

Jean-Pierre Torrell, O.P.



SAINT
THOMAS
AQUINAS

VOLUME I
THE PERSON
AND HIS WORK

Translated by Robert Royal

**Saint Thomas Aquinas:
Volume 1**

**Saint Thomas Aquinas:
Volume 1**

The Person and His Work

translated by
Robert Royal

JEAN-PIERRE TORRELL, O.P.

The Catholic University of America Press
Washington, D.C.

Originally published as *L'Initiation à Saint Thomas d'Aquin: Sa personne et son oeuvre* by Editions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse and Editions Cerf, Paris.
Copyright © 1993 Editions Cerf Paris.

Copyright © 1996
The Catholic University of America Press
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standards for Information Science—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

∞

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Torrell, Jean-Pierre.
[Initiation à Saint Thomas d'Aquin. English]
Saint Thomas Aquinas, Volume 1 : the person and his work/ Jean-Pierre
Torrell ; translated by Robert Royal.
p. cm.
includes bibliographical references and indexes.
1. Thomas, Aquinas, Saint, 1225?-1274. 2. Christian saints—Italy—
Biography. 3. Theology, Doctrinal—History—Middle Ages. 600–1500.
4. Catholic Church—Doctrines—History. I. Title.
BX4700.T6T5713 1996
230'.2'092—dc20
95-42079

ISBN 0-8132-0852-1 (cloth : alk. paper)

ISBN 0-8132-0853-x (pbk. : alk. paper)

Contents

Foreword	ix
Translator's Preface	xiii
Preface	xv
Abbreviations of Frequently Cited Works	xxiii
I. An Eventful Youth	1
The D'Aquino Family	1
Oblate at Cassino—Studies in Naples	4
Taking the Habit and Its Consequences	8
First Sketch for a Portrait	12
II. Disciple of Albertus Magnus (1245–1252)	18
Paris (1245–1248)	19
Cologne (1248–1252)	24
The Bible and Spirituality: The Super Isaia	27
III. First Teaching Years in Paris (1252–1256)	36
The Bachelor of the Sentences	39
Alia Lectura Fratris Thome	45
Two Opuscula	47
The Inaugural Lecture	50
IV. Magister in Sacra Pagina (1256–1259)	54
Legere: To Comment on the Bible	55
Disputare: The De ueritate	59
Praedicare: Theology and Pastoral Practice	69
V. Defender of Mendicant Religious Life	75
History of a Quarrel	76
The Contra impugnantes	79
The Deperfectione and the Contra retrahentes	84
The Polemicist	90
VI. Return to Italy: The Summa contra Gentiles	96
To Promote Study	96
The Uncertainties of 1259–1261	98

The Date of the Summa contra Gentiles	101
The Purpose of the Contra Gentiles	104
The Summa contra Gentiles: Method and Plan	107
The Contents of the Summa contra Gentiles	111
VII. The Stay in Orvieto (1261–1265)	117
Conventual Lector in Orvieto	118
Commentary on the Book of Job	120
A Theologian Much in Demand	122
De divinis nominibus	127
The Office of Corpus Christi	129
The Catena aurea	136
VIII. The Roman Years (1265–1268): The Beginning of the Summa	142
The Studium at Rome	142
The Summa theologiae	145
The Contents of the Summa	148
The Plan of the Summa theologiae	150
The Place of the Mystery of the Incarnation	153
Theology, Life, and Prayer	156
IX. The Other Writings from the Roman Period	160
The De potentia "cum annexis"	161
The Compendium theologiae	164
Expert Opinions on Some Contemporary Questions	167
The De regno ad regem Cypri	169
The Sententia Libri De anima	171
William of Moerbeke	174
X. The New Sojourn in Paris: Doctrinal Confrontations	179
Date and Place of Thomas's Departure for Paris	179
The Motives for Thomas's Return to Paris	182
The De aeternitate mundi	184
The Unicity of Substantial Form	187
The De unitate intellectus	191
XI. The Second Period of Teaching at Paris (1268–1272)	197
I. Scriptural Commentaries and Disputed Questions	197
The Lectura super Ioannem	198
Disputed Questions: De malo and Others	201
The Quodlibetal Disputes	207
II. Consultations and Diverse Works	212
De Mixtione elementorum; De motu cordis	213
De operationibus occultis naturae	214
De iudiciis astrorum	215
De sortibus	215
De secreto	217
The Letter to the Countess of Flanders	218

The De substantiis separatis	220
The Super Librum De causis	222
XII. The Commentator on Aristotle	224
The Expositio Libri Peryermenias	224
The Expositio Libri Posteriorum	226
The Sententia Libri Ethicorum	227
The Tabula Libri Ethicorum	229
Commentaries on the Physics and the Metaphysics	231
Uncompleted Works	233
Thomas and Aristotle	236
Thomas and His Secretaries	239
XIII. Last Period of Teaching: Naples (1272–1273)	247
The Course on the Pauline Letters	250
The Course on the Psalms	257
The "Life of Jesus"	261
XIV. The Last Months and Death	267
The People Who Knew Thomas	267
Reginald of Piperno	272
Thomas and His Family	275
A Preliminary Portrait	278
A Man of Great Contemplation	283
The Final Illness and Death	289
XV. Difficult Sequels: Cult, Process, Disputes	296
The Beginnings of the Cult	296
March 1277 in Paris	298
Dominicans and Franciscans	303
Defense of Thomas by the Dominican Order	308
Disciples and Confreres	310
XVI. Epilogue: The Canonization in Avignon	317
A Well-Conducted Development	317
The Canonization and Its Consequences	321
Doctor Ecclesiae	324
Brief Chronology	327
Brief Catalogue of the Works of Saint Thomas Aquinas	330
Abbreviations	362
Bibliography	364
Index of the Works of Saint Thomas Aquinas	397
Index of Names	399
Index of Subjects	405

Foreword

In preparing a study of Thomas Aquinas for the *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, Jean-Pierre Torrell found it necessary to review and summarize the most recent data about Aquinas's life and works, because continuing research, including his own and that by members of the Leonine Commission, has modified many points since the major work of James Weisheipl.¹ The present volume greatly expands the first section of the article, leaving for another volume, now being prepared, a similar expansion of the second part of the article, which presents Aquinas's spiritual doctrine.

Not that Thomas's spirituality is absent from this first volume. On the contrary: as the subtitle and introduction make clear, Torrell's aim is to do more than discuss dating of Aquinas's life and works or summarize his works and doctrine. While presenting the person of Thomas Aquinas in his complete family, social, and intellectual context, Torrell goes considerably beyond Weisheipl's study by ably bringing out the spiritual dimension of Aquinas's life as a Dominican religious dedicated to handing on to others what he had experienced in his faith-rooted contemplation, mystical as well as intellectual. That is, he gives us a picture of Thomas's own lived spirituality together with insights into his spiritual doctrine, which will be presented more fully in the second volume. Thus he follows Thomas's numerous journeys about France and Italy on his Dominican apostolate

¹ See J.-P. Torrell, "Thomas d'Aquin," *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 15 (1991) cols. 718–73. Compare J. A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino: His Life, Thought, and Works*, 2d ed. (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1983). The second edition did not alter the main text of the original 1974 volume but provided some new material in a brief appendix. *Albert & Thomas: Selected Writings*, The Classics of Western Spirituality (New York-Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1988), trans., ed., introd. Simon Tugwell, is a more recent discussion of questions concerning the dating of Thomas's life and writings. Torrell takes account of these as well as of earlier works in his own study. As will be indicated, his work has a much wider scope than either of these.

of intellectual ministry, portraying him as a dedicated religious and scholar nearly overwhelmed by his zealous devotion to this calling, yet vigorous and lively in defense of the faith and of the legitimate role of reason. Through Torrell's eyes we see Thomas as a man of prayer, a warm friend to many confreres and others, a loyal and sometimes deeply involved member of his family.

Jean-Pierre Torrell's own intellectual and spiritual apostolate has prepared him well for this. A Dominican of the Toulouse province, his search for a theology flowing from and reflecting a deeply experienced life of faith led him to prepare a thesis for the lectorate in philosophy and theology on the nature and method of theology, a study that incorporated his vision of how theologians should proceed.² He then went to Le Saulchoir, the studium of the Dominican province of Paris, where he received the doctorate after completing his dissertation on the theology of the episcopate at the First Vatican Council.³ Returning to his province to teach fundamental theology for the next twenty years, he also regularly examined in the *Revue Thomiste* books and articles on theology and its methodology, adding his own critiques and enriching his reviews with his own insights. A number of his personal writings reveal his deep concern that the theological endeavor should not be restricted to purely intellectual inquiry but should begin with and terminate in a life of living faith and holiness.⁴

Wishing to pursue the historical background of Thomas Aquinas's theology, Torrell undertook a second doctorate at the Université de Montréal. His dissertation dealt with earlier thirteenth-century discussions of the theology of prophecy, a topic that led him to examine the philosophy of knowledge at that time and eventually helped him to develop important new views about Christ's human knowledge.⁵ It also led to his fruitful col-

² *La notion intégrale de Sacra Doctrina chez S. Thomas d'Aquin* (Toulouse: Studium Dominicain de la Province de Toulouse, 1959).

³ It has been published as *La théologie de l'épiscopat au premier concile du Vatican* ("Unam Sanctam," 37; Paris: Cerf, 1961).

⁴ Too numerous to be listed here, these writings may be found in the bibliography of his publications given in *Ordo Sapientiae et Amoris: Image et message de saint Thomas d'Aquin à travers les récentes études historiques, herméneutiques et doctrinales: Hommage au Professeur JeanPierre Torrell OP à l'occasion de son 65e anniversaire*, ed. Carlos-Josaphat Pinto de Oliveira, O.P., Studia Friburgensia: Nouvelle Série, 78 (Fribourg, Suisse: Editions Universitaires, 1993).

⁵ This dissertation was published as *Théorie de la prophétie et philosophie de la connaissance aux environs de 1230*, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense 40 (Louvain, 1977). The important article on Christ's human knowledge, which appeared after publication of the French edition of the present volume, is "S. Thomas d'Aquin et la science du Christ: Une relecture des questions 9–12 de la <<Tertia Pars>> de la Somme de Théologie," in *Saint Thomas au XX^e siècle: Actes du*

(footnote continued on next page)

laboration with Dr. Denise Bouthillier, from which issued several studies of Peter the Venerable and other matters.⁶ Because his Montréal thesis involved a great deal of text editing, he was asked to become a member of the Leonine Commission and collaborate with its research on and editing of Aquinas's works; this he did while also teaching a graduate course in theology for eight years at the Gregorian University in Rome. His experience on the Leonine Commission until he was called to be professor of theology at the Université de Fribourg in Switzerland and his continuing close association with members of the commission have given him a unique opportunity to give us the most thorough and critical study of Aquinas's person, life and works that we have at present.

Torrell's many new conclusions concerning the life and works of Aquinas will greatly help the endeavor of those concerned to view the works in their historical context and to follow the Angelic Doctor's personal and intellectual development.⁷ Torrell's method of situating and describing each work should help to offset the tendency of some scholars who still treat the entire corpus of Thomas's writings as an undifferentiated whole, with no concern for nuances or for outright changes in his continuously developing teaching.

Readers will appreciate Torrell's careful analysis of the sources, historical and legendary, about Aquinas, and his judgment about their reliability. Among the many fine, frequently new insights he gives to the person of St. Thomas the following may be mentioned: his "first sketch of a portrait," derived from Thomas's childhood, early studies, and Dominican vocation; Aquinas's personal spirituality as seen from his early commentary on Isaiah; his lifelong devotion to his duties, as a master of theology, of commenting on Scripture and of preaching, as well as holding disputations; his passionate defense of mendicant religious life; his own personal views of the vocation of the theologian; the link of his theology with his prayer, including his Eucharistic piety; his devotion to the Fathers; his patient humility combined with energetic defense of his sometimes unique tenets in debates during his second Parisian regency.

(footnote continued from previous page)

colloque du Centenaire de la "Revue thomiste," 25–28 mars 1993—Toulouse, ed. Serge-Thomas Bonino (Paris: Saint-Paul, 1994) 394–409.

⁶ Some of the fruits of these studies and research are indicated in this volume's bibliography under Torrell's name. Others can be found in the bibliography indicated in the previous note.

⁷ His new conclusions about the place and dating of Thomas's works, with attention to his movements about Italy, France, and Germany, have been summarized, together with a few critical remarks, in my article, "An Important New Study of Thomas Aquinas: Jean-Pierre Torrell's *Initiation à saint Thomas d'Aquin*," *The Thomist* 58/3 (July 1994) 489–99.

Of great interest are Torrell's description of Aquinas's work habits, including the way he used secretaries, and his pointing out Thomas's greater emphasis, in his teaching in his later years, on the role of affectivity. Thomas's last months of life and his death receive a fresh review based on careful examination of many witnesses about the events, about his relations with his family, and about his personal holiness. Thomas's daring originality is brought out clearly in the final two chapters as they follow the controversies about his teachings, the condemnations of a few of his positions, and the canonization process some years later.

Because Torrell is himself a theologian and because he looks at the whole person and life of Aquinas, he is able to present an accurate picture of the Angelic Doctor as the theologian he was and intended to be—a scholar who, while more philosophically innovative than is immediately evident (his abundant use of Aristotelian vocabulary masks both his profoundly new doctrine of *esse* and his appropriation of elements of Neoplatonism), nevertheless advanced these philosophical insights for the sake of theology. This was true even of his commentaries on Aristotle, which he developed in order to offset the inroads against the Christian faith that he felt bound to oppose as a Christian theologian. Some professed followers of Aquinas tend to confine their interest to a "thomistic" philosophy amputated from its theological setting and intent, an operation that often deprives his thought of its vitality and interest. It is to be hoped that Torrell's more comprehensive view will help them to establish a better equilibrium in their approach to his work, will help them appreciate the living faith and deep mystical and theological experience within which Aquinas developed his most important insights.

For those wishing a quick view of Torrell's conclusions on individual works of Aquinas, the catalogue at the end will be useful. But it would be a great loss to restrict oneself to that, for then one would fail to experience the lucidity of Torrell's presentation of the context of Thomas Aquinas's works as well as his richly colored portrait of the person of the Angelic Doctor.

WALTER PRINCIPE, C.S.B.

FELLOW EMERITUS, PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

Translator's Preface

"While safeguarding the meaning of the truths that he translates, [the good translator] ought to adapt his style to the genius of the language in which he is expressing it."
Contra errores graecorum, Prologue

Saint Thomas's advice, quoted above, states the cardinal principle of all translation: translation is concerned with the expression of truth. But having acknowledged that lucid ideal, the translator finds that other factors immediately intervene. The relationship between truth and the language in which it is expressed is neither neat nor constant. At times, two languages may permit an almost algebraic equivalence of thought. At others, literal equivalence will be misleading. At still others, it almost appears that reality itself is slightly different depending on the language we are using to describe it. A good translation can only attempt to be as faithful, in every sense of the word, to the original as is humanly possible. I have tried, therefore, in this text to present what I think Father Torrell would have said were he a native English speaker.

Nora bene: In almost every instance, I have translated Father Torrell's quotations of works by Saint Thomas and others from the French as it appeared in his text rather than give the standard English translation. This seemed advisable for several reasons. Aquinas's Latin is notoriously spare, and most translations into the modern languages amplify it somewhat to convey its meaning better. Clearly, these amplifications may differ quite a bit from one language to the next. Torrell often develops arguments on the basis of expressions that appear in the French, but not, or not so clearly, in the standard English translation. If this creates some confusion on the part of those who turn from Torrell's penetrating analyses to the various English versions of Saint Thomas, they might do well to consult Thomas's

Latin or to appraise Torrell's comments in the larger context of the works he discusses. As someone who has had to examine these questions carefully for the sake of accuracy, I am convinced of the remarkable precision and depth he brings to bear at every point.

A final point: Working closely with another person's words enables one to appreciate something about their spirit. Father Torrell speculates at times about Thomas's motives and affections in writing certain works. In most authors, such speculations often have an air of unreality. In Torrell, the reflections on Thomas the man illuminate the complex and muchneglected questions in a convincing way. This has something to do with Torrell's similarity to Thomas in his search for the entire truth on the basis of all the evidence we have available to us. Like Thomas, Torrell wears his scholarship lightly and draws new meaning from the massive material he examines. He is the perfect author for the companion volume that he indicates in the Preface he is preparing and that will explore Thomas's teaching on the spiritual life.

I wish to thank Russell Hittinger, who first suggested this project to me. Bartholomew de la Torre, O.P., carefully went over the translation and, as he has done in various ways over many years of friendship, saved me from many errors. Romanus Cessario, O.P., provided several useful suggestions. David McGonagle of The Catholic University of America Press made the inevitable practical difficulties in producing this manuscript far less problematic than they might have been. Susan Needham, also of the CUA Press, has contributed an editor's sense of good English along with an appreciation for nuances in the French.

ROBERT ROYAL
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Preface

The main sources for Saint Thomas's life have been conveniently assembled in the *Fontes vitae S. Thomae Aquinatis*, thanks to the labors of two Dominicans: Dominique Prümmer and Marie-Hyacinthe Laurent. To the former, who began this undertaking at the start of the twentieth century, we owe the edition of the three oldest biographies: William of Tocco, Bernard Gui, and Peter Calo. To the latter, who finished the job before World War II, we owe the publication of the depositions by the witnesses at the canonization proceedings in Naples and Fossanova, in addition to a bunch of documents that gather together extracts from ancient chronicles or charters having to do with Thomas or the Aquinas family.

Though not all these texts meet the requirements of a critical edition as we understand that term today, the collection is one of the most useful, particularly if you do not have at hand the original documents, which are in many cases hard to find. More recently, Angelo Ferrua has reprinted some of these texts (Tocco, Gui, and Naples primarily), and there also exists a French translation of Tocco's biography and of the depositions from the proceedings at Naples.¹

In addition to the major documents, we have a certain number of "episodic anecdotes," thanks to Thomas of Cantimpré, Gérard de Frachet, and Tolomeo degli Fiadoni, better known by the name Tolomeo of Lucca. Cantimpré and Frachet were Thomas's contemporaries, but the first is hardly trustworthy and the second is more interested in Thomas's visions than in his life. As to the third, Tolomeo was Thomas's student in Naples 1272–74; a historian by profession, he finished his *Historia ecclesiastica* before Thomas's canonization and, though we must always verify his assertions, he still represents an original source.²

¹ All bibliographical references can be found in the list of abbreviations.

² For a fuller presentation of these authors and the earlier ones, we can still consult with

(footnote continued on next page)

With their usual critical sureness, the Bollandists had already ascribed to William of Tocco first place among the saint's biographers. In spite of an attempt at the beginning of this century to give priority to Bernard Gui or Peter Calo,³ Tocco must be preferred. Our approach to this question has been newly stimulated by Claire Le Brun-Gouanvic who has published, under the direction of Hugues-Vincent Shooner, a new critical edition of William's *Ystoria sancti Thorne*.⁴ One of the author's most interesting results is establishing the evidence, on the basis of late but trustworthy manuscripts, for four successive versions of this text, which William reworked up to the last moment, i.e., until Thomas's canonization, 18 July 1323, since "he lived at least until the month of August 1323." The third version was the one published by the Bollandists and Prümmer, but "the fourth version carries numerous additions that have remained unpublished until the present." This new edition offers a notably enlarged text and provides "precious information on the unfolding of the canonization process." It also allows us to see that the original features in Bernard Gui, which had earlier earned him special consideration from the historians, in reality come from the fourth version of Tocco. Gui was the first to use that version. His own first version goes back to 1324, his second to 1325–26. As to Calo, he is still later by a few years.⁵

This does not mean that Tocco's work is without blemishes. It does not suffice to say that he did not intend to write a biography in the modern sense of the term; he quite consciously decided to write the life of a saint—a hagiography, if you will, as long as that term does not entirely disqualify the text—where the birth, life, and death of his hero are accompanied by supernatural signs that attest to his greatness. It follows that factual and

(footnote continued from previous page)

profit E. Janssens, "Les premiers historiens de la vie de Saint Thomas d'Aquin," *Revue néoscol. de Phil. de Louvain* 26 (1924) 201–14; 325–52; 452–76.

³ J. A. Endres, "Studien zur Biographie des hi. Thomas v. Aquin," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 29 (1908) 537–58, 774–89; see also the controversy between P. Mandonnet, "Pierre Calo et la légende de S. Thomas," and D. Prümmer, "Quelques observations à propos de la légende de S. Thomas, par Pierre Calo," in *RT* 20 (1912) 508–16, 517–23. Endres's theses have been methodically refuted by F. Pelster, "Die älteren Biographien des hi. Thomas von Aquino. Eine kritische Studie," *ZKT* 44 (1920) 242–74; 366–97. See E. Janssens's article, above note 2, for a similar argument.

⁴ C. Le Brun-Gouanvic, *Edition critique de l' "Ystoria sancti Thorne de Aquino" de Guillaume de Tocco* (dissertation, University of Montreal, 1987), 2 vols.; we will cite this text in what follows, but for the reader's convenience we shall also refer to the edition of Tocco in the *Fontes*.

⁵ His *Vita* of Saint Thomas is inserted into a book of legends that was not finished until some time after 1330. Cf. A. Poncelet, "Le légendier de Pierre Calo," *Anal. Boll.* 29 (1910) 5–116.

chronological data are often neglected or, at best, diluted into vague anecdotes mainly intended to edify. Tocco adds to these three classical elements of ancient and medieval biography a fourth, more original element as he tries to show that this saint was also a teacher. But he allows the thinness of his evidence to show through here. He was hardly well informed about the stays in Paris and Cologne; he was also not intellectually prepared to deal with the subject. Here too, it is less what properly belongs to Thomas's teaching that makes him great for Tocco than it is a comparison with the greatest biblical figures: Jacob, Joseph, and Moses in the Old Testament, Christ Himself or the apostle Thomas in the New Testament. Even without dwelling upon the various stories that can also be found in numerous other saints' lives, modern scholars have had an easy time demonstrating all these inadequacies.⁶

And yet Tocco remains a preferred witness. He knew Thomas at the priory in Naples, where the latter lived from 1272 to 1274. Tocco was then thirty and already a priest, but he must have taken the courses on the Bible that Thomas gave for all the friars of the priory. Tocco naturally also knew several Dominican friars who, like himself, had dealings with Thomas, and he collected their testimony. Among them we find Reginald of Piperno, the *socius continuus* who accompanied Thomas—perhaps from his beginnings in Paris—until his death. It is from Reginald, sometimes directly, sometimes through third parties, that Tocco gets certain intimate details. He also got data from members of the Aquinas family: it was thus that he obtained testimony from Thomas's nephew, Thomas of San Severino—son of Theodora, Thomas's second sister—and from Thomas's niece, Catherine de Morra—daughter of Mary, the saint's third sister. It is to Catherine, already quite old at the time of the canonization process, that Tocco was especially indebted for the stories about the saint's childhood, which Catherine herself claimed to have heard from her grandmother, Dame Theodora.

If we add to all this that, as a promoter of the cause, Tocco was able to meet, both before and after their depositions, all the witnesses at the canonization process (including the monks at Fossanova who were present during Thomas's last moments) we have to admit that, in spite of his failings, Tocco was the most qualified person to write this biography. But we

⁶ Cf. for example, W. P. Eckert, "Stilisierung und Umdeutung der Persönlichkeit des hl. Thomas von Aquino durch die frühen Biographen," *FZPT* 18 (1971) 7–28; E. Coledge, "The Legend of St. Thomas Aquinas," in *Commemorative Studies*, 1, 13–28.

also understand that he was not the only one responsible for the hagiographic halo around this *Vita*. To all appearances, his informers gave him not raw material but already-interpreted information. It remains for today's historians, therefore, to carry out the hermeneutical task. They at least already know both how Thomas's contemporaries saw him and the idea they held of his sanctity.

Except for the work by Walz/Novarina, French readers until now were rather deprived in regard to biographies of Saint Thomas. In spite of its undeniable scholarly value, Walz/Novarina, which appeared in 1962, itself an adapted translation published from a 1953 German text, has become seriously dated.⁷ We note with appreciation the more recent work by James A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino*,⁸ though the first edition is now more than twenty years old and the second edition, despite numerous corrections, still contains many inaccuracies. In a more succinct way, Simon Tugwell's introduction to selected passages from Thomas and Albert is remarkable for its information and penetration and is very satisfying among the essays of its kind.⁹ We cannot say as much for Otto Hermann Pesch's *Thomas von Aquin*, whose historical documentation needs to be updated and which, despite its subtitle, is not an introduction properly speaking, for his point of view on *Kontroversialtheologie* somewhat obscures the image of the author whom Pesch wishes to make better known.¹⁰

⁷ A. Walz, O.P., *Saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Adaptation française par P. Novarina, Philosophes médiévaux 5 (Louvain-Paris, 1962). The German text was translated with revisions from the original Italian edition (*San Tommaso d'Aquino, Studi biografici sul Dottore Angelico*, Rome, 1945). [Note to English edition: We have cited Walz-Novarina rather than the English translation made by Sebastian Bullough, O.P. (*Saint Thomas Aquinas: A Biographical Study* [Westminster, Md., 1951]) because Father Torrell's arguments are based on Walz-Novarina, which often differs materially from the English translation.]

We purposely limit this historical account to the most recent works: going back further into the past, we should mention the highly valuable work by Father Antoine Touron, *La vie de S. Thomas d'Aquin, de l'Ordre des Frères prêcheurs, docteur de l'Eglise, avec un exposé de sa doctrine et de ses oeuvres* (Paris, 1740), and especially the fundamental study by J. Quetif and J. Echard, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum*, vol. I (Paris, 1719), fols. 271–347, which remains a point of reference.

⁸ J. A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino: His Life, Thought and Works*, with Corrigenda and Addenda (Washington, 1974, 1983); the French translation of this work integrated the corrections from the second edition, but the bibliography was not brought up to date: *Frère Thomas d'Aquin, Sa vie, sa pensée, ses oeuvres ** (Paris, 1993). From that point of view, the Italian edition is preferable: *Tommaso d'Aquino. Vita, Pensiero, Opera*, ed. I. Biffi and C. Marabelli (Milan, 1988). So far as we know, the German translation follows the first edition and has not included the improvements.

⁹ *Albert & Thomas: Selected Writings*, translated, edited, and introduced by S. Tugwell, O.P. (New York, 1988).

¹⁰ O. H. Pesch, *Thomas von Aquin. Grenze und Grösse mittelalterlicher Theologie. Eine*

(footnote continued on next page)

These two last titles, written respectively in English and German, are not accessible to everyone. The same is true for the invaluable data assembled in the prefaces to the various volumes of the Leonine edition. My own contribution to the *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* is usually available only in special libraries, and it suffers from having been highly condensed for editorial reasons.¹¹ It is time, therefore, to make available to the French reading public the latest research in this field.

Our ambition is not, however, solely to write another biography limited to a strict presentation of dates and places. For a person like Thomas—more than for many others—the life cannot be understood without the work. We cannot conceive of Saint Thomas without the *Summa theologiae*! This is true, but it remains a banality if we do not see the way he invested himself in the work, or if we do not know that his writings cannot be reduced to his greatest and universally known work. Far from it!

We would not know how to introduce Thomas's work without mentioning Father Marie-Dominique Chenu's *Toward Understanding Saint Thomas*. Truly "without equal," this book, translated into several languages, has influenced generations of medievalists and renewed their approach to Saint Thomas, whether they be historians, philosophers, or theologians.¹² We may sometimes wonder if Chenu has always been read carefully enough, but his was an unprecedented effort, so far as we know, to reinsert the Master into the concrete milieu in which he lived—not only the historical and theological, but the "evangelical and theological" milieu. He showed the "spirituality" in which Thomas was rooted and the contemplation he pursued, while fervently trying to share them with others.¹³

It would be wrong to think that Chenu was the only force for renewal. We could not properly ignore the work of Mandonnet, Grabmann, Glorieux, Lottin, and many others whose names will be mentioned in the following pages. But Chenu's work will long remain the primary witness

(footnote continued from previous page)

Einführung (Mayence, 1988). See our review: *FZPT* 36 (1989) 493–98. It is proper to add that the third edition (1995) has taken account of most of our remarks; see the appendix, pp. 653–56.

¹¹ J.-P. Torrell, "Thomas d'Aquin (saint)," *DS* 15 (1991) 718–73.

¹² We refer to the heartfelt praise addressed to Chenu by Alain de Libera, *Penser au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1991), 42–45. See also, *Hommage au Père M.-D. Chenu*, special issue, *RSPT* 75 (July 1991) 351–504.

¹³ To better understand this project, we should also add the other master work by Chenu: *La théologie comme science au XII^e siècle*, Bibliothèque thomiste 33 (3d ed., Paris, 1957), and for a more general public: *St. Thomas d'Aquin et la théologie*, *Maîtres spirituels* 17 (Paris 1959), whose importance should not be judged by its brevity.

to the rediscovery of the Middle Ages that our time has enjoyed. What we present to the reader here would not even have been thinkable without Chenu, and we are happy to acknowledge the debt. But his book appeared fifty years ago, and we also have to say that while *Toward Understanding* "remains the best guide for beginning a serious reading of Saint Thomas . . . it is, however, the book that seems to me to have aged most among Chenu's volumes."¹⁴ It is only fair to add that the aging is in large part thanks to Chenu's disciples and to the works that he inspired—and that he would have been the first to welcome. But whether it is the incomparable contribution of the twenty or so volumes of the Leonine edition and of the volumes of the *Aristoteles latinus*, of many other volumes of previously unpublished texts or of historical studies on thirteenth-century figures and their ideas, a multitude of achievements in many fields has deeply enriched and changed our knowledge of the period and, more specifically, of the man Thomas—who paradoxically was the great absence in *Toward Understanding*.

We must therefore try to make a new beginning, benefitting from the most recent scholarly research, if we wish—as Chenu desired—to read Thomas's works in their true context and to discover something of his face. He has too often been presented as a timeless thinker; but in fact he was situated in a specific time and place, marked by precise historical contingencies. Travelling the roads of Europe under religious obedience—from Naples to Cologne by way of Paris, then Cologne to Rome after another stay in Paris and one in Orvieto, back to Paris for a third time, finally Naples for several months—he died on the road while travelling to the Council of Lyon. He had to travel in haste, plagued by a thousand different tasks, leaving many of them unfinished. His search for eternal Truth, among almost all the philosophers and theologians known in his time (whose works he tirelessly scrutinized and commented on) was thus carried out under conditions of urgency and precariousness.

This new approach to Thomas's biography will not only lead us to discover something about his tumultuous existence; it will also allow us to restore the context to his works; for several of those works, context is indispensable to an exact understanding. This will become clearer as we introduce those works. In the present volume, we would like to give at least a brief summary of the contents of each them, and a relatively detailed

¹⁴ L.-J. Bataillon, "Le Père Chenu et la théologie du Moyen Âge," *RSPT* 75 (1991) 449–56 (cf. p. 454).

summary for the main works. Also, to the degree possible, we shall provide precise indications about their dates. Current historical research allows us to correct many approximations that have continued into even the most recent studies. The catalogue at the end of this volume will concisely gather all this together.

Along the way, we will also come to know another part of Thomas's physiognomy, something a little surprising to find so resolutely ignored by faithful Thomists, who seem to reserve it for edifying literature or for panegyrics. Like Tocco perhaps, but at a distance from his subject that he could not provide, we would like to show not only that the saint is inseparable from the philosopher or the theologian, but that these three figures are also accompanied by a "spiritual master." Growing reflection on the faith was a path to sanctity for Thomas and it shows in his works. There is in this an entire dimension of his teaching that is certainly familiar to those who closely study it over time, but that generally escapes those who have only a sketchy acquaintance with Thomas. This leads to a considerable loss and it suffices to point it out to experience the benefit of a different reading of Thomas. For that reason, we shall quote at greater length here and there to give an idea of how the theology overflows into the spiritual life or, if one wishes, into mysticism. We will return amply to this subject in our second volume.

We also hope to shed some new light on the man Thomas was; it has long been thought it was difficult, if not impossible, to discover his personality, which was said to be hidden behind his writings. This is less true than is usually thought, and though the undertaking is arduous, it is worth the attempt.

It is a pleasant obligation to thank here my friends on the Leonine Commission, Father Louis-Jacques Bataillon and, in particular, Father René-Antoine Gauthier, who agreed to review my text, chapter by chapter. They suggested numerous corrections and improvements, bestowing their immense learning on my readers. I also heartily thank my assistant, Father Gilles Emery, who helped me in many ways in the course of composition and assembled the bibliography, the catalogue, and the index of St. Thomas's works.

Abbreviations of Frequently Cited Works

Calo	<i>Vita S. Thomae Aquinatis auctore Petro Calo</i> in <i>Fontes</i> , fasc. 1 (p. 17–55).
Cantimpré	<i>Thomae Cantipratani, . . . Miraculorum et exemplorum memorabilium sui temporis Libri duo</i> (= <i>Bonum universale de apibus</i>), Douai, 1597.
<i>Chartul.</i>	<i>Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis</i> , ed., H. Denifle and E. Chatelain, vol. 1, Paris, 1889 (when the number of the volume is not given, it refers to volume 1; the rares references to volume 2 will be indicated).
Chenu, <i>Toward</i>	M.-D. Chenu, <i>Introduction à l'étude de saint Thomas d'Aquin</i> , Publications de l'Institut d'études médiévales 11, Montreal-Paris, ² 1954.
<i>Commemorative Studies</i>	<i>St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974 Commemorative Studies</i> , ed. A. Maurer, 2 vols., Toronto, 1974.
<i>Documenta</i>	<i>Fontes vitae S. Thomae Aquinatis. Documenta</i> , ed., M.-H. Laurent, in <i>Fontes</i> , fasc. 6 (p. 531[!]-677).
Ferrua	<i>S. Thomae Aquinatis vitae fontes praecipuae</i> (read: <i>praecipui</i>), ed. A. Ferrua, Alba 1968 (reproduces Tocco's <i>Vita</i> , Gui's, and the Naples process, as well as some fragments of Tolomeo, Frachet, and Cantimpré).
<i>Fontes</i>	<i>Fontes Vitae S. Thomae Aquinatis notis historicis et criticis illustrati</i> , ed. D. Prümmer and M.-H. Laurent, Toulouse, n.d. (6 fase., originally published in the <i>Revue thomiste</i> from 1911 to 1937; we cite these sources according to the abbreviations indicated, followed by their internal numbering and the pagination, which is continuous for the six fascicles).
<i>Fossanova</i>	<i>Processus canonizationis S. Thomae, Fossae Novae</i> , ed. M.-H. Laurent, in <i>Fontes</i> , fasc. 5 (pp. 409–532).
Frachet	<i>Fratris Gerardi de Fracheto O.P., Vitae Fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum . . .</i> , ed., B. M. Reichert (<i>MOPH</i> , vol. 1), Louvain, 1896.

- Grabmann, *Werke* M. Grabmann, *Die Werke des hl. Thomas von Aquin. Eine literar-historische Untersuchung und Einführung* "BGPTMA 22, 1–2," Münster Westf., ³1949.
- Gui *Vita S. Thomae Aquinatis auctore Bernardo Guidonis*, in *Fontes*, fasc. 3 (pp. 161–263).
- Käppeli Thomas Käppeli, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*, 3 vols. appeared (through letter S), Rome, 1970–80.
- Leonine *Sancti Thomae de Aquino Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, Rome, 1882–.
- Mittelalterliches Geistesleben M. Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben. Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Scholastik und Mystik*, 3 vols., Munich, 1926, 1936, 1956.
- MOPH *Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum Historica*, vols. 3–4: *Acta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum*, vol. 1 (1220–1303); vol. 2 (1304–1378), ed. B. M. Reichert, Rome, 1898 and 1899; vol. 20: *Capitulorum Provincialium Provinciae Romanae* (1243–1344), ed. T. Käppeli and A. Dondaine, Rome, 1941.
- Naples *Processus canonizationis S. Thomae, Neapoli*, ed. M.-H. Laurent, in *Fontes*, fasc. 4 (pp. 265–407).
- Scandone F. Scandone, "La vita, la famiglia e la patria di S. Tommaso de Aquino," in *San Tommaso d'Aquino, Miscellanea storico-artistica*, Rome, 1924, pp. 1–110.
- Tocco *Vita S. Thomae Aquinatis auctore Guillelmo de Tocco*, in *Fontes*, fasc. 2 (pp. 59–160).
- Tolomeo *Ptolomaei Lucensis Historia ecclesiastica nova*, Lib. XXII 17–XXIII 16, in L. A. Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores*, vol. 11, Milan, 1724 (partial critical edition by A. Dondaine, "Les *Opuscula fratris Thomae* chez Ptolémée de Lucques," *AFP* 31 (1961) 142–203.
- Tugwell *Albert & Thomas Selected Writings*, translated, edited, and introduced by Simon Tugwell, O.P.; preface by Leonard E. Boyle, O.P., New York, Mahwah, 1988.
- WN A. Walz, *Saint Thomas d'Aquin*, French adaptation by P. Novarina, *Philosophes médiévaux* 5, Louvain-Paris, 1962.
- Weisheipl J. A. Weisheipl, O.P., *Friar Thomas d'Aquino: His Life, Thought, and Works*, Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, ²1983.
- Xenia thomistica* *Xenia thomistica a plurimis . . . praeparata . . .*, ed., S. Szabo, 3 vols. Rome, 1925.
- Ystoria C. Le Brun-Gouanvic, *Edition critique de l'Ystoia sancti Thome de Aquino de Guillaume de Tocco*, Diss. dactyl., Université de Montréal, 2 vols., 1987.

Chapter I— An Eventful Youth

The date of Thomas's birth has been calculated approximately on the basis of the date of his death. His first biographer informs us that he died the morning of 7 March 1274, in his forty-ninth year.¹ This may mean that Thomas had already lived more than forty-eight years, but had not reached his forty-ninth birthday. But the same author also adds: "Having finished the forth-ninth year of his life, he began in his fiftieth the jubilee of eternal glory." His birth, therefore, should be placed in 1225. Bernard Gui, who wrote several years later, gives parallel confirmation that Thomas died when he had completed forty-nine years and begun his fiftieth year.² In a slightly earlier text, Tolomeo of Lucca echoes an uncertainty: "He died at the age of fifty, but some say forty-eight."³ There seems to be agreement today on 1224/25, but other secondary sources do not allow the complete exclusion of 1226 or even 1227.⁴

The D'Aquino Family

Identifying Thomas's birthplace once raised some difficulties—several locations contended for that honor. Today, however, historians agree that

¹. *Ystoria* 65, p. 395 (Tocco 65, p. 138).

². Gui 39, p. 205. It may nevertheless be asked if Gui does not take too seriously the mystical speculations of Tocco, for whom, after seven sabbatical years ($7 \times 7 = 49$), Thomas would finally have entered into eternal rest for his fiftieth year.

³. Tolomeo XXIII 10: "Obiit autem L vitae suae; alii vero dicunt XLVIII."

⁴. Thus Tugwell (p. 201) chooses 1226 (C. Vansteenkiste, *RLT* 24 [1991] 11, points out the problems with this position); Scandone (pp. 8–9) presents the different source data; cf. WN, p. 16, and P. Mandonnet's research, which is still sound in its conclusions if not always in its details, "Date de naissance de S. Thomas d'Aquin," *RT* 22 (1914) 652–64.

the site was the family castle at Roccasecca in southern Italy.⁵ Located in what was then the county of Aquino and in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, Roccasecca is found on the border of Latium and the Campagna almost midway between Rome and Naples, an equal distance from Frosinone in the north and Cassino in the south, slightly east of the interior route (the ancient Via Latina) that leads from Rome to Naples. This geographical location is far from insignificant, and was even the cause of a serious political difficulty; the familial domain of the Aquino family lay at the limit of the states of both the pope and the emperor, who, with others, contended for power over the nearby monastery of Monte Cassino. The local situation thus forced Thomas's family to oscillate between pope and emperor, and the family felt the effects sharply.

Originally from Lombardy, the family made its first historical appearance in 887. Since the end of the tenth century they had owned the castle of Roccasecca.⁶ An earlier branch of the family held the county of Aquino until 1137; it was from that branch that Thomas got his surname, not from the town of Aquino, which was not his birthplace. Another branch later inherited the county of Acerra, whose titleholder in 1221 was the first Thomas Aquinas; he possessed a viceroy's powers over the southern part of the Italian peninsula. Landolfo, the later Thomas's father, did not belong to the most powerful branch of the family and simply held the title *miles*.⁷ A follower of Emperor Frederick II since 1210, he was named by the latter "judge" of the "Tillage Land" (*Terra di Lavoro*), his region, in 1220,⁸ and in that role he was under the jurisdiction of the count of Acerra.

In spite of the labors of scholars, we are far from perfect clarity about Thomas's father and his family. For some, Landolfo would have been born about 1160/70 and married twice; for others, the name refers to two different people. The source materials are not unequivocal and lend them-

⁵ We need not spend time on the question here. Scandone (pp. 88–103) presents a detailed account of the arguments for Naples and Aquino, and finally (pp. 103–10) the demonstration of the birth at Roccasecca. Some additional information is in WN, p. 9, and more recently and completely in W. Pocino, *Roccasecca patria di San Tommaso d'Aquino*, Documentazione storico-bibliografica (Rome, 1974).

⁶ Cf. Scandone, pp. 42–46; WN, pp. 10–12.

⁷ *Documenta* 9, p. 541 (cf. T. Leccisotti, *San Tommaso e Montecassino* (Montecassino, 1965): Table VIII; cf. also *Documenta* 4, p. 535: *vir nobilis*).

⁸ *Documenta* 1, p. 532. These ties with Frederick II need to be clarified. According to Kantorowicz (*Ergänzungsband*, p. 45), the Aquinas family was among the principal supporters of the emperor, but it cannot be concluded that Thomas was related to him by blood. At most, we can establish family relations through alliances, though rather distant ones (*ibid.*, p. 282, no. 35; cf. Weisheipl, p. 17).

selves to diverse interpretations, particularly with regard to determining the number of the saint's brothers. Weisheipl, accepting a hypothesis of Mandonnet's, presents it as certain that Landolfo married twice and that he had by his first wife, of whom we know nothing otherwise, three children: James, Phillip, and Adenolpho.⁹ Walz-Novarina attributes the same opinion to Scandone, but the latter does not breathe a word about it and regards these three names as referring to brothers by Thomas's own mother.¹⁰ Pelster suggests rather that the three names belong to the sons of Thomas I, count of Acerra, and therefore they would be more or less distant cousins of Thomas.¹¹ Though it cannot be established definitively, this last view seems correct.

In any case, it is certain that Landolfo married, at an unknown date, Dame Theodora, who belonged to the Rossi branch of the Neapolitan Caracciolo family.¹² He had at least nine children with her, four boys and five girls. Aimo, the eldest son, doubtless named in honor of his grandfather, took part in an expedition to the Holy Land on behalf of Frederick II. He was taken prisoner, however, by a vassal of Hugh, king of Cyprus. Ransomed by the intervention of Pope Gregory IX in 1233, he remained faithful to the papal party for the rest of his life.¹³ Rinaldo, the second son, was at first a partisan of Frederick II, but joined the pope when Innocent IV deposed the emperor in 1245. The emperor, however, put him to death in 1246 for conspiring against him.¹⁴ The family considered him a martyr for the cause of the Church. Thomas, too, seems to have believed the same, since in a dream vision his sister Marotta, recently deceased, informed him of the eternal destiny of his two brothers: Rinaldo was in heaven, while Landolfo was in purgatory, the only thing we know about the latter.¹⁵

⁹ Weisheipl, p. 17.

¹⁰ Scandone, pp. 46–51 and 76ff.

¹¹ F. Pelster, "I parenti," p. 305. Kantorowicz maintains a similar position: *Ergänzungsband*, p. 276, no. 14, and p. 282, no. 35.

¹² *Ystoria* 37, p. 317: "nomine Theodora, de prosapia Caraculorum dictorum Rubeorum Neapolis." Cf., *ibid.*, p. 160. This datum, unknown to historians until the critical edition of the *Ystoria*, evidently weakens the speculations of Scandone (pp. 51–55), and others who followed him, on the origins of Dame Theodora.

¹³ *Documenta* 5, pp. 536–37; 10, pp. 541 and 543; Scandone, pp. 76–77.

¹⁴ Tolomeo XXII 20; Tocco 44, p. 118; Pelster, "I parenti," pp. 300–305; Mandonnet, "Novice," pp. 528–31; Kantorowicz, *Ergänzungsband*, p. 279, no. 25, has assembled the sources that refer to him.

¹⁵ *Ystoria* 44, p. 339 (Tocco 44, p. 118). Cf. *Naples* 78, p. 375, where Bartholomew of Capua alludes to Thomas's belief in the injustice committed in his brother's execution.

By contrast, we know Thomas's five sisters relatively well. Marotta, the eldest, became abbess of the convent of Saint Mary of Capua and died around 1259.¹⁶ The second sister, Theodora, became the wife of Roger of San Severino, count of Marsico.¹⁷ Thomas would go to her home to rest during his final illness. Her son, Thomas, who later worked for the canonization of his uncle, died wearing a Dominican habit.¹⁸ The third daughter, Mary, married William, the eldest of the San Severinos. Tocco got many details from their daughter, Catherine de Morra, about Thomas's family. Catherine heard them from her grandmother, Theodora.¹⁹ The fourth daughter, Adelasia, married Roger of Aquila; Thomas was the executor of Roger's will in 1272.²⁰ As to the fifth sister, we do not know her name. She died in early infancy, struck by lightning while the young Thomas, who was sleeping nearby alongside his nurse, was spared.²¹

***Oblate at Cassino—
Studies in Naples***

Since Thomas was the youngest of the sons, he was destined, according to the custom of the time, for the Church. The nearness of Monte Cassino hardly left room for any alternative. Landolfo therefore offered his son as an oblate to the monastery, probably with the thought in the back of his mind that some day he might become abbot.²² The abbey was in a period of decadence and was prey to both pope and emperor. Nevertheless, the treaty of San Germano, signed by both parties 23 July 1230, inaugurated a period of relative peace. And it is then, between that date and 3 May 1231, that we may place Thomas's entry into the monastery under the abbot Landolfo Sinibaldi.

¹⁶ *Ystoria* 10, p. 217 (Tocco 9, p. 74).

¹⁷ *Ystoria* 47, p. 347 (Tocco 47, p. 120). Cf. *Naples* 20 and 46, pp. 291 and 326. Theodora is identified by name as having obtained from the abbot of Fossanova a hand from Thomas's body as a relic (cf. *Ystoria* 68, p. 402; Tocco 69, p. 142). This fits rather well with the portrait Tocco draws of her as a person of great piety (*Ystoria* 37, p. 317; Tocco, 37, p. 111). Cf. Scandone, pp. 57–61.

¹⁸ *Ystoria* 37, p. 318; cf. Introduction, pp. 160–161.

¹⁹ *Naples* 62, p. 350; cf., Scandone, pp. 61–67.

²⁰ Scandone, pp. 67–69; WN, pp. a 15–16, who believes in a twice-married Landolfo, thinks that Adelasia was only Thomas's half-sister. Today there is no reason to hold this hypothesis.

²¹ *Ystoria* 3, p. 197 (Tocco 2, p. 67).

²² *Ystoria*, 2 and 5, pp. 194–95 and 301 (Tocco 1 and 4, pp. 66–67 and 69–70); *Naples* 76, p. 371. If we were to follow Scandone, pp. 77–79, and accept with him that Giacomo de Aquino was a brother of Thomas's, this would be the second attempt by Landolfo to put one of his sons into a rich ecclesiastical benefice. We know that this Giacomo had been elected head of the collegiate church of San Pietro de Canetto, before the election was invalidated because of irregularities. Cf. *Documenta* 2 and 3, pp. 532–35 (dated 11 February 1217).

The latter date is marked by a charter through which Landolfo, Thomas's father, makes the abbey the generous gift of twenty ounces of gold "for the remission of his sins."²³ It is not certain, but it at least appears that this donation constitutes the alms accompanying the oblation of noble children that Saint Benedict mentions in his Rule (Chapter 59). Thomas would have been five or six at the time, and, like Benedict himself, he was accompanied to the monastery by his nurse. Clearly, he received elementary training in reading and writing there and a first introduction to the Benedictine religious life of which traces may be found in his works. From 1236 on, however, the calm that the monastery had enjoyed was disturbed, and Landolfo, on the advice of the new abbot, Stephen de Corbario, had to shield his son from easily foreseeable troubles. After conferring together, therefore, his parents sent the adolescent Thomas to Naples to do more advanced study.²⁴

Thomas probably left the monastery in the spring of 1239. He would have been fourteen or fifteen, and therefore could have made profession in the *ordo monasticus*. But no document mentions such a step. This does not mean that Thomas had never been a monk. According to Leccisotti's²⁵ nuanced account (and whatever the juridical vagaries of the period), being an oblate had the value of a true monastic profession, but it was conditional and temporary, similar to simple profession in a religious order today. Since it was not a personal decision, it required later ratification by the person himself at the proper age; he remained free to accept the commitment established by his parents or to embrace another form of life.

This peculiarity explains both how the Cassino necrology can mention Thomas as "*primo Casinensis monachus factus*" and how this link ceased without any formal process the day Thomas entered the Order of Preachers. Furthermore, the fact that the abbot "counseled" Landolfo to send his son to Naples for his studies shows clearly that he did not have the power to send Thomas there himself. Had Thomas been professed, the abbot could evidently have done so. But it is highly likely that, upon his arrival

²³. *Documenta* 4, pp. 535–36; cf. T. Leccisotti, *S. Tommaso*, Table II.

²⁴. *Ystoria* 6, p. 204 (Tocco 5, p. 70): "Abbas . . . prouide ei (patti) *consuluit* ut puer mitteretur Neapolim ad studendum. . . . Unde puer *de utriusque parentis consilio* Neapolim mittitur." The reference to both parents in this passage is worth noting. It explains something about the future role of Theodora. For a brief account of the preceding events: Leccisotti, *S. Tommaso*, pp. 48ff; cf. *idem.*, "Il Dottore angelico a Montecassino," *RFNS* 32 (1940) 519–47, cf. p. 540.

²⁵. Leccisotti, *S. Tommaso*, pp. 34–37 and pp. 18–25; cf. *id.*, *Il Dottore*, pp. 533–40 and 523–28.

in Naples, Thomas spent some time at the monastery of San Demetrio, a lodging place for the Cassino monks in the city. And it is even more sure that his parents had not changed their plans for him.²⁶

Thomas, therefore, was able to enroll in the young *studium generale* in Naples in the fall of 1239. Founded in 1224 by Frederick II with the aim of forming men for the emperor's service, it was destined to become part of the University of Bologna. The emperor's subjects were not authorized to study anywhere else.²⁷ Thomas would have begun by studying the liberal arts and philosophy, the obligatory prerequisites for approaching theology.

Even if Frederick II's influence has been a little overestimated, the fascination of historians with him is one of the reasons why we know rather well the intellectual ambience at Thomas's arrival. Michael Scot, for instance, had launched into the business of translations on his own (we now know that he was already at work in Toledo in 1215).²⁸ But Scot entered the emperor's service beginning in September 1220 and must have remained in Palermo until his death in 1235. It is in part thanks to the translations he and his school made from Arabic and Greek that Sicily and southern Italy experienced an intense cultural life at the time. Aristotelian science, Arabic astronomy, and Greek medicine all were flourishing in Palermo, Salerno, and Naples.²⁹

It would be wrong to conclude, as was often done not long ago, that northern Europe was a stranger to this movement. Beginning in 1225, knowledge of Averroes is found in an anonymous Master of Arts,³⁰ and a

²⁶ Leccisotti, *S. Tommaso*, p. 53 (*Il Dottore*, p. 543); see the reproduction of the necrology in Table VIII, which indicates that Thomas had in fact become a monk of Monte Cassino.

²⁷ The original documents are in J.-L.-A. Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia diplomatica Friderici secundi* (Paris, 1854–59), vol. 2, part 1, pp. 450–53; vol. 4, part 1, pp. 497–99; vol. 5, part 1, pp. 493–96. Cf. H. Denifle, *Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400* (Berlin, 1885), pp. 11–14 (for the foundation of Naples, pp. 452–61) E. Kantorowicz, *Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite*, 2d ed. (Berlin, 1928), pp. 124–26; id., *Ergänzungsband* (Berlin, 1931), pp. 51–52. See also Weisheipl, pp. 13–15; WN, pp. 33–34.

²⁸ Cf. R.-A. Gauthier, "Note sur les débuts (1225–1240) du 'premier averroïsme,'" *RSPT* 66 (1982) 321–74, cf. pp. 332–34.

²⁹ Keeping in mind the precise details provided by Gauthier (see previous note), it is also worthwhile to consult J.-L.-A. Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia diplomatica*, Préface et introduction, pp. dxix–dlv: "De l'influence de Frédéric II sur le mouvement scientifique et littéraire-Beaux arts"; cf. Charles Homer Haskins, *Studies in the History of Medieval Science*, 2d ed. (Cambridge, 1927), pp. 272–98: "Michael Scot"; id., *Studies in Medieval Culture* (Oxford, 1929), pp. 124–47: "Latin Literature under Frederick II"; see also M. Grabmann, "Kaiser Friedrich II und sein Verhältnis zur aristotelischen und arabischen Philosophie," in *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben II* (1936), pp. 103–37.

³⁰ R.-A. Gauthier, "Le traité *De anima et de potentiis eius* d'un maître arts (vets 1224).

little later in William of Auxerre, and in Robert Grosseteste, who cites Averroes several times in his scientific work.³¹ In any case, Thomas could have become familiar very early with Aristotle's natural philosophy and metaphysics, at a time when studying them was still officially forbidden in Paris—only officially, though, because the repetition of the interdictions shows that they were scarcely respected. And, like the study of Averroes, the study of Aristotle was already flourishing in Paris around 1230.

Tocco has preserved for us the names of two masters who would have instructed Thomas: Master Martin, who would have taught him grammar and logic; and Master Peter of Ireland, who would have instructed him in the *naturalia*.³² These were only names for a long time, so much so that it was possible to regard them as a pure invention by Tocco. In this century, however, certain writings of the latter were identified, and he has been discovered a little later in the history: around 1250, in a group of Jewish and Christian scholars devoting themselves to studying Maimonides, and between 1258 and 1266, when he settles a disputed question in the presence of King Manfred.³³

It has often been said that the writings of Peter of Ireland exhibit great admiration for Averroes and that it was from him that Thomas got his taste for the literal commentary on Aristotle. In fact, the role of the literal commentary in Peter is weak and the first assertion is totally without foundation. From the first lines of his commentary on the *Peryermenias*, Peter

(footnote continued on next page)

Introduction et texte critique," *RSPT* 66 (1982) 3–55, for the explicit use of the name Aueroist (or Aueneroist), cf. lines 41 and 49, p. 29; see also, lines 56–57, p. 30, together with the critical apparatus.

³¹. R.-A. Gauthier, *Note sur les débuts*, pp. 337–40 for Robert; pp. 340–44 for William. Gauthier mentions numerous other authors of that period.

³². *Ystoria* 6, p. 204 (Tocco 5, p. 70); Calo 4, p. 20. It seems rather that logic would also have been taught to him by Peter (cf. Crowe in the following note). Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben* II, p. 124, proposed identifying Master Martin with Martin of Dacia, but what we know of the latter now would place him at a much later date, toward the end of the thirteenth century. Cf. J. Pinborg, *Die Entwicklung der Sprachtheorie im Mittelalter*, "BGPTMA 42/2" (Münster, 1967), pp. 67–68; Gauthier, *Leonine*, vol. I^{*} 1, pp. 72^{*}–73^{*}.

³³. Cf. C. Baeumker, *Petrus von Hibernia der Jugendlehrer des Thomas von Aquin und seine Disputation vor König Manfred*, Sitzungsberichte d. Bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos. u. hist. Klasse, Munich, 1920, and the presentation of it by Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben* I, pp. 249–65. A. Pelzer, "Le cours inédit d'Albert le Grand sur la morale à Nicomaque recueilli et rédigé par S. Thomas d'Aquin," *Revue néoscholastique de Phil.* 14 (1922) 333–61, 478–520; (for Peter of Ireland, pp. 355–57). See also the most recent work of M. B. Crowe, "Peter of Ireland: Aquinas' Teacher of the *Artes Liberales*" in *Arts libéraux et Philosophie au Moyen Age*, (Montréal-Paris, 1969) pp. 617–26; "Peter of Ireland's Approach to Metaphysics," *MM* 2 (1963) 154–60. These already-aging works should be completed and brought up to date in light of the research by R.-A. Gauthier, *Leonine*, vol. I^{*} 1 (1989), pp. 67^{*}–68^{*}.

shows himself completely up to date on the "Averroist" error, and he denounces it in clear terms as sophistical. Given that such an interpretation of Averroes was hardly widespread until after 1252 (the date of St. Bonaventure's denunciation of Averroes' error), there is little chance that we have here the course taken by the young Thomas between 1240 and 1244. But since one may notice "several coincidences, some of them rather remarkable" between his text and Peter's,³⁴ it might be asked if Thomas did not have at hand some account of the course—unless he used his own notes from one of Peter's courses prior to the denunciation of Averroes. It is necessary to conclude that we do not know anything precise about these years of study in Naples.

Taking the Habit and Its Consequences

It was also at Naples that Thomas became acquainted with the Dominicans. A priory had been founded there in 1231, and Jordan of Saxony, Saint Dominic's successor, had preached to the students in 1236.³⁵ In 1239, only two religious were there. Frederick II had authorized them to stay in service to their church, although he had expelled the mendicants from his realm. One who remained was John of San Giuliano, the inspiration for Thomas's vocation, who sustained him with visits during his imprisonment, and to whom Bartholomew of Capua pays heartfelt homage.³⁶ The other was the prior, Thomas of Lentini, a rather well-known figure since he became bishop of Bethlehem, papal legate, and patriarch of Jerusalem, who interests us here because he gave the habit to Thomas.³⁷ This fact, which formerly was believed to be attested only by Bernard Gui, is repeated in the fourth version of Tocco. The repetition no longer permits us to hold Mandonnet's hypothesis that Thomas received the habit at the hands of the master of the order, John the Teuton.³⁸ The event took place,

³⁴ Gauthier, *Leonine*, vol. I* 1, p. 68* b, where Peter's text, also denouncing Averroes's error, may be found.

³⁵ For the founding, see the two letters of Gregory IX to the archbishop and the chapter of Naples on the one hand, and to the people of the city on the other hand, dated 20 October 1231 (*Bullarium ordinis fratrum praedicatorum*, vol. 1 (Rome, 1729), pp. 36–37); the local tradition claims the first arrival of the friars with Thomas Agni da Lentini goes back to 1227. Cf. several remarks on this subject in Tugwell, p. 295, n. 39.

³⁶ *Ystoria* 7, p. 207; 12, p. 224 (Tocco 6, p. 71; 11, p. 76); Bartholomew: "Frater Iohannes de sancto Iuliano, antiquus frater valde, homo magne vite et humilitatis, qui dicebatur notorie dictum fratrem Thomam de Aquino recepisse in ordine Predicatorum" (*Naples* 76, p. 371).

³⁷ Cf. A. Redigonda, art. "Agni, Tommaso," *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* 1 (1960) 445–47.

³⁸ *Ystoria* 7, p. 208; Gui 5, p. 171. Cf., Mandonnet, "Novice," pp. 372–75.

it appears, in April 1244 or slightly earlier that year, as the following events allow us to establish.³⁹

Thomas's entrance into the Order of Preachers definitively compromised his parents' plans for him to become the abbot of Monte Cassino. If he thought that presenting them with a *fait accompli* would make things easier, he did not reckon on their obstinacy, particularly his mother's.⁴⁰ The Neapolitan friars had seen their priory sacked in 1235 after a young nobleman, whose family wanted him back, took the habit. Taught by this unhappy precedent, the friars were no longer naive, and they hastily made Thomas leave the city.⁴¹ Thus when Theodora went to Naples, hoping to dissuade Thomas, she arrived too late; she pursued him all the way to Rome, where, again, she was too late. Thomas had already left in the retinue of the master general, John the Teuton,⁴² who was on the way to Bologna for the general chapter of the order scheduled for the feast of Pentecost, 22 May 1244. Theodora sent a rapid courier to her sons who were making war in the company of Frederick II in the region of Acquapendente, a little northwest of Orvieto (north of Rome, but outside the Papal States), asking them to intercept their brother and bring him back.⁴³ All

³⁹ Tugwell, p. 204, leans more toward 1242 or 1243. This would place Thomas's entrance at an age of 16 or 17. In itself, this does not appear to be impossible, but it seems to fit less well with all the other data.

⁴⁰ My article in the *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* (col. 721) and following Mandonnet, Leccisotti, WN, Weisheipl, etc., puts Landolfo Aquinas's death on 24 December 1243. There is no basis for this in the manuscript sources. The date is found only in a later printed edition (Venice, 1588), and it is hard to understand why Tocco omitted it. Since in subsequent events Dame Theodora moves sharply into the foreground (*Ystoria* 8–9, pp. 210–14; Tocco 7–8, pp. 71–73), Mandonnet logically deduced that Landolfo was no longer in this world ("Novice," pp. 387–90). However the testimony of Bartholomew of Capua (*Naples* 76, p. 372) supposes that Thomas's father was still alive when he took the habit and that it was his father whom the Dominicans of Naples feared when they moved Thomas away. During the forced residence at Roccasecca, it is again the father who pressures the son to change his religious allegiance; finally, it is he who, won over by the prayers of his wife, frees Thomas. Tocco implicitly recognizes this in his testimony at the canonization process: "*tandem victi parentes et fratres sui ejus (Thomae) constantia restituerent ipsum ordini*" (*Naples* 62, p. 351). It is therefore preferable to follow Scandone's reconstruction of events here (pp. 50–51) echoed by Laurent (*Documenta* 9, p. 541) and Tugwell (p. 297, n. 54), and admit that the 24 December date of death for Landolfo came in 1245, or later. Why didn't he take charge himself of the attempts to capture Thomas? We might conjecture that various troubles at the time did not allow him to leave his castles without supervision, but we might also recall that Theodora knew how to assume his responsibilities (cf. above, note 24).

⁴¹ *Bull. O.P.* I, pp. 74–75, dated 15 May 1235; other examples are in the *Vitae Fratrum*. Cf. Tugwell, p. 297, n. 53.

⁴² John of Wildeshausen, having been provincial of Hungary and then of Lombardy, was master general from 1241 to 1252. He died at Strasbourg 3/4 November 1252, Cf. Th. Kappeli, *Scriptores* III, pp. 47–48.

⁴³ Tocco (*Ystoria* 8–9, pp. 210–14; Tocco 7–8, pp. 71–73) echoes here the tradition of the

(footnote continued on next page)

the sources agree on Acquapendente, and we also know that Frederick II was in the region at that time with his men. This had to be in the first two weeks of May, a sure reference point that allows us to put Thomas's taking of the habit a few weeks earlier, in April.⁴⁴

In the small force that seized Thomas, two people are named:⁴⁵ Rinaldo, his own brother, who was still a faithful follower of Frederick II; and Pier delle Vigne, the all-powerful counselor to the emperor.⁴⁶ The latter's presence allows us to suppose that Frederick II had agreed to this operation, just as the sources say. With a small squad, it was easy for them to lay hands on the young monk, from whom they tried in vain to remove his habit. Putting him on a horse, they led him to Montesangiovanni, a family castle north of Roccasecca (the much-talked-of episode of the prostitute sent in to tempt him may have occurred there).⁴⁷ But this was only a stopover, and Thomas was quickly led to Roccasecca itself.⁴⁸ Tocco adds that the Dominicans complained to Innocent IV about the use of force. According to him, the pope intervened with the emperor, who punished those involved. Fearing scandal, the Dominicans did not dare bring the Aquinas family to justice, knowing in any case that, even in prison, Thomas would continue in his intention.⁴⁹

There, the entire family tried to make him change his mind, but it would be wrong to imagine that he was mistreated or relegated to some dungeon.⁵⁰ It was more a kind of house arrest than imprisonment. Thomas could come and go, receive visits (repeated ones by John of San Giuliano

(footnote continued from previous page)

Aquinas family and tries to persuade his readers of Dame Theodora's good intentions, according to which she wanted only to embrace her son and help him in his decision. But subsequent events render this hardly credible.

⁴⁴ On Frederick II's presence in the Acquapendente region at the time, cf. Scandone, p. 14; Mandonnet, "Novice" (1924) pp. 535–47; (1925), pp. 3–24. Contrary to Tugwell (p. 297, n. 55) we believe it not very plausible that the family waited a year, maybe more, to react to Thomas's taking the habit.

⁴⁵ Tolomeo XXII 20; cf. A. Huillard-Bréholles, *Vie et correspondance de Pierre de la Vigne, ministre de l'empereur Frédéric II* (Paris 1865), pp. 39–40.

⁴⁶ In addition to Huillard-Bréholles's work mentioned in the previous note, cf. Charles Homer Haskins, *Studies in Medieval Culture*, pp. 133–34.

⁴⁷ This is Mandonnet's hypothesis, "Novice" (1925), pp. 222–36, which Weisheipl accepts, pp. 30–31; Le Brun-Gouanvic, p. 215, who discusses it, also inclines to the view that Montesangiovanni was the final place where Thomas was held, and not Roccasecca. Given what we know about subsequent events, this appears difficult to maintain.

⁴⁸ *Ystoria* 9, p. 213 (Tocco 8, p. 73).

⁴⁹ According to Cantimpré I 20, pp. 67–68, John the Teuton complained directly to Frederick II.

⁵⁰ Contrary to what the fanciful description of Cantimpré leads us to believe.

most notably, who brought him a new habit to replace his torn one).⁵¹ He conversed with his sisters and convinced his sister Marotta during this period to become a religious. Tocco reports that he took advantage of the time to pray, to read the entire Bible (*perlegit*), and to begin to study (*didicit*) the book of *Sentences*. His sisters even benefitted from his early learning—a clear sign of his future mastery.⁵²

A summary of logic for beginners, the *Tractatus fallaciarum*, has also been attributed to him during this period, but this is less certain (*ut dicitur*). In fact, two small treatises, *De fallaciis* and *De propositionibus modalibus*, have been preserved that, up until the beginning of this century, were considered works from Thomas's youth. Today they are regarded as spurious. Without wanting to speak too absolutely on the subject, Father H.-F. Dondaine, who edited them in the Leonine edition, printed them in small letters, to signify the "uncertain position of the two opuscula in the literary legacy of Saint Thomas."⁵³ Taking up the question several years later, Father Gauthier shows with an abundance of detail that there can be no doubt: based on several works, notably Peter of Spain's *Tractatus VII*, these little treatises are necessarily from a date later than this period. Diverse other reasons militate against an attribution to Thomas. Given that the *Fallacie* entered the collections of Thomas's opuscula in Avignon around 1310–20, Gauthier suggests looking for their author among the masters of arts from the south of France toward the end of the thirteenth century.⁵⁴

According to some sources,⁵⁵ Thomas succeeded in escaping after a while (with his mother's complicity), by climbing down a wall with a rope, like Saint Paul. The truth is no doubt more prosaic. Seeing that his resolve could not be shaken, his family delivered him to the priory at Naples after the lapse of a little more than a year.⁵⁶ If, as we might think, Innocent IV's deposing of Frederick II at the Council of Lyon (17 July 1245) was per-

⁵¹ *Ystoria* 12, p. 224 (Tocco 11, p. 76).

⁵² *Ystoria* 10, p. 217 (Tocco 9, p. 74); the terms used should be understood in the strongest sense. Calo is hardly exaggerating when he writes: "*totam bibliam legit . . . et textum sententiarum memorie commendavit*" (*Vita* no. 6, p. 23, variant n. 1).

⁵³ Leonine, vol. 43 (1976), p. 388.

⁵⁴ Leonine, vol. I* 1 (1989) pp. 56*–64*.

⁵⁵ Tolomeo XXII 21; *Ystoria* 12, p. 224 (Tocco 11, p. 77), but Tocco contradicts here his deposition at the canonization process (*Naples* 62, p. 351): "*parentes et fratres . . . restituerunt ipsum ordini*"; Tugwell, p. 207, seems to give some credit to this account.

⁵⁶ Besides Tocco (see above, note 47), Frachet IV 17,3: *dimiserunt eum*; Cantimpré 120: *fratres fratrem solverunt*.

ceived as a sign that the political situation was beginning to change, Thomas's release may have come slightly thereafter.⁵⁷

Before we conclude this chapter, we must not omit what may seem a paradox: despite these vicissitudes, Thomas's bond to his family milieu remained strong and deep. Many biographical details allow us to see this. Very quickly, when the political situation reversed itself and his family encountered difficulties because of its defection from the imperial cause, Thomas knew how to find ecclesiastical funds, with the permission of Clement IV, in order to come to his family's aid.⁵⁸ Afterward, in the course of his travels, he regularly stayed in the family castles: in San Severino, where his sister Theodora, countess of Marsico, lived,⁵⁹ and at Maenza, where his niece Francesca, countess of Ceccano, resided.⁶⁰ It is said that he went frequently to the latter's home. He stopped there during his final illness, and it was from there that he had himself transported to Fossanova, saying that if the Lord had to visit him, it was better he should find him in a religious house rather than in a secular home.⁶¹ Furthermore, Thomas was selected as executor for Roger of Aquila, count of Traiecto, husband of his sister Adelasia, and he carried out that task to everyone's satisfaction.⁶² We should not believe that Thomas broke with his family over the early disagreements. He remained feudally tied to his milieu and his time, and his language constantly reminds us of that, as when he borrows the vocabulary and metaphors of chivalry and the military profession—something often overlooked.⁶³

First Sketch for a Portrait

At the end of this first part of Thomas's biography, some of the features of his spiritual profile begin to emerge. The ancient biographers liked to

⁵⁷. He would thus have been detained about fifteen months, perhaps more, if we follow the biographers: *fere per duos annos* (*Ystoria* 12, p. 224; Tocco 11, p. 76): *plus quam per annum* (Bartholomew: *Naples* 76, p. 372); *annis duobus vel tribus* (Cantimpré 120).

⁵⁸. *Ystoria* 42, pp. 232–33 (Tocco 42, pp. 115–16); the *Ystoria* is more complete here; it might also be remarked with Le Brun-Gouanvic that it was in this context that the pope offered Thomas the archbishopric of Naples, hoping in this way to ally the Aquinas family more closely to the house of Anjou.

⁵⁹. *Ystoria* 37, p. 317 (Tocco 37, p. 111); *Naples* 79, pp. 376–78.

⁶⁰. *Ystoria* 56, p. 371 (Tocco 56, pp. 129–50).

⁶¹. *Naples* 15 and 8, pp. 286 and 276.

⁶². *Documenta* 25–27, pp. 575–79; Thomas's ties with his family have been emphasized with humor, but also with considerable penetration, by E. A. Synan, "Aquinas and His Age," in A. Parel, ed., *Calgary Aquinas Studies* (Toronto, 1978), pp. 1–25, cf. especially pp. 10–14.

⁶³. We might refer here to the learned and fascinating article by E. A. Synan, "Saint Thomas Aquinas and the Profession of Arms," *MS* 50 (1988) 404–37.

emphasize the Marian devotion of the child who would not for anything leave the piece of parchment on which he had written the Hail Mary. They have also insisted on the young Benedictine oblate's zeal in seeking God and the Neapolitan student's enthusiasm for study.⁶⁴ We can believe them, but many saints' lives provide similar facts. We will come closer to the historical truth by clarifying certain episodes that we have just examined, this time in light of the theologian that Thomas would become.

To what extent were the overlapping of the religious figure and the political member of the Aquinas family, and the reversals of alliance with pope and emperor, the source of some of Thomas's positions about the relationship of the spiritual and the temporal? In fact, he was almost twenty when he was detained at Roccasecca, and he had complete leisure to think about these things. It would not be impermissible to see a reflection of his experience in a celebrated text written ten years later, in which he draws a very clear distinction between the domain of the temporal power and that of the spiritual power:

The spiritual power and the secular power both derive from the divine power. That is why the secular power is not subordinated to the spiritual power, except to the extent that it has been subordinated by God, which is to say, inasmuch as concerns the salvation of souls. In this realm it is better to obey the spiritual power than the temporal. But in what concerns political goods, it is better to obey the secular power rather than the spiritual, as it is said in Matthew 22:21, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." At least this is so unless the secular power is joined to the spiritual power, as it is in the case of the pope, who possesses eminence in both powers, spiritual and secular, such that he disposes of them as both priest and king: a priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek; king of kings and lord of lords, whose power will never be taken away and whose kingdom will never be destroyed, forever and ever.⁶⁵

Unlike his contemporaries Saint Bonaventure and even Saint Albertus Magnus, who were still captive to the equation *ecclesia = christianitas*,

⁶⁴ *Ystoria* 4–6, pp. 198–205 (Tocco 3–5, pp. 68–70).

⁶⁵ *Sent.* II d. 44, *expositio textus*, ad. 4 See I. T. Eschmann, "Saint Thomas Aquinas on the Two Powers," *MS* 20 (1958) 177–205, for the sources and parallels to this doctrine. Its distant origin is Gelasius I's decree, *Duo quippe sunt*, but the immediate source would be a gloss by Huguccio on the Decretals of Gratian (c. 6, D. 96), cf. p. 184. One cannot follow Eschmann, however, in his basic thesis that this is an isolated text in Saint Thomas's teaching and that the position in *De regno* is the opposite (thus he doubts the authenticity of *De regno*). Better to adopt the relevant critique of L. E. Boyle, "The *De regno* and the Two Powers," in *Pastoral Care*, study XIII, which shows that this text defends the same dual position as the text in the *Sentences*, cited above.

which they inherited from the High Middle Ages with its perpetual temptation to hierocracy or, at the other extreme, Caesaropapism,⁶⁶ Thomas has a clearly dualistic conception of the connections between Church and society, and he never wavers on this subject.⁶⁷

Weisheipl (p. 8), who recalls this text from the *Sentences*, also sees in it the affirmation that the pope's temporal power is only an accident connected with his spiritual mission. This is to go too far, for Thomas never reaches that point. If he always remains faithful to his youthful intuition about the distinction between the two powers and their mutual subordination in their respective spheres, he also admits without discussion their de facto union in the pope, and he even allows the subordination of the ends of political society to the final end of the Church.⁶⁸ Though not always easy to interpret, Thomas's political thought is not without coherence. This could be demonstrated without having to consider *De regno* as inauthentic (as Eschmann would suggest with some precautions). Weisheipl is better: he suggests that the doctrinal position reflects a personal attitude in Thomas. He always stubbornly refused ecclesial honors that would inevitably have involved him in temporal affairs, whether it was a matter of the abbacy of Monte Cassino,⁶⁹ the archbishopric of Naples,⁷⁰ or a cardinal's hat.⁷¹ Tocco confirms that he even prayed that he would be spared such involvements.⁷²

The other telling event in Thomas's spiritual physiognomy is clearly his choice of the Dominican order. We can only guess at his reasons, though it seems easy to imagine what they must have been. Benedictine life in Monte Cassino at the time would not have much attracted a young man taken with the absolute. Nevertheless, Thomas would all his life retain a deep esteem for the Benedictine ideal. In his last known writing, a letter to Bernard Ayglier, abbot of Monte Cassino in 1274, he spontaneously

⁶⁶ Cf. the texts quoted by Eschmann, pp. 192–93.

⁶⁷ Besides Eschmann and Boyle (cf. n. 57), see L. P. Fitzgerald, "Saint Thomas Aquinas and the Two Powers," *Angelicum* 56 (1979) 515–56, who is also quite firm about the coherence of Thomas's thought on this point throughout his career, and about the authenticity of *De regno*. On the last point, the decisive contribution of the Leonine editors in their introduction to the critical edition of this opusculum (vol. 42, pp. 421–24) should be examined. We will also have occasion to return to the labors of B. Montagnes, "Les activités séculières et le mépris du monde chez S. Thomas d'Aquin. Les emplois du qualificatif 'saecularis,'" *RSPT* 55 (1971) 231–49.

⁶⁸ Cf., also *De regno* II 3 (formerly I 14), Leonine, vol. 42, pp. 465–67.

⁶⁹ Cantimpré I 20.; Tolomeo XXIII 21; WN, pp. 72–73.

⁷⁰ *Ystoria* 42, p. 332 (Tocco 42, p. 116).

⁷¹ *Ystoria* 63, p. 391 (Tocco 63, p. 137); *Naples* 78, p. 375.

⁷² *Ystoria* 32, p. 306 (Tocco 32, p. 107).

reverts to the language of a young monk and presents himself as a "devoted son always prepared for prompt obedience."⁷³ It is likely that Thomas's knowledge of St. Gregory the Great, with its particular attention to the *Dialogues* (whose authenticity he evidently did not doubt)⁷⁴ stems from this period.⁷⁵ We might say the same about his habit of regularly reading Cassian's *Collationes*, which he kept to his whole life.⁷⁶ In this, he may have been inspired by the example of Saint Dominic, who "read and cherished" this book. Jordan of Saxony says that it helped Dominic achieve "a high peak of perfection."⁷⁷

Meanwhile, Thomas surely perceived very quickly that his inclination toward study would be better satisfied in the new order and that, according to the theory he developed later, if it is good to contemplate divine things, it is even better to contemplate and transmit them to others.⁷⁸ To this we must add a point rarely seen in the lists of possible motives: Thomas's desire to live a life of poverty. This has been strikingly formulated: "The refusal of Monte Cassino is, for Thomas, the same gesture

⁷³. "Reuerendo in Christo patri Domino Bernardo . . . frater Thomas de Aquino *suus deuotus filius* se fatetur ubique *ad obedientiam promptum*"(!) This text may be read in the edition by A. Dondaine, either in the Leonine, vol. 42, pp. 413–15, or in the preparatory work that he published for Thomas's seventh centenary: "La lettre de saint Thomas à l'abbé du Montcassin," in *Commemorative Studies* I, pp. 87–108. Although today we do not regard this piece as in Thomas's own handwriting, its authenticity is no longer in doubt. There is a translation in P. Renaudin, "Saint Thomas d'Aquin et saint Benoît," *RT* 17 (1909) 513–37, cf. pp. 533–35.

⁷⁴. The controversy about the Gregorian authorship of the *Dialogues* has hardly ceased since the Renaissance. It resurfaced forcefully with the publication of F. Clark's *The Pseudo-Gregorian Dialogues*, vol. 2, *Studies in the History of Christian Thought* 37 (Leiden, 1987). For a response: P. Meyvaert, "The Enigma of Gregory the Great's 'Dialogues': A Response to Francis Clark," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 30 (1988) 335–81.

⁷⁵. See E. Portalupi, "Gregorio Magno nell'*Index Thomisticus*," *Bull. de la SIEPM* 31 (1989) 112–46. While the author refrains from drawing conclusions, he has to state that the 2470 occurrences of Gregory in Thomas's works make him "one of the privileged patristic sources of Thomas's output" (p. 127). He makes another significant remark: "our author [i.e., Gregory] carries a certain weight in the writings that defend the religious life" (*ibid.*). See also *Studi sulla presenza di Gregorio Magno in Tommaso d'Aquino*, Dokimion 10 (Fribourg, 1991), where the same author studies in greater detail Thomas's use of Gregory in the Questions *De ueritate* and *De malo*.

⁷⁶. *Ystoria* 22, p. 274 (Tocco 21, p. 95). in addition to these two specific points, it is probable that Thomas got a very serious basic education at Monte Cassino (cf. Leccisotti, *S. Tommaso*, pp. 26–33). Tolomeo XXII 20 assures us: "in logicalibus et naturalibus optime profecit." It is not impossible that he benefitted from the teaching of the monk Erasmus, whom we find again in 1240 at the University of Naples (cf. T. Leccisotti, "Magister Erasmus," *Bulletino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il medioevo e Archivio Muratoriano* 47 [1932] 209–16. C. Le Brun-Gouvanic (*Ystoria*, p. 205) suggests that there may even have been a connection between Thomas's departure to study at Naples and Erasmus's presence at the university.

⁷⁷. *Libellus* 13, trans. M.-H. Vicaire, *Saint Dominique et ses frères* (Paris, 1967), p. 55.

⁷⁸. IIa IIae q. 188 a. 6; cf. IIIa q. 40 a. 1 ad 2; a. 2.

made by Francis of Assisi."⁷⁹ The liveliness and evangelical depth with which he later defends the ideal of mendicant poverty against William of Saint-Amour may well find its origins in this period, hardly more than a dozen years earlier:

Of all that Christ did or suffered during his mortal existence, His venerable Cross is offered to us as the prime example that we must imitate. . . . Now, of all that he teaches us, absolutely first is poverty [*omnimoda paupertas*]; Christ was deprived of every exterior good, even to the point of bodily nakedness. . . . It is that nakedness on the Cross that those who embrace voluntary poverty wish to follow, particularly those who give up all gain. . . . Clearly, therefore, the enemies of poverty are also the enemies of Christ's Cross. The wisdom of the world thinks that earthly possessions belong to Christian perfection, while refusing them will lead only to a lesser perfection.⁸⁰

We might bring to light a third trait about the stubbornness with which Thomas resisted family pressure. The placidity and moderation that we usually link to his genius are legendary and will have to be examined further. Supposing these traits to have been real, we should not overlook the radicalism of which Thomas was capable. Here, the mature man theorizes about the adolescent's intuitions:

When parents are not in a situation of serious need for help from their children, the latter may leave parental service and enter the religious life, even against parental wishes. Having passed the age of puberty, whoever is free has the right to dispose of himself in the choice of a state of life, especially if it concerns serving God. Better to obey the *Father of spirits* (Hebrews 12:9) through whom we live than to obey the generators of our flesh.⁸¹

The emotional tremor that runs through this fierce declaration takes us back directly to the attitude of the novice sequestered by his family. It is still that young man who, speaking of the right of the *pueri* (i.e., adolescents) to enter the religious life, assures us that they may do it "even against

⁷⁹ M.-D. Ghenu, *Saint Thomas d'Aquin et la théologie*, Maîtres spirituels 17 (Paris, 1959), p. 11.

⁸⁰ *Contra Retrahentes* 15, Leonine, vol. 41, p. C 69. We will return to this subject a little later, but as bizarre as it may seem, William of Saint-Amour made a complete apology for clerical wealth. Cf. M.-M. Dufeil, *Saint Thomas et l'histoire*, Senefiance 29 (Aix-en-Provence, 1991), pp. 445–56: "Un universitaire réactionnaire vets 1250: Guillaume de Saint-Amour"; we refer provisionally to these few pages while waiting to return to the more considerable works of which they are the echo.

⁸¹ *Ila Ilae* q. 189 a. 6.

the wishes of their parents."⁸² And he adds: "In this domain, our relatives according to the flesh are more enemies than friends."⁸³

It's a great pity for him, but even more for us, that we generally know only Thomas's most abstract philosophical and theological writings. This imbalance often leads to a misconception about him further aggravated by commentators more concerned about logic than was Thomas himself. Whoever seeks Thomas's personality in his writings will soon discover it to be quite different than he may think.

⁸². *Quodlibet* IV q. 12 a. 1 [23]: *etiam invitis parentibus*.

⁸³. *Contra Retrahentes* 9, Leonine, vol. 41, p. C 57: *Propinqui autem carnis in hoc proposito amici non sunt, sed potius inimici*. If we are alert to this type of personal note, we may find it elsewhere, even in the fragments of *Super Mattheum* recently edited by J. P. Renard (50, 1983, p. 179, lines 754–756): *si aliquis propter introitum religionis sustinet plura dampna a parentibus, consilium est ut non pretermittat quod melius est*. H.-D. Saffrey, "Un panégyrique inédit de S. Thomas d'Aquin par Josse Clichtove," in *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 539–53 (cf. p. 540), notes a very curious detail that has all the marks of a personal confidence: repeating a passage where Saint Jerome recommends to "trample under foot," if necessary, your own father (*per calcatum perge patrem*), Thomas adds on his own: *per calcatam perge matrem* (IIa IIae q. 101 a. 4).

Chapter II— Disciple of Albertus Magnus (1245—1252)

Thomas was returned, then, to the Dominican order by his family in the summer of 1245. If, as seems to have been the case, Innocent IV's deposing of Frederick II played a role in that decision, it would have been made after 17 July 1245. The Aquinas family, partly detached from the emperor and obligated to good will toward the Church, would thus have released Thomas.¹

The Dominicans in Naples, little reassured by this happy development, thought it unsafe to keep the new recruit among them and sent him to Rome. There, *ad capitulum generale*, they could provide for his future and direct him to some university to pursue his studies.² In fact, there was no general chapter held at Rome that year, and we must understand Thomas to have been sent to Rome, where the master of the order, John the Teuton, was to be found on the point of departing for Paris, where the general chapter of 1246 was to be held. Thus, Tocco continues by explaining that John "received Thomas like a dear son in Christ, sending him first to Paris, then to Cologne, where a *studium generale* was in full bloom under the leadership of Brother Albert, master of theology, and reputed to be accomplished in all realms of knowledge."³

¹ The historians seem to have reached a consensus on this date (cf. Scandone, p. 15; WN, p. 56; Weisheipl, p. 35; *Ystoria*, p. 225, n. 18). Tugwell (p. 207) is the only exception; he prefers, in harmony with his other judgments, to put Thomas's release in the first few months of 1246.

² *Ystoria* 13, P. 226, corrects Tocco 12, p. 77, who instead of *ad capitulum generale* wrote *ad magistrum ordinis*.

