnet thinks that this second version is a reworking of Thomas' original commentary by Oiles of Rome. Grabmann disputes this point.

Vrede proves the non-authenticity of these two versions.

Expositio in Ieremias (Threnos) Jeremie prophetae

- (1) Bartholomew of Capua, Nicolas Trivet, Bernard Guidonis, the two Prague catalogues and John of Colonna say that Thomas wrote such an exposition.
- (2) Quetif-Echard, Grabmann, etc., have been unable to find any manuscript of this work.
- (3) Mandorlet dates this work in 1267, before the Expositio in Jeremias Prophetam.

Expositio in Jeremias prophetam

- (1) Bartholomew of Capua, Nicolas of Trivet, Bernard Guidonis, John of Colonna, the two Prague catalogues and the Stans catalogue say that Thomas wrote such an exposition.
- (2) Quetif-Echard found one manuscript of this work. Grabmann found another.
- (3) Mandorlet dates this work 1267-68 because it is unfinished and he thinks Thomas had to leave Paris. Eschmann asks whether it may not be unfinished due to death of Thomas.

Lecture in Sancti Pauli Epistolas

(1) Mandonnet's theory:

St. Thomas lectured on all the epistles of St. Paul at Orvieto at the papal court of Urban IV in the years following the summer of 1259 (1259-1263). These lectures were reported by Reginald of Piperno.

St. Thomas started to write his own commentaries on the epistles of St. Paul at Naples 1272-3. He had finished his commentary on the Romans, and I Cor. I-X, when death intervened.

(B) Eschmann's opinion:

Mandonnet's theory is not completely satisfactory, but is probably the most acceptable hypothesis. What our recent printed editions contain is as follows:

I ad Romanos---expositio of St. Thomas

I ad Corinthios, Ch. 1 to Ch. 7, v. 14, "... id est Christiani finit." Vives: Vol. 20, pp. 605-673a---expositio of St. Thomas

I ad Corinthios, Ch. 7, v. 14 to Ch. 11 (excl.). Vives: Vol. 20, pp. 673a-715. This text is taken from Peter of Tarantasia, a contemporary and disciple of St. Thomas'.

Rest of I ad Corinthios and all the other epistles are the "reportationes" of Reginald of Piperno.

Hence some difficulties remain to Mandonnet's solution.

Where did the first part of Reginald of Piperno's "reportatio" go? Why is the "expositio" of St. Thomas missing for I ad Cor. VII-XI? Where is it?

Mr. Kochmann thinks this is a very important work of St. Thomas, his earliest and finest commentary on Holy Scripture, i.e., ad Rom. and I ad Cor. I-VII.

(3) O. Lottin, O.S.B., Le peche original chez Albert le Grand, Bonaventure et Thomas d'Aquin, Recherches de theologie ancienne et medievale, Vol. 13, 1940, p. 307, thinks the lectures of Thomas on the Epistle to the Romans were given between 1266-68. He bases his reasoning on inner criticism, namely, the similarity of ad Rom. ch. 5, lect. 3 with S.C.G., IV, 52.

(4) Henri Bouillard, Conversion et Grace chez Saint Thomas, in the collection Theologie, Aubier, Paris, 1944, Appendix, dates the "expositiones" of St. Thomas at 1269-72 from inner criticism.

Catena aurea (modern title)

Glossa super quattuor evangelia (original title)

(1) Kochmann's opinion:

Pope Urban IV gave Thomas the task of building up a gloss of patristic quotations on the four gospels. Thomas

had completed the glosses for St. Matthew before the death of Urban IV (1264) and he dedicated it to him (cf. the dedicatory epistle). The other three glosses on Mark, Luke and John he dedicated to Cardinalis Hannibaldus Co Hannibaldus, O.P., d. 1272 (for information about Hannibaldus, see Grabmann, Mittelalterliches Gelehrtenleben, pp. 347-8). Hence the time of these glosses was about 1263-1265.

There is an English translation of the *Catena aurea* (Oxford, 1848-50) which is valuable because of the indication of the patristic references.

This is a very useful work of St. Thomas. This work frequently gives the patristic sources of St. Thomas' further theological development as manifested from the *Scriptum* to the *Summa*.

There are more manuscripts for the *Catena aurea* than for any other work of St. Thomas. All the catalogues say that this work is authentic.

(2) Grabmann's chronology:

Matthew: 1261-64
Mark, Luke, John: soon after death of Urban IV

(3) Mandonnet's chronology:

Matthew: 1262-63
Mark, Luke, John: before 1260

Expositio in Job ad Litteram

(1) Reuchmann's opinion:

Since St. Gregory's famous commentary on Job was termed "moralis", Thomas' exposition was termed "ad litteram". This work is certainly authentic and is one of Thomas' best works on the providence of God. Mandonnet dates this work as 1269-72 because of its perfection, but this is conjectural. Ptolemy of Lucca says that Thomas wrote this work at the court of Urban IV (1261-64).

Lectura in Ioannem

(1) The catalogues of Bartholomew of Capua, of Nicolas Trivet, of Ptolemy of Lucca, of Bernard Guidonis assert that this work is authentic.

Bartholomew of Capua says: "Item, lecturam super Iohannem, qua non invenitur melior; quam recollectus idea frater Reynaldus, sed correxit eam frater Thomas", n.63.

Ptolemy of Lucca says: "Item postillam super Iohannem de qua ipse super quinque capitula proprio stilo notavit, totum aliud reportatio fuit, sed correctum per ipsum."

In the colophon, Reginald of Piperno says that he reported the work.

(2) Mandonnet's opinion:

He does not admit the testimony of Ptolemy of Lucca concerning the first five chapters. He places the work 1269-1272.

(3) Grabmann's opinion:

First five chapters were written by Thomas. The rest is a reportatio of Reginald. The whole commentary can be safely used as Thomas' work. The work belongs to the last years of Thomas' life.

(4) Eschmann's opinion:

This is at least in part a reportatio. Mandonnet does not admit Ptolemy's evidence because it would upset the balance of his scheme.

Lecture in Facsimile

1. The catalogue of Bartholomew of Capme says: Item lectura super quattuor nocturnos Psalterii.

Nicolas Trivet: Et super tres nocturnos Psalterii.

Bernard Guidonius: Frater vero Boginaldus, socius ejus, dicitur reportasse postillas super tres nocturnos psalterii, ipso legente, quae incipit: In omni opere suo credit confessionem sancto.

William of Tocco: Scriptit super magnam partem Psalterii.

The Stemm catalogue: Itam scriptit super nocturnum primum,
secundum et tertium.

(2) Uccelli (cf. in Iesiam prophetem) found only two manuscripts of this work which contained Ps.1-51 (inclusive).