³ *Ystoria* 13, p. 226 (Tocco 12, p. 77): "Quem (Thomam) cum frater Johannes Theutonicus,

(footnote continued on next page)

Paris (1245–1248)

Until quite recently, historians hesitated to credit Thomas's stay in Paris after he was returned to the order by his family. Our oldest sources, Frachet and Cantimpré, are nevertheless quite clear: he was sent to Paris by the master of the order.⁴ Tocco describes two distinct stages: *duxit eum Parisius et deinde Coloniam*.⁵ Following him, Bernard Gui and Peter Calo mention this trip to Paris, then to Cologne. Tolomeo of Lucca says only that he went from Italy to Cologne.⁶ After a painstaking examination of the sources, Walz-Novarina conclude that the *journey* to Paris in the company of John the Teuton "without being certain can be considered probable," but they are more reserved on the question of *studies* at Paris: "The historical sources do not provide . . . proof that Thomas was a student in Paris."⁷

Many distinguished scholars (Denifle, De Groot, Pelster, Eschmann) take the same view, but many others (Mandonnet, Grabmann, Chenu, Glorieux) observe that the Paris trip would have had no point if Thomas did not study there. The latter group also notes in particular that the *studium generale* at Cologne was not in operation before 1248, the date of its opening by Albertus Magnus upon his return to that city.⁸ Until then, the young Dominican would have been wasting his time there. In fact, the stay in Paris, which might have remained a hypothesis, is presented as a certainty by the most recent historians who have examined it.⁹ Some new research has brought forward decisive arguments. These converging proofs, independently arrived at by different researchers, are of two kinds.

(footnote continued from previous page)

magister ordinis, in carissimum in Christo filium suscepisset *duxit ipsum Parisius et deinde Coloniam*: ubi sub fratre Alberto magistro in theologia eiusdem ordinis florebat studium generale, qui reputabatur in omni scientia singularis."

⁴ Frachet IV 17, 3: *missus est Parisius*; Cantimpré I 20: *transmissus est Parisios a magistro ordinis*.

⁵ Cf. note 3 above.

⁶ Gui, p. 176: "Quem (Thomam) . . . Johannes theutonicus . . . *duxit parisius. Deinde mittitur in Coloniam* . . ." Cf. Calo 8, p. 25, with Prümmer's notes. Tolomeo XXII 21 has Thomas leave for Rome at his colorful liberation (horses are ready under the walls of the castle when he escapes secretly): "Inde vadit Coloniam ad Fratrem Albertum ubi multo tempore fuit."

⁷ WN, pp. 62 and 64.

⁸ The organization of studies in the Dominican order distinguished between *studium solemne* and *studium generale*. The first operated at the provincial level for the philosophical and theological formation of ordinary students. The second was interprovincial, at the university level, and only the most capable students were sent there. For a long time, only the priory of Saint-Jacques in Paris enjoyed the latter status, which it first obtained in 1229 (Cf. C. Douais, *Essai sur l'organisation des études* . . . , pp. 15–140; Glorieux, *Répertoire* I, pp. 34–38).

⁹ Weisheipl, pp. 36–38. See the same author's "The Life and Works of St. Albert the Great," in *Albertus Magnus and the Sciences: Commemorative Essays*, 1980, pp. 25–26. Tugwell (p. 208) also allies himself with this position.

The first type is based on internal evidence. R.-A. Gauthier¹⁰ has noted that Thomas's works, particularly his commentary on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, bears deep traces of ideas circulating in Paris between 1240 and 1250. This may be observed in three different realms: (1) Thomas often quotes from memory the text of the *Ethica uetus*, the oldest translation and the only one then in use (he seems never to have recalled the *Ethica noua* in his work); (2) His commentary "attests a good knowledge of the exegesis that the Parisian masters of arts had performed on these [old] translations" from Aristotle. Thomas is so "deeply impregnated" with them that he continues to repeat their faulty interpretations even after Albert seems to have given him good ones;¹¹ (3) Thomas could not have gotten this at Naples (1239–43) because there is no record of the teaching of the *Ethics* there at this time, while such teaching was in full bloom at Paris between 1240 and 1250. And it seems hardly plausible that he would have returned later to a commentary on the *Ethica uetus* when Albert had already introduced him to the *translatio lincolniensis*. Effectively, after 1250 the commentaries on the *Ethica uetus* were out of date and were no longer circulated.

For all these reasons, it is more than probable that Thomas studied at Paris. But Gauthier takes a further step in saying that it was still not theology he studied with Albert in that period. He attended the faculty of arts instead of the faculty of theology, and thus finished the introduction to learning he had begun at Naples between the ages of fourteen and eighteen. Gauthier even hazards a guess about the names of the two masters he might have had: Alexander, who may be the same Alexander whose work was used to edit a *Sentencia super nouam et ueterem ethicam* mentioned in a catalog dated 1338;¹² and Arnoul de Provence, whose introduction to philosophy attracted interest for its treatment of moral questions. In support of this hypothesis, it might be added that the relations between Thomas and the arts faculty will show themselves more than once afterwards. These may reflect the continuation of acquaintances made during this Parisian period.

¹⁰ Cf. "S. Thomas et l'Ethique à Nicomaque," Leonine, vol. 48, pp. xv–xvii, which we summarize here and to which we refer the reader for a brief survey of the Latin translations of the *Ethics* from that period. Cf. preface to Leonine edition, vol. 47/1, pp. 236–37.

¹¹ For example, on *Eth.* I 5, 44–47 and I 12, 188–92.

¹² Cf. R.-A. Gauthier, "Le cours sur l'*Ethica noua* d'un maître ès arts de Paris (1235–1240)," *AHDLM* 42 (1975) 71–141; cf. p. 93, where the author engages in some speculations about this figure.

Converging arguments on the basis of external evidence have been advanced by Paul Simon in the Prolegomena to his edition of Albertus Magnus's *Super Dionysium De divinis nominibus*.¹³ This text was transmitted, along with other commentaries by Albert on Dionysius, in a Neapolitan manuscript (*Biblioteca Nazionale I. B. 54*),¹⁴ one of whose claims to interest is that it was written in Thomas's own handwriting; for several years, Thomas served as secretary to Saint Albert. The text of the first commentary in this volume, the commentary on *De caelesti hierarchia*, and only this commentary, presents the added distinction of being divided into "pieces" (*peciae*).

For anyone unfamiliar with the techniques of university book production before the invention of printing, it is necessary to realize that the pieces are the separate notebooks of a given manuscript volume. They could be given separately to different copyists without having to tie up the whole book at any time. This had the valuable advantage of considerably speeding up the copying of the volume. If twenty copyists worked simultaneously on each of the twenty pieces of a book, the whole book could then be copied in the time it would take to copy a single piece.¹⁵

This practice was, before 1250, already widely used in Paris, where there was a large student demand for books but it was still unknown at Cologne at this time because the university had not yet been founded there. The way the pieces are identified (capital letters in the upper margin on the first page of each piece) is typical of Paris. According to Simon (Shooner¹⁶ agrees with him), what the young Thomas did in his service to Albert was to prepare the edition of Albert's commentary for its reproduction by the copying system, which is to say that he was the first practitioner

¹³ P. Simon, *Prolegomena*, in *S. Alberti Magni Opera omnia*, ed. Coloniensis, vol. 37/1: *Super Dionysium de divinis nominibus* (Bonn, 1972), pp. vi–vii.

¹⁴ Cf. G. Théry, "L'autographe de S. Thomas conservé à la Biblioteca Nazionale de Naples," *AFP* 1 (1931) 15–86; P. M. Gils, "Le MS. *Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale I. B. 54* est-il de la main de S. Thomas?" *RSPT* 49 (1965) 37–59; H.-F. Dondaine and H.-V. Shooner, *Codices Manuscripti Operum Thomae de Aquino I* (Rome, 1967), p. 8.

¹⁵ Since J. Destrez's work, *Etudes critiques sur les oeuvres de saint Thomas d'Aquin d'après la tradition manuscrite*, Bibliothèque thomiste 18 (Paris, 1933), p. 5–31, researchers have made considerable progress in studying and understanding the system of book circulation and have also become more aware of the problems that system poses for critical editions. Among the most recent works, see: L.-J. Bataillon, B. G. Guyot, R. H. Rouse, eds., *La production du livre universitaire au Moyen-Âge, 'exemplar' et 'pecia'* (Paris, 1988) L.-J. Bataillon, "Exemplar, Pecia, Quaternus," in O. Weijers, ed., *Vocabulaire du livre et de l'écriture au Moyen âge*, CIVICIMA 2 (Turnhout, 1989), pp. 206–19.

¹⁶ H.-V. Shooner, "La production du livre par la pecia," in *La production du livre*, pp. 17–37.

of it. This conclusion seemed excessive to Leonard Boyle. Without questioning Thomas's handwriting or his copying of the text during the first visit to Paris, he strongly doubts that the text Thomas copied could have been used as an "exemplar" for university copying. The distinctive handwriting of the young monk and a series of other arguments, according to Boyle, work against this hypothesis. If his copy is already divided into pieces, that means he copied a manuscript already in that form. Thomas was, therefore, the first known witness to the system, not its first practitioner.¹⁷

Without delving further into this scholarly controversy, we might retain from this discussion the fact that a new researcher of high standing has joined with those who accept a prolonged stay by Thomas in Paris at this time. The manuscript mentioned above presents other oddities that P. Simon has analyzed with penetration, but the following points suffice for understanding his double conclusion. First, Albert composed his commentary on *De caelesti hierarchia* while he was in Paris, therefore before 1248. If Thomas, who copied it in his own handwriting according to the Parisian fashion, was one of its first beneficiaries, that was because he too was in Paris at the time. Returning to the text of Tocco with which we began, Simon properly remarks that *deinde* does not have the same meaning as *statim*, and that *deinde* permits us to suppose a rather long interval between the arrival in Paris and the departure for Cologne. In Cologne, Thomas would later retranscribe some of Albert's courses on Dionysius, but he was no longer obliged to present the manuscript in the same manner as he had in Paris.

Weisheipl agrees with Simon's and Gauthier's conclusions that the stay in Paris to study occurred, but he differs from Gauthier, who sees Thomas as a student in the faculty of arts. Normally, religious studied in their priories, Weisheipl recalls, and, according to the constitutions of the order, they could not attend courses outside without a dispensation. For Weisheipl, Thomas must therefore have acquired the knowledge he displays through private study.¹⁸ This is certainly possible, but we have to ask whether Weisheipl has taken into account all the available data on this point.

¹⁷. L. E. Boyle, "An Autograph of St. Thomas at Salerno," in A. Lobato, ed., *Littera, Sensus, Sententia, Studi in onore del Prof. Clemente J. Vansteenkiste* (Milan, 1991), pp. 117–34.

¹⁸. Weisheipl, pp. 37–38; see also by the same author, *Thomas d'Aquino and Albert His Teacher* (Toronto, 1980), pp. 5–6.

In a text that dates without question from 1220, the early Dominican constitutions restore, in effect, the earlier prohibitions against clerics "studying the books of the pagans." They even extend that interdiction further to the philosophers and the liberal arts, but the very same text provides that the authorities of the order may dispense from the interdiction.¹⁹ It is entirely believable that Thomas obtained this dispensation, since it was precisely one of the particular features of the Dominican order to grant dispensations from various obligations for reasons of study.²⁰ For a gifted person like Thomas, this would be at least plausible. But it would also not be impossible, as L.-J. Bataillon suggests, that qualified religious or friendly secular masters could have taught liberal arts within the priory. Such teaching was indispensable for the study of theology, but we still do not know how it was provided to the mendicant orders.²¹

For the young Thomas in particular, it is also necessary to take into account the amount of time we can see he had at Paris—too short a period for a complete course of study. In all likelihood, he left Monte Cassino with a good basic formation, but the four or five years in Naples (1239–44) were not enough for Thomas to have finished the full cycle of liberal arts (it usually took six or seven years).²² We must therefore admit with Gauthier that he completed his philosophy course in Paris or at least that

¹⁹. *De Oudste Constituties van de Dominicanen*, ed. A. H. Thomas, Bibliothèque de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique 42 (Leuven, 1965), p. 361: "In libris gentilium et philosophorum non studeant, etsi ad horam inspiciant. Saeculares scientias non addiscant nec etiam artes quas liberales vocant, nisi aliquando circa aliquos magister ordinis vel capitulum generale voluerit aliter dispensare . . ."; that same interdiction is repeated in the Constitutions of Raymond of Peñafort in 1241, cf. AFP 18 (1948), pp. 65–66. The text may be found in *Constitutions primitives* of the Dominican order, translated into French, in M.-H. Vicaire, *Saint Dominique de Caleruega d'après les documents du XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1955), pp. 136–84, or in the same author's *Saint Dominique, La vie apostolique* (Paris, 1965), pp. 161–97.

²⁰. Cf. the *Constitutiones Antiquae, Prol.*, in A. H. Thomas, ed., *De Oudste Constituties*, p. 311; G. Meersseman, "In libris gentilium non studeant. L'étude des classiques interdite aux clercs au moyen âge?" in *Italia medioevale e classica I* (Padua, 1958), pp. 1–13, who has given a nuanced exegesis of the modifications to this point in the ancient Dominican constitutions. He emphasizes that the closing clause on exemptions (reproduced in italics in the preceding note) was introduced in 1228 and it moderated noticeably the original rigidity; the Dominican superiors knew how to apply this clause widely.

²¹. L.-J. Bataillon, *Status quaestionis*, p. 647–57, cf. p. 650.

²². The information we have on the length and contents of these studies does not always agree. Cf. J. A. Weisheipl, "Curriculum of the Faculty of Arts at Oxford in the Early Fourteenth Century," *MS 26* (1964), 143–85. Cf. the article "Artes Liberales" (several authors) in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 1 (1980), 1058–1063. For the place of the liberal arts in the formation of a future theologian, cf. L. Hödl, *ibid.*, cols. 1061–1062; G. Leff, *Paris and Oxford Universities in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries: An Institutional and Intellectual History* (New York, 1968), pp. 164–65. See also F. Van Steenberghen, *La philosophie au XIII^e, siècle*, pp. 50–81 [2d ed. (1991), pp. 45–75].

he attended certain courses there, since the level was doubtless superior to what could be found in Naples. But we must also immediately add that he simultaneously began the theological course at Paris, too. It took at least five years of study to get the baccalaureate that would have allowed him to teach as a theologian. If, as we shall see, Thomas began commenting on the *Sentences* in 1252, we have to place his teaching on Isaiah in 1251–52. This would indicate a shortening of the five years of theology usually prescribed. A solution suggests itself: the period of study in Paris was a time of varied formation, during which Thomas's superiors, recognizing his intellectual gifts, allowed him to begin theology while he was finishing his philosophical formation.

We may thus sum up what we know about these first years as a Dominican: in the autumn of 1245, Thomas set out for Paris in the company of John the Teuton. He spent 1246, 1247, and the first part of 1248 there—three academic years. It is not impossible that the first of these years was the novitiate year, which Thomas had still not been able to make since taking the habit in April of 1244.²³ During the next two years, he could have studied the liberal arts either at the faculty of arts or in the priory. But nothing would have prevented him from studying theology in some courses with Albert at Saint-Jacques during the same time. He recopied Albert's *De caelesti hierarchia* in a manuscript that gives testimony to the Parisian system of "pieces." In 1248, he departed for Cologne with Albert, with whom he will continue his studies in theology and his work as an assistant.

Cologne (1248–1252)

Unlike the stay in Paris, Thomas's time in Cologne has never been questioned, because it is well documented. The only problem has to do with its length. We know that it lasts until 1252, but the scholars who would like to eliminate the stay in Paris make it begin in 1246, forgetting that Albert was not yet in Cologne. According to the timetable we have just proposed, there is no longer any difficulty.

On 7 June 1248 (Pentecost), the general chapter of the Dominicans, meeting in Paris, decided to create a *studium generale* in Cologne.²⁴ In

²³. This is Weisheipl's suggestion, p. 38. According to Tugwell's chronology, things went differently: Thomas did his novitiate and made profession before his family captured him (cf. p. 204).

²⁴. This step, confirmed by three successive chapters according to the Rule, in fact dealt with four provinces: Provence, Lombardy, Germany, and England. Cf. *MOPH* 3, P. 41.

the latter city, a Dominican priory had been founded in 1221/22 by Brother Henry, a companion of Jordan of Saxony.²⁵ Albert, whose reputation was already great, was asked to teach there.²⁶ He left Paris at the end of the academic year (the masters ended lessons on June 29) and took Thomas with him to begin the new academic year in the fall at Cologne. If they kept to the Parisian custom, they began teaching on September 14th, Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross.²⁷ They had already arrived by the Assumption, and it is highly likely that Thomas was present at the laying of the first stone for the cathedral, an event that took place that day. Albert speaks in his works about the excavations undertaken at the time, which brought to light some superb ancient mosaics.²⁸

The stay in Cologne constituted a decisive phase in Thomas's life. In all likelihood, this was the period of his priestly ordination, but we do not have any precise information on this question. We do know, however, that Saint Albert had a considerable influence on him. During these four years, between the ages of twenty-three and twenty-seven, Thomas was deeply impregnated with Albert's thought; he continued the work for him already begun in Paris. He was putting in order his notes from Albert's courses on Dionysius's *Divine Names* and Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*. This was heavy work, and Gauthier (following Pelzer) estimates that it took up one third of Thomas's working time during this period.²⁹

It has never been disputed that Thomas took Albert's course on the *Divine Names*, but it is astonishing that, already a theologian, Thomas also took the course on the *Ethics*, which normally was part of the philosophy program. Gauthier's investigations have shown in Thomas's own commentary on the *Ethics* some 350 passages in which "Albert's influence is evident." In that light, we cannot doubt any longer the assertions of the ancient biographers. These recollections from Albert's work do not refer to the later commentary by Albert, produced when Thomas was no longer

²⁵ On this foundation, see Weisheipl, *Life and Works*, p. 38, or WN, p. 66.

²⁶ Henri de Herford, *Liber de rebus memorabilioribus sive Cronicon*, ed. A. Potthast (Göttingen, 1859), p. 201: "Post tres annos magisterii sui Coloniam mittitur ad legendum."

²⁷ Cf. P. Glorieux, "L'enseignement," p. 103.

²⁸ Albert, *De causis et proprietatibus elementorum* I, tr. 2, cap. 3, Borgnet 9, 605b: "et nos in Colonia vidimus altissimas fieri foveas, et in fundo illarum inventa sunt paramenta mirabilis schematis et decoris, quae constat ibi homines antiquitus fecisse, et congestam fuisse terram super ea post ruinas aedificiorum."

²⁹ R.-A. Gauthier, *Leonine*, vol. 48, p. xvii, with reference to A. Pelzer, *Etudes d'histoire littéraire sur la scolastique médiévale*, Philosophes médiévaux VIII (Louvain-Paris, 1964), p. 282. Thomas's autograph of the *Divine Names* is preserved in the Naples manuscript of which we have spoken above.

his student. Rather, they refer to the older course, of which Thomas displays "a profound knowledge (the mass of his recollections proves it), but a distant knowledge (the number of his slips of memory shows this)."

If, as appears, Albert did not bother to follow Thomas's later theological output, we know with certainty that Thomas, by contrast, continued to pay attention to the publications of his former master, even having Albert's commentary on the *Ethics* put on note cards to be able to gain access to it more easily. This labor gave birth to the work known as the *Tabula libri Ethicorum*, which presents itself as a lexicon whose definitions are most often almost literal quotations from Albert. Gauthier, who has carefully examined this work and edited it for publication, suggests that Thomas may have begun compiling it while he was working on his own *Secunda Pars* of the *Summa theologiae*. He may have left the *Tabula* unfinished because his own maturation (he had not delayed the start of his own commentary on the *Ethics*) allowed him to see imperfections in the work of his former master.³⁰

Several anecdotes have come down to us from the Cologne period. These cannot be entirely ignored. Even if they are not historically accurate, they at least tell us how Thomas was perceived by his contemporaries. Take, for instance, the "dumb ox from Sicily." We imagine that Thomas's taciturnity earned him that nickname. But he could also on occasion show that he was capable of expressing himself in a magisterial way. It was about this time that Albert is supposed to have said prophetically: "We call him the dumb ox, but he will make resound in his doctrine such a bellowing that it will echo throughout the entire world."³¹ It is difficult to avoid this little story about Thomas, but perhaps it should be added that the nickname was less pejorative than we think. An old legend that brings onto the scene the mother of Reginald, his *socius* (about whom we shall speak later), gives a probable reason for the epithet: "He was so big that because of his body's massiveness he was called the Sicilian ox. The mother of Brother Reginald, his *socius*, recounts that when he was passing, the peasants in the fields left their labors and came near to look at him, full of admiration for a man of such corpulence and beauty."³²

Whatever the exact meaning of the expression, this anecdote (to which

³⁰ R.-A. Gauthier, preface to the edition of the *Tabula libri Ethicorum*, Leonine, vol. 48, p. B5–B55; Weisheipl, *Thomas d'Aquino and Albert His Teacher*, p. 13–14.

³¹ *Ystoria* 13, p. 229 (Tocco 12, p. 79).

³² M.-H. Laurent, "Un légendier dominicain peu connu," *Analecta Bollandiana* 58 (1940) 28–47, cf. p. 43.

we must clearly join the story of the tutor who wanted to help Thomas, the latter finally having to help the tutor out of difficulties) is at least a sign that Thomas's intellectual stature was beginning to be recognized and even to become legendary. In truth, it is doubtful that Albert would have had to wait so long to be persuaded of this. It is more likely that such stories reflect something of Thomas's true position with Albert—as not a simple student, but rather as an assistant who, at the same time he completed his own formation, could already be trusted with some teaching duties.³³ We can appreciate the high quality of this teaching by looking at his first known commentary on Scripture.

***The Bible and Spirituality:
The Super Isaiah***

Upon his arrival in Cologne, after Naples and Paris (and whatever may have been the details about his years of study), Thomas already had seven or eight years of formation behind him, even without counting what he learned on his own during the imprisonment by his family. Some scholars (De Groot, Berthier, Pelster) even think that he was already a lecturer in theology and probably the biblical bachelor for Albert (Scheeben, Eschmann).

Weisheipl takes up this hypothesis and suggests that Thomas taught *cursorie* on Jeremiah, Lamentations, and a part of Isaiah at Cologne.³⁴ These "cursory" lectures, we know, fell to the biblical bachelor during the first two years, when he was winning his spurs as a future master. Rapid by definition, "they do not enter into the details of all the different interpretations. . . . The lecturer's, that is to say the teacher's, aim is to make the literal sense of the text understood."³⁵ The commentaries on Jeremiah and Lamentations exactly correspond to that definition. Ironically, Sixtus of Siena in the sixteenth century denied the authenticity of these commentaries precisely because of their doctrinal poverty (*sterilitas doctrinae*). It is hardly worth lingering on this; but by contrast, the exposition of Isaiah, even if it sometimes leaves us a little hungry for more, possesses great riches on certain points.

³³. We may imagine the fraternal climate in which this collaboration may have developed, since Albert himself speaks rather often of the *socii* who worked with him. Cf. Y. Congar, "In dulcedine societatis quaerere veritatem. Note sur le travail en équipe chez S. Albert et chez les Prêcheurs au XIII^e siècle," in G. Meyer and A. Zimmermann, eds., *Albertus Magnus—Doctor Universalis 1280/1980* (Mainz, 1980), pp. 47–57.

³⁴. Weisheipl, pp. 45 and 369–70.

³⁵. P. Glorieux, "L'enseignement," p. 119; cf. M.-D. Chenu, *Toward*, p. 242.

The Leonine editors of the *Super Isaiam* (who did not know at the time Weisheipl's suggestion) put its composition during Thomas's first year of teaching in Paris, 1252–53.³⁶ But Weisheipl's arguments are not without weight. On the one hand, he reminds us that Thomas was sent to Paris to lecture on the *Sentences*, not the Bible.³⁷ Besides, he emphasizes that, if he had begun by reading the Bible, Thomas would have been an exception, since none of the masters who had occupied the second Dominican chair up until then had begun their teaching as bachelors with a cursory reading of the Bible. All had begun with the *Sentences*. Furthermore, by the middle of the thirteenth century it was no longer an absolute rule that the bachelor of the *Sentences* would earlier have been a biblical bachelor.³⁸

Weisheipl's suggestion is, therefore, well founded and it has been well received by accomplished scholars.³⁹ It remains within the generally accepted chronological framework for Thomas's first commentaries on Scripture, even if it slightly moves up the dates. Thus these commentaries, more than ever, may be regarded as "the first theological work by Saint Thomas."⁴⁰

As such, this first text deserves more attention than it usually gets. Among its other characteristics, it confirms Thomas's early taste for exegesis that gives preference to the literal sense. Curiously, this characteristic was even at the origin of a dispute over the work's authenticity. We know that in his interpretation of Isaiah 8:4, Thomas thinks that the *puer* announced there was the son of the prophet and his wife. This explanation, because of its closeness to the Jewish reading, which refused to see in this verse a prediction of Christ's birth, was enough to make Nicholas de Lyre doubt in 1326 the Thomist authorship of the commentary. Sixtus of Siena found it, in addition, unworthy of Thomas for its lack of erudition (*ob eruditionis inopiam*).⁴¹ Now, there is no doubt at all about the authenticity of this work. Not only is it listed in the catalogues of Thomas's work dating back to the end of the thirteenth century, but we have a large part of the manuscript in his well-known *illegibilis* handwriting.⁴²

³⁶ Leonine, vol. 28 (1974), pp. 19–20. Cf. Weisheipl's review in *The Thomist* 43 (1979) 331–37.

³⁷ *Ystoria* 15, p. 235 (Tocco 14, p. 81). See the following chapter, where we return to this subject.

³⁸ WN, p. 80, n. 29.

³⁹ Cf. L.-J. Bataillon, *RSPT* 64 (1980), p. 119; C. Vansteenkiste, *RLT* 9 (1977), no. 1, p. 12; M.-V. Leroy, *RT* 78 (1978), p. 666.

⁴⁰ Leonine, vol. 28, p. 20*, in regard to the *Super Isaiam*.

⁴¹ Cf. Leonine, vol. 28, "Introduction," pp. 3–4.

⁴² This consists of the commentary on chapters 34–50, which is found in the manuscript

(footnote continued on next page)

Writings in Thomas's own hand are too rare for them not to pique our interest. It is always valuable to see a genius at work, to discover his hesitations, his erasures, his second attempts, and, ultimately, the final form of his thought. The manuscript of the *Super Isaiam* presents the additional interest of allowing us to glimpse Thomas preparing, not a book that he would have had time to perfect, but his course lectures. Exactly the opposite of the *reportationes*, which represent a more or less carefully corrected clean copy of a course of lectures heard by a student, or taken in shorthand by a secretary (as Reginald frequently did for Thomas), the notes for the *Super Isaiam* were set down on parchment, day after day, by the young bachelor. He did this with an eye to the lectures that he had to give in a few hours. They bear all the marks of hasty work. This should explain, at least in part, the roughness of style, which seems to increase after the first few chapters. If he had a little time to prepare the first lectures, he had soon used up his prepared texts and was obliged to speak from later texts that were not completely written out.

All this was long ago described by P.-M. Gils with great precision,⁴³ but beyond these generalizations, Gils also drew attention to a unique feature of this handwritten manuscript. There are short, marginal annotations in a telegraphic form that accompany the text proper. We do not know what Thomas himself called them, but Jacobinus of Asti, the first transcriber in a clear hand of the autograph, called them *collationes*. They appear in the form of outlines, in the *illegibilis* hand like the rest of the text, and they are linked, assembled, by fanlike lines. Starting with a word from the text of Isaiah, Thomas hastily notes suggestions that he has about it for a spiritual or pastoral expansion of his literal commentary. (There are similar annotations in the *Super Ieremiam*, but the autograph manuscript has been lost.)

The word *collationes* makes us think immediately of notes for preaching. We know that the term *collatio*, which at the time already had a long history, had come to be used of sermons given at vespers.⁴⁴ But it also

(footnote continued from previous page)

Vaticanus latinus 9850, cf. Leonine edition, vol. 28, pp. 14^{*}–15^{*}. We should rectify here an error that the late Hugues Shooner mentioned to us a few days before his death. Owing to a transcription error of a badly written original, Thomas's handwriting is often described as a *littera inintelligibilis*—something that is barely "intelligible." In fact, we should read *littera illegibilis*—which is much more understandable (cf. H.-F. Dondaine, H.-V. Shooner, above, note 14, notice 3, P. 7). Bad habits are tenacious, as we will see in our quotations from other authors.

⁴³ P.-M. Gils, "Les *Collationes* marginales dans l'autographe du commentaire de S. Thomas sur Isaïe," *RSPT* 42 (1958) 253–64.

⁴⁴ Cf. J.-P. Tottell, "La pratique pastorale d'un théologien du XIII^e siècle. Thomas d'Aquin

(footnote continued on next page)

refers, and perhaps did originally, to the primary sense of *collatio*, things put together, or as Gils says, "assemblies": "The *collationes* of the *Super Isaiam* are *assemblies* of scriptural quotations, connections that a given word in Isaiah suggested, that do not find a place in a strictly literal commentary, but that inspire spiritual or moral applications of the text." Their placement in the margins should not, however, lead us into error. They "belong essentially to the commentary, and constitute its spiritual dimension, or 'mystical' part as the ancients said." We might, therefore, consider them as "the most authentic collection of 'spiritual works' by Saint Thomas."⁴⁵ They are therefore as important as the commentary itself for grasping how, from the beginning of his career, Thomas allowed the main traits of his style as a commentator on Scripture to emerge decisively. If the commentary gives the primacy to literal exegesis, the *collationes* show—and simultaneously confirm—the spiritual concern that animates the literal analysis.

We have examined elsewhere at length the twenty-four *collationes* of the part of the commentary on Isaiah in Thomas's handwriting.⁴⁶ It would be worth the trouble to devote a similar study to the annotations that were inserted into the body of the text by Jacobinus of Asti. These are easily recognizable by the *nota* or *notandum* that introduce them and that are intended to draw the attention of the reader as much as to announce that the author is changing registers, passing from the literal to the spiritual sense. Though we cannot perform such a task here, it is necessary at least to present one of these *collationes* in order to make clear both how Thomas proceeded and the richness of these little, ignored texts. For enriching our notion of Thomistic spirituality, they are of an entirely unique interest.⁴⁷

For instance, Thomas comments on, "I teach you some *useful things*" (Isaiah 48:17):

(footnote continued from previous page)

prédicateur," *RT* 82 (1982) 218–19. J. Hamesse, "*Collatio et reportatio*: deux vocables spécifiques de la vie intellectuelle au Moyen Age," in O. Weijers, ed., *Terminologie de la vie intellectuelle au Moyen Age*, CIVICIMA 1 (Turnhout, 1988), pp. 78–87, cf. pp. 78–82.

⁴⁵ P.-M. Gils, "Les *Collationes*," pp. 255, 262, 264.

⁴⁶ J.-P. Tortell and D. Bouthillier, "Quand saint Thomas méditait sur le prophète Isaïe," *RT* 90 (1990) 5–47, from which we reproduce some portions here. We would like to rectify the clumsy expression (pp. 8–9) that gives the impression that only the part in Thomas's hand was provided with these annotations. In fact, they are spread throughout the entire text, from which they are inseparable. Furthermore, such a practice was not unique to Thomas. Other good examples of such annotated texts may be found in his contemporary, Peter of Tarentaise, and earlier in Hugh of Saint-Cher (cf. Leonine, vol. 28, p. 16* and n. 7).

⁴⁷ It is even more astonishing that, prior to our article (see note 46), only H.-D. Saffrey had devoted a few words to these *collationes*, "Saint Thomas d'Aquin et l'héritage des anciens," in *VIF Centenaire de saint Thomas d'Aquin et restauration de l'église des Jacobins*, *Chronique de L'Institut catholique de Toulouse* (1975), no. 4, PP. 73–90, cf. pp. 76–77.

The word of God is useful for

- illuminating the intelligence: "the teaching is a light" (Proverbs 6:23);
- making glad the senses: "How sweet on my palate is your promise" (Psalm 119:103);
- inflaming the heart: "It was in my heart like a devouring flame" (Jeremiah 20:9); "The word of the Lord inflamed them" (Psalm 106:19);
- rectifying our labors: "Direct me in your truth, teach me" (Psalm 25:5);
- obtaining glory: "Observe counsel and prudence" (Proverbs 3:21);
- instructing others: "All scripture inspired by God is useful for teaching, reproof . . ." (2 Timothy 3:16)

This last collation is a highly structured meditation on the place of the Word of God in theology and preaching. From the outset, it is a light for the intelligence. But affectivity also finds a place there: to meditate on the Word is joy. It also inflames the heart. Theological emotion—the charity that supernaturalizes our power of loving—is necessary in theology. Thomas does not forget this. In fact, his whole anthropology appears in this sequence: intelligence, affectivity, heart. When immediately after-wards he speaks of "rectifying our labors," we must understand him to be speaking not simply of material labor, but also of the moral action of man who, thus made straight, is destined to "obtain glory." These two last points cannot, any more than the earlier ones, be read in isolation. We see in this development the practical goal that Thomas assigns to theology.⁴⁸

As to the "instructing others," we can see here, without deceiving ourselves, the signature of the young member of the Order of Preachers. The rumination on the Word does not find its end in itself. That Word is destined by God for His People. Theological reflection as well as meditation for the sake of preaching are only the early stages of the whole process. The preparatory stages fulfill a true need because neither theologians nor preachers are pure instruments. They are properly secondary causes. That is precisely why they must be formed over time themselves by study and meditation. If it is not too much out of place here to cite a passage from Nietzsche, we might say along with him: "He who wishes one day to preach / should ruminate a long time in silence. He who wishes to bear lightning / should remain a long time as a cloud."⁴⁹

Praise of the Word of God is not rare in Thomas. We might refer to the manner in which he comments on the second article of the Creed. He

⁴⁸ Cf. *ST* Ia q. 1 a. 4.

⁴⁹ Cf. *Ainsi parlait Zarathoustra* (Livre de poche), Paris, 1963, p. 264 (my translation from the original German).

enumerates five attitudes toward the Word of God: (1) We must first *listen* willingly to it: "One of the signs that we love God is listening willingly to his Word." (2) We must next *believe* in it, "for it is thus that the Word of God, that is to say Christ, lives in us." (3) We must also *meditate* on it constantly, "because it is not enough to believe it, we must also ruminate on it, otherwise it will not be of any use; but if we do it, this meditation is very useful against sin." (4) We must further *communicate* it to others "by exhortation, preaching, and enkindling" (*commonendo, praedicando, et inflammando*). (5) We must finally *complete* it by being, as Saint James says, "realizers of the Word and not forgetful hearers." Thomas concludes with the beautiful observation that these five attitudes were observed by the Virgin Mary in this very order when she gave birth to the Word of God: "She first heard it . . . then she adhered to it by faith . . . she also kept it and bore it in her heart . . . then she brought it into the world, and finally she nourished and nursed it."⁵⁰ Brief as it is, this *laus Mariae* says much in few words.

For Thomas, the attentive listening to the Word of God (*diligens verbi divini auditio*) is a privileged way of acquiring the love of God, because the story of the favors God has done us is eminently suited to awaken in us that love. The example of the disciples at Emmaus is there to confirm it for us: their hearts were entirely burning with love when Jesus explained the Scripture to them along the way.⁵¹ But it is also the surest means to remain faithful in that love, as Thomas explains in his comment on the precept to observe the Sabbath as a day of rest. This precept is not a pretext for laziness but an admonition to devote ourselves to God in religious exercises, the celebration of spiritual sacrifices, and meditation on the Word of God. On the last point, Thomas, who is sometimes hard on the Jews, is not afraid to offer them as an example for Christians. Jews spend their Sabbath meditating on the prophets: "Christians, whose justice should be more perfect, ought therefore on that day go to church to hear the preaching: 'Whoever is of God listens to the Word of God.' They should also speak of things useful (to salvation): 'Let no evil wish come from your mouth, but only what edifies.' These two things are in effect useful to the preacher as well, for his heart is changed by them for the better. . . . This is the opposite of what happens even to the best if they do not hear or speak

⁵⁰. *Sur le Credo*, nos. 895–896.

⁵¹. *Collationes in decem precepta IV*, ed. J.-P. Torrell, *RSPT* 69 (1985), pp. 30–31 (hereafter: *Collationes*).

of useful things. 'Bad conversation corrupts good habits.' The word is also useful to whoever is tempted, for the word of the Lord instructs the ignorant: 'Your word is a light to my feet'; similarly, it inflames the lukewarm: 'The word of the Lord has inflamed him.'"⁵²

The stories of the biographers completely corroborate this teaching. Precisely about his preaching, Tocco reports, "He was often heard to say that he was astonished when certain people, primarily the religious, allow themselves to speak of something other than God and of what concerns the edification of souls. Also, he had the habit since youth of immediately leaving the parlor or meeting, whatever it might be, when, in their common recreations, his interlocutors diverted the conversation toward subjects other than God and what is ordered to him."⁵³ Rigorism perhaps? More simply, doubtless, translation into action of what Thomas had learned from his holy patron in the Order of Preachers, who spoke only of God or with God (*nonnisi cum Deo aut de Deo loquebatur*).

The interesting thing about this last collation from the handwritten part of the commentary on Isaiah is that it allows us to grasp in a very direct way the personal preoccupations of the young Dominican. In fact, the discreet but precise allusions to the ideal of Saint Dominic, which the young preacher would honor in so eminent a fashion, are not at all rare in the *Collationes*. But one finds there also, at least sketched out, the great spiritual themes of all times: God, to be sure, Christ, and the Holy Spirit; but also more precise subjects: the approach to God, prayer, raising our gaze toward God, cooperation in the work of the Holy Spirit, the evil effects of sin, the return to oneself, tears of compunction, the demands of poverty, temperance, and discretion, a peaceful death. All this is still more striking since it appears that these several points stem from a spontaneous out-pouring. Thomas probably was not thinking about sketching out here the main points for a treatise on the spiritual life, but nothing prevents our consideration of them from that perspective.

Turning from the themes themselves to manner in which they are treated, we see Thomas proceeding by means of word associations. This is not immediately detectable in translation, but it is manifest in the Latin: in each citation, there is a characteristic word that triggers the sequel. Once this pattern is brought to our attention, we notice it throughout. We might be tempted to believe that Thomas worked with the aid of a concordance—

⁵². *Collationes* XVII, p. 238–39.

⁵³. *Ystoria* 48, p. 351 (Tocco 48, p. 122).

they already existed in his time—and this is a possible but not a complete explanation. For of the 130 biblical references in these 24 collations, 25 come from the Psalms. The next most often-quoted book (Isaiah excepted, having 12 references) is the book of Proverbs; with its 10 citations it lags far behind the Psalms.

If we are seeking a reason for the great predominance of the Psalms over all the other books, we might in the first place hear an echo of Thomas's prayer. He did not just work with a concordance; the material that came spontaneously to his heart and mind is that on which he had meditated longest. In this, he enters into the great Patristic tradition, where the Psalter is by far the most frequently cited book. But Thomas himself gives us the reason for this preference in his prologue to the commentary on the Psalter, "Everything that touches on the final goal of the Incarnation is presented in the Psalter with such clarity that we might think that we are reading the Gospel, not a prophet." And in the clear tradition from Augustine, which he too inherits, he explains a little more: "The subject matter of this book is Christ and His Church."⁵⁴

After the Psalms and Proverbs and Isaiah, the biblical books most mentioned are the Canticle of Canticles and Ecclesiastes (8 and 7 references respectively). A surprising thing is that the New Testament is much less frequently quoted (Matthew, 5 times; John, 5; Ephesians, 5; Second Corinthians, 5; and Romans, 4). This disparity may be explained by a general rule observable in Thomas's contemporaries as well. They give their preference to the wisdom books, because these books lend themselves more easily to "moralizing," an integral part of exegesis at the time.⁵⁵

Beyond the mere statistical analyses, we also see to what extent these spiritual elaborations are permeated with the experience of prophets and sages, apostles and evangelists. The Thomist spirituality has an undeniably biblical tone. But we also grasp what strikes him in the texts and thus something about his attitude before God and God's Word, and, notably in our example here, his concern as a preaching friar—in a word, his apostolic and saintly soul. Knowing Thomas's reticence, which only rarely

⁵⁴. *Prol. au commentaire sur les Psaumes*: "Omnia enim quae ad finem incarnationis pertinent, sic dilucide traduntur in hoc opere, ut fere videatur evangelium, et non prophetia. . . . Materia huius libri est Christus et membra eius."

⁵⁵. Cf. J. Verger, "L'exégèse de l'Université," in P. Riché, G. Lobrichon, *Le Moyen Age et la Bible* (Paris, 1984), pp. 199–232; cf. pp. 244 and 232.

allows us to pierce the veil of the text to see the man behind, we find these indications priceless. As the Leonine editors have well said: "Only in the manuscript of the *Super Isaiam* can we be present, in the margins of the literal commentary, at the outpouring of the *collationes*, with their play of sacred texts that shatter the univocity of the *historia*."⁵⁶

⁵⁶. Leonine, vol. 28, p. 20^{*}. We should add to the documentation on the *Super Isaiam* a fine study by D. Bouthillier, "Le Christ en son mystère dans les Collationes du *Super Isaiam* de saint Thomas d'Aquin," in *Ordo sapientiae et amoris* (Fribourg, 1993), pp. 37–64.

Chapter III— First Teaching Years in Paris (1252–1256)

According to William of Tocco, near the end of the Cologne period (1251, therefore, or at the start of 1252), the master general of the Dominicans asked Albert to designate a young theologian who could be appointed a bachelor to teach in Paris.¹ Albert proposed Thomas, whom he thought sufficiently advanced *in scientia et vita*.² John the Teuton seems to have hesitated, but not because he did not know Thomas—he had already met him in the highly unusual circumstances surrounding the beginning of his Dominican life. Tocco would never have suggested this explanation if he had not erred about the master general's identity. More probably, John hesitated because of Thomas's youth. Thomas was only twenty-seven then and, according to the university statutes, he should have been twenty-nine to receive these responsibilities canonically.³

It has also been suggested that John the Teuton, knowing the troubled situation in Paris at the time, hesitated to send a man there whom he

¹ *Ystoria* 15, p. 235 (Tocco 14, pp. 80–81); in his fourth version, Tocco thought he could specify that this master general was John of Vercelli. In reality, it was John of Wildeshausen (the Teuton), who remained in charge until his death, 3/4 November 1252 (cf. Käppeli II, p. 47). John of Vercelli only assumed such responsibilities in 1264, after Humbert of Romans had been master general.

² Tocco uses this formula twice within a few lines, probably not unintentionally. The statutes of Robert Curçon specify that no one could be a master in theology at Paris except a theologian exemplary in knowledge and virtue: *nisi probate rite fuerit et scientie* (*Chartul.* no. 20, p. 79).

³ Cf. P. Glorieux, *L'enseignement*, p. 114.

judged too peaceful. If this is what he thought, Thomas would not take long to correct John's impression. In any case, Albert insisted and wrote to Cardinal Hugh of Saint-Cher for his support. Hugh had been the second Dominican master in theology at Paris and is celebrated even today for his theological and exegetical work.⁴ Hugh knew the situation well. He was at the time (1251–53) Innocent IV's legate in Germany and in that role made several trips to Cologne, where he would have had every opportunity to converse with Master Albert as well as with his assistant, Thomas.⁵ And he probably met John the Teuton twice during those years.⁶ It seems, then, Tocco is right to say that it was through Hugh's intervention that Albert got what he wished.⁷ Thomas thus received the order to present himself in Paris at once and to prepare himself to teach the *Sentences* there (*ut . . . ad legendum sententias se pararet*).⁸ He began his teaching as a bachelor in September of the same year (1252) under the guidance of Master Elias Brunet de Bergerac from the Dominican province of Provence. Elias himself held the post left vacant by Albertus Magnus.⁹

Thomas must have found the intellectual climate in Paris less peaceful than the one he had known in Cologne. It was a large city, one of the intellectual centers of Christendom, and one with an already long and turbulent university tradition. It suffices to recall the general strike of masters and students from 1229 to 1231; some left Paris to establish themselves at Angers, many more went to Toulouse. Originally planned to last six years,¹⁰ the strike's effects were rapidly ended when, after the beginning of the academic year in September 1229, the Dominican Roland of Cremona

⁴ Cf. Käppeli II, pp. 269ff. Glorieux, *Répertoire* I, no. 2, pp. 43–51.

⁵ Cf. J. H. H. Sassen, *Hugo von St. Cher, Seine Tätigkeit als Kardinal, 1244–1263* (Bonn, 1908), p. 62.

⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 38 and 62.

⁷ *Ystoria* 15, p. 235 (Tocco 15, pp. 80–81): "suasu domini Vgonis cardinalis eiusdem ordinis, cui erat de ipso per litteras intimatum, predictus magister ipsum (Thomam) in predicti studii baccellarium acceptauit"; cf. WN, p. 79.

⁸ It was therefore the master of the order who designated Thomas for this teaching post at Paris. We see here anticipated in practice something that would become official only later after the general chapters of Bologna (1267) and Paris (1269), cf. *MOPH* 3, pp. 138 and 150. The general lines of the delicate agreement that regulated the relationship between the studium of Saint-Jacques and the university may be seen in Glorieux, *Répertoire* I, pp. 36–38. On the bachelor of the *Sentences* in general and the concrete development of his teaching, cf. Glorieux, *L'enseignement*, pp. 111–18.

⁹ We know very little about Elias except that he had been a lecturer in the studium at Montpellier from 1246 to 1247 before being called to Paris. We have little by him except for some *excerpta*, cf. Käppeli I, p. 363; Glorieux, *Répertoire* I, no. 12, p. 84.

¹⁰ Cf. the decree by the university's twenty-one overseers, 27 March 1220, *Chartul.* no. 62, p. 118.

took up his chair in theology. The mendicant orders thus acted as strike-breakers, something for which they were bitterly reproached later. And this was not unrelated to the progressive deterioration in relations between them and the secular masters, which followed.¹¹

Since the beginning of the century, another question had periodically shaken the little Parisian intellectual world: What place should be given to the teaching of Aristotle? Commenting on certain of his books was still officially prohibited in 1250.¹² This restriction remained a dead letter, as we have already said, but it permitted the relatively new university at Toulouse cleverly to hinge its promotion on the fact that those books could be studied in Toulouse that were forbidden in Paris.¹³

Between 1252 and 1255 moreover, that is, during the first part of Thomas's stay, the arts faculty finally received authorization to teach publicly all of Aristotle's work.¹⁴ Although it was only a confirmation of an already-existing state,¹⁵ and although for Thomas the teaching of Aristotle did not constitute an absolute novelty (we can conjecture that he had already come into contact with Aristotle in Naples), it had notable repercussions. It would contribute to the crystallization of opposition between the theology faculty and the arts faculty, which would reach its height in the 1277 condemnation. The young Dominican would be among the victims of the general mistrust of the Philosopher by a reactionary current. Twenty-five years later, he would be included in condemnations aimed against "Averroism," a term that must be clarified.

To explain this process, it would be necessary to record various stages of the conflict, which was still brewing at the time Thomas arrived in Paris. But perhaps this is the place to set straight a misunderstanding tenaciously reproduced for some time in numerous books aimed at a more or less large audience. It has been repeated continually since the end of the nineteenth century¹⁶ that this period was dominated by the opposition between Au-

¹¹ Cf. the secular masters' declaration against the religious, especially the Dominicans, *Chartul.* no. 230, pp. 252ff.

¹² A useful survey of the successive interdictions and permissions may be found in F. Van Steenberghen, *La Philosophie au XIII^e siècle*, pp. 81–117 (2d ed. 1991, pp. 74–107); a shorter account is in E.-H. Weber, *La personne humaine au XIII^e siècle*, "Bibl. thom." (Paris, 1991), pp. 1–15.

¹³ Letter addressed to all masters and students in the whole world toward the end of 1229, *Chartul.*, no. 72, pp. 129–31, cf. p. 131.

¹⁴ *Chartul.*, no. 246, pp. 277–79; Dufeil, *Guillaume de Saint-Amour et la polémique universitaire parisienne 1250–1259* (Paris, 1972) (hereafter: Dufeil, *Polémique*), pp. 150–52.

¹⁵ F. Van Steenberghen, pp. 143–48 (2d ed. 1991, pp. 130–34), shows that after 1240 (and probably even before) the repeated pontifical interdictions were a dead letter.

¹⁶ One of the first to formulate it—but with nuances that sometimes would be neglected—

(footnote continued on next page)

gustinianism and Aristotelianism, the latter being identified with Saint Thomas and the Dominicans, and the former with Saint Bonaventure and the Franciscans. This view is so well anchored in many minds that it has become a veritable historiographical commonplace. Meanwhile, over the last fifty years the work of several intellectual historians for this period shows without a shadow of a doubt that Augustinianism quietly made use of Arab and Jewish sources, and its own practitioners studied Aristotle.¹⁷ By contrast, their adversaries, Thomas Aquinas at their head, considered themselves legitimate heirs of Saint Augustine as well. To render justice to these actors—and we will have many occasions to repeat this point—the history requires a much more nuanced approach than the summary schemes allow us to suppose.

The Bachelor of the Sentences

In the meantime, before becoming profoundly engaged in these inglorious episodes, Thomas came to grips with a great new task: commenting on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. This second stage of his journey to becoming a master in theology followed his stint as a biblical bachelor in Cologne. According to an often-invoked parallel, the commentary on the *Sentences* was like the chef d'oeuvre that the apprentice was required to present in order to become a master artisan. After that, Thomas would have had to complete only the third and final step, the phase of a fully "formed" bachelor (*baccalarius formatus*), in which his principal task would be to assist his master in disputes.¹⁸

(footnote continued from previous page)

was F. Ehrle, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Scholastik. II: Der Augustinismus und der Aristotelismus in der Scholastik gegen Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Archiv f. Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters* 5 (1889) 603–13; id., "L'agostinismo e l'aristotelismo nella scolastica del secolo XIII. Ulteriori discussioni e materiali," *Xenia tomistica* 3, pp. 517–88.

¹⁷ Among the works that have contributed to the changed approach during this period, let us recall F. Van Steenberghen, *Aristote en Occident. Les origines de l'aristotélisme parisien*, Essais philosophiques 1 (Paris, 1946) (a revised and expanded edition, translated by Leonard Johnston, was published in English under the title *Aristotle in the West: The Origins of Latin Aristotelianism* (Louvain, 1955); D. A. Callus, *Introduction of Aristotelian Learning at Oxford*, Proceedings of the British Academy 29 (London, 1944). The first known commentaries on the *Physics* and the *Metaphysics* are the work of Roger Bacon in Paris and Richard Rufus at Oxford. Kilwardby was one of the first to comment not only on the *Logic* but also on the *Ethics*. All three are "Augustinians," pure and simple, as is the anonymous master of arts around 1245–50 whose course has been published by R.-A. Gauthier, *Lectura in librum De anima a quodam discipulo reportata* (Grottaferrata, 1985), cf. pp. 18*–22*.

¹⁸ Cf. P. Glorieux, *L'enseignement*, pp. 93 and 97–99; J. Verger, art. "Baccalarius," *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 1 (1980) 1323; G. Leff, *Paris and Oxford Universities in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*, London, 1968, p. 167.

Already a century old—since its definitive edition was published between 1155 and 1158—the *Sentences* entered the university with Alexander of Hales, who was the first to take it as a basic text for his teaching, from 1223 to 1227. It was very probably this future Franciscan master who divided the work into distinctions, chapters, and articles. Initially, it had been divided solely into books and chapters.¹⁹ The *Sentences* would remain in use—they were quickly made obligatory—in the schools for three centuries. And *uolens nolens*, all the scholastic writers were obliged to pour their instruction into this mold, even if in reality the process became more and more of a fiction. A detail that affected Thomas reveals the considerable importance attached very early to the *Sentences*. The Dominican constitutions, in a text dating from 1234, prescribe that the friars destined for study ought to receive from their province the three basic books: the Bible, the *Sentences*, and the *Historia scolastica* by Peter Mangiador.²⁰

As we know, Peter Lombard wanted to create a new teaching style. He therefore undertook to assemble in a single volume the different opinions (*sententiae*) of the Fathers of the Church on the diverse subjects that theology addresses. Lombard quotes the texts themselves at length for the convenience of masters and students. As Father Chenu has rightly observed, Lombard's work offers "the benefits, but also the limits, of the Patristic inheritance, well ordered, decanted, digested, wisely assimilated . . . rather prosaic . . . but for that very reason, it permitted the surest progress and, for the future, furnished a field of labor on which the freest initiatives would be able to exercise themselves, rendering the soil from which they sprang less and less fertile."²¹

In fact, the theologians were not slow to abandon the servitude of a strict commentary and forcefully to introduce new considerations, sometimes quite distant from Lombard's. This is why the commentaries on the *Sen-*

¹⁹The *Sentences* hardly need to be introduced. We refer the reader to the old but useful study by J. De Ghellinck, "Pierre Lombard," *DTC* 12, 2 (1935), cols. 1941–2019. The bibliography needs to be updated by consulting I. Brady, "Pierre Lombard," *DS* 12, 2 (1986), cols. 1064–1612, and in particular the *Prolegomena* to the recent edition of the *Sententiae*, 2 vols. (Grottaferrata, 1971 and 1981).

²⁰*Constitutiones Antiquae* II 28, ed. A. H. Thomas, p. 361; M.-D. Chenu, *Toward*, p. 227, n. 1, which drew our attention to this point, mistakenly refers to the *Acta* of the Montpellier Chapter, held in 1265 (*MOPH* 3, p. 129). But this text does not say a word about the question and, as we have seen, the prescription is much older.

²¹Chenu, *Toward*, pp. 228–29; cf. p. 226–37, which situate the *Sentences* within Thomas's oeuvre. See also the longer treatment in P. Glorieux, art., "Sentences (Commentaires sur les)," *DTC* 14, 2 (1941), 1860–1884.

tences may be considered theological works in their own right, revealing their author's thought.

Thomas was, therefore, not the first or only commentator to go "beyond Lombard." But he was without question one of those who did so most resolutely. Materially, his commentary on each *distinctio* presents itself as a series—longer or shorter as the case requires—of questions that are themselves subdivided into articles and subarticles (*quaestiunculae*). The whole is framed by a *divisio textus* at the beginning, and an *expositio textus* at the end. Between these two markers, we can see the vestiges of the literal commentary, which was honored less and less. If we wish to get an idea of the proportions of the young professor's text compared with that of the Master, we can consider the example Father Chenu once gave: the two pages of distinction 33 of Book III provide Thomas with the occasion to pose 41 questions, which he develops over 88 pages.

But more than length, content and inspiration change. The young bachelor did not hide his aims, and his choices show up immediately. There are more than 2000 quotations from Aristotle in the commentary on Lombard's four books. (The *Nicomachean Ethics* ranks first with some 800 citations; the *Metaphysics* follows far behind with around 300; the *Physics* and the *De Anima* account for around 250. Since the currently available editions of Thomas's commentary do not identify all the citations, these figures are approximate, but they do indicate an order of magnitude.) Saint Augustine, the most honored author after Aristotle, barely adds up to 1000 quotations. There are 500 for Pseudo-Dionysius, 280 for Gregory the Great, 240 for John Damascene. Father Chenu thought it possible to draw some striking comparisons by underlining the 133 quotations from the *Nicomachean Ethics* in distinction 33 of Book III alone, compared with only 12 in Albert's commentary and 3 in Bonaventure's.²² In reality, these figures must be handled with caution, since in 1245, the date when Albert was drawing up the Third Book of his Commentary on the Sentences, only Books I to III of the *Ethics* had been translated. Furthermore, in the absence of a critical edition of Thomas's commentary as well as of Albert's, the true terms of comparison are not known. In any case, these figures do not say all there is to say and must be nuanced: their Aristotelian fervor does not eliminate the roots in Augustine. We must, therefore, read with

²²Chenu, *Toward*, p. 271, has counted 125 quotations, but we would correct this along with Charles Lohr, *St. Thomas Aquinas "Scriptum super Sententiis": An Index of Authorities Cited* (Avebury, 1980). This, too, is a provisional study until we have trustworthy critical editions.

some reservations the well-known passage where Tocco lyrically celebrates Friar Thomas's beginnings:

In his lessons, he introduced *new* articles, resolved questions in a *new* and clearer way with *new* arguments. As a consequence, those who understand him to have taught *new* theses and to treat them according to a *new* method cannot doubt that God illumined him with a *new* light: in effect, can someone teach or write *new* opinions unless he has received from God a *new* inspiration?²³

This piece of bravura, lest there be any doubt, does not directly convey the impression of students of Thomas. Tocco borrowed it from Thomas of Celano who, with equal insistence, had celebrated Saint Francis of Assisi as a *nouus homo*.²⁴ It would be wrong, however, to use this literary larceny as a pretext to deny Thomas's original contributions. In fact, even if we can identify the immediate sources on which the young bachelor drew, his surpassing of Lombard's work with respect to the clarity of his positions has frequently been emphasized. Though the fact of being tied to Lombard's book did not always allow him to deploy fully his own genius, Thomas was able to let it break through sufficiently that no one can overlook it.²⁵

The most striking example may be found perhaps in the first pages, which deal with the organizing principles behind the theological matter. As Francis Ruello has observed, Saint Thomas's Prologue corresponds exactly to what we might expect in a good introduction. Placed ahead of the body of the book, but really drawn up after the work was finished, the Prologue suggests the spirit of the work and its general outline in full knowledge of the facts.²⁶

²³ *Ystoria* 15, p. 236 (Tocco 14, p. 81), translated WN, p. 87.

²⁴ This was brought to light by Henri de Lubac, *La postérité spirituelle de Joachim de Flore. I. De Joachim à Schelling* (Paris, 1979), p. 138, n. 2; cf., R.-A. Gauthier, "Introduction" to Saint Thomas d'Aquin, *Somme contre les gentils*, ed. Henri Hude (Paris: Editions Universitaires, 1993).

²⁵ To take only one example, see his way of speaking about charity, which is inspired simultaneously by Pseudo-Dionysius and Aristotle. Cf. A. Stevaux, "La doctrine de la charité dans le commentaire des Sentences de saint Albert, de saint Bonaventure et de saint Thomas," *ETL* 24 (1948) 59–97.

²⁶ F. Ruello, "Saint Thomas et Pierre Lombard. Les relations trinitaires et la structure du commentaire des Sentences de saint Thomas d'Aquin," *Studi Tomistici* 1, n.d. (but ca. 1974) 176–209, cf. p. 176: "Having compared Saint Thomas's remarks with the portions of his commentary that seem to clarify them, we are convinced that the general Prologue was written for the definitive edition, and that the three special prologues address questions that grew out of certain theses advanced in the general Prologue." This observation, criticized in *RLT* 9 (1977) no. 445, pp. 152–53, is at least highly credible.

Peter Lombard, as we know, divided his material into four books according to an order that is "simultaneously historical and logical": (1) the Triune God, in His essence and His persons, with some considerations on His presence in the world and in the lives of Christians; (2) God as Creator and His work (Creation in general, creation and fall of the angels, creation and fall of man and woman, grace, original and personal sin); (3) Incarnation of the Word and His redemptive work, to which are attached the analysis of the virtues and the gifts of the Holy Spirit, as well as the Ten Commandments (since they are all found within the commandment of love); (4) teaching on the sacraments, to which is joined the teaching on our final ends.²⁷

This simple enumeration tells us we are dealing with a compendium of materially juxtaposed questions rather than a treatise ordered around a central idea. The author in no way emphasizes the contours of his rather loose plan. Thomas, by contrast, gets the most out of what he does not hesitate to call the Master's *intentio*: he proposes to organize the theological material with God as the center and everything else around Him, according to the relationships that they maintain with Him, whether they come from Him as their first cause or return to Him as to their final end.²⁸

If we do not remember the biblical affirmation of God as the Alpha and Omega of all that is visible and invisible, this plan may seem only a rather flat assertion. We do not perceive all its depth until we grasp the organizing *ratio* that gives it its intelligibility. Thomas sees the *ratio* in the fact that the creation—the emergence of creatures from God, the first principle—finds its explanation in the fact that even in God there is an "emergence of the Principle," which is the procession of the Word from the Father. The divine efficacy that works in the creation is thus related to the generation of the Word, just as the formal cause of the grace that will permit creatures to return to God is linked to the spiration of the Holy Spirit. More precisely and fully, we might therefore say that the divine missions *ad extra* are explained according to the order of the processions of the divine persons *ad intra*.²⁹

²⁷This summary draws on I. Brady, "Pierre Lombard," *DS* 12, 2, col. 1608.

²⁸*Sent. I d. 2 div. textus*: "consideratio hujus doctrinae erit de rebus *secundum exitum a Deo ut a principio* [Books I and II] et *secundum quod referuntur in ipsum ut in finem* [III and IV]." Weisheipl, pp. 70–71, remarks that Alexander of Hales anticipated Thomas here. Alexander also mentions this movement of *exitus* and of *reditus* [*Glossa in quatuor Libros Sententiarum* (Quaracchi, 1951), vol. 1, p. 4, no. 8]. But this is only materially true; Alexander does not propose to substitute this for Peter Lombard's scheme, as Thomas does.

²⁹The implications of this theology have been thoroughly developed by G. Emery, "Le

(table continued on next page)

It would be easy to show that Thomas arranged that the Books of his Commentary would reproduce that vision of things. It is more important to emphasize that his presentation—which already anticipates the plan of the *Summa*—does not stem from a simple pedagogical option. It expresses a deep spiritual intuition, whose fecundity we shall soon trace. Here, however, we must identify two of its major implications. First, attentive to the demands of the word *theo*-logy, Thomas sees in God Himself the primary "subject" of his discourse; if he allows the Incarnate Word only second place—something for which he is sometimes criticized—it is because he gives first place to the Trinity. Like the creation, the Incarnation cannot be explained all by itself. It is necessary to "return" to the fountain of charity in the Father.³⁰ We must further emphasize that, in this way of conceiving things, the entire universe of created beings, spiritual and material, thus appears animated by a deep dynamism that, when the time came, would without difficulty permit the integration of historical becoming into theological reflections. This will become clearer in the *Summa*, but we may grasp right away the bearing of this proposition in all its audacity when we see that the possibility mentioned by Thomas only in the second place is Augustine's (put first, in fact, by Lombard) which bases itself on the distinction between *res* and *signa*.³¹

Whatever Tocco may say, these lectures were not the fruit of an infused knowledge, but the result of hard work. The handwritten manuscript of the Third Book, which has come down to us, as has the *Super Isaiam*, with erasures and second thoughts, still bears the traces of that labor.³² We find here a Thomas attentive to but also dependent on his contemporaries:

(table continued from previous page)

Père et l'oeuvre trinitaire de création selon le Commentaire des Sentences de S. Thomas d'Aquin," in *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 85–117; also his *La Trinité créatrice: Trinité et création dans les commentaires aux Sentences de Thomas d'Aquin et de ses précurseurs Albert le Grand et Bonaventure*, Bibliothèque thomiste 47 (Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1995). See also F. Marinelli, *Personalismo trinitario nella storia della salvezza* (Rapporti tra la SS.ma Trinità e le opere ad extra nello Scriptum super Sententiis di San Tommaso) (Rome, 1969); G. Marengo, *Trinità e Creazione. Indagine sulla teologia di Tommaso d'Aquino* (Rome, 1990).

³⁰This, too, has been well said by F. Ruello, *La christologie de Thomas d'Aquin*, Paris, 1987, p. 44: "The notion of Incarnation is therefore not primary in theology. It takes its place in a dialectic whose fundamental notions are those of departure (*exitus*) from God within God Himself (eternal processions) and outside of Himself (Creation), and of return (*reditus*) to God, in as much as the creature who is not united to God as a person, through the Person who is united to Him, but who in one of his natures comes himself from God."

³¹To see these things in greater detail, cf. P. Philippe, "Le plan des Sentences de Pierre Lombard d'après S. Thomas," *BT* 3 (1930–1933), Notes et communications, p. 131*–54*.

³²Cf. P.-M. Gils, "Textes inédits de S. Thomas: les premières rédactions du *Scriptum super Tertio Sententiarum*," *RSPT* 45 (1961) 201–228; 46 (1962) 445–462 and 609–28.

Master Albert, surely, whose influence is very powerful in the first three books, but less clearly perceptible in the fourth. Bonaventure is there too. Father Chenu has been able to find a series of nine arguments taken from him in as many objections in an article from the treatise on the sacraments³³—but Thomas also often borrows from Bonaventure as well as from many others, including an anonymous *quidam* who cannot always be identified (350 mentions of these *quidam*). A better acquaintance with contemporary currents of ideas now makes it easier to find further traces of the era in this work—for instance the allusions to the "end-of-the-worldism" of Joachim of Fiore and of William of Saint-Amour noted by Marie-Michel Duf  il.³⁴ But only the critical edition, yet to appear, will permit a more exact estimate of what Thomas owed to his predecessors and contemporaries. Only then will we be able to judge, in full possession of the facts, the extent and limits of his originality.

Alia lectura fratris Thome

The amplex of this work fits only with difficulty into the chronological framework that assigns the two first years in Paris to biblical teaching and the next two to the *Sentences*. But if we accept the solution that naturally suggests itself from the sources, we may spread out the composition of this immense, five-thousand-page commentary over a little more than four academic years (though the teaching, according to the university statutes, had to be completed within two years). All this accords with Tocco, who makes the time of composition spill over into the following period, not just the time of the "formed" bachelor, but that of the master as well.³⁵ We may thus understand Thomas's achievement much better. He was far from thinking his work definitive, however, and, from all appearances, he modified it, trying to improve it, when he took it up again to deliver to his students at Santa Sabina almost a decade later.

We know of this effort from Tolomeo, who says he saw in Lucca a copy of these lectures, which were given at Rome.³⁶ Until recently, the histo-

³³ Cf. Chenu, *Toward*, p. 273.

³⁴ Duf  il, *Pol  mique*, pp. 160–61, 210–12.

³⁵ *Ystoria* 15, p. 236 (Tocco 14, p. 81): "Scripsit in baccellaria et *principio sui magisterii* super quatuor libros Sententiarum."

³⁶ Tolomeo XXIII 15 (ed. A. Dondaine, p. 155): "Scripsit etiam eo tempore quo fuit Rome . . . iam magister existens, primum super Sententias, quem ego vidi Luce sed inde subtractus nusquam ulterius vidi." Tolomeo says here that he never saw this book again, for he himself left Lucca, where the book was located. Bernard Gui has badly misread this passage as insinuating that the book was stolen, cf. Gui 53, p. 217.

rians were still divided on this question. Though it was hard to reject Tolomeo's testimony, no one had found written evidence of these new lectures by Thomas on the *Sentences*. But the researchers of the Leonine Commission discovered in an Oxford manuscript (*Lincoln College, lat. 95*) at least three references to an *alia lectura fratris Thome*. Father Hyacinthe Dondaine, who established an edition of fifteen such passages together with a meticulous and circumspect study on them, felt himself forced to a rather negative conclusion: these annotations are by an anonymous author who faithfully draws on Thomas. But there are no truly decisive arguments that would indicate that the passages are taken from an *Alia lectura* at Rome.³⁷

Leonard Boyle has subjected the question to a new examination and, taking Dondaine's arguments point by point, Boyle highly praises the quality of analysis. But he draws an opposite conclusion: the text of these annotations—clear (sometimes more so than that of Thomas himself), intrepid, and so forth (these are Dondaine's terms)—is not from an indifferent anonymous author but from Thomas himself. The hand is that of a reporter who followed the courses at Rome in 1265/66. As to the *alia lectura*, it is not the course from Rome but from Paris, as we can tell from someone who heard Thomas in Rome and not in Paris.³⁸ This argument, which plausibly echoes Tolomeo's suggestion, appears conclusive, and it has already received a good critical reception.³⁹

Leonard Boyle's work was completed several years later by Mark Johnson, who published a complete list of the ninety-four marginal additions to that Oxford manuscript (*incipit* and *explicit* enough samples of the diverse passages to give an idea of their content).⁴⁰ Johnson, who worked in connection with Boyle, relates that Boyle is preparing a critical edition of the group of passages and that Boyle told him that Dondaine had come to

³⁷H.-F. Dondaine, "'Alia lectura fratris Thome'?" (*Super I Sent.*)," *MS* 42 (1980) 308–36.

³⁸L. E. Boyle, "Alia Lectura fratris Thomae," *MS* 45 (1983) 418–429. Thanks to an indication of the owner on the manuscript, Boyle believes he can take a further step and identify the reporter from Oxford as Jacobus Raynucii, who became archbishop of Florence in 1286 after being conventual lecturer at Città de Castello in 1273, when the priory was founded. Then he became prior of Santa Sabina until 1286. It is entirely possible that he was one of Thomas's students there in 1265–66. On Jacobus, see E. Panella, "Jacopo di Ranuccio da Castelbuono OP testimone dell'*alia lectura fratris Thome*," *Memorie domenicane* N.S. 19 (1988) 369–85.

³⁹L.-J. Bataillon, *Bulletin, RSPT* 73 (1989), p. 591: "L. Boyle . . . has made some completely convincing arguments, in my opinion, for their authenticity as Thomas's;" C. Vansteenkiste, *RLT* 19 (1986), no. 73, P- 40, takes a more qualified view.

⁴⁰M. F. Johnson, "Alia lectura fratris thome: A List of the New Texts found in Lincoln College, Oxford, MS. Lat. 95," *RTAM* 57 (1990) 34–61.

agree with his position on the authenticity of these texts.⁴¹ We must wait for the publication of this work to speak from a better knowledge of the facts about the improvements that Thomas may have made to his text, but the agreement of two such eminent researchers is our best predictor of how this question will be settled.

However this turns out, it was not this return to the subject in Rome that came down to posterity, but the Paris *lectura*. Thomas's text was transmitted along with Lombard's. The latter unintentionally contributed to the success of his young rival and to the persistence of a kind of misunderstanding. University rules required commenting on Lombard. Thomas's commentary was used much more than the *Summa*, which expressed more personally evolved thought (Thomas's adversaries, such as William de la Mare, were not mistaken, as we shall see).

Even in the fifteenth century, the first great commentator on Thomas, Capreolus, the *princeps thomistarum*, comments on the *Sentences* and not on the *Summa*. However, after about 1280, one of his disciples drew attention to the fact that Thomas had notably progressed on several points between the *Sentences* and the *Summa*.⁴² Furthermore, it is striking to discover that Lombard is hardly quoted in the *Summa*. We may certainly point to forty or so references, but Lombard is little referred to as an authority. Most references merely interpret him, and others ultimately reject his view.⁴³

Two Opuscula

Two well-known minor works are usually assigned to this period. The first is called (on the basis of printed editions that have popularized the title), *De ente et essentia*. But this is only one title among many others in the manuscript tradition. According to Tolomeo, Thomas wrote it "for his brothers and companions when he was still not a master."⁴⁴ We interpret that remark to mean that he was not yet an active regent master, which would take us back to the years 1252–56, when he was at Saint-Jacques. Tolomeo also says a bit earlier that this was the same period in which he

⁴¹ Cf. M. Johnson, p. 37, n. 11.

⁴² Cf. R.-A. Gauthier, "Les 'Articuli in quibus frater Thomas melius in Summa quam in Scriptis'," *RTAM* 19 (1952) 271–326; cf. *BT* 9 (1954–56), no. 1797, pp. 935–43.

⁴³ Cf. G. Geenen, "Les *Sentences* de Pierre Lombard dans la *Somme* de saint Thomas," in *Miscellanea Lombardiana* (Novara, 1957) 295–304.

⁴⁴ Tolomeo XXIII 12 (ed. Dondaine, p. 152): "Tractatus de ente et essentia, quem scripsit *ad fratres et socios nondum existens magister*," cf. XXII 21, p. 150.

was commenting on the *Sentences*. The historians have tried to narrow the date further. Roland-Gosselin thought it possible to propose that it was "around the moment when Saint Thomas was commenting on Distinction XXV of the *First Book*." Other writers are much less certain, and H.-F. Dondaine, in reporting the different opinions, remains prudently reserved.⁴⁵

As to the intention of the work, we may refer to the edition and commentary of Roland-Gosselin. It will suffice here to note that it bears entirely on the notion of *essentia* and on the connections that essence has with reality and logical intentions. Thomas shows himself to be very close to Avicenna, whose system gives a central place to the idea of essence, so that "in the cultural context of the 1250s," when Avicenna was still by far the most dominant figure, "to elucidate the notion of *essentia* and its resources of intelligibility, was simultaneously to make oneself understood among one's students or colleagues [as a follower of Avicenna] and also to introduce them to a clearer universe, the thomist universe—then in the process of being born."⁴⁶ This opusculum, whose Latin the learned in the Renaissance found uncultivated and barbarous—sometimes to the point of rewriting it—enjoyed extraordinary success. Even today there are 181 manuscripts, of which 165 are complete. And it has appeared in some forty printed editions.⁴⁷

Though it did not enjoy the same success, the *De principiis naturae* also had a more than respectable diffusion for a youthful little work (more than eighty manuscripts and forty printed editions). Composed for a certain Brother Sylvester, who is not otherwise known to us (he too may be from the priory of Saint-Jacques), its date remains uncertain. Mandonnet proposed 1255.⁴⁸ Roland-Gosselin thought it earlier than the *De ente*.⁴⁹ The Leonine editor, H. Dondaine, thinks of a still-earlier date: "The lucid little memento may even go back to Friar Thomas's student years, when he

⁴⁵ M.-D. Roland-Gosselin, *Le "De Ente et Essentia" de S. Thomas d'Aquin*, Bibliothèque thomiste 8 (Paris, 1948), p. xxvi; Leonine vol. 45, p. 320: "There is general agreement on dating the opusculum to the years 1252–1256. We do not see any objection."

⁴⁶ H.-F. Dondaine, Leonine vol. 43, P. 321.

⁴⁷ Among the many studies dedicated to this work, we mention: Thomas D'Aquin, *L'être et l'essence*, Text, translation and notes by Catherine Capelle, "Bibliothèque des Textes philosophiques," 8th ed., Paris 1985; Dietrich Lorenz, *I fondamenti dell'ontologia tomista, Il trattato De ente et essentia*, "Philosophia 10," Bologna, 1992.

⁴⁸ P. Mandonnet, "Chronologie sommaire de la vie et des écrits de saint Thomas," *RSPT* 9 (1920), P. 152.

⁴⁹ M.-D. Roland-Gosselin, *Le De Ente*, pp. xxvii–xxviii.

would be sharing with another student his reading about the *Physics* in the *Commentator*."⁵⁰

As these last words allow us to understand, if Avicenna was foremost in the *De ente*, Averroes emerges in the other opusculum. B. Montagnes once pointed this out about the teaching on *analogy*.⁵¹ The Leonine editors extend this insight to the whole work. This would put us in Thomas's youth, before he had yet distanced himself from certain positions.⁵² Nevertheless, the early presence of these two Arabic-language thinkers—as well as the presence of Maimonides, whom we shall soon encounter—draws our attention to what Thomas received from the Arab and Jewish worlds, starting with Aristotle. Without going so far as to say that he and his master, Albert, "silently plundered" their philosophico—theological arguments, it is important to be aware of what they owe to these predecessors.⁵³

Besides their contents, what is even more remarkable in these two opuscula is the point on which they resemble each other: Thomas composed them at the request of his brothers to render them a service. It was a common practice at the time, it seems: Albertus Magnus and William of Moerbeke, to name only two of his brothers, gave themselves to the same kind of fraternal help. Thomas thus began a long series of twenty-six works (out of ninety) that he composed "on request," whether at the request of friends (as with these works as well as the *Compendium theologiae*, which Thomas wrote for his *socius* Reginald) or upon official request (of Pope Urban IV, which led to the *Catena aurea*, or of John of Vercelli, the general of the Dominicans, who consulted him several times).⁵⁴ Despite heavy teaching and writing responsibilities, Thomas never neglected these demands of intellectual charity, and in this lies one of the elements of his sanctity. For anyone seeking the means he adopted, the secret is not to be found in

⁵⁰Leonine vol. 45, P. 6.

⁵¹Cf. *La doctrine de l'analogie de l'être d'après saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris-Louvain, 1963), pp. 169–80: "The literary and doctrinal sources of the *De principiis naturae*," which points out that the work's exposition on analogy is "almost a literal summary" of Averroes's doctrine in his Commentary on the *Metaphysics*.

⁵²[Note for English edition: We refer the reader to two translations into English: *The Principles of Nature*, included in the compilation *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Nature* by R. A. Kocourek (St. Paul: North Central, 1948); and *The Pocket Aquinas*, ed. R. I. Henle and V. I. Bourke (New York: Pocket Books, 1975).]

⁵³This is A. de Libera's formula in *Penser au Moyen Age*, p. 102, who properly recalls the capital importance of this "forgotten heritage," pp. 98–142.

⁵⁴Cf. *Responsio de art.* 108; *Responsio de art.* 43; *De secreto* (Leonine, vol. 42); *De forma absolutionis* (Leonine, vol. 40).

austerities or in special devotions, exterior to his intellectual life, but in the very concrete exercise of his intellect.⁵⁵

The Inaugural Lecture

By definition, the duties of a bachelor were transitional. In February 1256, Aimeric Veire, chancellor of the University,⁵⁶ awarded Thomas the *Licentia docendi* and ordered him to prepare his inaugural lecture. We know of this decision through a bull of Alexander IV, dated 3 March 1256, in which the pope congratulates Aimeric for taking this initiative even before receiving the already-dispatched pontifical letter that invited him to do so.⁵⁷

Such a papal letter for a simple university routine would be surprising, were it not for its allusion to the "sons of iniquity" who were disturbing the friars at the priory of Saint-Jacques. Indeed, the circumstances were far from peaceful for the Parisian Dominicans in the spring of 1256. Full guerrilla warfare had broken out among the secular masters against the mendicant masters. The former had even excommunicated the latter.⁵⁸ Alexander IV, who had recently been elected, vigorously took the side of the mendicants in his bull *Quasi lignum vitae*, in which he abrogated the excommunications and demanded reintegration of the regulars.⁵⁹ His intervention with the chancellor was not merely fortuitous: the pope wanted to encourage him to push Thomas to deliver his *principium* as soon as possible and to thank him for the good will he had shown toward the friars of Saint-Jacques.⁶⁰

This episode also is known to us through Tocco. Without mentioning the pope's intervention, he emphasizes another important detail. Other candidates could have been chosen, but the chancellor preferred Thomas, even though he still had not reached the required age.⁶¹ In fact, he was

⁵⁵Maritain once wrote of the "sanctity of intelligence," cf. *Le Docteur Angélique*, in J. and R. Maritain, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. IV (Fribourg-Paris, 1983), p. 101.

⁵⁶On Aimeric, see Glorieux's note in *Répertoire* I, no. 149, p. 332. Aimeric conferred the license on Saint Bonaventure as well as on Thomas.

⁵⁷The earlier letter is now lost, but the letter from 3 March has survived. Cf. *Chartul.*, no. 270, p. 507 (= *Documenta* no. 11, pp. 544–45).

⁵⁸Cf. *Chartul.*, nos. 222, 224, and 230, pp. 247–49 and 252–58.

⁵⁹Cf. *Chartul.*, nos. 247, pp. 279–85. See Chapter V below.

⁶⁰The same day, Alexander also wrote to the archbishop of Paris ordering him to excommunicate the masters and students who continued to block access to the Dominicans's courses. Cf. *Chartul.* no. 269, pp. 505–6.

⁶¹*Ystoria* 17, p. 245–46 (Tocco 16, pp. 84–86): *non seruato ordine secundum anticipationem temporis consueto*.

only thirty-one or thirty-two, and should have been thirty-five according to university statutes.⁶² Tocco elaborates on Thomas's reaction to the news: he would have preferred to avoid the responsibility, but constrained by obedience, he could not extract himself from the position. He therefore prayed (with many tears, the fourth edition adds). The following night, a certain venerable looking Dominican friar appeared to him in a dream and asked him the reason for this insistent prayer. When Thomas had explained, adding that he had no idea what subject he could address, the apparition reassured him and proposed the subject of his lecture: "From your heights you water the mountains, the earth is filled with the fruits of your works."⁶³

According to the testimony by Peter of Montesangiovanni, a monk of Fossanova, at the canonization process, Thomas himself told this story to the prior of Fossanova in the presence and at the request of Reginald, several days before his death.⁶⁴ Peter of Caputio, another witness at the process in Naples, reported that he had learned this fact when he was in the priory of Saint-Jacques, during the reading that was done to the friars at times of bleeding.⁶⁵ He adds that all the friars in Paris were convinced that the *frater antiquus* who appeared had been none other than Saint Dominic himself.⁶⁶ Except for this last detail, where the hagiographical process seems to be at work, the different stories agree, and historians have every reason to believe that we have here a personal confidence that goes back to Thomas himself.⁶⁷ He set to work and prepared his inaugural lecture, which was given sometime between 3 March and 17 June 1256.⁶⁸

This *prineipium* by the new *magister in actu regens* is the text we know as *Rigans montes de superioribus suis*. The discourse is clearly inspired by Dionysius. In the world of spirits as well as of bodies, God acts through a whole series of intermediaries. Thus, wisdom is communicated first by spreading into the intelligence of the doctors—mountains are the symbol

⁶² Cf. *Chartul.*, no. 20, p. 79.

⁶³ Psalm, 103; 13 according to the Vulgate.

⁶⁴ *Naples* 49, P. 331.

⁶⁵ The book read during bleeding was Gérard de Frachet's *Vitae fratrum* IV 24, 8. Already in circulation during Thomas's lifetime, it appears to be the source of the other stories.

⁶⁶ *Naples* 92, p. 398.

⁶⁷ The story had been transmitted by three different sources, all of which lead back to Thomas himself. Cf. K. Foster, *The Life of Saint Thomas Aquinas* (London, 1958), p. 69, n. 33. On hagiographic developments, see the study we made in another field: D. Bouthillier and J.-P. Tortell, "De la légende à l'histoire. Le traitement du *miraculum* chez Pierre le Vénéable et chez son biographe Raoul de Sully," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 25 (1982) 81–99.

⁶⁸ Cf. *Chartul.* no. 270, p. 307, and no. 280, pp. 319ff.

for them here. Then, by their ministry, wisdom bathes the intelligence of their hearers in waves of celestial light. From that starting place, Thomas develops four points: (1) The grandeur of spiritual doctrine; (2) the dignity of its doctors; (3) the conditions required in its disciples; (4) the economy of communicating doctrine. Better than anything else, this text's conclusion tells us what Thomas's spiritual state was at the time:

Surely, no one would claim to possess in himself and from his own resources the needed aptitude to fulfill such a ministry. But this aptitude can be hoped for from God: "*We cannot claim anything as our own. The power we have comes from God* (2 Cor. 3:5)." But to obtain it from God, we must ask it of Him: "*If any of you lacks wisdom, he should ask God and it will be given him, for God is a generous giver who neither grudges nor reproaches anyone* (James 1:5)." Let us pray to Christ that he may wish to grant it to us. Amen.⁶⁹

We do not possess a contemporary document that tells us exactly how the installation ceremonies of a new doctor occurred. If we may project onto Saint Thomas's age what we glean from the statutes of the faculty of theology at Bologna (which reproduces the Paris statutes, but in a text from after 1326), the ceremony occurred in two sessions: during the *vesperie* and in the *aula*. As the name indicates, the *vesperie* took place the afternoon of the first day, and two of the four questions that the future master had proposed to all the masters or bachelors several days earlier were solemnly discussed. That first evening, he returned to conclude the discussion on the second question with his magisterial response.⁷⁰

The second solemn gathering was held the following morning in the great hall of the bishop's palace, from which it took its name: *aula*. During the first part of the session, the new master took an oath between the hands of the chancellor, received the square flat cap, insignia of his office, from the hands of his sponsor, and then delivered his *principium*. After all this, the two final questions that he had proposed were discussed according to a complicated ritual in which it was expected that he would perform the *determinatio magistralis* on the third question.

Though he was not alone in defending his theses (his bachelor often

⁶⁹The Latin text can be found in *Opuscula theologica* I (Turin, 1954), pp. 435–43. A French translation is in Pègues-Maquart, pp. 365–77; detailed commentaries in Weisheipl, pp. 101–3, and in Tugwell, pp. 267–71, who also provides an English translation. See also A. Lobato Casado, "Santo Tomás, Magister in Sacra Teologia. El 'Principium' de su Magisterio," *Communio* (Seville) 21 (1988) 49–70.

⁷⁰Cf. Chartul., no. 1188, pp. 691–95, especially note 5, P. 693. A good summary appears in Glorieux, *L'enseignement*, pp. 141–47, and in Weisheipl, pp. 96–101.

contributed, too), and even if he was not equally engaged in every one of the different moments of the ceremony, it is clear that the young master was nonetheless constantly involved. As Glorieux emphasizes, his position could be "rather uncomfortable right to the end." But these two sessions did not finish everything. As we have seen, the new master did not intervene in discussion of the first and fourth questions. And he could legitimately still want to say something on them or to add to those points that were defended by his bachelor. An opportunity for these additions was given to him the first day of class following his reception, in what was called the *resumptio* or reprise. He thus had an entire morning for as lengthy an explanation as he wished (*determinatio ualde prolixa*). There was neither a lecture nor a dispute in the other schools that day, in order to allow everyone to attend.

We will return to the questions that Thomas proposed for discussion at his *inceptio*, but we may benefit here from a suggestion by Weisheipl. There are two known texts claiming to be Thomas's inaugural lecture. One is the *principium*, which we have just presented. The other is in praise of Holy Scripture, which clearly corresponds to what the statutes require to begin teaching. This text, transmitted under the title "*sermo secundus fratris Thome*," takes for its theme Baruch 4:1: "*Hic est liber mandatorum Dei*," and its *commendatio Scripturae* is followed by an explanation of how the different books of the Bible are divided.

Following Mandonnet, everyone up till now saw in this second text Thomas's inaugural lecture as he began his teaching as biblical bachelor at Paris in 1252. Now, as we have seen, to all appearances, Thomas never filled that post at Paris. He, therefore, could not have given this discourse on that occasion. Thus Weisheipl suggests that in this second discourse we have the text of Thomas's presentation on the day of his *resumptio*. This text is clearly continuous with the *principium* analyzed above and, in fact, completes and extends it. We may thus form a more precise idea of what happened in September 1256, during Thomas's entry into regency.⁷¹

⁷¹Cf. Weisheipl, p. 104. The text may be found in *Opuscula theologica* I, Turin, 1957, PP. 435–39.

Chapter IV— Magister in Sacra Pagina (1256–1259)

When Thomas gave his inaugural lecture, he had not yet finished writing his commentary on the *Sentences*.¹ But beginning in the following September he had to perform the three functions of the master in theology. These were announced at the end of the twelfth century by Peter Cantor and later confirmed in the statutes of the theology faculty: *legere, disputare, praedicare*.² Thomas was completely aware of this, and an entire passage in his *principium* explains the qualities that the doctors in Sacred Scripture (*doctores sacrae scripturae*, the title should be noted) must possess in order to carry out their triple function. They must be "elevated" (*alti*) by the eminence of their lives to be able to preach effectively; "enlightened" (*illuminati*) in order to teach in an appropriate way; and "fortified" (*muniti*) to refute errors in disputation.³

¹ Cf. the preceding chapter.

² Peter Cantor, *Verbum abbreviatum*, cap. I, PL 205, 25: "In tribus igitur consistit exercitium sacrae scripturae, circa lectionem, disputationem et predicationem;" *Chartul.* II, no. 1185, p. 683. In giving their degree to the newly promoted, the chancellor "dat eis licenciam *disputandi, legendi, et predicandi* et omnes actus exercendi in theologica facultate qui ad magistrum pertinent." This text comes from 1350, but we may reasonably suppose that the formula was hardly different in Thomas's time. For a rather complete exposition of what the three functions covered, see Glorieux, *L'enseignement*, pp. 105–61.

³ *Rigans montes*, Marietti, no. 1213: "Doctores sacrae scripturae esse debent *alti* per vitae eminentiam, ut sint idonei ad efficaciter *praedicandum . . . illuminati*, ut idonee doceant *legendo, . . . Muniti*, ut errores confutent *disputando . . .* Et de tribus officiis, scil. *praedicandi, legendi, et disputandi* dicitur," etc.

Legere:
To Comment on the Bible

Legere is "to read" Holy Scripture and comment on it verse by verse. This is something that has been well known to specialists for a long time but too much ignored by the great theological public. The great systematic works have monopolized attention. But "to read" Scripture was the first task for the master in theology, and therefore also for Thomas.⁴ Unlike the cursory lectures, which were the only form allowed the biblical bachelor (the *Super Isaiam* is a good example), the teaching method assigned to the master allowed him to give a much more searching commentary, as may be seen in the *Super Job* or the *In Ioannem*.⁵ Though long overlooked in favor of the *Sentences* or the *Summa*, this kind of biblical teaching was nevertheless Thomas's ordinary labor. And it was in this way that he commented on a little more than half of the New Testament and several books of the Old. If we wish, therefore, to get a slightly less one-sided idea of the whole theologian and his method, it is imperative to read and use in a much deeper fashion these biblical commentaries in parallel with the great systematic works.

The scholars find themselves in difficulties when they try to identify the biblical books that relate to this first period of teaching in Paris. It was generally thought that Thomas commented on Saint Matthew,⁶ but I. T. Eschmann showed quite a while ago not only that this could not have been prior to 1263, but also that many indications point toward the second period of teaching in Paris (1269–72).⁷ Following this line, Hugues Shooner brought forward some new arguments in favor of the later date,⁸ and we take into account a letter by H.-F. Dondaine that strongly supports this later dating: the *Lectura super Matthaeum* "clearly supposes the discussion

⁴ It is still useful to look at the pioneering work on this subject by H. Denifle, "Quel livre servait de base à l'enseignement des maîtres en théologie dans l'université de Paris?" *RT* 2 (1894) 149–61. More recently, Chenu has offered comments in his *Toward*, pp. 234–63. More comprehensive are the first pages of E. Panella, "La *Lex nova* tra Storia ed Ermeneutica. Le occasioni dell'esegesi di s. Tommaso d'Aquino," *Memorie Domenicane*, n.s. 6 (1975) 11–106, where one will also find a good example of the Thomist exegesis on the religious life, based on Matthew 10:9–10.

⁵ Cf. Chenu, *Toward*, chap. 7, PP. 234–63: "Les commentaires sur la Bible."

⁶ Weisheipl, pp. 371–72, echoes the position of Mandonnet-Synave, who proposed 1256–59.

⁷ I. T. Eschmann, "The Quotations of Aristotle's Politics in St. Thomas's *Lectura super Matthaeum*," *MS* 18 (1956) 232–40; cf. the same author's *Catalogue*, pp. 397–98.

⁸ Cf. the review of Eschmann's work in *BT* 10 (1957–59) no. 269, pp. 153–57; of. also the review of F. Stegmüller, *ibid.*, pp. 99–112.

in 1270 on the state of perfection" and "certain passages could not have been composed before the *Quodlibet* (XIV) by Gerard of Abbeville and the responses by Saint Thomas."⁹ Beyond the allusions to France that we find in the *Lectura*, as well as the fact that it supposes the existence of the *Catena* (which is to say, after the sojourn in Orvieto), Dondaine's is a clinching argument. We will permit ourselves therefore to sum up this demonstration here.

The dispute, as is well known, centered on the question of whether parish priests and archdeacons are in the same *status perfectionis* as bishops (and therefore superior to the religious). It is easy to see by a simple reading that Thomas uses materials in the *Lectura super Matthaeum* that he also puts to work in his other writings of this epoch.¹⁰ In places, however, the formulation of the *Lectura* is closer to that of the *De perfectione spiritalis uitae* than to that of his other contemporary writings.¹¹ We also find in the *Lectura* an echo of an argument that Gerard of Abbeville had drawn from a quotation by Chrysostom, according to which the bishop is in a state of perfection superior to that of any monk, be it Elias himself (*etiam si des Eliam, uel quemcumque*).¹² This allusion is also present in Thomas's refutations and therefore places the *Lectura* in this general context; we can thus situate it with great probability during Thomas's second Parisian sojourn, the scholastic year 1269–70.¹³

We should add to this discussion on the date an important clarification concerning the content of the text. We have always known that the *Lectura super Matthaeum* is *defectiua*,¹⁴ *incompleta* as Nicholas Trevet classifies it.¹⁵ Whatever the exact meaning of these two words in the ancient cata-

⁹ J.-P. Torrell, *Collationes*, p. 16–17, with the references where we deal with the date of the preaching on the decalogue, of which at least the fair copy by Peter d'Andria is contemporaneous with that of the *Lectura*.

¹⁰ Cf. *Lectura*, no. 1594–1596 (ed. Marietti), with *De perfectione*, chap. 20 and ff., *ST IIa IIae* q. 184; *Quodl.* III, q. 6 a. 3 [17], and especially *Lectura* no. 1596 and *ST IIa IIae* q. 184 a. 8.

¹¹ Cf. for example the distinction between *status* and *actus* perfectionis: *Lectura*, end of no. 1596; *De Perfectione*, chap. 23, ll. 79–84.

¹² *Lectura*, end of no. 1594; of Gerard, *Quodlibet* XIV (XVIII), Leon., vol. 41, p. B 17, ll. 122–27.

¹³ This is also the opinion of L.-J. Bataillon, whose objections have helped me to clarify my position, which was still hesitant after reading M. Arges, "New Evidence concerning the Date of Thomas Aquinas's *Lectura* on Matthew," *MS* 49 (1987) 517–23 (cf. *DS* 15, col. 733). The latter brings forward some new arguments that confirm the impossibility that the *Lectura* on Matthew was prior to 1263, but he wants to prove too much in saying that we should place it in 1263 or in the immediate neighborhood of that date.

¹⁴ Bartholomew of Capua's list: *Naples* 85, p. 389.

¹⁵ Cf. the study by Shooner, in the following note, pp. 134–35.

logues, it is certain that the text currently transmitted in the printed editions is not only incomplete but erroneous. A good part of Thomas's authentic commentary on the Sermon on the Mount is missing. That lacuna has been filled by the hardly scrupulous zeal of his first editor, Bartholomew of Spina (1527), who put in the place of the text missing from the manuscripts a part of the commentary by Peter de Scala, a Dominican of the late thirteenth century.

We can read the details of this operation in Shooner,¹⁶ but we must understand that the interpolated passages extend from chapter V, 11, to VI, 8, and, again, among some lines of chapter VI, 14 to VI, 19.¹⁷ Thanks to the researches undertaken by the Leonine Commission for a critical edition, however, a new witness to the *Lectura super Matthaeum* was discovered some forty years ago, and it contains Thomas's commentary in its entirety.¹⁸ While we wait for the Leonine Commission to give us a complete edition of the text, we are limited in our knowledge of the missing passages to the partial editions that the labors of H.-V. Shooner and J.-P. Renard have produced.¹⁹

If we return now to Thomas's work as *magister in sacra pagina*, we can be certain that, whatever book he commented on in this period, the choice already made in the *Super Isaiam* in favor of the literal sense must have continued, as is witnessed by the *Super Iob*, whose dating is the nearest to this text:²⁰ Saint Gregory having said everything on the mystical sense of this book, Thomas thought that all that remained for him to do was to explain it according to its literal sense.²¹ His biographer was astonished at this claim, which no teacher had made before him: Thomas speaks as if he had been chosen as judge by common agreement of Job and his friends,

¹⁶ Cf. H.-V. Shooner, "La *Lectura in Matthaeum* de S. Thomas (Deux fragments inédits et la *Reportatio* de Pierre d'Andria)," *Angelicum* 33 (1956) 121–42.

¹⁷ This corresponds to nos. 444–582 (lects. 13–17) and 603–10 (lect. 19) of the Marietti manual edition.

¹⁸ This is the manuscript from Basel, *Bibl. Univ. B. V. 12.*, described in Shooner, "La *Lectura*."

¹⁹ Shooner, "La *Lectura*," pp. 138–42, has published the passage on Matthew 5:13–16; J.-P. Renard, "La *Lectura super Matthaeum* V:20–48 de Thomas d'Aquin," *RTAM* 50 (1983) 145–90, has published the passage indicated in his title.

²⁰ According to Tolomeo XXIII 24, Leon., vol. 26, pp. 17*–20*, it was composed during the pontificate of Urban IV, while Thomas was in Orvieto, which is to say 1261–64.

²¹ *Prol., in fine*: "Intendimus . . . librum istum qui intitulatur *Beati Iob* secundum litteralem sensum exponere; eius enim mysteria tam subtiliter et diserte beatus papa Gregorius nobis aperuit ut his nihil ultra addendum videatur"; cf. Leon., vol. 26, pp. 25*–30*, for the nature and the method of the *Super Iob*.

pronouncing one by one on the rightness or wrongness of the different interlocutors.²²

Tocco was mistaken. Thomas had had at least one predecessor in Roland of Cremona, the first Dominican master at Paris, who had proposed a literal interpretation of Job some thirty years earlier.²³ But Tocco's praise underlines one of the characteristics of Thomas's method. This is a point on which he will never vary, as the theoretical expositions of his scriptural method bear witness.²⁴ This priority of the literal sense signifies in the first place that it alone is suited to the necessities of the theological arguments, but also that all spiritual interpretations should be confirmed by a literal interpretation of sacred Scripture in order to avoid all risk of error.

Much has been written on the four senses of Scripture in general and on the priority of the literal sense in particular. This is not the place to go into the question very deeply, but it is necessary to know that the most recent authors do not hide their hesitations nor even their retractions on the subject. A figure as competent as Beryl Smalley confessed toward the end of her life that she had not taken seriously enough the conclusion of the prologue of Job: If Thomas limits himself to the literal sense in his interpretation of this book, that is effectively because Gregory had said everything on the spiritual sense; but when he comments on the Gospels, Thomas feels himself obliged to give the spiritual sense.²⁵ The same author emphasizes elsewhere, and justly, the noticeable differences that we can find on this point between the theory and the practice of the medieval authors, including Saint Thomas.²⁶ If the literal sense is more and more considered the only invalidating argument in a strictly theological discussion, that is fitting in large part, but this does not prevent recourse to the spiritual sense. The priority of the literal sense therefore does not exclude the spiritual sense, which remains *de necessitate sacrae Scripturae*; it only translates the growing recognition of the limits of allegorizing exegesis.²⁷

²². *Ystoria* 18, p. 251 (Tocco 17, p. 88).

²³. This commentary has unfortunately remained unpublished; cf. A. Dondaine, "Un commentaire scripturaire de Roland de Crémone," *AFP* 11 (1941) 109–37.

²⁴. Cf. *Quodl.* VII q. 6 a. 1–2 [14–15]; *ST* Ia q. 1 a. 10; *In Gal. cap. 4 lect. 7*.

²⁵. B. Smalley, *The Gospels in the Schools c. 1100–c. 1280* (London and Ronceverte, 1985), pp. 265–66.

²⁶. B. Smalley, "Use of the 'Spiritual' Senses of Scripture in Persuasion and Arguments by Scholars in the Middle Ages," *RTAM* 52 (1985) 44–63.

²⁷. This has been clearly seen by J. Verger, "L'exégèse de l'Université," in *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, under the direction of P. Riché-G. Lobrichon (Paris, 1984), pp. 199–232, cf. p. 208–12.

Henri de Lubac, agreeing here with C. Spicq, once thought it possible to define the relevant character of the "novelty" of Thomas's method: "Thanks to his ordinary quality of robust simplicity, justness, and precision, Saint Thomas summarizes the common teaching quite nicely."²⁸ Beryl Smalley is clearly more positive in her appreciation—since she emphasizes that Thomas and Albert are the only two authors studied for whom she has not been able to find a principal source.²⁹ We must recognize that we find here indeed some of Thomas's qualities, and that they are perhaps the reason for his success: the style of the *Super Iob* inspires Albertus Magnus, Matthew of Aquasparta, Peter Olivi, and Nicholas of Lyre, to mention only the most ancient authors.³⁰ As Synan has noticed, Richard Simon mentions Nicholas of Lyre as the most striking exegete since Saint Jerome, but Nicholas would not have been able to play this role if Thomas had not opened a path for him.³¹ Thomas's exegesis is assuredly not comparable to the historical critical methods of today, but it has not ceased inspiring new studies.³²

Disputare: The De Ueritate

The second function of the master was the "dispute." This still meant to teach, but under another form, that of active pedagogy where one proceeded by objections and responses on a given theme. Without being able to discover the exact date of the *disputatio*'s first appearance (during the course of the twelfth century), we know it had already acquired its autonomy by the beginning of the thirteenth century, and it is entirely possible

²⁸ H. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale. Les quatre sens de l'Écriture*, vol. 4/2, 2, Théologie 59 (Paris, 1964), pp. 285–302; cf. C. Spicq, *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge*, Bibliothèque thomiste 26 (Paris, 1944), p. 315.

²⁹ Cf. *The Gospels*, above, note 25, pp. 257–71; cf. p. 274.

³⁰ Cf. Leon., vol. 26, pp. 33*–44*.

³¹ E. A. Synan, "Aquinas and His Age," in *Calgary Aquinas Studies*, ed. A. Parel (Toronto, 1978), pp. 1–25, cf. p. 23.

³² We will have to quote several of them in our future book; in addition to the titles mentioned in the preceding notes, we add here what remains without doubt the single most notable work of some length: C. Spicq, "Saint Thomas d'Aquin exégète," in *DTC* 15, 1 (1946) 694–738, and several general titles among the most recent ones: S. H. Seidl, "Thomas von Aquin und die moderne Exegese," *ZKT* 93 (1971) 29–44; M. Arias Reyero, *Thomas von Aquin als Exeget. Die Prinzipien seiner Schriftdeutung und seine Lehre von den Schriftsinnen* (Einsiedeln, 1971); S. Lyonnet, "L'actualité de saint Thomas exégète," in *Tommaso d'Aquino nel suo settimo centenario*, vol. 4 (Rome, 1976), pp. 9–28; Th. Domanyi, *Der Römerbrief des Thomas von Aquin. Ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung seiner Auslegungsmethoden* (Bern-Frankfurt, 1978); W. G. B. M. Valkenberg, *Did Not Our Hearts Burn? Place and Function of Holy Scripture in the Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Utrecht, 1990); M. M. Rossi, *Teoria e metodo esegetici in S. Tommaso d'Aquino. Analisi del Super Epistolas Sancti Pauli Lectura Ad Romanos*, c. 1, 1.6 (Rome, 1992).

to situate it within the evolution of forms of teaching. There had first been, as we have just seen, the *lectio*, which is to say, a commentary on a text, either from the Bible or from the *Sentences*. Then, because a strict commentary did not always lend itself to treatment of the problems that masters and students might pose, the *quaestio* appeared, which is to say, a more ample development of a precise subject that goes beyond a direct commentary (we might apply this characterization to all the questions that Thomas develops on the basis of texts from Peter Lombard, who serves as hardly more than a pretext).

The *disputatio* represents another stage in this "progressive detachment with regard to the text," a "natural process owing to the maturation of the medieval scientific spirit and to a greater mastery of the dialectical method."³³ To summarize the nuanced definition given by its most recent analyst,

[The *quaestio*] is a regular form of teaching, apprenticeship, and research, presided over by the master, characterized by a dialectical method, which consists in bringing forward and examining arguments based on reason and authority which are furnished by the participants and conflict over a theoretical or practical problem. The master must arrive at a doctrinal solution by an act of determination that confirms him in his magisterial function.³⁴

Compared to the *lectio*, one element has disappeared: the text. But another element has appeared: discussion. And while in the *lectio* the arguments began from "authorities" in conflict, arguments in the *quaestio* are initiated by the participants—who nonetheless do not deprive themselves of recourse to authorities.

The dispute came in two essential forms. The first, private dispute (*disputatio privata*), was held within the school—the master with his students and bachelor only.³⁵ The second type was public (*disputatio publica* or *ordinaria*), and the masters had to hold it at regular intervals, though many

³³ These are B. Bazán's expressions in what is today the most up-to-date study on the subject: "Les questions disputées, principalement dans les facultés de théologie," in B. C. Bazán, G. Fransen, J. F. Wippel, D. Jacquart, *Les questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les facultés de théologie, de droit et de médecine*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 44–45 (Turnhout, 1985), pp. 13–149.

³⁴ Bazán, p. 160.

³⁵ We think we have identified one of these questions held by Hugh of Saint-Cher, cf. J.-P. Torrell, *Théorie de la prophétie et philosophie de la connaissance aux environs de 1230*, *Spicilegium sacrum lovaniense* 40 (Leuven, 1977), pp. xv–xxi, with some indications on the concrete development of this exercise.

willingly dispensed themselves from it, for the exercise could be perilous. The difference between the first and the second form was therefore the public, since the students from other schools could attend, and sometimes masters as well. On occasion, they did not refrain from raising difficulties for the colleague engaged in the exercise.³⁶ In one of its forms, this second genre of disputed questions could even be a solemn public occasion (the famous *Quodlibets*), which were held twice a year, during Lent and Advent. They interrupted the regular courses in the university. As a result of P. Mandonnet's labors, we can agree today in dating from this first period of teaching in Paris Thomas's *Quodlibets* VII through XI.³⁷

Scholars long hesitated over the question of what constituted the basic unity of the disputed question. According to P. Mandonnet, each article furnished the material for dispute, while according to A. Dondaine it was the question itself.³⁸ The two theses collide with one another over certain insurmountable difficulties as to the duration and frequency of this exercise. In order to escape the difficulty, we may think about distinguishing between the dispute itself and its conversion into writing; the latter, not being subject to the time limits of the actual discussion, could become the object of a more extensive elaboration and of a fullness of development that the oral exchange never permitted.

By means of this latter suggestion and with the addition of a point that seems to impose itself, we would incline toward the hypothesis of Bernardo Bazán; if accepted, this would put to an end the long hesitation by researchers. According to Bazán, the diverse series of disputed questions by Saint Thomas do not belong to the genre of ordinary or public disputes, but indeed to the private disputes. And they arose, therefore, from his

³⁶ We have, perhaps, a good example from December 1255, if William of Saint-Amour, the great adversary of mendicant poverty, in fact came to oppose Saint Bonaventure on this subject. Cf. S. Bonaventure, *Quaestio reportata de mendicitate cum annotationibus Gulielmi de S. Amore*, ed. F. Delorme, BFSMAe 8 (Quaracchi, 1934), pp. 328–56; see also "Reportatio de la *Quaestio disputata de mendicitate* de Bonaventure par un étudiant favorable à l'opponens: Guillaume de Saint-Amour," in M.-M. Dufeil, *Saint Thomas et l'histoire*, Senefiance 29 (Aix-en-Provence, 1991) (=Dufeil, *Histoire*), pp. 457–93, according to whom William would actually have been present during the dispute; cf. Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. 176–85.

³⁷ L. E. Boyle, "The *Quodlibets* of St. Thomas and Pastoral Care," *The Thomist* 38 (1974) 232–56; reprinted in the same author's *Pastoral Care, Clerical Education and Canon Law, 1200–1400* (Variorum Reprints: London, 1981).

³⁸ Cf. P. Mandonnet, "Chronologie des questions disputées de saint Thomas d'Aquin," *RT* (1918) 271, n. 1; Mandonnet's Introduction to his edition of the *Quaestiones disputatae*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1925), pp. 12–17; A. Dondaine, "De l'étendue de la question disputée," in the same author's, *Secrétaires de saint Thomas* (Rome, 1956), pp. 209–16.

regular teaching.³⁹ It is thus possible to pronounce both Dondaine and Mandonnet correct: with the former, Bazán recognizes that the unity of the public dispute comes indeed from the question, but given that the *De ueritate* arises from another genre, there is no difficulty in admitting that its unity is the article. The collection of several articles into a single question derives from the plan followed by the master and appears only at the stage of final editing.

Thus we can show the development of a day's teaching at Saint-Jacques in the following manner. In the first hour of the day, Thomas gave his lecture; after that came the lecture of his bachelor; in the afternoon, both gathered with their students to "dispute" on a chosen theme. The three hours of this active pedagogy not being sufficient to exhaust the subject, they continued, article after article; eventually certain articles that were very short could be regrouped into a single session and, conversely, a longer or more delicate subject could be broken down into several sessions. The result (objections, responses, and magisterial determinations) was gathered together later into a final version, with a view to publication within the ultimate unity of the question. The elaboration of the *De ueritate* was thus extended over three scholastic years (1256–59), at the rate of some eighty articles per year, a number that corresponds rather closely to the number of days of teaching.⁴⁰

This general framework seems to us to correspond to reality; but we should, however, make two indispensable additions. First, it appears probable that the final result does not resemble, except in a very general way, the real unfolding of these private disputes between the master and the students. It suffices to read the text of the *De ueritate* or the *De potentia* to understand that these texts are very much above the level of what a discussion could be for average students. The students of Paris, better formed than those later at Rome, could doubtless follow the most difficult expositions, but even with them the discussion could not have taken the exact form of long, complex, and probing research; by necessity, it was briefer and simpler. We, therefore, must admit that what has come down to us bears witness to considerable editing.

³⁹ Cf. Bazán, especially pp. 70–85; see his review of the preceding historical literature. The author's argument bears directly on the *De ueritate*, but nothing prevents extending it to the *De malo* or the *De potentia*.

⁴⁰ Cf. in Bazán, pp. 72–76, the dense discussion which allows him to count 79 *dies legibiles* in the university year, which approaches the 75 days available to the arts faculty, according to Charles Thurot.

We should add that it is important to be attentive to the fact that the disputed question is also a literary genre. Formed in the dialectic of *pro* and *contra*, the minds of that epoch naturally express themselves in this form; the most beautiful specimen in this genre is the *Summa theologiae*, which is entirely composed according to this scheme. But one could easily multiply examples. This amounts to saying that certain *quaestiones disputatae* could not really have been disputed, either in public or in private. That is perhaps the case for the question *De anima*, to which we will have to return. But there are doubtless other examples. By making use of Bazán's labors, we can free ourselves from a too-strict servitude to the scholastic calendar, which has given so much difficulty to researchers.⁴¹

To return to the *De ueritate*, the final redaction had to follow very soon after the discussion, for its existence is attested very early. Well before the deposition during the canonization process at Naples by Bartholemew of Capua,⁴² a catalogue of Thomas's works published prior to 1293 mentions the questions *De ueritate* "quas disputauit Parisius."⁴³ But we have two other even earlier testimonies. Beginning in 1278, William de la Mare, Thomas's Franciscan adversary, author of the famous *Correctorium*, dedicated a section of nine articles attacking the (in his eyes) faulty theses of the *De ueritate*—an indisputable sign of Thomist authenticity. Thomas's friends also evidently recognized this, since they came to his defense.⁴⁴ At a still earlier period, Vincent of Beauvais introduced (prior to 1264/65, the date of his death), in his second edition of the *Speculum maius*, important

⁴¹. Bazán must still, however, resolve difficulties; two points still remain to be explained, it seems to us. On the one hand, according to his hypothesis, Thomas would have held only private disputes and no public ones (apart from the Quodlibets); now, if we can admit that the public disputed questions were not held between the time of his admission to mastership and that of his reception into the *consortium magistrorum*, we still do not see why he would not have taken part in them later. We must, therefore, recognize that both by their length and by their technicality, the questions *De ueritate* resemble magisterial disputes more than they do private exercises (that is why we must suppose in the latter case a considerable editorial activity). On the other hand, we do not understand very well why Thomas made so great an effort in composing these private exercises when he did not do so for his lectures in *sacra pagina* (which were, however—at least at Paris—his primary occupation); we have to wait until later, when he would become a celebrity, for the *reportatio* of his courses on Scripture, which we have in more finished forms. Our schema of a day's teaching at Saint-Jacques seems defensible, but we would have to be much clearer than we are about university regulations that were in fact applied during that period to be able to speak with less uncertainty.

⁴². *Naples* 85, p. 388.

⁴³. This is the list of the ms. *Praha, Metr. kap. A 17/2*, of which we can find a transcription in Grabmann, *Die Werke*, pp. 97–98; for the date see our discussion in *Collationes*, p. 6.

⁴⁴. See some of the details on this subject in the Leon. ed., vol. 22/1, p. 6^{*}; we will return to William de la Mare in chap. 15.

fragments from questions 11, 12, and 13 of the *De ueritate* under the explicit name of their author.⁴⁵ The use of the book was therefore practically contemporaneous with its completion, and this permits us to emphasize both the rapidity of its diffusion and the vitality of Parisian university circles at the time.

The *De ueritate* presents still another interesting aspect to which, generally speaking, too little attention has been paid, but which gives it a place completely apart in the whole of Saint Thomas's writings. While for the majority of these writings, we have only copies—rare handwritten texts excepted—the *De ueritate* is unique in that we possess the original dictation by Saint Thomas. Father A. Dondaine of the Leonine Commission began to explain in 1956 the reasons that permitted him to advance this thesis, and he has restated his demonstration at greater depth in the critical edition of this text that he produced several years later.⁴⁶ With the exception of some few opponents—whose reticence it is difficult to understand in light of the arguments being advanced⁴⁷—the whole scholarly world has accepted this position, and we must emphasize the benefits that have resulted from the discovery.

A dictated original is practically the equivalent of an autograph manuscript and has, therefore, all the advantages of the latter. We see in it the author at work in the very outpouring of his thought, making efforts to find its best formulation, about which he frequently hesitates. It suffices to cast an eye over the editorial corrections (erasures of a word or paragraph, hesitations about terms, the search for the best authority, etc.—the editors have given some examples among hundreds possible) to understand that the text did not emerge in a single block from Thomas's thinking.

The matter is even more striking in that this text had already undergone testing by discussions; Thomas dictated it with the notes taken during the sessions in front of him. For our knowledge of the man and of the author, the original text is an indisputable aid. Beyond this, we also discover something of Thomas's work methods and his organization: Thomas worked from "files," and he had an entire team of secretaries at his disposal; this is an important point to note and it is a subject to which we will return.

But it is primarily the text that must be reckoned with in the austere

⁴⁵ Leon., vol. 22, p. 7*, and p. 189* for a list of these borrowings by Vincent.

⁴⁶ Cf. A. Dondaine, *Secrétaires de saint Thomas* (Rome, 1956); Leon., vol. 22 (Rome, 1975), pp. 44*–60*.

⁴⁷ Cf. (C. Vansteenkiste), *RLT* 11 (1978), no. 131, pp. 49–54, who otherwise recognizes the irreproachable quality of the Leonine edition.

work of the editors and, finally, by us readers. Father Dondaine was able to show that the current printed text of the *De ueritate*, derived from the university tradition that quickly spread through the booksellers, was highly faulty: recourse to the original for questions 2–22 permitted the correction of some 10,000 passages where Thomas's text had been more or less severely altered. Everyone will easily grasp that scientific honesty imposes on whoever wishes to understand Thomas's thought a preliminary and serious verification of the accuracy of the text that he uses.

To turn now to its contents, the *De ueritate* is an imposing assembly of 253 articles, grouped into 29 questions. The first question has given its name to the entire series, but the other questions are more or less distant from that subject. Since it is probable that Thomas had thought out the plan in advance, at least in its large outline, we might suggest that he proceeded in two phases, as if he had anticipated a program spread out over two years, to which a third year would later be added.⁴⁸ We can see quite well that the whole is subdivided into two large parts: (1) truth and knowledge (qq. 1–20); (2) the good and the appetite for the good (qq. 21–29). S.-Th. Bonino thinks he can also discern a similarity in the internal organization of each of the two parts; we find, in effect, the same sequence; in God (among the angels), in man. For man, we can further discern a principle of organization that, prefiguring that of the *Prima Secundae*, treats first of structures, then of historical realizations.⁴⁹

Since we cannot go very much into the content of this work here, we must at least give an idea of the subjects that are treated in it. In the first question, universally and justly known, Thomas does not deal solely with truth but with the transcendentals and their convertibility. After this "introduction," he comes to the problems that present themselves about God's knowledge: knowledge in general,⁵⁰ divine ideas, the Word, providence, predestination, and the additional question of the "book of life" (qq. 2–7). For the angels, he first considers the problem of angelic knowledge, then

⁴⁸. The suggestion is P. Synave's in "La révélation des vérités divines naturelles d'après saint Thomas d'Aquin," *Mélanges Mandonnet* I, Bibliothèque thomiste 13 (Paris, 1930), pp. 327–70, cf. p. 358. It is repeated by J. Tonneau, in his introduction to *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Trois questions disputées du De Veritate*. Q. XV: Raison supérieure et raison inférieure; Q. XVI: De la syndérèse; Q. XVII: De la conscience, Texte, traduction et notes (Paris, 1991).

⁴⁹. S.-Th. Bonino, *Quaestiones disputatae De veritate. Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Question 12: La prophétie, Présentation, traduction et notes*, Licentiate thesis record (Fribourg, 1989), p. 161; also dealt with in the book cited in note 50, p. 97.

⁵⁰. This question is the subject of a remarkable book by S.-Th. Bonino, *Thomas d'Aquin. De la vérité. Question 2 (La science en Dieu)* (Fribourg/Paris: Editions Universitaires, 1995).

the problem of the communication of that knowledge (qq. 8–9). Man is the subject of a much fuller treatment: the mind (*mens*) in general, the master, prophecy,⁵¹ faith, superior and inferior reason, synderesis, conscience (qq. 10–17, for "structural" questions), the knowledge of the first man in the state of innocence, knowledge of souls after death, and the knowledge of Christ's soul (qq. 18–20, for the historical realizations). The subdivision *De bono* deals with the following points: the good and the appetite for the good in general (qq. 21–22), the will in God (q. 23), the will in man (free will), the sensibility and the passions of the soul (qq. 24–26, dealing with the "structures"), grace in general, justification of the wicked, Christ's grace (qq. 27–29: historical realizations).

This brief list still says nothing about the interest of this material, which makes of the *De ueritate* a remarkable work in more ways than one way. Not only does it help us to grasp the subjects that occupied Thomas and his students in this period, but even more it helps us to see in this work the genius of the young master. This confirms itself as we read on and, particularly, as we become conscious of the evolution of his theology: he has already changed his mind about certain points that he had dealt with in the *Sentences*, and he will change it again in later works.

To take only one example, the way in which he speaks of grace in the *Summa* supposes a path that has passed from the *Sentences* through the *De ueritate*.⁵² In the domain of Christology, the way in which he speaks of Christ-the-head as being in his humanity the cause of all grace, somewhat in the way in which God himself is the cause of all being, shows the progress that he has made since an early, overly strict vision of the instrumentality of that humanity.⁵³ Thomas will sometimes say clearly that he

⁵¹ In addition to the three questions translated by J. Tonneau (cf. n. 48), and those on prophecy and knowledge in God translated by S.-Th. Bonino (notes 49 and 50), see also *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Questions disputées sur la vérité, Question XI: Le Maître (De magistro)*, et *Question IV: Le Verbe (De Verbo)*, intro., trans., and notes by B. Jolles, Paris, 1983 and 1992. A partial translation by F.-X. Putallaz of the first question can also be found in R. Imbach and M.-H. Méléard, *Philosophes médiévaux. Anthologie de textes philosophiques (XIIIe-XIVe siècles)* (10/18), Paris, 1986, pp. 69–94.

⁵² It suffices to compare *Sentences* I d. 17 q. 1 a. 1 (or *Sent.* II d. 26 q. 1 a. 1) with *De ueritate* 27, 1–2, and *ST* Ia IIae q. 10 a. 1 (or Ia IIae q. 23 a. 2), to see how the large thesis about the created nature of charity or of grace (contra the position of Peter Lombard) is reinforced and better organized.

⁵³ *De ueritate*, 29, 5: "Christus . . . principium quodammodo omnis gratiae secundum humanitatem, sicut Deus est principium omnis esse"; of. *ibid.*, ad 3: "Christus autem operatus est nostram salutem quasi ex propria virtute." This aspect of things has been explored by J. R. Geiselmann, "Christus und die Kirche nach Thomas von Aquin," *Theol. Quartalschrift* 107 (1926) 198–222; 108 (1927) 233–55.

has changed his mind on certain points (for example, on the knowledge acquired by Christ); sometimes he does not think it useful to specify further. But it is important never to forget this: if he is consistent with himself in his large-scale choices, Thomas shows nothing of the fixed systematician. Rather, he is a genius in motion, perpetually in the act of discovery.

It is precisely to this that another work from this time witnesses: the *Super Boetium De Trinitate*. This little book, we know, is distinguished by several unique features. Beyond the fact that Thomas is the only author in the thirteenth century to have commented on this text, it is principally distinguished as one of the rare works that have come down to us in Thomas's own handwriting, and it is a windfall for the editor of the text, who has drawn from it some things that we will speak about below. Furthermore, it is unfinished, but that is less rare among Thomas's works (we have thirteen that were never finished). Finally it is in this theological work that Thomas produced his most developed arguments on the epistemology of the sciences.⁵⁴

Why did Thomas write this opusculum? The question is asked about all his commentaries, whether on Dionysius or Aristotle, and the scholars do not find any absolutely certain answer. We borrow from P.-M. Gils a series of hypotheses that may be formulated: "Some scholastic activities *intra muros*, while the official courses given at Saint-Jacques were in principle public? A literary genre that the author gives to some personal works? University teaching parallel to the *Lectura* and *Disputatio*, of which there is no trace in the regulations that have come down to us?"⁵⁵ If we must choose, the hypothesis of a personal reflection conducted with pen in hand and according to the system of the spontaneous *quaestio* in the style of one familiar with dialectic as Thomas was, appears to us the most satisfying explanation. It was for him a means of preparing, in a more

⁵⁴. For a presentation of the whole of the *Super Boetium*, we refer to the introduction by P. Gils, Leon., vol. 50, p. 5–9; but see also Chenu, *Toward*, pp. 237–39; Weisheipl, pp. 134–38; Tugwell, pp. 250–51; A. Maurer, *St. Thomas Aquinas. The Division and Methods of the Sciences*, 4th rev. ed. (Toronto, 1986). There are also several recent studies on this opusculum: L. Elders, *Faith and Science. An Introduction to St. Thomas's Expositio in Boethii De Trinitate* (Rome, 1974); F. Ruello, "La doctrine de l'illumination dans le traité *Super librum Boethii de Trinitate* de Thomas d'Aquin," *RSR* 64 (1976) 341–57; J. I. Saranyana, "Sobre el *In Boethii de Trinitate* de Tomás de Aquino," *MM* 19 (1988) 71–81; R. McNerny, *Boethius and Aquinas* (Washington, 1990) [cf. review by S.-Th. Bonino, *RT* 91 (1991), pp. 322–24]; D. C. Hall, *The Trinity: An Analysis of St. Thomas Aquinas's Expositio of the De Trinitate of Boethius*, Studien und Texte z. Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters (Leiden, 1992).

⁵⁵. Leon., vol. 50, p. 6.

or less preliminary fashion, his own writing; for us it is a first indication of that perpetually awake spirit we will come upon frequently in what follows.

Reexamining the dating, Gils concluded that we must place this work "somewhere in the middle of the way between the period of the *De ueritate* and the beginning of the *Contra Gentiles*, whether in the years 1257–1258 or the beginning of 1259, as Father Mandonnet more or less divined." The relationship of this proposal to the first books of the *Contra Gentiles* is not the only thing that makes the date plausible. The conflict between the seculars and religious also entered at this time into a period of provisional peacefulness. Without losing any time, Thomas therefore launched into some of his most demanding intellectual labors.

Except for the fact that it deals with a work by the same author, nothing obliges us to place here the reference to the other commentary by Thomas on Boethius. Historians habitually mention these two works one after another because of their common subject.⁵⁶ In the preface to the Leonine edition, Father Bataillon thinks instead—given the internal data that reveal differences—that the *Expositio libri Boetii De ebdomadibus* is probably later than the *Super Boetium De Trinitate*. But without external data that would permit us to situate it better (through dated sources, for example), Bataillon declares himself unable to propose a precise date.⁵⁷

Even if Thomas has furnished a Prologue with theological allure (explanation of a biblical verse), Boethius's subject in this opusculum is essentially metaphysical, and the commentator deals with it as such. To state it in its proper terms: "Given that all beings are good, we must determine the mode of that goodness, which is to say, how beings are good. Now, a predicate can be attributed to a subject in two ways, either substantially or by participation. The question therefore is to know if beings are good in their essence or by participation."⁵⁸ This reflection explains why the philosophers often begin their study of participation in Thomas with this work.⁵⁹

⁵⁶. Cf. WN, p. 103; 22; Weisheipl, p. 158; 414; Grabmann, *Werke*, pp. 358–60.

⁵⁷. Leon., vol. 50 (1992), pp. 263–64.

⁵⁸. Chap. 3, beginning.

⁵⁹. Cf. L.-B. Geiger, *La participation dans la philosophie de S. Thomas d'Aquin*, Bibliothèque thomiste 23 (Paris, 1942, 1953); C. Fabro, *La nozione metafisica di partecipazione secondo S. Tommaso d'Aquino* (Torino, 3d ed. 1963); for a rapid general presentation, see G. Casey, "An Explication of the *De Hebdomadibus* of Boethius in the Light of St. Thomas's Commentary," *The Thomist* 51 (1987) 419–34.

Without getting ourselves further embroiled in this material, we call the reader's attention to the quite beautiful Prologue on the advantages of a life dedicated to the pursuit of wisdom:

Zeal [*studium*] for wisdom has this privilege that, in pursuing its end, it suffices to itself. . . . In this the contemplation of wisdom is comparable to a game, for two reasons. First, because a game is enjoyable and the contemplation of wisdom carries with it the highest delight. . . . Then, because a game is not ordered to something else but to itself, and it finds in itself its own end; we also find this in the enjoyment of wisdom. . . . But contrary to what occurs in the case of our ordinary enjoyments, about which we anticipate that the least hindrance will bother our joy, sometimes greatly disturb it, . . . it is in itself that the contemplation of wisdom finds the cause of its delight. It does not suffer, therefore, from any anguish such as when we need to wait for something. . . . That is why divine wisdom compares its own delight to that of a game: "I rejoiced day after day, playing in his presence" (Proverbs 8:30).

Without any doubt, we are dealing here with a sort of program, and we will find other echoes of it as we proceed in our reading of this text.

Praedicare:

Theology and Pastoral Practice

Preaching was the third and last of the master's main obligations.⁶⁰ The people of the Middle Ages saw no opposition between the scientific teaching of theology and its pastoral application. On the contrary, the first was seen as the normal preparation for the second. Peter Cantor even specifies: "It is after the *lectio* of Scripture and after the examination of doubtful points thanks to the *disputatio*, and not before, that we must preach."⁶¹

The masters occupied themselves with this aspect of things and not only labored to put at the disposal of pastors such working implements as concordances and distinctions for a more leisurely and surer use of the Bible,⁶² but also frequently joined to their own *lectio* both entire sermons, and plans

⁶⁰ On this subject see the general presentation by Glorieux, *L'enseignement*, pp. 148–61.

⁶¹ *Verbum abbreviatum* 1: PL 205, 25 A–B.

⁶² Cf. L.-J. Bataillon, "Les instruments de travail des prédicateurs au XIII^e siècle," in *Culture et travail intellectuel dans l'Occident médiéval*, ed. G. Hasenohr and J. Longère (Paris, 1981), pp. 197–209; by the same author: "Intermédiaires entre les traités de morale pratique et les sermons: les *distinctiones* bibliques alphabétiques," in *Les genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982), pp. 213–26; "*Similitudines* et *exempla* dans les sermons du XIII^e," in *The Bible in the Medieval World. Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, ed. K. Walsh and D. Wood, Subsidia 4, (Oxford-New York, 1985), pp. 191–205.

or condensations of sermons that could aid their listeners in making the transition from the *lectio* to the *praedicatio*.⁶³ In addition, they knew how to make good use of their own works when they had to preach; thus, Thomas used the patristic files that he had gathered together in the *Catena aurea*.⁶⁴

The practice shows that the theory provided in the statutes of the faculty was indeed well honored. Even before presenting himself for the tests needed to receive the license, the young theologian had to promise to give two *collationes* personally to the university, or a *sermo* and a *collatio*.⁶⁵ Once he was a master, he was not dispensed from further preaching. The statutes also provided for the creation of a commission, consisting of four regent masters, charged with assigning to others the sermons they would have to give in the course of the year. It was furthermore provided that, if the designated master could not carry out this obligation himself, he had to find another master as replacement.⁶⁶ The obligation was not limited to Sundays; it included the feasts when the faculty of theology was shut down; in this latter case, preaching was given at the residence of the mendicants, either the friars minor or the preachers.⁶⁷ For the mendicant masters, a special clause provided that they would give a sermon in the morning *coram universitate* in a house of their order, and they were also supposed to carry out the *collatio* at Vespers; but if the morning sermon took place elsewhere, they were not held to this obligation.⁶⁸

In line with these dispositions, which doubled the demands on his vocation as a member of the Order of Preachers, Thomas therefore had to preach at least several times per year at the university; these university sermons are far from ever having known the same distribution as the rest of his work—not only his theological works properly speaking, but even his

⁶³ Cf. here L.-J. Bataillon, "De la *lectio* à la *praedicatio*, Commentaires bibliques et sermons au XIII^e siècle," *RSPT* 70 (1986) 559–75, who gives a number of examples of these matters, which have received the names of *processus*, *adnotatio*, or even *collatio*; he suggests (p. 58) that we see something analogous in the *collationes* of the *Super Isaiam*.

⁶⁴ Cf. L.-J. Bataillon, "Les sermons de saint Thomas et la *Catena aurea*," in *Commemorative Studies* I, pp. 67–75.

⁶⁵ Cf. *Chartul.* II, no. 1190, p. 705, *Juramenta* (12).

⁶⁶ Cf. *Chartul.* II, no. 1189, p. 703, *Stat.* no. 66.

⁶⁷ *Chartul.* II, no. 1188, p. 692, *Stat.* no. 4; in a written communication, L.-J. Bataillon has assured me that "the Parisian practice, well attested from the *sermones de tempore* from Bonaventure on, is that the university sermons on Sundays would normally take place at the residence of the Dominicans and those on the feast days that fell during the week at the residence of the friars minor."

⁶⁸ *Chartul.* no. 1188, p. 692, *Stat.* no. 14.

preaching on the *Pater*, *Ave Maria*, *Credo*, or the Decalogue.⁶⁹ While each one of these four series is confirmed by at least 80 testimonies and sometimes, the *Credo* for example, by almost 150, there is no university sermon that has come down to us in more than four manuscripts, and frequently we do not have more than one.

From what does this difference stem? It is difficult to know. We should not say that Thomas's preaching would have been considered a minor genre since the other preaching series on the great Christian prayers had a quite good diffusion. The difference comes perhaps from the fact that these four series were treated as opuscula and transmitted as such, while the sermons that were presented as separate entities did not enjoy the same esteem with posterity. This would doubtless have been different if Thomas himself had undertaken the compilation of a substantial body of these sermons, as, for example, Saint Bonaventure did.⁷⁰

Through patient labor, L.-J. Bataillon, the unrivaled specialist on this material, has succeeded in establishing a list of 20 authentic university sermons, of which 11 are furnished with their *collatio*. But he thinks Thomas preached "a good deal more frequently."⁷¹ As to the dates when these sermons were preached, it is frequently difficult to say; we can calculate them beginning with the places that are sometimes indicated: Bologna, *coram universitate*; Milan, *coram clero et populo civitatis*; Paris, *coram universitate*. Paris is the probable site of at least 12 of these sermons (13 with the *Ave Maria*), given their positions in the collection of sermons of Parisian origin. It is therefore plausible that those not otherwise designated are similarly Parisian in origin.

Some echoes of Thomas's preaching *coram universitate* have come down to us; the most colorful is dated from 6 April 1259. We know of it through a letter of Alexander IV dated 26 June 1259: the pope asked the bishop of Paris, Renaud de Corbeil, to punish energetically the beadle of the Picard nation, who had allowed public injury to Friar Thomas Aquinas. The preceding Palm Sunday, this beadle, named Guillot, had taken

⁶⁹ On Saint Thomas's preaching see our study: "La pratique pastorale d'un théologien du XIII^e siècle: Thomas d'Aquin prédicateur," *RT* 82 (1982) 213–45 (= *Pratique*).

⁷⁰ Cf. S. Bonaventure, *Sermones dominicales* . . . , ed. J. G. Bougerol (Grottaferrata, 1977); the editor mentions 32 manuscripts, some that transmit the total corpus of these sermons, and some that transmit only a part.

⁷¹ L.-J. Bataillon, "Les sermons attribués à saint Thomas. Questions d'authenticité," *MM* 19 (1988) 325–41; he recalls that the *Sermones dominicales* as well as the *Sermones festivi* included in the large collections of Thomas's *Opera omnia*, are apocryphal in their entirety.

it upon himself to interrupt Friar Thomas, who was in the process of preaching, in order to publicize *in conspectu cleri et populi* the little book by William of Saint Amour against the religious mendicants. To punish this audacity, the pope asked that the beadle be excommunicated, deprived of salary, and definitively relieved of his office.⁷² The pope pleaded without much success it seems, since several years later, 27 August 1266, we find the same Guillot still beadle of the Picards and still an agitator. On 7 July 1267—as beadle of the university now—he acted against the decision by the legate Simon de Brion, the future Martin IV.⁷³ This episode might have been comic if it did not take place in the tense context that we have seen above.

The small number of university sermons is a true handicap for our knowledge of Thomas the preacher, but the condition in which they have come down to us (sometimes in the form of a skeletal summary,⁷⁴ corresponding to hardly one-tenth of the actual sermon), is even more regrettable. Happily, in addition to these sermons, we have the three series of preachings on the *Pater*, *Credo*, and *Ave Maria* as well as the Decalogue. Even if, despite Mandonnet's affirmations,⁷⁵ their date is not more sure than the date of the majority of other sermons,⁷⁶ they do permit us to form a rather precise idea of Thomas's style and themes.

Though not generally remarked, this part of Thomas's literary output is precious if we wish to know him better. Compared with a number of his contemporaries, Thomas distinguishes himself by his simplicity and sobriety, the absence of scholastic subtleties and technical terms.⁷⁷ This commitment to sobriety not only excludes a mandarin vocabulary; it equally rejects oratorical flights. Thomas believes orators need an art that can move the feelings, but he refuses to reduce that art to the wisdom of

⁷² Cf. *Chartul.*, no. 342, pp. 390–92; cf. *Documenta*, no. 16, pp. 562–63; Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. 104–5, points out another story of a beadle mistreated by the friars in the exercise of his functions (according to *Excelsi dextera*, *Chartul.*, p. 256).

⁷³ Cf. *Chartul.*, no. 409, p. 450; no. 416, p. 468.

⁷⁴ This is the case for the three sermons transmitted by Bonaventure's secretary (a clarification we owe to Father Bataillon).

⁷⁵ P. Mandonnet, "Le Carême de saint Thomas d'Aquin à Naples (1273)," in *Miscellanea storico-artistica* (Rome, 1924), p. 195–212; this position was accepted without discussion by the great mass of scholars including Weisheipl, pp. 319 and 401–3, nos. 86–89.

⁷⁶ Cf. J.-P. Torrell, *Collationes*, pp. 9–17, where we show the weakness of Mandonnet's position.

⁷⁷ On this see: L.-J. Bataillon, "Les crises de l'université de Paris d'après les sermons universitaires," *MM* 10 (1976) 155–69; "L'emploi du langage philosophique dans les sermons du treizième siècle," *MM* 13/2 (1981) 983–91.

this world. That is why we scarcely find in him those little stories (*exempla*) so valued by so many preachers. He warns us, on the contrary, against what he calls "frivolities" (*frivolitates*).

Thus in his response to Gerard, the conventual lector of Besançon, who questioned him on the form of the star that appeared to the Magi (a cross, a man, or a crucifix?), Thomas responds that there is nothing in Scripture or tradition that addresses this and he adds rather dryly: "It is not proper for the preacher of truth to lose himself in unverifiable fables."⁷⁸ For an intellectual, Thomas's preaching appears astonishingly concrete, supported by daily experience, concerned with social and economic justice.⁷⁹

We certainly see here the mentality of his epoch (superstitions, antisemitism, male biases, etc.), but his preaching is also impregnated with a massive use of the Bible and a profound love for the Word of God. (It is in the context of a sermon on keeping holy the Lord's Day that he invokes the Jews as an example to Christians because Jews spend the Sabbath meditating on Scripture.)

As to the content, his sermons repeat many themes favored by the preachers of every time: the meaning of God, devotion to the Virgin, prayer, humility (Thomas loved the theme of the *vetula* who knows more about God than a proud intellectual), but we also find here some personal lines of force. In the first place, concern for the essential, charity: *Tota lex Christi pendet a caritate*.⁸⁰ Then, imitation of Christ: "Everything the Lord did and suffered in the flesh is a salutary teaching for us."⁸¹

The theme of man as the image of God finds a place in this context, for Christ came to restore the image disfigured by sin. Thomas insists here on freedom as the privileged sign of resemblance to God. Finally, he

⁷⁸. *Responsi ad lectorem Bisuntinum*, Leon., vol. 42, p. 355; see in Torrell, *Pratique*, pp. 224–25, two other examples of this attitude and the somewhat larger context of this response. We also refer to this study for the following paragraphs. No one has done more than L.-J. Bataillon for a better knowledge of Saint Thomas's preaching. We refer again to a text edited by him: "Le sermon inédit de S. Thomas *Homo quidam fecit cenam magnam*. Introduction et édition," *RSPT* 67 (1983) 353–69; cf. his earlier: "Un sermon de S. Thomas sur la parabole du festin," *RSPT* 58 (1974) 451–56.

⁷⁹. See the examples given in Torrell, *Pratique*, pp. 230–31; in reference to our article in the *DS* (col. 727, par. 2), Father Gauthier has advised us that, in his work in preparation for the edition of the *Quodlibets*, he is "on the contrary struck by the complete lack of concern for social justice;" Thomas did not engage himself in that way, contenting himself with passing on, through Saint Ambrose, Saint Basil's positions, themselves drawn from Stoicism, "whose social criticism is a significant trait," while Aristotle was rather conservative. This perhaps results from the difference of literary genre, but Thomas's preaching seems to us more positive in this field.

⁸⁰. *Collationes XI* (ed. Torrell), p. 227.

⁸¹. *Sermon Puer Iesus proficiebat* (ed. Raulx I, p. 418).

strongly emphasizes the place of the Holy Spirit as a source of Christian liberty, the bond of ecclesial communion, the origin of our prayers, the realizer of the petitions in the *Pater*.

These are some themes to which we return in the next book,⁸² dedicated to Thomas's spiritual theology. In mentioning them here, we wish to draw attention to the connection that exists for him between theology and preaching. We can speak of Thomas, as about many of the theologians of this period, as a "preacher's magisterium."⁸³

⁸². As this volume goes to press, preparation of the French edition of the second volume is nearly complete; an English translation of the second volume will be published by The Catholic University of America Press.

⁸³. This is the theme of a wonderful study by J. Leclercq, "Le magistère du prédicateur au XIII^e siècle," *AHDLM* 21 (1946) 105–47.

Chapter V— Defender of Mendicant Religious Life

The Palm Sunday 1259 incident, mentioned in the previous chapter, was only one sign among several of a university atmosphere in continual deterioration since the arrival of the mendicant friars in Paris.¹ The Dominicans had obtained their first chair in theology thanks to Roland of Cremona, who received a master of arts degree from Bologna and had entered the order in 1219. He arrived in Paris in 1228 and became bachelor of the *Sentences* for John of Saint Giles, an English secular master. He was to become master of theology in May 1229. With the agreement of the chancellor and the Holy See, he began teaching as a regent-master because of the strike of 1229–30. Thanks to the good reputation the friars enjoyed, he quickly acquired a strong student following.² In September 1230, John of Saint Giles was to take the Dominican habit. Since he was already regent-master, he retained his chair and continued teaching.³ This was the second chair in theology at Saint-Jacques, the one designated "for foreigners" (rather improperly, it seems).

¹ M.-M. Dufeil's thesis, *Guillaume de Saint-Amour et la polémique universitaire parisienne 1250–1259* (1972), which is remarkable in many ways, also makes that decade come alive again with an impartiality that religious historians have not always maintained; some of the data about Saint Thomas ought to be adjusted in light of recent work by the Leonine Commission; cf. also [C. Vansteenkiste], *RLT* (1975) no. 774, pp. 318–22.

² In addition to the observations of Glorieux, *Répertoire* I, no. 1, p. 42, see on this subject M.-H. Vicaire, "Roland de Crémone ou la position de la théologie à l'université de Toulouse," *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 5 (1970), pp. 145–78.

³ On John of Saint Giles, cf. Glorieux, *Répertoire* I, no. 3, pp. 52–53; Käppeli, *Scriptores* II, pp. 536–37; on what seem to be the real, concrete circumstances about the acquisition of these chairs, cf. Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. 24–25.

History of a Quarrel

The secular masters never forgave the Dominicans for sabotaging a strike they thought legitimate; they also looked askance at the presence of the religious orders in their ranks, which had previously been homogeneous.⁴ To understand their attitude, we must remember that the number of chairs in theology at the University of Paris (though not the number of professors) was strictly limited.⁵ At the beginning of the century, there were only eight, of which three were reserved for the canons of Notre Dame; this group, once graced with Peter Lombard, also furnished the university chancellor. In the beginning, the seculars were thus clearly a majority. In 1254, the number of chairs grew to twelve, but three mendicants were now included in addition to the canons of Notre Dame. Each new arrival meant another lost chair for the seculars; beyond the fact that the fruitful commercial game that surrounded the appointments (locations, exchanges, or even the selling of chairs) was somewhat upset by this development, the constellation of forces was becoming very different and relentlessly played out to the seculars' detriment.⁶

Things were therefore complicated when the English master Alexander of Hales entered the Franciscans in 1236.⁷ An active master since 1229, Alexander naturally kept the chair and passed it on to John of Rochelle, Eudes Rigaud, and William of Meliton. The straw that broke the camel's back, however, was the Franciscans' claim to a second chair in theology, as the Dominicans had. The occasion presented itself at the candidacy of Saint Bonaventure.⁸ A bachelor of the *Sentences* since 1250, Bonaventure

⁴ Cf. the manifesto *Excelsi dextera*, February 4, 1254, addressed to all the prelates and university figures, in which the secular masters give their version of the events that occurred following the arrival of the Dominicans at the university; see also the analysis and commentary on this document in Dufeil, *Polémique* pp. 103–6, 110–12.

⁵ Cf. the remarks of Glorieux, *L'enseignement*, p. 91, and *Répertoire* I, p. 225; cf. Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. 109–10, and the appendix containing a detailed table of the chairs and their occupants from 1215 to 1284.

⁶ The arrival of the Cistercian Guy de l'Aumône seems to have marked the beginning of a noticeable increase in the ranks of the regulars (cf. Glorieux, *Répertoire* I, no. 360, p. 251, and also p. 228). Cf. Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. 106–7, 113; P. Michaud-Quantin, "Guy de l'Aumône, premier Maître cistercien de l'Université de Paris," *Anal. S. Ord. Cisterciens*. 15 (1959) 194–219.

⁷ Glorieux's work in *Répertoire* II, no. 1, pp. 15–24, should be updated with M. Mückshoff, *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 1 (1980) 377–78; see also V. Doucet's additions in his review of Glorieux: *AFH* 26 (1933) 4–11.

⁸ Cf. Glorieux, *Répertoire* II, no. 305, pp. 37–51; A. Gerken, *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 2 (1983) 402–7; Dufeil's *Polémique*, pp. 3–9, 157–58, presents the details and hidden side of this claim to a second Franciscan chair.

had received his license in theology in 1253, but beginning in February 1252 the secular masters had put out new statutes denying the regulars more than one master's chair per religious college.⁹

Without entering further into the Franciscans's engagement in this quarrel—they were as implicated as the Dominicans, and the widespread Joachimism among them rendered them more vulnerable, as Dufeil has shown—and without explaining in detail the endless skirmishing that followed,¹⁰ we may sum up the principal phases in the conflict thus: in March 1253, a new strike broke out at the university. Once again, the regulars (on the Dominican side, Elias Brunet and Bonhomme) continued their courses. In April and September, the seculars promulgated new statutes requiring those who wished to be admitted to the college of masters to take an oath promising to observe the new rules.¹¹ But on 26 August, Innocent IV invited the two parties to reconcile with one another, and asked them to come to Rome if they did not succeed in reaching an understanding prior to 15 August 1254.¹² The seculars began a large offensive campaign, and in February they sent the letter *Excelsi dextera* to all the prelates in Christendom. In it, they presented the history of the conflict from their point of view.¹³ Shortly afterward, William of Saint-Amour, the university delegate in the case against the Order of Preachers, went to Rome and succeeded in obtaining from an aged Innocent IV a late declaration of support: the Bull *Etsi animarum* (21 November). That document limited the privileges of the mendicants with regard to confessions, collections, preaching, and so forth, but maintained a prudent reserve about the university.¹⁴ The pope died on 7 December, and his successor, Alexander IV, quickly promulgated (22 December) the Bull *Nec insolitum*, which quashed *Etsi animarum*.¹⁵

After 14 April 1255, the Bull *Quasi lignum vitae* would modify the

⁹. The text is *Quoniam in promotione* (*Chartul.*, no. 200, pp. 226–27), which Humbert of Romans, the master general of the Dominicans, will describe as having been promulgated by a *congregatio clandestina* (*Chartul.*, no. 273, p. 310).

¹⁰. Besides Dufeil, *Polémique*, we might refer to H.-F. Dondaine, *Préface à Léon.*, vol. 41, pp. A 7–8, which updates P. Glorieux, "Le conflit de 1252–1257 à la lumière du Mémoire de Guillaume de Saint-Amour," *RTAM* 24 (1957) 364–72.

¹¹. *Chartul.*, no. 219, pp. 242–43.

¹². *Chartul.*, no. 225–26, pp. 249–51.

¹³. *Chartul.*, no. 230, pp. 252–58; cf. above, Chapter III, p. 3.

¹⁴. *Chartul.*, no. 240, pp. 267–70; the Bull *Lecta coram* of 10 May (*Chartul.* no. 26, pp. 263–64) had already appeared and established the same general stance. See the analysis of the two documents and their circumstances in Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. 114–19, 127–31.

¹⁵. *Chartul.*, no. 244, pp. 276–77.

decrees against the mendicants, demand their reintegration, and suppress the limit on the number of chairs. But the Pope's letter was far from being one-sided: though it commends the two Dominican masters for refusing to join the 1253 strike, when they had been excluded from the university, it recommends that in the future they participate in a just strike.¹⁶ Significantly echoing the pope's letter, the Dominican general, Humbert of Romans, wrote to the friars of his order, at the behest of the general chapter at Milan (1255), to do everything possible to overcome the quarrels with the seculars in the domain of administering the sacraments, preaching, burials, alms, etc.¹⁷

In the fall of 1255 (2 October), the seculars published a novel declaration, *Radix amaritudinis*, in which they affirmed their readiness to dissolve their society and leave Paris rather than admit the Order of Preachers among them—a maneuver that would prove to be a mistake.¹⁸ An attempt at mediation by the bishops of the Paris region reached a halting compromise, which the Franciscans accepted but the Dominicans refused. The pope, however, rejected it in a letter of 17 June 1256, which also relieved of their duties the four masters most engaged in the conflict: William of Saint-Amour, Odon of Douai, Nicholas of Bar-sur-Aube, and Christian of Beauvais.¹⁹

The pope further asked King Louis IX to expel these four masters from the kingdom of France. But Louis limited himself to seizing and referring to Rome William's *De periculis*. Only after William had been condemned by Rome and forbidden by the pope to reenter France did Saint Louis ban him as well.²⁰ From the university's point of view, these contestations found a provisional conclusion on 12 August 1257, when, in the church of the friars minor, Christian of Beauvais pronounced his submission to a delegate of the bishop of Paris and promised to work toward the university's reception of brothers Thomas and Bonaventure.²¹ Thomas, therefore,

¹⁶ *Chartul.* no. 247, pp. 279–85; cf. Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. 152–56.

¹⁷ *MOPH* 5, pp. 21–24; Dufeil, *Polémique*, p. 163.

¹⁸ *Chartul.* no. 256, pp. 292–97.

¹⁹ *Chartul.* nos. 268 and 280, pp. 304–5 and 319–23; for the bishops's efforts, see Dufeil, *Polémique*, 203–12.

²⁰ *Chartul.* nos. 282 289, 288, 314–16, pp. 324–25, 333–35, 331–33, 362–64; see also on this subject M.-M. Dufeil, "Le roi Louis dans la querelle des mendiants et des séculiers," in *Histoire*, pp. 517–30.

²¹ *Chartul.* no. 317, pp. 364–67; cf. *ibid.*, no. 293, pp. 338–40, for Odon of Douai's retraction; Nicholas, who belonged to the arts faculty, was simply called to order, cf. Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. 282 and 286; see p. 307 where he proposes 23 October 1257 as the effective date for the reception of the two religious masters into the *consortium magistrorum*.

waited about eighteen months for his admission into the *consortium magistrorum*. Bonaventure, however, had waited four years, and he gave his *principium* when he had already been minister general of the friars minor for six months.

This dry account hardly conveys the violence of the quarrel; the seculars had manoeuvred well enough to raise a segment of the students and the Latin Quarter against the religious. Thus during the winter of 1255–1256, the friars were assaulted in the streets, and Saint-Jacques had to be guarded by the royal archers. When Thomas gave his inaugural lecture, it was under their protection; some demonstrators kept outside listeners from entering.²²

The Contra impugnantes

Thomas's admission to the college of masters resolved only part of the problem. The conflict had very quickly overflowed the university setting. It became clear that the wave of opposition, whose leader was William of Saint-Amour, had at bottom a much more central question: the very legitimacy of the ministry of the mendicants, who claimed to be devoted to study and teaching, and to live, not by labor, but by alms. These are the central theses of one of the major pieces in the quarrel, the *Tractatus de periculis nouissimorum temporum*, which William published around March–April 1256.

That work, which survives in several versions, presents itself as a warning to the bishops and other pastors of the Church about the perils of the last days before the Antichrist. It seeks to make them aware of the danger that the false preachers described by Saint Paul will pose to the Church.²³ The essence of William's proposed remedy consists in sending all the religious back to their monasteries (from which they should never have departed) to perform manual labor. This simplistic proposition shows the depth of the misunderstanding: William never comprehended that the mendicant religious were not monks, nor to what extent the order of

²². *Chartul.* no. 279, pp. 317–19 (= *MOPH* 5, pp. 31–38); no. 280, p. 321; the second of these documents is by Alexander IV, the first by Humbert of Romans: Dufeil, *Polémique*, 217–18, has no trouble showing that Humbert espouses without reservation the Dominican point of view, but the facts are beyond dispute. Most notably, the protection of Saint-Jacques by the royal police is confirmed in one of the secular masters's documents (*Radix amaritudinis*, *Chartul.*, no. 256, p. 294; cf. Dufeil, *Polémique*, p. 170, and note 91, p. 193.)

²³. For an analysis of this work and the various versions, see Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. 212–27, 241–42, 252–53.

preachers was defined by study and preaching. This book was condemned by Alexander IV on 5 October 1256, not before making waves that lasted a long time.²⁴ The poet Ruteboeuf, an ardent partisan of William, witnesses to this in his way.²⁵

Marie-Michel Dufeil has written an unflattering portrait of William of Saint-Amour.²⁶ Subdeacon for life, he collected, however, two prebends as a canon and one as a curate. Irascible, violent, and obstinate, he certainly did not possess the intellectual breadth of his adversaries Thomas and Bonaventure, but it is necessary to try to understand his motives and those of his colleagues. Those motives were doubtless mixed: envy and jealousy over the success of the religious masters, and fear for a loss of revenues played a part. But not all their motives were mean-spirited, nor was their fear of heresy without its reasons. That William took to Rome the *Introductorius ad Evangelium aeternum* of Gerard de Borgo San Donnino, when it was still anonymous and attributed to the Dominicans, or that he drew up with his colleagues the list of thirty-one errors sent to Pope Innocent IV by Renaud Mignon de Corbeil, the bishop of Paris, testifies to a certain perspicacity.²⁷ But the misguided fear of heresy made him confuse one kind of friar with another by putting into the same category the new preachers and Gerard's sectarians.

William's sincerity is probably not to be doubted, since he seems to have ended believing in the dangers he was denouncing.²⁸ But his theological conservatism drove him to defend the established hierarchy, without the

²⁴ *Chartul.*, no. 288, pp. 331–33.

²⁵ See Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. 148–50, 316–24, and the same author's "L'oeuvre d'une vie rythmée: Chronographie de Ruteboeuf," in *Histoire*, pp. 671–87.

²⁶ To the point of being suspected of a certain Manicheism by Jacques Le Goff in the preface that he wrote to *Saint Thomas et l'histoire* (cf. p. 12); for the biographical data, see Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. xx–xxxii, or, for want of it, the same author's *Saint Thomas et l'histoire*, in two articles that sum up the essential points: "Un universitaire parisien réactionnaire vers 1250: Guillaume de Saint-Amour," pp. 445–56, and "Guillaume de Saint-Amour," pp. 543–50. For a less partisan judgment, see Philippe Delhay, "Guillaume de Saint-Amour," *DS* 6 (1967) 1237–40.

²⁷ Cf. *Chartul.*, no. 257, p. 297; the book was condemned by a commission of cardinals, and Saint Bonaventure was not soft on the author, since the tribunal over which he presided condemned the author to life imprisonment. Cf. P. Péano, "Gérard de Borgo San Donnino," *DHGE* 20 (1984) 719–21; for his condemnation at Anagni, cf. H. Denifle, "Das Evangelium aeternum und die Commission zu Anagni," in *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters* 1 (1885) 49–142. Several texts concerning this affair have appeared in French in Dufeil, "Trois 'sens de l'histoire' affrontés vers 1250–1260," in *Saint Thomas et l'histoire*, pp. 619–66: cf. also Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. 119–27, 172–73.

²⁸ Dufeil, *Saint Thomas et l'histoire*, pp. 546 and 627, who is joined on this point by J. D. Dawson, "William of Saint-Amour and the Apostolic Tradition," *MS* 40 (1978) 223–38, especially p. 234.

proper and necessary nuances, against the invasion of "the papal militia." (His position often seems a Gallicanism before the fact.) This stance made him misunderstand the newness of Spirit at work in the history of that time. Without entering here into an evaluation of the underlying ecclesiologies behind the respective positions, we may still think that one reason for the (temporary) defeat of the seculars lay precisely in this theological rigidity, which hindered William and his associates from seeing the growing importance of the papacy.²⁹

Thomas did not wait long to get involved in the melee. As we have seen, at the same time that he gave his inaugural lecture the new master was supposed to dispute four questions during the two days that his *inceptio* lasted. According to Weisheipl, it is to this occasion that we owe the *De opere manuali religiosorum*.³⁰ According to Gauthier, we should consider this text rather an integral part of the first *Quodlibet* defended by Thomas after his accession as master.³¹ Neither hypothesis affects the date, since that remains fixed during Lent of 1256, Easter falling that year on 16 April.

Analysis of the text, article 18 in particular, shows that Thomas is following and refuting the *De periculis*. The proposed dates make this entirely possible. The first version of William's text could have appeared after 15 March or at the beginning of April 1256.³² And we know from other sources that Thomas undertook his *inceptio* between 3 March and 17 June of that same year. It would evidently be a clear sign of the combativeness of the young master if he had spontaneously chosen this topic in preference to another, less burning one for an exercise already dangerous enough in itself. But this does not change the result in the slightest: Thomas immediately took a position.

It also seems clear that, around this time, he began the composition of *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem*. In any event, that work was finished before William's condemnation became known at Paris, since

²⁹ Dufeil's thesis (*Polémique*, pp. 260–64 in particular) about this point is well founded, but a better contextualized theological analysis may be found in Dawson's article (cf. note 28 above). Dawson shows that William's error was to have taken the reference to the primitive Church as a strict juridical norm, and also to have opposed it to innovations in his day. Yves Congar's, "Aspects ecclésiologiques de la querelle entre mendiants et séculiers dans la seconde moitié du XIIIe et le début du XIVe," *AHDLMA* 28 (1961) 34–151, retains its relevance to this point.

³⁰ *Quodlibet* VII q. 7 a. 1–2 [17–18]; cf. Weisheipl, pp. 104–9, who joins here P. Castagnoli, "Regesta," *DTP* 31 (1928) 253–56.

³¹ We thank Father Gauthier for communicating this information to us along with the new text of the *Quodlibet VII*, which he has edited for volume 25 of the Leonine edition.

³² Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. 214–15, 232–33.

Thomas would certainly have mentioned it. The Leonine editors say November was the date of completion, but, with Weisheipl, we might push that date back to October.³³ As to the place of composition, in spite of Tocco, who is clearly misinformed, it was not Anagni but evidently Paris.³⁴

At first sight, this is not Thomas's most passionate work. But after Hyacinthe Dondaine's introduction to the text that he prepared for the Leonine edition and the labors of Dufeil, it can be read with a new eye and considerable interest. In addition to being very well constructed, its plan exactly reflects the parties in the debate then underway.³⁵ Thomas begins by defining a *religio*, which is to say a religious order, and what constitutes its perfection (chapter 1); for the whole argument of our adversaries, he says, seems directed against the religious orders (*quia eorum tota intentio contra religiosos esse videtur*—Prologue). He then establishes the licitness of teaching for the religious orders (2), and their right to belong to the professorial body (3).

These two last chapters use official university documents, while the following chapters, which energetically defend the mendicant ideal, use materials borrowed from various sources such as disputed questions, sermons, and lampoons of all sorts published by their opponents. First, he defends the right to preach and hear confessions, even if the mendicants did not have pastoral responsibilities (*cura animarum*, chapter 4). They were not to be hindered from these activities by the obligation to do manual labor (chapter 5). This is why Thomas claims for them the right to the most absolute poverty (chapter 6) and the possibility of living by alms in order not to be entangled in financial administration or other business (chapter 7).

The seventeen remaining chapters of this work are used to demonstrate the iniquity of the infamous accusations formulated against the "religious mendicants." These chapters follow rather closely the argument of *De peri-*

³³. Cf. Leonine, vol. 41, pp. A 12–13; Weisheipl, p. 88.

³⁴. Cf. *Ystoria* 20, pp. 262–67 (Tocco 19, pp. 91–93); this entire chapter in Tocco should be approached with caution.

³⁵. This plan is stated at the end of the prologue, and a synopsis of the whole book may be found in the Leonine, vol. 41, p. A 7; see also Glorieux, "Le 'Contra impugnantes' de S. Thomas," *Mélanges Mandonnet* I, 51–81, and the very lively analysis by Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. 253–60. All references in this chapter to the *Contra impugnantes*, *De perfectione*, and *Contra retrahentes* refer to vol. 41 of the Leonine edition with its threefold division: A, B, C. There is a French translation, complete but aged (from 1857), of these three opuscula in *Opusculs de Saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Vrin-Reprise 4 and 5) (Paris, 1984). Often the chapter numbering does not correspond with that in the critical edition.

culis. Thomas took pains to discover the weak spots in that work's armor. Everything passes in review: things (the habit, the mobility of the religious, study, their way of preaching *ornate*, etc.), all good but turned to seeming evil by a manifest intention to detract; persons are accused of being false apostles, brigands, and thieves—because they let themselves into others' sheepfolds—and of being precursors of the Antichrist, who announces his coming in their preaching. Thomas lets nothing pass, because the honor of the Preachers is at stake. He thus uses in his book an almost unheard-of array of *auctoritates*, among which the Decree and the Gloss receive a special place. It is clear that he wants to wrest from William his very weapons, since the latter believed himself to be proceeding on the basis of received authorities.

We can appreciate the *Contra impugnantes* from diverse points of view. Thus, Dufeil can praise Thomas's sense of history compared with William's rigidity or Gerard's confused messianism.³⁶ In place of a lengthy exposition, we might highlight that Thomas's historical sense matches the vision of religious life that we find in his opening chapter. Thomas puts the theological life in its fullness at the root of the religious life: faith first, which is the first link that reunites man to God. But he also includes hope and charity. All charitable works thus become part of that "service" rendered to God in the religious life. What unifies everything is the New Testament "spiritual sacrifice": the offering of oneself, body and soul, as an agreeable victim (Romans 12:1) through the vows of chastity and obedience, and of one's goods through the vow of poverty.

Along the way—one cannot help but admire it—Thomas positions his pawns in full theological truth. First: given charity's extension throughout all the works of the Christian life, "there is no work of compassion [in the full sense he gives to this word] that may not become the focus of a religious order *even if it has never been done up until now*."³⁷ Nothing remains but to present preaching and teaching theology as a spiritual work of mercy (because "man does not live by bread alone") in order with a single stroke to legitimate the Order of Preachers despite the novelty of their intentions.

Second example: the perfection of a religious order comes naturally, as for every other thing, from the end that it pursues (the active and contem-

³⁶. Cf. note 29 above, but also the central thesis of *S. Thomas et l'histoire*, especially pp. 102–5.

³⁷. *Contra impugnantes* 1, ll. 66–68, p. A 54: "Nec est aliquod opus misericordiae ad cuius executionem religio institui non possit, *et si non sit hactenus instituta*."

plative lives are distinguished by this), but also from the means employed, which may be more or less suitable for the achievement of that end. Take two contemplative orders: the more perfect one will have an internal organization that liberates its members for contemplation.³⁸ The reasoning is irrefutable; Thomas uses it in the appropriate way to show the connection between poverty and perfection.

The De perfectione and the Contra retrahentes

After William's condemnation and his associates' retraction, the debate lay dormant for several years, and Thomas completed his first round of teaching in Paris in a more peaceful atmosphere. As we have seen, it is probably to this interlude that we owe the *Super Boetium De Trinitate*, which was composed around this period. The peace was fragile, though. So as not to have to return to it later, let us anticipate a bit of the history that was to follow. A new wave of assaults against the religious soon started up. William of Saint-Amour was exiled to his lands in the Mâconnais, but he was not inactive;³⁹ the attack, however, was led first by Gerard of Abbeville, then by Nicholas of Lisieux.

The latter is hardly known except for his participation in these polemics,⁴⁰ but the former was a considerable figure. A colleague of William of Saint-Amour as early as 1254, Gerard survived William in the corps of regent-masters until his death in 1272. Highly active within the university, he was one of the rare masters (along with Saint Thomas) regularly to hold two *quodlibets* annually. Richly endowed with benefices, a true "prince of the Church," he can be considered one of the founders of the Sorbonne's library; he left more than 300 volumes to the college founded by his friend Robert. Until death a fierce adversary of the mendicants, Gerard moreover specified that he was leaving his books to poor students so long as they were not in religious orders.⁴¹

³⁸. Ibid., ll. 135–69, pp. A 54–55; there is a third point of view, that of penitence and various austerities, but the other two are "more essential," says Thomas, *cum perfectio vitae magis consistat in interiori iustitia quam in exteriori abstinentia* (ibid., ll. 166–68).

³⁹. Cf. Dufeil, *Polémique*, pp. 324–31.

⁴⁰. Cf. R. Hissette's article, "Nicolas de Lisieux," *Catholicisme* 9 (1982) 1254–55; P. Glorieux, "Une offensive de Nicolas de Lisieux contre S. Thomas d'Aquin," *BLE* 39 (1938) 121–29.

⁴¹. Gerard's biography, will, and the disputed edition of his *Quodlibet* may be found in Phillip Grand, "Le *Quodlibet* XIV de Gérard d'Abbeville. La vie de Gérard d'Abbeville," *AHDLM* 39 (1964) 207–69; see the same author's article, "Gérard d'Abbeville," *DS* 6 (1967) 258–63; Glorieux, *Répertoire* I, no. 174, pp. 356–60. See also A. Teetaert, "Quatre questions

(footnote continued on next page)

In 1267, Gerard had already held his *Quodlibet* XI on the licitness of encouraging young people to promise to enter the religious life. In his *quodlibet* of Christmas 1268, he questions the Franciscan teaching about perfect poverty. During a sermon eight days later, in the very church of the friars minor, he places the highest perfection in the office of pastor of souls (not in the bishops alone, which would have been unquestionable, but in the curates and the archdeacons as well). Furthermore, this perfection, he argues, is in no way diminished by possession and administration of temporal goods. In his *quodlibet* of Easter 1269, he again devoted two questions to defending the perfection of prelates; finally, in the course of summer of 1269, he published his *Contra adversarium perfectionis christianae*, which led to a resounding polemic between him and the friars minor.⁴²

It may be that the recrudescence of that acrimony was among the reasons for Thomas's return to Paris in the fall of 1268. In any case, after the spring of 1269, he entered the lists with his Easter *quodlibet*. He first occupied himself with showing that for a religious to apply himself to study and teaching not only was not a sin but was a work of perfection. And this was all the more the case for anyone who did so at a high level, for those he formed would be able, in turn, to teach others.⁴³ In the important response *ad 2*, he clearly announces the two central lines of his position on poverty: first, poverty as an *instrumentum perfectionis*, and second, the difference between perfection and the state of perfection.

Thomas returns at his leisure to these two points in the *De perfectione spiritualis vitae*. Begun rather early in 1269, it appears to have been finished at the beginning of 1270, since its last chapters echo the *Quodlibet* XIV Gerard of Abbeville held at Christmas 1269. Traces of the controversy may be found in the *De perfectione*, since the first twenty-two chapters,

(footnote continued from previous page)

inédites de Gérard d'Abbeville pour la défense de la supériorité du clergé séculier," in *Archivio italiano per la storia della pietà* 1 (1951) 83–178. For the stages in this new phase of the quarrel, cf. P. Glorieux, "Les polémiques 'contra Geraldinos'," *RTAM* 6 (1934) 5–41, and the prefaces by H. Dondaine in Leonine, vol. 41, pp. B 5–9 and C 5–8.

⁴² This work has been edited by S. Clasen in *AFH* 31 (1938) 276–329; 32 (1939) 89–200. It was on this occasion that Saint Bonaventure published his *Apologia pauperum* [*Opera omnia* 8 (Quaracchi, 1898), pp. 233–330], and John Pecham his *De perfectione evangelica*. Cf. F. Delorme, "Quatre chapitres inédits de Jean Pecham O.F.M. sur la perfection religieuse et autres états de perfection," *Coll. Franciscana* 14 (1944) 84–120.

⁴³ *Quodlibet* I q. 7 a. 2 [14]: "Ipsa etiam ratio demonstrat quod melius est erudire de pertinentibus ad salutem eos qui et in se et in aliis proficere possunt, quam simplices qui in se tantum proficere possunt."

which develop free of any doctrinal controversy, brusquely give way to four chapters not foreseen at the outset. In these, Thomas indicates he must respond to the attacks against him; this visibly reflects Gerard's *Quodlibet* XIV.⁴⁴

The interest of the *De perfectione* is not limited to the history of this polemic. From the very outset, its teaching on Christian perfection and the religious life begins an exposition that will find its completion in the *Summa* and is already rather different from the one in the *Contra Gentiles*.⁴⁵ Furthermore, this little work marks a decisive stage in Thomistic theology about the bishop's office. Under the influence of Dionysius, Thomas from then on sees the episcopal function as a true power of a kind that constitutes the bishop in the state of *perfector*.⁴⁶

Thomas will return to contemporary questions in his *quodlibet* of Easter 1270, notably on the licitness of encouraging young people to promise to enter into the religious life and on the binding nature of such promises. He will also address the question whether curates are in a greater state of perfection than the religious orders.⁴⁷ The analogy is with the *status servitutis*, in which one is not free to follow one's own wishes and has been consecrated by a solemn commitment. He will deal again with *De ingressu puerorum* in his *quodlibet* of Easter 1271.⁴⁸ But this subject is developed at length in the *Contra retrahentes*.

According to its conclusion, this new opusculum is directed "against the erroneous and pernicious [*pestiferam*] doctrine of those who dissuade men from entering into religion."⁴⁹ H.-F. Dondaine believes this work comes after the *De perfectione*—to which it explicitly refers—and is contemporaneous with *Quodlibet* IV, which, in article 23, takes up again the theme *De ingressu puerorum*. It also takes up (in article 24) the relation

⁴⁴. Cf. *De perfectione*, beginning of chapter 24, Leonine edition, vol. 41, p. 99: "quorum assertiones postquam premissa conscripseram ad me pervenerunt"; beside Grand's edition (see note 41 above), a partial edition of Gerard's *Quodlibet* XIV may be found in the same Leonine volume, pp. B 56–62. See P. Glorieux's article, "Pour qu'on lise le *De perfectione*," *VS Suppl.* 23 (1930) 97–126. A more current, but partial, translation than the Vrin-Reprise version may be consulted in *VS* 18 (1928) 498–506, 619–24; 19 (1928) 85–97, 223–28, 342–52, and H. Maréchal, *Thomas d'Aquin, Vers la perfection de la vie spirituelle* (Paris, 1932).

⁴⁵. Cf. *ST* IIa IIae qq. 182–89; *SCG* III 130–38.

⁴⁶. *De perfectione*, 28, ll. 93–115, P. B 108; see also J. Lécuyer, "Les étapes de l'enseignement thomiste sur l'épiscopat," *RT* 57 (1957) 29–52.

⁴⁷. *Quodl.* III q. 5 a.1–2 [11–12], and q. 6 a.3 [17].

⁴⁸. *Quodl.* IV q. 12 a.1 [23].

⁴⁹. Text in the Leonine edition, vol. 41, pp. C 39–74; on this point, chapter 16, l. 164, p. C 74.

between precepts and counsels. The parallelism of subjects and argument is quite striking between the two articles and chapters 2–7 of the *Contra retrahentes*. Since the *quodlibet* is securely dated to Lent 1271, there is no need to doubt the date of this opusculum, in Dondaine's view. Dondaine says Glorieux thought it possible to place the *Contra Retrahentes* a little bit before the *De ingressu puerorum*, but that the labors of A. Sanchis have convinced him and other scholars to place the composition of the *Contra retrahentes* between Lent and Christmas, "perhaps after Easter 1271 or not much later than the vacation of 1271."⁵⁰

Nevertheless it is still possible to regard the *Contra retrahentes* as anterior to *Quodlibet* IV in its reference to the text of Augustine quoted at the beginning of the response of article 23. This passage speaks of those obtuse spirits who will not give in, even to the clearest statements. Could Thomas have written this if he had not already written the *Contra retrahentes*? And could he have written the latter work immediately after having written this? In any case, we are speaking about the same period (within a few months). A sermon for *Sexagesima* Sunday, in which we find several points that are taken up only in this opusculum (the sermon clearly predates it), shows that Thomas was entirely occupied with writing at the time.⁵¹

His reflections, however, deepen from the *De ingressu* to the *Contra retrahentes*. Thomas had stated as much: "To extirpate this error radically, it is necessary to discover its root or origin."⁵² Thus, in order to better establish the relationship between precepts and counsels, he abandons the distinction used in *Quodlibet* IV, article 24, between interior acts of virtue and exterior acts. Instead he utilizes a new reflection, the absolute primacy of charity, which will be taken up again and developed in *Quodlibet* V, article 19, of Christmas 1271, and above all in the *Summa* (IIa IIae q. 189 a. 1).

It should not be surprising that we encounter, among the strong points in this defense and at the highest level of importance for Thomas, voluntary and mendicant poverty. In fact, according to M.-M. Dufeil's for-

⁵⁰ H.-F. Dondaine, Leonine edition, vol. 41, p. C 7, who refers to A. Sanchis, "Escritos espirituales de Santo Tomás (1269–1272)," *Teologia espiritual* 6 (1962) 277–318; cf. P. Glorieux, *La polémique*, pp. 40–41 (table adopted by Grand, *DS* 6, col. 262).

⁵¹ Cf. Th. Käppeli, "Una raccolta di prediche attribuite a S. Tommaso d'Aquino," *AFP* 13 (1943) 59–94, cf. pp. 66–67, 84–85.