It begins: Incipit postilla super primum psalmus secundum fratrem Thomam de Aquino. It ends: Explicit postilla super partem Psalterii secundum fratrem Thomam de Aquino ordinis praedicatorum, quia non invenitur plus in exemplari fratris Reynaldi de Piperno qui fuit socius fratris Thome usque ad mortem et habuit omnia scripta sua. Uccelli dates this manuscript in the thirteenth century. Certainly it is before Thomas' canonisation. This commentary extends to Ps. 56, v. 16.

(3) Mendonnet places this work 1272-73; Syname 1271-72.

The Dionysian and Boethian Commentaries

Expositio in Dionysium de divinis nominibus; Expositio in librum Boethii de hebdomadibus; Expositio in librum Boethii de Trinitate.

These three works are listed in the Catalogue of Bartholomew of Capua immediately after the Scriptural writings and just before the Aristotelian commentaries. Later they will be listed as opuscula but several MSS. put them where Bartholomew does.

1.) Expositio in Dionysium de divinis nominibus:

a.) Dionysius: He was a Greek monk of the 5th century greatly dependent on Proclus and Plotinus for his doctrine. He gives one to believe that he is a disciple of St. Paul. From 500 to 1500 this was believed to be literally true. The humanists discovered the error and reviled the Middle Ages (which they began to call the Dark Ages) for their mistake. This criticism as not been forgotten today and makes us, unconsciously perhaps, forget this work. This Mediaeval mistake shows us how hard it was for people of that time to think in time and space.

Dionysius is not really a forger. He is an Oriental with an Oriental flair in his writing. He was no ignoramus. He

spoke his own mysterious language and to him goes the credit for preserving the Orient in the Church. Valla and his fellow humanists were true to their instincts when they turned on what was so typical of the Middle Ages. The Middle Ages considered Dionysius a great man. All great thinkers are faithful disciples. St. Thomas had a very keen sense of what was good in literature and Dionysius is one of his most frequently quoted sources.

b.) The Expositio: St. Thomas recognized the Platonic character of the work and it is interesting to see how he harmonizes Plato and Aristotle. This is the most extensive treatment of Platonism in Thomistic writings. It is a great mistake to identify Thomism with Aristotelianism.

The three main points of the Expositio:

i.) The cognoscibility of God: the application of analogy: these notions are certainly not from Aristotle.

ii.) Ratio boni: the definition and essence of the good, the metaphysics of love: this is not Aristotelian either, cf. especially chapter III. Our traditional, rationalistic Thomism stresses the intellect. Thomas was more true to reality than we are. Dionysius kept Thomas from overemphasizing the intellect.

iii.) The order of the universe: its beauty. Here we have a metaphysic of Esthetics which breathes a sympathy, an

intimate inter-communication of all things in the universe. Father Eschmann says there is a definite relationship between the tradition of Dionysius and Mediaeval architecture, between Neoplatonism and Feudalism. The order of the cosmos is reflected in Feudalism, in Christendom itself. It is to be regretted that St. Thomas did not comment on other works of Dionysius. St. Albert did and Thomas quotes other works frequently. Dionysius is most typical of the Mediaeval mind.

c.) Chronology: Mandonnet dates this work c1261. Cf. A. Feder, S.J. "Des Aquinaten Kommentar zu Pa.-Dionysius' *de divinis nominibus*" Scholastik, I, 1926, pp. 321-351. Fr. Feder dates the work before 1268 and Fr. Eschmann agrees because in 1268 Proculus' Elements of Theology was translated by William of Moerbeke and when St. Thomas commented on the Liber de causis, he pointed out the relationship between the latter and the Elements. But in the commentary on the Divine Names there is no mention of Proculus. Therefore the Dionysian commentary must have been written before 1268. (Cf. E.R. Dodds, Proclus, The Elements of Theology, Oxford, 1933, especially pp. xxxi and xlivi.) N.B. For a good treatment of Dionysius, cf. E. Gilson, La philosophie au moyen age, Payot, Paris, 1947, pp. 80-85.

2.) Expositio in librum Boethii de hebdonadibus:

a.) This work is wrongly entitled. What St. Thomas commented on is a meditation on a particular point treated in a larger work, now lost, which was probably called de hebdonadibus. It had to do with ancient numerology. St. Thomas gives a fantastic explanation of this point. Boethius' book is Neoplatonic. The important treatments are the relationship between ens and bonum and the terminology for the distinction between quod est et quo est, also for the distinction between esse and id quod est.

b.) Chronology: Mandonnet dates the work 1257-58, which would make it the first philosophical commentary. Fr. Eschmann says this is the most traditional date. So there was a philosophical commentary involving Platonism before any Aristotelian commentary.

3.) Expositio in librum Boethii de trinitate:

a.) This work is extremely valuable for the classification of the sciences, the difference between philosophy and theology. N.B. the following editions: that of P. Wyser, O.P., Thomas von Aquin in librum Boethii de trinitate quaestiones quinta et sexta, nach dem Autograph Cod. Vat. lat. 9850, Fribourg, 1948; and that of P.A. Uccelli, Rome, 1880. The latter is not a very good edition according to Fr. Eschmann. Usually this work is classed among the

opuscula. This is wrong. It is not so classified in the Catalogue of Bartholomew of Capua. The Expositio is written in the style of the Scriptum, i.e. first the expositio textus, then questions are raised on the basis of the text.

b.) Chronology: Cf. M.-D. Chenu, O.P., "La theologie comme science au XIII^e siècle," Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge, II, 1927, pp. 31-37. This is a very important study. Chenu assigns an early date, 1256-59, i.e., the first stay at Paris. N.B. the formulas here developed on the nature of theology and philosophy are more refined than in the Liens. If Chenu's date is right, then we have the curious phenomenon of a retrogression in the thought of Thomas. And tradition does assign an early date. (cf. art. cit., pp. 67-68.)

Cf. a series of articles in Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses by J. F. Bonnefoy, O.F.M., "La theologie comme science et l'explication de la Foi selon saint Thomas d'Aquin," XIV, 1937, pp. 421 and 600; XV, 1938, p. 491. Fr. Bonnefoy rejects Chenu's thesis and sets a late date. Fr. Eschmann disagrees with Bonnefoy.

Cf. M.-D. Chenu, O.P., "La date du commentaire de S. Thomas sur le de trinitate de Boece?" Revue des sciences philosophiques et theologiques, II, 1941-42, p. 432. Chenu gives a rebuttal and

adds the following argument for an early date. Hannibal Hannibaldis borrowed a text from this work of St. Thomas when he wrote his own Commentary on the Sentences in 1260. Therefore the Expositio must have been published before that date.

The Expositio is incomplete. Why? Mandonnet conjectures that it was interrupted when Thomas began the Summa Contra Gentiles.

The Aristotelian Commentaries

1. General Background: These commentaries can only be understood against the background of the history of Aristotelianism in the West. (Cf. F. Van Steenberghen, Aristote en Occident, les origines de l'aristotelisme parisien. Louvain, Editions de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, 1946.)