⁵² *Contra Retrahentes*, chap. 6, ll. 2–3, p. C 45: "Ad hunc autem errorem radicatus extirpandum, oportet eius radicem sive originem invenire."

mulation, this was not the basis of the quarrel, but it was the most obvious axis for it.⁵³ Thomas defended here one of the newest aspects of his order, and he dedicated his longest chapters to it: 1025 lines for the chapter on voluntary poverty in the *Contra impugnantes*; 1694 lines in chapter 7 on the right to the mendicant life in the same book. Chapter 7 alone amounts to one sixth of the entire work. But we should not let ourselves be distracted by these quantitative data; it is not in poverty itself that Thomas places perfection. He explains very clearly in the *De perfectione*:

If we examine carefully our Lord's words, it is not in the abandonment of riches itself that he has placed perfection; he shows that this is only a way that leads to perfection, as his manner of speaking proves when he says: "If you wish to be perfect, go, sell all that you have, give it to the poor, and follow me" (Matt. 19:21). This is to say that perfection consists in following Christ [*in sequela Christi consistat perfectio*] and that renouncing riches helps us to walk in that path.⁵⁴

Thus the distinction of *Quodlibet* I q. 7 a.2[14] ad 2 between the end and the means is established once and for all, and this thesis about poverty as an *instrumentum perfectionis* will come to completion in the definitive formula of the *Summa*: "Perfection does not consist essentially in poverty, but in following Christ . . . poverty is like a means or an exercise which permits us to arrive at perfection."⁵⁵

Faithful to the principle he had announced at the beginning of the *Contra impugnantes*, he explained in the *Contra Gentiles*: we judge the goodness of poverty according to the liberty that it produces in the pursuit of spiritual good.⁵⁶ He continues, we judge its relative perfection in the way it contributes to attaining the goals of the order that practices it: "A religious order will be the more perfect from this point of view, when it practices a poverty better adapted to the ends which it pursues."⁵⁷ We may guess that it is no longer the secular masters who are being addressed here

⁵³. M.-M. Dufeil, "Evolution ou fixité des institutions ecclésiastiques: une controverse universitaire. L'édition critique de trois oeuvres polémiques de saint Thomas d'Aquin," *RSP* 55 (1971) 464–79, cf. p. 472.

⁵⁴. *De perfectione* 8, ll. 86–94, p. B 73.

⁵⁵. *ST* IIa IIae q. 188 a.7: "Perfectio non consistit essentialiter in paupertate, sed in Christi sequela. . . . Paupertas est sicut instrumentum, vel exercitium perveniendi ad perfectionem."

⁵⁶. *SCG* IV 133, no. 3067: "Non enim paupertas secundum se bona est: sed in quantum liberat ab illis quibus homo impeditur quominus spiritualibus intendat"; see also no. 3066 and chap. 135, no. 3080, and *ST* Ia IIae q. 108 a. 2 ad 3: "Iam imminet tempus perfectae libertatis."

⁵⁷. *Ibid.*: "Tanto erit unaquaeque religio secundum paupertatem perfectior, quanto habet paupertatem magis proportionatam suo fini"; cf. *ibid.*, ad 1.

but the Franciscans: John Pecham was not deceived when he violently attacked the Thomist thesis of poverty as *instrumentum perfectionis*.⁵⁸

Thomas in this way liberated his order from the endless disputes about perfect poverty that continued to agitate the various Franciscan factions. But we should especially remark in these texts the place given to the *sequela Christi*. Perhaps in no place does he underline more strongly the place of Christ and following in his footsteps as the essentials of religious life. It is a true leitmotiv. That becomes clear in the first chapter of the *Contra retrahentes*, where Thomas recalls several times that Christ taught poverty *et facto et verbo*.

But we should also read the admirable chapter 15 of this work in which—with a liveliness his usual reserve hardly prepares us for—Thomas unveils a personal mysticism of attachment to the poor Christ, which must be explained in part by the struggles that he had to undergo to enter into his Dominican religious family, and later to defend that life.⁵⁹

Thomas held to this theme of Christ the model. We find it again in his thought on the Christian life in general, but, for the religious life, we cannot help but remark how his well-known theory of the superiority of the apostolic life over the solely contemplative life is based directly on the example that Christ has left us.⁶⁰ More paradoxically, he tells us that Christ himself chose this life because of its superiority:

The contemplative life is better than the active life that solely concerns itself with bodily necessities; but the active life that consists in passing on to others through preaching and teaching truths that have been contemplated is more perfect than the solely contemplative life, for it presupposes a plenitude of contemplation. *That is why Christ chose a life of this type.*⁶¹

After Christ, the best reference point is the early Church. The faithful heir of the successive rebirths of the monastic life, all of which took their model from the *uita apostolica*, Thomas loves to refer to that life: it is in

⁵⁸. J. Pecham, *De perfectione evangelica*, ed. F. Delorme, pp. 117–20. This was only the beginning of a controversy that would develop particularly after Thomas's death, but which already finds here one of its roots; see on this point U. Horst, *Evangelische Armut und Kirche. Thomas von Aquin und die Armutskontroversen des 13. und beginnenden 14. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1992).

⁵⁹. Cf. above, chap. I, pp. 10–12.

⁶⁰. Cf. *ST* IIa IIae q. 186 a.6.

⁶¹. "Vita contemplativa simpliciter est melior quam activa quae occupatur circa corporales actus; sed vita activa secundum quam aliquis praedicando et docendo contemplata aliis tradit, est perfectior quam vita quae solum contemplatur, quia talis vita presupponit abundantiam contemplationis. *Et ideo Christus talem vitam elegit*" (IIa q. 40 a. 1 ad 2).

the primitive Church that we find the most perfect state of religion, and it is from this model that all the religious orders have drawn their inspiration.⁶² The same idea with the same scriptural support (*cor unum et anima una*, Acts 4:32) is found almost literally in the *De perfectione*: "*a quorum exemplo omnes religiones derivatae sunt*." The reference to this very passage in Acts is repeated in the *Contra retrahentes*, but this time to address more specifically the question of religious poverty.⁶³

Meanwhile we find in the *Contra impugnantes* what we might call the double evangelism of the religious life according to Saint Thomas. In that work we find a practice that would like to join the life in common of monks and canons with the apostolic mission of the itinerant preachers in the previous century.⁶⁴ Basing himself simultaneously on Acts 4:32 and on Matthew 10, Thomas thinks that the true *vita apostolica* conjoins the teaching of these two texts. Thus, confronted with William of Saint-Amour who turned the example of the primitive Church into a quarrelsome juridical rule against the "innovations" of the mendicants, Thomas provided a scriptural basis for Saint Dominic's order that gave it legitimacy from its very foundation. If this was the form of the apostle's lives, he says, it is quite clear that someone might follow it in a religious order instituted for that reason:

Every religious order has been founded upon the model of the apostolic life, according to that which is said in the Acts; everything was in common among them . . . the apostolic life was such that, having abandoned everything, they went about the world to evangelize and to preach, as one sees in Matthew 10, where that is imposed upon them as a rule. We are therefore very well justified in founding a religious order for these two tasks.⁶⁵

The Polemicist

In these polemical writings defending the religious life, Thomas commits and manifests himself personally in a more open way than in other

⁶². *Quodlibet* IV q. 12 a. 1[23]: "*In primitiva Ecclesia omnium christianorum erat perfectissimus religionis status, secundum illud Act. 4, 32: Multitudinis credentium erat cor unum et anima una . . . ad cuius vitae exemplar omnes religiones sunt institutae*."

⁶³. Cf. *De perfectione* 27, ll. 240–42, p. B 106; *Contra retrahentes* 15, ll. 225–42, pp. C 70–71.

⁶⁴. Cf. M.-H. Vicaire, "L'ordre de saint Dominique en 1215," *AFP* 54 (1984) 5–38, cf. pp. 36–38.

⁶⁵. *Contra impugnantes* 4, ll. 880–89, p. A 78: "Omnis religio ad exemplum vitae apostolicae formata est . . . Haec autem fuit vita apostolica ut relictis omnibus per mundum discurrent evangelizando et praedicando, ut patet Matthew 10 ubi regula quaedam eis inscribitur: ergo ad predicta potest aliqua religio convenientissime institui."

works; we feel him touched here in that which he holds most dear: the vocation for which he struggled in his youth. For that reason these books are among those in which we can best grasp the passionate character of Thomas's temperament. And they allow us to add several significant traits to his spiritual portrait. If we feared, for example, that he may have been too timorous in the troubled university situation, these writings do not lack in vigor or firmness or even, as M.-M. Dufeil has underscored,⁶⁶ in a "sarcastic irony which bursts forth at intervals" in the *Contra impugnantes*. Thus Thomas replies to the objection that one cannot belong to two colleges at the same time (the body of masters and a religious family) that Church law does not in any way prohibit this double membership, but instead proscribes the simultaneous adherence to two ecclesiastical colleges, or being a canon of two different churches.⁶⁷

If the later writings avoid this tone, they are neither less severe nor less firm; the young master's moderation has its limits, and if he does everything possible to constrain himself within "serious and delicate dialogue" (H.-F. Dondaine), he allows himself sometimes to be carried away to the point of judging his adversaries: "They lie plainly (*plane mentiuntur*)."⁶⁸ Everyone remembers the well-known close of the *De perfectione*:

If anyone desires to write against this work, that would be quite acceptable [*acceptissimum*] to me; for the truth will never manifest itself better than in resisting those who contradict it and in refuting their errors; as the book of Proverbs says: "Iron is sharpened by iron, man is refined in the contact with his neighbor."⁶⁹

The conclusion of the *Contra retrahentes* is no less firm:

If someone would like to contradict this work, let him not go and babble to children, but let him write a book and publish it, so that competent persons can judge what is true and reject what is false according to the authority of truth.⁷⁰

Non coram pueris garriat, doubtless an allusion to the students in the arts faculty, clearly younger than the theologians, whom various people

⁶⁶ M.-M. Dufeil, *Evolution ou fixité*, p. 471.

⁶⁷ *Contra impugnantes* 3, ll. 341–72, p. A 67.

⁶⁸ Ibid. 24, l. 238, p. A 162; grammatically it would doubtless be possible to translate: "They deceive themselves," which would leave his adversaries with good faith intact. But the context reminds us of the ill-will with which they have proceeded toward the religious, and it hardly allows doubts to remain about Thomas's indignation.

⁶⁹ *De perfectione*, chap. 30, p. B 111, the quotation is from Proverbs 27:17.

⁷⁰ *Contra retrahentes*, chap. 17, p. C 74.

were trying to dissuade from joining the friars. It is worth emphasizing this conclusion: it is the third text published in a single year (1271) that formulates this invitation to discussion in the form of a personal challenge.⁷¹ In an article already mentioned, Edward Synan has remarked on the abundant metaphors borrowed from chivalry in the most unexpected contexts. We might add to the documentation that Synan collected these challenges issued to an opponent, which make us think about the challenges *milites* addressed to one another when they engaged in tournaments.

But it is not enough to say that Thomas was capable of issuing challenges; he was also capable of showing surprise, impatience, and even indignation when his adversaries' arguments were highly inconsistent or lacking in verification. This is true not only of the young Thomas, the one who wrote the *Contra impugnantes*, but also of the man he remained for the rest of his life (in 1270–71 he had already marked his forty-fifth birthday). It suffices to reread some passages to be convinced of this, and to see emerge a type of man entirely different from the placid and majestic obese figure popularized by current iconography.

In response to the general of the order, John of Vercelli, who questioned him on the positions of Peter of Tarentaise, which had been brought to his attention as suspect, Thomas formulated this judgment. He certainly recognized the weak points in his colleague's argument, but he was not afraid of defending them in the clearest terms: "The objector is committing a calumny, he does not understand what is being debated." And a bit further: "What the objector says is a calumny and completely frivolous."⁷²

With regard to a radical position on the separated intellect, he is astonished that people can go astray "so lightly,"⁷³ and he is not afraid to speak of "delirium" (*insania*) to describe another position.⁷⁴ But it is particularly in the *De unitate intellectus* that the harvest of these signs of impatience appears abundantly; this might be explained in part by the heatedness of the discussion and the crucial character of the subject, but it is also fair to regard it as an example of the capacity of a "master polemicist."⁷⁵

⁷¹. Cf. the conclusion of the *De unitate intellectus*, chap. 5, Leonine edition, vol. 43, p. 314, ll. 434–41; *Quodlibet* IV, q. 12 a. 1 [23], beginning with the *Responsio*, where Thomas uses a text from Saint Augustine to issue the challenge.

⁷². *Resp. de 108 art.*, 16 and 74, Leonine edition, vol. 42, pp. 282 and 290.

⁷³. *Super III De anima*, chap. 1, ll. 372–73 (Leonine ed., vol. 45/1, p. 207): "Mirum autem est quomodo *tam leuiter* errauerunt."

⁷⁴. *De substantiis separatis* 13, ll. 26–28 (Leonine ed., vol. 40, p. D 64): "Adhuc in maiorem insaniam procedentes aestimant Deum nihil nisi se ipsum intellectu cognoscere."

⁷⁵. This is the title of an article by P. Glorieux, "Un maître polémiste: Thomas d'Aquin,"

(footnote continued on next page)

It is in this book that Averroes is described as the *deprauator* and even the *peruersor* of Aristotle's thought,⁷⁶ but he is not in the least suspect in regard to intelligence. By contrast, Thomas strongly doubts the intelligence of his Parisian adversaries, which he characterizes rudely: "Those who defend that position must confess that they do not understand anything at all [*confiteantur se nihil intelligere*] and that they are not even worthy of discussion with those whom they attacked."⁷⁷ We pass over other delicious phrases of this kind and go to the conclusion, which is itself also justly celebrated:

If anyone, glorifying himself with false knowledge, dares to argue against what I have just written, let him not babble in the corners or with infants [*in angulis uel coram pueris*] who are incapable of judging such a difficult subject, but let him write against this book—if he dares. You will then have to deal not solely with me, who am only the least in this affair, but with a crowd of other lovers of truth who know how to resist your errors and remedy your ignorance.⁷⁸

Even if we must concede that this polemic does not bring out the best in Thomas, we must recognize that the man who speaks thus is not a timorous intellectual; he has a consciousness of his own worth and does not fear confronting adversaries. In addition, perhaps he even inwardly regrets not finding them up to his measure. What we may glimpse here also is a simmering sensibility that is obliged to contain itself in order not to surface too often in discussion, where passion must not obscure clarity of the argument. These observations are already enough to destroy the legend of a highly secretive author who does not speak of himself and never reveals himself. Thomas never wrote his *Confessions*, it is true, but his works say a great deal about him, more than one would think. And what we feel in reading his writings is confirmed in an indisputable way by an analysis of his handwriting.

(footnote continued from previous page)

MSR 5 (1948) 153–74, to which we refer the reader for several amplifications on this point; cf. also the Leonine edition, *Super Iob*, Introduction, vol. 26, p. 18*.

⁷⁶ *De unitate intell*, 2, l. 155; 5, l. 392: Leonine ed., vol. 43, pp. 302 and 314; this is an entirely different matter than a simple mood, for Thomas had already long known to what extent Averroes's interpretation of Aristotle was opposed to his own, and he could not "think about it without rancor." Cf. R.-A. Gauthier, Leonine ed., vol. 45/1, pp. 224*–25*, who has assembled a significant dossier on this subject.

⁷⁷ Ibid. 3, ll. 315–17, p. 306; cf. 5, ll. 397–400, p. 314, where Thomas confesses his astonishment or, better, his indignation that a Christian philosopher (not identified further) dares to speak *tam irreverenter* about the Christian faith.

⁷⁸ Ibid. 5, ll. 434–41, p. 314.

For a long time it has been known that the study of his handwriting bears on the history of Thomas's thought in that it allows us to see the changes through which Thomas passed before arriving at the definitive versions of his text.⁷⁹ That shall not detain us here; but instead we shall look at a too-often neglected aspect which the study of Thomas's handwritten manuscripts also allows us to address: a better comprehension of Thomas the man. Thomas's writing is of legendary difficulty, but we cannot say that he did not know how to write; Father Gils, the undisputed specialist on Thomas's handwritten manuscripts, long ago showed the foolishness of these received ideas.⁸⁰ Thomas simply had a highly personalized way of writing, and it reveals with undeniable force the author's temperament.

The expressions that occur most frequently in the austere and fascinating study by Gils are so surprising that you understand why he felt the need to repeat them and support them by hundreds of examples. Thomas is "tense and hurried"; he "would like to go faster"; "that patience," which he would need to write correctly, "Thomas did not possess." It is only because he noticed that "his own texts were frequently badly interpreted by his assistants" that he dedicated himself to being clearer. "Hurried," "fatigued," "distracted," he allowed "lapses," "cacographies," and "dreadful errors" to remain in his text.

In his efforts at composition, when the subject or the expression escapes him for a minute and he sometimes has to begin the same paragraph three times, "it sometimes happens that he writes the contrary of what he thinks, he forgets words, he commits some anacoluthon and . . . he does not always correct himself." Since we cannot transcribe the whole passage, let us record the closing summary: "Saint Thomas is thus a man in a hurry. He clashes with himself over the demands of writing. He is constantly experiencing distractions, which oblige him to interrupt himself and to return later. He struggles with putting his thoughts in order and with the means of expressing them. He is simultaneously meticulous, and careless of the inconsistencies that his irresistible forward movement cause him to commit."⁸¹

⁷⁹. We refer simply to the two magisterial studies: P.-M. Gils, "Textes inédits de S. Thomas: Les premières rédactions du *Scriptum super Tertio Sententiarum*," *RSPT* 46 (1962) 445–62 and 609–28; L.-B. Geiger, "Les rédactions successives de *Contra Gentiles I*, 53 d'après l'autographe," in *Saint Thomas d'Aquin aujourd'hui*, *Recherches de philosophie* 6 (Paris, 1963), pp. 221–40.

⁸⁰. I cannot recommend enough the entire study where P.-M. Gils synthesizes what he has learned through an assiduous examination for more than forty years of Thomas's handwritten texts: *S. Thomas écrivain*, Leonine ed., vol. 50, pp. 175–209.

⁸¹. P.-M. Gils, Leonine ed., vol. 50, pp. 176, 179, 195, 208–9.

We must recognize that this portrait hardly fits with the image of the timeless thinker that is usually given of the "Common Doctor" or "Angel of the Schools." Shall we say that, even if it corresponds to reality, the portrait has ultimately little to do with his thought, which is fixed forever? To argue thus would be to show little respect for the historical rootedness of that doctrine, a rootedness that provides illumination for an accurate understanding of it. Does not Thomas himself repeat after Aristotle: "When we consider things in their genesis, we obtain a perfect understanding"?⁸² Not only the successive versions of the text should interest us, but what he was still seeking in thought at the time of his death, something to which many points in his work testify. There is more to be gained than lost in this type of research.

Without entering further here into the question of Thomas's intellectual evolution, let us say that it would scarcely be a testimony to someone whom we venerate as a saint to neglect him as a person and a model for the Christian life, which he incarnated. Indisputably, there is a continuity between the man who writes in this way and the man who so happily challenges his adversaries, or is irritated by their inconsistency. If he was able to express himself with such vehemence, we may suspect he struggled to achieve the virtuous self-mastery that was required for the birth of more austere works (where signs of humor practically never show themselves). Beyond the impatience that these linguistic remnants reveal, they eloquently witness that the spontaneity-in-moderation, which the whole world recognizes in Thomas's genius, was the fruit of a conquest. Meditating on what is only a simple confirmation, a disciple of Thomas's may well perceive that he was a master, not only of thought, but of life.

⁸² Cf. Aristotle, *Politics* I ii, 1; cf. Saint Thomas, *Sententia libri Politicorum*, Leonine ed., vol. 48, p. A 73, ll. 135–37: "In omnibus enim ita uidemus quod si quis inspiciat res secundum quod oriuntur ex suo principio, optime poterit in eis contemplari ueritatem." We have used the translation by M.-D. Chenu, *La théologie comme science au XIIIe siècle*, Paris, ³ 1957, p. 9.

**Chapter VI—
Return to Italy:
The *Summa contra Gentiles***

At the beginning of June 1259, Thomas arrived at Valenciennes, where the general chapter of the Dominicans was being held, in order to participate in the work of a commission established to promote studies. This commission consisted of five members, all masters of theology in Paris, and it comprised the intellectual elite of the order at that time. In addition to Thomas, it included Albertus Magnus, his former master; Elias Brunet's colleague Bonhomme le Breton, who taught in the first Dominican chair at Saint-Jacques; Florent of Hesdin, Bonhomme's successor, who was Thomas's colleague during the academic year of 1256–57; Peter of Tarentaise, who would teach in the very same chair from 1259 to 1264, and then again between 1265 and 1267. Peter would also twice be provincial for France, until his election as a cardinal in 1272, and then would be elected pope under the name Innocent V on 21 January 1276. He was to exercise that office for only a few months, since he died on 22 June 1276.¹

To Promote Study

This commission's meeting and work should be placed in the framework of the general policy of the order, which favored the intellectual life, in

¹ See on this topic M.-H. Laurent, *Le bienheureux Innocent V (Pierre de Tarentaise) et son temps* (Studi e Testi 129), Rome, 1947; A. Amargier, art. "Innocent V," *Catholicisme* 5 (1962) 1661–1664; the other figures mentioned here are known to a greater or lesser extent. On them, see Glorieux, *Répertoire* I, or Käppeli, *Scriptores*.

conformity with the original intention of Saint Dominic.² John the Teuton had already given proof of his wish to be faithful to that intention; the clearest indication is the decision by the 1248 general chapter in Paris to open four *studia generalia*, which would be added to the one already in existence at Saint-Jacques. It was one of the consequences of that decision that Albert and Thomas departed for Cologne. With this new commission, Humbert of Romans in turn showed that he intended to continue that orientation; to all appearances, it was Humbert who had named the commission and convoked the members before the chapter.³ He showed, furthermore, to what extent this subject was close to his heart in his *De uita regulari*, which he composed after stepping down as general and whose long pages detail what pertains to study and books.⁴

The commission sketched out a series of recommendations that were inserted into the chapter's acts.⁵ All these acts asserted the priority of study over other tasks: avoiding the use of lecturers in jobs or responsibilities that would prevent their doing their primary work, and making sure that Mass not be celebrated at the same time as lessons for those who had to attend them. As to the young, superiors should select those most adept at study to be sent to a *studium generale*; the older brothers should be reminded that even the priors are supposed to follow courses—whenever they are able to do so conveniently; the lecturers themselves ought to go to the *disputatio* when they are available. Without being fully formulated, the idea already exists here of continual formation, a notion cherished in our time.

If a province is too poor in personnel to provide a lecturer in each priory, it should make sure not to leave the young in these houses; they should instead be sent wherever they can be formed. If a province does not have someone capable of public teaching (teaching open to others in addition to the friars), they should at least have teaching carried on in private (within

² Cf. A. Duval, "L'étude dans la législation religieuse de saint Dominique," *Mélanges offerts à M.-D. Chenu*, Bibl. thom. 37 (Paris, 1967), pp. 221–47.

³ The suggestion of WN, p. 112. (following Quétif-Echard), according to which Thomas would have participated in the chapter as *socius* of the delegation from the Roman province, does not find any support in the texts, and we know the name of that *socius*: Lawrence of Todi, designated the previous year at the chapter in Viterbo (*MOPH* 20, p. 23).

⁴ Humbert of Romans, *Opera de uita regulari*, ed. J. J. Berthier (Rome, 1888–89), vol. 2, pp. 254–66.

⁵ *MOPH* 3, pp. 99–100; *Chartul.*, no. 335, pp. 385–86, which gives the names of the five members of the commission according to the provincial chapter held at Béziers in 1261 (the text is in Douais, *Essai*, p. 173); see also the brief analysis of this text in Weisheipl, pp. 138–39.

the priory). The *Historia ecclesiastica* by Peter Mangiador should be read, or the *Summa de casibus*, by Raymond of Peñafort, or some manual of that type.⁶ The friars should not remain inactive (*ne fratres sint ociosi*). Houses of study in the liberal arts should be fostered in particular, so that the young may receive their basic philosophical formation.

Reading this text certainly gives a high idea of the work of the commission and the ideals of the order about this material. But it allows us clearly to perceive a new situation. Whereas the first generations of Dominicans often consisted of people already formed, capable of immediately assuming positions in government or teaching, the influx of vocations was bringing in young members who were lacking in the basics. It was therefore necessary to see to this lack, and it immediately became apparent that certain provinces were quite poor. It was also clear that the desire for study was not shared universally. Visitors would have to oversee the implementation of these measures: to verify regular participation in the courses (the friars who abstained from taking them would be severely punished, *dure puniantur*); to assure the progress of the young in study and to punish the lazy (*puniant negligentes*); to look into the quality and the frequency of the teaching provided and to make sure that there would be a sufficient number of teachers in all provinces, which required a certain mobility of personnel.

The Uncertainties of 1259–1261

After the chapter, Thomas probably returned to Paris. If there had been a few days still available he might have given several lectures (up until 29 June), but he was coming to the end of his regency. In order to understand what we have just said, it is necessary to grasp that Dominican policy briskly rotated the masters in and out of positions at Paris in order to form the greatest possible number and then to send them to teach elsewhere.⁷

Several weeks earlier, Thomas had presided at the *inceptio* of his successor, who was then his bachelor of *Sentences*, the Englishman William

⁶ See Leonard Boyle's commentary, "Notes on the Education of the *Fratres Communes* in the Dominican Order in the Thirteenth Century," in *Pastoral Care*, study 6, which demonstrates the exceptional place that the manuals of morals held for confessors at the beginning of the order, notably Raymond of Peñafort's.

⁷ Tolomeo XXII 24 tells us that Thomas "rediit de Parisius *ex certis causis*"; the historians have lost themselves in conjectures trying to penetrate what these words cover (cf. WN, pp. 115–16); the explanation that we propose is the one that appears the most natural, which is also Weisheipl's view, pp. 142–43, and Tugwell's, p. 217.

of Alton (or of Altona), who had exercised that responsibility for only one year (1259–60). Although William's biblical work was rather extensive and gave witness to an interest in the rabbinical tradition, in line with studies that had been going on at Saint-Jacques since Hugh of Saint-Cher, his work does not show any influence from Thomas's commentaries.⁸ The chair was to pass after that to Thomas's disciple and friend, Annibaldo d'Annibaldi, who held it for two years (1260–62), until December 1262, when Urban IV made him a cardinal. It was to Annibaldo that Thomas would dedicate, several years later, the last three books of his *Catena aurea*. Unlike his predecessor—and without doubt for the first time then—if Annibaldo used Peter of Tarentaise, he also permitted his master's influence to appear, since Annibaldo's commentary on the *Sentences* is only a recapitulation of Thomas's.⁹

During the next two years, dates and places are less certain. We do not know the date of Thomas's departure for Italy. Tolomeo gives us to understand that it was under Urban IV, and therefore not before 29 August 1261, but this is much too late.¹⁰ Mandonnet, apparently reproducing the view of De Rubeis, thought that Thomas went directly to Anagni, to the residence of Alexander IV, in order to become a lecturer in the pontifical curia;¹¹ but that view, once accepted by several scholars, has been abandoned today because it has not been supported by any biographer or by the ancient documents. With some justification, Weisheipl hypothesized that, returning to Italy, Thomas would quite normally have gone to Naples, his original priory.¹² He stayed there from the end of 1259, or from the beginning of 1260 until September 1261, the date on which he was assigned to Orvieto.¹³

This hypothesis seems to us to be the most plausible, but it runs afoul of the fact that no document explicitly attests Thomas's stay in Naples at this time. And certain people even think that perhaps he did not leave Paris immediately; such a thoughtful historian as Walz did not hesitate to imag-

⁸ William is not well known ("a shadowy figure"), cf. T. Käppeli, "Guillaume d'Alton," *DHGE* 22 (1988) 836–37; *Scriptores* II, pp. 82–88; Glorieux, *Répertoire* I, no. 18, pp. 113–16.

⁹ Tolomeo XXII 23 had already noticed this; cf. R. Coulon, "Annibaldi ou Annibaldeschi della Molara," *DHGE* 3 (1924) 387–88; Käppeli II, pp. 174–76; Glorieux, *Répertoire* I, no. 19, p. 117.

¹⁰ Tolomeo XXII 22 and 24; see the discussion in Mandonnet, "Thomas d'Aquin lecteur à la curie romaine. Chronologie du séjour (1259–1268)," in *Xenia thomistica* III, pp. 9–19.

¹¹ Mandonnet, *Chronologie sommaire*, p. 144.

¹² Weisheipl, pp. 143–44; Tugwell, p. 221, agrees with Weisheipl.

¹³ Cf. *Documenta* 30, p. 582.

ine this scenario.¹⁴ We know nothing more about what he did in Italy, except perhaps that the provincial chapter in Naples made him general preacher in 1260.¹⁵ Whatever the case, it seems that Thomas had not yet arrived in Italy by September 1259, since the chapter of the Roman province held on that date does not mention him. If, therefore, we follow Walz, who recalls the nuanced position of Denifle, of A. Dondaine, and of Gauthier (in his early phase), we would have to maintain a prudent reticence: "It seems probable that Thomas left France at the end of 1259 or the beginning of 1260 and that he was in Italy before the provincial chapter in Naples (29 September 1260)."¹⁶

Making his own examination of the question, Tugwell sums up quite clearly the uncomfortable situation in which the historians find themselves, and Tugwell makes some ingenious suppositions in order to fill the void left us by our documents. We can sum up his position thus: after Valenciennes, Thomas passed through Paris, but only in order to pick up his effects; it is improbable that he would have stayed there solely to write. But we do not know why he took so much time to reach Naples. Perhaps he lingered in Milan and Bologna—to gather information for the master general on the programs of study for the friars?—and he perhaps preached the two Advent sermons there that these places give testimony to. After that he returned to Naples, his original priory, where he remained until 1261 or 1262, the date of his assignment to Orvieto.¹⁷

In our opinion, it would be wrong to press the silence of our texts too much; there were many other provincial chapters besides the one in 1259 that do not speak about Friar Thomas Aquinas. It does not seem at all plausible that Thomas lingered in Paris beyond the end of the scholastic

¹⁴ WN, p. 117: "Contrary to general opinion, perhaps [Thomas] returned to Paris after the Valenciennes chapter. Not to teach, since we know his successors, but to work on the *Summa contra Gentiles*." But this is hardly compatible with what an examination of the autograph teaches us (see further on in the text).

¹⁵ Cf. above, note 13; tentativeness on this point is in any case necessary since the source to which we refer to establish this fact is an anonymous document from the end of the sixteenth or beginning of the seventeenth century, which does not at all indicate on what it bases its information; P.-T. Masetti, *Monumenta et Antiquitates veteris disciplinae Ordinis Praedicatorum ab anno 1216 ad 1348* . . . (Rome, 1864), vol. II, pp. 267–68, who reproduces this document in an appendix, does so with the reservations to be observed in such cases.

¹⁶ WN, p. 117; in his *Somme contra les gentils, introduction* (Paris: Editions universitaires, 1993), Gauthier places this voyage in the fall: Thomas would thus have avoided the great heat of the summer and the bad weather of winter.

¹⁷ Tugwell, pp. 216–23; we ought to correct note 207, p. 313, which quotes one of my articles under Father Gauthier's name and attributes to me a contradiction of which I do not think myself guilty, since I have never disputed Mandonnet on this point.

year; whatever the exact date of his return to Italy (the second half of 1259 is preferable to the beginning of 1260), we can take it as the most natural solution that Thomas lived in Naples during this period. (Without being certain about this, we might read Conrad of Suessa's testimony at the canonization process¹⁸ in such a way.) Thomas thus would have enjoyed, as Weisheipl suggests, a period of relative leisure that allowed him to make progress on his *Summa contra Gentiles*, which he had begun before leaving Paris.

The Date of the Summa contra Gentiles

The *Contra Gentiles* is one of the works we are privileged to have in large part in Saint Thomas's own handwriting (about a third of the work, from Book I, Chapter 13 until Book III, Chapter 120, but with many lacunae).¹⁹ We might add to the usual remarks about his handwriting that we have here "a work that Saint Thomas took great care over: he reread it, modified and corrected it several times. . . . All the chapters preserved in the handwritten version have undergone at least one revision; for the most part they show two or three, or even four, if we take into account the final rereading."²⁰

Father Gils, from whom we borrow this information, draws a conclusion to which we will have to return. But it is Father Gauthier who has the honor of having been the first to recognize that the beginning of the *Contra Gentiles* is written on the same parchment and even with the same Parisian ink as the *Super Boetium*. Starting on folio 15 we can verify the change of parchment, and on the back side of folio 14 (l. 43) we may perceive the change ("brutal" says Gauthier, "radical" says Gils) of the ink itself.²¹ From all this a probable conclusion imposes itself: the change dates from the time when Thomas left Paris for Italy.

This conclusion, fully adopted by the latter critic²² and confirmed by careful examination of the utilization of Aristotle, of the conciliar documents, and, notably, of the evolution of Thomas's doctrine on the Word,

¹⁸ *Naples* 47, pp. 326–27; about this deposition, see Tugwell's remarks, note 206, p. 313.

¹⁹ Cf. H.-F. Dondaine and H.-V. Shoener, *Codices manuscripti operum Thomae de Aquino*, vol. I (Rome, 1967), pp. 3–5.

²⁰ P.-M. Gils, *Leonine*, vol. 50, pp. 204 and 207.

²¹ *Introduction historique à S. Thomas d'Aquin. Contra Gentiles*, introduction by A. Gauthier, trans. R. Bernier and M. Corvez, vol. 1 (Paris, 1961), pp. 31–34. We should be careful to distinguish the older work from the *Somme contre les gentils, introduction* (1993), which completes the earlier one, very often corrects it, and should be used in the future.

²² For Gils, cf. *Leonine*, vol. 50, p. 208.

permits Gauthier to sum up the results at which he arrived thus: "Saint Thomas had almost certainly written the earliest version of the first 53 chapters of Book I in Paris before the summer of 1259. In Italy, starting in 1260, he revised these 53 chapters and wrote the rest of the *Summa contra Gentiles* starting with chapter 54 of Book I. It is certain that the first version of Book III, chapter 4, cannot be before 1261, and that Books II and III were still being worked on at that date. It is very probable, not to say sure, that Book IV was not finished before the end of 1263 or the beginning of 1264, but it was completed before 1265–1267."²³

With the exception of P. Marc, who would situate the *Contra Gentiles* at a much later date, during the second period of teaching at Paris,²⁴ this proposal seems to have won over the critics.²⁵ Gauthier returned to this question again after some thirty years, and in the light of all the labors he himself had carried out in the meantime as well as many other studies by other scholars (notably those involved in the Leonine Commission and the *Aristoteles latinus*, whose importance cannot be overemphasized), Gauthier was only able to add further precision. The general framework was too solid to be changed very much, and the criteria he had adopted remained the same.

Nevertheless a more precise knowledge of the date of appearance of the translations of Aristotle's works and of their respective singularities allows us to confirm that the Italian part of the *Contra Gentiles* uses an Aristotle that was not the one current in Paris in the 1250s, but an Aristotle that began to be known in Italy around 1260–1265: "We have seen some new works appear here, the translation of the *Rhetoric* by Hermann the German, the *Liber de bona fortuna*, and particularly the first translations by William of Moerbeke, the translation of the *Politics*, the translation of the books on animals; we have thus had to push back to 1263–1264 the writing of Book III, chapter 85."²⁶

This demonstration is made more precise by the complementary observation that this Aristotle is still not the one who will begin to appear in December 1265 in the *Prima Pars* of the *Summa theologiae*, in the commentary on the *De anima*, and in the disputed questions *De anima* and

²³. Gauthier, *Introduction*, p. 59.

²⁴. P. Marc, *Introductio à S. Thomae Aquinatis Liber de Veritate Catholicae Fidei contra errores Infidelium* (Turin, 1967), vol. 1, pp. 312–82.

²⁵. Cf. O. L(ottin), *BTAM* 9 (1962–65), no. 457, pp. 145–46; L.-J. Bataillon, *RSPT* 47 (1963) 248–49.

²⁶. *Somme contre les gentils*, chap. II.

De spiritualibus creaturis. Decisive progress has been made over the first attempt at dating Book IV. The *terminus post quem* is easy enough to establish by examining the conciliar and patristic documents. Thomas uses here the *Collectio Casinensis*, which gave him access to the texts of the first four councils, notably Ephesus and Chalcedon. He was still unfamiliar with these in his commentary on the *Sentences*. It is therefore at his return to Italy that he made their acquaintance.²⁷ More clearly still: Thomas knew Nicholas de Cotroni's *Liber de processione Spiritus sancti et fide Trinitatis contra errores Graecorum*, which Pope Urban IV submitted for Thomas's examination, doubtless in 1263 or at the beginning of 1264. He will refute this work in his *Contra errores Graecorum*.²⁸ All this corresponds well with what we know of the date of composition for the first three books of the *Contra Gentiles*.

As to the *terminus ante quem* of this fourth book and of the entire work, Gauthier believes he can strongly put forth 1265. Saint Thomas's intellectual evolution on the doctrine of the Word, as highlighted by H. Paissac,²⁹ remains a keystone of the demonstration. It consists in evaluating two stages after the initial hesitation in the *Sentences*: the first is found in *Contra Gentiles*, Book I, 53 and Book IV, 11; the second in the *De potentia*, questions 8 and 9. After giving these references, Gauthier refines his historical statements: chapters IV, 11 and I, 53 are in reality contemporaneous because, according to the testimony of the handwritten manuscript, Thomas returned to the text of I, 53 when he was working on IV, 11. As far as the *De potentia* is concerned, we know that it was disputed in Rome, where Thomas had been assigned on 8 September 1265.³⁰

We should add to all this that Thomas himself refers at times to the *Contra Gentiles*: in the *De rationibus fidei* several times;³¹ in the *Com-*

²⁷. Cf. Geenen, "En marge du concile de Chalcédoine," *Angelicum* 29 (1952) 43–59.

²⁸. Cf. Leonine, vol. 40, p. A 5–20, see p. A 19; chaps. 38 and especially 69 of Book IV testify that the *Contra errores graecorum* was already completed (since Book II, chap. 39 of the latter work is reproduced in the *Contra Gentiles* IV 69); cf. Leonine, vol. 40, p. A 9, and H.-F. Dondaine, "Le *Contra errores Graecorum* de S. Thomas et le IV^e livre du *Contra Gentiles*," in *Les sciences philosophiques et théologiques* (1941–42), pp. 156–62.

²⁹. H. Paissac, *Théologie du Verbe. Saint Augustin et saint Thomas* (Paris, 1951).

³⁰. We will return to the chronology of Thomas's Italian sojourn, but the date of the *De potentia*, already established by a series of indications, is confirmed further by the manuscript *Subiaco, Bibliothèque de l'abbaye 211*, f. 175r, from the end of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century, which explicitly indicates: *Questiones fratris T. de aquino quas disputavit rome*, cf. Grabmann, *Die Werke*, p. 306.

³¹. Prol. 1, I. 63; chap. 7, 29–31; 10, 112; cf. Leonine, vol. 40, p. B 57, 66 and 73; for the date, cf. *ibid.*, p. B 7.

pendium theologiae, where the relationship to the *Contra Gentiles* is manifest;³² in the commentary on the *De anima* he does so as well, where Thomas excuses himself from having to refute Averroes at greater length, for he has already done it amply elsewhere.³³ Now, all these books can be placed very soon after 1265. Basing himself on all the convergent data, Gauthier could conclude: "It might be permitted to conjecture that Saint Thomas finished his *Summa contra Gentiles* before his departure for Rome in September 1265. Book IV therefore was composed, without doubt, in 1264–1265."³⁴

Without basically disputing this conclusion—which had not yet been published in this form when he was writing—P.-M. Gils believed it possible to propose an addition to Gauthier's thesis: considering the later revisions of which the manuscript bears traces, he would not reject "a hypothesis that maintains Thomas had added corrections to this privileged work even during his second stay in Paris. Even though they were only some semicolons!" We may admire here the scrupulous work of the paleographer, but we cannot conclude from it that Marc's thesis could be as true as Gauthier's; corrections of that type are evidently not substantial modifications that would call into question the earlier date proposed. In our view, Gauthier is right to put us on guard against a false interpretation that one might draw from Gils words: "Saint Thomas's teaching in Rome constitutes the *terminus ante quem* for the whole final version of the *Contra Gentiles*."³⁵

The Purpose of the Contra Gentiles

If, therefore, the dates of the several stages of composition seem clear enough, the intention of this *Liber de ueritate catholicae fidei contra errores infidelium*—as some manuscripts begin—still remains the subject of rather lively discussions. Following the mention of the *Gentiles* in the title (a title without special authority given by the *exemplar* from around 1272) the received tradition—only from the sixteenth to the seventeenth cen-

³². "Captivating parallels," as J. Perrier says; Thomas sketched the *Compendium* with "the *Contra Gentiles* in front of him," adds A. R. Motte (Leonine, vol. 42, p. 8, note 3); as to the date, Father Dondaine allies himself with Van Steenberghen's proposition: "The *De fide* would be more or less contemporary with the *De potentia*," *ibid.*, p. 8.

³³. *Sentencia libri de anima* III 1, ll. 353–55, Leonine, vol. 45/1, p. 207; cf. Introduction, pp. 227*–28*.

³⁴. *Somme contre les gentils*, chap. II.

³⁵. *Somme contre les gentils*, chap. I; Gils, Leonine, vol. 50, p. 208.

ture—sums it up thus: Thomas would have composed this book at the request of Raymond of Peñafort, with the intention of converting the Muslim world, still very much present in Spain. "Raymond would have asked his young confrere to equip the missionaries with the necessary intellectual weapons."³⁶ Hasty readers have not noticed that Father Chenu formulated this position in the conditional, and that he refutes it formally two pages later: "The *Summa [contra Gentiles]* goes considerably beyond a missionary manual, even one that is full-bodied in order to meet the needs of elites. . . . Also, it does not aim particularly at Averroes; it is a collection of various *errantes*, pagans, Muslims, Jews, heretics, who are both examined and criticized."³⁷

Would that everyone had read more carefully this great precursor! Without meaning to, he initiated an entire polemic that still endures and whose large lines we might recall, for it partly conditions our understanding of this book. Father Gauthier, one of the first scholars to do so, shows the fragility of the "missionary" tradition: the poorly documented text of the chronicler Peter Marsili speaks rather of the pagans than of the Arabs, and an examination of Thomas's text shows indeed that the Muslims are not at all the only infidels or heretics aimed at. He hardly concerns himself about them, and what he says of them shows that he knew their teaching quite poorly. The *Contra Gentiles* goes far beyond any direct missionary purpose—even if this is understood in the sense of the interior mission against the "averroistes"—or even as an apologetic. We are dealing here with a theological work in its pursuit of wisdom as well as in its method; and "rarely was a work less historical" than this.³⁸

Far from settling the discussion, Gauthier's judgment seems rather to have launched it on a new path. In 1964, A. C. Pegis raised doubts and proposed to identify the intended recipients of the text as Aristotelian philosophers: "[Thomas] wanted to show them the truths about Aristotle under the aspect of a living reality purified in the heart of Christian theology and to show in the world of revelation a vivifying food for these verities."³⁹

Two years later, in 1966, F. Van Steenberghen proposed a promising

³⁶. Chenu, *Toward*, pp. 247–48.

³⁷. *Ibid.*, p. 250.

³⁸. Gauthier, *Introduction*, pp. 60–87, cf. p. 121; we refer to those pages for the prior scholarship; one should also read the *Somme contre les gentils*, chap. III: "Les erreurs des infidèles."

³⁹. A. C. Pegis, "'Qu'est-ce que la *Summa contra Gentiles*?" in *L'homme devant Dieu. Mélanges offerts au père Henri de Lubac*, vol. 2, Théologie 57 (Paris, 1964), pp. 169–82, cf. p. 182.

formula: "Saint Thomas clearly wrote for Christian thinkers (theologians or philosophers) committed to their faith; it is not at all implausible that he conceived the *Summa contra Gentiles* specially for the use of persons destined to have contact with circles of 'unfaithful' intellectuals, principally in Muslim countries."⁴⁰

The missionary intention, or at least the apologetic purpose, of the work was also defended in 1967 by P. Marc⁴¹ and in 1974 by A. Huerga.⁴² But in the same year, M. Corbin put forward his refutation of Gauthier and proposed seeing in the *Summa contra Gentiles* "the second theological discourse by Saint Thomas."⁴³ In 1974, Q. Turiel explained his thesis that this was a work of apologetics for internal use, destined for cultivated believers as a "verification" of the Catholic faith.⁴⁴ Without ignoring this discussion, in 1986 M. D. Jordan gave an entirely different reading: "The work is concerned to persuade its readers to the practice of the virtues of Christian wisdom, both acquired and infused."⁴⁵

Nevertheless in 1983, A. Patfoort advanced "a middle solution" which—apparently without his knowing it—reproduces rather closely Van Steenberghe's position and, in his opinion, perhaps more completely accounts for all the data that exist. He proposes that we see here "a work '*thought for*' some non-Christians, for some infidels, but '*addressed to*' Christians themselves called to undertake contacts with the infidels, to respond to their objections, to present doctrine in a way that shows that it avoids the difficulties they see and coincides largely with their own convictions. In brief, the *Summa contra Gentiles* would be a school for presenting the Christian faith to the infidels, an ecumenical effort, before the fact, between Christians and infidels."⁴⁶ Certain critics, wishing to return to a four-square missionary intention, do not find this thesis persuasive enough,⁴⁷ but these arguments "appear rather convincing" to others.⁴⁸

⁴⁰. La Philosophie au XIII^e siècle, p. 323 (2d ed. 1991, p. 290).

⁴¹. P. Marc, *Introduction*, pp. 535–61.

⁴². A. Huerga, "Hypótesis sobre la génesis de la *Summa contra Gentiles* y del *Pugio fidei*," *Angelicum* 51 (1974) 533–57.

⁴³. M. Corbin, *Le chemin de la théologie chez Thomas d'Aquin* (Bibl. des Archives de Phil., N.S. 16)(Paris, 1974), pp. 475–691.

⁴⁴. Q. Turiel, "La intención de Santo Tomás en la *Summa contra Gentiles*," *Studium* 14 (1974) 371–401.

⁴⁵. M. D. Jordan, "The Protreptic Structure of the '*Summa contra Gentiles*,'" *The Thomist* 50 (1986) 173–209, cf. p. 208.

⁴⁶. A. Patfoort, "La *Somme contre les Gentils*, école de présentation aux infidèles de la foi chrétienne," in *Saint Thomas d'Aquin. Les clefs d'une théologie* (Paris, 1983) (= Patfoort, *Clefs*), pp. 103–30, here p. 105.

⁴⁷. C. Vansteenkiste, *RLT* 19 (1986) 208: "Un manuale eccellente per i missionari."

⁴⁸. M.-V. Leroy, *RT* (1984) 303.

Though these scholars have not convinced R.-A. Gauthier (who pertinently discusses the sense of *convincere* advanced by Patfoort), he has been expressing himself in a more nuanced fashion as a result of their labors: he says that the *Summa contra Gentiles* has a "timeless ambition," which signifies that "it makes itself useful to all times" and not solely to its own. Its intention is not an "*immediate and limited* apostolate, but aims at wisdom *of a universal apostolic bearing*."⁴⁹ We can agree with this last formulation, which is certainly closer to Saint Thomas's habitual manner.

The Summa contra Gentiles: Method and Plan

As to the method and plan of this work, Thomas clearly explained them in a very beautiful passage that it is necessary to reproduce at length and to comment on carefully. For it is not only a condensation of his conception of theology (we might find very close parallels to it in other works, even earlier texts like the *Super Boetium*, or later texts like the *Summa* or the *Quodlibet* IV). But this is the place where Thomas permits us to understand clearly that he is undertaking a personal labor.⁵⁰ After three years of regency, the young master, at the height of his powers and in perfect consciousness of what he wishes to do, begins his first synthesis:

The intention of the wise man ought to be directed toward the twofold truth of divine things and at the same time toward the destruction of the errors that are contrary to this truth. For the one task, reason suffices; the other surpasses every effort of reason. I am speaking of a "twofold truth of divine things," not on the part of God himself, who is truth one and simple, but from the point of view of our knowledge, which assumes various modalities toward divine things.

To the hurried reader, this mention of double truth could lend itself to a mistaken impression, which Stephen Tempier will denounce later. But we see that Thomas immediately explains himself in a satisfying fashion. We might remark rather how these first lines correspond to a much more rapid formulation in chapter II on a more personal note:

⁴⁹. Gauthier, Leonine, vol. 45/1, pp. 293* and 289*, note 2; Gauthier maintains this in his *Somme contre les gentils*, where, in addition, he regrets "several unhappy expressions in [his] earlier introduction."

⁵⁰. *SCG* I 9: in fact, the first nine chapters seem like a "discourse on method" and the ninth is a summary of it.

In the name of the Divine Mercy, I have the confidence to embark upon the work of a wise man, even though this may surpass my powers, and I have set myself the task of *making known*, as far as my limited powers will allow, *the truth the Catholic faith professes*, and of *setting aside the errors that are opposed to it*. To use Saint Hilary's words, "*I am aware that I owe this to God as the chief duty of my life, that my every word and sense may speak of him.*"

Often justly cited as one of the places where Thomas reveals himself a little, this passage has been commented on by René-Antoine Gauthier with rare perceptiveness:

What is proposed in these pages, what made Thomas write them neither at the head of the *Sentences* nor at the beginning of the *Summa Theologiae*, is not their content, which would have been appropriate there as here. It is their personal tone, it is the emotion contained, the fervor that causes Saint Thomas to confess that, out of his profession as theologian, he makes his life: the program became a confidence, and the *Summa contra Gentiles* is thus not a course, nor a didactic work, but an essay in personal reflection.⁵¹

We can also say that this text gathers together under two principal tasks the function that Thomas assigns to the theologian and that he had developed in a tripartite form in the *Super Boetium* a few months earlier.⁵² But we remain here within the same framework, which is at the same time resolute confidence about the use of reason in theology and clear awareness of what we cannot ask of reason:

The manifestation of the truth under the first modality therefore demands that we proceed by way of demonstrative reasons, capable of convincing the adversary. But such reasons are not valid for truth under the second modality; one should not have as a goal convincing the adversary by arguments, but resolving arguments that he advances against the truth, *since natural reason cannot go against the truth of the faith*. This particular manner of convincing whoever opposes such truth is drawn from the Scriptures, divinely confirmed by miracles. *That which passes human reason we believe only through the revelation of God*. With the aim of clarifying that truth,

⁵¹ Leonine, vol. 45/1, p. 290*.

⁵² Cf. *Super Boetium de Trinitate*, q.2 a.3.: " . . . in sacra doctrina philosophia possumus tripliciter uti. Primo ad demonstrandum ea quae sunt praeambula fidei . . . quae fides supponit. Secundo ad notificandum per aliquas similitudines ea quae sunt fidei . . . Tertio ad resistendum his quae contra fidem dicuntur siue ostendendo ea esse falsa siue ostendendo ea non esse necessaria."

we may, however, advance certain arguments that appear to be true, where the faith of the faithful finds matter on which it may operate and rest, without being of a nature to convince adversaries. *For these latter the very insufficiency of these arguments would confirm them rather in their error, in giving them reason to think that we consent to the truth of the faith for these poor reasons.*

The last two italicized phrases find their natural commentary in two passages that are too little known from the *Summa theologiae*. Echoing the first, Thomas reaffirms a principal datum with regard to the Incarnation: "What depends on the will of God alone and to which the creature has no right, can be known to us only in the measure in which it is taught in sacred Scripture, which allows us to know the will of God."⁵³ Without a doubt the Word could have been incarnated even had man never sinned, but to reason thus would be to pour out a hypothetical theology where man, imagining "what would have happened if . . ." would substitute his own view of things for God's. More humbly, the truthful theologian wishes to remain a realist and to adhere more closely to given revelation; also, careful about reason and the synthesis that it gives, Thomas never forgets that his edifice rests on salvation history, that "economy" is the sole path to "theology."

The conclusion of the text commented on is only the other face of the same truth and a new invitation to modesty; Thomas certainly knows the force of reason, but also its limits: "To dare to prove the Trinity by natural reason is to commit a double fault in faith. . . . First, one misapprehends the dignity of the faith itself, which has invisible things as its object, which is to say, those that go beyond human reason. . . . Further, one compromises the means to lead certain men to the faith. In effect, to bring as a proof of the faith reasons that are not necessary is to expose *that faith to the scorn of the infidels*; they think that it is upon these reasons that we base ourselves, and it is on account of them that we believe."⁵⁴

Our plan being therefore to proceed according to the proposed method, we will try to show this truth that faith professes and that reason uncovers by producing some demonstrative and some probable arguments. Some of these will be provided for us from works of philosophers and others by saints [*sancti*]. And they will help us to confirm the truth and to convince [*con-*

⁵³. *ST* IIIa q.1 a.3.

⁵⁴. *ST* Ia q.32 a.1; cf. q.46 a.2.

uincere] the adversary. Passing thus from the more clear to the less clear, we will explain the truth that passes reason by refuting the arguments of the adversaries and *in clarifying, as much as God permits, the truth of the faith through probable arguments and by authorities.*

The *sancti*, we should know, are the Fathers of the Church; we will speak further along about the importance that Thomas recognizes in them. We should notice here also the word *conuincere*, which does not at all have the meaning that we normally give it: here it means not "persuading" but "convincing of error whoever has erred."⁵⁵ That reason cannot demonstrate faith does not mean that it is impotent when faced with the objections of adversaries. On the contrary, Thomas shows a robust confidence in the capabilities of reason in the believer. "Since natural reason cannot go against the truth of the faith," it can at least show that the adversaries arguments are not true demonstrations but sophisms that can be "dismantled."⁵⁶

At the conclusion of this passage, Thomas therefore announces what he will treat in the fourth book of the *Contra Gentiles*: an explanation of the truth of the faith that is outside of the grasp of reason; here we meet only *probable* reasons and not *necessary* reasons, but Thomas does not decline to speak to this mystery. As he will explain it later, there are two types of theological disputes: one pushes back errors, the other makes truth intelligible. If one is content with the first type, the hearer will know without doubt what is true and what is false, but he will not have any idea of what the truth means which is proposed to him. He will go away with an empty head.⁵⁷ The well-formed mind is already preferable to the wellfilled mind.

We propose therefore to follow by way of reason that which the human reason can discover of God; we will have to study first what belongs to God in himself, we will then study the emergence of creatures from God. In the third place we will see the ordering of the creatures to God as to their end.

⁵⁵. On this point see the arguments of Gauthier, Leonine, vol. 45/1, pp 290*–92* (against Patfoort, *Clefs*, p. 114); *Somme contre les gentils*, chap. IV: "La double tâche du sage."

⁵⁶. *ST Ia q.1 a.8*: "Cum enim fides infallibili veritati innititur, impossibile autem sit de veto demonstrari contrarium, manifestum est probationes quae contra fidem inducuntur, non esse demonstrationes, sed solubilia argumenta."

⁵⁷. *Quodlibet IV q.9 a.3* [18]; note the end of this text: "Quaedam vero disputatio est in scholis, non ad removendum errorem sed ad instruendum auditores ut inducantur ad intellectum veritatis quem intendit, et tunc oportet rationibus inniti investigantibus veritatis radicem et facientibus scire quomodo sit verum quod dicitur; alioquin si nudis auctoritatibus magister quaestionem determinet, certificabitur quidem auditor quod ita est, sed nihil scientiae vel intellectus acquirat sed vacuus abscedet."

These last words sketch therefore the plan for the first three books, which are dedicated to truths accessible to reason—by which we should understand, truths that find support in Aristotle, however distant: "*Primo* . . . de his quae Deo secundum seipsum conveniunt [the existence of God and the divine perfections]; *secundo* vero, de processu creaturarum ab ipso [the creative act in itself and its effects]; *tertio* autem, de ordine creaturarum in ipsum sicut in finem [providence and God's government]." This plan clearly prefigures the one that Thomas will also use in the *Summa theologiae*, passing from the Incarnation to the Parousia, by way of the sacraments. In the first three books, he excludes the Trinity and the work of salvation; he reserves that material for Book IV, which is dedicated "ad illius veritatis manifestationem . . . quae rationem excedit," which is to say, to what the Fathers of the Church call properly *theologia* and *oikonomia*. The resemblance and difference between the two works should be noted: Thomas is thus already in possession of a circular plan whose fertility he will again exploit; but for reasons that partly escape us, he did not perfectly succeed here in emphasizing the unity of the divine plan.⁵⁸

The Contents of the *Summa contra Gentiles*

If we now wish to form an idea of the material treated by our author, we must follow it closely through all four Books. As in all his other works, the structures are of a perfect clarity and we do not have any difficulty in discerning the arrangement of the various sections. A comparison with the *Summa theologiae* also permits us to clarify these two works, the one by means of the other.

In accord with the "discourse on method" that we have just examined, Book I comes immediately to the existence of God (10–13). As this existence is not evident in itself for us, it must therefore be established, for

⁵⁸. There are translations of the *Contra Gentiles* in almost all the European languages. In English, the Blackfriars edition, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, trans. English Dominican Fathers (London: Burns, Oats, and Washbourne, 1934); *Of God and His Creatures*, trans. J. Rickaby (Westminster, Md.: Carroll Press, 1950); *Saint Thomas Aquinas, on the Truth of the Catholic Faith*, A. C. Pegis, J. F. Anderson, J. Bourke, C. J. O'Neil, eds. (New York: Doubleday, 1955–57), 5 vols. In French, while we await the one to which Gauthier has written a new introduction, the best remains Bernier-Corvez. In addition to the studies mentioned in the course of this chapter, see: B. Montagnes, "Les deux fonctions de la sagesse: ordonner et juger," *RSPT* 53 (1969) 675–86; A. C. Chacon, "El tratado sobre la gracia en la *Summa contra Gentiles*," *Scripta theologica* 16 (1984) 113–46; N. W. Mtega, *Analogy and Theological Language in the Summa contra Gentiles. A Textual Survey of the Concept of Analogy and Its Theological Application by St. Thomas Aquinas* (New York/Berne, 1984); J. R. Mendez, *El amor fundamento de la participación metafísica. Hermeneutica de la "Summa contra Gentiles"*, Diss. Later. (Rome, 1985) [cf. *RLT* 21 (1988), no. 88, pp. 56–60].

such is the "necessary foundation of the entire work . . . if that is not achieved, then the entire study of the divine realities sinks fatally."⁵⁹ A parallel reading of the beginning of the *Summa theologiae* allows us a first confirmation here: Thomas will broaden his course, but he will maintain the same structure quite well for both works. We also notice in both cases the essential role that he gives to the negative way (*via remotionis*) in his arguments: through the positive way, he says, we arrive solely at the *existence* of God. When we are dealing with his *essence*, this path shows itself to be inadequate:

The divine substance, in effect, exceeds in its immensity all forms that could reach our intelligence, and we cannot therefore grasp it in knowing that which it is. We have, however, a certain knowledge of it in studying *that which it is not* [*quid non est*]. And we approach closer to that knowledge insofar as we are able, thanks to our intelligence, to discard more things from God Himself.⁶⁰

We cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of these lines. For Thomas, there is nothing to know about God except to know that which He is not, for we distinguish Him thus from all that is not Him. Thus, from negation to negation, we shall arrive at a "proper knowledge of the divine substance when God will be understood as distinct from everything. But there will not be perfect knowledge in this, for we will not know what God is in Himself." The theological discourse in its entirety is thus prefaced in each case—in the *Contra Gentiles* and in the *Summa*, but also in the *Sentences*—by an apophatic declaration. It will be necessary to keep this in mind when we find it in rather a poignant way at the end of the author's life; but, in fact, it never ceased to accompany him in his journey.

The experts in the history of medieval thought have no difficulty in recognizing here what Thomas Aquinas owes to Maimonides and his *Guide for the Perplexed*. The sharp sense of the divine transcendence in that Jewish thinker leads him to place first in his thinking the *via negationis* and the negative attributes; as a result, he assures us we cannot know of God "what He is," but only "that He is"—and this furthermore on the condition that we conceive that divine existence as completely other than our own. In a beautiful book dedicated to the relations between the two

⁵⁹. SCG I 9, to the end; the references in the text of the following pages refer entirely to the *Contra Gentiles*; the Arabic figures designate the chapter of the book in question in this section.

⁶⁰. SCG I 14; cf. ST Ia q.3 Prol. . .

thinkers,⁶¹ Avital Wohlman recalled not long ago that Thomas worked on his text with Maimonides in front of him, but she has forcefully underlined that the doctrine of analogy allowed Thomas to commit himself to a path where Maimonides' equivocation keeps him from going forward. In distinguishing between the *ratio significata* (the perfection designated by the attribute) and the *modus significandi* (the way in which it is realized in God), Thomas gives himself the means for a valid discourse on God—permitting him to attain and say something real about God—but respectful of the divine mystery, since the properly divine mode, in which is realized the perfection signified, definitively escapes us.

This basic datum having been established and presented, Thomas can then enumerate all the divine perfections as if he ignored nothing of them. Having denied all change in God (15–17)—a philosophical necessity as much as a biblical revelation—and all composition (18–27), he can state that He is sovereignly perfect (28–29) but at the same time the object of analogical knowledge and of naming (30–36). The theologian can truly *speak* about God—without which he would only be able to keep silent. Such a discourse is not possible except on the basis of what God Himself has given us in revelation, but it is possible, and it is indeed this that distinguishes Thomas radically from Maimonides.

As to God's perfections, His *goodness* comes first: in itself and in its connection to creatures (37–41); not only is God good but He is the Good of all good; then follow His *unity* (42) and His *infinity* (43); His *intelligence*, by which in His eternal present God knows Himself and all things in their actuality—even down to the thoughts of our hearts and to the most humble of creatures (44–71); His *will* also, by which He wills and loves all that is, in willing Himself—even if He cannot will the impossible nor remove from things their contingent character (72–85). These last theses, as one may guess, will be the heart of his future disputes; has Thomas imprudently placed limits on the divine omnipotence? . . . He ends this first Book by specifying in what way we can speak of free will, passions, and virtues in God (88–96), but above all, he emphasizes that He is the Living One par excellence (97–99) and the very realization of perfect happiness, which is called beatitude (100–102).

As we already know, Book II studies the "departure," or the procession of creatures from God. After several preliminary reflections (1–4), the tri-

⁶¹ A. Wohlman, *Thomas d'Aquin et Maïmonide. Un dialogue exemplaire* (Paris, 1988), see in particular pp. 105–64.

partite plan is stated in chapter 5: (1) the production of beings (6–38); (2) their distinction (39–45); (3) the nature of these created and distinct beings (46–101); the author wishes to treat of all this "inasmuch as this touches on the truth of the faith." This last note is of the highest interest, for it shows that, far from being a "Summa of philosophy" as is sometimes said, the *Summa contra Gentiles* is indeed a theological work.

From that point of view, the preliminary considerations with which Book II opens are of the highest importance. Thomas the theologian gives several reasons why a knowledge of creatures may provide a means of knowing God: first, we cannot perfectly know a being if we do not know its action; further, meditation on the works of God causes the building up of faith; but above all "given that creatures show a certain resemblance to God, errors about them lead to errors about divine things." Thus, although the philosopher and the theologian have different points of view about creatures, the latter is no less interested in them than the former (1–4).

Thomas therefore proposes for us a treatise on creation. God the principle of being is also a principle of activity through his active power (6–14); He is the universal cause of existence of all beings and of all being, and His action as creator exerts itself without a preexisting subject, without movement or change or succession (15–19). As to its modalities, this action is exclusively proper to God alone, is omnipotent, wise, free, gratuitous (20–29), and—a qualification that carries weight—*temporal in its effects* (30–38). The question here is the much-debated eternity of the world, which we find in these last chapters; but while in his celebrated opusculum *De aeternitate mundi*, of which we will soon speak, Thomas allows himself sometimes to be carried away by passion, here he expresses himself with gravity and measure. And he gives us one of his most beautiful explanations of the subject. Faithful to the teaching of the first chapters of Genesis, which speak of a beginning, he rejects the philosophical notion of an eternally existing world, but he raises himself with the same vigor against the Christian teachers who claim to be able to prove rationally that the world truly had a beginning. This point we cannot hold except by faith.

The several chapters of the second section add that, even if the first production of things must be attributed to God, their distinction cannot be the effect of chance, or of prime matter, or of secondary causes, good or bad. Distinction among creatures can only be the effect of the ordering wisdom of God, who willed it for the perfection of His work (39–45).

The third section inquires, therefore, into the nature of God's effects,

especially on intellectual creatures, whom God wished to place at the summit of the universe He created (46–55). The material is divided here into two large subsections: first the intellectual creatures united to a body, men (56–90); next the separated intellectual substances, the angels (91–101). Without going further into this, we can find in these pages (especially in chapters 56–58 and 68–72) Thomas's fundamental and characteristic position on Aristotelian hylomorphism: in spite of its incorruptibility and immateriality, the soul is nevertheless immediately united to the body as its substantial form.

Book III, the most voluminous, has 163 chapters. As in the earlier books, the first pages are crucial, for the author clarifies his purpose in them and connects it with what he has already done:

As in the First Book we have dealt with the perfection of the divine nature, in the Second in the perfection of its power by which it is the cause and master of all beings, it now remains in this Third Book to study the perfection of its authority and its dignity insofar as it is the end and ruler of all beings. We will therefore follow this order: (1) God as end of all beings; (2) His universal government, inasmuch as He rules over every creature; (3) His particular government over intelligent creatures. (III, 1)

The general theme is therefore God's providence as He takes care of this universe that He created and governs. Put differently, it deals with the way that He guides it toward Himself (the very first statement of this plan says: *de ordine creaturarum in Deum sicut in finem*). To follow this plan in detail would take us too far away from the purposes of this book. We must however point out a similarity to and a difference from Thomas's execution of the same plan in the *Summa theologiae*: a similarity, in that the *Secunda Pars* also speaks of the return of man to God; a difference, in that what properly concerns divine government has already been dealt with in the *Prima Pars*. The result is that the section on providence is much more developed in the *Summa contra Gentiles*, while the part that touches on virtuous action by men in search of their true end is much more fully dealt with in the *Summa theologiae*.

This simple statement of what is immediately perceptible in a quick glance at the plan of the two works should be seriously refined. It may be that the fullness of treatment devoted to providence has a completely contingent cause (at that time Thomas was working on his *Expositio super Job*, where providence is a major theme). But we also rather sense that he is here seeking the best way to construct his exposition of the whole of the-

ology. Such a powerfully synthesizing spirit as his could not be satisfied with the scattered efforts to which his commentary on the *Sentences* had condemned him. He therefore sought other paths. The plan of the *Summa theologiae* will satisfy him more, no doubt, but the reader will not conclude from this that he no longer has to return to the previous work, the *Contra Gentiles*. It still remains indispensable.

The different choices of plans for the two *Summae*, as well as their complementarity, also appear in the fourth Book, since the author placed a treatise on the Trinity there (IV 1–26), while in the *Summa theologiae*, he put it in the *Prima Pars*. This is, one recalls, because he had preferred to refer at the end of his proposal to the "truths inaccessible to reason." But as we have said, the plan of the *Contra Gentiles* also announces that of the *Summa theologiae*: the Incarnation (27–55); the sacraments (56–78); the final end of man (79–97). These three last parts allow us to emphasize the complementarities. The *Summa theologiae* is more complete about the Incarnation, for it is enriched with an ample existential Christology (which is called the "life of Jesus," IIIa qq. 27–59). By contrast, since death prevented Thomas from finishing his treatise on the sacraments and on man's final end in the *Summa theologiae*, it is in the *Summa contra Gentiles* that we find his most complete exposition of these subjects, for the latter work concludes with them. We might even say that it could conclude only with them, because it is only in them that God's work is finally accomplished, "for it is when it returns to its beginning that an effect is sovereignly perfect" (II 46). It is not only to Neoplatonism that Thomas owes this, but to the Bible, and it is to the Bible that he makes his final appeal: "I see a new heaven and a new earth."⁶²

⁶² Revelation 21:1; Isaiah 65:17–18, quoted at the end of *SCG* IV 97.

Chapter VII— The Stay in Orvieto (1261–1265)

Even if we admit that Thomas enjoyed several months of relative liberty for the composition of the *Summa contra Gentiles*, we may not conclude from this fact that he did not have other obligations. His new role as preacher general made him a member by right of the provincial chapters, and imposed on him obligations to participate in their sessions. Thanks to the acts of the chapters of the Roman province, which have been preserved and sometimes mention his name, we can reconstitute with relative certitude his series of annual movements and can sketch a chronological framework for his activities in the years he passed in Orvieto, and then in Rome.

Thus on 14 September 1261, the Feast of the Triumph of the Cross, Thomas was at Orvieto in the company of priors and delegates from each priory of the province; on 6 July 1262, for the Octave of Saints Peter and Paul, he found himself with them at Perugia; in September (?) 1263, at Rome; on 29 September 1264, feast of Saint Michael in Viterbo; on 8 September 1265, the Feast of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary, at Anagni; on 5 August 1266, the Feast of Saint Dominic, at Todi; in July (?) 1276, at Lucca; 27 May 1268, Pentecost, at Viterbo.¹

According to Tocco, Thomas preferred contemplation and enjoyed traveling very little; if he obeyed promptly, it was because he knew that,

¹. Cf. *MOPH* 20, pp. 25–35; *WN*, pp. 117–18.

by the humility it inspires, obedience is the mother of all the virtues.² We can easily imagine the reasons for his repugnance: in addition to his corpulence, which could scarcely have facilitated things, the time passed in these comings and goings must have seemed lost from his other activities in writing and teaching, which had an entirely different importance in his eyes. He needed first of all to finish writing the *Contra Gentiles*; but many other things would soon come along demanding his attention.

Conventual Lector in Orvieto

On 14 September 1261, which is to say to during the first chapter in which he participated, Thomas was named lector to the Orvieto priory (*pro lectore in conventu Urbevetano*).³ Let us emphasize something in passing. Contrary to what Mandonnet once wrote,⁴ Thomas had not been teaching in the studium established in 1244–45 by Innocent IV, as an annex to the pontifical curia, but in the Dominican priory. The titles *lector* or *prior*, or the expression *conventus romanae curiae*, that are found beginning in this period among the mendicant orders, do not signify anything more than lector or prior of the priory in the city where the Roman curia resides. After the well-documented studies devoted to this subject,⁵ doubt on this matter is no longer possible and we should not continue to repeat old errors.⁶

The position of conventual lector had to be exercised in each Dominican priory in light of the recommendations issued by the general chapter of Valenciennes two years earlier to provide for what one would today call "permanent formation." Thomas would thus have had to devote himself to regular teaching of those who were called the *fratres communes*, which is to say all those who had not been able to study in the *studia generalia*

² *Ystoria* 25, p. 282 (Tocco 25, p. 98).

³ *Documenta* 30, p. 582.

⁴ P. Mandonnet, "Thomas d'Aquin lecteur à la curie romaine. Chronologie du séjour (1259–1268)," *Xenia thomistica* III, pp. 9–40.

⁵ See on this subject the studies of R. Creytens, "Le Studium Romanae Curiae et le Maître du Sacré Palais," *AFP* 12 (1942) 5–83, and of R. Loenertz, "Saint Dominique écrivain, maître en théologie, professeur à Rome et Maître du Sacré Palais d'après quelques auteurs du XIV^e et XV^e siècle," *ibid.*, pp. 84–97, repeated with some rearrangements by Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas*, pp. 153–63.

⁶ The studies by Creytens and Loenertz have been confirmed and completed by E. Panella, "Il 'lector romanae curiae' nelle cronache conventuali domenicane del XIII–XIV secolo," *CIVICIMA* 5 (1992) 130–39, who has established that teaching in the studium annexed to the pontifical curia conferred the distinctive title of *lector sacri palatii* or *in sacro palatio* (starting with the Avignon papacy) and that no Dominican from Saint Albert to that epoch ever occupied the post.

or even the *provincialia*—which was the case for nine out of ten friars—to prepare them better for the two principal missions entrusted to the Dominicans by Pope Honorius III, preaching and confession. Thanks to Leonard Boyle's work,⁷ we know rather well in what that teaching consisted.

In that period, the Dominican order, founded in 1217, was almost fifty years old. In order to prepare their confreres to fulfill the tasks that would be entrusted to them, several Dominicans had already written a whole series of moral manuals. The best known are the *Summa de casibus* by Raymond of Peñafort (the first edition goes back to 1224, but it was reedited and improved in 1234–35), the *Speculum ecclesiae* by Hugh of Saint-Cher (around 1240), the *Summa uitorum* and the *Summa uirtutum* by William Peyraut (1236 and 1249/1250), and the *Speculum maius* by Vincent of Beauvais (1244 and 1259). In Orvieto, Thomas, who had as his primary task the formation of the brothers with a view to pastoral practice, would not have been unaware of these manuals. He knew very well, among others, the *Summa de casibus* by Raymond of Peñafort, from which he had borrowed liberally for his commentary on the distinction in the *Sentences* concerning marriage.⁸ He would also remember it later in the drafting of the *Summa theologiae*, for we find precise echoes of it in the *Secunda Secundae*.⁹ It is true, as Gauthier emphasizes,¹⁰ that this use is not a blind one and that Thomas knows how to keep his distance from Raymond; this approach could be a specific instance of a more general attitude, since only the books of Scripture are absolute authorities for Thomas;¹¹ but it appears

⁷ "Notes on the Education of the *Fratres communes* in the Dominican Order in the Thirteenth Century," *Xenia* . . . Käppeli, pp. 249–67 (reprinted in *Pastoral Care*, Study 6).

⁸ Cf. J.-M. Aubert, *Le droit romain dans l'oeuvre de saint Thomas* (Paris, 1955), p. 32, n. 6: "Saint Raymond is the principal canonical source for Saint Thomas on the subject of matrimony"; Aubert has counted at least fifty places where Thomas depends on Raymond in the Fourth Book of the *Sentences* alone; see also pp. 19–23 and the index.

⁹ Compare Boyle, *The Setting*, p. 7, who has been able to find several literary borrowings in IIa IIae q. 100 a.1 ad 5; a.2 ad 6; a.6 ad 5. Thomas was present at the general chapter of Valenciennes (1259) and at the provincial chapter of Lucca (1267), which recommended Raymond's work [cf. *MOPH* 3 (1898), p. 99, and 20 (1941), p. 33].

¹⁰ R.-A. Gauthier, *Somme contre les gentils*, chap. IV, quotes a passage of the *Quodl.* XI q. 8 a.2 ad 1 and 2, where Thomas takes a position contrary to that of the canonists (among whom we find Raymond) who maintain that one could not frequent an excommunicated person without mortal sin; he finds that this position allows too much weight to positive law, and he prefers to give greater importance to natural law (which was the position of the new school of the Hostiensis). Thomas sees in such encounters only a venial sin; compare also *Contra Retrahentes* XI 131, where adversaries pit Raymond's and other jurists' authority against Thomas, and XIII 183–86, where he replies that it is improper and ridiculous for theologians to take seriously the *glosulas* of the jurists.

¹¹ Cf. Ia q. 1 a.8 ad 2.

that already by this time there has developed an attitude of hostility toward Saint Raymond's rigorism, and perhaps Thomas participated in it.¹²

Perhaps Thomas took advantage of this period of teaching on pastoral morals to sketch the first drafts of what he would take up again later and more fully in the *Secunda Secundae*. But it is rather certain that he also noticed the partial and spotty character of this casuistic formation of Dominican preachers. Not only did it not possess an intelligibility as a whole, since teachers were content to take up the different virtues or the different sins or even the different sacraments one after the other, to examine concrete problems that each of them proposed, and to do all this without worrying further about founding these things in the teachings of the Gospels. But most serious of all, the proper dogmatic formation in the great truths of the Christian faith was dangerously neglected. Thomas certainly remembered this experience at Orvieto when he began the *Summa theologiae* several years later.

Commentary on the Book of Job

Parallel with this teaching, Thomas also had to comment on a book of Scripture for his brothers; Tolomeo says that this was the Book of Job.¹³ Despite the contrary opinion of Mandonnet and several others, the editors of the Leonine edition have aligned themselves with Tolomeo's view.¹⁴ Added confirmation is provided by the fact that one of the major themes of the *Expositio super Job* is the mystery of providence. Thomas is very clear about this subject in his prologue: "The entire *intentio* of the book is to show by probable reasons that human affairs are ruled by divine providence." Now, this is also the central subject of the Third Book of the *Contra Gentiles*, which was written at almost the same time. It would therefore be entirely consistent for Thomas to have chosen to comment on this book in order not to disperse his thinking too much.¹⁵

As an invitation to the reading of this book, we can say that it is among the most beautiful scriptural commentaries that Thomas has left us. But it is still good to be warned about its scholastic and theological nature. Thus we will not ask from Thomas's exegesis what we look for in modern

¹². Cf. E. Panella, "I Quodlibeti di Remigio dei Girolami," *Memorie Domenicane*, N.S. 14 (1983) 1–149; cf. pp. 56–59.

¹³. Tolomeo XXII 24 (ed. Dondaine, p. 151).

¹⁴. Leonine, vol. 26, pp. 17*–20*; accepted by Weisheipl, p. 368.

¹⁵. Cf. Leonine, vol. 26, p. 5; cf. S. Ausín, "La providencia divina en el libro de Job. Estudio sobre la 'Expositio in Job' de Santo Tomás de Aquino," *Scripta Theologica* 8 (1976) 477–550.

authors, nor will we seek the kind of immediate spiritual application that Gregory the Great gives to his readers. The editors of the Leonine edition have clearly explained the difference in approach:

Since Saint Gregory, commentators have seen in the book of Job an exhortation to patience during trials; God had permitted the just man to be tormented so that he would show his constancy in suffering: that is a moralizing aim. With Saint Thomas, the story of Job presents the occasion for discussion of the metaphysical problem of providence; the subject of the dispute, the suffering of a just man, establishes the limits of the debate. This, in effect, presupposes that we are already in agreement on the fact of divine government over natural things. Doubt arises on the subject of human affairs because the just are not spared from suffering; for such persons to be afflicted without cause seems to contradict the idea of providence.¹⁶

One original feature of this commentary consists in the way in which Job's propositions are explained, even the most excessive ones. "Thomas distinguishes three kinds of discourses by Job: those in which he is led by his sensibility, those in which he rationally disputes with his friends, and those, finally, in which he gives in to divine inspiration." Divine inspiration, manifesting itself not by an exterior word but in the pathways of a man's conscience; thus one can follow "the successive stages through which the just man who is afflicted passes, from the first overturning of his sensibility even to his total *conversio ad Deum*, without doing violence to the unity of his person."¹⁷ For it is indeed the same man from one end of the process to the other. And we thus better understand his human and religious evolution.

Like the biblical book itself, Thomas's commentary offers, therefore, a reflection on the most fundamental questions that are put to man, since the tragic reality of the suffering of the just and innocent man remains of a nature to inspire doubts about the existence of divine justice, particularly if there is no future world in which good and evil will be properly rewarded. Beyond the philosophical and theological anthropology that is found in Thomas's text,¹⁸ this book presents itself therefore, as a profound meditation on the human condition.¹⁹

¹⁶ Leonine, vol. 26, p. 28*, with reference to the Prologue of the book (ll. 58–71). See also the excellent dissertation of D. Chardonnes, *Dei providentia circa hominem: Providence divine et condition humaine selon l'Expositio super Iob ad litteram de Thomas d'Aquin* (Fribourg, 1995).

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 29*, with a reference to chap. 39, ll. 370–79.

¹⁸ Cf. M. F. Manzanedo, "La antropologia filosofica nel commentario tomista al libro de

(footnote continued on next page)

A Theologian Much in Demand

If we glance now at the other works attributable to this period, we immediately get the impression of intense literary activity. Without being able to linger equally on all these works, we will try to say a few words about each of them and at least mention their titles. For quite often these are works of circumstance, undertakings meant to respond to a question that is more or less official, or from a friend. Such requests are a flattering echo of confidence in his competence, which arose spontaneously at the master's arrival from Paris. We may also guess, by means of these texts, something about his daily life and the human relations that Thomas maintained in this little provincial town.

De emptione et uenditione

In line with his preoccupations about pastoral theology, which we have just seen, we should recall first the opusculum, *De emptione et uenditione ad tempus*, also known as "buying and selling on credit," dedicated to what Thomas called usury but we would prefer to call speculation. Dated 1262, this short letter gives Thomas's response to the question that the conventual lector of Florence, a certain James of Viterbo, had posed to him.²⁰ No doubt these problems were posed in great number at Florence, an important merchant city. But they were also to be found in numerous other places in the industrious Italy of the thirteenth century. Beyond the interest of the response in itself, this little work has the advantage of showing us Thomas's involvement in the world of his time. All the more remarkable is the fact that, before giving his carefully thought out response, Thomas took the time to confer about it with two experts: his confrere Cardinal Hugh of Saint-Cher, and the chaplain to Pope Urban IV, Marin d'Eboli, elected archbishop of Capua. These

(footnote continued from previous page)

Job," *Angelicum* 62 (1985) 419–71; idem., "La antropologia teologica en el comentario tomista al libro de Job," *ibid.*, 64 (1987) 301–31.

¹⁹ For a French translation: Saint Thomas d'Aquin, *Job, Un homme pour notre temps*, trans. J. Kreit (Paris, 1980); see also R. Coggi, "Dolore, Provvidenza, Risurrezione nel libro di Giobbe. Validità di un'intuizione esegetica di S. Tommaso," *Sacra Doctrina* (Bologna) 27 (1982) 215–310; D. Chardonens, "L'espérance de la résurrection selon Thomas d'Aquin, commentateur du Livre de Job. 'Dans ma chair, je verrai Dieu' (Job 19:26)," in *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 65–83.

²⁰ Otherwise unknown, this person should not be confused with the Augustinian of the same name at the end of the century and the beginning of the fourteenth century, who was the author of *De Regimine christiano*; the opusculum is dated to around 1262 by H.-F. Dondaine, from whom we borrow the following details, cf. *Leonine*, vol. 42, pp. 380–94.

two figures, who resided in the pontifical curia of Urban IV, were certainly acquaintances of his, and we see his thought maturing in the exchange with them.

Contra errores Graecorum

Composed at the request of Urban IV himself, the *Contra errores Graecorum* dates from the same period, 1263 or the beginning of 1264.²¹ Although rather badly titled, this little work is an irenic and well-intentioned examination of a collection of texts from the Greek Fathers, probably compiled by Nicolas de Durazzo, the bishop of the former Crotona beginning in 1254, which the editors of the Leonine edition have published following Thomas's text.²² This *florilegium* interested Thomas even though it was not critical enough, used doubtful attributions, and amplified texts with the personal glosses of the compiler, who bent the texts in the direction of Latin theology. But owing to an a priori confidence in the Greek Fathers's teaching in matters of faith, Thomas abstained from contradicting them and sought rather to detach the true doctrinal content from the sometimes doubtful assertions. Perspicaciously, he noticed that the use of the texts and the translations were defective, and that is why, in the first part, he occupies himself with explaining the equivocal texts. It is striking to notice that, though Thomas doesn't know it, it is most often the unauthentic quotations that he has to elucidate, which is to say, he corrects the personal theology of the compiler. The second part is unhappily compromised by its a priori confidence in the text; examining it more closely, on four specific questions concerning the procession *a Filio*, the primacy of the pope, the Eucharistic celebration with unleavened bread, and purgatory, Thomas is clearly forced to rely more on the texts that are closer to Latin theology, when in fact these are often only glosses foreign to the Fathers.

A work that arose owing to circumstance, rapidly composed, this opusculum of Thomas suffers from its almost exclusive dependence on the

²¹ The critical edition of this work has been done by H.-F. Dondaine in the Leonine edition, vol. 40, pp. A 69–105; for the date cf. p. A 19; cf. Weisheipl, pp. 168–71; the edition of P. Glorieux, *Saint Thomas d'Aquin Contra errores Graecorum* (Paris, 1957), is clearly superseded by the Leonine edition, but it also contains the *Libellus* and various additions; the Abbé Bandel's translation may still be used. Published by Vivès in 1856, it may be found today in the *Opusculs de Saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Vrin-Reprise), vol. 2 (Paris, 1984), pp. 1–76.

²² Leonine, vol. 40, pp. A 109–51: *Liber de fide Trinitatis ex diversis auctoritatibus sanctorum graeconam confectus contra grecos*; cf. on this subject M. Hubert, "Note sur le vocabulaire gréco-latin d'un *Libellus*, 'Liber de fide Trinitatis', édité par le Père Hyacinthe Dondaine," *ALMA* 37 (1970) 199–224.

Libellus, which had been given to him for his examination.²³ We cannot therefore look for a wide-ranging confrontation between the respective positions of the Greeks and Latins in this text, but we see emerge here a constant principle of Thomas's method: for discussion with a given adversary, he makes use only of authorities accepted by the adversary.²⁴ Thus the exegetical arguments of the first five chapters of the second part are borrowed solely from the Greek Fathers.

The Prologue of this work is justly celebrated for its methodological considerations. Thomas states at the outset the principles that should inspire every good translator: "While safeguarding the meaning of the truths that he translates, he ought to adapt his style to the genius of the language in which he is expressing it." Furthermore, Thomas also explains here at some length the rules of reverent exposition:²⁵ far from being an arbitrary operation that would consist in twisting the "wax nose" of the authorities in various directions, it obeys—at least in Thomas—some precise norms that make it into a true hermeneutic.²⁶

De rationibus fidei

In certain respects, the *De rationibus fidei* takes up the same main subject, and Thomas gives some further valuable advice about method. Addressed to a "cantor of Antioch," whom nothing enables us to identify, this little work responds to several questions put by his correspondent after his meeting with people coming from the most diverse

²³ Except for some occasional quotations from the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, all his documentation comes from the *Libellus*.

²⁴ *Quodl.* IV q. 9 a. 3: "A certain type of dispute is meant to dispel all doubt about the question of the existence 'of a given truth' [*an ita sit*], and therefore, in a theological discussion of this type, it is necessary to make use primarily of the authorities admitted by those with whom one is debating. If it is with Jews, we should make use of the authorities of the Old Testament; if it is the Manicheans, who reject the Old Testament, we should only use the authorities of the New Testament; if it is the schismatics, who admit the Old and New Testaments, but who reject the doctrine of our *sancti* (the Latin Fathers), one will discuss with them in light of the two Testaments and of those Fathers of the Church that they accept. If the adversary does not admit any of these authorities, then we will have recourse to rational arguments alone."

²⁵ *Expositio reverentialis* or *exponere reverenter* describes a method for interpreting texts—common in the Middle Ages in all disciplines—which, without tampering with the letter of the *auctoritas*, sometimes borders on emptying it of its primary sense. But it also frequently allows us to rediscover the author's intention beyond the immediacy of the letter; in addition to the studies quoted in the following note, see Chenu, *Toward*, pp. 122–25, and our concluding thoughts on Thomas's exegesis of Aristotle in chapter XII.

²⁶ Cf. Yves Congar, "Valeur et portée oecuménique de quelques principes herméneutiques de saint Thomas d'Aquin," *RSPT* 57 (1973) 611–26; M. D. Jordan, "Theological Exegesis and Aquinas's Treatise against the Greeks," *Church History* 56 (1987) 445–56; J.-P. Torrell, "Autorités théologiques et liberté du théologien. L'exemple de saint Thomas d'Aquin," *Les Ethos de Saint-Maurice*, N.S. 18 (1988) 7–24.

lands bordering the Near East.²⁷ Along with the Saracens, who ridiculed (*irrisores fidei*) the Christian dogmas of the Trinity, Incarnation, redemption, and Eucharist, there are Greeks and Armenians who do not believe in purgatory, and other nations (*alias nationes*), who share with the Saracens a conception of divine foreknowledge that does not allow any place for free will or merit.

The recipient of this text asks for rational arguments (*rationes philosophicas et morales*). Thomas concedes that it would be vain to argue from authority against those who do not admit those authorities (I, 55ff.), but he also puts his interlocutor on guard against the temptation to prove the faith by *rationes necessariae*. In a discussion with infidels, the Christian can have no other aim but to defend the faith and to show through reason that it is not false.²⁸ In contrast, for the Greeks and the Armenians, Thomas uses the authority of sacred Scripture (chapter 9). It is remarkable that this little work frequently reminds us of the *Contra Gentiles*. Thomas, who had just completed his great work, refers to it explicitly three times and draws on it abundantly; these indications invite us to date this text slightly after 1265.²⁹

Expositio super primam et secundam Decretalem

We are a little less sure of the date of the *Expositio super primam et secundam Decretalem*, but the fact that it is dedicated to Giffredus d'Anagni, archdeacon of Todi beginning in 1260, invites us to place it during the Orvieto period.³⁰ The first

²⁷ This work is edited in the Leonine edition, vol. 40, pp. B 57–73, but see also the valuable introduction by H.-F. Dondaine, pp. B 5–8; taking this edition into account, one may still use the French translation by the abbé Fournet, which appeared in 1857 and is republished in *Opusculum de saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Vrin-Reprise), vol. 2 (Paris, 1984), pp. 411–53. For a good presentation of the work, see also L. Hagemann and R. Gleis, *Thomas von Aquin, De rationibus fidei*, Kommentierte lateinisch-deutsche Textausgabe, Corpus Islamo-Christianum 2 (Altenberge, 1987), which reproduces the text of the Leonine edition along with a German translation and an introduction largely drawing on L. B. Hagemann, "Missionstheoretische Ansätze bei Thomas von Aquin in seiner Schrift De rationibus fidei," *MM* 19 (1988) 459–83.

²⁸ *De rationibus fidei* II 17–22: "Ad hoc igitur debet tendere christianus disputatoris intentio in articulis fidei, non ut fidem probet, sed ut fidem defendat . . . ut scilicet rationabiliter ostendatur non esse falsum quod fides catholica confitetur."

²⁹ WN, pp. 122–23, and Weisheipl, p. 394, following Grabmann, would like to place this opusculum in 1264, but the Leonine edition (vol. 40, p. B 7) contents itself with situating it in a relative fashion, "after the *Contra Gentiles*, which was probably already published"; at the time that would mean perhaps before 1268, but in light of the most recent labors of Father Gauthier (see our preceding chapter) one might date it two or three years earlier.

³⁰ An edition of this has been done in the Leonine series, vol. 40, pp. E 30–44; for the recipient and the date, see pp. E 5–6; see also A. Dondaine and J. Peters, "Jacques de Tonengo et Giffredus d'Anagni auditeurs de saint Thomas," *AFP* 29 (1959) 52–72, cf. pp. 66–72; some

(footnote continued on next page)

decretal, as we know, is simply the "profession of faith, solemn, precise, and complete," known also under the name *Firmiter*, promulgated by the Fourth Lateran Council (1215). Without concerning himself about the historical conjuncture, Thomas gives a rich doctrinal commentary on it. The second decretal, *Damnamus*, is a text from the same council, which recalls, refutes, and condemns the book in which Joachim of Fiore attacks the Trinitarian doctrine of Peter Lombard. The conciliar text, which is already quite elaborate, leaves only a little room for the work of a commentator, who must content himself with making a simple paraphrase.

De articulis fidei et ecclesiae sacramentis

This opusculum was composed at the request of Leonard, archbishop of Palermo from 1261 to 1270—the years, therefore, within which we can situate its composition. Scholarly agreement scarcely goes any further: Mandonnet proposes 1261–62 and Weisheipl 1261–65; G. Lafont—who points out that the opusculum has a very exact knowledge of Pelagianism, as in the *Contra Gentiles* III 149—proposes a 1262 (which hardly agrees with the latest clarifications of Gauthier, who proposes as date of composition the stay in Rome, i.e., between September 1265 and September 1268); then there is Mongillo, who perceives in the Prologue an allusion to Thomas's intention to write the *Summa*, and proposes to situate this work between 1266 and 1268; Father Hyacinthe Dondaine, being more reserved, sees in the dating of this opusculum "a hopeless enterprise."³¹

Whatever its exact date, the archbishop of Palermo, who might have met Thomas at the pontifical curia, asked him for a doctrinal summary of the articles of faith and the sacraments, accompanied by questions that might arise about them. Thomas remarks that this material is much too large and, in fact, encompasses all of theology; he thus proposes a more modest development by following the articles of the *Credo* and the sac-

(footnote continued from previous page)

remarks on the writing itself may be found in Yves M.-J. Congar, "Saint Thomas et les archidiacres," *RT* 57 (1957) 657–71; for an interesting attempt to sharpen the date, see also M. F. Johnson, "A Note on the Dating of St. Thomas Aquinas's *Expositio super primam et secundam decretalem*," *RTAM* 59 (1992) 155–65.

³¹ *Introduction* to the Leonine, vol. 42, p. 211, with references to the diverse authors; for the text see page 245–57; cf. G. Lafont, "Simbolo degli Apostoli e metodo teologico: Il *Compendium Theologiae* di San Tommaso," *La Scuola Cattolica* 102 (1974) 557–68, cf. p. 561; D. Mongillo, "L'opuscolo di Tommaso d'Aquino per l'arcivescovo di Palermo," *O Theologos* 2 (1975) 111–25; C. Militello, "De articulis fidei et Ecclesiae sacramentis ad archiepiscopum Panormitanum," *ibid.*, pp. 127–206 (Latin text, Italian translation, index of quotations and of errors denounced).

raments. Faithful, however, to the request of his correspondent, he divides his material into two large sections, and the brief explanation that he gives of each article is followed by the principal errors that have been made on the subject. But the unity of this work suffers from its occasional nature, and the two parts are rather juxtaposed than truly coordinated. This little text has nevertheless enjoyed a considerable diffusion, notably in Germany during the fifteenth century, and its second part "has furnished the basis—and frequently the letter—of the section on sacraments in the decree on the Armenians of the Council of Florence."³²

De divinis nominibus

We are in a similar state of uncertainty about the date of the commentary on Pseudo-Dionysius's *De divinis nominibus*. Walz-Novarina proposed 1261, making the text the subject of Thomas's teaching among the friars at Orvieto. But Weisheipl, more conservative on this subject, places the text at a later stage, when Thomas was in Rome.³³ Although the conventual lector was not obliged to comment on Scripture, we may doubt that this text was indeed linked to teaching, especially if we recall the low intellectual level of the friars at Orvieto. In any case, Thomas had known the work for a long time since, we recall, he once recopied by hand the course that Saint Albert gave on Dionysius' text; it is not, therefore, astonishing that he had the idea of making it the subject of deeper study.

The apostolic origin that the genial forger of this text claimed for himself was, without doubt, for many people the reason for the authority that he exercised during the Middle Ages. In any case, through him a considerable dose of Neoplatonism passed into the Thomist synthesis and notably nuanced the material drawn from Aristotle. Father Chenu long ago noticed that, if Thomas was at first deceived by certain exterior resemblances that made him believe that Dionysius was following Aristotle, Thomas knew very well what to hold onto when he commented on the *Divine Names*: it is not without reason that Dionysius uses an obscure style, he says, but in order to shield Christian doctrines from the mocking of the infidels. He

³². Leonine, vol. 42, p. 212; the Leonine editors have discovered about 200 manuscripts from the fifteenth century (out of a total of 275), the majority of which are of German origin.

³³. WN, pp. 132–34; Weisheipl, p. 382; there still does not exist a critical edition of this commentary (although the Leonine labors on this are rather advanced), nor is there a French translation; we can still recommend the now old, but well-done work by J. Durantel, *Saint Thomas et le Pseudo-Denis* (Paris, 1919), pp. 208–34, for the commentary on the *Divine Names*; cf. also H.-F. Dondaine, *Le Corpus dionysien de l'Université de Paris au XIII^e siècle*, Rome, 1953.

adds further: another difficulty is the fact that Dionysius uses Platonic ways of speaking, which are unfamiliar to the modern reader.³⁴

Opinions are divided on the precise influence of Pseudo-Dionysius in transmitting Platonic elements to Thomas's thought. According to certain scholars, "Dionysius was chosen among all others as the indisputable master."³⁵ Such a view perhaps slights the *Liber De causis*, about which we will need to speak later and through which Thomas found himself directly linked through Proclus to the Platonic heritage. According to other scholars, "If Thomas is a Platonist, it is because Aristotle himself is more of one than we usually think," which can be illustrated from the dialectic of more and less that we find in Book XII of the *Metaphysics* and in the *quarta via*.³⁶

Walz and Chenu complained that this strain in Thomas's thought had still not been sufficiently studied, but that is much less true today than fifty years ago.³⁷ *Toward Understanding Saint Thomas* by Father Chenu, which emphasizes the Neoplatonic inspiration in the plan of the *Summa*, has doubtless been decisive. But we cannot ignore the transposition of the Platonic theory of ideas into the form of eternal reasons present in the divine understanding, in which everything that is participates; Thomas received that directly from Saint Augustine, but he was not ignorant of its origin.³⁸ For the Christian faith, that participation does not occur by em-

³⁴ We can easily trace this evolution in the brief series of quotations that follow, where we see Thomas (c. 1255) say at the outset that Dionysius follows Aristotle almost everywhere and close (c. 1270) by saying that Dionysius is most of the time in agreement with the Platonists: *Sentences* II d. 14 q. 1 a. 2: "Dionysius autem fere ubique sequitur Aristotelem, ut pater diligenter inspicienti libros ejus"; *Expositio super librum de divinis nominibus Prooemium*: "... Dionysius in omnibus libris suis obscuro utitur stilo (...) plerumque utitur stilo et modo loquendi quo utebantur Platonici"; *De malo* q. 16 a. 1 ad 3 (Leonine, vol. 23, p. 283, l. 389): "Dionysius qui in plurimis fuit sectator sententie platonice."

³⁵ This is P. Faucon's expression, *Aspects néoplatoniciens de la doctrine de saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Lille-Paris, 2975), p. 391 [on this book see the reviews by A. Reix, *RPL* 76 (1978) 257–59, who is very favorable, and by M. Corvez, *RT* 77 (1977) 287–89, who is more skeptical].

³⁶ This is C. Giacon's thesis in "Il platonismo di Aristotele e S. Tommaso," *DC* 28 (1975) 153–70, summed up by R. Imbach, "Le (néo-)platonisme médiéval, Proclus latin et l'Ecole dominicaine allemande," *Rev. théol. phil.* 110 (1978) 427–48 (cf. p. 441), in whom we find numerous indications and judgments about this matter, which is still being worked on.

³⁷ It is not very well known, but one of the first directors of the *Revue thomiste*, H.-A. Montagne, in a text titled "Notre programme," said as much quite explicitly: to penetrate into Thomas's teaching, is not solely to study him in himself, but "to determine what he owes to the Stagirite, and what he owes also to Plato, and to the other great thinkers of antiquity" [*RT* 17 (1909) 15]; in fact, two years later, he accepted a study on this subject: C. Huit, "Les éléments platoniciens de la doctrine de saint Thomas," *RT* 19 (1911) 724–66.

³⁸ Cf. *ST* Ia q. 84 a. 5: "Ideo Augustinus in libro 83 Quaest. <q. 46> posuit loco idearum quas Plato ponebat, rationes omnium creaturarum in mente divina existere, secundum quas omnia formantur, et secundum quas etiam anima humana omnia cognoscit."

anation but by free creation, yet Christianity nonetheless supposes the divine exemplarity. As has been well said, "Thomas retained from the Neoplatonic tradition the *principle* of exemplarity and the double participation [cf. Ia q. 84 a.4]; what he rejects are the *ways* of participation."³⁹

Since Father Chenu's remark mentioned above, works on this subject have multiplied, especially in the last few years.⁴⁰ Examples of the influence of the Platonic ideas have been given in the domain of noetics, ontology, Christology, and theological methodology to show that "Thomism presents itself to us as an attempt at reconciling Platonic and Aristotelian sources."⁴¹ Beyond the rather summary positions that do not wish to see anything in Thomas other than an Aristotelian, we must now recognize that he knew how to take the good where he found it; for the rest, the manner in which he uses his preferred authors does not leave them intact; the inspiration of his own synthesis profoundly transformed those borrowed elements.⁴²

The Office of Corpus Christi

We must also situate the composition of Thomas's Office for the Blessed Sacrament during this same period at Orvieto, which was decidedly very fruitful. Once disputed by the Bollandists because of its late attribution, the Thomist authenticity of this work was not long ago still a problem for

³⁹ J. Moreau, "Le platonisme dans la 'Somme théologique,'" in *Tommaso d'Aquino nel suo settimo centenario*, vol. I, pp. 258–47, cf. p. 242 (my emphasis). In the same work see the two pages (256–57) by A. von Ivanka, "S. Thomas platonisant," where he shows very well that only a platonizing reading of Aristotle prevents us from seeing that the final causality exerted by the Absolute Good as desired by everything and by every one (*Movet ut desideratum*; cf. *ST* Ia q. 6 a. 1 ad 2; *SCG* III 19) is an authentically Platonic heritage.

⁴⁰ In addition to Faucon, *Aspects néoplatoniciens*, we mention the now-old study by R. J. Henle, *Saint Thomas and Platonism. A Study of the Plato and Platonic Texts in the Writings of Saint Thomas* (La Haye, 1956), which presents an inventory of texts accompanied with an index and a commentary [see the reviews of B. Montagnes, *RT* 57 (1957) 587–91, and of C. Vansteenkiste, *Angelicum* 54 (1957) 518–28, who gives a list of complementary texts]. Closer to our time: W. N. Neidl, *Thearchia. Die Frage nach dem Sinn von Gott bei Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita und Thomas von Aquin* (Regensburg, 1976) [cf. *RLT* 12 (1979) 58–62]; I. E. M. Anderegg, *La metafísica de santo Tomás en la Exposición sobre el "De Nominibus" de Dionisio Areopagita*, Diss. PUG (Rome, 1988); M. B. Ewbank, "Remarks on Being in Saint Thomas's *Expositio de divinis nominibus*," *AHDLM* 56 (1989) 123–49; F. O'Rourke, *Pseudo-Dionysius and the Metaphysics of Aquinas*, Studien und Texte z. Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 22 (Leiden, 1992).

⁴¹ P. Faucon, *Aspects néoplatoniciens*, p. 73, who even speaks of an "ancillary function" of the Aristotelianism in service to the Platonism (cf. 76, 117, 241).

⁴² We must remember that Thomas was in good company in his recourse to Plato. We might refer to the recent translation by E. von Ivanka, *Plato christianus. La réception critique du platonisme chez les Pères de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1990) (German ed., Einsiedeln, 1964).

authors such as C. Lambot or L. M. J. Delaissé. It is true that we must wait for Tolomeo to hear mention of it,⁴³ followed a little later by William of Tocco,⁴⁴ but since the labors of Father Pierre-Marie Gy, attribution to Saint Thomas can no longer reasonably be placed in doubt.⁴⁵

As we know, the Roman Office of Corpus Christi was preceded by an office from Liège (*Animarum cibis*), because it was through the impetus of Saint Julienne of Mont-Cornillon that this feast began to be celebrated around 1240. But it also exists in two forms in the Roman office, which are identical in some places. The manuscript from which Father Gy prepared the critical edition for the Leonine Commission (*Paris B.N. lat. 1143*) has the distinction of coming from the library of Boniface VIII and, according to the signs that it shows, it seems to be the original booklet for the feast.

In comparing his text with those earlier edited by Dom Lambot, Gy accepts the latter's opinion that this office, designated by the name *Sapientia*, had a provisional form, which was used in the first celebration of the feast in 1264. It already contained certain elements from the second office, *Sacerdos in aeternum*. The latter, accompanied by the Mass *Cibavit*, is the one that was passed on to posterity (even if neither the Mass nor the office corresponds entirely to the Vulgate transmitted by contemporary breviaries and missals), and it was promulgated on 11 August 1264 by Pope Urban IV with his bull *Transiturus*, which instituted the feast for the universal Church.

⁴³. It is worth quoting Tolomeo (XXII 24, ed. A. Dondaine, p. 151), for he draws attention to the beautiful unity of this office, notably in its readings from the Old Testament, which are in fact among its original features: "Officium etiam de corpore Christi fecit ex mandato Urbani, quod est secundum quod fecit ad petitionem Urbani. Hoc autem fecit complete et quantum ad lectiones et quantum ad totum officium tam diurnum quam nocturnum quam etiam ad missam et quicquid illa die cantatur; in qua historia, si attendimus ad verba scribentis, quasi omnes figure Veteris Testamenti in hoc officio videntur contineri, luculento et proprio stylo adaptata ad Eucharistie sacramentum."

⁴⁴. *Ystoria* 18, p. 252 (Tocco 17, p. 88).

⁴⁵. P.-M. Gy, "L'Office du Corpus Christi et S. Thomas d'Aquin. Etat d'une recherche," *RSPT* 64 (1980) 491–507 [newly presented in his *La Liturgie dans l'histoire* (Paris, 1990), pp. 223–45; the affirmative title—"L'office du Corpus Christi, oeuvre de Saint Thomas d'Aquin"—and the conclusion of this summary, which omits the "probably" of the first study, show clearly that the author no longer has any doubt]; cf. "L'Office du Corpus Christi et la théologie des accidents eucharistiques," *RSPT* 66 (1982) 81–86; we thank Father Gy, who kindly sent us in advance the text that he has prepared for the critical edition (the first three readings from it have since been published in the reprint indicated above, pp. 144–45). We add that the argument in favor of authenticity has been further confirmed by R. Zawilla, *The Biblical Sources of the Historiae Corporis Christi Attributed to Thomas Aquinas*, Diss. (Toronto, 1985); see also the same author's "Saint Thomas d'Aquin et la théologie biblique de l'eucharistie du XI^e au XIII^e siècle," an unpublished communication to the *Journée thomiste de Saint Jacques* (Paris, 24 November 1987).

In addition to the external data, into which we cannot enter here, a set of internal arguments permits Father Gy to argue for attribution to Saint Thomas as a very probable conclusion. Since the matter has seemed doubtful, it will be useful to recall the internal arguments at greater length. The first argument draws on the omission in *Sacerdos* of Matt. 28:20: "Behold I am with you even until the end of time." Thomas's contemporaries saw in this a promise of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, and the bull *Transiturus* itself makes that point. Thomas, on the contrary, never uses this text in that sense; there are, thus, strong reasons why its absence from the office may stem from a deliberate choice.

We also notice in this office the absence of the idea of *praesentia corporalis*. Whereas that idea was much in evidence in the first office of Liège for Corpus Christi (*Animarum cibus*), in contemporaries like Bonaventure and Peter of Tarentaise, and in the bull *Transiturus*, it is carefully avoided in the reading for matins (the *Legenda* "*Immensa divinae largitatis beneficia*" was written, however, after the bull), which makes no allusion to it by way of gloss and speaks rather of the "ineffable mode of the divine presence in the visible sacrament." That expression well suits Thomas's usage. In the earlier phase of his thought, Thomas preferred to avoid speaking about a "corporal" presence of Christ in the sacrament, for it appeared to him linked with a "localization," while the presence *in loco* pertained only to the accidents. It is only in the *Tertia Pars*, several years later, that he will accept speaking of corporal presence, but, as we will see later, in an entirely different sense.⁴⁶

The second reading for matins furnishes an even clearer argument if we recall the contemporary theological debate: "*Accidentia enim sine subiecto in eodem existunt, ut fides locum habeat dum visibile invisibiliter sumitur, aliena specie occultatum, et sensus a deceptione immunes reddantur, qui de accidentibus iudicant sibi notis.*" The entire passage certainly appears a little bit incongruous in a liturgical celebration, but it is in fact the equivalent of a signature. The italicized words, which show to best advantage a judgment on the meaning of the Eucharistic accidents, express a position that occurs five times in the context of this *Legenda*. Although this is not a point of view that is exclusively Thomas's own, his rigorous Aristotelian perspective makes him probably the only one of his

⁴⁶ Cf. Gy, *L'office*, p. 506, which refers notably to *Sent.* IV d. 10 a. 1 ad 4, and to *Resp. de 36 art.* proposition 33: "corpus Christi non est in sacramento ut in loco"; cf. IIIa q. 75 a. 1, which we cite further on.

contemporaries who would think to use it in such a context, for it was he alone who gave it such great importance.⁴⁷

The Adoro Te

If the Office of the Blessed Sacrament, properly speaking, no longer poses a problem of authenticity, the same cannot be said for the *Adoro Te*. In a study that has remained a point of reference, Dom André Wilmart has explained the particular problems the tradition of this text poses.⁴⁸ Without concluding one way or another, Wilmart strongly leans toward discarding this piece from Saint Thomas's literary heritage. We also know that the error of the senses with respect to the eucharistic accidents of which the hymn speaks has been suspect for some time in the eyes of the Thomists.⁴⁹ This appears in all its incongruity in the context we have just mentioned, and Father Gy has forcefully stated it: "Neither poetic emotion nor devotion would have made Thomas write: '*Visus, gustus, tactus / in te fallitur. Sed solus auditus / tute creditur.*'"⁵⁰

From the point of view of external criticism, the argument drawn from the relative silence of the manuscripts has not convinced all the researchers,⁵¹ for it is quite remarkable that the manuscripts do not attribute the authorship of this text to anyone other than Saint Thomas. Nevertheless, a new element has been added to the file, since we now find this hymn in full in the fourth version of Tocco.⁵² If this fourth version is valid, as the

⁴⁷ Father Gy notes that the formula "*Et si sensus deficit*" of the *Pange lingua*, which was prior to the formula in the *Legenda*, does not show that sense is deceived, but that it is impotent to go beyond its proper object.

⁴⁸ A. Wilmart, "La tradition littéraire et textuelle de l'Adoro Te devote," in *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du moyen âge latin* (Paris, 1932), pp. 361–414 [first published in *RTAM* 1 (1929) 21–40, 149–76]: the *Adoro Te* is not mentioned until rather late in the manuscript tradition; only three go back to the fourteenth century (some fifty years after Thomas's death); the others are all from the fifteenth century.

⁴⁹ Cf. E. Hugueny, "L'Adoro Te est-il de saint Thomas?" *AFP* 4 (1934) 221–25, who reminds us of some texts that are strongly contrary: "*In hoc sacramento non est aliqua deceptio neque fictio*" (*Sent.* IV d. 11 q. 1 a. 1 qc. 2 ad 1); "*In hoc sacramento nulla est deceptio*" (*ST* IIIa q. 75 a. 5 ad 2); furthermore, discarding the idea that there are only appearances here as in magic, Thomas emphasizes: "*Veritatis sacramento nulla fictio decet*" (*De rationibus fidei* 8, Leonine, vol. 40, pp. B 68–69).

⁵⁰ *L'Office . . . et la théologie*, p. 83; for supporting proof, the author also remarks that the *velatum* (*Iesu quem velatum nunc aspicio*), a frequent term of the theologians of the time, hardly appears in Thomas's vocabulary in this context.

⁵¹ Thus M. Grabmann, *Werke*, pp. 368–69, along with a series of researchers for whom authenticity is not in doubt.

⁵² *Ystoria* 58, pp. 380–81; although it would not be unthinkable, the editor does not give here any indication that would permit us to suspect that the manuscripts have been interpolated; it would be necessary to suppose that the interpolation was produced by an intermediary on whom they both depend (as, for example, two of the manuscripts in the fourteenth century quoted by Wilmart, when they allude to the same circumstances of composition as does Tocco). We can hardly see why we ought to suspect this page any more than the other retouchings of the fourth version.

editor thinks, we then have the most ancient direct testimony for the *Adoro Te*, and that would suffice to ruin Wilmart's argument. Wilmart further underscores quite honestly that we might go back by conjecture to a manuscript from the beginning of the fourteenth century which has a *Friar* Thomas pronouncing this prayer *on his death bed*.⁵³ But Wilmart sees an insurmountable objection to this point in the fact that Tocco does not say anything about this ultimate prayer.⁵⁴ Now, it is exactly this testimony of Tocco's that we find in his fourth version.

Continuing on the basis of external criticism, another reference to the *Adoro Te* has been discovered, an indirect but clear one, in Jacopone da Todi (died Christmas Eve 1306). In one of his poems that we can date between 1280 and 1294, we find the following lines, where we emphasize the most important words: "Li quattro sensi dicono / Questo si è vero pane / *Solo audito* resistelo / Ciascun de lor fuor remane / So' cuestas visibil *forme* / Cristo occultato ce stane / Cusi a l'alma se dâne / En questa misteria." ⁵⁵ The *solo audito* of this text is an evident allusion to the *solus auditus* of the Latin eucharistic poem and, in order to be understood, it supposes that the other poem is already widely known.

Jacopone's poem contains another highly revealing detail, the word *forme* (forms). One of the most interesting results of Dom Wilmart's research has been to reestablish the original text of the first two verses of the *Adoro Te*, which should be read thus: "Adoro deuote, latens *ueritas* / Te qui sub his *formis* uere latitas." Now *formis* is also in the text of the fourth version of Tocco (in place of *figuris* in the current text) and it was clearly this that the term *forme* in Jacopone translates. Less than twenty years after Thomas's death, the text of the *Adoro Te* is thus attested to according to Wilmart's research, in an unexpected way, but nonetheless credibly. If we doubt that the verses were composed on Thomas's deathbed, it is no longer unreasonable at least to attribute them to him.

As to the problems of internal criticism—the doubts raised by the error of the senses—we might ask ourselves if the objection is as strong as at first we might think. It is true that, according to common doctrine in Thomas's time, sense cannot deceive itself about its proper object: "sensus . . . propriorum *semper uerus est*!"⁵⁶ But can one reasonably expect to find in a

⁵³ *Frater*, and not *sanctus*, could go back to before 1323; but we can hardly insist on this point, for *frater* has continued to be used even since canonization.

⁵⁴ Wilmart, pp. 404 and 389–90.

⁵⁵ Cf. F. J. E. Raby, "The Date and Authorship of the Poem *Adoro Te Deuote*," *Speculum* 20 (1945) 236–38, from which we borrow this text and the other data in this paragraph.

⁵⁶ Aristotle, *De anima*, 427b11–12; 428b18–20; Nemesius, *De natura hominis*, trans. Bur-

(footnote continued on next page)

prayer—which is a poem in addition—all the rigor of a theological treatise? Even in such a treatise, we find that Thomas does not hesitate to say that the Eucharist stimulates faith to its maximum of merit, for it conducts the believer to give his commitment "not only beyond reason, but even *against sense*."⁵⁷ With the exception of "it seems" (*ut videtur*), which weakens the expression in the text of the *Sentences*, we are here very close to the *Adoro Te*.⁵⁸

Another argument from internal criticism deserves at least a mention here. As has often been recalled, the sixth stanza of the *Adoro Te* celebrates the precious blood of Christ, of which "a sole drop would suffice to save the whole world."⁵⁹ Now this is an expression that Thomas uses elsewhere twice, attributing it to Saint Bernard: *una gutta sanguinis Christi fuit sufficiens pretium nostre redemptionis*.⁶⁰ Although it appears each time in a concessive mode (since the Passion of Christ is indeed more expressive of God's love), Thomas does not hesitate to say that because of the dignity of Christ's person a single drop of his blood would have sufficed to save the entire world. There is, therefore, a doctrinal parallel here, which, joined

(footnote continued from previous page)

gundio (ed. Verbeke-Moncho, p. 78, 3–4): "*Visus enim in propriis sensibilibus non fallitur*: colorem enim et formam nouit"; I owe these two references, as well as other suggestions that I have followed up in these pages, to the kindness of Father Gauthier.

⁵⁷. *Sent.* IV d. 10 q. 1 a. 1: "et maxime meritum fidei in hoc quod creduntur multa in hoc sacramento quae non solum praeter rationem sunt, sed etiam *contra sensum*, ut videtur." A. Dondaine, *BT* 5 (1937–1939), pp. 111–12, mentioned this text to express his doubts about Wilmart's thesis. For those familiar with this difficult aspect of Thomist psychology, i.e., knowledge through the senses, we can still submit for examination the following argument: the text of the *Adoro Te* does not say that *all* the senses are deceived, it specifies to the contrary that the *auditus* is not deceived; that could perhaps suffice to save the truth of sense judgments, for that pertains to the *sensus communis*, the place where the five senses meet one another, cf. Q. *De anima* a. 13; *ST* Ia q. 78 a.4.

⁵⁸. We might also ask ourselves if "*fallitur*" has indeed the strong sense that we are inclined to give it; if we can believe the dictionaries (Littré, final etymological remark on *faillir*; F. Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française, on faillir, or défaillir*), *fallor* easily also takes the weakened sense of "fail," "be lacking," "to be incapable of," and we would then have a case similar to that of the *sensus deficit* of the *Pange lingua*, of which Father Gy has reminded us of the exact meaning. It is precisely this that was retained in the Greek translation of the hymn done by André Scleghias between 1450 and 1460, cf. J.P. Cavaros, "Greek translations of the 'Adoro Te devote' and the 'Ave verum,'" *Traditio* 8 (1952) 418–23.

⁵⁹. "Me immundum munda tuo sanguine / Cujus una stilla saluum facere / Totum mundum posset ab omni scelere" (*Ystoria* 58, p. 380).

⁶⁰. *Sent.* III d. 20 a. 3 arg. 4 and ad 4; cf. *Quodl.* II q. 1 a. 2 [2] compare under a stronger form: *minima gutta*. For the attribution to Saint Bernard, Father Gauthier (in the Leonine edition of the *Quodlibet*, of which he has sent us an advance text) refers with caution to the *Super Cantica*, *Sermo* 22, iii 7, from which we might infer it; it also signifies that Henry of Suso, Hostiensis (*Summa aurea*, c. 5, *De remissionibus*, Lyon, 1556, fol. 430a), whom Thomas surely read, had already used this expression and the idea.

to the other arguments based on external and internal criticism, not only prevents us from being too negative in our appreciation of the Thomistic authorship of the *Adoro Te* but even invites us, on the contrary, to lean toward it.⁶¹

The Eschatological Banquet

To return to the Office of the Blessed Sacrament, it seems that this was a decisive moment in Thomas's spiritual evolution.⁶² He centered the celebration on the mystery of Christ, God and perfect man, entirely contained in the sacrament, to such a point that he does not say: receive the body or the blood of Christ, but indeed: receive Christ (*Christus sumitur*, or even: *Deus sumitur*). The notion of presence also begins to be refined, and we intuit what will become the definitive formulation in the *Summa*: Christ does not become present to us (a "localizing" conception that Thomas continued to discard), it is we whom He renders present to Himself:

What is entirely proper to friendship is to live with one's friends [*convivere amicis*] . . . , and that is why Christ has promised us his bodily presence in compensation. . . . But in the meantime he did not want to deprive us of that bodily presence during our pilgrimage, but by the truth of his body and blood he joins us to him in this sacrament [*nos sibi coniungit in hoc sacramento*]. . . . Thus this sacrament is the sign of the greatest love and the comfort of our hope because of this highly intimate union with Christ.⁶³

This evocation of hope in connection with the Eucharist does not occur by chance: full of the memory of the Passion, the celebration is entirely turned toward the eschatological achievement, since it is the pledge, the *pignus*, of future glory.⁶⁴ According to Father Gy, who is quite convincing,

⁶¹. Since these lines were written, Professor Robert Wielockx, of the Catholic University of Louvain, has twice referred to the *Adoro te* (at the Journée thomiste de Saint-Jacques, 3 December 1994, and at the conference "Christ among the Medieval Dominicans," 7 September 1995); the comparison of the manuscript tradition and the attentive examination of internal parallels in Thomas's work leads without reservation to a conclusion of its authenticity.

⁶². We owe, again to Father Gy, these crucial remarks, cf. his study "La relation au Christ dans l'Eucharistie selon S. Bonaventure et S. Thomas d'Aquin," in *Sacrements de Jésus-Christ*, J. Doré, ed. (Paris, 1983), pp. 69–106; reproduced in the same author's *La liturgie dans l'histoire*, pp. 247–83; we also ought to mention the more technical study by the same author that allows us to verify the centrality of the office in Thomas's thought: "Le texte original de la Tertia Pars de la *Somme Théologique* de S. Thomas d'Aquin dans l'apparat critique de l'Édition Léonine: le cas de l'Eucharistie," *RSPT* 65 (1981) 608–16.

⁶³. *ST* IIIa q. 75 a. 1.

⁶⁴. Everyone recalls the well-known anthem, a remarkable condensation of eucharistic theology: "O Sacrum convivium in quo Christus sumitur, recolitur memoria passionis eius, mens impletur gratia et futurae gloriae nobis pignus datur."

this displacement of Thomas's eucharistic theology toward eschatology, of which the Office of *Corpus Christi* bears several signs, and of which "we will hardly find an equivalent among contemporary theologians," is entirely in line with his "theological and spiritual personality," so deeply marked by a "straining toward the vision of God."⁶⁵

It is also at this moment that we can confirm a new cognizance of the affective element in the eucharistic communion. While it is hardly emphasized in the *Sentences*, the words *suavitas* and *dulcedo* return in the lessons of the *Sacerdos*, and in the *Summa* Thomas will emphasize that though venial sins or distraction do not hinder a fruitful reception of the Eucharist, whoever receives communion in that state deprives himself of the sweetness of a certain spiritual repast.⁶⁶ Against that background, the biographers' stories concerning Thomas's eucharistic devotion do not appear as lacking in credibility. Without going so far as to guarantee the literal truth of the stories that have been reported, this theology gives such stories a cachet of truth that is not at all surprising.⁶⁷

The Catena aurea

In the midst of the intense literary output of this period, we must make a special place for the commentary on the four evangelists through a series of quotations from the Fathers of the Church.⁶⁸ Known as the *Catena aurea*, this work was undertaken by Thomas at the request of Urban IV toward the end of 1262 or the beginning of 1263. The speed of Thomas's work has something surprising about it, since the volume on Matthew was

⁶⁵. Among the indications of this straining toward the vision of God and typical of Thomas's intellectualism, we recall the conclusion, rather unexpected from the liturgical point of view, but as clear as one could wish, of the hymn *Sacris solemniis*: "As you visit us, we honor you / Lead us through your ways to where we are going (*duc nos quo tendimus*) / in the light that you inhabit."

⁶⁶. *ST* IIIa q. 79 a. 8: *quaedam actualis refectio spiritualis dulcedinis*.

⁶⁷. Recall simply the confession of faith in the Eucharist that Thomas gave on his deathbed, according to Bartholomew of Capua: "I receive you, price of my soul's redemption, I receive you viaticum of my pilgrimage, for the love of whom I studied, watched, labored, preached, taught. . . ." (*Naples* 80, p. 379).

⁶⁸. *Catena aurea in quatuor evangelia*, ed. A. Guarienti, 2 vols. (Turin-Rome, 1953); in translation, cf. *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Exposition suivie des quatre Evangiles . . . La chaîne d'Or*, trans. by Abbot E. Castan, 8 vols. (Paris, 1854–55); *St. Thomas Aquinas, Catena Aurea. Commentary on the Four Gospels*, trans. M. Pattison, J. D. Dalgairns and T. D. Ryder, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1841–45) (preface by Newman); *S. Tommaso d'Aquino, Catena aurea*, Italian trans. ed. by E. Logi, 2 vols. (Siena, 1954). Among the recent studies, see G. Berceville, "L'*Expositio continua* sur les quatre Evangiles de Saint Thomas d'Aquin (*Catena aurea*): le commentaire de Marc," *Memoire de D.E.A.* (1988), deposited at Le Saulchoir; C. G. Conticello, "San Tommaso ed i Padri: La *Catena aurea super Ioannem*," *AHDLMA* 65 (1990) pp. 31–92, who makes this point in a well-documented introduction on the set of problems concerning the *Catena*.

offered to the pope before his death on 2 October 1264. We might suppose that Thomas had already begun to assemble some texts even before the papal request, but his work was also greatly facilitated by the fact that he could use some *florilegia* and that he was helped by a staff of secretaries. The secretaries did not need to be highly qualified in order to group texts according to the Gospel verses; Thomas took charge of the final ordering of the text. To all appearances, he worked simultaneously on the other three evangelists. These texts also were rapidly developed, since the work was finished in Rome between 1265 and 1268, before Thomas returned to Paris. The author dedicated the rest of his work to Cardinal Annibaldo d'Annibaldi, his former student and his provisional successor at Saint-Jacques, with whom he was united by bonds of friendship.⁶⁹

Though the purpose of the *Catena* is similar to that of the Gloss that came from Laon in the preceding century,⁷⁰ this compilation of patristic texts differs from the Gloss, in the sense that it is an *expositio continua*, verse by verse, of the totality of the four evangelists. The whole is done in such a way as to permit a continuous reading of it, as if it had come from a single author (*Quasi unius doctoris uideatur esse littera*). To comment on Matthew, Thomas made use above all of what he already had at hand, the Latin authors and Saint John Chrysostom. But the table of heresies that we find present in the very first lesson also cites Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria, of whom Thomas had some knowledge thanks to the *Collectio Casinensis*.

By contrast, in his dedicatory letter to the section on Mark, Thomas emphasizes that he also had to have translated what had not been available in Latin.⁷¹ This constitutes the great novelty of the work and we will have to return to it, but we should also note Thomas's care in introducing each quotation with the name of its author. When he does not know the author, he says simply *Glossa* or *Grecus*. This is worth remarking, because few authors before him, with the exception of the Venerable Bede and Raban Maur, took care to identify their sources.⁷²

⁶⁹. Cf. the end of the dedicatory epistle: "et antiqua dilectio, amoris affectum in offerentis munere comprehendat," ed. A. Guarienti (Turin, 1953), vol. I, p. 429.

⁷⁰. Cf. B. Smalley, "Glossa ordinaria," *TRE* 13 (1984) 452–57.

⁷¹. We do not yet know everything that Thomas had at his disposition; beyond the Commentary of Theophylactus (for Mark, Luke, and John), he had a *catena* by Victor of Antioch (Mark) and another by Nicetas of Hericlea (Luke); Conticello (pp. 56ff.), who goes over the results that we have already recorded above, has been lucky enough to discover the original florilegium of the text by Saint Basil on Saint John.

⁷². Cf. C. Spicq, *Esquisse*, p. 307.

We should also emphasize that Thomas was completely clear about his methodological presuppositions. In introducing us to the way to use his work, he explains how he proceeded and declares straightforwardly that he worked on large sections to avoid prolixity and changed certain passages for purposes of continuity; he also specifies the meaning of certain texts (*sensum posui*) and sometimes even omits some words (*verba dimisi*).⁷³ This procedure is presented with particular clarity in Chrysostom's homilies because of the *translatio vitiosa*, but the procedure is even clearer when it uses an apocrypha of Chrysostom, the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaem*, in which Thomas carefully corrects two Arianizing passages.

However, contrary to what one might fear, the fidelity of this work to the original cannot be said to be substantially altered. To judge it according to the anonymous *Opus imperfectum* (the author most often cited in the *Catena*: 444 times), all the citations are literal, as J. Van Banning's studies have allowed us to see. Thomas abridges, but only twice does he change words—for the two Arian passages already mentioned.⁷⁴ One should also see that Thomas's critical sense makes him distinguish carefully between the authentic homilies by Chrysostom, which he reads in Burgundio of Pisa's translation and designates as *Homiliarium*, and the *Opus imperfectum*, which he calls *Commentarium*.

If we leave the *Catena* aside for a moment to verify how Thomas uses patristic texts in his systematic works, we can note that he maintains his liberty of spirit even with regard to the authors most assiduously followed; thus it is that he is more strict than Chrysostom on matrimonial morals, less so in what concerns riches.⁷⁵ These few indications, which it would be necessary to multiply systematically, show at least that Thomas never accepted the *auctoritates Patrum* without subjecting them to an attentive critique, which the term *expositio reverentialis* has sometimes misrepresented. On the contrary, he had "a personal knowledge, which was quite up-to-date, of hermeneutical methods."⁷⁶

⁷³. Cf. Conticello, "San Tommaso ed i Padri," pp. 65 ff. for a concrete example of the application of this method; see also C. Dozois, "Sources patristiques chez saint Thomas d'Aquin," *Revue de l'Université, d'Ottawa* 33 (1963) 28*–48* and 145*–167*; 34 (1964) 231*–241*; 35 (1965) 75*–90*.

⁷⁴. J. Van Banning, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaem. Praefatio*, CCSL 87 B (Turnhout, 1988), pp. cxcvi–ccvii; see also by the same author: "Saint Thomas et l'*Opus imperfectum in Matthaem*," *Studi Tomistici* 17 (1982) 73–85.

⁷⁵. Cf. Van Banning, *Praefatio*, pp. cci–cciii.

⁷⁶. Cf. W. H. Principe, "Thomas Aquinas's Principles for Interpretation of Patristic Texts," in *Studies in Medieval Culture VIII–IX* (Western Michigan University, 1976), pp. 111–21, cf. p. 116: "A quite sophisticated and skillful knowledge of hermeneutical method"; in addition to

(footnote continued on next page)

Initially a simple compilation, this work in reality takes on a considerable importance: First, for the quantity and the quality of the material assembled, then because Thomas shows here an exceptional knowledge, for his time, of Greek Patristics; thus he cites fifty-seven Greek authors compared with twenty-two Latins, of whom certain ones such as Theophylactus were unknown in the West before their use in the *Catena*.⁷⁷

The importance of the work may also be measured by the use to which Thomas himself and others after him put it. The last chapters of his commentary on Saint John are a rewriting of the *Catena*,⁷⁸ and we easily discover the influence of this work in his preaching.⁷⁹ The same holds true for his theology, and we note that the patristic documentation in the realm of Christology sextupled between the *Sentences* and the *Summa*.⁸⁰

To know this is to better understand why Weisheipl, following Eschmann, could speak of the *Catena* as a *turning point* in the development of Thomas's thought. But it also had great importance for Catholic theology in general, because the *Catena* had a wide diffusion. Without taking into account the fragments, we count seventy-three complete manuscripts for Saint Mark, eighty-two for Saint Luke, eighty-eight for Saint John, eighty-nine for Saint Matthew, and the editions produced after the invention of printing run to high figures.⁸¹ As C. Spicq once remarked, by its very richness this repertory constitutes "a mine for the exegetes, the theologians, and the preachers." But for our knowledge of Thomas it is even more interesting that the person whom we willingly regard as the archetype of the metaphysician and speculative theologian, "[also] has a place of the first order in the history of positive and patristic theology."⁸²

(footnote continued from previous page)

the studies of Congar, *Valeur et portée*, and Torrell, *Autorités théologiques*, quoted above note 26, cf. also C. G. Geenen, *Le fonti patristiche come 'autorità' nella teologia di San Tommaso*, *Sacra Doctrina*, no. 77 (1975), pp. 7–17; J. J. De Miguel, "Los Padres de la Iglesia en la criteriología teológica de santo Tomas de Aquino," *Scripta theologica* 7 (1975) 125–61.

⁷⁷ Cf. C. G. Geenen, "Saint Thomas et les Pères," in the article "Thomas d'Aquin," *DTC* 15/1 (1946), col 738–61.

⁷⁸ Cf. here especially Conticello, "San Tommaso ed i Padri," pp. 79–86.

⁷⁹ Cf. L.-J. Bataillon, "Les sermons de saint Thomas et la *Catena aurea*," in *Commemorative Studies* I, pp. 67–75.

⁸⁰ Cf. I. Backes, *Die Christologie des hl. Thomas v. Aquin und die griechischen Kirchenväter* (Paderborn, 1931), p. 122; the reemployment of the *Catena* in the Christology has been carefully studied by L.-J. Bataillon, "Saint Thomas et les Pères: de la *Catena* à la *Tertia Pars*," in *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 15–36. We can also add to this the related fact that Thomas is the first Latin theologian to quote literally the acts of the first five ecumenical councils. Cf. C. G. Geenen, "En marge du concile de Chalcédoine. Les textes du Quatrième Concile dans les oeuvres de saint Thomas," *Angelicum* 29 (1952) 43–59.

⁸¹ Conticello, "San Tommaso ed i Padri," pp. 42–43.

⁸² C. Spicq, *Esquisse*, p. 310.

In their own fashion, the ancient biographers themselves testified to this attitude toward sources as one of Thomas's major character traits. This is the clearest meaning of the famous anecdote in which Thomas would much prefer to have the commentary of Chrysostom on Matthew than to possess the entire city of Paris.⁸³ The same intellectual curiosity appears when Tocco says that Thomas "was going from one priory to another, reading the works of the different Fathers, and learning by heart a great part of the commentaries, which he later transcribed."⁸⁴ We can easily identify some of the places where Thomas could have consulted documents: the Abbey of Monte Cassino, which he knew contained a twelfth-century manuscript of the Acts of the councils of Ephesus and of Chalcedon. But the *florilegia* of the Greek patristic authors could not have escaped him there either. Thomas without doubt could also have gone to the archives of the papal curia, even to Orvieto after 1261. In fact, the works from that period begin to testify to the new documentation. A notable fact: Thomas, along with Albert, his master, from whom he no doubt learned this habit, belonged to that rare category of authors who are not content with *florilegia* and frequently have direct recourse to the sources.⁸⁵

The stay at Orvieto was also a period rich in human contacts for Thomas. If he was unquestionably a lover of solitude and study, we also know that he had friends among his confreres, and the proximity of the papal court led to many encounters with them. We may guess this from the simple enumeration of the works of circumstance (which we have mentioned above). The historians have given us inventories of the names of the people who entered or could have entered into relations with Thomas.⁸⁶

If we cast a retrospective eye on this period of Friar Thomas Aquinas's life, we cannot help but be impressed by the speed with which he worked.

⁸³. *Ystoria* 42, pp. 331–32 (Tocco 42, p. 115); cf. *Naples* 78, p. 376, where the dialogue reported by Bartholomew of Capua is perhaps closer to the true event; cf. Van Banning, *Praefatio*, pp. clxxviii–clxxx.

⁸⁴. *Ystoria* 18, pp. 250–51 (Tocco 17, p. 87); on Saint Thomas's memory, cf. *Ystoria* 41, p. 329 (Tocco 41, p. 114).

⁸⁵. Cf. H.-F. Dondaine, "Les scolastiques citent-ils les Pères de première main?" *RSPT* 36 (1952) 231–43 (on Dionysius); "Note sur la documentation patristique de saint Thomas à Paris en 1270," *RSPT* 47 (1963) 403–6.

⁸⁶. Cf. WN, pp. 104–7 and 128–31; A. Walz, "L'Aquinate a Orvieto," *Angelicum* 29 (1952) 176–90; M. Grabmann, "Die persönliche Beziehungen des hl. Thomas von Aquin," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 57 (1937) 305–22.

In five years (after leaving Paris), he composed the *Summa contra Gentiles*, the *Commentary on the Book of Job*, a good part of the *Catena aurea*, and an entire series of opuscula. The three great works hardly need to be praised, since a single one of them would have sufficed to occupy the time of more than one author. The briefer writings display without doubt a little bit of haste, but they have the merit of showing a theologian at work in the world of his own time, attentive to problems that are posed to him, and trying to respond as best he can. The solitude of his priory had nothing of the isolation of an ivory tower.

**Chapter VIII—
The Roman Years (1265–1268):
The Beginning of the *Summa***

On 8 September 1265, or during the following days, the provincial chapter held at Anagni enjoined Thomas "for the remission of his sins" to take up residence at Rome and found there a *studium*—at Santa Sabina, to all appearances—for the formation of chosen friars from the various priories of the Roman province. Their houses of origin should provide for their support, but Thomas would have full authority over them and could return them to their priories if they did not perform satisfactorily in their studies.¹

The Studium at Rome

According to Boyle, to whom we owe a perspicacious rereading of this period of Thomas's life,² the Roman chapter's measures should be understood in the context of the declarations made by the two preceding chapters deploring the sad state of studies in the province. The matter merits even further notice in that, with rare and hardly explicit exceptions (the nomination of a Friar Philip as lector in the new priory at Pistoia in 1259; the nomination of Thomas himself at Orvieto in 1261), this is the first time

¹ *MOPH* 20 (1941), p. 32; the stock phrase "for the remission of his sins" signifies that the responsibility imposed on the religious and accepted by him in virtue of his vow of obedience will serve for his growth in charity.

² L. Boyle, *The Setting of the Summa Theologiae of Saint Thomas* (Toronto, 1982), pp. 9–12.

that the question of studies arises in the acts of the chapters of this province after the recommendations of the general chapter of 1259, at Valenciennes.³

We have to be careful not to conclude from this that no one was interested in the life of the mind in the province. History has preserved names, among them Ambrosio Sansedoni of Siena, a former student of Albertus Magnus in Paris and Cologne, lector and preacher-general (1220–87); James of Benevento, lector and preacher of renown (dates unknown); Romano of Rome, bachelor of the *Sentences* for Thomas in 1270–72, who succeeded him as regent-master in Paris from 1272 to 1273 and died 28 May 1273.⁴ These individuals would suffice to save the intellectual honor of the province; but by definition the chapters addressed themselves to the entire body of friars and were not afraid of pointing out what was missing.

The Rome chapter allows us to suspect that the friars had little ardor for study, but it contents itself with a simple warning to the priors and subpriors.⁵ The warning at the Viterbo chapter is much more direct and pressing: "Since we see that study is neglected in this province, we desire and we strictly order that the priors use the greatest diligence in pursuing this matter." They are therefore enjoined to compel the friars to study, to order that they review their lessons once a week and to make sure that the master of studies checks what the friars, especially the youngest ones, learned during the week. As to the lectors, they must not too easily give up offering courses, particularly without the permission of the prior.⁶

Now it may help to explain the above if we recall that, from 1261 on, Thomas participated in these provincial chapters as a member by right. Since he was also well placed to know what had been decided at Valen-

³ *MOPH* 20, p. 24 (Rome, 1259); *Documenta* 30, p. 582 (Orvieto, 1261); the only other earlier mention is an interdiction of the study of astronomy and of teaching the *artes seculares* (Viterbo, 1258: *MOPH* 20, p. 22). With regard to the absence of names, we should doubtless qualify this remark, for we have noted that the *Acta* only begin to give them (particularly for the priors) at a much later date, cf. E. Panella, "Priori di Santa Maria Novella di Firenze 1221–1325," *Memorie Domenicane* N.S. 17 (1986) 253–84, cf. p. 258.

⁴ See also the notices of Käppeli, *Scriptores*, for the various names.

⁵ *MOPH* 20, p. 28: "Item monemus priores et supprioros . . . quod faciant quod tam iuvenes quam alii fratres frequentent scholas et quod repetant lectiones, et compellant eos stare in cellis, et vacantes otio dure corrigant et . . . in studio teneant occupatos."

⁶ *MOPH* 20, p. 29: "Item quia videmus quod in ista provincia studium negligitur, volumus et districte iniungimus quod priores circa hoc diligentiam maiorem apponant et ad studium cogantur fratres, et ordinent quod in qualibet septimana lectiones semel repetant; et examinentur diligenter, maxime iuvenes, a magistro studentium de hiis que in scholis per septimanam audierint a lectore. Volumus etiam quod lectores non sint faciles ad dimittendum lectiones et maxime absque priorum suorum licentia et assensu."

ciennes, it seems plausible that he must have intervened toward that goal; the foundation of a house of studies in Rome thus appears as the culmination of his efforts and as a concrete opportunity given to him to remedy this state of affairs.

This foundation, doubtless rather modest, had nothing of a *studium generale*, comparable to the ones at Paris, Bologna, Oxford, Cologne, or Montpellier, the great study centers of the order in that age. It was probably not even a *studium provinciale*, which might occupy a place midway between a priory school and the great centers.⁷ It was rather, thinks Boyle, a *studium personale*, founded as an experiment so that Thomas could freely apply there a study program of his own choosing. In fact, we do not see any assistant or any lector alongside Thomas, and the enterprise does not seem to have survived his departure from Rome.⁸

The innovation that Thomas would attempt cannot be properly appreciated if we do not recall his work at Orvieto. Parallel to his commentaries on Scripture, he had the task of forming the friars in moral theology and in the pastoral work of confession, which went along with the mission of preaching that had been entrusted to the order. For this, he had at his disposal the manuals published by the first generations of Dominicans; but that predominance of practical theology in the formation of friars, as we have said, gave them only a partial and narrow view of theology; this resulted in a marked imbalance, to the detriment of dogmatic theology, which could not help but leave Thomas dissatisfied. We must therefore read what he was about to do in Rome as an attempt to put the formation of the friars on a broader basis.⁹

History has preserved at least two indications of Thomas's dissatisfaction. He tried immediately, as we have said, to reuse the commentary on the *Sentences* that he once taught at Paris for his new students. This did not appear sufficient to him, however, and he abandoned that attempt at the end of the first year (1265–66) in order to make a second effort: the composition of the *Summa theologiae*. Boyle seems entirely well founded in saying that, though the execution of the project did not begin until the time of his stay in Rome, its true cause may be found in Thomas's expe-

⁷ A city of clerics and pilgrims with a minimal economic life, Rome of the thirteenth century was not at all large, having only between 17,000 and 20,000 inhabitants (the most optimistic estimates reach only 30,000), cf. J. C. Russell, *Medieval Regions and their Cities* (Newton Abbot, 1972), pp. 51–52.

⁸ Despite the suppositions by Weisheipl, pp. 197 and 231–32.

⁹ Cf. L. Boyle, *The Setting*, pp. 15ff.

riences during four years teaching among the *fratres communes* at Orvieto. As a result of that experience, Thomas wanted to contribute to the already long and remarkable tradition of the manualists in his order, but he also wanted to fill in the most conspicuous gaps by giving moral theology the dogmatic basis it had been lacking.

The Summa theologiae

The context we have recalled here permits us better to understand the opening of the *Summa* and its purpose. Often quoted, these few lines are sometimes only half understood:

Since the teacher of Catholic truth should not only teach the most advanced but also instruct the beginners . . . our intention is therefore to explain what concerns the Christian religion according to the mode that is necessary for the formation of beginners.

The intellectual gifts of the students for whom a manual of such exceptional quality was intended have often been questioned. It is possible that Thomas overestimated their abilities, but he was thinking less about the intrinsic difficulty of the material being taught than about its arrangement in a body of doctrine that would offer students, not only a simple series of questions (sometimes well, sometimes ill juxtaposed), but indeed an organic synthesis that would permit them to grasp internal links and coherence:

We have observed in effect that, in the use of the writings of diverse authors, the newcomers to this material are hampered, sometimes by the multiplication of useless questions, articles, and proofs, sometimes because what they must learn is not treated according to the demand of the materials being taught [*secundum ordinem disciplinae*] but according to what the explanation of books or the occasion of disputes requires. It may be that the frequent repetition of the same things engenders in the listener's spirit weariness and confusion.

Here indeed we find the concerns of a pedagogue, and we understand them much better if we know to listen for an echo of the Orvieto experience.

Did Thomas really teach the *Prima Pars* of the *Summa* and a portion of the *Prima Secundae* in Rome, as Boyle suggests, or did he only compose them there? It is difficult to respond to this question in a decisive way. If we remember that the first task of the *magister in sacra pagina* in Paris was

to comment on Scripture, we will be tempted to respond "no." But it is not proved by irrefutable texts that the same obligation was applied elsewhere. The courses on Saint Paul could well have taken place at this moment, but, curiously, no record has been preserved of it, or of which books would have been commented on during these years. If we accept, on the contrary, that the Anagni chapter gave Thomas carte blanche, we would lean rather toward an affirmative response; it would then be necessary to recognize that Thomas was even more of an innovator than we generally think. What is certain is that he began a project that was going to occupy a good part of the rest of his life.

The dates of composition for the *Summa* are still debated by scholars. It seems certain that during the time he was at Rome (until September 1268), Thomas composed the *Prima Pars* in its entirety and that this portion was in circulation in Italy even before his return to Paris. The difficulty begins with the *Prima Secundae*; it is generally admitted that this part was not begun before the return to Paris. According to Glorieux and Eschmann, whom Weisheipl follows,¹⁰ the completion of the *Prima Secundae* should be situated during the summer of 1270. The *Secunda Secundae*, begun shortly thereafter, during the long scholastic vacation, would have been finished (according to these scholars) before December 1271—perhaps even during the long vacation, some say, but this seems scarcely plausible.

Gauthier, who at first accepted this view,¹¹ recanted and thinks now that the *Prima Secundae* was not written until 1271.¹² He has a rather weighty argument for this view: Thomas uses in massive fashion (more than 100 times) Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in Moerbeke's translation. That text did not come into his hands until near the end of 1270. Gauthier also agrees with the position defended in 1928 by Dom Lottin, who had placed the *Prima Secundae* after Question VI of the *De malo*, having established that the latter dates from around the end of 1270.¹³

The most apparent obstacle to this last proposition stems from the fact

¹⁰ P. Glorieux, "Pour la chronologie de la Somme," *MSR* 2 (1945) 59–98; I. T. Eschmann, "A Catalogue," pp. 386–88; Weisheipl, p. 221–22.

¹¹ R.-A. Gauthier, "La date du Commentaire de Saint Thomas sur l'Ethique à Nicomaque," *RTAM* 18 (1951) 66–105.

¹² *Somme contre les gentils*, p. 80; cf. pp. 65–67; cf. the same author's earlier view, *L'Ethique à Nicomaque*, I, 1, *Introduction*, 2d ed., 1970, pp. 128–29, note 135.

¹³ Cf. O. Lottin, *Psychologie et Morale*, vol. VI, pp. 353–72, and what we say below (chap. IX) on the date of the *De malo*; on this point, Lottin agrees with P. Synave, "Le problème chronologique des questions disputées de saint Thomas d'Aquin," *RT* 31 (1926) 154–59.

that it overburdens the end of Thomas's time in Paris. It leads us to think that in eighteen months he would not only have composed the *Prima Secundae* and the enormous *Secunda Secundae* but also begun the *Tertia Pars* (we accept that the first 20 or 25 questions of the *Tertia* were written in Paris). This schedule seems hardly believable, but it is difficult to escape the constraints that impose it. We must therefore go back and try to explain how Thomas composed all that—and many other things as well—in such a short lapse of time.

The composition of the *Tertia Pars* was probably begun in Paris at the end of the winter of 1271–72, and continued in Naples until 6 December 1273, the date on which Thomas ceased writing. He had by then arrived at the sacrament of penance (IIIa q. 90 a.4). The sequel, known under the name of *Supplement*, was composed by his disciples on the basis of his commentary on the *Sentences*.¹⁴ Thomas would thus have carried on with this work during the last seven years of his life despite other occupations. This is without doubt the clearest sign of the importance that he attached to it.

The *Summa theologiae* is today still the most widely used work by Thomas and without doubt the best known, even by those who open it only occasionally.¹⁵ It is an even greater pity that the text, published at the beginning of the twentieth century among the first volumes of the Leonine edition, is not entirely satisfactory.¹⁶ The critical edition remains to be redone according to the criteria that have made the Leonine Commission's

¹⁴ Like Grabmann (*Werke*, pp. 296–301) and A. Dondaine ("Sermons de Réginald," p. 378, and note 68), many people believe, with varying degrees of uncertainty, that Réginald might have been the author of the *Supplement*; that was already the opinion of Quétif-Echard, followed by Mandonnet, but the Leonine edition is more circumspect (cf. *Praef.*, vol. 12, pp. xvi ff., as well as the introduction by Father Suermondt for the reprint in the manual edition, Turin, 1963, pp. xi–xiii); cf. also Eschmann, "A Catalogue," p. 388.

¹⁵ Leonine, vols. 4–12; this same text has been reproduced in a pocket edition in 3 vols., in Turin (1963), but we might also mention the five-volume edition published by the Studium Dominicain, Ottawa (1941–45), or the one-volume edition that appeared by the Editions Paulines, Rome (1962), which is perhaps preferable. It does not seem that Thomas himself gave the title to the work; we retain the most ancient and the most widely attested title, *Summa Theologiae* (not *theologica*), cf. A. Walz, "De genuino titulo *Summae Theologiae*," *Angelicum* 18 (1941) 142–51.

¹⁶ Cf. P.-M. de Contenson, "Documents sur les origines et les premières années de la Commission Léonine," in *Commemorative Studies* II, pp. 331–88; L.-J. Bataillon, "L'édition léonine des oeuvres de saint Thomas et les études médiévales," in *Atti dell'VIII Congresso*, vol. I (1981) pp. 452–64, notes that the deficiencies primarily concern the *Prima Pars* and the *Prima Secundae*, the *Secunda Secundae* being already much improved; cf. the same author's "Le edizioni di *Opera omnia* degli scolastici e l'edizione leonina," in *Gli Studi di filosofia medievale fra otto e novecento* (Rome, 1991), pp. 141–54, cf. pp. 151–53.

reputation what it is today.¹⁷ It does not cease in any case to stimulate studies and translations.¹⁸

The Contents of the Summa

Before returning in greater detail to specific parts, a general presentation of the work is clearly necessary. At the outset, it would not be useless to distinguish between its plan and its content. Many commentators agree on the second point, however much their ideas may differ on the first. There cannot but be unanimity that Thomas divided his work into three large parts; the second being itself subdivided into two subparts. These initial data, even today, structure the usual presentation of the *Summa* in four volumes. To get a more precise idea of the contents that this material division covers, it suffices to refer to the Prologue of Question 2 of the First Part. We present here, in a translation with gloss, what Saint Thomas condensed into a few lines with a sobriety that no one but he possessed.

Since the principal purpose of *sacra doctrina* is to transmit knowledge of God [which has just been explained in Q.1, itself a kind of discourse on method], we will speak first about God (*Prima Pars*), then about the movement of the rational creature toward God (*Secunda Pars*), and finally about Christ who, according to his humanity, is for us the way that leads toward God (*Tertia Pars*).¹⁹ This is, therefore, the entire proposal in its grand simplicity; Thomas will be more explicit at the beginning of the *Secunda Pars* and the *Tertia Pars* about the contents of each, but he is already quite clear about the purpose of the *Prima Pars*.

He is going to speak about God first, according to what God is in himself

¹⁷ The work has in fact already begun for the *Tertia Pars*, cf. M. Turrini, "Raynald de Piperno et le texte original de la *Tertia Pars* de la *Somme de Théologie* de Thomas d'Aquin," *RSPT* 73 (1989) 233–47; cf. also P.-M. Gy, "Le texte original de la *Tertia pars* de la *Somme Théologique* de S. Thomas d'Aquin dans l'apparat critique de l'édition léonine: le cas de l'eucharistie," *RSPT* 65 (1981) 608–16.

¹⁸ The most recent French translation, in four volumes (text only with brief annotations), appeared in Paris (1984–1986); it does not replace the older one, the so-called "Revue des jeunes" (from the name of the review that supported it) in 68 vols. in a popular edition that has the added advantage of giving the Latin text and full, high-quality annotations. Among English translations there is the Blackfriars' edition, *Summa theologiae*, ed. Thomas Gilby and T. C. O'Brien, 60 vols. (London/New York, 1964–73).

¹⁹ We should perhaps read this text in its Latin original: "Quia igitur principalis intentio huius sacrae doctrinae est Dei cognitionem tradere, et non solum secundum quod in se est, sed etiam secundum quod est principium rerum et finis earum, et specialiter rationalis creaturae . . . ad huius doctrinae expositionem intendentes, primo tractabimus de Deo; secundo de motu rationalis creaturae in Deum; tertio de Christo qui secundum quod homo via est nobis tendendi in Deum" (*ST* Ia q. 2 Prol.).

(*secundum quod in se est*). These words announce the first two subdivisions of the *Prima Pars*: (1) those things that refer to the divine essence (*ea quae pertinent ad essentiam divinam*: QQ.2–26); (2) those that belong to the distinction of persons (*ea quae pertinent ad distinctionem personarum*: QQ.27–43). But since God is also the beginning and the end of all things (*sed etiam secundum quod est principium rerum et finis earum*), it is also necessary to speak about the way creatures proceed from God; thus he announced the conclusion of the *Prima Pars* (QQ.44–119). That conclusion includes three large sections: creation in general (QQ.44–46); the distinction of creatures (QQ.47–102), with the three major subdivisions being dedicated to angels (QQ.50–64), to the work of the six days and a commentary on the biblical story of creation (QQ.65–74) and to man: first in his intellectual nature (treated with a strong Aristotelian flavor), but also as a creature made in the image of God (QQ.75–102). That part finishes with a section that explains the way God governs his creation both in himself and through the mediation of secondary causes (QQ.103–19).

In a few words, Thomas has therefore stated in stages his overall project and the relevant detail for the First Part. He will not be any less brief in the Prologue to the *Secunda Pars*; it is even striking to see how he guides the enormous and complex mass of his reflections, which are both very fine and detailed, into two essential categories: since we are speaking about the return of man to God, his ultimate end, the first considers that *end* in itself (QQ.1–5: beatitude), then the *means* by which man arrives at that end or, on the contrary, turns away from it.

The category of "means" is vast and extends over two volumes. In the first phase (*Prima Secundae*), Thomas studies, in a detailed fashion, human acts (QQ.6–89) as formally human, which is to say voluntary and free, and therefore capable of being good or bad (QQ.6–21); then the passions of the soul (QQ.22–48); after that, he deals with the internal principles that qualify human powers, which is to say, the *habitus*, good or bad, which are virtues and vices in their generality (QQ.49–89); finally come the exterior principles that influence human activity: law (QQ.90–108) and grace (QQ.109–14).

In a second phase (*Secunda Secundae*), Thomas makes a probing return to these first data and gives an analysis of the theological virtues: faith, hope, and charity (QQ.1–46); of the cardinal virtues: prudence, justice, temperance, and fortitude (QQ.47–170), specifying for each of them their proper acts and their contrary sins. This reflection concludes with a study

of charisms and states of life, a small treatise on ecclesial diversity that ends with the contemplative life (QQ.171–89). Here we find, in a masterful recapitulation, the definition of beatitude that was placed at the beginning of the entire *Secunda Pars*.

The prologue to the *Tertia Pars* is slightly more explicit:

Our Savior, the Lord Jesus . . . showed Himself to us as the way of truth, through which it is possible for us now to come to resurrection and to beatitude in eternal life. And to bring to conclusion our entire theological enterprise, we must now, having studied the ultimate end of human life, then the virtues and vices, continue our study by way of the Savior of all things, considered in Himself, then by way of the benefits with which He has graced the human race.

Here again sections and subsections present themselves as evidence. The first section is dedicated to Jesus the Christ, the Savior who brings our salvation (QQ.1–59). This lends itself to two large developments: (1) the mystery of the Incarnation in itself (QQ.1–26); (2) that which the Word did and suffered for us in the flesh (QQ.27–59). The second section of the *Tertia Pars* consists of a study of the sacraments through which we arrive at salvation: in general first (QQ.60–65), then baptism, Eucharist, penance (QQ.66–90, partly unfinished). The third was to consist of a detailed reflection on the end to which we are called, eternal life, into which we enter by being raised through Christ. (Thomas was not able to write this part.)²⁰

The Plan of the Summa theologiae

All the commentators agree in recognizing the existence of these large parts and sections; the differences arise the moment we put the question of whether this apparently simple division does not hide another, less evident plan, whose internal movement would be much more illuminating for the understanding of Thomas's purposes.

To speak solely of contemporary Thomists, this discussion was begun in 1939 by M.-D. Chenu,²¹ but it was only after 1950 and the appearance of his *Toward Understanding Saint Thomas* that studies begin to appear on this theme.²² Beyond the technical side of the question, what is at stake

²⁰ Numerous authors have tried to give a synopsis of the contents of the *Summa*; we refer, for example, to J.-J. Berthier, *Tabulae . . . Summae Theologiae* (Paris, 1903), or to Thomas Aquinas, *Somme théologique* (Paris, 1984), vol. 1, pp. 68–89.

²¹ M.-D. Chenu, "Le plan de la Somme théologique de saint Thomas," *RT* 47 (1939) 93–107; reprinted in the same author's, *Toward*, pp. 297–325.

²² In addition to the works mentioned above, these are some of the other principal studies

(footnote continued on next page)

is not only the place of Christ in the plan of the *Summa*, but indeed, for Thomas, the capacity to take into account the history of salvation. Sharply schematicizing and dealing primarily with the French literature on the subject, we can, it seems, distinguish three principal positions.²³

1. In the first phase, M.-D. Chenu proposed reading the *Summa* in the light of the Neoplatonic scheme of the *exitus* and of *reditus*. According to him, the *Prima Pars* deals with the emanation of things from God considered as principle; the *Secunda Pars* speaks of their return toward God as toward their ultimate end. According to Chenu's own formula, the *Prima Pars* and the *Secunda Pars* "are between them like the *exitus* and *reditus*." They are strictly connected in their unity, which is that of two inverse movements. Thus he starts from the Bible, where all creatures gush forth from the hand of God and return toward him according to his design, for he guides the history of his creation. Likewise theology envisages reality "from the point of view of God," *secundum quod est principium rerum et finis earum* (Ia q. 2 Prol.). As Max Seckler has well said:

In a surprising way, there appear here, in strict correspondence with one another, the origin and end of *history*, the source and the completion of *being*, the first and last cause of *understanding*, so that not only can theology turn itself into a 'science' of the history of salvation, but the *history of salvation itself bears within itself the fundamental theological design*. It is not therefore, according to Thomas, the theologian who brings order into the tangled events of salvation, but it is the order of salvation that structures theology.²⁴

(footnote continued from previous page)

on the subject: A. Hayen, *Saint Thomas d'Aquin et la vie de l'Eglise* (Louvain-Paris, 1952); idem., "La structure de la Somme théologique et Jésus," *Sc. Ecclés* 12 (1960) 59–82; P. E. Persson, "Le plan de la Somme théologique et le rapport *ratio-revelatio*," *RPL* 56 (1958) 545–75; Y. Congar, "Le sens de 'l'Economie' salutaire dans la 'Théologie' de S. Thomas d'Aquin (Somme théologique)," in *Festgabe J. Lortz*, vol. 2 (Baden-Baden, 1957), pp. 59–82; idem., "Le moment 'économique' et le moment 'ontologique' dans la *Sacra Doctrina* (Révélation, Théologie, Somme théologique)," in *Mélanges offerts à M.-D. Chenu*, Bibl. thom. 37 (Paris, 1967), pp. 135–87; G. Lafont, *Structures et méthode dans la Somme théologique de saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris-Brussels, 1961); U. Horst, "Ueber die Frage einer Heilsökonomischen Theologie bei Thomas von Aquin. Ergebnisse und Probleme der neueren Forschung," *MThZ* 12 (1961) 97–111 [reprinted in *Thomas von Aquin*, ed. K. Bernath, vol. 1, *Wege der Forschung* 188 (Darmstadt, 1978), pp. 373–95]; O. H. Pesch, "Um den Plan der Summa Theologiae des hl. Thomas von Aquin," *MThZ* 16 (1965) 128–137 (reprinted and completed in "Wege der Forschung 188," pp. 411–37); L. Elders, "La méthode suivie par saint Thomas d'Aquin dans la composition de la Somme de théologie," *NV* 66 (1991) 178–92.

²³ See also the presentation of H.-D. Gardeil, in *S. Thomas d'Aquin. Somme Théologique: La théologie*, "Revue des jeunes" (Paris, 1968), pp. 171–202.

²⁴ Chenu, *Toward*, pp. 297–322; M. Seckler, *Le salut et l'histoire. La pensée de saint Thomas d'Aquin sur la théologie de l'histoire*, *Cogitatio fidei* 21 (Paris, 1967), pp. 30–31.

2. This explanation, which has in its favor the force and the seductiveness of simplicity, has the disadvantage of not directly integrating the *Tertia Pars*. And Christ seems to survive "only as the means willed by God" to assure man's return to his end. Chenu concedes this himself: "To judge it abstractly," the *Tertia Pars* seems "only to play the role of a piece added after the fact." H. Schillebeeckx was one of the first to point out this weakness and to emphasize sharply that the different parts of the *Summa* speak of only a single *motus rationalis creaturae in Deum*.²⁵ But the most pertinent critiques against this scheme, which is too simple to take into account the complexity of the *Summa*'s plan, were formulated by A. Patfoort.²⁶ On the one hand, the movement of *exitus* is not identified with that of the *Prima Pars*, for the *reditus* begins before the end of that part, since Thomas already speaks there about aspects of the *reditus* that are common to all creatures, before specifying in the *Secunda Pars* and the *Tertia Pars* what concerns the human person. On the other hand, the *reditus* is not limited to the *Secunda Pars*, but extends well into the *Tertia Pars*, for what we have is a "*reditus per Christum*." There is thus simultaneously an overlapping of the notion of *reditus* in the different parts of the *Summa* and also a certain equivocation in that concept. Patfoort proposes, therefore, abandoning this scheme, which does not appear to him to be truly explanatory, and he himself makes diverse suggestions that would be closer to what Thomas did, but that we cannot enter into here.

3. According to the M.-V. Leroy, there is no reason to give up the *exitus-reditus* scheme, but we must make it clear that it applies only to the "economic" part of the *Summa*. Before that, Thomas sets up another grand division that reproduces purely and simply the one established by the Fathers of the Church between "theology" and "economy." The "theology" corresponds to the beginning of the *Prima Pars* (QQ.2–43), where we are dealing with God Himself; then the "economy" regroups all the rest of the *Summa* (beginning at *Prima Pars* Q.44). This ensemble of 393 questions is itself to be understood according to the scheme *exitus-reditus*.²⁷

In the second part of the *Prima Pars* (QQ.44–119), the dominant (but not unique) movement is still the *exitus* (even if for some creatures, namely the angels, the *reditus* is already evoked). As to the *Secunda Pars* and the

²⁵ H. Schillebeeckx, *De sacramentele Heilseconomie* (Anvers, 1952), pp. 1–18.

²⁶ A.-M. Patfoort, "L'unité de la *Ia Pars* et le mouvement interne de la *Somma* théologique de S. Thomas d'Aquin," *RSPT* 47 (1963) 513–44 (reprinted in *Les clés*, pp. 49–70).

²⁷ M.-V. Leroy, *RT* 84 (1984) 298–303, a review of Patfoort's text in *Les clés*.

Tertia Pars, they speak only of the *reditus*, but in so far as it has something specific for the rational creature, which is to say, for man as the image of God. This movement finds its culmination when man arrives at a perfect resemblance in attaining communion with God (cf. Prol., *Secunda Pars*), through the mediation of Christ "*qui secundum quod homo via est nobis tendendi ad Deum*" (Prol., *Tertia Pars*). Complete and nuanced, this explanation seems to correspond well to what Saint Thomas did. We must nevertheless add with Leroy that "before being Neoplatonist [this scheme] is quite simply Christian." Thomas explicitly emphasizes this elsewhere when he says with the book of Revelation that God is the Alpha and the Omega of the whole creation.²⁸

The Place of the Mystery of the Incarnation

The explanatory value that Thomas attached to his construction of the *Summa* receives a double and interesting confirmation. The first confirmation is often used because it deals with the frequency with which this structure appears in diverse works: from the *Sentences*, where the choice is already rather clear,²⁹ to the *Summa*, where all the prologues bear the more or less explicit trace of this option, to the *Contra Gentiles*.³⁰ In fact, this schema imposes itself on all theology that allows itself to be structured by faith and the Creed: from God the creator to God who returns in Christ to take man with Him into glory. As Jean Tonneau has justly put it: "We do not think it useful to attribute to Saint Thomas the dubious honor of having imposed on the doctrine that he is expounding an internal structure, a sequence in the order of the mysteries, other than those of revelation and faith."³¹

²⁸. Cf. *Sent.* I d.2, *divisio textus*; it is also perhaps because of this that this vocabulary, although present in the *Sentences*, is no longer found in the *Summa*; T. F. O'Meara, "Grace as Theological Structure in the *Summa Theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas," *RTAM* 55 (1988) 130–53, who rightly recalls this, proposes to see in grace a reality present everywhere in the *Summa*—as a main thread—which gives it its properly theological form: in the first two parts and in each treatise there is a movement of *crescendo* that goes from *esse* to the life with God. We will see in our future book that we can (and that we must) admit this omnipresence of grace, without necessarily rejecting the movement from exit to return.

²⁹. Cf. *Sent.* II Prol.: "Theologus considerat creaturas secundum quod a primo principio exierunt et in finem ultimum ordinantur qui Deus est"; we will return in our future book to the key text from *Sent.* I d. 14 q.2 a2.

³⁰. *SCG* 19: "primo occurrit consideratio de his quae Deo secundum seipsum conveniunt: secundo vero, *de processu creaturarum ab ipso*; tertio autem, *de ordine creaturarum in ipsum sicut in finem*."

³¹. J. Tonneau, "Le passage de la Prima Secundae à la Secunda Secundae," *Bull. du Cercle Thomiste de Caen* (1975), no. 69, pp. 29–46, no. 70, pp. 21–31, after *RLT* 11 (1978), no. 655, p. 212.

The second confirmation has perhaps been a little neglected in this discussion; it stems from the fact that Thomas's thought is itself profoundly impregnated with this circular vision of the world, to such an extent that he does not hesitate to say that "the circular movement is the most perfect of all because it produces a return to the beginning. In order that the universe may attain to its final perfection, it must therefore return to its beginning."³² We can show that, philosophically, this occurs according to a triple plan:³³ first in cosmology, then in metaphysics, and finally in the philosophy of knowledge.

It suffices to refer to the beginning of the Commentary on the *Metaphysics* to see that Thomas well understands Aristotle's assertion that "all men by nature desire to know." It is only in this way that they may rejoin their origin, and it is in that origin that their perfection consists; that is why the circular movement is *perfectissimus*. Thomas develops this at length in his *Contra Gentiles* in explaining that man, the only being capable of an explicit *reditio completa* to its source through knowledge, finds his beatitude there.³⁴

All this clearly does not take on its full meaning except in a Christian vision of man and the world. That is why we find the most remarkable illustration of it in the theology of the Incarnation. In the epigraph to the Prologue, which precedes his commentary on the Third Book of the *Sentences*, Thomas cites the celebrated biblical verse on the rivers that return to their source: "Ad locum unde exeunt, flumina reuertuntur, ut iterum fluant" (Ecclesiastes 1:7). From that image of the eternal return Thomas does not conclude, as the biblical author did, that all things are vanity; he links it to an opposite view:

It is the mystery of the Incarnation that is signified by this return of the rivers to their source . . . These rivers are in effect the natural gifts which God has provided for his creatures: being, life, intelligence . . . and the source from which they come is God . . . Although they find themselves in a dispersed condition in all creation, these goods are regrouped in man, for he

³². *SCG* II 46, no. 1230: "motus circularis inter omnes motus, est maxime perfectus, quia in eis ad principium reditur. Ad hoc igitur quod universum creaturarum ultimam perfectionem consequatur, oportet creaturas ad suum redire principium."

³³. Cf. J. A. Aertsen, "The Circulation-Motive and Man in the Thought of Thomas Aquinas," in *L'homme et son univers au Moyen Age*, ed. Chr. Wenin (Louvain-La-Neuve, 1986), vol. I, pp. 432–39; idem., *Nature and Creature. Thomas Aquinas's Way of Thought*, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 21 (Leiden, 1988); idem., "Natur, Mensch und der Kreislauf der Dinge bei Thomas von Aquin," *MM* 21/2 (1991) 143–60.

³⁴. *Sent. super Metaphys.*, I, lect. 1, no. 4; cf. *SCG* III 25.

is a sort of horizon, the limit where bodily and spiritual nature meet; being a kind of center, he participates in the spiritual goods as in temporal goods. . . . That is why when human nature was reunited with God by the mystery of the Incarnation, all the rivers of natural goods returned to their source.³⁵

Placed thus in the exergue to an entire book, this explanation is certainly not an *obiter dictum*. Also, when we find it stated more briefly elsewhere, we can believe that it expresses an option to which Thomas has committed himself:

The totality of the divine work finds its culmination when man, the last creature created, returns to his source by a kind of circle, when through the work of the Incarnation he finds himself united to the very source of things itself.³⁶

It is a pity that Father Chenu did not have these texts in mind in his first essay, for they show with great clarity that in Thomas's thought not only does the Incarnation not introduce any disruption into the schema *exitus-reditus* but, on the contrary, it is only through the Incarnation that this movement achieves its fruition.

It would be unjust, however, not to repeat that Chenu's undeniable merit remains in his having brought to light this profound movement of the *Summa*, and precisely apropos of Christ and of the *Tertia Pars*: "Saint Thomas's plan manifests clearly that he remains a master over the Platonic scheme at the very moment when he uses it. The Word incarnate of the Christian is not the creator Logos of Plotinus's emanationism; the Word is the object of history, while Plotinus evokes time as a sort of stain and God's liberty as unintelligible imperfection. The paradoxical result is a theology that knows how to link within a feeling for the transcendence of God both the knowledge of necessity and respect for the contingencies of an eternally free love. The *Tertia Pars* is an expression of this result."³⁷

³⁵ *Sent. III Prol.*: "Et ideo quando humana natura per incarnationis mysterium Deo coniuncta est, omnia flumina naturalium bonitatum ad suum principium reflexa redierunt"; see on this text: I. Biffi, "Misteri di Cristo, sacramenti, escatologia nello Scriptum super Sententiis di san Tommaso d'Aquino," *La Scuola Cattol.* 102 (1974) 569–623, cf. pp. 578ff.

³⁶ *Compendium theol.* 201 (Leonine, vol. 42, p. 158): "Perficatur etiam per hoc quodam modo totius operis diuini uniuersitas, dum homo, qui est ultimo creatus, *circulo quodam in suum redit principium*, ipsi rerum principio per opus incarnationis unitus"; cf. also *Sent. III d.2 q. 1, a. 1 resp.*: "quia homo est ultima creaturarum, quasi ultimo creatus, cuius natura assumpta, ultimum *conjunctum est principio per modum circuli*, quae est figura peffecta . . ."

³⁷ *Toward*, p. 320.

Finally, Thomas thus returns to the well-known biblical theme of eschatology, which responds to protology, for only He has the mastery of the end Who has the mastery of the beginning. That intuition allows him to propose an *ordo disciplinae*, a manner of exposition for the whole of theology, thanks to which he was able to make a place for contingent truths in the history of salvation. He knew very well that theology is not a science of the necessary, in the way that Aristotle conceived it, but an organization of contingent data received from revelation, upon which the theologian labors to find the arrangement of God's design.³⁸ This constrains him to proceed most often by arguments of fitness rather than by necessary reasons, but he can thus give full place to the history of salvation. In fact, we meet in the *Summa* large chunks of biblical theology—such as the work of the six days (Ia QQ.67–74), the treatise on the Old Law (Ia IIae QQ.98–106), the life of Jesus (IIa QQ.27–59)—that would not find any place in a overly deductive conception of theology. (It is with regard to these that Cajetan made his celebrated statement: *Potius meditanda quam exponenda!*) But precisely because of his utilization of the *exitus-reditus* scheme, Thomas can integrate these biblical pieces with ease.

Theology, Life, and Prayer

The implications of Thomas's basic option cannot be drawn out very far here without trespassing into another book where we shall develop all this further. But at the risk of anticipating a little, we should already emphasize that this way of considering God as the beginning and the end of the theological enterprise has quite evident repercussions.

First, it has a profoundly unifying influence on theological knowledge itself. This thesis is clear from the very first pages of the *Summa* (*Prima Pars* q. 1 a.4); *sacra doctrina* is a knowledge that is both one and unique (*una scientia*) for, in it, everything is found considered from God's point of view. This is confirmed from the two points of view from which we can regard it, as speculative knowledge or as practical knowledge.

Regarding theology as speculative knowledge, Thomas emphasizes that God is the "subject" of his "science," since everything in this science is found to be treated from the point of view of God, whether God Himself,

³⁸. See on this in particular the beginning of *ST* Ia q. 1 a.8; IIIa q. 1 a. 3: "ea quae ex sola Dei voluntate proveniunt . . . nobis innotescere non possunt nisi quatenus in Sacra Scriptura tradantur"; we should also refer to an exposition of the "ostensive" function of theology, for example, Yves M.-J. Congar, "Théologie," in *DTC* 15/1 (1946) 451–62. J.-P. Torrell, *La théologie catholique*, Que sais-je? 1269 (Paris, 1994), pp. 56–60.

or the realities that come from God or that are ordered to Him.³⁹ This certainly does not prevent other realities from becoming objects of theological reflection, but they will be so only to the extent that the connection between origin and end is brought to light and its consequences evaluated in the always-clear consciousness of the first end, which requires the knowledge of God to be the only end of theology.