In 1210 the reading of the libri naturales of Aristotle was forbidden to the Faculty of Arts at Paris. (Cf. Chartularium Univ. Paris., Vol. I, Nos. 11, 20, 77, 87.) These works were forbidden as text books. Why? Because certain Masters, including David of Dinant, were invoking Aristotle as an authority. Therefore we may conclude that Aristotle must have been connected with heresy early in the century. Note that the prohibition did not concern Oxford. Intensive activity re the works of Aristotle was carried on there, especially by Adam of Boofeld. Note also that neither the libri logicales nor the ethica were forbidden. Of the latter only the three first books were known.

In 1215 the prohibition was made more specific, i.e. libri naturales and metaphysicae and summaries of them.

In 1231 Gregory IX modified the prohibition, "as long as they have not been examined and purged of their errors (especially the error of the eternity of the world)". The Pope instituted a commission to purge Aristotelianism. William of Auxerre was a member. We have no record of any results of this commission. Perhaps William's death late in 1232 brought about the dissolution of the commission.

During the years following 1232, despite the prohibitions, Aristotle was read particularly by the Faculty of Theology and even used as a text in the Faculty of Arts. N.B. Grabmann puts the date of the use of Aristotle as a text much later than most historians. There was an ever increasing use of Aristotle by the Theological faculty, but of course not as a text.

Under Alexander IV and Urban IV the Holy See changed its policy. There began a prudent favoring of Aristotelian studies. So we see a remarkable change. At the beginning of the century, the Aristotle of the Physics and Metaphysica, i.e. David of Dinant's Aristotle who was Neoplatonic and Arabian, was a heretic. By mid-century Aristotle had become precursor Christi. St. Albert could say: "Conveniunt autem omnes Peripatetici in hoc quod Aristoteles verum dixit; quia dicunt quod natura hunc hominem posuit quasi regulam veritatis, in quo summam intellectus humani perfectionem demonstravit." In de anima, lib. III, tract. 2, cap. 3.

There is a tradition which says that Albert and Thomas were the two on whom Gregory IX relied to present Aristotle within the Christian faith. Now it is not a question of purguing Aristotle but of presenting him as he was. Ptolemy of Lucca says that a considerable portion of the Aristotleian commentaries were written by Thomas at Rome^{under Urban IV} (1265-66). This cannot be true because Urban died in 1264. Yet there is a connection between Urban and Thomas' Aristotelian commentaries.

In 1263 Urban renewed the prohibitions of Gregory IX. At this time, Thomas and William of Moerbeke were both at the Papal Court and tradition fixes this as the time when Urban inspired Thomas to write his commentaries. The policy was to detach Aristotle

from Arabian tradition and to show no real decisive difference between Aristotelianism and Christian Faith. N.B. There is no documentary evidence for this Papal inspiration. The work which Thomas now undertakes is the completion of what had been begun in the Summa Contra Gentiles.

2. William of Moerbeke: He was born in Moerbeke in Brabant in 1215. He became a Dominican of the old German Province at Louvain. He might have studied at Paris and could have been in Cologne under Albert at the same time Thomas was. He later went to Frankish Greece and there learned Greek. In 1260 he translated Aristotle's Historia Animalium at Thebes. The same year he translated Alexander of Aphrodesius' Commentary on Aristotle's Meteorologica. After 1260 he was Penitentiary for Urban IV and Clement IV. At the Papal court during the 60's he collaborated with St. Thomas. When Thomas left Italy William stayed on under Clement and Nicholas III. The latter named him Archbishop of Corinth. He died in 1286. All of the sources tell us that William made his translations ad instanciam Fratris Thomae, c.f. the Tabula of Stams. These translations were not only of Aristotle but also of the Greek commentators and some other works.

3. The Commentaries: Some general remarks on the chronology: Ptolemy of Lucca says they were all written in Rome. Special mention is made of the Ethics and Metaphysics. This is not entirely correct. As a Master of Theology Thomas had no occasion to teach the arts.

But at the Dominican convent he was free to give lectures to his own brethren and this is apparently what he did. Some of the commentaries bear unmistakable signs of being lectures. 1265 seems to be the date when he decided to write a corpus of Aristotelian commentaries. But not all were written in Rome or in Italy. They were begun there but continued elsewhere.

Modern chronological research is based on two criteria: 1.) quotations in the commentaries of certain Greek commentators, e.g. Simplicius and Themistius. 2.) The precise Aristotelian text used by St. Thomas.

We know that there was renewed vigor in Aristotelian studies in the late 60's and if we know the dates of Williams' translations, even of the commentators and can indicate their use by St. Thomas, at least we can be sure of the terminus a quo of a particular work.

Cf. F. Pelster, S.J., "Die Übersetzungen der aristotelischen Metaphysik in den Werken des hl. Thomas von Aquin," Gregorianum, XVI, 1935, pp. 325-348; pp. 531-561; XVII, 1936, pp. 377-406. Fr. Pelster's articles furnish an abundance of bibliographical data. Such studies in the framework of the two criteria mentioned above are still going on. Scholars are handicapped by a lack of critical editions of both William's translations and Thomas' commentaries. In 1887 Susemihl published a critical edition of the Politics but others are lacking. In our printed editions the text of St. Thomas is fairly accurate but the Aristotelian text is in very poor shape. The antiqua versio pretends to be William's but it is not. The antique of the Politics is Robert Grosseteste's. The recens versio is a Renaissance translation and is critically worthless. The text divisions of our editions are not what Thomas had before him.

N.B. Father Eschmann spent more time on the In. Met. than any other commentary because it offers the best case study from a literary point of view.

a.) In duodecim libris Metaphysicorum:

i.) The various translations used by St. Thomas:

Cf. G. Lacomb, Aristoteles Latinus, Roma; La Libreria dello Stato, 1939, pp. 61-66.

i.) Vetustissima: late 12th century, includes Books I - IV (cap. 4).

ii.) Vetus: contains more text but is mixed up with the littera Boethii. The littera Boethii seems to be a distinct text, received its title not because it was translated by Boethius but by reason of its association with the Boethian translations of the logical works.

iii.) Nova or Arabica: 1230-31 from an Arabic original, contains Books I - X and XII. N.B. The following important data re the enumeration of the Books of the Metaphysics:

A	Λ	B	Γ	Δ	Ε	Ζ	Η	Θ	Ι	Κ	Λ	Μ	Ν	Greek enumeration
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Our enumeration
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	-----------------

I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	Mediaeval enumeration
---	----	-----	----	---	----	-----	------	----	---	----	-----	------	-----	-----------------------

The Arabica has Books I - X, skips XI, then has XII, so becomes XI in this translation.

iv.) Media: same number of books as the Arabica.

v.) Prima Moerbekeana: not his own translation but a revision of the Media. It follows the Media enumeration.

vi.) Secunda Moerbekeana: William's own trans-

lation: K, M and N are all known, thus it contains Books I - XIV. K is known to St. Thomas from 1271 on. Therefore whenever Thomas quotes Δ as XI the work is before 1271, when he quotes Δ as XII, it is after 1271. Δ is the famous book on the order of the universe and is quoted by St. Thomas throughout his works but sometimes as XI and at others as XII. But even this information is not of much help to the student because zealous editors have changed the XI to XII under the impression that they were helping the reader, whereas they actually destroy one of the purposes of a critical edition. Thus the printed editions of the Ia Pars refer to Δ as XII, yet it was written before 1271. The Leonine Summa Contra Gentiles leaves the XI intact and puts XII in the margin. Cf. Summa Theologiae, I, q. 47, a. 3, ad 1; q. 103, a. 2, ad 2; In III Sent., d. 33, q. 3, a. 1, ad 4.

What translation did St. Thomas use? Cf. Pelster's articles. Thomas continually sought various ways Aristotle had been translated, "aliter plenius", "aliter amplius", "alia littera melius;" "littera Boethii habet," etc. A critical edition of Thomas' Commentary on the Metaphysics should contain three Mediaeval versions of Aristotle because Thomas used three.

In particular in Books I - IV the media is the favorite, sometimes the vetus is preferred, rare use of the prima Moerbekana. The arabica is frequently used in earlier works, e.g. De ente et essentia, but here it is very rare. Books IV (sap. 6) - V use mostly the media, the vetus almost disappears, the prima Moerbekana is more numerous. Books V (near end) - XII use the secunda Moerbekana almost exclusively, others are the exception.

N.B. concerning Book K: In Book VII, lect. 1, a division of Aristotle's Metaphysics is given and is called XI. (Cf. # 1245 in the Cathala edition where the text actually says "in duodecimo libro" but this is one of the misguided corrections spoken of above. The Ms. read XI.) In the introduction to Book XI (# 2146) Thomas speaks of "in principio sequentis libri" which he now knows as K, i.e. the true XII. Even in some of the earlier books A is (in the MSS. and not only in corrected texts) designated as XII. How can you explain the discrepancy? Cf. A. Mansion, "Pour l'histoire de commentaire de saint Thomas sur la Metaphysique d'Aristote," Revue neoscholaistique de philosophie, 1925, p. 280, in which the theory of a double composition is proposed. A. Dondaine, "Saint Thomas et les traductions latines des Metaphysiques d'Aristote," Bulletin Thomiste, Vol. V, n. 131, thinks that the former books may have been retouched after the existence of K was discovered or it could have been done by later scribes. Pelster is sceptical and asks why Book VII was not corrected.

Some concluding remarks on the chronology of the In Met.: Certainly it was not finished before 1271 because K was unknown before that date. It was not written at one time. The use of several translations shows that the work must have extended over several years. It was probably begun at Rome in 1265 and part was probably taught at the Dominican convent, c.f. Book V., lect. 2, "haec littera" as though the book of Aristotle were lying open before the lecturer. It was continued later in Paris but not as lectures. N.B. In Book XII Simplicius is quoted 3 times and his commentary was translated, i.e. completed June 12, 1271. So the

most probable dates are 1260-1272.

Father Macnaman advises us to watch for such clues as we read. As yet, the fund of such clues is meager and further research depends on them.

b.) In libro de Anima expositio:

According to Bartholomew of Capua, Book I is a reportatio by Reginald of Piperno, Bks. II & III are by Thomas himself. Therefore Book I was given as Lectures.
Chronology:

It must have been finished before Bk. X. of Nat., discovered because it is quoted twice as X, cf. In de Anima, Bk. I, locut. 1 and Bk. III, locut. 11. This finished before 1271-72. Since Themistius' commentary is quoted and since Wm. of Oberboks finished his translation of this work November 22, 1267, the In de Anima must have been written between 1267 and 1272.

R.B.--The dates of the translations of Themistius' commentaries help in dating Thomas' works. Before these translations were made, Thomas quoted Themistius from Averroes' works. Cf. M. De Corbe, 'Themistius et saint Thomas d'Aquin, Contribution a l'étude des sources et de la chronologie du commentaire de saint Thomas sur le De anima', Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire

du moyen age, VII, 1952, pp. 47-83, and a refutation (with which Father Eschmann agrees) by G. Verbeke, 'Les sources et la chronologie du commentaire de St. Thomas d'Aquin sur *De Anima d'Aristote*', Revue Philosophique de Louvain, 1947, pp. 314-338. De Court maintains that Themistius is quoted by Thomas from the Noerbeke translation in Book I and not in Books II and III. He also dates the Noerbeke translation in 1268 following the conclusions of A. Birkenmajer, 'Kleinere Thomasfragen', Philosophisches Jahrbuch, XIXIV, 1921, pp. 31-49. Verbeke refutes De Court on both scores and proves that the Noerbeke translation is used in Books II and III and that this translation was finished in November, 1267, because it is used by St. Thomas in De spiritualibus creaturis, q. 10, a; De malo, q. 16, a. 12, a4 l; and S. Theol., I, q. 79, a. 4, q. Therefore the In die omnia dates can be narrowed down to 1267-1270.

c.) In octo libros physiologum expositione

This is a complete commentary on eight books.

Cf. A. Mansion, 'La théorie aristotélicienne du temps chez les peripatéticiens médiévaux', Revue neoscholastique de philosophie, XXVI, 1934, p. 275 ff; P. Falster, N.d.s., 'Die Verarbeitungen der aristotelischen Metaphysik in den

Werken des hl. Thomas von Aquin^o, Gregoriana, Rome, XVII,
1936, pp. 377-406, esp. pp. 393 ff. In the ms. Met.
is always XI, therefore the terminus ad quem is 1271.
Here again there is a variation of the translation used,
first a Vetus, then William's. Most probable dates are
1267-1270. From an internal criticism of the doctrine of
"time", Mancion puts the date at 1268.

a.) In libris de caelo et mundo expositione

An unfinished work, Thomas wrote up to Book III,
lect. 8. Peter of Alvernia wrote the remainder. Cf. H.
Oetmann, Werke, p. 265.

Chronology:

William of Moerbeke's translation of Simplicius
on De Caelo was finished in June, 1271, and since St. Thomas
shows a much better grasp of Simplicius than he did in the
Met., the De Caelo was written after the Met.. All quotes
of Met. call it III. In 1274 after St. Thomas' death
the faculty of arts at Paris wrote to Naples asking for
some manuscripts that had been in Thomas' possession; among
others they asked for Simplicius' De Caelo. Therefore the
De Caelo of Thomas must have been written at Naples after
1272.

(e) In librum de generatione et corruptione,
expositio; cf. Grabmann, Berke, p. 264. Unfinished.
 Thomas wrote up to Bk. I, lect. 17, the remainder is
 probably by Thomas of Sutton.

Chronology: William of Tecco says he saw
 Thomas working on this commentary at Naples. Other evi-
 dence agrees. Nat. is always quoted as XII. There-
 fore at Naples, 1272.