God, the "*subject* of theology," is certainly a technical expression. But without playing too much on the meaning of the word, it is also the spontaneous expression of a truth that should not be neglected: to speak of God as a subject is also to say that theology does not reduce Him to an object—not even to a purified mental object that the theologian can conceptualize. As subject, God is a person whom we know and love (because He has given Himself to be known and to be loved), a person whom we invoke and whom we meet in prayer. When Thomas says that theology is principally speculative, he means that it is in the first instance contemplative; the two words are practically synonymous in Thomas.⁴⁰ This is why—we shall not be slow to see this operative in Thomas's life—research, study, reflection on God can find their source and their completion only in prayer. The Eastern Christians like to say of theology that it is doxology; Thomas would add some further clarifications to that, but he would not reject the intention: the joy of the Friend who is contemplated is completed in song.

Considered as practical knowledge (that is, theology as it directs Christian action—what is commonly called *moral theology*), theology does not lose its contemplative aim (Ia q. 1 a.4). It is still and always directed by the consideration of God, since He is the End in view of which all decisions are made and the Good in connection with which all other goods are situated. To speak of God as beginning and as end is not a purely theoretical option; it concerns the entire Christian life. If God is the source of all being and of every being, he is also the accomplishment of all desires and of all actions (*finis omnium desideriorum et actionum nostrarum*, *ST* IIa IIae q.4 a.2 ad 3). We should not deceive ourselves. Thomas finds himself here closer to Augustine and his restless heart than to Freud and the infan-

³⁹. "Omnia autem pertractantur in sacra doctrina sub ratione Dei, vel quia sunt ipse Deus, vel quia habent ordinem ad Deum, ut ad principium et finem. Unde sequitur quod Deus vere sit subiectum huius scientiae" (Ia q. 1 a. 7).

⁴⁰. Cf. S. Pinckaers, "Recherche de la signification véritable du terme 'Spéculatif,'" *NRT* 81 (1959) 673–95; J.-P. Torrell, "Théologie et sainteté," *RT* 71 (1971) 205–21, on the contemplative finality of theology, see pp. 206–12.

tile megalomania of desire. Thomas knows that the natural desire to see God cannot be vain, for it is God Himself who has put it in the human heart.

The upshot of all the preceding is that it is impossible, according to Thomas, to do theology independent from faith. Only faith permits us to receive the God who gives Himself and reveals Himself; faith is therefore the only thing able to give a real object to this knowledge. It is also the *lumen sub quo*—which is to say, the formal point of view under which everything is seen. This is also true for theology in its practical function: just as the speculative intellect becomes practical by extension, so faith would not know how to be itself if it did not act in charity. That is why we do not know in this perspective how to practice an ethic outside of the directing light of faith and its ecclesial context without reducing it to a purely philosophical enterprise.

This is not our direct purpose here, but it is not without value to say in concluding this presentation of the *Summa* that to imagine that this innovative project was accepted with enthusiasm, even by the Dominican confreres of our author, would be an error. For a long time, the *Sentences* were preferred to the *Summa*—not only because of university obligations—and in the *Summa* itself, the "special" moral part—better known under the name of *Secunda Secundae*—was far more widely diffused than the dogmatic parts.⁴¹

Even though it is to be regretted, the historian must declare that Thomas's masterwork did not itself directly reach a very large public. Its options in questions of moral theology would be circulated much better by some vulgarizers, such as John of Freiburg in his *Summa Confessorum* (1298), which was largely inspired by Thomas, and which, by that very fact, differs in inspiration from the manuals that preceded Thomas. By around 1290, the master of the order, John of Vercelli, had directed Galien de Orto, lector in the priory of Perugia, later in Viterbo, to make a summary of the *Secunda Secundae*. In the course of the fourteenth century, other manuals of the same type saw the light. These too were much better distributed than the *Summa* itself: the summary of John of Freiburg himself by William of Cayeux-sur-Mer, who was the prior at Saint-Jacques and vicargeneral of the order a little after 1300; the simplified version of the *Summa*

⁴¹ See here again Boyle, *The Setting*, pp. 23–30.

rudium, around 1333; the alphabetically ordered summary under the name of *Pisanella*, after the name of its compiler, Bartholomew of Pisa, around 1338 (600 manuscripts).⁴²

This was not at all the type of success that Thomas would have wished; it was perhaps in this way, however, that he slowly became, not without misunderstandings, the "common doctor."⁴³

⁴². Cf. L. Boyle, "The *Summa confessorum* of John of Freiburg and the Popularization of the Moral Teaching of St. Thomas and of Some of His Contemporaries," in *Commemorative Studies II*, pp. 245–68, reprinted in *Pastoral Care*, Study 3.

⁴³. An addendum to note 28 above: See also the more ample discussion of Thomas O'Meara's point of view by R. Cessario, "Is Aquinas's *Summa* only about Grace?" in *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 197–209.

Chapter IX— The Other Writings from the Roman Period

Viewed from a distance, it would seem that the composition of the *Summa* must have taken up all of Thomas's energy and free time. In reality, it was far from being his only occupation. We only have to turn, for instance, to the *Catena aurea*; Thomas still had to finish it (Luke and John remained to be written). He also would have to dedicate himself to the students who had been entrusted to him. His first task was therefore their instruction. He was also occupied with a certain number of other writings.

As to the teaching, it is rather difficult to form an exact idea of what Thomas actually did. If he had indeed given *alia lectura* on the First Book of the *Sentences*, that means that he did not refuse (at least at first) to play the role of a bachelor of *Sentences* again for his students. We can allow that this would have taken up the first year of the Roman period (1265–66). But it is precisely here that we find the major difficulty that prevents us from fully pursuing Boyle's suggestion about Thomas's possibly teaching the *Prima Pars* to his Roman students. Given that the first book of the *Sentences* and the *Prima Pars* have exactly the same subject, it is difficult to see Thomas teaching the same material over two successive years to the same students.

Therefore, though we might accept that he gave a new course on the *Sentences*, since the lector did not have the same obligations as the master (although Tolomeo's text on the *alia lectura* does not say *legit*, but indeed

scripsit, and although this revision could only have been made in writing), it is less certain that the *Summa* itself became the subject of teaching. Nothing would have prevented Thomas from also fulfilling his responsibilities as a *magister in sacra pagina*. He may have returned to a mode of teaching with his Roman students that was rather close to what he had already used in Paris: offering close commentary on a book of Scripture (we do not know which one), as well as sessions—if not daily, at least frequent—of disputed questions.

The De Potentia "cum annexis"

The disputed questions *De potentia* are precisely situated in this period. To the series of indications that the scholars have made available to us that favor the Roman period, Martin Grabmann has added a manuscript from the end of the thirteenth century or the beginning of the fourteenth century, which clearly specifies: *Questiones fratris T. de aquino quas disputavit rome*.¹ If the frequency of disputations was the same in Rome as in Paris, the 83 articles of this work would correspond to one year's teaching. But we may doubt this if we think about the *rudes* who made up Thomas's audience at the time. We may therefore imagine a somewhat slower pace, which would have permitted him to fit two other series of disputed questions into the three years of this Roman sojourn: the question *De anima* (21 articles) and the question *De spiritualibus creaturis* (11 articles) in addition to diverse opuscula. Though we cannot examine all these at length, we must try at least to situate these works in that time and say a few words about the most important of them.

In a pioneering article,² Father Glorieux once proposed situating the question *De anima* at a time a little later, during the second Parisian sojourn (1269). He was then followed thirty years later by James Robb, an earlier editor of this text.³ Today, the scholars seem to agree in dating this

¹ Ms. *Subiaco*, *Bibl. de l'abbaye 211*, f. 175r, in Grabmann, *Werke*, p. 306.

² P. Glorieux, "Les Questions disputées de S. Thomas et leur suite chronologique," *RTAM* 4 (1932) 5–33; we note that Glorieux's suggestions (followed by Grabmann, etc.), proposing to distribute the *De potentia* and other questions between Rome and Viterbo, lose all their cogency the minute we acknowledge that Thomas never resided at Viterbo.

³ J. H. Robb, ed., *St. Thomas Aquinas. Quaestiones De anima*, A newly established Edition of the Latin Text with an Introduction and Notes (Toronto, 1968), pp. 27–37. Using the same old documentation, the author persists in this position, cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, O.P., *Questions on the Soul [Quaestiones de Anima]*, trans. with intro. by J. H. Robb (Milwaukee, 1984). Although we cannot follow him on this point, we can profit from his introduction about the contents of this disputed question.

Question to the Roman period. Thus the very elaborated researches of Bernardo Bazán, editor of the text for the Leonine Commission, allow us to situate the disputation of these questions during the year 1265–66 and their publication in Italy a little bit later. This corresponds perfectly to Gauthier's suggestion that we consider this question a "preparatory exercise" to the composition of Questions 75 through 89 of the *Prima Pars*, which itself dates from this epoch.⁴ Bazán also proposes placing the Question *De spiritualibus creaturis* between November 1267 and September 1268 (Thomas having done, in the meantime, the commentary on Aristotle's *De anima*). This also corresponds to a similar remark by Gauthier, who had noted that "the question *De spiritualibus creaturis* is clearly more attentive to an exact usage of the *Novus*."⁵ That judgment is entirely confirmed by Bazán, who bases it on the study of the use of other translations of Aristotle. As to the publication of the *De spiritualibus creaturis*, it did not occur until the return to Paris.

We would emphasize with Bazán that, as sometimes happens, Tolomeo is relatively trustworthy here, since he places the two disputes in Italy, the first a little too early without doubt (between 1261 and 1264, under Urban IV), the second at a more exact date (between 1265 and 1268, under Clement IV), but relatively right in their chronology.⁶ By contrast, it is less certain that we ought to follow Tolomeo when he also places during this period in Rome the *De malo* (101 articles) and the *De uirtutibus* (36 articles), for Thomas's program would then have been too full. This is a question that we will examine further on.

Insofar as it is possible to discern a plan in the course of the *De potentia*, it seems that we can distinguish the first six questions from the last four.⁷ The first six in effect are grouped around the theme *De potentia*: (1) God's

⁴ B. Bazán, Introduction to Leonine, vol. 24 (forthcoming); Gauthier, *Quelques questions*, pp. 452–53, note 44 bis.; we note here the incisive comment concerning the question *De anima*: "doubtless too long to have been really [orally] disputed"; we have seen above (chap. IV) that we must consider this hypothesis.

⁵ Gauthier, *Quelques questions*, pp. 452–53; this is also not very distant from the dating of Glorieux (and others) who proposed: Viterbo, September to November 1268. We almost certainly must now say "Rome" and move up the date by several months, since Thomas left Italy around September. Until the text of the Leonine edition appears, cf. L. W. Keeler, ed., *S. Thomae Aquinatis. Tractatus De spiritualibus creaturis* (Rome, 1937); cf. the translation by M. C. Fitzpatrick, *On Spiritual Creatures* (Milwaukee, 1949).

⁶ Tolomeo XXII 38–39 (ed. A. Dondaine, p. 151): "Fecit etiam tunc temporis (scil. Clementis IV) questiones de spiritualibus creaturis, *de malo et de uirtutibus*."

⁷ Cf. M. Bouyges, "L'idée génératrice du *De potentia* de S. Thomas," *Rev. de Phil.* 31 (1931) 113–31; 246–68; with the discussion of A. Dondaine in *BT* 4 (1934–1936), no. 196, pp. 140–42.

power in general; (2) the generative power of God; (3) His creative power;

(4) creation of matter; (5) the conservation of created things in being; (6) on the miraculous. The last four questions belong by contrast to Trinitarian theology: (7) the simplicity of the divine essence; (8) the relations within God; (9) the divine persons; (10) the procession of the divine persons. This simple description clearly suggests that the *De potentia* shows something analogous to what we found for the *De ueritate*: the title of the first question served to designate the whole series without being exactly applicable to each and every element.⁸

The connection between the *De ueritate* and the *De potentia* suggests itself for more than one reason: not only is there a series of questions disputed in both cases, but we are dealing with great texts by the Master. His disciples are happy to emphasize their metaphysical profundity and they consider them a highly important link in the evolution of his thought.⁹ Though not entirely unfounded, this kind of commentary leads to an inflationary spiral of praise, which immediately loses all credibility. It is simpler and truer to say that we cannot talk about certain points in the Thomist theology of creation or of divine government without recourse to the elucidations of these questions here, for they indeed are their heart.

It suffices to run through the titles to understand that reflection on the creation occupies a quite central place in the *De potentia*, where it appears at the heart of Thomas's work. He is certainly not the only Christian thinker to have developed a creationist view of the universe following the book of Genesis, but he has probably done it with the greatest rigor, not only in dealing with questions relative to the beginning of the world or to its eternity, but even more perhaps in unfolding all the implications that stem from the biblical teaching. To say that the world is created signifies that it is entirely, in each and every element, in a relationship of total dependence on God: everything that is, is from God, God giving to each existing thing not only being, but being what it is, and the power of acting according to the nature He has given it.

The originality of this thought—already present in the *Contra Gentiles* and to be found again in the *Summa theologiae*—is that this total depen-

⁸ The ancient catalogues are more exact in mentioning specifically: "De potentia Dei *et ultra*" (Prague Catalogue, in Grabmann, *Werke*, p. 92); or see: "De potentia Dei *cum annexis*" [*Ms. Vat. Borghese 120*, quoted in *BT 4* (1934–36) 142].

⁹ So Weisheipl, p. 200: "in fact, *De potentia* is chronologically and speculatively the immediate predecessor of the first part of the theological *Summa*."

dence is accompanied by an equally total autonomy, since God respects the proper constitution of each creature and allows it to act according to its own laws. This is not the place to develop further this Thomist theology of creation, but we should know that it contributes to the Thomistically inspired spirituality one of its clearest characteristics. It has been profoundly remarked that if we had to designate Thomas by a religious name, we could call him "Thomas *a Creatore*." Thus, we would express one of the most profound intuitions about his vision of the world.¹⁰

The Compendium theologiae

We should also speak more fully about the *Compendium theologiae*, written at the request of Brother Reginald, apparently during this period. Scholarly opinion has wavered for a long time over its date: after many different views, Mandonnet and Grabmann finally settled on the years 1272–73, dates suggested to them by the work's incompleteness; Thomas's death would have interrupted its composition. For Chenu, Motte, H. Dondaine, Perrier, and finally Gauthier, the resemblance of certain chapters in the *Compendium* to the *Contra Gentiles* is so striking that we should regard them as parallel compositions. More probably, the *Compendium* was done a little after the *Contra Gentiles*, which is to say, as we now know, in the years 1265–1267.¹¹

In any case, H. Dondaine takes up a suggestion by Perrier, further worked out by F. Van Steenberghen, according to which we should distinguish between the two parts of the *Compendium*: the first (*De fide*: 246 chapters) indeed goes back to this period; the second (*De spe*), interrupted immediately after the beginning of chapter X, may be from a later period. Other occupations would have forced Thomas to suspend his composition after the *De fide*; only after his return to Naples in 1272 would he have been able to return to it, again at the request of Brother Reginald. In effect,

¹⁰ G. K. Chesterton, *Saint Thomas Aquinas*, in *Collected Works*, vol. 2 (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986), p. 129; cf. J. Pieper, "Kreatürlichkeit. Bemerkungen über die Elemente eines Grundbegriffs," in L. Oeing-Hanhoff, ed., *Thomas von Aquin, 1274/1974* (Munich, 1974), p. 47. A good analysis of Q. 3 can be found in Weisheipl, pp. 200–211; in French perhaps one of the best works remains A.-D. Sertillanges, *L'idée de création et ses retentissements en philosophie* (Paris, 1945). So far as we know, there does not exist a French translation of *De potentia*, but there is an English one: *On the Power of God (Questiones Disputae De Potentia Dei)*, literally trans. by the English Dominican Fathers, 3 vols. (London, 1932–34); in Italian, *La potenza di Dio Quaestiones disputatae De Potentia Dei I–III*, ed. A. Campodonico, introd. by L. Tuninetti (Florence, 1991).

¹¹ Cf. above chap. 6; detailed references to the various essays mentioned here can be found in the introduction by H.-F. Dondaine, *Leonine*, vol. 42, p. 8.

illness and death would have prevented him from completing this work. This conjectural hypothesis about the end of the opusculum might indeed correspond to the reality, but we must not overlook the first proposition: that the date of the *Compendium* in its first part (the *De fide*) is slightly later than that of the *Contra Gentiles* makes the *Compendium* probably contemporary with the *De potentia*.¹²

Rather improperly classified among the "opuscula," this work—"little" only in comparison with Thomas's great works (though unfinished, it takes up 125 pages in the Leonine edition)—is without doubt too little known. We discover here an unusual Thomas (certain people would even speak of a style Bonaventurian rather than Thomasian in the *De spe*). He is careful to be simple and brief; his short chapters rarely take up more than a column and frequently only a half column (even though chapter II 9 goes on for 12!). Thomas thus very honorably takes his place in the series of "abbreviators" of Christian doctrine who have not ceased to mark the centuries.

A comparison with Saint Augustine's *Enchiridion* suggests itself; doubtless, Thomas borrows from Augustine the idea of building his work on the three theological virtues. Also like Augustine, Thomas develops what concerns faith in its relation to the articles of the Creed; those on hope based on the petitions in the "Our Father"; the part on charity takes the Decalogue for a framework. This plan is rather natural to him: the *De articulis fidei*, too, follows the order of the *Credo*, and he uses the same distribution with the three great series of sermons on the *Credo*, the *Pater*, and the *Decem precepta*. We grasp here doubtless one of the spontaneous orientations of Thomas's pastoral theology.

There is also a kind of personal touch here that we should not fail to notice, for we can add to Thomas's spiritual portrait. He gives the title of nobility once and for all to the popularizer's task by explicitly putting his proposed brevity under the patronage of the kenosis of the divine Word, Who contracted His immensity to the limits of our smallness and placed

¹². See the English translations, one by L. Lynch (New York: McMullen, 1947), the other by C. Vollert, *Compendium of Theology* (St. Louis University, 1947; St. Louis: B. Herder, 1952). There are two French translations of the *Compendium*: the first was made in the nineteenth century from the text of the Vivès edition, by the abbé Vêdrine, "Vrin-Reprise" (Paris, 1984); the second is the work of J. Kreit, *Thomas d'Aquin. Bref résumé de la foi chrétienne*, Docteur Angélique 6 (Paris, 1985); this however was not done from the critical Leonine edition text and we should mention that the missing part has been "completed" with various texts borrowed from Saint Thomas but originating in diverse periods.

within our reach in a brief "Summa" the entire breadth of doctrine in the books of the Bible.¹³ This is the familiar theme of the *uerbum abbreviatum*, the "brief word," spoken by the Lord to the universe, which Thomas borrows from Saint Paul.¹⁴ In fact, he continues, salvation for mankind consists in three things: to know the truth, which is entirely contained in the articles of the Creed; to pursue a just end (*intentio debiti finis*), which the Lord taught us in the petition of the *Pater*; finally, to observe justice, which is summed up in the single commandment of charity. Saint Paul signifies this in his way by teaching that perfection in this life consists in the observation of the "three things that remain"; Saint Augustine says in his own way that through these three virtues God is truly honored.¹⁵

With this pronouncement, the general plan is entirely traced out. He can only follow the three virtues in their traditional order, "for love would not be right [*rectus*] if the true end had not first been fixed by hope, and that is not possible without knowing the truth."¹⁶ Thomas therefore can conclude in an observation to his reader: "You must first have faith in order to know truth; then hope, in order to fix your love on a true end; and finally charity, by which your love will be totally rectified."¹⁷

As to the internal order of the exposition on the faith, the author is not very prolix. Two large parts nevertheless can be discerned: the first deals with the *diuinitas Trinitatis* (chaps. 3–184). Its plan is rather systematic: first the unity of essence, then the trinity of persons, finally the effects of the divinity.¹⁸ The second part develops that which pertains to Christ's humanity (chaps. 185–246); its plan is closer to the articles of faith and therefore to the history of salvation. It begins therefore with recalling original sin and closes with the last judgment. The two ultimate terms will be the same in the *Summa*, but we do not feel in reading the *Compendium* the clearly perceptible difference that we see in the *Tertia Pars* between

¹³ Chap. 1, beginning: "Eterni Patris Verbum sua immensitate universa comprehendens . . . breue fieri voluit nostra breuitate assumpta . . . propter occupatos sub breui summa humane salutis doctrinam conclusit."

¹⁴ Cf. Romans 9:28; we encounter the same quotation beginning with the homilies on the Ten Commandments: Manifestly, not everyone can pass his time in laborious study. Thus Christ has given us a law whose brevity makes it accessible to everyone and, thus, no one has the right to be ignorant of it: such is the law of divine love; that "brief Word that the Lord spoke to the Universe" (*Collationes* II, p. 26); cf. Torrell, *La pratique*, p. 235.

¹⁵ Cf. 1 Cor. 13:13; *Enchiridion*, chap. 3 (BA 9, p. 204).

¹⁶ Chap. 1: "Non enim amor rectus esse potest nisi primo debitus finis spei statuatur, nec hoc esse potest si veritatis cognitio desit."

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Cf. the conclusion of chap. 2.

speculative Christology and what is usually called "the life of Jesus." Briefer and simpler, the *Compendium* at first sight appears better unified, and the result is undeniably seductive.¹⁹

Expert Opinions on Some Contemporary Questions

We can also situate in this period the first of the doctrinal consultations requested from Thomas by John of Vercelli, who directed the Dominican Order from 1264 to 1283. In the text known under the title *Responsio de 108 articulis*, Thomas gives his opinion as a theological expert on certain points of the teaching of his confrere Peter of Tarentaise. Before becoming pope, Peter, the future Innocent V, had divided his time between teaching in Paris and directing the Dominican province of France.²⁰ Given his prominence, the dossier accusing him wound up in the hands of the master of the order.

We can hardly specify the date further than the general framework of the Roman sojourn. H. Dondaine repeats without questioning further the dates proposed by Mandonnet: 1265–1266; or by Martin: 1265–1267. We know nothing more of the identity of the person who had been disturbed about Peter of Tarentaise's orthodoxy; the attack may have come from outside, but it is not impossible that it came from a Dominican. In any case, Thomas is not very easy on the accuser (whom he calls the *obiciens*): "He has not understood the passage, he has understood askew; a number of his attacks are unjust; his objection does not stand, the major allegation is false, and another shows a profound ignorance. What is even worse, several of the extracts that he attacks are altered by tendentious omission or addition."²¹ We understand even better the sharpness of his reaction, because certain criticisms also touched Thomas himself directly.²² This is indeed the same man whom we encountered in the quarrel several years earlier between the mendicants and the seculars.

In order not to have to return to them, let us mention here the other two

¹⁹ Cf. P. Glorieux, "La Christologie du *Compendium theologiae*," *Sc. ecclés.* 13 (1961) 7–34; for the problems posed by overlapping of the two kinds of development, of. Gh. Lafont, *Structures et méthode*, pp. 124–31; same author's, "Simbolo degli Apostoli e metodo teologico: il *Compendium theologiae* di San Tommaso," *La Scuola Cattolica* 102 (1974) 557–68.

²⁰ Cf. above, the beginning of chap. VI.

²¹ Summed up by H.-F. Dondaine, *Préface*, Leonine, vol. 42, p. 264, from whom we borrow many other details; the text is found pp. 279–94.

²² This matter has been well established by A. Dondaine, "Saint Thomas et la dispute des attributs divins (*I Sent.*, d.2, a.3)," *AFP* 8 (1938) 253–62; by the same author, "Saint Thomas a-t-il disputé à Rome la question des attributs divins?" *BT* 3 (1930–33) 171–82.

doctrinal consultations that John of Vercelli requested from Saint Thomas. The first is the *De forma absolutionis*, probably dated 22 February 1269; this is an examination of an anonymous pamphlet whose author is disturbed at seeing an indicative formula of the sacrament of penance expanding within the order: "Ego te absolvo." Thomas's doctrine of the instrumentality of the minister in this sacrament makes it easy for him to respond to the difficulties raised in the name of the deprecativ formula.²³

The second of these doctrinal consultations for John of Vercelli, the *Responsio de 43 articulis*, is very well dated to Holy Thursday, 2 April 1271 (Thomas received a letter from his superior on the vigil during the High Mass). The story unfolds within a highly interesting context.²⁴ Again, some points of doctrine are under discussion, but here cosmological problems occupy an important place (the action of the celestial bodies on terrestrial phenomena, action of the angels in this domain, the location of hell, etc.). Since the master of the order addressed himself at the same time to two other members of the order, Albertus Magnus and Robert Kilwardby, and their responses have been preserved, we can reconstruct with great exactitude the text of the incriminated articles, and simultaneously make some interesting comparisons about the respective ways the three masters approached these problems.²⁵

For Thomas, this consultation for John of Vercelli had been preceded by another on the same subjects by the lector of the priory in Venice, Baxianus de Lodi. It is thus that we have a first *Responsio de 30 articulis*, addressed to the lector of Venice, of which 27 are found, more or less literally, in the 43 responses to John of Vercelli. But by an amusing circumstance that says a great deal about the climate of intellectual emulation at Venice, Baxianus's students wrote in turn to Thomas to submit some

²³. Compare the edition of the text and the Preface by H.-F. Dondaine in Leonine, vol. 40, pp. C 1–47; L. Ott, "Das Opusculum des hl. Thomas von Aquin 'De forma absolutionis' in dogmengeschichtlicher Betrachtung," in *Festschrift Eichmann* (Paderborn, 1940), pp. 99–135.

²⁴. Cf. here again the edition of the text in the Preface by H.-F. Dondaine, Leonine, vol. 42, pp. 295–346.

²⁵. For Kilwardby's response, see M.-D. Chenu, "Les réponses de S. Thomas et de Kilwardby à la consultation de Jean de Verceil (1271)," in *Mélanges P. Mandonnet*, vol. 1 (Bibl. Thom. 13) (Paris, 1950), pp. 191–221, and his complete text in H.-F. Dondaine, "Le *De 43 quaestionibus* de Robert Kilwardby," *AFP* 47 (1977) 5–50; for Albert, D. A. Callus, "Une oeuvre récemment découverte de S. Albert le Grand: *De XLIII problematibus ad Magistrum Ordinis* (1271)," and his text in J. A. Weisheipl, "The *Problemata determinata XLIII* ascribed to Albertus Magnus (1271)," *MS* 22 (1960) 303–54 [second ed. corrected by the same author in *Alberti Magni Opera omnia*, ed. Coloniensis, vol. 17/1 (Münster, 1975), pp. 45–64]. Numerous editions mention only 42 articles for Saint Thomas; it is important to correct this error.

supplementary difficulties. He then redid his own copy recasting four articles into two, and then adding five new ones, some arising from the response to John of Vercelli that had come in the meantime. Thus, the thirty articles from the earlier *Responsio* addressed to Venice become thirty-six in the second.²⁶

As to the substance of these matters, a comparison of Thomas's response with those from the other two masters permits us to see that he does not engage the cosmological questions. While Kilwardby and Albert do not hesitate to do so, Thomas protests from the outset that the faith is not engaged in that material: "A number of these articles pertain more to philosophy than to faith. We do a great disservice to the *doctrina pietatis*, when we affirm or we reprove in its name things that do not belong to it as if they were related to *sacra doctrina*."²⁷ He also does not see how the way of interpreting Aristotle relates to the doctrine of the faith.²⁸ Whether hell is at the center of the earth or elsewhere, that does not concern faith; and for the rest, it is useless to worry about this type of question.²⁹ Without spending more time on this, we should remark that Thomas rigorously observes the same attitude in his *Responsio ad lectorem Bisuntinum de 6 articulis*.³⁰

The De regno ad regem Cypri

The problems posed by the *De regno ad regem Cypri* are relatively complicated. Simplifying questions about the addressee: theoretically we might choose between three contemporary kings of Cyprus. But a single name seems to fit with all the relevant data, Hugh II of Lusignan (1253–67). His premature death may have been the cause of the incompleteness of the work. This was the position of Echard, accepted by Mandonnet, which permitted them to situate the opusculum around 1267. Eschmann's efforts (followed by Weisheipl) tried to move up the *terminus ante quem* to 1265,

²⁶. These two texts have also both been edited by Father Dondaine (ibid.), to whom we also owe a debt for having so well disentangled their interspersed connections.

²⁷. *Resp. de 43 art.*, introductory considerations, Leonine, vol. 42, p. 327, II. 21–29; Thomas will repeat at the end of his letter that obedience constrained him to respond to some subjects that went beyond the limits of the theology faculty (*quamvis plures eorum sint prefer limites theologice facultatis*), creating an obligation for him that his profession did not at all require: "ex uestra iniunctione factum est michi debitum quod proprii officii professio nullatenus requirebat."

²⁸. Ibid., art. 34, p. 333.

²⁹. Ibid., art. 32, p. 333.

³⁰. Leonine, vol. 42, pp. 349–56; H.-F. Dondaine allies himself with the proposal to date this writing to 1271; for its content, cf. Torrell, *La pratique*, pp. 224–25.

which does not seem acceptable today because the commentary on the *Ethics* that it uses is clearly later (1271). If that were the case, we would have to posit another addressee: Hugh III of Antioch-Lusignan (1257–84), whom Echard discarded, since he thought it unlikely that Thomas would have dedicated his work to Charles of Anjou's direct rival for the crown of Jerusalem. While we wait for future works that may bring us some new light on this subject, we must therefore here register a margin of uncertainty, which the Leonine editor also notes, following the indications of M. Grabmann.³¹

Without entering too deeply into these questions, we should remember here that the incomplete state of the work stimulated the zeal of Tolomeo of Lucca, who bestowed on it 62 supplementary chapters, with a view to making it correspond to the four books it announces. Thus for two centuries, from the invention of printing until Echard, who detected the intervention of a foreign hand, the Thomistic authenticity of this opusculum was frequently questioned because of historical inexactitudes and the doctrinal weakness of its chapters. These doubts still persisted not long ago, for such a scholar as Eschmann seriously questioned the authenticity of the work.³² Since the work of the Leonine Commission, this doubt is no longer in vogue, but it is important to know that Thomas's legacy in this work stops in the middle of chapter II 8 (formerly II 4).

According to the author's own words, he wanted to compose a work dealing with royalty, in which he would explain "the origin of royalty and what pertains to the duties of the king, according to the authority of sacred Scripture, and separating carefully the teaching of the philosophers and the example of the most highly praised princes" (Prol.). But we find that the content hardly corresponds to what Thomas says elsewhere concerning the best form of government. He usually recommends a mixed government, where the king collaborates with an aristocracy chosen by the whole people; here he recommends an absolute monarchy. We perhaps must see the reason for this in that he knew the special situation in Cyprus during the time he was writing. But we must also emphasize the incompleteness of the work, and that the author could not have reviewed it.

We cannot say much more about this without entering into developments that do not have their place here, but the reader will understand that it would be a bad methodology to permit oneself on the basis of this

³¹. Cf. H.-F. Dondaine, *Leonine*, vol. 42, pp. 424–25.

³². Cf. Weisheipl, p. 213, note 6, and see above, chap. I, notes 65 and 67.

text alone-as has been sometimes done-to build up a political system *ad mentem sancti Thomae*. Father Chenu once said it quite well: "The *De Regno* is a pedagogical and moral treatise for the use of a prince, not an organic work of political theory."³³ In response to the indiscreet commentators who would try to use this text in a unilateral fashion, it is useful to reproduce H. Dondaine's warning here: "Incomplete, perhaps of checkered background . . . this opusculum presents itself under some rather difficult conditions; those conditions call for prudence and discretion in recourse to the text as an expression of the thought of its author."³⁴

The Sententia Libri De anima

Before leaving this Roman sojourn, we must mention one other activity of Thomas's. To all his numerous occupations, he found a way to add still one more, apparently disinterested, but which required considerable labor from him in the years to come: commenting on Aristotle. As G. Verbeke once showed, it is at the end of the Roman period that we must situate the commentary on the *De anima*.³⁵ At the time when Thomas wrote it, he knew Themistius's paraphrase of this treatise. Now, William of Moerbeke did not complete the translation until 22 November 1267; Verbeke concludes from this that the entire commentary was after that date, but he believed we should push the *terminus ante quem* of this work to 1270. Thus, only the first book would date from the Roman period (in fact, he thought it was from Viterbo); Thomas's sojourn having been sharply curtailed, he would have had to finish books II and III in Paris.

Father Gauthier's more recent work confirms these initial results, but he also completes and corrects them.³⁶ He emphasizes that this is the first time Thomas uses the *Translatio noua*, which is to say the revision that

³³. *BT* II (1927–1929), no. 297, p. [334].

³⁴. Leonine, vol. 42, p. 424; the text is found on pp. 449–71. In English there is *On Kingship*, trans. G. B. Phelan and I. T. Eshmann (Toronto: PIMS, 1949). The French translation by M.-M. Cottier, *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, du Royaume. De Regno* (Paris, 1946), is from earlier than the critical edition; we mention also the translation by Cl. Roguet, *Du gouvernement royal* (Paris, 1931), with a preface by Charles Journet. In addition to the works mentioned in chapter I, notes 64 and 66, we mention also: L. Génicot, "Le *De Regno*: spéculation ou réalisme?" in *Aquinas and Problems of His Time*, pp. 3–17; W. Mohr, "Bemerkungen zur Verfasserschaft von *De regimine principum*," in *Virtus Politica*, Festgabe . . . A. Hufnagel, ed. J. Möller and H. Kohlenberger (Stuttgart, 1974), pp. 127–45, but these two works are prior to the Leonine edition.

³⁵. G. Verbeke, "Les sources et la chronologie du Commentaire de S. Thomas d'Aquin au *De anima* d'Aristote," *RPL* 45 (1947) 314–38; by the same author, "Note sur la date du Commentaire de S. Thomas au *De anima* d'Aristote," *RPL* 50 (1952) 56–63.

³⁶. R.-A. Gauthier, *Préface à Sentencia Libri De Anima*, Leonine, vol. 45/1, pp. 283*–88*, notably.

William did of the *Translatio uetus* of the *De anima*. While Thomas still did not know the latter when he was writing his *Summa contra Gentiles*, he shows a firsthand knowledge of the *Noua* (although in a deficient text) in the works that appear around 1268, which is to say, in addition to the *Sententia Libri De anima*, the *Prima Pars*, and the Questions *De anima* and *De spiritualibus creaturis*.

To all appearances, William executed in parallel a revision of the *Translatio uetus* of the *De anima* and a translation of Themistius's paraphrase. Thus, before the close of 1267 Thomas could have made use of this new material, and it may indeed be this that would have awakened in him his vocation as a commentator. He must have performed the task vigorously, since this commentary was published in Italy before September 1268 (his departure for Paris); numerous manuscripts attest to its diffusion after that date and—a notable fact—we are dealing with the three Books in their entirety.³⁷

We cannot exaggerate the importance of this last fact in the manuscript tradition; it reduces to nought many other previous hypotheses. First, it affects Verbeke's theory about the completion of the *De anima* at Paris, but also M. De Corte's.³⁸ The latter, who first discovered that Thomas was quoting Themistius literally in his commentary, had also been struck by the clearly perceptible difference in the nature of the commentary between the first book on the one hand and the two latter books on the other hand: the first was more technical, the two others more doctrinal. To account for this, De Corte thought that Thomas had taught the *De anima* twice: first in Italy before 1268, and that we have only Books II and III from that period. According to De Corte, the Second time Thomas taught *De anima* would have been at Paris, from which we would have only Book I, in the *reportatio* of Brother Reginald. The publication of three books in Italy after 1268, therefore, seems to dispute the validity of this hypothesis, but even more, we know today that the commentaries on Aristotle were never the subject of Thomas's oral teaching. The difference in question is explained therefore simply by the character of Aristotle's books.³⁹

³⁷ Cf., *ibid.*, pp. 285*–86*.

³⁸ M. De Corte, "Themistius et saint Thomas Aquin," *AHDLM* 7 (1932) 47–83.

³⁹ See on this subject the full explanations by Gauthier, Leon., vol. 45/1, pp. 275*–82*; we can hardly enter here into the content of the *De anima*; see the English translation by K. Foster and S. Humphries, *Aristotle's De Anima with the Commentary of St. Thomas Aquinas* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951); there is no French translation, but we can refer the reader to an Italian version: Tommaso d'Aquino, *Commentario al "De Anima"*, translation, in-

(footnote continued on next page)

Let us add in passing, for it is appropriate here, that Verbeke's and De Corte's hypotheses hold up very well for the *De sensu et sensato*. It was always thought that Thomas had commented on this little book in the course of the *De anima*, since it is the natural extension of the latter. Ever since Father Gauthier noticed that Thomas refers here to his own commentary on the *De anima*, we have been able to consider the later composition of *De sensu et sensato* as an established fact. There is another new element here: the *De sensu* was not diffused in Italy at the same time as the three books of the *De anima*. We only have a Paris university copy. We must conclude from this that, although this commentary may have been begun in Rome before September 1268, it was completed in Paris, sometime in 1269 (before 1270 in any case, the date of the *De unitate intellectus*).⁴⁰

We will have to return later to Thomas's work as a commentator on Aristotle. But we should say here at least a few words on the meaning of the new role he began to fulfill from this date; we may thus add a decisive touch to his intellectual and spiritual portrait. From the first, we find here much intellectual curiosity and flexibility, to which Thomas had already given witness with regard to the Greek heritage of Christianity. After all, he already knew the *De anima* in the *Translatio uetus* and nothing prevented his continuing to use this text, which he had so long considered a good one. But on the contrary, he questions his knowledge—and rightly so for the first book—by systematically consulting Themistius's paraphrase—in the most radical fashion.

But, since he did not have to teach Aristotle and he had so many other tasks in hand, why did Thomas take up this new burden? If we follow Gauthier, the answer is simple and convincing: Thomas was composing Questions 75–89 of the *Prima Pars* at the time, and the questions *De anima* and *De spiritualibus creaturis* at almost the same time. All his thinking being then concentrated on problems of the soul, the appearance of Moerbeke's translation was an invitation to deepen his knowledge

(footnote continued from previous page)

troductory study, and notes by A. Caparelli, 2 vols. (Rome, 1975). See also L. Elders, "Le commentaire de saint Thomas d'Aquin sur le *De anima* d'Aristote," in the same author's *Autour de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, vol. I (Paris-Brussels, 1987), pp. 55–76.

⁴⁰ R.-A. Gauthier, ed., *Sentencia libri De sensu et sensato*, Leon., vol. 45/2; we know that this book consists of two treatises: *De sensu exteriori* and *De memoria et reminiscencia*. For the date, see the *Preface*, *ibid.*, pp. 127^{*}–28^{*}; Thomas's reference to his own commentary on *De anima* (II 20, ll. 24–88, pp. 152–53, Leon., vol. 45/1) is found in *De sensu* I 4 (l. 163, Leon., vol. 45/2, p. 30). On this edition, cf. R. Wielockx, "Thomas d'Aquin, commentateur du *De Sensu*," *Scriptorium* 41 (1987) 150–57.

of Aristotle. He did not put aside composition of the *Summa*; rather, he was given the means to it carry out: "Saint Thomas will find this formula so useful that he will apply it again when, in the margin of the *Secunda Pars* of the *Summa theologiae*, he will write his commentary on the *Ethics*."

Other activities of this kind may have been asked of him owing to diverse circumstances, but we should emphasize that this work in its origin was "born of the practice of his profession of theologian": "Texts for refining the instruments of theological reflections, the commentaries on Aristotle form an integral part of the work of the theologian, and this is particularly true of the commentary on the *De anima*." Gauthier is right to say: "Saint Thomas's whole work, including his commentaries on Aristotle, is therefore by its very nature apostolic, and it is apostolic in its entire development, an explanation of the truth as a refutation of error."⁴¹ Without knowing Gauthier's work, Weisheipl nonetheless entirely agrees with it in emphasizing that Thomas would have never dedicated his time and energy to these commentaries if he had not seen in them an urgent apostolic task.⁴²

William of Moerbeke

William of Moerbeke's name has already been mentioned several times in the course of these last pages. His name is usually linked a little too closely by the historians with the name of Thomas Aquinas, which calls for an explanation. Furthermore, though the man is now a little better known, some historiographical commonplaces, now quite dated, continue nevertheless to haunt people's memories.

The Flemish Dominican William of Moerbeke is a celebrated figure, since he was one of the most eminent and most productive of the translators from Greek into Latin of the numerous philosophical and scientific works that were written from the fourth century before Christ to the sixth century of our era. One of his biographers emphasizes that the thirteenth century owes "a spectacular widening" of its knowledge of the treasures of Greek civilization to William's abilities and his tireless labors.⁴³ In fact, the list

⁴¹. Leon., vol. 45/1, pp. 288*–94*; the quotations refer to pp. 288*–90*.

⁴². Weisheipl, pp. 310–11.

⁴³. L. Minio-Paluello, "Moerbeke, William of," *Dict. of Scientific Biography* 9 (1974) 434–40, cf. p. 434: "A spectacular widening and increase of the Greek sources . . . were due to Moerbeke's insatiable desire to pass on to Latin-reading students the yet undiscovered or rediscovered treasures of Greek civilization, his extensive linguistic knowledge, his indefatigable search . . ."

of his translations is impressive, and their diffusion underlines their importance.⁴⁴

Without entering into minute detail, we should recall the few things that we know of his life, for dates and places will have a decisive importance here. William was born between 1220 and 1235; in the spring of 1260 he was at Nicea (or at Nicles, in the Peloponnesus); in the autumn of the same year, he was at Thebes, where the Dominicans had been since 1253 and where he dated his translation of the *De partibus animalium*. His presence is attested at Viterbo, at the time the papal residence, from 22 November 1267, the date when he signed the translation of Themistius's commentary on the *De anima* of Aristotle, then again in May 1268. On 15 June 1271, still at Viterbo, he signed his translation of Simplicius's commentary on Aristotle's *De caelo* with the title of apostolic penitentiary; it is possible that he exercised this function beginning in November 1267, but this is not supported by any document.

As penitentiary and chaplain to the pope, his presence is attested in 1272 at Orvieto, where the papal court was then located. His knowledge of Greek enabled him to take an important part in the council of Lyon in May–July 1274. From April 1278 to his death, which was probably several months before 26 October 1286 (the date of the nomination of his successor), he would be archbishop of Corinth, but he did not die in that city. We find him again in Italy at the end of 1283 and perhaps earlier: given a mission on 30 December of the same year by Martin IV, his presence is attested at Perugia in January 1284; he probably died there at the papal court.⁴⁵

These meager biographical data, which were even more skeletal at the beginning of this century, forced earlier historians to erect hypothetical scaffoldings about this figure; one of them quickly became a kind of official truth, repeated without verification for several generations. According to this story, Thomas would have been appointed to Orvieto at the request of Urban IV, not only so that he might teach in the Roman curia, but also in order to collaborate in the great design that the pope had conceived of

⁴⁴. A scholarly conference brought this subject up to date, and many details that we cannot go into here may be found in J. Brams and W. Vanhamel, eds., *Guillaume de Moerbeke*. Recueil d'études à l'occasion du 700^e anniversaire de sa mort (1286), Leuven, 1989.

⁴⁵. We borrow this summary from A. Paravicini-Bagliani, "Guillaume de Moerbeke et la cour pontificale," in *Guillaume de Moerbeke*, pp. 23–52; cf. same author's "Nuovi documenti su Guglielmo da Moerbeke OP," *AFP* 52 (1982) 135–43; E. Panella, "Nuove testimonianze su Guglielmo da Moerbeke," *AFP* 56 (1986) 49–55.

laying the foundations of a Christian Aristotelianism. Toward that end, the pope would have caused Thomas's collaboration with William of Moerbeke, which continued later at Viterbo.⁴⁶ In this scenario, therefore, it would have been Thomas himself who pushed William into his translation enterprise, in order to have at hand the necessary pieces for this great work.⁴⁷

After everything that has been said up to this point, it is easy to perceive the weak points in such a supposition. In the first place, we know that Thomas was assigned, not to be lector at the pontifical curia in Orvieto,⁴⁸ but to perform the function of conventual lector among his brothers there. The pope certainly had recourse to him, but in a more occasional fashion. Furthermore, in 1267, the period in which we know that Moerbeke was at Viterbo, Thomas had been assigned to Rome for two years, and no document allows us to say that he would have stayed at Viterbo before his return to Paris.

In addition, we know that Moerbeke had begun his translation work long before coming to Italy, and he continued it well after Thomas's death. Though it is certainly true that Thomas used certain translations by Moerbeke (but far from all of them) as soon as they were done, he resembles in this many other authors of his time. But the most notable thing for our purpose has been pointed out by Gauthier with regard to the commentary on Aristotle's *De anima*. Thomas was indeed one of the first to use the *Translatio Noua*, which Moerbeke made of this text, but he had at his disposal only an imperfect copy, which led him into error on several, sometimes important, points.⁴⁹ Nothing would have been easier for Thomas

⁴⁶ P. Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant et l'averroïsme latin au XIII^e siècle, 1^{ère} Partie: Etude critique*, 1911², pp. 39–41.

⁴⁷ We already find this affirmation in a list of Thomas's works dating probably from 1312: "Fr. Wilhelmus Brabantinus, Corinthiensis, transtulit omnes libros naturalis et moralis philosophiae de graeco in latinum *ad instantiam fratris Thomae*" (*Catalogus Stamsensis*, ed. G. Meersseman, *MOPH* 18, 1936, p. 62, no. 33); although he does not mention William by name, it is probably from this text that Tocco borrows his information: "procuravit [Thomas] quod fieret nova translatio que sententie Aristotilis continet clarius ueritatem" (*Ystoria* 18, p. 252; Tocco 17, p. 88).

⁴⁸ Cf. above chap. VII, notes 4–6.

⁴⁹ Cf. the list and the commentary on these errors, Leon., vol. 45/1, pp. 176^{*}–99^{*}, and the eloquent schema on p. 175^{*}. We know that the manuscript tradition of Moerbeke's works, frequently revised by him, is one of the most complicated; cf. the illustration given about this in R. Wielockx, "Guillaume de Moerbeke réviseur de sa révision du *De Anima*," *RTAM* 54 (1987) 113–85; cf. J. Brams, "Guillaume de Moerbeke et Aristote," in J. Hamesse and M. Fattori, eds., *Rencontre de cultures dans la philosophie médiévale. Traductions et traducteurs de l'antiquité tardive au XIV^e siècle*, Louvain-la-Neuve-Cassino, 1990, pp. 317–36.

than to consult Moerbeke if had lived in Viterbo at the same time as William did.

Despite the recent attempts by C. Steel to save what can be saved from Mandonnet's hypothesis by showing that there was, all the same, a privileged relationship between the two men,⁵⁰ we must state that we have no historically trustworthy proof of any such collaboration between William and Thomas. We have to admit, with Minio-Paluello and Gauthier, the possibility of occasional contacts during the brief trips that Thomas made to Viterbo in July 1267 while going to the general chapter of Bologna and in May 1268, during the chapter of the Roman province, which William attended as an apostolic penitentiary.⁵¹

The question that still remains to be resolved (but according to the experts it is still unsolvable) is whether Moerbeke exercised a real influence on Thomas. On a doctrinal level, we would have to prove that one or another of his corrections to the already-existing translations had an effect on a position taken by Saint Thomas. As to the Aristotelian commentaries, except for Moerbeke's original translations, which added something new, we would have to establish that one of these corrections had some impact. In both cases, the verification remains to be made; to be comprehensive, it also ought to try to make sure that the influence exercised was, indeed, toward the authentic Aristotle, for, according to Father Gauthier, the corrections made by Moerbeke—who was already impregnated with scholasticism—are not always felicitous.

Thus we complete our description of the three years passed by Friar Thomas Aquinas at Rome. Sent there under obedience ("for the remission of his sins"), not only was he concerned with teaching the friars who had been entrusted to him, but he showed how seriously he took to heart his task as a teacher and how deeply he sought the restructuring that his responsibilities called for. It is ultimately to his concern as an educator that we owe the *Summa theologiae*, which would immortalize his name. At

⁵⁰. C. Steel, "Guillaume de Moerbeke et saint Thomas," in *Guillaume de Moerbeke*, pp. 57–82.

⁵¹. Father Gauthier has returned several times to this subject; cf. esp. Leonine, vol. 47/1, pp. 232*–34* and 264*–65* (which Minio-Paluello calls the "best critical assessment" on the question); vol. 48, pp. xviii–xx (French version of the preceding text); "Quelques questions à propos du commentaire de S. Thomas sur le *De anima*," *Angelicum* 51 (1974) 419–72, cf. pp. 438–42, where he demonstrates that Thomas never lived at Viterbo (we must therefore correct his earlier text). His last return to this point is in *Nouvelle introduction*, chap. II.

the same time, he remained available for more occasional tasks, and though we might suspect that these tasks were sometimes a burden for him, we must also recognize that he honestly forced himself to satisfy those who appealed to him. Finally, during this period he also launched himself into the work of commenting on Aristotle, which was going to become a considerable part of his activity. And this occurred because of his concern better to fulfill his principal profession in the service of truth. If we recall that he also preached at this time,⁵² we must recognize that his extraordinary gifts did not remain unused, but we also understand perhaps a little better the state of exhaustion in which he found himself less than ten years later.

⁵² We have at least one example: Tocco (*Ystoria* 53, p. 365; Tocco 53, pp. 126–27) reports that Thomas preached at Rome one Holy Week; after his preaching on Easter day, a woman suffering from a flow of blood was freed from her illness after touching the holy doctor's cape, and she went from Saint Peter's to Santa Sabina to recount this fact to Brother Reginald; cf. *Naples* 75, p. 369: Leonardo of Gaeta reports the same thing, which he says he got from Reginald himself, but he places the sermon at Santa Maria Maggiore.

**Chapter X—
The New Sojourn in Paris:
Doctrinal Confrontations**

Thomas's occupations during the years in Rome, as well as at Orvieto, were numerous, as his works exist to testify. Yet his literary output reflects a calm and serenity that have always struck observers. We suspect that he is sometimes overburdened, but he is neither impatient nor irritated with his direct interlocutors. If he is sometimes angered by certain errors—in the *Summa contra Gentiles* or in the commentary on *De anima*—it is over a conflict of ideas with some philosophers of the past. He does not have contemporary adversaries confronting him who directly menace the Christian faith. But things began to change upon his return to Paris; the works from this new period attest to an agitation that impinges on the peaceful tone of the works from the previous period.

Date and Place of Thomas's Departure for Paris

When did Thomas return to Paris? Historians have long wavered about this matter. Many historical essays dealing with this subject are still in circulation, although they are now mostly out of date. But it will not be useless to review here for the reader some of the scholarly give and take.

In 1910, Mandonnet summed up with great perspicacity the results of his inquiry: "All the positive data that we have establish, therefore, that Saint Thomas Aquinas resumed his professorial duties at the University of Paris probably in autumn 1268 and certainly before Easter 1269. And it is in this capacity that he undertook his first quodlibetal dispute, if not at

Christmas, then just before Easter of the same scholastic year."¹ Today's historians have tested and further sharpened this intuition, but they have also confirmed it.

The problem with Mandonnet's assertion is not so much the date of return as the point of departure for Thomas's journey. This question is important, for it reflects on Thomas's place of residence during his last year in Italy. An admonition of the general chapter of Bologna (July 1267) recommends that the Roman province watch carefully that the priory of the city where the pope is be peopled with intellectually capable friars.² On that basis, Mandonnet had concluded that Thomas must have been assigned to Viterbo soon after this chapter, since the pontifical curia was there. In fact, as Gauthier recalled and as we can see in the passage itself (see note 2 below), the text in question speaks neither of Thomas nor of Viterbo. And the conclusion that he was there, arrived at by a purely imaginary inference, is not supported by any document.³

Although Mandonnet's position was adopted by a number of historians,⁴ nothing allows us to think that Thomas left Rome for any reason other than the short absences required by the chapters in which he had to take part; we must therefore conclude that he remained at Rome until his departure for Paris.⁵

No text allows us to specify exactly the date of this return to Paris. Mandonnet, who had this journey leaving from Viterbo, situates the de-

¹ Mandonnet, *Siger I*, p. 88 (see also preceding pages).

² *MOPH*, vol. 3, p. 138: "Prior provincialis Romane provincie. diligenter provideat. ut conventus. ubi curia fuerit. fratres ydoneos habeat secundum exigenciam curie. priorem specialiter et lectorem."

³ Gauthier, *Quelques questions*, pp. 438–42, has retraced the rather instructive history of this "sojourn" at Viterbo; it was the German scholar J. A. Endres who first spoke of it (in 1910) thanking Father Mandonnet for having revealed to him the meaning of this text from the Bologna chapter; for Mandonnet the issue was settled from that point on and, without giving further proof, he summed up the situation thus: "At the behest of Clement IV, he was recalled [from Rome] to the curia and resided at Viterbo from autumn 1267 to November 1268, when he was suddenly sent to teach a second time at the University of Paris" (*Chronologie sommaire*, p. 144); we can see in reading this page that the determining element for this theory was Thomas's (supposed) position as "lector to the pontifical curia"; in this capacity, he was supposed to have resided at Anagni before arriving in Orvieto during the years 1259–61, although no document can be quoted in support of this deduction.

⁴ WN, p. 147; Weisheipl returned to this subject in his revised edition (pp. 230, 473) While he expresses the position in a hypothetical fashion, he does not seem to have perceived the force of the arguments against his view.

⁵ We might add to the account of these brief departures from Rome a visit for a Christmas feast to the castle of La Molarà on the via Latina a little beyond Grottaferrata, at the invitation of Cardinal Richard De Annibaldis; Thomas's preaching caused the conversion of two of the cardinals' Jewish guests (*Naples* 86, pp. 389–91).

parture in mid-November 1268 and the arrival in January.⁶ Since Thomas preached two sermons for Advent in Bologna and Milan, Mandonnet proposed situating them in December 1268, on the way back, before Thomas took the route through the Alps to France.

Walz and Verbeke long ago expressed doubts on the dates proposed for these sermons and the plausibility of this crossing of the Alps in the dead of winter;⁷ people generally chose a better season to confront this route. As to the Advent preaching in Bologna and Milan, this can be situated quite well, as Tugwell suggests, in December 1259, which is to say several years earlier, at the time when Thomas was returning to Italy after his first teaching assignment at Paris.⁸

After reexamining the evidence, Father Gauthier arrived at the conclusion that the departure from Rome (and not from Viterbo), could well have taken place several months earlier. The commentary on the *De anima* having been completed, since it had already been published in Italy in the autumn of 1268, nothing prevents us from thinking that Thomas could have left at that time (probably in September).⁹

Gauthier thus came to the position that G. Verbeke had already reached by an entirely different route (although the details in his argument cannot be maintained any longer). He also thought that we could say that Thomas must have departed before 12 September 1268. We may add to these considerations the invasion of Rome by Conradin in July 1268 (Santa Sabina was pillaged at the time), which provides an additional motive for the earlier departure date.¹⁰ For Gauthier there is no doubt; Thomas left Rome in that period and travelled by boat (the story about a storm that he and his companions endured may be explained quite well as an equinoctial storm).¹¹

This solution would have permitted Thomas to save time and fatigue (Thomas could have embarked at Civitavecchia, disembarked at AiguesMortes, and sailed up the Rhone by boat). It also presents, in our view,

⁶ *Lecteur*, pp. 26–31.

⁷ A. Walz, "Wege des Aquinaten," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1958) 221–28, cf. p. 135; cf. WN, p. 151; G. Verbeke, *Jean Philopon Commentaire sur le De Anima d'Aristote* (Louvain-Paris, 1966), pp. lxxiii–lxxv, note 9.

⁸ Tugwell, p. 221.

⁹ Gauthier, *Leonine*, vol. 45/1, p. 286*–87*.

¹⁰ Cf. A. Fliche, C. Thouzelier, Y. Azais, *La chrétienté romaine (1198–1274)*, *Hist. de l'Eglise* 10 (Paris, 1950), pp. 442ff.

¹¹ *Ystoria* 38, p. 321 (Tocco 38, pp. 111–12); Le Brun-Gouanvic lists a series of authors who call this third trip to Paris a voyage by sea.

the advantage of filling in a lacuna of several months in the occupation of the second Dominican chair at Paris. Mandonnet and others attribute this chair to Thomas at his arrival in January 1269, but we cannot say who occupied the chair for the beginning of the university year 1268–69. Mandonnet had believed it possible to place Master Gerard Reveri in it, of whom we know scarcely anything other than the fact that he died at Saint-Jacques while he was regent. It would have been his death that caused Thomas's earlier return; but in fact, his death was some ten years earlier!¹²

The hypothesis that Thomas left as early as possible and by way of the most rapid means of travel would therefore allow him to arrive at Paris a little after 14 September, the official opening of the school year. This would finally return to Mandonnet's first intuition, but free of the additional inventions that have obscured his position somewhat. Thus, it seems we can say with reasonable historical certitude that Thomas taught almost an entire year, and we should speak of 1268–72 (rather than 1269–72), for this second stint of teaching in Paris.¹³

The Motives for Thomas's Return to Paris

We can only guess at the reasons that might have motivated Thomas's recall to Paris. For Mandonnet, the Averroist crisis was the principal reason; Weisheipl thinks instead that it was a new flare-up in the secular agitation against the mendicants.¹⁴ Verbeke sums up this situation very well and adds a third motive: at his return to Paris, Thomas would have to "struggle on three fronts simultaneously: he would have to battle the conservative minds in the theology faculty who saw in Aristotle only a danger for the Christian faith; in the other direction, he would have to oppose the Averroist monopsychism; and finally, he would have to provide an apology for the mendicant orders against the seculars, who wished to exclude them from university teaching."¹⁵

It is rather striking to note that, in this same year of 1268 Saint Bonaventure, speaking about certain errors that threaten the Christian faith, denounces on his own part a triple danger: the eternity of the world; the *necessitas fatalis*, which is to say, the determinism of the will by the stars;

¹². Mandonnet, *Lecteur*, p. 33; the text of the epitaph that Mandonnet quotes in support of his hypothesis still stands, however: *MCCLIX die . . . februarii*; Glorieux speaks of February 1260, cf. *Répertoire* I, and the inset between 228–29 and no. 23, p. 123: "Gérard Reveri."

¹³. Tugwell, p. 221, and notes 249–50, p. 317, himself comes to the same conclusion.

¹⁴. Mandonnet, *Siger*, vol. I, p. 88; *Lecteur*, pp. 31–38; Weisheipl, p. 237–38.

¹⁵. Verbeke, *Jean Philopon*, pp. lxxiv–lxxv.

and the unicity of the intellect for all men. This last error is the worst, adds Bonaventure, for it contains the other two.¹⁶ Bonaventure is probably not speaking about contemporaries, but we are very close to the errors that Thomas will address. Given all the work that he already had underway, this was, despite his capacity for work, his astonishing concentration, and his ability to dictate to three and even four secretaries at a time,¹⁷ more than enough to occupy him and his assistants.

The first front on which Thomas had to battle was the defense of the mendicant religious life. Since we have already spoken amply about this earlier, we recall here simply that this is the period of the *De perfectione spiritualis vitae* (early 1270) and of the *Contra retrahentes* (between Lent and summer 1271). We can also add here that Thomas used all the means at his disposal: these writings were accompanied by taking positions, at first oral and then written, in the quodlibetal disputes (*Quodlibet* II to V, between Christmas 1269 and Christmas 1271) and in the university sermons, notably *Osanna filio David* (December 1270) and especially *Exiit qui seminar* (February 1271), which contains some arguments repeated in the *Contra retrahentes*.¹⁸

In this first battle, Thomas, and the Dominicans in general, as well as the Franciscans, fought against the seculars, their common enemy, who saw scarcely any difference between the two orders. One testimony among many others is provided for us by the refutations of Nicholas of Lisieux, who will respond simultaneously both to John Pecham's *Quaestio* on the evangelical perfection of poverty and Thomas's *Contra retrahentes*. Although the two responses have their own titles, they follow one another in the manuscripts and are sometimes designated by the common title *Contra Pecham et Thomam*.¹⁹ There is a certain irony in this, since the English Franciscan John Pecham, who began his teaching in Paris a little after Thomas's return and who would later become archbishop of Can-

¹⁶ St. Bonaventure, *Collationes de septem donis Spiritus Sancti* VII, no. 16–19, *Opera*, vol. 5 (Quaracchi, 1891), pp. 495–96.

¹⁷ This is a subject to which we will have to return, see the section in chapter 12 titled "Thomas and His Secretaries."

¹⁸ Cf. Käppeli, *Una raccolta*, pp. 65–68 and 72–88; Leonine, vol. 41, p. C 7.

¹⁹ To our knowledge, they are still unpublished, but the accompanying letter from Nicholas to William of Saint-Amour can be seen along with the response of the latter in *Chartul*, nos. 439–40, pp. 495–99; see also I. Brady, "Jean Pecham," *DS* 8 (1974) 647; Leonine, vol. 41, p. C 5; we recall also P. Glorieux, "Une offensive de Nicolas de Lisieux contre saint Thomas d'Aquin," *BLE* 39 (1938) 121–29, who edited the extract made by Nicholas of the errors contained in the *De perfectione* and the *Quodlibet* III from Easter 1270.

terbury, was also one of Thomas's fiercest adversaries, the type perhaps of the conservative Augustinian tendency that opposed the new Aristotelian ideas. History has preserved two unambiguous testimonies of Pecham's opposition to Thomas: unfavorable witness from the Dominicans,²⁰ favorable when Pecham himself speaks.²¹ We can consider the case of the *De aeternitate mundi* as emblematic of this situation.

The De aeternitate mundi

This brief is currently much studied by the specialists, with regard as much to the historical situation of the opusculum as to its content, for in the absence of decisive external arguments, it is to questions of internal criticism that we must have recourse.²²

The question of the eternity of the world was the order of the day after the introduction of Aristotle's philosophy had placed it at a high level of importance.²³ We know that the majority of theologians at that time, among them Bonaventure and Pecham, declared that it was unthinkable and that it was easy to prove by very effective arguments that the world began.²⁴ For Thomas, on the contrary, only faith can make us hold that the world began, and it is not possible to prove the contrary: *mundum non semper fuisse sola fide tenetur, et demonstrative probari non potest: sicut et supra de mysterio Trinitatis dictum est*.²⁵ This clearly does not prevent us from believing in the fundamental and permanent dependence of the

²⁰ Bartholomew of Capua learned from several Dominicans that John and Thomas confronted each other in a dispute at Paris and that "dictus frater Iohannes exasperaret eundem fratrem Thomam *verbis ampullosis et tumidis*, nunquam tamen ipse frater Thomas restrinxit verbum humilitatis sed semper cum dulcedine et humanitate respondit" (*Naples* 77, p. 374; cf. *Ystoria* 26, pp. 284–85; Tocco 26, pp. 99–100).

²¹ We possess three letters in which Pecham speaks about Friar Thomas *bone memorie* and even *sancte memorie* and praises his humility (*Chartul.*, nos. 517, 518, 525, pp. 624–27, 634–35).

²² Independent of the discussion here, let us mention the symposium held at Nimègue in 1986: *The Eternity of the World in the Thought of Thomas Aquinas and His Contemporaries*, ed. J. B. M. Wissink (Leiden, 1990), which is a good testimony to current interest.

²³ We refer to L. Bianchi, *L'errore di Aristotele. La polemica contra l'eternità del mondo nel XIII secolo* (Florence, 1984), as well as R. C. Dales, *Medieval Discussion of the Eternity of the World* (Leiden, 1990).

²⁴ See Pecham's text edited by Brady (above, note 29) or in R. C. Dales and O. Argerami, eds., *Medieval Latin Texts on the Eternity of the World* (Leiden, 1991), pp. 69–87; this volume gathers together about fifteen texts, from William of Dorham (end of the 1220s) to John of Jandun (1315), without selections from Thomas or Bonaventure. This selection should be complemented with S. F. Brown, "The Eternity of the World Discussion in Early Oxford," *MM* 21/1 (1991) 259–80, which studies Robert Grosseteste, Richard Fishacre, Richard Rufus, and prints a text by Rufus (*In II Sent.* d. 1 q. 1).

²⁵ *ST* Ia q. 46 a. 2.

world on its relationship to God. It is therefore this thesis, which Thomas already held in the *Sentences* and never abandoned afterward, that is summed up forcefully and in a new light in the *De aeternitate mundi*.²⁶

The date of this work has been highly debated by the scholars for many years. Given the context that we have already noted, Mandonnet situated it at first during the second period of teaching in Paris and, more precisely, during 1270. That period saw increased acrimony in the controversy that temporarily culminated in the condemnation of 10 December 1270, pronounced by the bishop of Paris, Stephen Tempier.²⁷ Mandonnet admitted, however, that this opusculum might be situated one or two years later.

The plausibility of this position has led the great majority of specialists—except for some dissenting voices (F. Pelster, F. Hendrickx and Th. P. Bukovski, who wished to move this text to a much earlier date, between the *Sentences* and the *Summa*)—to adopt it. While recalling the contrary opinions, the Leonine edition also accepts this theory.²⁸ But in searching for a more precise context, Ignatius Brady published an original essay on the occasion of the seventh centenary of Saint Thomas's death. He proposed there that *De aeternitate mundi* be considered as a reply directed against John Pecham and be seen as the result of the dispute that Tocco and Bartholomew of Capua mention.²⁹

During his inaugural lecture, in the presence of Gerard of Abbeville and Thomas Aquinas, Pecham in effect would have passionately upheld the thesis opposed to Thomas's about the eternity of the world. Out of respect for the candidate for mastership, Thomas kept silent; but upon leaving the ceremony, his indignant students pressed him to intervene. The next day, therefore, during Pecham's *resumptio* of the thesis expounded the previous evening, Thomas intervened calmly but firmly in

²⁶ Cf. *Sent.* II d. 1 q. 1 a. 5, which responds to Bonaventure; *SCG* II 32–38; *De Pot.* III 17; *ST* Ia q. 46 a. 2.

²⁷ *Chartul.*, no. 432, p. 487, prop. 5: "Quod mundus est eternus."

²⁸ Leonine, vol. 43, pp. 54–58 (for the introduction of H.-F. Dondaine, with earlier bibliographical references up to 1976) and 85–89 (for the text); trans. Abbé Bandel, in *Opusculum de S. Thomas d'Aquin*, Vrin-Reprise 6 (Paris, 1984), Bukovski returned to this subject at a later date, notably in "Rejecting Mandonnet's Dating of St. Thomas's *De aeternitate mundi*," *Gregorianum* 71 (1990) 763–75.

²⁹ I. Brady, "John Pecham and the Background of Aquinas's *De Aeternitate Mundi*," in *Commemorative Studies* II, pp. 141–78, with the edition of Pecham's text; cf. *Ystoria* 26, p. 284–85 (Tocco 26, pp. 99–100); *Naples* 77, p. 374; we should add that the agreement among the disciples who pressed Thomas to intervene did not include his own bachelor of the *Sentences* who, that same year (1270–71), found the reasons given not *cogentes*, preferring himself to maintain the common opinion (opposed to Thomas's view), cf. Leonine, vol. 42, p. 56, note 10.

order to show his opponent the fragility of his position. Nothing remains from that oral intervention, but a little later Thomas wrote *De aeternitate mundi*. To all appearances, this opusculum repeats the same arguments that had been developed orally, for Thomas refutes Pecham's arguments step by step.

After first accepting Brady's proposition on this subject, Weisheipl began his own detailed examination.³⁰ Weisheipl arrived at several conclusions, the first somewhat off the main line of the discussion but not without interest, since it emphasizes that this opusculum is not a philosophical but rather a theological text.³¹ Second, Weisheipl thinks that we should look not for a direct refutation of anything but simply the manifestation in broad daylight of an opinion that had come to maturity. If we recognize Pecham's arguments here, Thomas in fact strikes, without specifying, all who oppose his position. In reality, the same reasons are found as a commonplace among all those whom the overly strong presence of Aristotle in this field had disturbed.

As to the date, Weisheipl draws on a study by John F. Wippel, which had put all the texts where Thomas speaks of the subject in chronological perspective.³² Wippel remarked that Thomas had not always held exactly the same position; at first, influenced by Maimonides, who had strongly contested Aristotle's thesis, Thomas believed that the Philosopher himself considered his arguments as only probable; not wishing to give them a greater force than their author had, he therefore contented himself with saying that it was not possible to prove peremptorily the beginning or the nonbeginning of the world. But after having commented himself on Book Eight of the *Physics*, Thomas perceived that Aristotle's conviction was much more constraining than he had previously thought.³³ This new cer-

³⁰ J. A. Weisheipl, "The Date and Context of Aquinas's *De aeternitate mundi*," in *Graceful Reason. Essays . . . Presented to Joseph Owens*, ed. L. P. Gerson (Toronto, 1983), pp. 239–71, with a very careful *status quaestionis*.

³¹ Weisheipl is supported here, and rightly it seems to us, by F. J. A. De Grijns, "The Theological Character of Aquinas's *De aeternitate mundi*," in Wissink, *The Eternity*, pp. 1–8; this position is disputed by J. A. Aertsen, "The Eternity of the World: The Believing and the Philosophical Thomas. Some Comments," *ibid.*, p. 9–19.

³² J. F. Wippel, *Metaphysical Themes in Thomas Aquinas*, Washington, 1984, p. 191–214: "Thomas Aquinas on the Possibility of Eternal Creation"; this study had appeared earlier under the title: "Did Thomas Aquinas defend the Possibility of an Eternally Created World? (The *De aeternitate mundi* Revisited)," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 19 (1981) 21–37; with a detailed record of the various positions.

³³ *In VIII Physic.*, lib. 8, lect. 2 (ed. P. M. Maggiolo) (Turin, 1954), no. 986: "perpetuitate temporis et motus quasi principio utitur (Aristoteles) ad probandum primum principium esse, et

(footnote continued on next page)

titude found expression in the opusculum we are considering: not only has the noneternity of the world not been demonstrated; not only can it not be demonstrated; but indeed, a world eternally created is possible.³⁴

The interest of this development for our inquiry is that it places the *De aeternitate mundi* a little after the commentary on the *Physics* (1268–69). And it confirms, therefore, its late date, if not exactly in the same terms as Mandonnet, at least with a new force, since we can thus show that it is situated at the end of an entire evolution in Thomas's thought. In our understanding, contrary to what Weisheipl believed, this does not at all force us to renounce Brady's reading, which has the merit of giving the opusculum a plausible context.³⁵ The debate with Pecham would have been the spur to Thomas's expressing with full clarity the certitude at which he arrived by his frequent recourse to Aristotle.³⁶

The Unicity of Substantial Form

After what we have just seen, we understand how Pecham retained a stinging memory of his meeting with Thomas; but what set these two masters at odds was much more serious than a simple question of personal opinion. We have spoken of Augustinianism against Aristotelianism; that is only partly true. Today it is widely recognized that the partisans of the plurality of forms claimed themselves to be in the school of Aristotle; as to Thomas, he could have placed himself in an authentic line of descent from Augustine.³⁷ With much truth, Saint Bonaventure had already seen in these contrasting intellectual positions a reflection of the differences in spirit between the two great orders: "The first [certainly the preachers], apply themselves first to *speculation*, from which they even take their

(footnote continued from previous page)

hic in octavo et in XII Metaphys.; unde manifestum est, quod supponit hoc tanquam probatum"; see on this C. Stroick, "Die Ewigkeit der Welt in den Aristoteleskommentaren des Thomas von Aquin," *RTAM* 51 (1984) 43–68.

³⁴ See the texts reviewed by J. F. Wippel: *Sent.* II d. 1 q. 1 a. 5; *SCG* II 31–38; *De Pot.* III 17; *Compendium theol.* 198–99; *ST* Ia q.46; *Quodl.* III q. 14 a. 2; *De aeternitate mundi*; *Quodl.* XII q.6 a. 1 (we will reestablish the most probable chronological order in our view). This position of Wippel's has been contested by T. Bukovski, "Understanding St. Thomas on the Eternity of the World: Help from Giles of Rome," *RTAM* 58 (1991) 113–25, in whose opinion Thomas held the same position throughout his career.

³⁵ Wippel accommodates it quite well, cf. p. 213.

³⁶ Weisheipl, "The Date," p. 249, uses certain inexactitudes in Tocco to conclude that this cannot be Pecham's *resumptio*; Brady responded to that objection in advance by emphasizing that we cannot take Tocco's story literally, since he is notoriously uninformed about the practices of Paris universities.

³⁷ Cf. L. Elders, "Les citations de saint Augustin dans la *Somme Théologique* de saint Thomas d'Aquin," *Doctor communis* 40 (1987) 115–67.

name, and in the second place to *unction*; the others [the friars minor] aim first at *unction*, then at *speculation*.³⁸

Even this does not suffice to explain the violence of the confrontation, for many Dominicans also opposed Thomas on the same subjects, such as Robert Kilwardby. There was the conviction that Thomas's thesis on the unicity of substantial form and on the eternity of the world put the faith in danger pure and simple. As to the eternity of the world, we have seen, Thomas was not at all convinced of it and persevered in his position until the end. With the unicity of substantial form, the debate moved from the domain of creation theology to the domain of anthropology.

Far from being novel to our epoch, this problem occupied minds for over fifty years. Dom Lottin once thought he could conclude that around 1230—among thinkers such as Roland of Cremona and Philip the Chancellor, John de La Rochelle and even Alexander of Hales—there existed veritable unanimity against the plurality of the forms, and that one would not dream of citing the authority of Saint Augustine in its favor. Rather, according to Lottin, it was thought characteristic of the Jewish philosopher Avicbron (Ibn Gebirol).³⁹

Numerous other works since⁴⁰ have modified this first approach and show on the contrary that the greatest diversity reigned during the first scholasticism. The partisans of the plurality of forms made use not only of Avicbron's name, but also especially of Avicenna's and, through him, of Al Farabi.⁴¹ As to Saint Augustine, the uncertainty of his position on this subject led those who wished to use his name to try to reconcile him with the Aristotelian doctrine. Thus scholars were led to identify the traditional doctrine before Saint Thomas as an *eclectic Aristotelianism*,⁴² or

³⁸. "Alii principaliter intendunt *speculationi*, a quo etiam nomen acceperunt, et postea *unctioni*. Alii principaliter *unctioni* et postea *speculationi*" (*In Hexaemeron*, XXII 21, *Opera*, ed. Quaracchi, vol. V (1891), p. 440).

³⁹. O. Lottin, "La pluralité des formes substantielles avant saint Thomas d'Aquin," *RNS* 34 (1932) 449–67, with a review of the previous studies.

⁴⁰. In addition to Zavalloni and Bazán, cited above, we mention only D. A. Callus, "The Origins of the Problem of the Unity of Form," *The Thomist* 24 (1961) 256–85; we refer especially to E.-H. Wéber, *La personne humaine au XIII^e siècle*, Bibl. thomiste 46 (Paris, 1991) 17–119 (for the period before Thomas), 120–98 (Albert and Thomas); the bibliography is fairly up to date, but see also note 63 below.

⁴¹. R. Zavalloni, *Richard de Mediavilla et la controverse sur la pluralité des formes. Textes inédits et études critiques*, Philosophes médiévaux 2 (Louvain, 1951); while agreeing on a number of points with this fundamental study, B. Bazán, "Pluralisme de formes ou dualisme de substances. La pensée pré-thomiste touchant la nature de l'âme," *RPL* 67 (1969) 31–73, thinks that it is better to speak of a dualism of substances to characterize the pre-Thomist epoch.

⁴². Both labels can, without doubt, be discussed, but the way in which Zavalloni sums up

(footnote continued on next page)

in even a more nuanced fashion, *eclectic neo-Platonizing Aristotelianism*, emphasizing again Avicenne's influence on it.⁴³

Already lively on the strictly philosophical level, the discussion became even sharper in passing into the theological domain. The point of crystallization for the quarrel was one of those questions to which the scholastics had the secret.⁴⁴ It recurs under diverse forms in the quodlibets that Thomas was obliged to undertake during Lent and Advent in the years 1269–70. At the beginning one question appears that seems harmless at first: "Are the preceding forms annihilated by the arrival of the intellectual soul?" The first question brings with it a series of others that are apparently gratuitous: "Did Christ remain man during his three days in the tomb?" or even frankly outlandish: "After His death, was Christ's eye 'really' an eye or only in an equivocal fashion?" right down to the question on which we must pause for a moment: "Did Christ's body remain numerically the same on the Cross and in the tomb?"⁴⁵ The constant return of these questions indicates the preoccupation of certain minds; they appear futile to a modern person. But they really raise the most fundamental problems of

(footnote continued from previous page)

the diverse positions has at least the merit of nuancing in a sensible fashion an overly Manichean vision of the situation: "The doctrinal debate of the thirteenth-century scholastics is not involved in choosing between *Augustinianism* and *Aristotelianism*, but in choosing between the *traditional doctrine* and the *Thomist doctrine*. The traditional doctrine grafts itself, as does the Thomist doctrine, onto some conceptions of Aristotelian origin. The expression that might best characterize the traditional doctrine would be an *eclectic Aristotelianism*, to oppose it to the *radical Aristotelianism* of Siger of Brabant and to the *personal Aristotelianism* of Saint Thomas. Eclectic Aristotelianism presents a different tint in various authors according to the predominant influence that they have undergone. Thus we can speak of a neo-Platonizing Aristotelianism in Roger Bacon, an Augustinianizing Aristotelianism in Thomas of York, Saint Bonaventure, and Roger Marston, and of an Augustino-Avicennicizing Aristotelianism for Richard of Mediavilla" (Zavalloni, *Richard*, p. 472).

⁴³. This is Bazán's position (above, note 41), who agrees in using this label with F. Van Steenberghe, *La philosophie*, pp. 181ff. (2d ed. 1991, pp. 169ff.).

⁴⁴. For the debate prior to Thomas, see A. M. Landgraf, "Das Problem *Utrum Christus fuerit homo in triduo mortis* in der Frühscholastik," in *Mélanges Auguste Pelzer* (Louvain, 1947), pp. 109–58.

⁴⁵. Cf. *Quodl.* I q.4 a. 1 [6] (Lent 1269): "Utrum formae praecedentes corrumpuntur per adventum animae?"; II q. 1 a. 1 (Advent 1269): "Utrum Christus idem in triduo <mortis> fuerit homo?"; III q. 2 a. 2 [4] (Lent 1270): "Utrum oculus Christi post mortem fuerit oculus equivoce?"; IV q.5 a. 1 [8] (Lent 1271): "Utrum corpus Christi in cruce et in sepulcro sit unum numero?"; we recall that these titles were not given by Thomas himself, but are taken from the text of the question. Zavalloni (pp. 487–89) believes he can detect an evolution between *Quodl.* III and *Quodl.* IV, which are found on one side and the other of the episcopal condemnation in December 1270. As to the first case, Thomas concluded that Christ's eye was not an eye in an equivocal fashion, as a dead eye; the condemnation led him to "insist further on the identity of the living body of Christ and of his cadaver." Doubtless, but we ought to add with Zavalloni: more a verbal than a doctrinal difference.

christological anthropology. And whoever goes through Q. 50 of the *Tertia Pars*, for example, will easily see it.⁴⁶ In article 5, Thomas returns to the question which had already been put to him in diverse forms during the quodlibets: "Did the body of Christ remain numerically the same before and after his death?"

To sum up these matters in a somewhat simplistic fashion, for Thomas—in accord with the hylomorphic doctrine he got from Aristotle—the intellectual soul is the only substantial form of the human composite, and it exerts this function at different levels of the life of that composite: vegetative, sensible, intellectual. His adversaries held, on the contrary, for a plurality of forms according to the different levels and, in the eyes of these adversaries, Thomas's doctrine was heretical, for it put in doubt the numerical identity of Christ's body before and after his death. In effect, the soul being the unique form of the body and Christ's body being deprived of it temporarily by death, one could no longer say that the body in the tomb was the same as the body of the living Christ. It was necessary therefore to admit in addition to the soul, a "corporal form" (or *forma corporeitatis*) that remained the same, inhering in the body before and after death, and thus was able to assure the continuity and the unity between these two states of Christ's body.

No more than his adversaries did Thomas doubt the numerical identity of Christ's body before and after his death; for him nevertheless it is not a corporal form that conserves it but, indeed, the hypostatic union. A being remains numerically the same, he explains, when it has the same supposit, which is to say the same hypostasis. Now it has been well established that Christ's body, living or dead, had never had another hypostasis than that of the Word, for the hypostatic union of the person of the Word with his soul and his body did not cease at Jesus' death. The body and soul of Jesus thus conserved their relation to the unique person of the Word. And it was this that maintained their numerical identity. There is therefore no need to invoke a hypothetical corporal form here when we have the guarantee of an entirely certain dogmatic datum, defined at the time of the struggle against the Apollinarians: the permanence of the hypostatic union beyond death.⁴⁷

⁴⁶. It was precisely with this question that Pecham quarreled in his *Quodl.* IV, q. 2, *responsio* [ed. G. J. Etzkorn (Grottaferrata, 1989), pp. 197–98; cf. L.-J. Bataillon, *RSPT* 75 (1991) 510].

⁴⁷. Cf. *ST* IIIa q. 50 a. 5, with the responses to the objections; a useful summary of the question and its role in the debate comes from the pen of P. Synave, *S. Thomas d'Aquin, Somme*

(footnote continued on next page)

The De unitate intellectus

On the front opposite to the conservatives, Thomas also had to battle what was once called "Averroism." In the 10 December 1270 condemnation of the errors of this heterodox tendency, Stephen Tempier, bishop of Paris, assembled thirteen propositions, which we can sum up under four principal points: the eternity of the world, the denial of God's universal providence, unicity of the intellectual soul for all men (or monopsychism), and determinism.⁴⁸ Representatives of these views were found primarily in the arts faculty, and we can easily bring forward Siger of Brabant as the best known.⁴⁹ Recent works have established that we have perhaps emphasized Siger too much. He began publishing in 1265. And if he furnished the largest part of the propositions condemned in 1270 and 1277 by the bishop of Paris, he is far from being the only one involved. Furthermore, the lack of published documents should not lead us into an error of perspective.⁵⁰ As we gradually come to know the period better, we see that Boethius of Dacia and others were also targets, and Boethius no less than Siger.⁵¹

In fact all our knowledge of this period has been deeply advanced by comparison with where it stood at the beginning of the twentieth century;⁵²

(footnote continued from previous page)

Théologique ("Revue des Jeunes"), *Vie de Jésus*, vol. IV (Paris, 1931), pp. 345–54, Appendix II: "Le corps du Christ pendant les trois jours de sa mort"; cf. also L.-B. Gillon, "La pluralité des formes," "Thomas d'Aquin," *DTC* 15/1 (1946), cols. 678–84.

⁴⁸ *Chartul.*, no. 432, pp. 486–87.

⁴⁹ In addition to the *Siger* by Mandonnet (1911), cf. F. Van Steenberghen, *Maître Siger de Brabant* (Louvain-Paris, 1977); B. Bazán, ed., *Siger de Brabant. Quaestiones in Tertium de anima. De anima intellectiva. De aeternitate mundi* (Louvain-Paris, 1972); cf. also the editions of the different *reportationes* on the *Metaphysics* by W. Dunphy, *Siger de Brabant, Quaestiones in Metaphysicam* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1981), and by A. Maurer, *Siger de Brabant, Quaestiones in Metaphysicam* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1985).

⁵⁰ Cf. R. Hissette, *Enquête sur les 219 articles condamnés à Paris le 7 mars 1277* (Philosophes médiévaux 22) (Louvain-Paris, 1977); we also note that, in 1277, Siger had already retired from teaching (and converted!). He was at Orvieto, perhaps for something to do with the chapter of Liège, when he died, stabbed by his secretary (*clericus*), who had gone mad, during the papacy of Martin IV (1281–85).

⁵¹ Boethius of Dacia (or of Denmark) is not well known; all that we know is that he was a master in the arts faculty from 1270 to 1280 and that he is designated in certain manuscripts as *principalis assessor* of the propositions condemned in 1277. He left relatively abundant writings, the critical edition of which has now been completed in the *Corpus Philosophicorum Danicorum Medii Aevi*; we can also recommend the *Modi significandi sive quaestiones super Priscianum Maiorem*, ed. J. Pinborg, H. Roos, S. S. Jensen (Copenhagen, 1969) (vol. IV/I), and, more important here, the *De aeternitate mundi*, ed. N. G. Green-Pedersen (Copenhagen, 1976) (vol. VI/II); cf. also G. Sajó, *Un traité récemment découvert de Boèce de Dacia De mundi aeternitate* (Budapest, 1954).

⁵² See here the instructive retrospective on the historiography of Averroism by R. Imbach,

(footnote continued on next page)

it is useful, therefore, to do a brief retrospective on this subject in order not "to travel today with a map from yesterday." Once called (following Renan and Mandonnet) "Latin Averroism" this tendency was characterized afterward by Van Steenberghen as being instead a radical or heterodox (less happy qualifiers) Aristotelianism. But R.-A. Gauthier has shown that these matters are rather complex.⁵³

In the first place, as to the date of Averroes' entrance into the West, we must place it at least in 1225, which is to say at least five years earlier than the 1230 commonly accepted a short while ago; but we also have to look at the appreciation that thirteenth-century writers showed for him. In a first phase, up until around 1250, the scholastics saw in Averroes a commentator on Aristotle who should be preferred to Avicenna. Avicenna had made the agent intellect a separate power, which is a mistake, while Averroes made it a power of the soul, which is the truth. During this entire period and beyond, a certain number of other theses from Arabic philosophy passed into use in the schools and would be so highly assimilated that their Averroist origin would be lost (which explains, among other things, how it is that Thomas frequently uses Averroes without quoting him).