(f) In Librum Hebreorum expositio,
 unfinished. Thomas wrote up to Bk. IX, lect. 10, Bks.
 XI and XII by Peter of Alvernia, Bk. IV by John of Paris.
 Cf. W. Grabmann, Berke, pp. 264-265. Dates at Naples,
 1272-1273.

(g) In Librum de Sensu et Sensato expositio
 cf. an excellent article by A. Mansion, 'Le commentaire
 de S. Thomas sur le "De Sensu et Sensato" d'Aristote.
 Utilisation d'Alexandre d'Aphrodise', Mémoires Mandancourt,
 I, 1930, pp. 83-102. Written in conjunction with the
In de Anima and shortly after.

(h) In Librum de Memoria et Reminiscencia
expositio: Fr. Kochmann says this work written under the
 same circumstances and time as the previous one. Cf.
 Mansion's article.

(l) In I & II libros peribarmonitis expositio:

cf. H. Grabmann, Werke, pp. 260-261. An unfinished work; up to bk. II, lect. 3 by St. Thomas, the rest by Cajetan in the sixteenth century. In bk. I, lect. 3, there is a reference to Heg. as XI, therefore this work began before 1271. The letter from the faculty of arts at Paris mentioned above also asked for certain logical writings of Thomas begun at Paris but not finished there.

(j) In primis et secundum libros posteriorum

analyticorum expositio: cf. Grabmann, Werke, p. 262. An unfinished work also. No indication of the date. Mandanet dates both logical works 1269-1271.

(k) In secum libros Etapicorum expositio: cf. A. Pelzer, "Les versions latines des ouvrages de moyens conservés sous le nom d'Aristote en usage au XIII^e siècle", Revue Ecclésiastique de Philosophie, 1921, pp. 316-341 and pp. 370-412. According to Magr. Pelzer there were three main translations:

1. Getung: fragments of Bks. XI and XII.
2. Novi: fragments of Bk. I.
3. Robert Grosseteste's translation made about 1245 and some other miscellaneous fragments.

No, it seems to have been the basic text used by St. Thomas. However, recently E. Vianelloini, "S. Tommaso e l'Ethica Nicomachea", aggiunta di Filosofia Neoplatonica, LXVIII, 1936, pp. 314-328 has proposed the thesis that William of Moerbeke retouched Grossetoto's work and this was what Thomas used. This opinion is not certain, according to Mr. Grabmann. Cf. Leuckel, Ed., The Vulgate Text of St. Thomas Commentary on the Ethics, Gregorianum, XVII, 1936, pp. 418-426 for a treatment of the printed editions and their critical value.

Chronology:

Grabmann says it is the first Aristotelian commentary. The most probable date is 1260-1269.

(1) In librum Politicorum expositio: cf. Grabmann, Werke, pp. 267-268. Hardly any literary studies have been made. An unfinished work. Thomas completed up to Bk. III, locc. 6 incl. The remainder was done by Peter of Alvernia. Printed texts of this work are in very bad shape. St. Thomas used William of Moerbeke's translation, which was completed ca. 1260 and no other. Grabmann dates this commentary very late, i.e. 1272 or later.

H.B.--The Big Four among the commentaries are the only

finished works, In lib. de Anima, Eth., and Phys. In general, we may say that they have the earlier dates. The other commentaries are unfinished and should be dated after the Big Four, i.e., at the end of the second Paris sojourn and at Naples.

(n, In liberum de causis expositio; cf. Grabmann, Werke, p. 260.) This work is usually printed among the Opuscula but this is an error. It belongs at the end of the Aristotelian corpus, not because Aristotle wrote it but because it rounds out the corpus composed by Thomas on philosophy. Thomas never believed that Aristotle wrote this book. In 1268 when William of Moerbeke translated the Elements of Theology of Proclus, Thomas knew where the Liber de causa came from. The Liber is practically taken from the Elements of Theology. Now since the Liber was translated after 1268 and since Thomas always quotes Met. cc. XII, the commentary was written after the In Met. Lib. after 1271 or 1272 and this is its natural place as a completion of the corpus philosophicum envisioned by Thomas.

Q. B. -- To what extent can you quote St. Thomas' commentator on the true thought of the Master. According to

Father Edmund, not as a matter of fact but as a matter of security only when the quotation is backed up by a parallel quotation from Thomas' personal writings.

General References

- (1) H. Pirenne, La question Alexie de Brabant et le "Pseudo-Aquino" d'Amiens. In: S. Thomas d'Aquin, Revue neoscolastique de philosophie, Vol. 30, (1928), pp. 193-200.
- (2) Pierre Mandonnet, O.P., Des écrits authentiques de S. Thomas d'Aquin, 2nd edition, Fribourg, 1910.
- (3) Pierre Mandonnet, O.P., Les "Opuscules" de S. Thomas d'Aquin, Introduction to Tractatus de Anima, (1927), Paris, vol. I, pp. I - LIII.
- (4) Dr. Martin Grabmann, Die Maxime des heiligen Thomas von Aquin, Münster, (1931)
- (5) P. Synave, O.P., Le Catalogue Officiel des Ouvrages de S. Thomas d'Aquin, Archives d'Historie doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age, Vol. III, (1938), pp. 25-103.
- (6) P. Glorieux, Le Contre immanentes de S. Thomas. Ses sources. Non plus., Mélanges Mandonnet, Vol. I, pp. 31-21.
- (7) P. Glorieux, Les polémiques "contra Geraldinos". Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale, Vol. VI, 1934, pp. 5-41.
This article is very good and is to be recommended.
- (8) K. Schleyer, Disputes scolastiques sur les états de l'aristotéisme. Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale, Vol. 10, 1938, pp. 279-293.
- (9) K. Schleyer, Anfänge des Gallikanismus im 13. Jahrhundert. Der Bilderdienst des französischen Klavus gegen die Trivallation der Latitudinaires. Historische Studien 314, Berlin 1937.

- (10) Bierbaum (editor), *Ratiocinio und Wahrnehmung bei der Universität Paris*, Franziskanische Studien, Beihert II, Münster 1930, pp. 320 sq. XIV-8
- (11) P. Glorieux, *Contre Geraldinos. L'enseignement des Polémiques*, Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, Vol. 7, 1935, pp. 139 sq.
- This article contains a very good chronological resume.
- (12) P. Glorieux, *Pour ou contre le "De Perfectione"*, Vie Spirituelle, Vol. 23, 1930, Suppl., pp. 193-210.
- (13) O. Ottaviano, *Saggio contro la Dottrina Avicenniana dell'Unità dell'Intelligenza*, trad. prof. e note (sime tr. lat.), Lanciano, 1930.
- (14) P. Peuster, S.J., *De concordantia dictorum Thomae*, *Een eerste werk aus den letzten Lebensjahren des heiligen Thomas*, Gregoriana, Vol. 4, 1923, pp. 75-105.
- (15) P. Mandonnet, O.P., on the same subject as above, Bulletin Thomiste, Vol. I, 1924, pp. 71 sq.
- (16) J. B. McAllister, *The letter of saint Thomas Aquinas De operibus operibus naturae et operibus militum ultramontium*, Philosophical Studies, Catholic University of America, No. 42, Washington, 1939.
- (17) O. Lottin, O.S.B., *Le peche original chez Albert le Grand, Bonaventure et Thomas d'Aquin*, Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, Vol. 12, 1940, pp. 310, Ann. 64.
- (18) A. Motte, O.P., *Un chapitre inauthentique dans le Compendium theologiae de St. Thomas*, Revue Thomiste, Vol. 48, 1939, pp. 749-55.

- (19) M. de Bargas y Mazo, Es de Santa Tomas el tratado de los principios? Anales de la Academia de ciencias morales y politicas; Vol. 43, 1933, pp. 369-384, 385-394; Vol. 44, 1933, pp. 41-60.

The Nature of an *Opusculum*

The concept of *opusculum* in current usage does not add to the glory of Thomistic philology and scholarship. *Opusculum* has come to mean a nondescript medley, a Thomistic grab-bag. The lack of description is due to the editors of St. Thomas. Are the commentaries on the Liber de Causis and on the de Divinis Nominibus to be considered as *opuscula*?

Opuscula are occasional writings or decisions on particular questions or controversies in which St. Thomas took part. For example, the Duchess of Brabant asked St. Thomas how to deal with the Jews. Thomas' answering work is an *opusculum* because it is an occasional writing. Consult the article by K. Pirenne.

Other examples of *opuscula* are furnished by the controversy at the University of Paris at the time St. Thomas became a Master of theology. William of St. Amour raised strong objections to religious studying theology. In 1269 Gerard of Abbeville enlarged the same controversy. St. Thomas intervened formally as a Master in quodlibet VII, article 12, "Utrum presbyteri parochiales sint majoria

perfectionis quam religiosi", (which is entirely against Gerard of Abbeville); consult also *Huiusmae*, q. 194, a. 3, "UTERUM presbyteri curati et archidiocenzi sint majoris perfectionis quam religiosi". However St. Thomas also intervened in the controversy by means of monographic accounts which were not academic, namely, the following *opuscula*: *Contra impugnatores Dei cultus et religionem* (1256-57), *De perfectione vites spiritualis* (1269), *Contra peccatorum doctrinam retrahentium homines a religionis ingressu* (1270).

The Authenticity of the Opuscula

1) Introduction

The question of the authenticity of the opuscula is complicated. For instance, in the Opera Omnia of Vives genuine and spurious works are intermingled, e.g., *de Fato* (Albert the Great), *de Eruditione Principum* (Cuielamus de Peraldo?), *de Ursie* (Aegidius de Lessines). Again, in volume one of his collection of opuscula, Mandonnet publishes as presumably genuine four entire books of the de Decimis Principiis, although he knows only part of the work is genuine.

2) The Problem

We might sum up the problem of the authenticity of the opuscula as follows. Mandonnet published his first book on the authenticity of St. Thomas' works in 1910 (in which he

also considered the authenticity of the opuscula), and treated in particular the authenticity of the opuscula in the introduction to his 1926 edition of them. In this 1926 edition of the opuscula he divided them into three classes: genuine, vix dubia, and fusaria.

The genuine (vol. 1 - philosophica; vol. 2, 3, 4, pp. 1-503 - theologica) are admitted as genuine by all with two exceptions (of which Mandoumet was conscious). The last part of the De Regimine Principiorum, beginning from "Quia ut Seneca dicit.." bk. 2, ch. 4, p. 383 to the end of bk. 4 on p. 437, is not genuine. The De Secreto (vol. 4, p. 497-501) is not a work of St. Thomas but a transcript of several Masters at the Chapter General of 1363. Thomas, on pages 500, 501, makes two small remarks in the consultation.

The vix dubia are de propositionibus modalibus, de fallacie, de modo studiorum, pisa praeceps. These works (with the exception of the pisa praeceps) were considered spurious by Mandoumet in 1910, but he changed his opinion on them to vix dubia by 1926. Other critical opinions about these works are divergent.

The fusaria are 26 works. Of these, 9 works are considered genuine by critics. They are de quadruplici oppositio, de demonstratione, de natura accidentis, de natura experientia, de instantiis, de principio individuationis, de verbo (de natura verbi intellectus), de differentia verbi divini et humani, de natura materialia (et dimensionibus interminatis).

3) Mendonnet's Theory

Mendonnet's fundamental point is that one catalogue has outstanding authority. This catalogue of Bartholomew of Capua he calls the official catalogue. This catalogue is included in Bartholomew's deposition at the canonization proceedings. According to Mendonnet, at least the root of this catalogue, if not the catalogue itself, is due to Regino of Piperno who drew up this catalogue of authentic works at the request of Dominican Superiors. With this as a basis, Mendonnet concludes that in general every work in the official catalogue is authentic, any work not in the official catalogue is spurious. Thus the 24 works referred to above are spurious because they are not found in the official catalogue, although the 9 mentioned above are found in some manuscript collections and in some of the other catalogues. The works which Mendonnet labelled xix-xx Austria, are not found in the official catalogue but he admits them because of other reasons.

Mendonnet proposed his theory in 1910, and in 1927 he gave a fuller and more substantiated theory of the evolution of the manuscript tradition. He divided this evolution into four stages.

The first stage was the primitive stage containing 25 opuscula. These 25 opuscula are not only found in the official catalogue, but are also copied and bound in one volume. Thus the manuscript 19-15 of the Chapter Library of Toledo contains

the same opuscula as the official catalogue and in the same order. The manuscript, written by an Italian, is dated from the middle of the 14th century. However this is seemingly the one and only example of such a collection which we have. The manuscript of San Marco, Venice, contains the same opuscula but in a different order, is of the early 15th century, and seems to belong to the same family as the other manuscript.

The second stage added seven other works, which were listed elsewhere in the catalogue of Bartholomew, to the original 25, bringing the total to 32. Mandonnet attempts to give some documentary evidence for this stage. The works added were Super Dicayalium De divinis regnibus, Super Postuum de hebdomatibus, Super Postuum de Trinitate, Collationes De Pater Noster, Collationes de Credo in Deum, Collationes De deo omnipotens, Collationes de Ave Maria.

The third stage was the addition of seven spurious (according to Mandonnet) opuscula toward the end of the thirteenth century. These works are not listed in the official catalogue, but are mentioned by Ptolemy of Lucca and Bernard Guiotus. They are De instantibus, De natura verbi intellectus, De principiis individuationis, De natura exteris, De natura accidentium, De natura exterioris et dimensionibus interminatis, De quatuor oppositionibus. Mandonnet thinks that these works may have been written by Thomas Sutton, O.P. As evidence, Mandonnet referred to the manuscripts Vat. Lat. 307, and St. Geneviève 219.