But it was only in 1250, under an initially vague form in Albertus Magnus, then in 1252, in a more precise form in Robert Kilwardby, that Averroes will be accused of having said that there is only a single soul for all men. Meanwhile, Saint Bonaventure, in his commentary on Book II of the *Sentences*, will formulate in a definitive way the "Averroist" error: "There is only one intellectual soul for all men, and that not only *quantum ad intellectum agentem, sed etiam quantum ad intellectum possibilem*."⁵⁴

As Gauthier says without much beating about the bush: "Everything invites us, therefore, to believe that 'Latin Averroism' is the invention of theologians. In effect, we admit more and more today that Averroes was not an Averroist."⁵⁵ That "tendentious" reading spread very quickly, and

(footnote continued from previous page)

"L'averroïsme latin du XIII^e siècle," in *Gli Studi di Filosofia Medievale fra Otto et Novecento*, a cura di R. Imbach and A. Maierú (Rome, 1991), p. 191–208.

⁵³ R.-A. Gauthier, "Notes sur les débuts (1225–1240) du premier 'averroïsme,'" *RSPT* 66 (1982) 327–74; "Préface" to the *Sentencia libri De anima*, Leonine, vol. 45/1, pp. 218*–35*.

⁵⁴ St. Bonaventure, II *Sent.*, d. 18 a.2 q.1, *Opera* II, pp. 446–47.

⁵⁵ Gauthier, Leonine, vol. 45/1, p. 222*, with reference to S. Gomez Nogales, "Saint Thomas, Averroès et l'averroïsme," in *Aquinas and Problems of his Time*, ed. G. Verbeke and D. Verhelst (Leuven, 1976), pp. 161–77, who says well: "Averroes is not Averroist. If it is true

(footnote continued on next page)

Thomas, prepared by his Master Albert, took it from Bonaventure and denounced it in his own commentary on the *Sentences*. If one thinks that Siger of Brabant found this thesis in Saint Thomas, whom he read assiduously, and not in Averroes, the paradox is not minor: that "heresy" which did not exist before the theologians denounced it, exists from then on thanks to them.⁵⁶

Had Thomas already heard some echo of the teaching of Siger and of his colleagues on monopsychism while he was still in Italy? Father H.-F. Dondaine suggests this in referring to two articles of the Question *De spiritualibus creaturis* (a. 2 and a. 5) and two other articles of the Question *De anima* (a. 2 and a. 3).⁵⁷

In reality, this seems hardly probable. If we recall the date of these two questions (1265–66 for the *De anima*; 1267–68, for the *De spiritualibus creaturis*) and remember that the *Quaestiones in Tertium De anima* by Siger are from the scholastic year 1269–70, Thomas certainly could not have known them before his return to Paris. It is scarcely plausible either, in the absence of any text, that Thomas would have known of these ideas through the *reportationes* of a student.

Furthermore, as Bernardo Bazán has shown, if we look carefully at how Thomas discusses Averroes' noetic in these articles, nothing permits us to suspect that he is thinking about contemporary authors.⁵⁸ It is rather at his return to Paris, after reading the *reportationes* of the masters of the arts faculty (and not only of Siger), that he takes the measure of the danger and sketches his *De unitate intellectus contra averroistas*, justly considered pivotal to the controversy.⁵⁹

(footnote continued from previous page)

that there have been Averroists who have admitted the unicity of the human intellect, that is not the case for Averroes himself, who admits the individual immortality of the human soul, even in the material intellect" (p. 177); see also the similar positions of M.-R. Ruben Hayoun and A. de Libera, *Averroès and l'averroïsme*, Que Sais-Je? 2631 (Paris, 1991), pp. 78ff.; opposed to them, B. G. Bazán, "Le Commentaire de S. Thomas d'Aquin sur le *Traité de l'âme*," *RSPT* 69 (1985) 521–47, thinks that Averroes' *Grand commentaire* indeed contains the error that the theologians denounce in it (cf. pp. 529–31).

⁵⁶ Gauthier, Leon., vol. 45/1, p. 222*; for Siger as a reader of Thomas cf. R.-A. Gauthier, "Notes sur Siger de Brabant. I. Siger en 1265," *RSPT* 67 (1983) 212–32, who retraces, with textual supports, the route that we have just described. On Thomas's use of Averroes, see the list compiled by C. Vansteenkiste, "San Tommaso d'Aquino ed Averroè," *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 32 (1957) 585–23; and the briefer overview: L. Elders, "Averroès et saint Thomas d'Aquin," *Doctor communis* 45 (1992) 46–56. More specific and more ample, cf. J. M. Casciaro Ramirez, *Las fuentes arabes y rabínicas en la doctrina de Sto. Tomás sobre la Profecía* (Rome, 1971).

⁵⁷ Cf. reference to *De unitate intellectus*, Leonine, vol. 43, p- 249.

⁵⁸ Cf. Bazán, *Siger de Brabant, Quaestiones in Tertium De anima*, pp. 70*–74*.

⁵⁹ The text of the *De unitate intellectus contra averroistas* is found in the Leonine edition,

(footnote continued on next page)

Thomas did not think himself less well armed than his adversaries, and he followed them onto their terrain in a close discussion of the texts. Making use of the most recent translations of Aristotle and his commentators, he shows them how much "Averroes" (in reality, Averroes "re-read" by the theologians) is opposed simultaneously both to Aristotle's doctrine and the Christian faith. He challenges them therefore to take into account this data of common experience: *Hic homo singularis intelligit*.⁶⁰

The argument seems to have troubled them, Siger notably, since he was already a reader of the Thomas of the *Sentences*. Siger was led to read Thomas frequently, and seems to have evolved afterward toward less heterodox positions. We know that in his *De anima intellectiva*, which appeared after the *De unitate intellectus*, while continuing to pit his own exegesis of Aristotle against Thomas's, he names Thomas in company with Saint Albert as being, both of them, *praecipui viri in philosophia* and concedes that the intellect "intelligendo est operans intrinsecum ad corpus per suam naturam."⁶¹ Going still further, he will write in his *Super De causis*: "Intellectus . . . naturaliter est unitus corpori; . . . anima intellectiva est corporis perfectio et forma."⁶² This writing manifestly uses Thomas's *Super De causis*, as well as the *Prima Pars* and the *Super Physicam*.⁶³

(footnote continued from previous page)

vol. 43, pp. 289–314; lacking that, one might use the edition by L. W. Keeler, *S. Thomae Aquinatis Tractatus de unitate intellectus contra averroistas*, Textus et documenta, Series philosophica 12 (Rome, 1936) (see the remarks by F. Van Steenberghen, "Corrections au textes du *De unitate intellectus* de Thomas d'Aquin," *Bull. SIEPM* 19 (1977) 65–67, especially à propos Keeler's edition); French translation by the Abbé Bandel, *Vrin-Reprise 3* (Paris, 1984); there are also translations in various languages (English, Spanish, Italian). See Catalogue at the end of the present volume. Since the French edition of this book, a first-rank book on this subject has appeared: Thomas d'Aquin, *L'Unité de l'intellect contre les averroïstes, suivi des textes contre Averroès antérieurs à 1270*, trans. and intro. A. de Libera (Paris: GF-Flammarion, 1994).

⁶⁰ This was already the argument in the Q. *De anima*, a. 2: "Si autem intellectus possibilis esset substantia separata, impossibile esset quod eo intelligeret homo."

⁶¹ Siger, *De anima intellectiva*, ed. Bazán, pp. 81 and 85; it was thought until a short while ago that there had been between these two writings a *De intellectu*, by Siger, directly addressed to Thomas, in which the author showed himself still to be very radical according to the fragments that were known of it (cf. Bazán, *ibid.*, p. 75), but some serious doubts have recently emerged about the existence of this text, and the fragments in question seem to belong rather to the *Tertium De anima*. Cf. A. Pattin, "Notes concernant quelques écrits attribués à Siger de Brabant," *Bull. de Phil. médiévale* 29 (1987) 173–77.

⁶² Siger, *Super De causis*, ed. Marlasca, p. 106, quoted by Leonine, vol. 45, p. 250.

⁶³ Cf. Bazán, Siger, *ibid.*, p. 74*–77*; H.-F. Dondaine, Leonine, vol. 43, pp. 248–51; Van Steenberghen, *La philosophie au XIII^e siècle*, pp. 430–56 (2d ed. 1991, pp. 387–98). The Leonine gives the following chronology: (1) Thomas, *Sentencia libri De anima*; (2) Siger, *In*

(footnote continued on next page)

These discussions, too briefly described here, are not of purely intellectual interest; they are also important to an understanding of Thomas's personality. The biographical sources underline Thomas's good will and his humility in confrontation with Pecham in spite of the latter's impetuosity, and it is true that Pecham himself (a propos of another episode?) emphasizes Thomas's humility.⁶⁴ But we should also stress that in these controversies Thomas appears himself again: a battler who does not hesitate to fight when it is necessary and who is ready to respond to any challenge.⁶⁵ Loyal and rigorous certainly, but also impatient in polemics when faced with adversaries who do not understand the weight of an argument, indignant when they question things involving the faith⁶⁶ and even ironic, as when he addresses himself to them, paraphrasing Job 12:2, as if they were the only reasonable beings among whom wisdom had appeared.⁶⁷

More than these character traits, however, which do not show Thomas in the best light but do translate in their way the ardor of the controversy and the concern of the believer at these questionings, we retain from all this Thomas's desire not to compromise the faith—under pretext of defending it—by ineffective argument. This occurs sometimes in theological circles, when the faith is surreptitiously invoked to give a force to arguments that they themselves do not always have. Thomas thinks about the image that theology gives of itself to some redoubtable dialecticians in the faculty of arts and, at the risk of rendering the task temporarily more difficult, he refuses to depreciate the demands of reason.

Thus he not only gives a proof of his intellectual loyalty but also elicits respect from his toughest adversaries, who will thus accept dialogue with him—Siger for example. He thinks also of God's transcendence, which inadequate apologists render ridiculous. This is not simply the attitude of

(footnote continued from previous page)

Tertium De anima (1269–70); (3) Thomas, *De unitate intellectus* (1270); Siger, *De intellectu* (1270; but cf. above, note 52) [the Censure of the ten propositions (10 December 1270)]; (5) Thomas, *Super De causis* (1272); (6) Siger, *De anima intellectiva* (1273–74); (7) Siger, *Super De causis* (1274–76). For the relations between Thomas and Siger we should recall the important study by B. C. Bazán, "Le dialogue philosophique entre Siger de Brabant et Thomas d'Aquin. A propos d'un ouvrage récent de E. H. Wéber O.P.," *RPL* 72 (1974) 53–155, who pertinently discusses the theses of *L'homme en discussion à l'Université de Paris en 1270. La controverse de 1270 à l'Université de Paris et son retentissement sur la pensée de S. Thomas d'Aquin*, Bibl. thom. 40 (Paris, 1970).

⁶⁴. Cf. above, note 21.

⁶⁵. *De unitate*, conclusion.

⁶⁶. *De unitate* IV, ll. 315–19; *ibid.* V, ll. 422–30.

⁶⁷. *De aeternitate*, Leonine, vol. 43, p. 88, l. 254; cf. pp. 86–87, ll. 115–17.

a thinker and professor, it is also that of a concerned preacher of the faith to a faithful people. In the sermon *Attendite a falsis prophetis*, which denounces *illi qui dicunt quod mundus est aeternus*, he puts on guard those who raise objections that they do not know how to resolve, for one thus gives over reason to the adversary: "*Idem est dubitationem movere et eam non solvere, quod eam concedere*."⁶⁸

⁶⁸. *Sermones et opuscula concionatoria*, ed. J.-B. Raulx, vol. I (Paris, 1881), pp. 486–87 (ed. S. E. Fretté [Vivès], vol. 32, p. 676); cf. V. Serverat, "L'irrisio fidei chez Raymond Lulle et S. Thomas d'Aquin," *RT* 90 (1990) 436–48.

**Chapter XI—
The Second Period of Teaching at Paris:
(1268–1272)**

The motives for Thomas's return to Paris have led us to speak first of his engagement in contemporary controversies. It is important, nevertheless, not to commit a frequent error of perspective and to imagine that he was mixed up in these matters to such an extent that he dedicated all his time to them. Far from it! His principal occupation remained teaching *sacra pagina*, and it is to this period that we owe some of his most celebrated works: the scriptural commentaries and disputed questions.

**I—
Scriptural Commentaries and Disputed Questions**

We already know that we must situate during this sojourn the lectures on the Gospel of Saint Matthew, reported on by Peter d'Andria and Léger de Besançon, which to all appearances were the subject of Thomas's courses in the academic year 1269–70.¹ It still remains for us to situate the two great works: the lectures on the Fourth Gospel and on the Epistles of Saint Paul. The questions about these works are numerous and they will remain so for a long time until the critical edition of the texts will have allowed us to replace hypotheses, if not always with certitude, then at least with more certain data.

¹. Cf. above, our chap. IV.

The *Lectura super Ioannem*

It seems that we may attribute the *Lectura super Ioannem* with sufficient certitude to this second period of teaching at Paris. Unless we are mistaken, the majority of authors (Glorieux, Eschmann, Weisheipl), agree on this temporal framework, but without being any more precise than that. Mandonnet, who placed the *In Matthaeum* during the first period of teaching at Paris, and the *Expositio in Job* at the beginning of the second (according to him, January to June 1269), thought he could situate the *Super Ioannem* during the following two years, 1269 to 1271.²

The tentative chronology for the *Super Matthaeum* leads us rather to shift this proposal by a year. The course on Saint John, therefore, would have been given in 1270 to 1272.³ But the questions on this point are still more numerous than the answers. If as Mandonnet believed—he judged on the basis of the number of lectures as we find them in the printed editions—Thomas needed two years to teach Saint John, we would then have to shift the lectures on Saint Paul to the period at Naples. This appears plausible, as we will see, but we should not base it on Mandonnet's reasoning. We know today that the divisions of the printed texts do not correspond to those that we find in the manuscripts; there would not, therefore, be anything constraining in the divisions, and we could envisage another way of viewing things.

It is true that the size of the *Super Ioannem* invites us at first to allow it more time, but it is also possible that this greater extension stems from a rewriting done either by Thomas (rather unlikely) or by Reginald (more likely).⁴ We know, through the testimony of the principal manuscripts, that Reginald reported on this course on Saint John at the request of certain confreres, especially the provost of Saint-Omer. This passage is important enough to warrant translation:

Here therefore is what I, Friar Reginald of Piperno, of the Order of Preachers, at the request of certain companions and particularly at the order of the reverend Father Lord Provost of Saint-Omer, have gathered together in fol-

² Mandonnet, *Chronologie des écrits scripturaires*, pp. 50–59.

³ We thus agree with C. Spicq's suggestion, *Esquisse*, p. 311, who suggests 1270–71 without, however, explaining himself; Weisheipl (p. 372) held to the framework 1269–72 without specifying further.

⁴ We can verify precisely this phenomenon of amplification in the case of the preaching on the Decalogue, where we see an increase, sometimes of two-to-one, in comparing the rewritten text with the text of the *reportatio*. Cf. *Collationes*, ed. Torrell, pp. 17–18.

lowing Father Thomas Aquinas—just like he who gathers the grapes [left] after the harvest. Please God that it is not too inadequate to the work.⁵

The provost, identified elsewhere as having been Adenulf of Anagni, was at the time one of Thomas's students, and probably contributed to the incidental costs of the operation (parchment, recopying).⁶ As this labor of reporting was customary for Reginald and he was not always specific about it, we must doubtless understand in this reference that he not only took notes listening to his master but also clarified them at Adenulf's request. This would have been greatly facilitated for him further by the fact that Thomas had already composed the *Catena* on John, and Reginald drew massively on that work; that is also why we find the same patristic sources, Chrysostom and Augustine, in particular in the two works.⁷

We recall that Bartholomew of Capua and Tolomeo of Lucca state that this *Reportatio* was revised by Thomas. In light of his other occupations during this time (we will return to this later), this seems improbable enough; Reginald would not have failed to emphasize it and, if Thomas had done the revision, Reginald would never have dared to write *utinam non diminute*. The reason that "we do not find a better" *reportatio* than this should rather be sought in the careful work that he carried out. If this hypothesis of an amplified revision is well founded, we can then generalize with an observation (to which we will soon return) about the frequency of the disputed questions. And we may suppose that, for the course on Saint John, Thomas adopted a lightened teaching load in order to reserve more time for his other works.

To all appearances, Thomas took the books of the New Testament in their canonical order. In passing directly from Matthew to John, he must have thought that Matthew took the place of the two other Synoptics, while John had something special to say. Furthermore, he is clear enough on

⁵ "Haec ergo sunt quae ego Frater Reginaldus de Piperno, ordinis Praedicatorum, ad preces quorundam sociorum et specialiter ad mandatum Reverendi Parris Domini praepositi Sancti Audomari post fratrem Thomam de Aquino, quasi qui colligit racemos post vindemiam, utinam non diminute, collegi" (colophon of ms. *Paris, Mazarine, 801* (177), according to Mandonnet, *Des écrits authentiques*, p. 39, note 1). The same text is transcribed a little more fully by Gauthier, *Angelicum* 51 (1974) 456.

⁶ Cf. Mandonnet, *Chronologie des écrits scripturaires*, pp. 56–58; Adenulf, nephew of Pope Gregory IX, canon of Notre Dame, master of theology in 1272, elected bishop of Paris in 1288, had himself carried, already ill, to Saint Victor, where he died in monk's garb in 1289. Cf. *Lexikon des Mittel.* 1 (1980), col. 149.

⁷ This matter has been established beyond all dispute by Conticello, *San Tommaso ed i Padri*, pp. 79–86.

this subject in his *Prologue*: "The other evangelists deal principally with the mysteries of Christ's humanity; in his Gospel, John puts first and in a special way Christ's divinity."

These few words furnish the reader with a precious reading guide, for this same statement returns at the end of the book. When he comments on the risen Jesus' appearance to the apostle who had not believed up until then and who cried out "My Lord and My God," Thomas explains what had occurred to his patron saint thus: "In confessing the true faith, Thomas immediately became a good theologian [*statim factus est Thomas bonus theologus, veram fidem confitendo*] [who recognized] Christ's humanity . . . and his divinity." It was without doubt for the same reason that Thomas, at the beginning of his *Lectura*—following the whole tradition—presents the Apostle John as a very model of the contemplative, who has a sharp awareness of the insufficiency of theological discourse about Christ:

The words and deeds of Christ are also the words and deeds of God. If someone wished to write them or to recount them in detail, he would not know how to do so. Indeed, the entire world would not suffice. An infinity of human words could not attain to the unique Word of God. Since the beginning of the Church, we have always written about Christ; never enough however. Even if the world were to endure for hundreds of thousands of years, the books that we could write on this subject would never succeed in perfectly elucidating his deeds and words.⁸

It would be a bit foolish to try drawing up a ranking of Thomas's best scriptural commentaries, but it is certain that we could classify this one along with the commentary on Job or on the Epistle to the Romans as among the most fully finished and most profound that he has left us. Certain people do not hesitate to say that it holds among them a "unique place," and that we could even say that it is "the theological work par excellence by Saint Thomas." This statement can be explained if we recall that "John's gospel contains the ultimate in revelation."⁹

⁸ *Super Ioan.*, finale, no. 2660: "Verba autem et facta Christi sunt etiam Dei. Si quis autem vellet eorum rationem per singula scribere vel narrare, nullo modo posset; immo etiam nec totus mundus hoc potest. Infinita enim verba hominum non possunt attingere unum Dei Verbum. A principio enim Ecclesiae semper scripta sunt de Christo, nec tamen sufficienter; immo si duraret mundus per centum millia annorum possent libri fieri de Christo, nec ad perfectionem per singula, facta et dicta sua enuclearentur."

⁹ M.-D. Philippe in his full and beautiful preface to: *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Commentaire sur l'Evangile de saint Jean*, Versailles-Buxy, 3 vols. now available (up to chapter VIII) 1981, 1982, 1987; we recommend this translation, which was done with much care, and has benefitted from the corrections of the Leonine edition and thus improves upon the Cai edition (Marietti).

I will not linger on the point here. But we cannot recommend too highly a reading of the superb lectures on the mystery of the Incarnation as they pertain to John's *Prologue*, or the no less beautiful lecture concerning the Holy Spirit, regarding the "wind that blows where it will," and the "spring of living water that gushes from his breast," and the Paraclete in chapters fourteen to sixteen, who completes Jesus' work and lead us toward all truth. Thomas reveals himself here as one of the contemplatives of whom Saint John is the model.¹⁰

Disputed Questions: De malo and Others

As to the disputations that Thomas began to hold again within the framework of his university activity, scholars are far from agreement. Not long ago, in light of Mandonnet,¹¹ Weisheipl, who placed the *De malo* and the *De spiritualibus creaturis* at Rome, assigned to the second period of teaching in Paris the disputed questions *De anima*, *De uirtutibus in communi*, *De caritate*, *De correctione fraterna*, *De spe*, *De uirtutibus cardinalibus*, as well the question *De unioni Verbi incarnati* (which Mandonnet put at Viterbo).¹²

This clump of titles allows us to see the difficulty that once existed in establishing the exact date of these disputes solely on the basis of internal criteria. Nevertheless, since the recent labors of the Leonine editors, we see here a little more clearly, and we know at least that we should place the questions *De anima* (1265–66) and *De spiritualibus creaturis* (1267–68) during the Roman period;¹³ but we must also undertake an examination of the date and place of the writing of *De malo*, which we left unresolved.

Tolomeo puts the *De malo* in Italy in the time of Clement IV (1265–1268);¹⁴ many historians have believed this statement, but we cannot trust ourselves to it blindly. Without going over in detail the diverse positions,¹⁵

¹⁰. Numerous studies have appeared on this commentary; we note here studies of general interest: J. A. Weisheipl, "An Introduction to the Commentary on the Gospel of Saint John," in *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Commentary on the Gospel of Saint John*, Part I (Albany, N.Y., 1980), 3–19; S. Cipriani, "Riflessioni esegetiche su 'Super S. Joannis Evangelium lectura' di S. Tommaso," in *Tommaso d'Aquino nel suo settimo Centenario*, vol. 4 (Naples, 1976), pp. 41–59; A. Cirillo, *Cristo Rivelatore del Padre nel Vangelo di S. Giovanni secondo il Commento di San Tommaso d'Aquino*, Diss., Angelicum (Rome, 1988).

¹¹. Mandonnet, *Chronologie des questions disputées*, p. 354.

¹². Weisheipl, pp. 307–12 and 365–66.

¹³. Cf. above, chap. IX.

¹⁴. Tolomeo, XXII 39 (ed. A. Dondaine, p. 151, l. 50).

¹⁵. Cf. on this O. Lottin, "La date de la question disputée *De malo* de saint Thomas d'Aquin," in *Psychologie et Morale aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles*, vol. VI (Gembloux, 1960), pp. 353–72: which was the *status questionis* at the time; now see Leonine, vol. 23, (1982), pp. 3*–5*.

we can say here that the discussion turns principally on the doctrinal evolution that Question 6 attests to and that permits us to propose the following reference points for a potential chronology. This Question 6 is prior to Questions 9–10 of the *Prima Secundae* and therefore to that entire part of the *Summa*. If the *Prima Secundae* had been begun in Italy, as is sometimes said, it would be necessary to situate the first six questions of the *De malo* before the departure from Rome.

But at the same time this very Question 6 is without doubt later than *Quodlibet* I, which generally has been dated to Easter 1269 (Pelster: Christmas 1269). And it is admitted that this question reflects the situation in Paris a little before or a little after the condemnation of 10 December 1270. We must therefore also admit that the *Prima Secundae* was not begun until after that date. This puts in doubt the date proposed by Glorieux,¹⁶ as we have said, but it leads in the direction suggested by Gauthier, for whom the massive use of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in the *Prima Secundae* meant that it was begun after 1270.¹⁷

Without yet knowing Gauthier's suggestions, Father Bataillon had recommended caution: "A somewhat simultaneous composition of these two works would explain rather well both the disputed question and the *Summa*, which seems to give the final position of Saint Thomas's thought."¹⁸ Bataillon distinguishes carefully the respective dates of *dispute*, *redaction*, and *publication* of the questions *De malo*. For the first, it is difficult if not impossible to be more precise, but for the editing there are some solid facts: because of the use of the Simplicius's commentary on the *Categories* in Q. 1, we must place it after March 1266;¹⁹ the same goes for article 12 of Q. 16, which is situated after November 1267, since it cites Themistius's commentary on the *De anima*.²⁰ As to Q. 6, as we have just said, its redaction supposes the context of the December 1270 condemnation. It must therefore be placed a little before or after that event.²¹

¹⁶ Glorieux, *Chronologie de la Somme*, p. 94: he says it was begun upon the return to Paris in the beginning of January or a little bit earlier.

¹⁷ Cf. above, chap. VIII.

¹⁸ Preface to the critical edition to the *De malo* (by P.-M. Gils), Leonine, vol. 23, p. 5*.

¹⁹ Cf. *De malo*; Q.1 a. 1 ad 2, 7, 11; for the date of the translation, cf. A. Pattin, ed., *Simplicius, Commentaire sur les Catégories d'Aristote, Traduction de Guillaume de Moerbeke* (Louvain-Paris, 1971), pp. xi–xii.

²⁰ Cf. *De malo*, Q.16 a. 12 ad 1; cf. G. Verbeke, ed., *Thémistius, Commentaire sur le traité de l'âme d'Aristote, Traduction de Guillaume de Moerbeke* (Louvain-Paris, 1957), p. lxiii.

²¹ Leonine, vol. 23, p. 4* note 7, connects proposition 3 and the *De malo*, Q.6, arg. 1, 1.4; prop.9 and *ibid.*, arg. 7, 11. 60–63, and refers to A. San Cristobal-Sebastian, *Controversias acerca de la voluntad desde 1270 a 1300* (Madrid, 1958), pp. 13–20.

As to the date of publication, we also have some precise data, for the textual criticism carried out by the Leonine Commission has allowed us to establish that the whole manuscript tradition stems from a single Parisian copy. This already points toward a Parisian source for the work. Furthermore, the fact that the oldest manuscripts stop at piece 23 and contain only the first fifteen questions, invites us to think that the work had first circulated in this shorter form; Question 16 would have been added a little later with the author's permission, without doubt before his departure for Italy in the spring of 1272. In effect, the first taxation lists from the book-shops, around 1275–80, attest to the existence of the complete work in 28 pieces.²² Bataillon advances, therefore, as a strongly plausible hypothesis publication in two phases: one without doubt around 1270 for Questions 1–15; the other, probably 1272, for Question 16.

As to Question 6, which, it has been quite often pointed out, breaks the regular flow of the *De malo*, it is quite remarkable that it never circulated separately; "It is now certain that Thomas himself placed it where it is found in the series of these questions."²³ There is nothing illogical in this, Father Bataillon remarks; it is even entirely comprehensible that, after having spoken about original sin, Thomas decided to bring the subject of free will up to date before passing to the examination of actual sin.

As these last reflections suggest, we should now say a few words about the content of this series of questions. The first question has given its name to the whole, but it is the only one that speaks explicitly of the problem of evil in general. We must therefore read it in connection with Thomas's other great explanations in order to have his full thought on the subject.²⁴ Two questions then follow on sin and its causes (*De peccatis* and *De causa peccati*, Questions 2 and 3), and two others on original sin and the punishment that followed it (Questions 4 and 5). Question 6, *De electione*

²² *Chartul.* no. 530, p. 646; Denifle situates this list between 1275 and 1286, but Destrez notes that it still does not show the *Tertia Pars* and that we must therefore bring it closer to the first of the two dates (cf. Leonine, vol. 23, p. 3, n.8); cf. *Chartul.* II, no. 642, p. 108: the list for 1304.

²³ Leonine, vol. 23, p. 5*.

²⁴ See in particular *Summa Theologiae*, la qq. 48–49, with, for example, the annotations by A. D. Sertillanges in the edition of the *Revue des Jeunes*, with the appendix V, pp. 273–80; *Sent.* 11 d.34 and 37; *SCG* 111 5–15, 71; *Compendium theol.* 114–18, 141–42. We refer also to the fuller work by L. Sentis, *Saint Thomas d'Aquin et le mal*, Foi chrétienne et théodicée (Paris, 1992), which studies Thomas's evolution beginning with the *Sentences*, passing through the *Summa contra Gentiles*, and the *Summa*; the *De malo* is studied on pp. 161–204, with some large translated extracts from Q. 1 (cf. however, the strict recension of S.-Th. Bonino, in *RT* 95 (1995) 512–18).

humana, should also be read in the context of other great developments in Thomas on liberty,²⁵ but this is a subject to which we will return. We then approach the question of venial sin (Question 7), followed by a general question on pride and the seven deadly sins (Question 8), which are presented in this order: vainglory, envy, sloth, anger, avarice, gluttony, luxury (Questions 9–15). Finally, question 16 offers the reader an exposition of demonology relatively complete in twelve articles.²⁶

Until the critical edition is completed, we will be hampered in dating the other Disputed Questions in a more precise fashion; if we have tried to do so here, it is only through what seems plausible. Without neglecting the degree of uncertainty this entails, we can reasonably think that, since the questions *De potentia*, *De anima*, and *De spiritualibus creaturis* belong to the Roman period, this constitutes a supplementary indication to the already numerous data that orient us toward the second teaching period in Paris for the public dispute on the questions *De malo*. Thomas's other works saw very rapid publication, and there is no reason this one should have been an exception. With a single difference, we therefore find, by an entirely different route, the chronology once proposed by Palémon Glorieux.²⁷

The question now is to know if we should put *De malo* at the beginning or the end of the period. Glorieux thought we should place the dispute *De anima* in Paris, between January and June 1269, and he placed the *De uirtutibus* and its thirty-six articles at the beginning of the scholastic year 1269–70.²⁸ He was thus led to put Questions 1–5 of the *De malo* in the spring of 1270, while Questions 6–16 were spread from September 1270 to Easter 1272. By then, nothing more would have remained to be disputed

²⁵ See on this *Summa Theologiae, Prima Pars*, Question 83 with its parallels and the annotations by S. Pinckaers, in the volume *Les actes humains*, *Revue des Jeunes*, vol. 2 (2d ed. Paris, 1966), pp. 249–73; see the same author's *The Sources of Christian Ethics*, trans. Sr. Mary Thomas Noble (Washington, D.C., 1995), pp. 354–99; H.-M. Manteau-Bonnamy, "La liberté de l'homme scion Thomas d'Aquin. La datation de la Question disputée *De malo*," *AHDLMA* 46 (1979) 7–34.

²⁶ There is an English translation, which was done before the critical edition: Saint Thomas Aquinas, *Disputed Questions on Evil*, trans. J. J. Oesterle (Notre Dame, 1983).

²⁷ P. Glorieux, "Les Questions Disputées de S. Thomas et leur suite chronologique," *RTAM* (1932) 5–33; cf. pp. 22ff.; except for a few things (the *De spiritualibus creaturis*, which he wished to place at Paris, forcing him to shift the *De malo* a little bit), we have P. Synave's chronology here as well, *Le problème chronologique*, pp. 157–58.

²⁸ This figure corresponds to the sum total of what has been divided in the printed editions between the questions *De uirtutibus in communi*, *De caritate*, *De correctione fraterna*, *De spe*, *De uirtutibus cardinalibus*.

than the *De unione Verbi incarnati*, in May 1272, before the return to Italy.

What we now know of the diffusion of the manuscript of the *De malo* (already beginning around 1270), seems to call more for situating the disputes that preceded redaction and publication to the beginning of this second Parisian period. Thus, the series *De uirtutibus*, followed by the *De unione Uerbi*, would be placed instead at the end. This would not change a great deal about the annual average of some forty disputes (identified in the articles) that permitted Glorieux to arrive at his division. If we take away the Question *De anima*, that average goes down by five, but this does not constitute an insurmountable obstacle if we think that the scholastic year 1271–72 was probably shortened. In any case, we are much below the average of more than eighty annual disputes, which had taken place for the *De ueritate*. We must therefore conclude about this that, in conformity with what we have already verified in Rome, in his maturity Thomas noticeably reduced the frequency of his ordinary disputes so as to reserve for himself a little more free time for his other occupations.

Among the advantages of the chronology proposed here, there is that formerly exploited by Glorieux (and Gauthier more recently in another form) to show how the writing of the various disputes and Aristotelian commentaries took place in parallel with the composition of the *Summa theologiae*. Friar Thomas was certainly a great and rapid worker, but he knew how not to disperse his concentration or his forces. If the *De malo* Q. 6 precedes the opening of the *Prima Secundae* a little, the *De uirtutibus* accompanies quite well some other passages from this part or from the *Secunda Secundae*.²⁹

This is not to say that there is total simultaneity between the two elements of each of these parallels, but it certainly points us toward temporal proximity. Indeed, in this light, we believe that we can clarify the question of the date of the *De unione Uerbi incarnati*. We know the doctrinal issues involved from the anteriority or the posteriority of article 4 to the *Tertia Pars* q. 17 a.2: Did Thomas change his opinion and admit at the end of his life that there are two *esse* in Christ—one the principal *esse*, the other

²⁹. Without entering into the details here, compare the Q. *De anima* with the *Prima Pars*, QQ.75–87; the *De malo* I and XVI with *Prima*, QQ.48–64; the *De malo* 11–VII with *Prima Secundae*, QQ. 71–89; the *De malo* 7–15 with *Secunda Secundae*, QQ. 35–153; the *De uirtutibus* I and V with *Prima Secundae*, QQ. 55–69; the *De uirtutibus* II–XV with *Secunda Secundae*, QQ. 17–33; and finally the *De unione uerbi incarnati* with the *Tertia Pars*, Q.17. These comparisons seem quite convincing; cf. the table in Glorieux, *Les Questions Disputées*, p. 33.

secondary—corresponding to his two natures (which is the teaching of the *De unione*)? Or indeed does he admit definitively only a single *esse*, as he had always said elsewhere and repeats in the *Tertia*? But then how shall we interpret the "faux-pas" of the *De unione*?³⁰

We do not have to enter here further into this question, which has occupied Thomists for a long time (630 years, as Pelster told us in 1925). Some of them (Cajetan) say that the *De unione* is a youthful work and that Thomas retracted it; others (Billot) go so far as to declare it unauthentic. The Leonine Commission's labors no longer leave any doubt about its authenticity, since the text of this Question was already transmitted in manuscripts from the end of the thirteenth century and it is included in the works announced by the booksellers in the taxation lists of the most ancient catalogues.³¹

This question has experienced a considerable return to relevance in our century.³² If we stick to the simple question of dating and if we judge in the light of the parallels mentioned above, it is highly implausible that Thomas would have inserted this dispute in his teaching program, outside of any link with works then underway or foreseen for the immediate future.

The end of his Italian sojourn or the beginning of his last Parisian period do not lend themselves very much to this scenario; on the contrary, the spring of 1272—when the *Tertia Pars* was nearly ready to be written if not already begun—would fit better with these factors. Pelster considers as certain a discussion in Naples in 1272–73,³³ but the testimony of the catalogues does not leave any doubt: the third series of Thomas's disputes was held *secunda uice Parisius*.³⁴ We incline rather to accept those authors who situate this question toward the end of the second period of teach-

³⁰. See the principal places where Thomas spoke about this question: *Sent.* III d.6 q. 2 a. 2; *Quodlib.* IX q. 2 a. 2; *Comp. theol.* 1212; Q. *De unione* a.4; *ST* IIIa q. 17 a. 2. In all these passages, Thomas repeats *unum esse in Christo*, except in the *De unione*: "Est autem et aliud esse huius suppositi . . . in quantum est temporaliter homo factum. Quod . . . non . . . est esse principale sui suppositi, sed *secundarium*."

³¹. Preface to the Leonine edition, vol. 24, in preparation.

³². The principal work on this is by A. Patfoort, *L'unité d'être dans le Christ d'après S. Thomas. A la croisée de l'ontologie et de la christologie* (Paris, 1964), in which we find the prior literature; see also the review by M.-D. Philippe, *Philosophical Studies* 16 (1967) 291–99, and the "compte-rendu" by M. L.-B. Guérard des Lauriers, *BT* 12 (1963–65) 5–168.

³³. F. Pelster, "La Quaestio disputata de saint Thomas *De unione verbi incarnati*," *Arch. de Phil.* 3 (1925) 198–45; cf. the review by P. Synave, *BT* 1 (1926) 3, pp.[1]–[21].

³⁴. The Prague List (Grabmann, *Werke*, p. 92); "aliam *secunda vice Parisius*, scilicet de virtutibus et ultra"; cf. *Chartul.* I, p. 646; II, p. 108 (booksellers list from 1275 [?] and 1304, which mentions only *De uirtutibus*, but the number of "pieces" witnesses that the *De unione* was included).

ing in Paris: before Easter, early in April (Weisheipl) or May (Glorieux) 1272.³⁵

The Quodlibetal Disputes

To be complete, this scanning of the horizon should also mention the quodlibetal disputes that were added to the ordinary disputes. This academic activity, so characteristic of the medieval university, has been the subject of numerous studies and, without having yielded all its secrets, is now well understood.³⁶ We know that these disputes took place two times a year, during Lent and during Advent (we currently say Easter and Christmas for convenience) and that they developed over two sessions. In the first, as the name indicates, those present, whether they were masters or students or even the simply curious, could raise all sorts of questions (*de quolibet ad voluntatem cuiuslibet*).³⁷ The master normally let his bachelor respond and did not intervene unless he got into difficulty; the master reserved the right to give his magisterial determination in the second session, which took place either the next day or several days later.

Although reserved for masters, this activity did not, however, constitute an obligation for them. If it is an exaggeration to say that only the greatest figures dared deliver themselves over to this perilous exercise, it is true that not all of them submitted to it. It is furthermore well known that certain masters, for example, Henry of Ghent, Godfrey of Fontaines, John of Pouilly, etc., took pleasure in them and made the occasion a preferred form of expression. The undisputed champion in this format is Gerard of Abbeville, a secular master and rival of Thomas Aquinas, whom we have already met. We know of twenty quodlibets by him.³⁸ As one can see in reading the lists of the proposed subjects, liberty to speak was real, but the exercise was not purely spontaneous. The master could himself propose certain questions and make certain persons—bachelors or students—in-

³⁵. Weisheipl, pp. 307–12 (analysis of the contents of the Question) 365–66; Glorieux, *Les Questions Disputées*, pp. 30–31.

³⁶. The pioneer in this field is P. Glorieux; among his numerous works, we recall *La littérature quodlibétique de 1260 à 1320*, Bibliothèque thomiste 5 and 21 (Paris, 1925 and 1935) (this subject is dealt with more briefly in Glorieux's *L'enseignement*, pp. 128–34); we can bring this up to date thanks to the remarkable synthesizing study by J. F. Wippel, "Quodlibetal Questions Chiefly in Theology Faculties," in B. Bazán, et. al., *Les Questions disputées*, pp. 151–222. Wippel updates and gives a survey of the literature prior to 1985.

³⁷. Humbert of Romans, *Opera de vita regulari*, ed. J. J. Berthier, II, p. 260.

³⁸. For his part, Thomas has only twelve of them; Godfrey and Henry fifteen; cf. Glorieux, *L'enseignement*, pp. 128–34.

tervene. He could also refuse to respond to this or that intervention if he judged it frivolous or out of place, but too frequent refusals clearly would have harmed his reputation.³⁹

Given its very style, the quodlibetal literature is deeply rooted in actual university life; we have already seen this with regard to the quarrel between the mendicants and the seculars, as well as in the confrontation between Thomas and the Franciscans on the unicity or the plurality of forms, but these are only two questions among many others. We also find more down to earth questions that let us glimpse the more immediate concerns of the persons who are present. Made up in large part of clerics, this public allows its pastoral preoccupations concerning private morals or social and economic subjects to appear. Thus along with the life of the university, it is the entire life of an epoch that is reflected here and that in fact makes the quodlibets a fascinating subject of study.⁴⁰

It would be impossible to enumerate all the subjects dealt with by Thomas in these public discussions without running the risk of tiring the reader (there are 260 such subjects, which gives an average of more than 20 for each session),⁴¹ but it is necessary to know that if questions of high speculation are well represented, practical problems are not at all absent. Boyle has drawn up an instructive list of these and has shown that it is in part thanks to these moral cases that Thomas's quodlibets found an entirely unexpected audience, far beyond the small circle of his listeners.

We find that among students of this second period of teaching in Paris, there was a John of Freiburg, whom we have already met as the vulgarizer of the *Secunda Pars*. When he was composing his *Summa Confessorum* in 1298, he drew largely on the teaching of his former master and notably inserted an entire series of twenty-two questions on practical morals coming directly from these quodlibetal disputes, each one among them being properly introduced by the same formula: *secundum Thomam in quadam questione de quolibet*. This disciple's work was much more widely distributed than the master's. Thus, it was by this indirect route that Thomas's ideas had a much broader diffusion.⁴²

As to dates, after the first tentative steps, the researchers have reached agreement on dividing the quodlibets into two groups according to the two

³⁹. Cf. Wippel, "Quodlibetal Questions," pp. 171–72; 199–201.

⁴⁰. L. Boyle, "The Quodlibets of St. Thomas and Pastoral Care," in Boyle's *Pastoral Care*, Study 2 (which first appeared in *The Thomist* 38 (1974) 232–56).

⁴¹. Cf. the complete list in Glorieux, *La littérature quodlibétique* II, pp. 276–90.

⁴². Cf. Boyle, *The Quodlibets*, pp. 252–56.

Parisian sojourns: Quodlibets VII–XI belong to the first period, while Quodlibets I–VI and XII (the *reportatio* on this latter was not revised by Thomas) belong to the second. Apart from this general framework, there are still many differences among scholars about assigning them to Christmas or to Easter of one year or another. Only the publication of the largest possible number of texts and a better knowledge of contemporary events will permit us to achieve little by little those certitudes that are still lacking to us. Table 1 sums up the principal positions.

We cannot leave the quodlibets without trying to see what they teach us about their author. Though carefully reviewed by him, these texts echo the discussions from which they came, and some clearly show Thomas's consciousness of his position as a master in theology. It is worth looking at the Easter 1269 quodlibet, which examines whether it is a waste of time to dedicate oneself to study or teaching.⁴³

Thomas addresses these things from a great height and compares pastoral action to the construction of an edifice, for which both architects and manual laborers are needed; the first carry out a nobler task than the second and receive a better payment for their labor. The same is true in the construction of the spiritual edifice that is the Church:

There are those whom we can compare to manual laborers who are especially employed in the care of souls, for example, in administering the sacraments and in other similar tasks. But those who are comparable to the architects here are the bishops who direct the task of the earlier group and arrange the way in which they ought to accomplish their office; that is why, furthermore, we call them "bishops," which is to say "superintendents." Similarly, the doctors in theology are also architects, who research and teach how others ought to work toward the salvation of souls.⁴⁴ Speaking absolutely, it is better to teach *sacra doctrina*—and more meritorious, if this is done with a good intention—than to consecrate oneself to a particular care of this or that individual. This is why the apostle says of himself: *Christ has sent me not to baptize but to preach* (1 Corinthians 1:17), although to baptize

⁴³. *Quodl.* I q.7 a.2 [14] (cf. above chap. 5); see on this point the long note in the Leonine edition by Fr. Gauthier on the Aristotelian sense of *architector* (and not *architectus*, though a better Latin form), which is quite strongly seized upon, it seems, in the gloss on 1 Corinthians 3:10: not he who draws up the plan of the house, but "he who lays the first stone."

⁴⁴. This comparison will be repeated several years later by a canon regular, Gervais (or Servais) of Mont Saint-Eloi: "*ars disputatoria est architectonia et predicatoria est manu operativa et ideo minus nobilis et minus meritoria, manu operativi minus merentur quam architectonici*," *Quodl.* I q.40, ed. by J. Leclercq, "L'idéal du théologien au moyen âge. Textes inédits," *RevScRel.* 21 (1947) 121–48, cf. p. 130.

is the work most fitting for the salvation of souls. Saint Paul also says: *Recommend the faithful who are capable of it to instruct others in their turn* (2 Tim. 2:2). Reason itself demonstrates that it is more profitable to instruct in the knowledge of salvation those who can make progress in it, both for themselves and for others, than to instruct the simple who can profit only for themselves. However, in case of imminent necessity, bishops and doctors ought to leave their proper office to dedicate themselves to the salvation of particular souls.

This text doubtless contains something a little astonishing for a twentieth-century reader, who perhaps risks being shocked at seeing the pastors of souls considered as simple manual workers, while the theologian is set up as an aristocrat, like a master of the work. The hearers of this proposition would hardly have been surprised; the text conveys not only the high social position of the masters of the University of Paris (let us recall that there were hardly a handful for all of Christendom); it also expresses the com-

THE DATES OF THE QUODLIBETS

We have made use of the table drawn up by Father Boyle (p. 239) to which we add here Father Gauthier's proposals, which he has kindly communicated to us in anticipation of the publication of Volume 25 of the Leonine edition (Paris, 1996), which he has prepared.

The abbreviations used are as follows: E = Easter (the preceding Lent); C = Christmas (the preceding Advent). The complete titles may be found in the bibliography:

Mandonner 1 = P. Mandonnet, *Siger*, vol. 1, ²911, p. 85–87.

Mandonnet 2 = P. Mandonnet, *Chronologie sommaire*, p. 148.

Destrez = J. Destrez, *Les Disputes*, p. 151.

Synave 1 = P. Synave, rev. by Destrez, *BT* 1 (1924) [32]–[50].

Glorieux 1 = P. Glorieux, *Littérature* I, p. 276–290.

Mandonnet 3 = P. Mandonnet, *S. Thomas créateur de la dispute*.

Synave 2 = P. Synave, *L'ordre des Quodlibets VII à XI*.

Pelster 1 = F. Pelster, *Beiträge zur Chronologie*.

Glorieux 2 = P. Glorieux, *Littérature* II, p. 272.

Van Steenberghen = F. Van Steenberghen, *Siger* II, p. 541.

Glorieux 3 = P. Glorieux, *Les Quodlibets VII–XI*.

Pelster 2 = F. Pelster, *Literarische Probleme*.

Isaac = J. Isaac, rev. by Pelster 2, *BT* 8 (1947–1953) 169–72.

Marc = *Introductio to the Summa contra Gentiles* I, p. 412.

Weisheipl = J. A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas*, p. 367.

Gauthier = R.-A. Gauthier, *Préface*, Leon., vol. 25.

QUODLIBET	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	XII
Mandonnet 1 1910	1264	—	—	—	1268	1269 P	1269 N	1270 P	1270 N 1271 P	1271 N		1264– 1268
Mandonnet 2 1920											1272 P	
Destrez 1923	1259	—	—	—	1268				1271 P			
Synave 1 1924	1265 N	1267 N	1266 P	1266 N	1267 P				1270 N			1271 P
Glorieux 1 1925									1271 P			1270 N
Mandonnet 3 1926	1256 N	1257 N	1258 P	1258 N	1259 P				1271 P			1270 N
Synave 2 1926	1257 N								1270 N			1271 P
Pelster 1 1927			1265 Rome			1271 P	1270 N		1269 N			1272 Naples
Glorieux 2 1935	1255 N											
Vansteenberghe 1942									1271 P			1270 N Paris
Glorieux 3 1946	1255 N	1254 N?	1256?	1256 N?								
Pelster 2 1947			1258– 1259			1269 N	1270 N		1271 P			
Isaac 1948	1257 N		1256 N									
Marc 1967	1257 N?	1257– 1260		1257– 1260								
Weisheipl 1974									1271 P			1270 N
Gauthier 1992	1256 P	1257 P	1257 N	1258 P or N	1259 P	1269 P	1269 N	1270 P	1271 P	1271 N	1270 N	1272 P

plementarity of tasks in the ecclesial body. Finally, by concluding this subject with the need to give a hand in the labor if the need arises, it reestablishes, without mincing words, the true hierarchy of values.

Thomas, therefore, did not fear to make the office of teacher and that of the bishop parallel. Far from being a slip, this appears frequently in his work and he purposely compares the *cathedra pontificalis* and the *cathedra magistralis*.⁴⁵ For both, it is a duty to teach sacred Scripture; the difference

⁴⁵ Cf. *Quodl.* III q.4 a.1 [9].

lies in this, that the first proceeds by virtue of the *officium praelationis*: he who preaches teaches and cannot arrogate that role to himself without a mandate. The second does so by virtue of the *officium magisterii*; the manner in which the masters in theology teach. But the task of one and the other, bishops and doctors, has the same final end, which was that of the authors of the sacred Scripture: to lead men to eternal life.⁴⁶ This requires on either side a high morality,⁴⁷ but on the side of the doctors it demands a greater university knowledge, for in that area, as is notorious, the prelates do not know very much.⁴⁸

We would deceive ourselves if we viewed this as some sort of corporatist revenge of the "theologians" against the "magisterium," as was said later. To appreciate these proposals without anachronism, we must recall that Thomas still wavers over the sacramentality of the episcopal office.⁴⁹ In his thought, bishops (or rather prelates as he says more currently) and doctors are equally subject to the judgment of the Church. What he expresses here is the very high consciousness he has of the duty of the doctor, and he cannot better emphasize it than by setting in relief its pastoral end.⁵⁰

II—

Consultations and Diverse Works

The public activities of polemics and of teaching should not hide the intense personal work that the master of Saint-Jacques continued to accomplish. The years 1268–72 are the ones when Thomas composed the enormous *Secunda Pars* of the *Summa theologiae* (probably between January 1271 and Easter 1272) and began composition of the *Tertia Pars*. He did not cease responding to the occasional demands on his intellectual charity during this time, which sometimes put his patience to the test. As was the case at Orvieto and at Rome, this last Parisian sojourn brought its share of personal consultations from which he doubtless could not extricate himself. We have already mentioned some of these, but we must now add several others.

⁴⁶. Cf. *Sent.* IV d. 19 q.2 a.2 qc.3 sol.2 ad 4.

⁴⁷. There is much to meditate on in the *Quodl.* V. q. 12 a.24: *Utrum ille qui semper propter inanem gloriam docuit per penitentiam aureolam recuperet*; a theme repeated by Rainier de Clairmarais, around 1295–96: *Quodl.* I q.2, in Leclercq, *L'idéal du théologien*, p. 143.

⁴⁸. *C. impugnantes* 2, l. 449 f.: . . . *doctrina scolastica cui praelati non multum intendunt*.

⁴⁹. Cf. above chap. 5, n. 46.

⁵⁰. For additional reflections on this subject see Torrell, "La pratique pastorale," pp. 243–44.

De mixtione elementorum; De motu cordis

We first encounter two brief texts (153 and 259 lines) that in our time we would expect not from the pen of a master in theology but rather from a scientific writer. The *De mixtione elementorum* deals with the four elements (water, air, earth, and fire), their qualities (cold and hot, dry and moist), and the role that ancient medicine had them play in the theories of humors and of temperaments. In the Middle Ages, theology, queen of the sciences, could not be uninterested in these matters, and Thomas says nothing that would allow us to believe that his correspondent forces him to go beyond the limits of his knowledge. On the contrary, not only had he spoken about these matters several times⁵¹ (a number of his contemporaries also dealt with them), but the subject of pure physics, which appears to be without theological bearing, became the object of bitter discussion among partisans and adversaries of the unicity of substantial form.⁵² In any case, the text enjoyed an excellent diffusion, since we know of 117 manuscripts and 35 editions.

As to the *De motu cordis*, its central thesis is that the movement of the heart in animals and in men is a natural movement-and not violent as Alfred de Sareshel held in his text of the same name. Without citing the latter, Thomas probably aims to rectify and go beyond it. He himself was interested in this subject in relation to the command that the will could exercise over the limbs of the body: if the heart escapes from this rule, he explained, this indeed is a proof that it has a natural movement. The idea that he exploits here is that the movement of the heart in animals is the same as the movement of the heavens in the world.⁵³ One sign of the interest that this text aroused: we know of 126 manuscripts and 33 printed editions.

Master Philip, the recipient of these two opuscula, was originally from Castrocielo, a commune very close to Roccasecca. He is known to us as

⁵¹ Cf. *Sent*, II d. 12 a.4; IV d.44 q.1 a.1 qc.1 ad 4; *Super Boetium de Trin.* q.4 a. 3 6; *ST Ia* q.76 a.4 ad 4; *Quodl.* I q.4 a.6 ad 3; Q. *De anima* a.9 ad 10.

⁵² Cf. the Preface by H.-F. Dondaine, in his edition of the text: Leonine, vol. 43, pp. 135–37; this opusculum has scarcely been studied, but we take note of L. Robles, "Un opusculo ignorado de Tomás de Aquino, El 'De mixtione elementorum,'" *Estudios Filosóficos* 23 (1974) 239–59.

⁵³ *De motu cordis*, II. 164–65 (Leonine, vol. 43, p. 129): "Sic enim est motus cordis in animal sicut motus celi in mundo"; Thomas returns to this subject in *ST Ia IIae* q.17 a.9. See also on this text the probing study by E. Paschetta, "La natura del moro in base al De motu cordis di S. Tommaso," *MM* 19 (1988) 247–60.

a professor of medicine in Bologna and Naples and, according to Mandonnet, it is not impossible that he was Thomas's classmate at Naples during the time when the young Aquinas was studying there (1239–44). He would also have been his colleague when he returned there in 1272–74.⁵⁴ If that was the case, we understand that it would have been difficult for Friar Thomas not to respond to a request from Master Philip.

We can hardly go further in trying to specify the date of these two opuscula. Since Mandonnet, the *De mixtione* has been placed during the second period of teaching at Paris, and since it shows no sign of polemics, we can believe it precedes the discussions of 1270 on the unicity of substantial form. As to the *De motu cordis*, the same author puts its composition a little later, at Naples in 1273, relying on the plausibility of the relationship between the two colleagues at that time. Father H. Dondaine, editor of these opuscula for the Leonine edition, has accepted these propositions. Weisheipl, following Eschmann, places the *De motu cordis* as well as the *De mixtione elementorum* in Paris between 1270 and 1271.⁵⁵

De operationibus occultis naturae

These "hidden operations of nature" clearly have something to do with magic, which Christian thought, for better or worse, has had to confront since its beginning. Following Saint Augustine in particular,⁵⁶ Thomas encountered the same problem in his own time, but his Aristotelian formation allowed him to approach it in a more rational way. He therefore tries to discern what amounts to the secret action of natural but hidden causes and what might be attributed to the intervention of an evil spirit. Thomas addresses what relates to the four elements, mixed bodies, living things, celestial bodies, and finally, separated substances. He can, therefore, conclude by denouncing the pretensions of astrology: the fact of being born under an astral conjunction or the recourse to amulets or to magic formulas connected with such constellations, cannot have any new effects. If these simulacra or formulas have extraordinary effects, we must attribute them to the intervention of spirits.

⁵⁴. Cf. Mandonnet, "Les 'Opusculs,'" *RT* 32 (1927), pp. 137–38 (cf. p. Marc, introduction to the Marietti edition of the *SCG*, p. 418, no. 1, who reproduces the documents on which Mandonnet based his work); the whole is summed up by H.-F. Dondaine, preface to *De motu cordis*: Leonine, vol. 43, p. 95.

⁵⁵. Eschmann, "A Catalogue," pp. 419–20; Weisheipl, pp. 394–95.

⁵⁶. Cf. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* X xi; according to Gauthier, on *Quodl.* II q. 7 a. 1 [13], the other major source for Thomas on magic is Alkindi, *De radiis* (Leonine, vol. 45/2, pp. 96*–97*).

We know two parallel places for this exposition (*Quodl.* XII q.9 a. 13; *Ila Ilae* q.96 a. 2 ad 2), both dating from the second period of teaching at Paris. Mandonnet saw in this an invitation to date the opusculum to this period. If so, the *Miles ultramontanus* to whom it is addressed should be thought of as living in Italy; this would accord well enough with what we know elsewhere concerning the vogue of magical arts in that country in the thirteenth century, which was much greater, it seems, than in Paris or Oxford.⁵⁷

De iudiciis astrorum

Even shorter than the preceding texts (56 lines), this letter—whose recipient may be Reginald (to judge from its familiar tone, not from the testimony of the manuscripts, which do not say anything of the kind)—shows how widespread, then as now, astrological superstitions were. But this is only an echo of the question that Friar Thomas amply treated elsewhere.⁵⁸

Thomas does not dispute the influence of the stars on "corporal effects" in our world, and that is why it is useful to be aware of lunar phases in agriculture, in medicine, or in navigation. But he accords only a very limited value to explanations of the predictions that astrologers draw up from their observations of dreams, auguries, and geomancy: all that makes little sense (*hoc modicam rationem habet*). On the contrary, he is quite firm (if there could be any doubt) in his defense of human liberty: "The will of man is not subject to the necessity of the stars, for if free will were to disappear, we would no longer be able to impute merit to good works nor fault to evil ones. The Christian must therefore hold as very certain that what depends on the will—for example, human acts—is not subject to the stars by necessity."⁵⁹

De sortibus

Giacomo de Tonengo, the recipient of this opusculum, is rather well known: chaplain to the pope, originally from Tonengo in the Piedmont

⁵⁷. Cf. J. B. McAllister, *The Letter of saint Thomas Aquinas De occultis operationibus naturae ad quendam militem ultramontanum* (Washington, 1939) We must nevertheless say that while the term *Ultramontanus* was known in Italy at this time, it was still unknown in Gaul.

⁵⁸. Cf. *SGG* III 82–87 and 154; *ST Ia* q. 115; *Ia Ilae* q.9 a. 5; *Ila Ilae* q.95 a. 2; *De sortibus* IV; for Thomas and astrology, cf. Lynn Thorndike, *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, II (2d ed. New York, 1929), pp. 608–12; Th. Litt, *Les corps célestes dans l'univers de saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Louvain-Paris, 1963), pp. 220–41.

⁵⁹. *De iudiciis astrorum*, II. 28–35, Leon., vol. 43, p. 201; no indication allows us to fix a date for this; Mandonnet proposed 1269–72 (cf. *Chronologic sommaire*, p. 151).

province of Asti, he is mentioned several times in the registers of the curia in 1263 when Thomas also was at Orvieto.⁶⁰ It must have been during this time, without doubt, that they formed the friendship to which Thomas alludes in his introduction. Following an ingenious hypothesis by Dondaine and Peters, we can, as a first approximation, situate the opusculum between November 1268 and September 1271, during the vacancy of the pontifical seat. The canons of the diocese of Vercelli, among whom was Giacomo de Tonengo, not arriving in time to agree on the election of their bishop and wearied from expecting an intervention by the Holy See (which could not arrive owing to the lack of a pope), reached an agreement to draw lots; it is on this proposal that Friar Thomas's friend would have consulted him. He gave his response during the long vacations which left him, he says, a little free time.⁶¹ Reasoning within this general framework, then, we can presume that the opusculum was composed during the summer of 1270 or 1271.

In spite of the slightrness of the subject, Thomas gave it very careful, and even new and original, study. In five chapters, he explores the reasons that one might have recourse to drawing lots, toward what end, in what way, what is their efficacy, and if, according to the Christian faith, it is licit to have recourse to them. The interest of this opusculum lies in the fact that Thomas develops here what he does not touch on elsewhere except briefly, and he does it on the basis of historical documentation of the best quality. This permits his editor to recommend it to the reader "not only in order to discover a minor dimension of the author's genius: this 'opusculum' is a model of its genre, and among the best by Saint Thomas."⁶²

The most interesting thing for a reader today without doubt is chapter four, where Thomas delivers himself on what we might call the "critique of efficacy" on the use of lots to predict the future. He engages "an entire doctrine of free will in the face of chance in the order of the universe, and finally a doctrine of Providence; the theologian resumes his office here: a magnificent shortcut (4, 212–249) evokes the free play of Providence beyond all causes, all human projects, which does not scorn to reveal its will

⁶⁰ Cf. A. Dondaine, J. Peters, "Jacques de Tonengo et Giffredus d'Anagni auditeurs de saint Thomas," *AFP* 29 (1959) 53–66; it is from this study that we borrow the following information, also reprinted by the Leonine edition, vol. 43, pp. 207–8.

⁶¹ *De sortibus*, *Prol.*, Leonine, vol. 43, p. 229: "intermissis paulisper occupationum mearum studiis, *solempnium uacationum tempore*."

⁶² We reproduce here H.-F. Dondaine's judgment, who gives well-documented reasons for it, Leonine, vol. 43, pp. 208–9.

by way of lots (4, 267ff.)."⁶³ These are the principles for discerning the cases in which it is or is not permitted to resort to lots.

De secreto

Before passing to more extensive works, let us mention again this curious and little-known text. It is not, properly speaking, one of Thomas's works, but rather a kind of *compte-rendu* from a consultation by John of Vercelli during the general chapter of Pentecost 1269; this was therefore just after Thomas's return to Paris. As Hyacinthe Dondaine sums it up: "It deals with six cases having to do with the limits of the power of a religious superior over the conscience of a subordinate who is accused of a secret fault or knows the unknown author of a misdeed."⁶⁴ We may suppose that these were difficulties actually encountered and that John of Vercelli, as well as the capitularies gathered around him, desired to clarify their conduct by taking advantage of the presence among them of the order's intellectual elite.

In addition to Thomas, the commission to which had been assigned the examination of these questions included five other members, all masters from Paris: Bonhomme, Peter of Tarentaise, Bartholomew of Tours, Beaudouin de Maflax, and Gilbert de Ovis, or van Eyen.⁶⁵ They pronounced themselves in total agreement except for Thomas, who became a "lone knight" on two questions. To question four, Thomas said that if it was a case of a judicial procedure, where a civil judge could demand an oath, the religious superior could prescribe it in the name of obedience. Question six concerned the unknown author of a misdeed discovered in the monastery (theft, fire): unlike the other masters, Thomas believed that the superior could issue a general precept to reveal the author of the misdeed in such a way that it would have bound in conscience anyone who knew about it. The first response conforms completely with *Quodlibet* I a. 16, which dates from the same period. The second has embarrassed commentators who find it "weak."⁶⁶ We retain from this episode at least the double echo of Thomas's participation in the activities of the order, and of his independence of spirit.

⁶³. Ibid., p. 209.

⁶⁴. Leonine, vol. 42, p. 475; the text may be found on pages 487–88, ll. 95–101 and 117–21, for Thomas's response.

⁶⁵. On these figures see Glorieux's comments, *Répertoire* I, and Käppeli's *Scriptores*.

⁶⁶. Cajetan in *Ila Ilae* q.69 a.2: "*pro infirma habetur*"; cf. Leonine, vol. 42, p. 476; Tugwell, p. 231, emphasizes, quite rightly, Thomas's originality here.

The Letter to the Countess of Flanders

This is another series of responses to questions that we find in the text published by the Leonine edition under the title *Epistola ad ducissam Brabantiae*, but which some manuscripts call, with Tolomeo, *ad comitissam Flandrie*. It is also still known, somewhat improperly, as the *De regimine Iudeorum*.⁶⁷ This name is improper because, for more than half of its short length, this text speaks of the non-Jewish subjects of the recipient and could be better called "*De regimine subditorum*."

The identity of the recipient has intrigued historians for some time: Pirenne saw in her Alix (or Adelaide) of Burgundy and proposed dating the letter after the death of her husband, Henry III of Brabant, in 1261 (his will contains some clauses about the Jews); for Glorieux, the recipient would be rather Margaret of France, daughter of Louis IX, wife of Duke John, and this would mean the year 1270. Summing up the research in 1979, Father H. Dondaine stated with his customary reserve: "The two hypotheses . . . have their plausibility and also their weakness, the latter in particular."⁶⁸

In the same vein, Raymond Van Uytven published in 1983 the results of a serious investigation that permitted him to conclude resolutely in favor of Adelaide of Burgundy; the date of Thomas's text would therefore be determined by her rule (1261–67), but 1266 seems to be a *terminus ante quem*, the years 1263–65 being the most favorable.⁶⁹ We ought to say that two elements seem strongly in favor of this position:⁷⁰ first the precise parallels between the count's will and Thomas's letter; then the fact that there were no Jews in Flanders at the time and Brabant is the only area in the region where the Jewish presence is adequately attested in this epoch.

Van Uytven unfortunately was unaware of the data provided by a study that appeared a little after his and that has notably modified the situation. Although in his first edition, Weisheipl had opted for the second hypothesis, he changed his mind in the second edition in order to follow Leonard Boyle's position, which had been published in the meantime.⁷¹ For the

⁶⁷ Leonine, vol. 42, pp. 360–78, with a preface by H.-F. Dondaine.

⁶⁸ Leonine, vol. 42, p. 363.

⁶⁹ R. Van Uytven, "The Date of Thomas Aquinas's *Epistola ad Ducissam Brabantiae*," in *Pascua Mediaevalia. Studies voor Prof. Dr. J. M. De Smet*, ed. R. Lievens, E. Van Mingroot, W. Verbeke (Leuven, 1983), pp. 631–43.

⁷⁰ Cf. C. Vansteenkiste in *RLT* 19 (1986), no. 76, pp. 42–43, and 20 (1987), no. 11, pp. 423–24.

⁷¹ L. E. Boyle, "Thomas Aquinas and the Duchess of Brabant," *Proceedings of the PMR*

(footnote continued on next page)

latter, we are dealing with the daughter of Baudouin I, count of Flanders and first emperor of Constantinople, Margaret *of Constantinople*, who was *countess of Flanders* for 33 years (1245–78), a great and constant benefactress of the Dominicans. Thomas could have met her at Valenciennes in 1259, where she received the general chapter in a town in her county; this may explain why he addressed himself to her in a relatively familiar tone. If true, Thomas's text would be placed at Paris, in 1271, and this would explain (since the countess was already rather elderly) why he might have wished her to reign *per longiora tempora*.

This attribution—which was already made by Tolomeo and which Quétif-Echard repeated without hesitation—is now confirmed in a new way, since Boyle has discovered a similar letter by John Pecham to the same person, properly identified, which responds to same questions, a single one excepted. Furthermore, Gilbert Dahan has noticed that the countess had also been written to by a secular jurist (perhaps Gerard of Abbeville) to whom she had posed the same questions.⁷² She therefore would have launched a rather large consultation and we can line up other pieces alongside Thomas's text.

It now remains to sum up briefly the contents of this text. The eight concrete questions to which Thomas had to respond hardly lend themselves to great developments and instead leave us glimpses of the preoccupations on the recipient's mind: "Can she levy taxes on the Jews? Can she punish with a fine a Jew who is at fault, but who lives by usury? Can she accept a voluntary gift from a Jew? If he restores a sum greater than the Christian who has been harmed asks, can she accept it? Can she sell or pawn public offices; raise funds from Christians; use the monies irregularly extorted by ducal officers that come to her? Finally, is it proper to oblige the Jews to wear a sign that distinguishes them from others?"⁷³

It would seem that, since John Pecham had dealt rather completely with the question, Thomas was not moved to respond to these requests; he does not hide that he has a great deal of other work and that he would have preferred that the duchess address herself to someone more competent in the specific subject. He therefore writes briefly and in a less careful way

(footnote continued from previous page)

Conference 8 (1983) 23–35; among the other interesting contributions of this study, the text of the Leonine edition must be corrected and reestablished at line 242 (p. 378), *potentiam* in all the manuscripts that H. Dondaine thought ought to be modified into *prouinciam*.

⁷² G. Dahan, review of the study by Boyle in *BTAM* 14 (1986–90) no. 1121, pp. 530–31.

⁷³ Summary by H.-F. Dondaine, Leonine, vol. 42, p. 363.

than usual, it seems, without making any special efforts at originality. About the Jews in particular, he contents himself with reproducing the common doctrine of his time on the state of servitude that belongs to them. He underlines, however, that we must treat them with moderation and that if it is necessary to punish them for practicing usury, we should punish them just the same as all other usurers. In fact, the principal interest of these pages resides less in the treatment he reserves for the Jews than in the general principle that supports the legitimacy of taxes imposed by the prince, which is public utility (*communis populi utilitas*).⁷⁴

The De substantiis separatis

In this category of works responding to a private request, we should also put the small incomplete book whose twenty chapters occupy forty or so pages in the Leonine edition.⁷⁵ Though it does not explicitly say so, we might, with the ancient catalogues, identify the recipient as having been Friar Reginald himself. We can see an indication of this in the "confidential character" of the prologue where Thomas alludes to circumstances that only a close colleague would have known: "Since we cannot participate in the solemnities sacred to the angels, we must not let our times of devotion pass without doing anything; we must therefore compensate, with the labor of writing, whatever is taken away from the office of singing the Psalms."⁷⁶

Much commentary has been devoted to the reasons that might have prevented Thomas from being at the divine office; we might imagine some indisposition, but also a dispensation from the choir granted to the masters in theology by the Dominican constitutions. It seems that we should not press the invocation of angels, as if he were speaking of a specific liturgical feast; it is more probable, however, that, in preparing himself to write, Thomas would have remembered the monastic theme of the psalmody as an angelic office, something of which the Dominican tradition also was aware.⁷⁷

⁷⁴ Among the numerous studies dedicated to this opusculum, see: H. Liebeschutz, "Judaism and Jewry in the Social Doctrine of Thomas Aquinas," *The Journal of Jewish Studies* 13 (1962) 57–81; B. Blumenkranz, "Le *De regimine Judaeorum*: ses modèles, son exemple," in *Aquinas and Problems of His Time*, G. Verbeke and D. Verhelst, eds. (Leuven-The Hague, 1976), pp. 101–17.

⁷⁵ Leonine, vol. 40, pp. D 41–80; ed. and intro, by H.-F. Dondaine; an old French trans. by abbé Bandel is in the collection Vrin-Reprise, vol. 3 (Paris, 1984), pp. 153–248 (the chapters are not the same as in the Leonine edition).

⁷⁶ *Prol*, II, 1–4: "Quia sacris angelorum solemnibus interesse non possumus, non debet nobis devotionis tempus transire in vacuum, sed quod psallendi officio subtrahitur scribendi studio compensetur."

⁷⁷ Humbert of Romans: *conveniunt angeli sancti cum psallentibus* (*De vita regulari* II, ed.

(footnote continued on next page)

As to the author's design, it is quite clearly expressed in the prologue: he wants to speak about the holy angels, but he proposes to look first, in a conjectural way, at what antiquity thought about them. If he finds something in accord with the faith, he will make use of it, but he will refute whatever is contrary to Catholic doctrine.⁷⁸ The two phases announced here are again quite clearly marked at the beginning of chapter 18: "Since we have shown what the great philosophers [Plato and Aristotle] have thought on the subject of spiritual substances, their origin, the creation of their nature, their distinction, and the manner in which they are ruled, it remains for us to show now what is the teaching of the Christian religion about them. For this purpose we will make use primarily of the books of Dionysius who has dealt better than all the others with what concerns spiritual substances."⁷⁹ The second part of his proposal was barely begun, since Thomas stops at chapter twenty, right in the middle of a passage on the sins of angels, about which he has just said that it presents many difficulties to reflection.

These brief indications suffice to show that his intention was primarily theological, and they explain also the waverings in the manuscript tradition, which sometimes speaks of this book as a *De angelis*. But we should also add that the importance of this treatise is not to be measured by its thickness; Eschmann speaks of it as "one of the most important metaphysical writings by Aquinas," while Henle considers what is said about Plato in the first chapter as the most developed Platonic synthesis in Thomas.⁸⁰

As to the date, this treatise is not only later than May 1268, the date of the completion of Moerbeke's translation of Proclus's *Elementatio theologica*, which it cites at two points in chapter twenty, but also after the condemnation of December 1270, to which it makes several allusions; finally, he knows the Book *Lambda* of the *Metaphysics* as Book XII. We can then situate it after the first half of 1271, but it is not easy to be more precise or to decide whether it was written in Paris or Naples.⁸¹

(footnote continued from previous page)

Berthier (1889), p. 83; cf. *ibid.*, I, p. 174); Humbert himself refers to an expression by Saint Bernard (*In Cant.*, sermon 7, n. 4).

⁷⁸ *Prol.* ll. 4–10: "Intendentes igitur sanctorum angelorum excellentiam utcumque depromere, incipiendum videtur ab his quae de angelis antiquitus humana coniectura aestimavit; ut si quid invenerimus fidei consonum accipiamus, quae veto doctrinae catholicae repugnant refutemus." Father Dondaine properly underlines the similarity of this two-stage proposal with that of the *Summa contra Gentiles* (I 9).

⁷⁹ *De subst. separatis*, chap. 18, ll. 3–12 (Leonine, vol. 40, p. D 71).

⁸⁰ Cf. the references in Lescoe (following note), p. 51.

⁸¹ Cf. Leonine, vol. 40, pp. D 6–7; F. J. Lescoe's examination, written several years later,

(footnote continued on next page)

The Super Librum De causis

Although the *Super de Causis* is not a work composed "by request," it is right to speak of it here because of its probable date and its relationship with the *De substantiis separatis*. Having long been considered a work by Aristotle, despite several doubts, the *De causis* was designated in the faculty of arts as one of the Philosopher's works that had to be commented on over the course of seven weeks.⁸² Even today, its author is not certain, but thanks to William of Moerbeke's 1268 translation of Proclus's *Elementatio theologica*—Proclus was one of Plato's last successors in the Athenian Academy—Thomas was the first to identify the author as an Arabic philosopher who borrowed from this work by Proclus.⁸³

To comment on this text was, therefore, for Thomas to pursue a new dialogue with Neoplatonic philosophy, already slanted by the author of the *De causis* toward monotheism and moderate realism. As Henri-Dominique Saffrey has well said in his remarkable preface to the critical edition that he has produced, when he commented on this text, Saint Thomas had three books open in front of him: "The text of the *Liber*, a manuscript of the *Elementatio*, and Dionysius' *corpus*. The texts of these three authors are quoted *ad litteram*, the other authors used, principally Aristotle, are quoted *ad mentem*." In this resides the particular interest of the undertaking: "Saint Thomas's true *intentio* in this commentary is to compare the three texts. This is the whole argument of the work and it is perhaps a unique case in the Saint's entire oeuvre." Thus he will be able to value each one, position himself vis-à-vis Proclus, author of the *Liber*, and Dionysius, "whose connections with Aristotle or Saint Augustine he emphasizes." Thus, he rejects separated forms and divine hypostases, which is to say Neoplatonic polytheism, as well as its emanationism and

(footnote continued from previous page)

"*De substantiis separatis*: Title and Date," *Commemorative Studies* I, pp. 51–66, arrives at the same conclusions.

⁸². *Chartul.* no. 246, p. 278; Thomas himself, at the beginning of his career, also attributed this work to Aristotle, cf. *Super Boetium De Trin.* q.6 a. 1, *Uterius*, arg. 2; going a little outside our subject, we can refer to E. P. Bos and P. A. Meijer, eds., *On Proclus and His Influence in Medieval Philosophy*, *Philosophia Antiqua* 53 (Leiden, 1992).

⁸³. *Prooemium* (ed. Saffrey, p. 3): "Et in graeco quidem invenitur sic traditus liber PROCLI PLATONICI, continens ccxi propositiones, qui intitulatur *Elementatio theologica*; in arabico vero invenitur hic liber qui apud Latinos *De causis* dicitur, quem constat de arabico esse translatus et in graeco penitus non haberi: unde videtur ab aliquo philosophorum arabum ex praedicto libro PROCLI excerptus, praesertim quia omnia quae in hoc libro continentur, multo plenius et diffusius continentur in illo."

the priority of the one and of the good over being, "but he will also carefully preserve in his synthesis the great orders of creation. Being, living things, intelligences, and God over and above all."⁸⁴

As to the date, it hardly presents a difficulty. The continual use of the *Elementatio theologica*, completed by Moerbeke on 18 May 1268, situates this work after that date; but the designation of the Book *Lambda* as Book XII of the *Metaphysics* also places it after the first half of 1271. These two characteristics, which are also found in the dating of the *De substantiis separatis*, led Father Saffrey to consider these two works as contemporary. Furthermore, a careful comparison of *Quodlibet* V q.4 a.7—disputed Christmas 1271—with the proposition 2 of the *Super de causis* suggests the priority of the quodlibet to the commentary. Saffrey therefore concludes that the latter should be dated to "the first half of 1272."⁸⁵

In conclusion, if we attempt to establish provisionally where we are with regard to the texts presented in this chapter, we are certainly struck by their number, but even more perhaps by their diversity. Knowing his title as *magister in sacra pagina*, we would more or less expect to see in Thomas the man of a single book, the Bible. He is certainly that, by profession and by predilection (his expositions on the New Testament remain at the heart of his activity), but we are also impressed by the variety of his output (the different short texts that we have mentioned testify to it) and by his presence in the midst of contemporary questions: whether it is a case of the seculars or of "averroism," we see Thomas active on all fronts and the quodlibets confirm it. To this range of activities, we must however add a final category: Thomas was also a commentator on Aristotle.

⁸⁴. *Sancti Thomae de Aquino super Librum De causis Expositio*, ed. H.-D. Saffrey, Textus philosophici Friburgenses 4/5 (Fribourg, 1954), Préface, pp. xxxvi–xxxvii.

⁸⁵. Saffrey, *ibid.*, pp. xxxiii–xxxvi; with the exception of the very last point, which seems to him too speculative; Eschmann, "A Catalogue," p. 407, accepts this line of argument; the same is true of Weisheipl, p. 383. The work has been carefully examined and we recall here several of the more recent studies: Thomas Aquinas, *Commento al Libro delle Cause*, a cura di C. D'Ancona Costa (Milan, 1986) (with an important introduction and bibliography); L. Elders, "Saint Thomas d'Aquin et la métaphysique du Liber de Causis," *RT* 89 (1989) 427–42; A. de Libera, "Albert le Grand et Thomas d'Aquin interprètes du *Liber de causis*," *RSP* 74 (1990) 347–78. C. D'Ancona Costa, "Saint Thomas lecteur du 'Liber de Causis.' Bilan des recherches contemporaines concernant le 'De Causis' et analyse de l'interprétation thomiste," *RT* 92 (1992) 785–817, which appeared too late for inclusion in this discussion, has been reprinted in *Recherches sur le Liber de causis*, Etudes de philosophie médiévale, vol. 72 (Paris: Vrin, 1995), pp. 229–58.

Chapter XII— The Commentator on Aristotle

The last major occupation during this third Parisian sojourn was Thomas's commenting on Aristotle. This activity, which Thomas had begun with the *De anima* in the last year of his sojourn in Rome, was continued in Paris at an accelerated pace. Since he could not have done it earlier, he first completed the *De sensu et sensato* sometime around 1269, which is to say before the *De unitate intellectus*. He must have continued this task without ceasing since the commentaries multiply beginning around this date. Apparently he did them alongside one another, because all the confirming evidence that we can find lead to dates that are very close. In what follows we will not see, therefore, a strict chronological order, which is very difficult to establish—if indeed one can ever be established at all.

The Expositio Libri Peryermenias

In the current state of research—thanks to Father Gauthier's reediting of the earliest volumes of the Leonine edition—the *Expositio Libri Peryermenias* appears to be one of the first commentaries from this period.¹ The dedication of this work to Guillaume Berthout, provost of Louvain, furnishes us with a means of approximating its date. Berthout, then studying under Thomas at Paris, was named provost of Saint-Pierre in Louvain at the end of 1269 or 1270 (his predecessor died 18 November 1269 or 1270).

¹ Usually this title is written in two words: Peri Hermeneias. We retain here the usage that was Thomas's own and has been restored by R.-A. Gauthier, editor, *Expositio libri Peryermenias*, editio altera retracta, Leonine, vol. I*1 (Rome, 1989).

Since Thomas alludes to the errors of the *moderni* on free will (I 14), which were condemned on 10 December 1270, the opening of his book must be later than the condemnation and almost contemporaneous with Q. 6 of the *De Malo* and of QQ.9–13 of the *Prima Secundae*. As to the moment when the composition ceases, we need to situate it before the end of 1271, which was when Thomas adopted the numbering of the books of the *Metaphysics* of William of Moerbeke's translation.²

We can take a further step and situate the end of composition toward the middle of October 1271; on 15 October, Guillaume Berthout was probably in Louvain for business. It is likely that Thomas took the occasion of his departure to abandon this task, which he seems to have undertaken against his will,³ and it is thus that this commentary remained unfinished. Thomas however took the manuscript with him to Naples; after his death this text was sent from Naples back to Paris, along with the exposition of the *Posterior Analytics*, at the request of the masters of the arts faculty who had wished to possess these two books. This explains why there was no Italian edition, but only a Parisian one of these two works that were hardly known until 1275.⁴

The masters in arts in Paris had some reason for claiming these commentaries; they recognized in them the technique of exposition that

² This fact is too little known by the average reader of Saint Thomas, but its importance is great. Until Moerbeke's translation, one referred to the *Metaphysics* according to the translation by Michael Scot or according to the *Translatio media*, which was anonymous; both having omitted book *Kappa*, the book designated *Lambda* was also referred to as book XI.

William of Moerbeke is the first to translate book *Kappa*, which in his translation will become XI, while the book *Lambda* will become book XII. This criterion has permitted us to divide Saint Thomas's works into two series, the one which dates before the *Moerbecana*, where the book *Lambda* is called XI, the other which dates from after the *Moerbecana*, when book *Lambda* is called XII. The exposition of the *Peryermenias* belongs in the first series, which also includes the first works from Saint Thomas's second period of teaching at Paris: the *De unitate intellectus*, the questions *De malo*, the *Prima secundae* in its entirety. The second series includes the *Secunda Secundae* (beginning with q. 1, a. 8, arg. 1), the *Commentary on the Ethics* (beginning from 16), a part of the *Commentary on the Metaphysics*, the commentaries on *De causis*, *De caelo*, and *De generatione*, the *De substantiis separatis* and the *Tertia Pars*. The key date, which is to say the date when Saint Thomas knew the *Moerbecana* of the *Metaphysics*, is situated toward the middle or the end of 1271.

(R.-A. Gauthier, *Préface* to the *Expositio libri Peryermenias*, Leonine, I* 1, pp. 85–86; see also on this point the *Somme contre les gentils*, introduction, chap. II, pp. 62–67, where the author recommends the flexibility necessary in using this criterion).

³ After everything that we have said, it will be understood that the evocation in his dedication of *multiplices occupationum mearum sollicitudines* may not be a simple figure of speech.

⁴ Gauthier, Leonine, vol. I* 1, pp. 85*–88*.

Thomas had borrowed from them (something he had already done in the *Sententia libri De anima*). Here, in any case, the *sententia*, which consists of a simple doctrinal summary, gives way rather frequently to the explication of the letter (this is without doubt why, in his dedication, he himself designates his work as an *expositio*).⁵ As to the content properly speaking, it is not possible to sum up a treatise of logic, but we could say that, with some exceptions, Thomas entrusted himself to two principal sources, Boethius and Ammonius, whom he docilely follows without ever naming them, except when he departs from their views—faithful in this to the custom of all his contemporaries. He adds to them sometimes certain things from his own genius: "In the first place concision and clarity . . . [but] particularly a coherent philosophy, which everywhere underlies the technical explanations and assures their intelligibility."⁶

The Expositio Libri Posteriorum

This book is situated in the immediate temporal neighborhood of the commentary on the *Peryermenias*. Father Gauthier has been able to establish that chapters I 1–26 of the commentary on the *Posteriora* still use the ancient text by James of Venice, but that Thomas had already begun to familiarize himself with Moerbeke's translation. To all appearances, he must have received the *translatio moerbecana* of the *Posterior Analytics* almost at the same time as the translation of the *Metaphysics*, toward the middle of 1271. We can therefore date from this moment the beginning of this new commentary, and perhaps it is not too artificial to see it immediately succeeding the *Peryermenias* (halted in October, let us recall). As he hardly had leisure to work on it, the commentary was not at all advanced when he had to leave Paris for Naples at Easter 1272 (24 April).

Though we cannot provide certain proof, it seems that the change of place also led to a change in the translation being used: from I, 27 to II, 20, Thomas comments on Moerbeke's text. Thus the composition of the work extended from the end of 1271 in Paris to the end of 1272 in Naples.

⁵ For the differences among *lectura*, *sententia*, and *expositio*, we refer to R.-A. Gauthier, "Le cours sur l'*Ethica noua* d'un maître des arts de Paris (1235–1240)," AHDLM 43 (1975) 71–141, cf. pp. 76–77.

⁶ Gauthier, *ibid.*, pp. 82*–84*; to complete this brief presentation, see J. Isaac, *Le Peri Hermeneias en Occident de Boèce à saint Thomas*, Bibl., thom. 29 (Paris, 1953) (Gauthier has reservations about pp. 148–51, which gives a "displeasing image of Thomas"); G. Mura, "Ermeneutica, gnoseologia e metafisica. Attualità del commento di S. Tommaso al Perihermeneias di Aristotele," *Euntes Docete* 40 (1987) 361–89.

It was from Naples, too, that, toward 1275, the commentary was sent to Paris at the request of the masters of the arts faculty, who took it upon themselves to have an *exemplar* made, which would assure its diffusion.⁷

Despite their technical character, or perhaps even because of it, these two works found a rather large audience: twenty-one manuscripts more or less complete for the *Peryermenias*; more than fifty-four for the *Posterior Analytics*; as to the editions that have very often put them together, they number thirty-one (including the one in the *Index Thomisticus*).

The Sententia Libri Ethicorum

Trusting in some indications in Tolomeo, historians for a long time attributed this commentary to Thomas's Roman period. Progress in research has taught scholars to be wary of Tolomeo's information, and more than forty years ago Father Gauthier, in a radical change of perspective, proposed situating this commentary during the second period of teaching in Paris.⁸ The monumental edition that he has done since⁹ permits us to confirm and specify further his first judgment: the commentary on the *Ethics* was composed in Paris in 1271–72, as the specialists have now agreed.¹⁰

We do not need to go over here the details that led to this dating to understand that it is Thomas's adoption in Paris of the numbering of the *Translatio Moerbecana*'s books of the *Metaphysics* and the parallelism between certain passages of the commentary on the *Ethics* and the *Secunda Secundae* that have been the decisive elements. Perhaps we might add—taking into account some of Gauthier's later propositions about the beginning of the composition of the *Prima Secundae* in 1271—that the *Secunda*

⁷ Cf. Gauthier, Leonine, vol. 1*2, pp. 50*–54' and 73*–77*; cf. above, what we have said about the *Peryermenias*, which followed the same course. This commentary by Saint Thomas has scarcely been studied in itself; we note the recent thesis presented by C. Marabelli, "Note preliminari allo studio del commento di S. Tommaso ai 'Secondi Analitici' di Aristotele," *DTP* 88 (1985) 77–88 (unfortunately prior to the new Leonine edition).