The fourth stage ends with the last years of the 15th century by which time there were 72 gruscula. These 72 gruscula went into the printed Piana edition of 1570-2, the principle seemingly being, the more St. Thomas, the better.

4) Grabmann's Theory

Grabmann has extensively criticized the theory of Father Mandonnet. Grabmann says that the manuscript tradition presents collections of gruscula, which go back roughly to the end of the 13th century. Some of these collections include, and some exclude the gruscula in question. Grabmann does not think that any one collection of gruscula is better than another, and that hence all have equal probability. Therefore Grabmann concludes that Mandonnet's theory is not proven by the manuscript evidence, and that for the time being the non-authenticity of the problematic gruscula is not proven.

5) Synave's Theory

Father Synave does not think that the official catalogue has anything to do with Reginald of Piperno, but rather is a list of actual university books at the Parisian stationers in 1270. Hence the official catalogue does not have the exclusive authority attributed to it by Mandonnet, but rather reflects the books of Thomas actually available at the Stationers in 1270. Consequently it is true that almost every item in the official catalogue is authentic, but it is false that every item not there is spurious.

Father Synave also asks the question, "which came first,

the catalogue or the collection of manuscripts?" He thinks that the collection of manuscripts came first, and that the catalogue came second.

6) Father Bachmann's Opinion

Before Father Mandonnet, the older editors tried to determine the authenticity of a work by intrinsic evidence. Thus Cajetan says that "de natura materiae repugnat doctrina St. Thomas, ergo non est acceptio". Some moderns still use the same technique. Thus Poluni-Gassolin decided that de principio individuationis is spurious because of its doctrine. Similarly, Fr. I. N. Bochenek, O.P., in his article in the Revue des sciences philosophiques et theologiques (1937, p. 673 sq.) decided that the De Propositionibus Mentalibus is spurious because of intrinsic evidence. Again, Ferrier's first volume of the Oeuvres (1949) seems to use largely intrinsic criteria of authenticity.

In general, such intrinsic considerations are not valid here. If it is certain that a work is genuine from extrinsic, historical evidence, then no intrinsic evidence can change that judgment. It is difficult to see how you can judge the authenticity of a work on the basis of whether it is worthy of St. Thomas. Intrinsic evidence might constitute a basis for a chronological order, for a development of doctrine, e.g., from Sermonum to the Summa.

It is Mandonnet who first tried to remove the problem of authenticity from the realm of inner criticism to that of external criticism. He attempted the problem scientifically and methodically.

In general, no Thomistic expert of the present day holds Mandneret's principles (about the official catalogue, etc.) although they accept many of his conclusions. Father Eschmann thinks that Grabmann's position is the only tenable one for the time being.

As regards synave's position, Father Eschmann thinks that if the official catalogue was a stationer's list, there should be some evidence of the media in the collection of manuscripts. Again, Father Eschmann is not so sure that the collection of manuscripts came before the catalogue. Perhaps some one wanted a copy of the manuscripts, listed in that catalogue.

In this whole problem of authenticity, Father Eschmann's position is as follows. Authenticity in the medieval sense is not a univocal concept. Because you have a critical text of St. Thomas, you cannot therefore conclude that every word was written by St. Thomas. Such a conclusion is manifestly false since we have Expectationes of St. Thomas, which are certainly authentic, but not written by him, cf. Lectura in Matthaeum. Consequently we must conclude that authenticity in the medieval sense of the term means something quite different.

The problem of authenticity is especially acute in the posthumous works of St. Thomas. These works were clearly not edited by Thomas. Most of the grauula fall into this category. These works (answers of St. Thomas to letters, etc.) were gradually collected after his death and put into one volume. The persons who drew up the first apograph of St. Thomas grauula,

were not particularly bright. They made their mistakes. We can use such opuscula as authentic works of St. Thomas. However we are not thereby authorized to use every word and sentence as coming from St. Thomas. For instance, it is legitimate in making a historical demonstration to take one sentence from the Sermo contra Gentiles, and one sentence from the Sermones Theologici, and to contrast their doctrine and expression. However such a procedure is not justified with many of the opuscula of St. Thomas, e.g., with the De Principio Individuationis. In other words, we have an authentic text of some opuscula but we cannot use this text as we could that of the S.G.G.

A few of the opuscula were edited by St. Thomas and circulated during his lifetime. These texts are as authentic as any texts we have of St. Thomas. Such are the De Unitate Intellectus, Contre instrumentia Deli cultum et religionem, De perfectione virtutis spiritualis, Contre peccatorum doctrinam retrophantium hominem a religione irragegnus.

Summing up, then, let us remember that a demonstration of authenticity in some cases will not justify us in saying that every word of the authentic text is from St. Thomas.

Printed Editions of the Opuscula

Here we shall consider the printed editions of the opuscula, outside of the various opera omnia.

- 1) P. Mandonnet, O.P., Opuscula omnia genuina quidem nec non spuria melioris notae debito ordine collecta, Paris, (Lethieilloux), 1927, 5 volumes. (a corrected reprint of the Lethieilloux edition of 1881).

- 2) Jean Perrier, O.P., Opuscula omnia recentia opera minora.
Vol. I, Opuscula philosophica, Paris, (Lethieilloux), 1949.

This edition was made under war conditions and the editor had access only to Parisian manuscripts. What the editor should have done, would have been to take the printed text and correct it with the Parisian manuscripts. Nobody could have asked for more.

What the editor actually did, was to take the Parisian manuscript, Bibl. Nat. Cat. 14340, and make it the basis of his text. He dates the manuscript incorrectly from 1280. Therefore he considers this manuscript, not only the best of the Parisian manuscripts, but the best of all possible manuscripts (he misunderstands Mandonnet on this point). Consequently he ruthlessly "corrected" the text and so frequently gives some very imaginative corrections. Father Eichmann thinks that Fr. Kaeler's edition is a better piece of work.

- 3) Roland-Goscelin, O.P., la "De ente et essentia" de S. Thomas d'Aquin, Bibliothèque Thomiste, Vol. 2, Le Sculhoir, Reim, 1926.

This edition is based on one Parisian manuscript.

- 4) Ludwig Daur, De ente et essentia opusculum, Opus. et textus, Series Schol. I, Munster, 1926.

This is the best edition of this work.

- 5) I. Rossi, Expositio Salutationis Angelicae, Divus Thomas (Piac.), Vol. 39, (1931) pp. 445-479.

- 6) P. Castagnoli, C.M., L'opusculo "De forma solutionis" di San Tommaso d'Aquin, Divus Thomas (Piac.), Vol. 36, (1933)

pp. 300-416.

This editor puts in every variant of St manuscripts. This is not the idea of a critical edition, namely, to list every variant, including the errors of stupid scribes. Only those variants should be listed which indicate your theory of the family of manuscripts.

- 7) L. W. Koeler, S.J., De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas, ad. critica, (Text. et Doc. Series philos., 12) Rome (Univ. Gregor.), 1936.

This is not properly a critical edition.

Contre impugnantes Doi cultum et religionem

De perfectione vita spiritualia.

Contre postularem doctrinam retrahentium horumque a religionis incremento

These proposita constitute a coherent group on the value of the religious life, on the juridical and moral position of mendicant friars. The occasion of these proposita began shortly after 1250, namely, whether the Franciscan and Dominican friars should teach in the University. Gradually the controversy spread to include the authority of the Pope over the bishops, the jurisdiction of bishops, etc.

The controversy was touched off in apocalyptic fashion by William of St. Amour (a professor of the University of Paris) in his article, De Periculis Novissimorum Temporum. Some historians see here the beginning of Millenarianism. On this point consult Schleyer and Bierbaum.

St. Thomas answered William of St. Amour in his Contra impugnatoem cultum et religionem, which we can definitely date as September, 1268.

St. Thomas answered Gerard of Abbeville in his De Perfectione Vitae Spiritualis. Ch. 1-30 are from 1269, Ch. 31-38 are from January, 1270.

St. Thomas answered Nicholas of Lisieux (among others) in his Contra positionem doctrinam retractantium hominem a religione in October, 1270. Nicholas of Trivet entitles this work Contra doctrinam Coroldinorum et retractantium a religione.

The opposition to the friars in Paris was very strong at this time. The controversy started with the right of the friars to teach at the University. The controversy included the notion of sua propria, the right for every one to exercise his own functions on authority received directly from God. On the one side of the controversy were ranged William of St. Amour, Gerard of Abbeville, Nicholas of Lescain, Henry of Ghent; on the other were Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Peckham, Thomas of York.

These works are very important for dating certain questions in the quodlibets of the second Parisian period, which in turn help in dating certain parts of the Summa. They are also helpful in reconstructing the tempo of the second Parisian period.

De Unitate Intellectus

This work is a polemic against the Arabian and Averroistic philosophies.

C. Ottaviano (the "enfant terrible") has tried to assign this work to 1266. However his position has been disproved

and neglected. Practically everybody assigns this work to about 1270.

De Antinomia Mundi Contra Averroistas

This work is against the Averroistic understanding of Aristotle.

The texts of St. Thomas on the eternity of the world have been frequently compared. Pelstу places this work before the prima pars of the Summa. Mandonnet dates this work 1270. Father Neumann prefers Mandonnet's opinion.

De Ente et Essentia

This work is variously entitled; De Cividitate et Regno, De Cividitate Antium, Treatatus de Ente, Treatatus de Essentia, etc.

Ptolomy of Lucca says of this work: "Treatatus de ente et essentia, quem scripsit ad fratres et socios, nondum existens magister."

Roland-Goscelin dates this work as 1254-6.

Sachmann agrees that this is an early work of St. Thomas, and thinks that it is to be coupled with De Principiis Naturae.

De Principiis Naturae et Ceterorum Primitivorum

This is an early writing, 1252-56 (Ptolomy of Lucca).

De Natura Materiali

This work points to the Principia Naturae and presupposes it (Crubmann). Crubmann thinks this work is genuine and dates it 1262-56.

Father Eschmann thinks, as a hypothesis, that all these philosophical groupings should go together in a group.

De Mixtione Elementorum

1273, Mandonnet

De Motu Cordis

1273, Mandonnet

De Cœlūtiō Operatiōibus Naturae

1269-73, Mandonnet

about 1273, Ballister

De Substantia Separata et fratero Beccalum

This work is unfinished and was written during the last years of Thomas' life. Mandonnet dates it 1272-3. This work has very wonderful and advanced doctrine, and is often called De Angelis in the manuscripts.

De Rese

This work is also entitled De Rese et Resu, and less properly De Resu et Principiis.

This work is certainly authentic. The authentic text of Thomas continues up to the words "ut animal hominem rebeatetur" (bk. 2, ch. 4, ed. Vives, vol. 27, p. 360). However Father Eschmann is certain that our text, as it stands, does not come from the pen of Thomas. He bases this opinion on intrinsic reasons: namely, the disorganized, unfinished pieces of the work; the long-winded style in places, not all characteristic

of St. Thomas. Ptolemy of Lusca seemingly finished the work. Consequently Father Eschmann thinks that one should be very careful in using any part of this work in a historical concentration. He thinks that a very incompetent editor assembled it after St. Thomas' death.

In his lectures of 1945 Father Eschmann had this to say about the historical background of this work. This work is dedicated ad regem Cypri. Cyprus in the middle ages was the most important point on the road to the Holy Land. Hence the geographical position of Cyprus explains its cardinal importance in medieval events. Cyprus was a part of the great colonial organization of the Latin Christian Empire in the East. This empire was under the Franks (cf. William Müller, Cambridge History, Vol. 4, p. 437). The nobles from the West showed a capacity for governing in the 13th and 14th centuries. The Hellenic islands were to them what the English colonies were to the younger sons in England of the 19th century.

In 1191 Henry I of England took Cyprus from the lord despot. He sold the island to the Knights Templars, who in turn sold it to Guy Lusignan, the titular king of Jerusalem. Guy ruled from 1192-1194. Amoris, his brother, succeeded, 1194-1205. From this point on, Cyprus was governed to 1489 by the same dynasty. The Lusignans introduced the feudal system, etc., to the island of Cyprus. Consequently a medieval theologian could speak of common western institutions to such a king. Guy took over the Assizes of Jerusalem, which are really a medieval occidental law-book.

Hugh II was born in 1203 and died in 1267. He was succeeded by his cousin, Hugh the Great, who ruled from 1267-1285. This latter was crowned in 1269 King of Jerusalem, but this was only a title, since Jerusalem was lost in 1264. The Kings of Cyprus assumed this title (King of Jerusalem) long after its fall.

Justiz-Eckard have touched on the chronological problem of this work (Scriptures, Vol. I, p. 337). They say that the King of Cyprus to whom Thomas dedicates his work, is Hugh II. Consequently Thomas' part of this work must have been finished by 1267. Their reasons are as follows. (1) It is more convenient that such a treatise should be addressed to a youngster. (2) Hugh III, by taking on the title of King of Jerusalem in 1269, put himself in conflict with Charles of Anjou. However, Thomas was an intimate friend of Charles of Anjou. Hence Thomas would not have dedicated a work to Charles' enemy. Father Bachmann criticizes these reasons as follows. (1) A Master man was more likely to want to read a treatise on government. In 1269, King Louis (then 24 years a king) asked a Franciscan to write letters de conditione regum et principium. Thomas' book is a theologian's opinion on the nature of government and is not de conditione or pedagogical in character. (2) St. Thomas' friendship with Charles of Anjou is not substantiated by any known fact. Charles of Anjou did ask the Dominicans to send Thomas to the University of Naples, but this request was an act of high politics, and not of intimate friendship.