⁸ R.-A. Gauthier, "La date du commentaire de saint Thomas sur l'*Ethique à Nicomaque*," *RTAM* 18 (1951) 66–105; a summary of prior hesitations on the point may be found there, but also some views that have been modified a bit by what followed.

⁹ Cf. *Sententia libri Ethicorum*, Leonine, vol. 47/1 and 2, 1969; for anyone who would have difficulty in mastering the learned Latin of the Preface, we refer to the summary of it that the author has given in the Leonine, vol. 48, pp. i–xxv, "Saint Thomas et l'*Ethique à Nicomaque*."

¹⁰ Cf. O. Lottin, *BTAM* 6 (1950–1953), no. 1799, p. 550; L.-J. Bataillon, *BT* 9 (1954–56) no. 120, pp. 89–91; Eschmann, *A Catalogue*, pp. 404–5; Weisheipl, p. 380. C. Vansteenkiste, *RLT* 4 (1972) no. 58, pp. 29–30, leans toward a more ancient date (with a review of the diverse earlier opinions).

Secundae probably was not begun before the long vacations of that same year.

We cannot enter here into the contents of the commentary without being led to trace the outlines of Thomist moral teaching, and that would cause us to encroach on our future volume. The work is indeed a *Sententia*, which is to say a summary and rather doctrinal explication, and not an *expositio*, an in-depth commentary with textual discussions. This is important, we hasten to say, if we are to appreciate correctly Thomas's effort vis-à-vis Aristotle: he did not wish to make a critical commentary, and his title sufficiently indicates as much.

But if we wish to avoid equivocations, we must also add that as a commentator Thomas does not leave Aristotle to himself. It has too often been said that Thomas was the most faithful and penetrating of the commentators on Aristotle; this is to forget that between their two moralities lies the entire difference added by the Gospel. While Aristotle moves in the order of a deeply pagan ethic, Thomas places himself explicitly in the Christian perspective and arranges things so as to have the Philosopher speak of the contemplative finality in which Thomas himself sees the happiness of beatitude.¹¹ Father Gauthier explains better than anyone else what has happened: "So that Aristotle's ethics, which hardly speaks of anything other than man, can speak of God, Saint Thomas, without wishing it, without his even noticing it, had to transform it profoundly. If he had wanted to perform the work of a historian or of a critic, a historian or critic would have been right to judge his work and to find it wanting. But Thomas wanted only to compose a work of wisdom."¹²

We will doubtless better understand what Thomas wanted to do if we recall that these commentaries were not courses he would have given to his students. They are rather the equivalent of a personal reading made with pen in hand to constrain himself to penetrate the text of Aristotle in order to prepare himself for the composition of the moral part of the

¹¹. This had already been properly seen by F. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy, vol. II: Mediaeval Philosophy. Augustine to Scotus* (London, 1959), chap. 39, pp. 398–411. On this see also A. Thiry, "Saint Thomas et la morale d'Aristote," in *Aristote et saint Thomas d'Aquin*, pp. 229–58; L. Elders, "Saint Thomas Aquinas's Commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics*," in same author's *Autour de saint Thomas*, pp. 77–122.

¹². Leonine, vol. 48, pp. xxiv–xxv; we also refer with the author to the deliberately paradoxical pages where he shows that the affirmation of God as the highest end of man led Thomas to turn the Aristotelian doctrine of *phronesis* upside down, R.-A. Gauthier, *Aristote. L'Ethique à Nicomaque* (2d ed., Louvain, 1970), vol. I, 1, pp. 273–83; see *ibid.*, pp. 128–34, for the radical change between Aristotle and Thomas as well as the reason for the attacks by St. Bonaventure against the *Nicomachean Ethics* read by the masters in arts.

Summa theologiae. He had already used this procedure with the *Sententia libri De anima*; with a firm constancy he continued his effort until the end. There is here in any event a new element testified to by a rather little known work.

The Tabula Libri Ethicorum

We have already spoken briefly of this *Table* with respect to the attention that Thomas continued to devote to the literary output of his master, Albert. It is not idle to return to it here, for it is rich in teachings that enable us to achieve a better familiarity with our author.

This curious little work posed a unique problem to the editors of the Leonine edition: never published prior to 1971 and totally forgotten since the fifteenth century, it was not mentioned by any historian either. It appears however in a good place in one of the most ancient (25 February 1304) bookseller's lists of Thomas's works as an *exemplar* in eight pieces, that could be borrowed for the sum of five *deniers*.¹³ Furthermore, it furnished Stephen Tempier with the material for one of the propositions he condemned in 1277. We have thus from two different sources a double confirmation of its authenticity and its ancient diffusion.¹⁴

As its name indicates, this is a table of contents and, more precisely, what we would call today an index of the principal themes (*index rerum notabilium*) of the *Nicomachean Ethics* and the commentary that Albert the Great had once made on it. At the time when he was preparing himself to compose the moral section of the *Summa theologiae*, Thomas returned to these things in depth: he proceeded with a written commentary on this work by Aristotle; he also reviews the commentary of his former master, Albert, and has his secretaries compile files that indicate the principal references in both authors. That this work first took the form of files is clear enough from the fact that we can find some repetitions, some sentences out of place, and other anomalies that would certainly have been noticed and eliminated if the author had been able to supervise the clean copy.¹⁵

This work remains incomplete, and it is plausible that his own work

¹³ *Chartul.* II, no. 642, p. 108; cf. Gauthier, Leonine, vol. 48, pp. B 5–6.

¹⁴ The condemned proposition was no. 178: "Quod finis terribilium est mors" (*Chartul.* no. 473, P. 553); cf. R. Hissette, *Enquête sur les 219 articles*, pp. 304–7 (proposition 213 in his set). Note in Leonine, vol. 48, the addition by Gauthier to the list of the *Addenda et emendanda* (B 50), where he emphasizes that this expression is common in Thomas, who uses it seven times outside of the *Tabula*; the context of these seven uses takes away any possibility of a bad interpretation; it is therefore from the *Tabula* that the condemned proposition would have been extracted.

¹⁵ Cf. Gauthier, Leonine, vol. 48, pp. B 45–47.

had convinced Thomas that he no longer needed to depend on the master who had guided his first steps. Such as it is, however, it is not only a revelation of the seriousness with which Thomas was preparing to write the *Secunda Pars*; it also casts a precise light on his work methods. Studying the files of the *Tabula* confirms what we had sensed during the composition of the *Catena aurea*: Thomas's secretaries were not simple copyists writing under dictation or pure executants. He allowed them a certain liberty, reserving to himself the final touch when it came time to put things in definitive form. In the present case, this method explains not only the blemishes that we have noticed but, in addition, certain things that Thomas himself could not have written, such as a repetition of exegeses that he had already chosen to discard. That these have come down to us shows only that he was not able to reread this work, and even perhaps that it was not intended for publication.

This *Table* interestingly is the second example of this genre that we know of. Before the summer of 1259, at the time of his first teaching assignment in Paris therefore, Thomas had had copied for his own use a Corpus of the *Parua naturalia* by Saint Albert. Now the first notebook of this volume contains precisely a table of Albert's commentary on the *Physics*, written by the person designated as secretary D, for lack of knowledge of his name. Perhaps Thomas had other labors of this kind carried out for him; these suffice to show that Thomas did not disdain using those work instruments that have remained our own.¹⁶

This new stroke to Thomas's portrait is perhaps less surprising than those that come from his writing, but it does not contradict them. Well before Gils's conclusions were known, and solely on the basis of the particularities of the *Tabula*'s composition, Gauthier felt himself entitled to write that he had found in this work all the characteristic traits of our author: "His text of Aristotle, his devotion to Saint Albert, the expressions that were common to him and more generally that *mixture of carefulness and of negligence*, of clarity of thought and liberty of form, which characterize his intellectual physiognomy, those thousand details that a *counterfeiter* could not have copied."¹⁷

As to the date of the composition of the *Tabula*, Gauthier thinks "in the neighborhood of 1270"; this springs from everything that the text of

¹⁶. Cf. Gauthier, *Leonine*, vol. 48, pp. B 51–55; for secretary D, see A. Dondaine, *Secrétaires de saint Thomas*, pp. 26–40 and 185–98.

¹⁷. *Ibid.*, p. B 51; our emphasis.

Aristotle used for this work suggests. But it is also consistent with everything we know otherwise. The date would also have the advantage of responding to the question posed by the long interval separating the *Prima Pars* from the *Prima Secundae*. If Thomas's numerous other occupations did not permit him to devote himself to the composition of the *Summa* between September 1268 and the beginning of 1271, he nevertheless did not cease thinking about it, and the composition of the *Tabula libri Ethicorum* is an eloquent indication of this.

Commentaries on the Physics and the Metaphysics

We cannot deal fully with the numerous commentaries that date from this period; we must, therefore, speak briefly of them, for the astonishing multiplication in Thomas's literary output—one perhaps ought to say his "explosion"—poses a problem to the researcher. Not only the problem of their order—since we must conceive of their composition as almost simultaneous, the dates necessarily overlap one another—but indeed we must question the very possibility of so many publications within the given time.

The commentary on the eight books of the *Physics* had once been assigned by Mandonnet to the Roman period, in 1265, prior to the *Prima Pars*. But he was little followed in this view. Several authors doubted the dating (Grabmann, Castagnoli, Mansion), and Eschmann proposed situating the commentary in Paris between 1268 and 1271. More recently, Weisheipl has maintained that, in this work, Thomas refers indifferently to book *Lambda* of the *Metaphysics* as Book XI or XII; this would signify that he had learned of the existence of the Book *Kappa* while writing the commentary and would invite us to situate its composition during the year 1271, since it is toward the middle of that year that this change in title began to appear.¹⁸ Surprised by this affirmation, Father Gauthier was kind enough to perform for us a provisional search of the manuscripts, from which it is clear that Thomas speaks only of a Book XI; the error came in with the printed edition. Gauthier proposes the scholastic year 1268–69 as the date, perhaps the beginning of the second period of teaching in Paris.¹⁹ Thomas's motives for these labors are certainly to be found in the

¹⁸ Weisheipl, pp. 375–76, a correction from in 1983, but without other proof for this affirmation.

²⁹ Leonine, vol. 45/1, p. 270^a, with the reference to a more comprehensive study by Mansion; once again I thank Father Gauthier for the research he performed on this occasion.

interest of Aristotle's work in itself; we recall that it opens with an entire book dedicated to disengaging the principles of becoming and of natural beings, and it closes with the demonstration of the existence of the Prime Mover.²⁰

In preparation for many years, the *Sententia super Metaphysicam* poses several formidable problems for the editors: its size, the versions of the text of Aristotle Thomas used (not fewer than five it seems), and also its date. The examination of the original manuscript allows us to understand that Thomas could not have followed the order of Aristotle's books in the commentary and that, in addition, he returned to the parts already composed to make some corrections.

Even less than in other cases, we cannot enter here into these questions, which are highly complex; suffice it to say that the way of quoting book *Lambda* of the *Metaphysics* always serves as a valuable criterion for establishing the date of composition. Greatly simplifying the most reliable results at which researchers have arrived, we have said that Thomas began to designate book *Lambda* as Book XII beginning with the commentary on Book VII and that he does not change until the end of Book XII; this part cannot therefore have been composed before the beginning of 1271. The beginning of the commentary could therefore date from the university year 1270–71, but Books II and III pose a special problem; they could be the fruit either of self-correction or even of a second redaction, after the change in the name of Book *Lambda* went into effect (thus, toward the end of 1271 at the earliest). If we retain these dates—adapted from those proposed by Duin²¹—composition could have occurred in Paris, at least in part, but authors such as Eschmann and Weisheipl also think it may have been Naples.²² James Doig also leaves open this hypothesis, which

²⁰ The text may be found in Leonine, vol. 2, 1884 (although the Latin text of Aristotle may not be the one that Saint Thomas knew) reproduced with some changes in the presentation by P. M. Maggiolo (Turin, 1954). An English translation exists: Thomas De Aquino, *Commentary on Aristotle's Physics*, trans. R. J. Blackwell, R. J. Spath, and W. E. Thirlkel, intro. by V. J. Bourke (New Haven, 1963). For the contents of this work, we refer to the rapid but precise presentation by L. Elders, "St. Thomas Aquinas' Commentary on the *Physics* of Aristotle," in *Autour de saint Thomas*, vol. 1, pp. 23–63; of B. Harkins, *God in St. Thomas' Commentaries on Aristotle's Physics and Metaphysics*, diss. Pontifical University of St. Thomas (Rome, 1986); J.-M. Vernier, "Physique aristotélicienne et métaphysique Thomiste," *RT* 91 (1991) 5–33; 393–413.

²¹ J. J. Duin, "Nouvelles précisions sur la chronologie du *Commentum in Metaphysicam* de S. Thomas," *RPL* 53 (1955) 511–24; this highly technical study sums up and renders more precise the previous labors by Th. Käppelli and A. Dondaine on the *Naples* manuscript.

²² Eschmann, "A Catalogue," p. 404; Weisheipl, pp. 412–13.

does not exclude the possibility of a first version going back to the Roman period.²³ As long as the critical edition remains unpublished, we cannot hope for anything better than these approximations.²⁴ The only, thing that researchers are entirely certain of is that the commentary on the *Metaphysics* is prior to the commentary on *De caelo et mundo*.

Uncompleted Works

Sententia libri Politicorum

Ever since Tolomeo,²⁵ it has been known that this work was left unfinished; completed by Peter of Auvergne, its authentic portion ceases at Book III 6. However, all of the printed editions up until the Leonine version in 1971 have transmitted a "complete text" in eight Books, which can be explained because they all go back to the edition done in Rome by Louis of Valencia, in 1492. This is a first reason to be wary of current editions, but there is a second that prevents us from using even the first three Books with confidence: the first editor pitilessly mutilated Thomas's text, eliminating Greek words that Thomas had obtained from William of Moerbeke's translation as well as their explanations and "improving" the author's Latin to render it more in keeping with the taste of Renaissance humanists.²⁶ The Leonine text is therefore not just recommended here, it is indispensable.

After the research performed by the Leonine editors and in the current state of the documentation (which is to say, while the critical edition of Albert's commentary on the *Politics* remains undone), it seems indeed that

²³ J. C. Doig, *Aquinas on the Metaphysics. A Historico-Doctrinal Study of the Commentary on the Metaphysics* (The Hague, 1972); this book is the first important historical monograph dedicated to the whole commentary and focuses notably on comparing Avicenna's exegesis, Averroes's and Albertus Magnus's, with Thomas's who takes his position in relation to them. Rather cavalierly treated by V. J. Bourke [*The Thomist* 37 (1973) 241–43], the author has defended the seriousness of his work (*ibid.*, pp. 826–42), but his interpretation of Thomas's metaphysics has been questioned by other authors (*RLT* 7, 1975, no. 557, pp. 208–18, in part by G. Perini, who returns to the point at greater length in *DTP* 77 (1974) 206–45).

²⁴ This book has been less studied than one would expect. We mention here several of the more recent studies: S. Mansion, "L'intelligibilité métaphysique d'après le Prooemium du Commentaire de saint Thomas à Métaphysique d'Aristote," *RFNS* 70 (1978) 49–62; L. Elders, "St. Thomas Aquinas's Commentary on the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle," in the same author's *Autour de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, vol. 1, pp. 123–45; J. F. Wippel, "The Latin Avicenna as a Source of Thomas Aquinas's *Metaphysics*," *FZPT* 37 (1990) 51–90.

²⁵ Tolomeo XXIII 11 (ed. Dondaine, p. 125): "Scripsit etiam super physicam, et super de caelo, et super de generatione sed non complevit, et similiter politicam sed hos libros complevit magister Petrus de Alvernia fidelissimus discipulus eius."

²⁶ Cf. C. Martin, "The Vulgate Text of Aquinas's Commentary on Aristotle's *Politics*," *Dominican Studies* 5 (1952) 35–64; *Préface* to the edition of the text in the Leonine, vol. 48, pp. A 15–18.

Thomas's commentary is later than Albert's, and that he had a certain knowledge of his master's text and drew certain advantages from it. To all appearances, this commentary is connected to the same period in Paris as the preceding works. As the indications in the manuscript tradition do not provide us with certainty, it is the frequent quotations from this book in the *Prima Secundae* and the *Secunda Secundae* that led Eschmann to propose a more or less simultaneous composition of a paraphrase of Aristotle and of that part of the *Summa*; the Leonine editors align themselves with his proposition.²⁷

De caelo et mundo

For this work we have the good fortune of knowing with certainty the *terminus post quem* of Thomas's commentary. He used Simplicius's commentary on this book of Aristotle's in the version that William of Moerbeke had provided, and Moerbeke dates his translation 5 June 1271. Thomas's text is therefore necessarily later than that date, but in addition, he shows himself much more familiar with this work by Simplicius than he was when he commented on Book *Lambda* of the *Metaphysics*, where he still makes certain errors concerning the ancient astronomers. The latter circumstance permits us therefore to situate it after the *Metaphysics* and probably in Naples in 1272–73.²⁸ Did illness and death prevent Thomas from completing this commentary? Perhaps it was simply overcommitment. In any case, while Aristotle's work numbers four books, Thomas's stops a little after the beginning of Book III.²⁹

As to the subject, it deals with cosmology and we find in it some quite probing considerations, without interest for our immediate purposes, on the universe, celestial bodies, their incorruptibility, the divinity of the heavens, their animation, eternity, etc. It is clear that, here more than elsewhere, Thomas reinterprets Aristotle in the direction of the Christian faith, and we can see this quite well when he again takes up the question

²⁷ Cf. Eschmann, "A Catalogue," p. 405; Leonine, vol. 48, p. A 8, with reference to the different authors; as to the contents, we must wait for studies based on the new edition, but we can consult H. Kéraly, *Préface à la Politique*, Avant-Propos, trans. and explanation (Paris, 1974); J. Quillet, "L'art de la politique selon saint Thomas," *MM* 19 (1988) 278–85.

²⁸ The fact that the masters of arts, in their letter to the general chapter after Thomas's death, claim the Simplicius text that he had promised them presupposes that this book was not to be found in Paris, of. *Chartul.*, no. 447, P. 505.

²⁹ See the text in the Leonine, vol. 3 (1886), reprinted in the edition of A. Spiazzi (Turin, 1952) (on vols. 2 and 3 of the Leonine, already better than vol. 1, cf. Bataillon, *L'édition léonine*, pp. 456–57); for questions of dating, of. Eschmann, "A Catalogue," p. 402; Weisheipl, pp. 376–77.

of the eternity of the world. All this testifies to the knowledge and erudition of our author, but this Aristotelian cosmology would have for us only historical interest if Thomas had not completed it with his own metaphysical views, which still deserve to be better known.³⁰

De generatione et corruptione

This, too, is an incomplete commentary, barely begun, one ought to say, since Thomas did not even finish the fifth chapter of Book I (there are two books in Aristotle's text).³¹ The text is certainly later than the commentaries on the *De caelo* and on the *Physics* since Thomas refers explicitly to these two works.³² In his deposition during the process in Naples, William of Tocco says that he saw the saint in the process of writing this book and he even thought that it was his last work in philosophy.³³ Everything agrees therefore in situating this work in Naples in 1272 or 1273, in the last month of the master's activity (before December 1273).

Super Meteora

Although it too was not finished, the *Super Meteora* does not permit any precise conclusions as to its date of composition. The translation of Aristotle's treatise by William of Moerbeke, completed in 1260, was already known among the Latins in 1267. Thomas's commentary theoretically could have been done around that date; but the majority of authors situate it during his second period of teaching in Paris, or even after his return to Naples, sometime between 1269 and 1273.³⁴ A new element, however, has to be placed in the file, since it has been noticed that Thomas's text was used by Mahieu le Vilain in his translation of the *Meteora*, a work that his editors inclined to place before 1270. If that date were certain, this would invite us to place Thomas's commentary even

³⁰. We can get a more complete idea of this book thanks to J. A. Weisheipl, "The Commentary of St. Thomas Aquinas on the *De caelo* of Aristotle," *Sapientia* (Buenos Aires) 29 (1974) 11–34; L. J. Elders, "Le commentaire de saint Thomas d'Aquin sur le *De caelo* d'Aristote," in *Proceedings of the World Congress on Aristotle* (Thessaloniki August 7–14, 1978) vol. II (Athens, 1981), pp. 173–87; A. Caparelli, "La terminologia greca nel Commentario al *De caelo*: Tommaso d'Aquino e lingua greca," *Angelicum* 55 (1978) 414–57.

³¹. The text from the Leonine, vol. 3, PP. 261–322, is reprinted by Spiazzi (Turin, 1952); in the two volumes we find in addition the apocryphal texts, inspired by Saint Albert, with which Thomas's text had been completed.

³². *De generatione*, lect. 7 (Spiazzi, no. 52): *manifestavimus in VIII Physic. et in I De caelo*.

³³. *Naples* 58, p. 345: "vidi eum scribentem super librum 'De generatione et corruptione', quod credit fuisse ultimum opus suum in philosophia."

³⁴. Cf. Grabmann, *Werke*, p. 278; Eschmann, "A Catalogue," pp. 402–3; Weisheipl, pp. 377–78.

earlier. The only plausible thing here would be its priority in connection to Mahieu, but we cannot go much further with this investigation until the critical edition is completed.³⁵

The text circulated in printed editions up until the end of the nineteenth century was rather gravely deficient, for it was the edition that appeared in Venice in 1532 and attributes to Thomas a complete commentary on the four books. We have known for some time that he commented on only two of them. The edition produced by the Leonine commission in 1886 cleared the text of these inauthentic additions, but it suffers in turn from the narrowness of its documentary base (only two manuscripts were used); it takes too much away from the Venetian edition and does not reproduce Thomas's text in its integral character.³⁶ Dondaine and Bataillon's work on the manuscript tradition—"perhaps the most disordered among those which have transmitted Saint Thomas's works to us"—allowed them to consult about a dozen other manuscripts and to restore to our author three supplementary lessons. This permits them to assure us that "Saint Thomas explicated the *Meteora* up until the next to last chapter of Book II."³⁷ In any case, a revised edition, which would take into account these new data, remains to be done.³⁸

Thomas and Aristotle

In and of itself, this list of commentaries on Aristotle's works would suffice to testify to the intensity of the work Thomas carried out and to its rapidity. As to its quality, opinions differ. Soon after his death, his adversaries very seriously put in doubt his fidelity to Aristotle on some specific points, as well as the way in which he applies the notion of *scientia* to theology. On this point Thomas's followers have to concede that their master had to "extend" the Philosopher.³⁹

³⁵ Cf. K. White, "Three Previously Unpublished Chapters from St. Thomas Aquinas's Commentary on Aristotle's *Meteora*: *Sentencia super Meteora* 2, 13–15," *MS* 54 (1992) 49–93, cf. pp. 67–68, notes 43–45, referring to *Mahieu le Vilain, Les Metheores d' Aristote: Traduction du XIII^e siècle publiée pour la première fois*, ed. Rolf Edgren (Uppsala, 1945), pp. viii–xvi.

³⁶ Leonine, vol. 3, PP. 323–421 (the apocryphal text of Books III and IV is reproduced in an appendix in the same volume); the same remarks apply to the edition by Spiazzi, who reprints this volume from the Leonine edition.

³⁷ A. Dondaine and L.-J. Bataillon, "Le commentaire de saint Thomas sur les *Météores*," *AFP* 36 (1966) 81–152.

³⁸ K. White, who has published these three supplementary readings (see above, note 35), is also preparing this new Leonine edition. Until that edition is ready, all technical studies on Thomas's Greek remain hampered by uncertainty, cf. A. Caparello, "Terminologia greca tomista nel 'commentarium ad Meteorologica,'" *Sacra Doctrina* 23, no. 87 (1978) 243–87.

³⁹ Cf. C. Dumont, "La réflexion sur la méthode théologique. Un moment capital: le dilemme posé au XIII^e siècle," *NRT* 83 (1961) 1034–1050; 84 (1962) 17–35; cf. p. 30.

Without going over this whole history once again, let us recall the way in which Martin Grabmann synthesized it three-quarters of a century ago.⁴⁰ On the question of the use that can be made of these commentaries to reconstruct Thomas's thought, the Thomists have responded in three different ways. The first group has emphasized the objectivity and fidelity of the commentator, whose personal opinion always remains in reserve. To put it in the words of Charles Jourdain, "Saint Thomas's commentaries . . . rarely offer a trace of his own opinions. He speaks in them almost always according to Aristotle, rarely as himself: we could count the passages where he departs from that rule." Grabmann noted that, while this is applicable to a certain extent for certain commentaries, we must not extend it to other texts without qualification.

Contrary to this first position, another group (among its members L. Schütz and E. Rolfes) emphasized that Thomas does not refrain at all from expressing his personal point of view, rectifying and amplifying Aristotle when he thinks it necessary; thus we can depend on these commentaries to reconstruct Thomas's thought. Between these first two groups, a third has tried to find an intermediary position that is less summary: it maintains that there is basically an objective fidelity in the interpretation, but since Thomas also expresses his point of view, we can use these commentaries to reconstruct his thinking each time that it matches a doctrine expressed in other works. Grabmann places himself in the third group, but we can also count among authors of this type Eschmann, Chenu, or Gilson, for example.

This way of posing the problem had already run its course in the second quarter of the twentieth century;⁴¹ without losing all relevance, this approach gave way long ago to more radical questions among many contemporary authors who question not only the originality of the Thomist exegesis, but even more its fidelity.

As to the originality of the method and the technique, the reason for these has been understood for a long time: from the first labors of Dom Lottin to the more recent research by Father Gauthier, no one maintains any longer, as Mandonnet once did, that Thomas was the inventor of literal exegesis of this material. Far from being particularly original, he does

⁴⁰M. Grabmann, "Die Aristoteleskommentare des heiligen Thomas von Aquin," in same author's *Mittelalterliche Geistesleben* I (Munich, 1926), pp. 266–313; cf. pp. 297–300 for a summary of the three contending positions.

⁴¹See an illustration of this in the study by T. R. Heath, "St. Thomas and the Aristotelian Metaphysics," *NS* 34 (1960) 428–60, and the further refinements of W. H. Turner, "St. Thomas's Exposition of Aristotle. A Rejoinder," *NS* 35 (1961) 210–24.

only what others had been doing in the arts faculty in Paris since around 1230.⁴² This does not take away all merit from him in this field, since Thomas knew how to get rather remarkable results out of this instrument, but it leads us closer to the truth about the facts.

As to the fidelity of this exegesis to Aristotle, the historians have generally become more and more critical. The commentary is certainly recognized as both intelligent and profound, frequently literal, but it has nonetheless slanted Aristotle's teaching on certain decisive points, such as where the commentary on the *Ethics* is guided by the explicitly Christian idea of the beatific vision,⁴³ or where the *Metaphysics* is oriented toward a metaphysics of being, which would have been entirely foreign to Aristotle.⁴⁴ This is to say nothing of the creationist metaphysics or the abandonment of polytheism! As it was once pleasantly put by one of the most profound contemporary interpreters, Thomas "baptized" Aristotle,⁴⁵ unless one prefers to say with Gauthier that Thomas inherited an Aristotle "already entirely Christian" and that his effort was to give him a certain purity, to make him a new instrument of his own theological reflection.⁴⁶ Even those who today want to defend Thomas's substantial fidelity to Aristotle must admit that it takes place by means of a "deepening and surpassing of Aristotle's text."⁴⁷

To our way of thinking, many errors can be avoided if we take into account Thomas's real intention. According to a formula that he frequently repeats—and not only about Aristotle—he wishes to uncover the *intentio auctoris*. That is one of the rules of the *expositio reuerentialis*, let us say of the medieval hermeneutic, whose end is to find what the author "wished to say." In order to understand Aristotle we must therefore exert ourselves to find the overall movement of his thought and to recall the truth in search of which he set out and that he seeks, more or less clumsily, to express. At this precise point, Thomas feels himself authorized to substitute for Aristotle in order to "extend" him and make him say some things

⁴² In 1934, Dom Lottin wrote: "It is capricious to see in S. Thomas Aquinas the creator of literal exegesis on these subjects"; see *Psychologie et Morale*, vol. 6, p. 230.

⁴³ Cf. H. V. Jaffa, *Thomism and Aristotelianism: A Study of the Commentary by Thomas Aquinas on the Nicomachean Ethics* (Chicago, 1952).

⁴⁴ Thus J. Owens, "Aquinas as Aristotelian Commentator," in *Commemorative Studies I*, pp. 213–38.

⁴⁵ L.-B. Geiger, "Saint Thomas et la métaphysique d'Aristote," in *Aristote et Saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris-Louvain, 1957), pp. 175–220, especially p. 179; see in the same volume the important study by D. A. Callus, "Les sources de saint Thomas," pp. 93–174.

⁴⁶ R.-A. Gauthier, *Introduction à Anonymi Lectura in Librum De anima*, p. 22.

⁴⁷ The expression is from L. Elders, "Saint Thomas d'Aquin et Aristote," *RT* 88 (1988) 357–76.

that he would not even have been able to think. The exact historical reconstruction of Aristotle's thought does not interest him in itself. Even if his scholarly resources were less great than those of a historian today, he knew quite well what to hold on to most of the time. But he also wanted to go along further within Aristotle's aim and to lead to its fruition the intuition that he thought had been Aristotle's. Aristotle was incapable of verifying such things, owing to a lack of the light of Christian revelation, Thomas thought, but this is what he "wanted to say."

At first sight, the historian of doctrine, formed according to the rigorous methods that are now ours, can only judge this enterprise severely. But can we expect without anachronism that Thomas would conduct himself as a twentieth-century historian of doctrine? . . . We cannot ask from him what he does not claim to give. Without engaging in a shameless apologetic that finally does a disservice to his cause, we can say that we will appreciate his work more equitably if we remember that he undertook these commentaries in an apostolic perspective in order better to carry out his job as a theologian, and better to accomplish his labor of wisdom such as he would understand it in the double school of Saint Paul and Aristotle: to proclaim the truth and refute error.⁴⁸

It certainly would not be out of place to invoke in conclusion the reflection that he made elsewhere à propos of the first steps and hesitations of the great philosophers of antiquity concerning the ultimate happiness of man. In short, with a burst of true intellectual charity, he shared the "anguish of these great spirits" who did not know that we await final felicity after this life in our knowledge of God.⁴⁹ In trying to express what they had "wished to say," Thomas showed what they really sought without knowing it—as Saint Paul at Athens had met his interlocutors on the Areopagus.

Thomas and His Secretaries

The conclusion of the chapter on the Roman period emphasized the large quantity of work Thomas did during those three years. If we now cast a retrospective glance on his productivity during the second Parisian

⁴⁸. For fuller developments of this subject, we refer to the enlightening explanations by Father Gauthier, Leonine, vol. 45/1, pp. 288*–94*.

⁴⁹. SCG III 48. In a valuable little book which came into my hands too late to be utilized here (*Thomas von Aquin. Prologe zu den Aristoteleskommentaren*, edited, translated, and introduced by F. Cheneval and R. Imbach [Frankfurt/Main, 1993]), the authors have gathered together and translated the twelve prologues to the commentaries on Aristotle, as well as the prologue to *Super De causis*. The careful reading of these texts is enlightening for the *intentio* of Thomas himself and perfectly justifies the opinions of the authors (pp. lx–lxiv), who emphasize that his purpose is to not only explain the Philosopher, but indeed to seek the truth.

period, we can only be struck with astonishment. A summary of the works probably from that epoch renders the following list: *Lectura* on Matthew, *Lectura* on John, and also, perhaps, a course on the Epistle to the Romans; the *Secunda Pars* of the *Summa theologiae* in its entirety, plus some twenty-five questions of the *Tertia*; a dozen or so commentaries on Aristotle, some of them unfinished, others quite huge, to which we must add the *Super de causis*; the Questions *De malo* (101 articles), *De uirtutibus* (36 articles), *De unione Verbi incarnati* (4 articles); seven series of quodlibets (176 articles); a series of 14 "opuscula," among them the *De aeternitate mundi*, *De unitate intellectus*, *De perfectione uitae spiritualis*, *Contra retrahentes*, *De substantiis separatis*, to mention only the most important ones.

If the historical probabilities—and sometimes the certainties—were not so strong, it would be not mere astonishment that this list would provoke but sheer incredulity. It has been necessary, therefore, to ask and try to verify if this thing was materially possible and under what conditions. We will run through several numerical calculations that we hope will be excused by the fact that we have kept them to a bare minimum. They may be taken *cum grano salis* given our uncertainty on the exact dates of composition. But the accounting in the *Index Thomisticus* being otherwise very precise, the degree of approximation is, in short, not large.

A numerical evaluation of Thomas's work during the period that runs from October 1268 to the end of April 1272, i.e. around 1253 possible work days,⁵⁰ gives a total of 4061 pages according to the Marietti manual edition (which corresponds except for a few things to as many columns of the *Opera omnia* in R. Busa's edition for the *Index Thomisticus*⁵¹). This corresponds to an average of 3.24 pages a day, or to a daily word count of 2403 (742 words per page). If we only consider the sixteen months of the final period (1271–72)—keeping in mind the fact that certain works straddle 1 January 1271—the number rises to around 2747 pages composed in 466 days, or a daily average of 5.89 pages, clearly superior to the earlier figure.⁵² A final figure perhaps will help to visualize the work ac-

⁵⁰. We have chosen—perhaps a little arbitrarily—350 work days per year, in order to take into account possible indispositions or obstacles. We can be certain that Thomas kept these to a minimum.

⁵¹. The texts commented on (the Bible or Aristotle) or the editor's notes being carefully excluded from the Marietti text, a column in Busa = 1.024 Marietti pages.

⁵². If we must withdraw the commentary on the Epistle to the Romans from the Parisian period and situate it at Naples, as we will see in the following chapter, the averages should be

(footnote continued on next page)

complished: a typical sheet of paper in Europe today will hold around 350 closely typed words. Thomas wrote 12.48 of them a day.

This result cannot be explained by Thomas's labor alone. Several times earlier, we have had to mention the team of secretaries he had at his disposal. They became here a palpable necessity. They are already mentioned during the first stay in Paris, and their presence is discovered constantly afterward. Reginald's hand, for example, is recognizable in different manuscripts, Jacobinus of Asti's also perhaps. Though we cannot always identify their handwriting, we know the names of several secretaries: Raymond Severi, Nicholas of Marsillac, Peter of Andria were, all three, Dominicans. Evan Garvit, a secular cleric of whom we will soon have to speak again, may have been a professional secretary, while Léger of Besançon, the reporter on the *Lectura super Matthaeum*, seems to have been only Thomas's student.⁵³

Tocco frequently repeats that Thomas spent most of his time *writing* or, better, *dictating*.⁵⁴ We may suppose that the second occupation came to predominate with time, for the rare autographs that have come down to us are of works that belong to the first part of his career (*Super Isaiam*, *Super Boetium*, *Sentences* III). The *Contra Gentiles* seems to be the last known example. Perhaps Thomas noted that his own handwriting was too difficult for the average scribe to decipher, but we have proof of the existence of secretaries from his start as a teacher. And we also know that he had the habit of dictating to several persons simultaneously.

Thus Bartholomew of Capua, recounting the way in which Thomas had organized his days, reports that after having celebrated Mass and given his course, "he began writing and *dictating to several secretaries*."⁵⁵ Tocco also echoes the same fact that he claims to have learned from the "true relation of his *socius*, from his students and his secretaries." According to these witnesses, the master "dictated at the same time on diverse subjects

(footnote continued from previous page)

modified as follows: for the whole period 1268–72, we then have a total of 3896.3 pages and a daily average of 3.10 pages (2298 words); for the last sixteen months, we would have a total of 2581 pages and the average would be 5.50 pages a day (or 4081 words; 11.65 close pages in today's typical typed format).

⁵³. We should refer here to the master work by A. Dondaine, *Secrétaires de saint Thomas* (Rome, 1956), particularly chaps. I 1, pp. 1–25, and II 4, pp. 186–208, and to the important study by H.-D. Saffrey, "Saint Thomas d'Aquin et ses secrétaires," *RSPT* 41 (1957) 49–74. See also G. Cappelluti, "Fra Pietro di Andria e i Segretari di S. Tommaso," *Memorie Domenicane* 6 (1975) 151–65.

⁵⁴. *Ystoria* 28, p. 291; 29, p. 295; 30, p. 299 (Tocco 28–50, pp. 102–5).

⁵⁵. *Naples* 77, P. 373: "ponebat se ad scribendum et dictandum pluribus scriptoribus."

to three secretaries and sometimes four."⁵⁶ Tocco continues with an anecdote from Thomas's secretary (*scriptor suus*) Evan Garvit, a Breton from the diocese of Tréguier, according to whom "after dictating to him and to two other secretaries that he [Thomas] had, sitting to rest for a bit, he fell asleep and continued dictating even while sleeping."⁵⁷ Whatever interpretation should be given to this strange way of dictating, the story is rich in information: we would retain from it another testimony to a multiplicity of simultaneous secretaries, of whom one, the secretary named, was a secular cleric.⁵⁸ But we also see Thomas's weariness.

Simultaneous dictation to several secretaries is not unknown in history. The fact is reported of Caesar and of Napoleon. In our day, we are not astonished to see chess players able to play several games simultaneously. Examples of this kind doubtless help us to understand something of what may have happened in Thomas's case. His legendary *abstractio mentis* was then the indispensable condition to carry out all these works. But we are also led to think he had established a real organization and a well thought out method to speed up his work. We glimpse it in the composition of the *Catena aurea* and the considerable documentary research that it presupposes. We approach even closer to it with the *De ueritate*—where the files Thomas used are mentioned. And we touch it with our finger, so to speak, with the *Tabula Libri Ethicorum*, which we have, almost in the rough state of the work of the secretaries, prior to the master's revision.⁵⁹

A curious example will perhaps cast some additional light on Thomas's work methods. It has been long noted that the text of the *Ila Ilae* q. 10 a. 12 (*Utrum pueri Iudaeorum . . . sint inuitis parentibus baptizandi*) is a literal repetition (including both arguments and responses) of *Quodlibet* II q. 4 a. 2 [7], with the exception of an omission through homoeoteleuton

⁵⁶ *Ystoria* 18, p. 253 (Tocco 17, p. 89): "Nam ut uera relatione sui socii et suorum studentium et scriptorum ueraciter est compertum, predictus doctor de diversis materiis tribus scriptoribus et aliquando quatuor in sua camera . . . dictabat."

⁵⁷ "De quo (Thoma) retulit *scriptor suus*, quidam Bricio, Euenus Garuith Trecorensis dyocesis, quod postquam dictauerat *sibi et duobus aliis scriptoribus* quos habebat, tanquam fessus pre labore dictandi, ponebat se dictus doctor pro pausationis gratia ad quietem, in qua etiam dormiendo dictabat." Note the *Garuith* (usually *Garnit* according to Prümmer). There were also doubts about his home diocese: Tréuier in Brittany, or Cork in Ireland. Le Brun-Gouanvic (in a note on this passage) has re-established the correct orthography of his name and says that no MS has the reading *Crocarensis*.

⁵⁸ We should not be surprised to see a secular in Thomas's service. It was expressly provided that seculars could be employed as secretaries. Cf. Humbert of Romans, *De vita regulari*, II, pp. 267–68.

⁵⁹ Tugwell, p. 616, expresses his incredulity on this. In our opinion, he has not sufficiently explored the way we should read these data.

and some small copyist's errors. We might think here that Thomas gave the text to one of his assistants to be recopied and did not reread it. Without always using exceptional cases like this one, we may suppose that the secretaries also frequently prepared materials that the master only had to put into proper form. Every professor who has benefitted from the collaboration of a competent assistant will easily understand the procedure. We would not be going too far, therefore, we believe, in portraying Thomas's collaborators as organized into a veritable workshop for literary production—according to the well-known example of the schools of painting, to say nothing of the "ghost-writers" well known in literary circles. There is hardly any other plausible way to explain Thomas's productivity.

The text quoted on the preceding page that draws attention to Thomas's fatigue underscores another aspect of these matters too little noticed: only late evenings or even all-night work permitted Thomas to address all these fronts at the same time, and that clearly left him subject to the consequences of excess. Falling asleep wherever he happened to be was the most benign form this took. Accidents ensued sometimes—we have a memory of Thomas burning himself with a candle without noticing it while he was dictating something on the Trinity.⁶⁰ Reginald also remembered having been awakened during the night to hear dictated a passage on Isaiah. But while Reginald slept, Thomas was awake and prayed or reflected aloud.⁶¹

Though well known, these stories are often discounted because of their anecdotal aspect or the pious interpretations that accompany them. It would be a shame because of these factors to neglect the real facts that they report, though we need not put them in the foreground. *Mentalité* history has recommended for a long time that researchers read *miracula* as if they were palimpsests.⁶² If we keep all that in mind, we will easily understand that Tocco's story about the last days in Naples only relates the strict truth and that Thomas's regime then was probably the same that he had followed for a long time:

⁶⁰. *Ystoria* 47, P. 348 (Tocco 47, P. 121). This doubtless refers to the *Super Boetium De Trinitate*, and therefore takes us back to the first stay in Paris.

⁶¹. *Ystoria* 31, p. 302 (Tocco 31, P. 105); *Naples* 59, P. 346; 93, P. 399. John Giudice, who lived close by Thomas's cell, reports a similar fact: "frequenter audiuit ipsum loquentem cum aliquo et sepius disputantem, cum solus et sine socio in ipsa (cella) maneret" (*Ystoria* 31, P. 304; fourth version of Tocco: not in the *Fontes*).

⁶². Cf. G. Bedouelle, *L'histoire de l'Eglise. Science humaine ou théologie?* (Paris, 1992), pp. 44ff.

Every day, Friar Thomas celebrated Mass early in the morning in the chapel of Saint Nicholas. Another priest immediately followed him, who celebrated mass in turn. After having heard it, [Thomas] took off his [priestly] vestments, and immediately gave his course. That done, he began writing and dictating to several secretaries. After that, he ate, returned to his room where he attended to divine things until rest time. After rest, he began again to write, and it was thus that he ordered his whole life to God.⁶³

Certainly, there is nothing here but what was very ordinary for a religious of that time, but it is hardly necessary to question the text to understand that Thomas did not lose a minute from morning until evening. When the biographers mention his massive productivity, they willingly see something miraculous in it. If there was a miracle, it should perhaps be seen in the fact that he kept this pace with increasing intensity for some twenty-five years.

At the end of this second period of teaching in Paris, so rich in controversies, in publications, in Thomas's own labors—doubtless in human contacts also, but contacts that escape us and that we can only suspect—we glimpse a man at the height of his powers, in full mastery of his knowledge, overflowing with activity and projects.

We already know from his reactions in the controversies he got mixed up in that he remained true to himself, lively and impatient, without overindulgence for the bad faith he detected in some adversaries or for their intellectual limitations. However, if we do not wish to rest content with appearances, we must try to see behind all this to what may still reveal something of his personality to us. In that period, we may remark in his writings a rather clearly perceptible change in his positions in several areas. And this perhaps allows us to see a certain modification in his spiritual physiognomy.

Dom Lottin had already noted this shift with respect to Thomas's views on free will between Question 6 of the *De malo* and Questions 9 and 10 of the *Prima Secundae*,⁶⁴ where we see a much more nuanced explanation of the causes that result in the free act. While earlier, reason alone seemed involved—the freedom of the deliberative will being based on the indeterminacy of the preceding judgment—Thomas henceforth underscores the confluence of four factors: reason as formal cause; the passions of the

⁶³. Bartholomew of Capua: *Naples* 77, P. 373.

⁶⁴. O. Lottin, *Psychologie et morale*, vol. 1, pp. 225–62.

sensitive appetite, which influence the way in which the object is presented to the will; the will that moves itself because of the end that it pursues; and finally God Himself. An exterior event may have played a role here, since the December 1270 condemnation of theses denying liberty had intervened (some of Thomas's teachings may have been implicated in the condemnation). But we must also see a maturation in Thomas's positions, which springs from a much more complex grasp of human reality than the one suggested by the earliest analyses.

Father Ramirez, with an excellent knowledge of the *Secunda Pars*, trying to find the exact place Thomas occupied in the two great schools of the thirteenth century—one "affective" of Augustinian tendencies, the other "speculative" of Aristotelian orientation—was led to emphasize the evolution in the way Thomas spoke of the theological virtue of faith and, as a consequence, of the gifts of intelligence and wisdom that accompany it. While faith was considered a purely speculative virtue in the *De ueritate*, with scant value in the practical order, except for the remote occasion of acting well (*occasio remota aliquid operandi*),⁶⁵ everything changes in the *Secunda Pars*. First Truth, the proper object of faith, being also "the end of all our desires and of all our actions," faith must work through charity. Initially contemplative, faith therefore becomes practical, as does the speculative intellect, by extension.⁶⁶ Ramirez saw here, as in many other places, an increasing influence of Saint Augustine in Thomas's thought as it comes into its maturity.⁶⁷ In fact, Thomas refers explicitly to him in this passage, but he also refers to Aristotle. If the former furnished him with the *auctoritas* needed, the latter gave him the technical means to take it into account.

We could extend these enquiries with Father Gauthier's observation of an analogous evolution concerning the seat of continence and of perseverance. Throughout the first part of his career, up to and including the *Secunda Secundae*, Thomas placed them in the reason in the strict sense of the word. Beginning with Question 155 of the *Secunda Secundae*, he

⁶⁵. *De ueritate*, q. 14 a. 4, line 114 (Leonine, vol. 22/2, p. 450.).

⁶⁶. *ST* IIa IIae q. 4 a. 2 ad 3: "Sed quia ueritas prima, quae est fidei obiectum, est finis omnium desideriorum et actionum nostrarum, ut patet per Augustinum in I *De Trinitate*, inde est quod per dilectionem operatur. Sicut etiam intellectus speculatiuus extensione fit practicus, ut dicitur in III *De anima*."

⁶⁷. J. M. Ramirez, *De hominis beatitudine. Tractatus theologicus*, vol. 3 (Madrid, 1947), pp. 192–93. For intelligence and wisdom, gifts of the Holy Spirit, compare *Sentences* III d. 34 q. 1 a. 2, and Ia IIae on the one hand, with IIa IIae q. 8 a. 6 and 3 on the other hand.

will thereafter place them in the will. According to Gauthier, this evolution consists in allowing the morality of the *Ethics* to benefit from the enrichments of the Aristotelian psychology in *De anima*. We must see here the sign of a mitigation of "the excessive intellectualism that he had first professed."⁶⁸

Is it necessary to go further and evoke, as Weisheipl does, Eschmann's perplexity, who declared himself unable to account for the change in tone between the first two parts of the *Summa*? Contrary to the coolly metaphysical, dry and intransigent style of the *Prima Pars*, the *Secunda Pars* would show itself profoundly human, full of delicacy and nuance. Weisheipl, who reproduces these remarks on his own authority, suggests seeking the cause of the change in some deep spiritual experience that affected Thomas's personality, his perception of reality, and, as a consequence, his writings.⁶⁹

This cannot at all be excluded, and we have emphasized in the Orvieto period the turning point the composition of the Office of the Blessed Sacrament seems to have represented. But there is surely no place to harden into opposition the difference that we can see between the *Prima* and the *Secunda Pars*. We must rather notice several converging factors that may already explain, humanly speaking, this evolution. First, the material itself calls for an entirely different treatment. It is normal to call upon experience when we are dealing with the laws of human action. We might note an analogous change in Aristotle as he goes from the *Physics* or the *Metaphysics* to the *Ethics* and the *Rhetoric*. Furthermore, the first two parts of the *Summa* are separated by an interval of almost three years. Thomas had time to change during that period. Finally, that time had been spent in part on the commentary on the *De anima* and in a better knowledge of the *Rhetoric* and the *Ethics*, so abundantly used in the *Secunda Pars*. There is hardly any doubt that, despite the modifications that he made to Aristotle's morals and psychology, Thomas himself was influenced by them in return.

These attempts at explanation are partial and hypothetical, and they perhaps do not entirely suffice to account for the phenomenon. But we can hardly go any further until there is a full study of this evolution. For a better knowledge of Saint Thomas, it would be important to spell out its breadth and depth.

⁶⁸. Gauthier, *La date de l'Ethique*, pp. 98–104.

⁶⁹. Weisheipl, pp. 244–45.

Chapter XIII— Last Period of Teaching: Naples (1272–1273)

Thomas left Paris in the spring of 1272, after a sojourn of almost four years. Since Lent, the university had been living again through a period of agitation: a conflict not at all clear for us pitted the masters against the bishop of Paris, and a strike had been announced that was supposed to last from Lent until the Feast of Saint John the Baptist, which is to say, the end of the scholastic year. In fact, only the law faculty would observe it to the end; the other faculties—or at least the chairs of the regulars—do not seem to have been involved to the same extent.¹

As is often the case when it is a matter of dates, we must confess here to relative uncertainty. It is certain that Thomas had been able to hold his quodlibetal dispute for Lent of 1272,² a sign that for him university activity was not totally suspended, or at least that the strike did not affect the theology faculty. However, a little after Pentecost of that very year (12 June 1272), the chapter of the Roman province, meeting in Florence, gave him the task of organizing a *studium generale* of theology, and left him the free choice of the site, the staff, and the number of students.³

This decision is an indication of the fact that he had already returned,

¹ *Chartul.*, no. 445, pp. 502–3; cf. Mandonnet, *Siger*, pp. 202–6.

² According to Gauthier, this is Quodlibet XII, whose *reportatio* had not been reviewed by Thomas; Tugwell, pp. 318–19, note 262, also held this opinion.

³ *MOPH* 20, p. 39: "Studium generale theologie quantum ad locum et personas et numerum studentium committimus plenarie fr. Thome de Aquino."

or was on the point of returning to Italy. We can base this on a letter, written after Thomas's death to the chapter general meeting at Lyon two years later, in which the masters of the arts faculty recall that they had then asked at the general chapter of Florence (it, too, Pentecost 1272) for his return to Paris.⁴ The Parisian masters asked the chapter to have sent to them certain books that Thomas had promised them and—sign of the great esteem that they bore him—to give them at least relics of the person they had been unable to retain while alive. Paul Synave interprets differently the 1272 request to which this letter makes allusion: he sees in it an ultimate attempt to retain Thomas in Paris, for if he had already left the Ilede-France, the request would not any longer have had a chance of arriving and the hope of seeing him return would have been vain.⁵

If we apply here the criterion used on other occasions, we may doubt that this voyage would have been undertaken after the scholastic year, which is to say during the hottest part of the summer; it seems, therefore, more natural to situate it in spring, a little bit after Easter. Thomas would have taken the time to install his successor, Romano of Rome, who had been his bachelor of *Sentences* from 1270 to 1272 and would die less than a year later, before 28 May 1273.⁶ But he must have left Paris for Naples shortly after. Whatever the means of travel chosen, through the Alps or by sea, he could have been in Italy at Pentecost. Several documents of which we will speak again attest to his presence at Naples by 10 September 1272.⁷

Contrary to what one might believe, the choice of Naples as a place for the new center of studies that he had been charged with was not a subjective matter for Thomas. This place had already been designated for that purpose by a previous provincial chapter, which had decided on the creation of two *studia generalia* for the Roman province, one at Naples, the other at Orvieto;⁸ this decision, made in 1269, which is to say three years earlier, had without doubt at least begun to be executed: a minimum of organization must have been in place to receive the students sent by the priories

⁴ *Chartul.*, no. 447, p. 504, letter dated 2 May 1274.

⁵ P. Synave, *Le problème*, p. 159.

⁶ Romano Rossi Orsini, the younger brother of Cardinal Matthew to whom we will return, cousin of the future Nicholas III; his commentary on the first two books of the *Sentences* and some sermons have been preserved, of. Glorieux, *Répertoire* I, no. 28, p. 129; Käppeli, *Scriptores* III, pp. 332–33. Tocco reports a vision that Thomas had of Romano after the latter's death (*Ystoria* 45, PP. 342–44; Tocco 45, PP. 118–19).

⁷ *Documenta* 25–28, pp. 575–80.

⁸ *MOPH* 20, p. 36.

of the province. Furthermore, some other completely objective reasons imposed such a choice, inasmuch as, among the possible cities, Naples was the residence of the most powerful Italian prince and was the only such city to possess a certain university tradition since the foundation by Frederick II and the attempt at restoration by Charles I.

Thus, although it is not impossible that Thomas left Paris for the simple reason that he had already taught there for four years and the policy of the order always favored a rapid rotation of masters, it remains quite possible—and even seems likely—that Charles of Anjou was at the bottom of this return and that he exerted pressure that his capital be chosen and a well-known master be installed there at the head of this new center of theology. In fact, in a letter of 31 July 1272, he tried to profit from the strike at Paris and invite masters and students to come to his city—whose charms and amenities he vaunts—so that they can continue their studies.⁹ We know at least three masters who allowed themselves to be tempted,¹⁰ and we know also that Thomas will receive from the king an ounce of gold a month as a salary for his teaching.¹¹

We know nothing about what had been done before his arrival, nor anything about the concrete organization that he put in place. But we can say that this new foundation was not simply a "more eminent center after the fashion of the Roman province."¹² The decision of the province must be placed in the context of similar decisions taken by the general chapter of Florence (1272) and Budapest (1273), which wanted to bring up from four to six the number of *studia generalia* for the entire order.¹³ In refusing the third approval required, the 1274 chapter of Lyon interrupted the process thus begun, but this permits us to understand the overall direction of the new foundation.¹⁴ Without having the importance of the one in Paris, the mendicants in the *studium* in Naples, for practical purposes, constituted the faculty of theology of the university, there as in Bologna, Padua, or Montpellier.

⁹ *Chartul.*, no. 443, pp. 501–2: Naples is "aeris puritate salubris, loci amenitate conspicua, ubertate rerum omnium opulenta."

¹⁰ Peter of Blois, Robert of Courton, and John of Centenovilla, *ibid.*, p. 502 note.

¹¹ *Documenta* 28, pp. 579–80; we will return to this point in the following chapter.

¹² Contrary to WN, p. 175, which Weisheipl accepted, p. 295–96.

¹³ Cf. *MOPH* 3, pp. 164 and 167.

¹⁴ It was only in 1303 that Naples got a full *studium generale*, but at the time the south of Italy would be constituted into a province independent from that of Rome; it is indeed remarkable that the chapter of Besançon, which made this decision, makes it *ad instanciam domini regis Sicilie* (*MOPH* 3, P. 325).

The Course on the Pauline Letters

As to the material taught during these last months of Thomas's life, all indications that we have today point toward a course on the epistles of Saint Paul, and more precisely on the Epistle to the Romans. For a long time doubt had been the rule among the researchers on this subject. We can even say that, from Mandonnet to Weisheipl and passing through Glorieux, the greatest diversity reigned and the most ingenious hypotheses were formulated. Although it became necessary to revise them completely in the light of the achievements of the most recent research—to which we have had access thanks to the works of the Leonine Commission¹⁵—we can still perhaps profit from some of their suggestions.

According to Mandonnet, Thomas taught Saint Paul in two phases: the first time in Italy (Orvieto-Rome) from 1259 to 1268; a second time at Naples, from October 1272 to December 1273; the motive the second time would have been Thomas's dissatisfaction about his first course, but the new enterprise was interrupted by his death. From the second series solely the *expositio* sketched by Thomas himself on the epistle to the Romans has come down to us and the first part of 1 Corinthians. From the first series we have only Reginald's *reportationes* beginning from chapter XI of the first letter to the Corinthians, for the existence of the more complete *expositio* would have made him neglect the corresponding parts, which were solely reported.¹⁶

Starting from this way of looking at things, there are some confirming indications from the catalogues, which draw a neat distinction between the *Super epistolam ad Romanos* and the *Super primam ad Corinthios capitula XI* (or *X*), on the one hand, which are ranged in the first category of works attributed to Thomas, and the *Lectura super Paulum a XI capitulo prime ad Corinthios usque ad finem*, on the other hand, which takes its place among the *reportationes* made by Reginald of Piperno.¹⁷ This fact doubtless explains in part why, despite many criticisms of detail, the gen-

¹⁵. We warmly thank Father Gilles de Grandpré of the Canadian section (Ottawa) of the Leonine commission, who is preparing the edition of the commentaries on Saint Paul, and who has generously communicated to us some of this information first hand.

¹⁶. Mandonnet, *Chronologie des écrits scripturaires*, pp. 70–93.

¹⁷. There are concordant indications from the two lists of Prague (Grabmann, *Werke*, pp. 92–99) and from Bartholomew of Capua (*Naples* 85, pp. 388–89); Tolomeo (XXIII 15, p. 155) expresses himself differently, but underlines the difference between Romans (not Corinthians) and the rest of the epistles. Romans apart, none of these texts speaks of an *expositio* in its own right (Prague 2: *glosas*).

eral framework proposed by Mandonnet has been kept by numerous researchers.¹⁸ To our knowledge, the only exception was Weisheipl, who wished to place the *lectura* on the Romans in the second Parisian period. But that is difficult to sustain, given the diffusion of the manuscripts of this work, which seems to have originated in Italy.¹⁹

Accepting this hypothesis, many specialists have thought they could support it by some internal criticism: the teaching of the commentary on the Romans would testify to a rather advanced doctrinal evolution compared with what is evident in the remainder of the commentaries on the epistles (on the sin of drunkenness, the salvation of infidels, or the gifts of the Holy Spirit).²⁰ Certain thinkers believed they had found the reason for this in the fact that this part had been composed directly by Thomas; but that does not seem to suffice, and the incontestable doctrinal evolution supposes a rather long temporal interval between Reginald's *reportatio* and this new redaction.

Though this general framework is perhaps still viable, Mandonnet's views call for serious reworking on certain points. Thus no one today holds any longer what appeared to Mandonnet evident: that Thomas commented in a parallel way on two books of the Bible, one from the Old and the other from the New Testament. But of even more direct relevance, we do not know what Thomas did from 1259 to 1261; further, we know that the period at Orvieto (1261–65) was the time of the *Expositio in Job* (Mandonnet, whom we have just seen put it in Paris, was not bothered by this); it was also the period of the completion of the *Contra Gentiles* and of beginning composition (on Matthew, at least) of the *Catena aurea*. Would it have been physically possible for Thomas to teach simultaneously on Saint Paul? This is why, if we must retain the hypothesis of a first teaching on Saint Paul in this epoch, we would be inclined to think that the period that would best fit was the Roman sojourn (1265–68).²¹ But for that it

¹⁸. Suffice to enumerate: Spicq, *Esquisse*, pp. 305–6; Glorieux, "Les commentaires scripturaires," pp. 254–58; Eschmann, "A Catalogue," p. 399; Weisheipl, pp. 372–73.

¹⁹. It is true we might think of some presentation of this course on Romans during the second Parisian year and its diffusion at the place where it was given would have been hindered by the Thomas's departure (more or less hasty) to Italy.

²⁰. See on this in particular H. Bouillard, *Conversion et grâce chez S. Thomas d'Aquin. Etude historique*, Théologie 1 (Paris, 1944), pp. 225–41: "Date du Commentaire de saint Thomas sur l'épître aux Romains."

²¹. We agree here with an indication from P. Synave, "Les Commentaires scripturaires de saint Thomas d'Aquin," *VS* 8 (1923) 464, cf. 455–69, who does not give any reason for it, however.

would be necessary to accept the hypothesis suggested above, that neither the *alia lectura* on the *Sentences* nor the *Prima Pars* were used in teaching and that Thomas continued to give his daily lecture on Scripture; Paul's epistles could then have furnished the material for them, but nothing is less certain.²²

In addition to the data in the catalogues, which can be read in this way, the sole external datum that permits support for the preceding hypothesis is the difficulty that we would have in placing all these courses on Saint Paul in those few months of the last period of teaching at Naples. But until future labors on the critical edition are completed, it is impossible to verify the validity of these views more fully.

Research is, however, rather advanced on the Epistle to the Romans and enable us to say that the two major witnesses to the text had a direct access to the documents left by Thomas.²³ The first eight chapters carry traces of numerous editorial interventions, whose frequency diminishes very rapidly in what follows. These are not arbitrary interventions owing to the copyist or to the editors who guided their work, as often happens, but some rapid corrections by the author that the perplexed scribes had a hard time introducing in their exact places, for they were poorly indicated. In support of the observations to which the two manuscripts concerned lend themselves, we can bring forward the testimony of Tolomeo. When he speaks of the *postille super omnes epistolas Pauli*, he reserves a special place for the parts on Romans in adding: "preter epistolam ad Romanos quam ipse notavit, quas ego vidi et legi." This formula ceases to appear strange if we think of the original manuscript with the corrections by Thomas himself that the scribes from Naples and Dubrovnik had a hard

²². One or two other difficulties come into play against this dating, according to Henle, *Saint Thomas and Platonism*, pp. 47–48. The commentary on Colossians (I, *lect.* 4, no. 39–41), would contain a rather long passage that draws on the *Elementatio theologica* of Proclus (Props. 101 and 103); now the translation of this text was only finished by Moerbeke on 15 May 1268; it would have had to come into Thomas's hands very quickly for him to utilize it while he was still in Rome; this does not seem at all impossible, and should not be considered an absolute impossibility, and furthermore it does not appear to us to be evident that the *Elementatio theologica* is in question here; Dionysius and the *Liber de causis* would suffice to explain this passage. As to the allusion to the *Prima Pars*, which we find in the commentary on the Letter to the Hebrews (4, *lect.* 1, no. 203), if it is not an interpolation, it could be explained without difficulty, since in that period the *Prima Pars* was already written.

²³. See the manuscript *Naples, Bibl. Naz. VII. A. 17* (Shooner, *Codices*, III, no. 1907) and the manuscript *Dubrovnik, Dominikanska Bibl., 11 (36–III–4)*, (Dondaine-Shooner, *Codices*, I, no. 670), which must be retained until the critical edition by G. de Grandpré appears; many details of my text originate in documentation that he had sent to me (March 1992).

time deciphering and that Tolomeo may well indeed have had in his own hands. We have no reason to doubt his insistence.

Without being able to say, properly speaking, that what we have is a "revision," for the labor would have been done in a rather negligent fashion, everything seems to indicate that Thomas indeed gave a course at Naples on Romans, of which he rapidly corrected the first eight chapters, but the rest has come down to us in the condition of notes from the course—a *reportatio*. Probably the text was diffused from Naples, as was the case without doubt for the rest of the Pauline corpus.²⁴ There is no indication in the manuscript tradition in any case that the texts were diffused from Paris (this is the main argument that weakens Weisheipl's thesis).

In support of this reading, we might again invoke—with the usual reservations—the stories of the biographers: the tradition maintains a memory of Thomas teaching Saint Paul *in Naples*. Tolomeo reports a highly significant anecdote under the form of a dream that a holy friar from that priory had. Thomas was seated in his magisterial chair, in the process of commenting on the epistles, when, behold, the Apostle himself entered the lecture hall, which was already filled with a distinguished crowd. Thomas interrupted himself to give witness to his reverence for the Apostle and, after a few casual words of conversation, asked him if he was explaining Paul's text according to the meaning that he had wanted to give it. To this question the Apostle responded that Thomas indeed was teaching what could be understood from his epistles during this life; but a time would come when he would understand them according to their whole truth. Saying this, he took him by the cape and dragged him along with him. Three days later Thomas's death became known at Naples.²⁵ The premonition in this dream has less importance here than the identification of Thomas as a commentator on Paul by his contemporaries in the last months of his life.

It is true that the hagiographical tradition has also transmitted a memory of lessons on Saint Paul at Paris. In recalling that Thomas was recommending the study of the epistles in preference to all the other books of Scripture, with the exception of the Gospels, Tocco adds that it was while

²⁴. We might mention here also the diffusion of the Commentary on Job, which is not without analogy to the diffusion of the Pauline corpus, cf. Leonine, vol. 26, pp. 18^ab–9^a.

²⁵. Tolomeo XXIII 9 (Ferrua, no. 177, pp. 362–63); Tocco knows the name of the visionary (Paul of Aquila, inquisitor in Naples in 1274), but except for a few things, reports the same story: *Ystoria* 60, pp. 385–86 (Tocco 60, pp. 133–34).

he was giving the *expositio* at Paris that he would have had a vision of Saint Paul.²⁶ It is difficult, however, to accord the same weight to this story as we have given to the previous one, for no testimony in the textual criticism comes to the support of this second case. If it is not merely an attempt to correct an inopportune impression (Thomas had not taught at Paris *solely* on Matthew and John, but *also* on Paul), we must see here simply one of those errors of localization quite frequent in stories of this type.²⁷

For the other epistles, things are a little less clear. We know effectively of two versions for the first seven chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews and for chapters 11 to 13 of the First Letter to the Corinthians,²⁸ but the specialists are hardly inclined here to speak of a revision. For the Epistle to the Hebrews, the second version—longer than the first (the Marietti edition gives extracts from it in small letters)—presents this particularity, of being the one that Reginald of Piperno uses by choice. Antoine Dondaine thought that this version was Reginald's own *reportatio*.²⁹ As to the double version of chapters 11–13 of 1 Corinthians, it may be due simply to the momentary presence of a second reporter.

If, despite all the uncertainties that we have spoken of, we now try to sum up what seem to be the best explanations currently available, we might characterize the state in which Thomas's Pauline corpus presents itself thus:

(1) The part where his hand seems rather directly perceptible comprises the first eight chapters of Romans; the rest of this commentary on Romans has not been corrected; in all probability this course dates from the last years of Thomas's life, which is to say, from Naples in 1272–73.

(2) We cannot say anything precise concerning the course on chapters 1–10 of the First Letter to the Corinthians, which the catalogues treat separately, if only because, for an unknown reason (perhaps simply because of the absence of the reporter) Thomas's commentary on 1 Corinthians from 7:10 to the end of chapter 10 is lost; it was replaced very early in the manuscripts and the

²⁶. *Ystoria* 18, p. 251 (Tocco 17, p. 88): "Scripsit super epistolas beati Pauli omnes, quarum scripturam preter evangelicam super omnes alias commendabat, in quarum expositione Parisius uisionem prefati apostoli dicitur habuisse."

²⁷. Tugwell, pp. 247–48, takes support from the repetition of this anecdote to suggest that Thomas could have taught on Saint Paul *at Paris and Naples*; we were ourselves tempted by this hypothesis but the information obtained through examination of the manuscript tradition has led us to abandon it.

²⁸. Cf. H.-V. Shooner, reviewed by Stegmüller, *BT* 10(1957–59), no. 180, p. 111; A. Dondaine, *Sermons de Réginald*, pp. 390–94.

²⁹. A written communication from Father Bataillon (7 May 1992).

printed editions with the text borrowed from Peter of Tarentaise (in a version attributed to Nicholas Gorran).³⁰

(3) The *reportatio* by Reginald of Piperno extends from 1 Corinthians 11 up to the Epistle to the Hebrews inclusively; this *could* be the fruit of Thomas's teaching from the years 1265 to 1268 in Rome. We know of two editions of the first seven chapters of the commentary on the Hebrews, and the second seems to be Reginald's. There are also two editions of the course on chapters 11–13 of 1 Corinthians, but we cannot draw from that any conclusion.³¹

Despite the heterogeneity of these pieces, it is nonetheless certain that Thomas thought of his commentary as a whole. The proof of this is given in the Prologue that he placed at the head of this whole. He proposes there a general plan of the Pauline epistles, according to which each one corresponds to a precise design. Certainly, he could have placed this here at the time of a second version, but in fact he refers to this plan at the start of each epistle, which shows quite well that he was conscious of the unity of his intention, even for the parts simply reported on. We will translate a rather lengthy passage from this text, for it is both very clear on this global vision and significant, at the same time, for his method:

The Apostle wrote fourteen epistles: nine of them instruct the Church of the Gentiles; four the prelates and princes of the Church, as well as kings; the last is addressed to the Hebrews, the sons of Israel. The teaching bears entirely on Christ's grace, which we can consider under a triple modality.

In the first place, according to its existence in the Head himself, Christ, and it is thus that we find it in the Epistle to the Hebrews; then, as it is in the principal members of the mystical body, and it is thus that we find it in the epistles addressed to the prelates [the pastoral epistles]; finally, according as it is in the mystical body itself, which is the Church, and it is thus that we find it in the epistles addressed to the Gentiles.

³⁰. Cf. Mandonnet, *Chronologie des écrits scripturaires*, pp. 89–92; H.-D. Simonin, "Les écrits de Pierre de Tarentaise," in *Beatus Innocentius pp. V (Petrus de Tarentasia O.P.)*, *Studia et Documenta* (Rome, 1943), p. 228, note 53; in the Cai edition (Marietti), this apocryphal part extends from no. 336 to no. 581 inclusive. There are in fact two editions of this text by Peter of Tarentaise; it is the second that we find in the printed editions; the first is transmitted by three other testimonies.

³¹. According to Father de Grandpré—from whom I take several indications—except for the manuscript tradition of Italian origin, which presents the Pauline corpus in a uniform fashion, we must distinguish, from the point of view of textual criticism, four blocks: (1) Rom. (+ 1 Cor. 1–7); (2) (1 Cor. 1–7 +) 1 Cor. 10 + 2 Cor. + Gal. + Eph.; (3) Phil. + Col. + 1–2 Thes. + 1–2 Tim. + Tit. + Philem.; (4) Hebr.; but these are only the exterior characteristics of the manuscript transmission and we must add, "the place of each of the sections in the more vast whole of the Pauline corpus is evident and each one of the sections is an integral part of the corpus inseparably, on questions of date, of authenticity, etc."

[In the last instance,] there is another distinction, for Christ's grace is susceptible of a triple consideration. First, in itself, as in the Epistle to the Romans. Second, in the sacraments of grace, as in the two epistles to the Corinthians—of which the first treats of the sacraments themselves and second of the dignity of their ministers—and in the Epistle to the Galatians, in which are found excluded superfluous sacraments [*superflua sacramenta*] against those who wish to add the ancient sacraments to new ones [*uetera sacramenta nouis adiungere*]. Third, Christ's grace is considered according to the work of unity that it realizes within the Church.

[From this last point of view,] the apostle therefore treats first of the foundation [*institutio*] of ecclesial unity in the Epistle to the Ephesians; then its confirmation and its progress in the Epistle to the Philippians; then its defense: against errors in the Epistle to the Colossians, against the present persecutions in the first letter to the Thessalonians, against future persecutions and, above all, persecutions in the time of the Antichrist in second Thessalonians.

As to Church prelates, it instructs equally the spiritual as well as the temporal. For the spiritual, he speaks of the foundation, of the construction, and of the government of ecclesial unity in the first letter to Timothy; of firmness against persecutors in the second; of the defense against heretics in the Epistle to Titus. As to temporal lords, he instructs them in the Epistle to Philemon.

Here therefore are the reasons for the distinction and the order of all the epistles.³²

Today's reader, used to an entirely different approach to the Bible, whether scientific or pastoral, cannot help but be surprised at this systematic exposition. Thomas does not seem to realize that Paul's letters are nothing more than occasional writings and that nothing was further from the Apostle's thinking than to wish to transmit so strongly constructed a teaching about Christ's grace. We must, nonetheless, not think Thomas more naive than he was, nor that he imagined himself to have discerned all the richness of Paul's text.

This long text does not emphasize solely the unity of Thomas's purpose; it also shows to what extent the ecclesial perspective is present in his thinking. This will be precious for us later in understanding something about his spiritual theology. One need only skim his commentary to find numerous indications in this regard. Before returning more fully to this in

³² *Prol.*, ed. Cai (Turin-Rome, 1953), no. 11; we translate here from the critical text by Father de Grandpré.

our next volume, and by way of example and invitation, we will translate here some lines on the Holy Spirit as a pendant to the text on Christ quoted above. This is a propos of Romans 8:2: "The law of the Spirit, who gives life in Jesus Christ":

In a first sense, *this law is the Holy Spirit itself*. So that by *the law of the Spirit* we must understand *the law that is the Spirit*. The proper quality of the law, in effect, is to incite man to do the good. According to the Philosopher . . . the legislator's intention is to produce good citizens; now human law can do this only in making them know the good and the necessity to do it. The Holy Spirit Himself, who abides in the soul, not only teaches that which it is necessary to do by illuminating intelligence, but also inclines the affections toward acting rightly. . . . In a second sense, this law can be understood as *the proper effect of the Holy Spirit*, which is to say, of the faith that operates through charity. It too teaches interiorly what it is necessary to do according to the verse from 1 John 2: *His unction teaches you all things*, but it also spurs the will toward action, according to 2 Corinthians 5: *Christ's love constrains us*. This law therefore is called a new law because it is identified with the Holy Spirit, or because the Spirit itself carries it out within us. . . . And if the Apostle adds *in Jesus Christ*, that is because this Spirit is given only to those who are in Jesus Christ. As the natural vital breath does not come to the members who are not joined with the head, in the same way, the Holy Spirit does not come to the members who are not linked to their chief, Christ.³³

The Course on the Psalms

Outside of the Epistle to the Romans, we do not exactly know what subjects could have been taught during the year 1272–73. No disputed question can be assigned to this period, and it seems indeed that there were

³³. In Roman. 8, lect. 1, no. 601–606. See F. R. Larcher's translation, *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (Albany, N.Y.: Magi Books, 1966), and M. L. Lamb's translation, *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (Albany, N.Y.: Magi Books, 1966). Apart from the abbé Bralé's translation, which appeared in 1874 published by Vivès, there exists in French, to our knowledge, only the translation by A. Charlier, *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Commentaire de la seconde épître aux Corinthiens* (Paris, 1980), 2 vol.; we mention again several studies of general interest: O. H. Pesch, "Paul as Professor of Theology. The Image of the Apostle in St. Thomas's Theology," *The Thomist* 38 (1974) 584–605; W. Swierzawski, "God and the Mystery of His Wisdom in the Pauline Commentaries of Saint Thomas Aquinas," *DTP* 74 (1971) 466–500; Th. Domanyi, *Der Römerbriefkommentar des Thomas von Aquin. Ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung seiner Auslegungsmethoden* (Bern, 1979); M. Hendrickx, *Sagesse de Dieu et sagesse des hommes. Le commentaire de 1 Co 1–4 et sa confrontation avec la grande glose de Pierre Lombard* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1987); J. Ti-Ti Chen, *La unidad de la Iglesia según santo Tomás en la epistola a los Efesios* (Pamplona, 1979).

none.³⁴ Since Mandonnet, one generally says that Thomas gave a course on the Psalter, but that he was interrupted by illness and death and that he could explicate only the first fifty-four psalms.³⁵ This opinion is shared by Glorieux, Eschmann, Weisheipl. But judges as good as Father Bataillon say that these texts hardly correspond to the maturity of this period and we can ask ourselves why Thomas would have waited so long before commenting on so fundamental a text as the Psalter.³⁶ But it is true that the interruption points us in a certain direction. If we must abandon the hypothesis of Mandonnet, of a course simultaneously on Romans and the Psalter (on alternating days, or, indeed, one course in the morning and another in the evening), we could look toward the beginning of September–October 1273, which would lead us then to the very last days of Thomas's teaching and would explain perhaps certain particularities of the text that has come down to us.

The catalogues in effect attribute the *reportatio* on it to Reginald, but whereas the Prague list speaks of a "Lectura super tres nocturnos [psalterii],"³⁷ Bartholomew of Capua speaks of a "Lectura super quatuor nocturnos psalterii."³⁸ This matter might be explained thus: as we know, the "nocturnals" allude to the liturgical office of matins, where the Psalms were divided according to the days of the week. The three nocturnals from the Prague list correspond to the Psalms of the first three days (Sunday, Monday, Tuesday), which go up to and include Psalm 51. The rare manuscripts that transmit this work do not contain more, and even today the contemporary printed editions do not know of any further material.

We had to wait until 1880 for Paolo Uccelli to discover in the archives of Naples a new manuscript of the *Lectura* on the Psalms, where we find the lessons on the three following Psalms (52–54).³⁹ Beyond this fragment

³⁴ Despite the attempts by Pelster to situate the Q. *De unione uerbi incarnati* at Naples (cf. above, chapter XI, note 33).

³⁵ Mandonnet, *Chronologie des écrits scripturaires*, pp. 59–70.

³⁶ Tugwell, p. 248 and note 474, receives this suggestion favorably and believes it may belong to the very beginning of Thomas's career. Since the publication of the original, French edition of this book, one informed reviewer has furnished me with two supplementary pieces of information that favor a later dating: (1) the evolution of Thomas's theology of the episcopate; (2) the allusion to the sanctity of St. Louis [king of France] (see A. Bandera, *Ciencia Tomista* 120 [1993] 636). Further, even Father Bataillon seems to have been convinced by our argumentation: "The commentary on the Psalms is almost certainly the last instruction of Thomas" (see his "La diffusione manoscritta e stampata dei commenti biblici di San Tommaso d'Aquino," *Angelicum* 71 [1994] 579–90, esp. 589).

³⁷ Grabmann, *Werke*, p. 93.

³⁸ *Naples* 85, p. 389.

³⁹ P.-A. Uccelli, S. *Thomae Aquinatis in Isaiam prophetam, in tres psalmos David, in*

(footnote continued on next page)

of Thomas's authentic work, the high interest of this discovery resides in the colophon of that manuscript, which specifies that it had been copied from the exemplar by Reginald of Piperno, and that no more of it was to be found.⁴⁰ Bartholomew of Capua, who knew both Thomas and Reginald in this period at Naples, was well situated to know whether Thomas had commented on the Psalms of the fourth nocturnal, those of Wednesday; he simply omits telling us that the work was not finished. This is without doubt the strongest indication for situating this work in the last weeks of Thomas's teaching, but we can say no more about it.⁴¹

The prologue is most instructive for grasping the method and intention of our author, who set himself to commenting on this treasure of ecclesial prayer. As enlightening as his comments on St. Paul cited above and complementary to them, it illustrates the way in which Thomas approaches his various commentaries on Scripture. He wishes to emphasize its "cause," which is quadruple: matter, form, end, agent (*materia, modus seu forma, finis et agens*): "Its *matter* is universal; while each of the canonical books has its special material, this one ranges over the material of all theology." This can be verified in several domains, but above all in what concerns the work of salvation carried out by Christ:

Everything that bears on the end of the Incarnation is expressed in this book in so clear a way that one might believe oneself face to face with the Gospel, not with prophecy. . . . This plenitude is the reason why the Church returns ceaselessly to the Psalter, for it contains all Scripture.⁴²

After dealing with the matter, he seeks to characterize the mode or the form of this book:

The *mode* of sacred Scripture is in effect multiple. It can be narrative . . . as in historical books; commemorative, exhortative, and prescriptive . . . as in the Law, the Prophets, or in the Wisdom Books; disputative, as

(footnote continued from previous page)

Boetium de Hebdomadibus et de Trinitate expositiones (Rome, 1880), pp. xv–xvi and 241–54; this manuscript—described by H.-V. Shooner, *Codices*, vol. 3, no. 1959, pp. 30–31, according to notes taken by J. Destrez and T. Käppeli—was destroyed by fire following the bombardment of Naples during the Second World War, 30 September 1943.

⁴⁰. "Explicit postilla super partem psalterij secundum fratrem thomam de aquino ordinis predicatorum, *quia non invenitur plus in exemplari fratris Raynaldi de piperno* qui fuit socius fratris thome usque ad mortem et habuit omnia scripta sua," according to Shooner, *ibid.*; cf. Mandonnet, *Chronologie des écrits scripturaires*, p. 68.

⁴¹. We might simply underline that—as in the case of the Pauline Corpus—the manuscript diffusion began from Naples.

⁴². *Prooemium in Psalm*, Vivès ed., vol. 18, p. 228.

in Job or Saint Paul; deprecative or laudatory, as here. In effect, everything that in the other books is dealt with according to a precise mode is here found under the form of praise and of prayer. . . . It is from this that the book takes its title: *The beginning of the Book of Hymns, which is to say, of the soliloquies of the prophet David about Christ*. The hymn is a praise of God under the form of a song. The song is the exaltation of the soul over the subject of eternal realities that are expressed by the voice. It teaches therefore to praise God in joy. The soliloquy is the personal colloquy of man with God or, indeed, only with himself; and this is necessary for whoever praises or prays.

As to the *end* of this Scripture, it is prayer, elevation of the soul toward God. . . . It is possible for the soul to elevate itself toward God in four ways: by admiring the greatness of his power . . . the elevation of faith; by extending itself toward the excellence of its eternal beatitude . . . the elevation of hope; by attaching itself strictly to divine goodness and its holiness . . . elevation of charity; by imitating the divine justice and its action . . . the elevation of justice. [These different points are insinuated into the various Psalms], this is why Saint Gregory says that if the Psalmody is accompanied by the intention of the heart, it prepares in the soul a path for God, who infuses into it the mysteries of prophecy or the grace of compunction.

As to the *author* of this work, it is evidently God Himself, since the sacred Scriptures are not the fruit of a human will but indeed of divine inspiration, which is aroused in appropriate instruments. Thomas ends his introduction, therefore, with several indications on the way in which prophetic revelation occurs, but this is not the place to tarry on this point—except to say that Thomas retains the play of secondary causes.⁴³

Instructive and astonishing as to its method, this text of the Prologue is slightly deceptive in its content for an uninitiated reader. But whoever returns frequently to Thomas's reading of the Psalms will not regret it. His dryness allows us to guess that the reporter has noted only the essential ideas, and has permitted the escape of the nuanced explications and the warmth of living speech that make of oral teaching something entirely different than the simple course notes, however well they have been taken. We must know how to read this text so that it will deliver up a little of its richness, going back to the sources and seeing what Gregory or Augustine said, in order more or less to reconstruct what he must really have said.

⁴³ Cf. *ST* IIa IIae qq. 171–74; *De uer.*, q. 12; J.-P. Torrell, "Le traité de la prophétie de S. Thomas d'Aquin et la théologie de la révélation," *Studi Tomistici* 37 (1990) 171–95.

We can take as an example the commentary on Psalm 3:3: *Ego dormivi et soporatus sum*, which evokes in a word the birth of the Church from the pierced side of Christ sleeping in the sleep of death, signified by the birth of Eve from the side of Adam sleeping in the morning of Genesis.⁴⁴ Thomas gives here an echo of a true patristic commonplace, which extends the Pauline parallel between the two Adams through a parallel also dear to Irenaeus, that of the two Eves—the Church being the new "mother of the living"—which was transmitted to Thomas by two familiar authors, Augustine and Chrysostom. Similar cases could be multiplied with regard to prayer, affectivity, the desire of God, etc. We cannot overemphasize to whoever would attempt a translation of the scriptural commentaries, that it would not be useful or fruitful unless accompanied by notes that extend the text in the sense sketched here, for the difficulty is less in the Latin than in what is not said in these texts.

The "Life of Jesus"

Upon leaving Paris, as we have said, Thomas took with him a certain number of books already under way. Among the most important tasks still pending, the first was certainly the completion of the *Summa*. At his arrival in Naples, only the first questions of the *Tertia Pars* had been written (20, according to Eschmann, or 25, according to Glorieux, but not without some questions). This corresponds roughly to the properly speculative part of the theology of Christ, the study of the hypostatic union and its consequences. It is, therefore, during the Naples period that Thomas composed the remainder of these questions on Christ and the beginning of his theology of the sacraments. We can put aside here whatever concerns his sacramental theology,⁴⁵ but we must speak at least briefly about this part of his christology.

Popularized in France under the name *Vie de Jésus* (Life of Jesus), these Questions 27–59 of the *Tertia* reveal a scriptural and patristic return to

⁴⁴. In Ps. 3:3 (Vivès, vol. 18, p. 242): "Iste sopor signatur in sopore Adam . . . quia de latere Christi in cruce mortui formata est Ecclesia."

⁴⁵. There is much here to grasp. Think of what we have already said above (chapter 7) about the Eucharist; but we might also think about the highly "personalist" approach that Thomas took to the sacrament of reconciliation—which he called penitence. Cf. C. E. O'Neill, *Sacramental Realism. A General Theory of the Sacraments* (Wilmington, Del., 1983), pp. 164–84. We also refer to the study by L. G. Walsh, "The Divine and the Human in St. Thomas's Theology of Sacraments," in *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 321–52, this study shows quite well the intimate links that connect the theory of causality at work in the sacramental theology to the theory that Thomas uses in his doctrine of creation and his anthropology.

sources that would astonish those who do not wish to see in Thomas anything other than an impenitent Aristotelian. There is here, on the contrary, nothing surprising for one who has studied Thomas's scriptural commentaries and knows the gigantic effort of research into the patristic heritage represented by the *Catena aurea*. We must speak about this at some length, for it is probably the most original part of his christology, and we will be able to observe more than one point of contact between these pages and Thomas's evolution in the last months of his life.

The title *Life of Jesus* is, however, misleading; Thomas says more exactly that he wishes to speak about "what the Incarnate Son of God did and suffered in the human nature that was united to him,"⁴⁶ or—according to a formula that occurs several times—of the *acta et passa Christi in carne*. To understand the extent to which this goes beyond what we would normally mean by the term "life"—more or less historically understood—it is sufficient to recall the plan announced by the author. He develops it in four sections, about which we do not have to comment on their relation to the construction of the *Summa theologiae* itself:

(1) The entrance (*ingressus*) of the Son of God into this world (QQ. 27–39). This is the occasion for speaking of his mother, the Virgin Mary, of her sanctification *in utero* (as we know, Thomas did not accept the Immaculate Conception), of her virginity, of her marriage with Joseph (a *true* marriage), of the annunciation by the angel, etc. One sometimes speaks here of Thomas's "Mariology," quite improperly without doubt, but it is true that despite the completely out-of-date physiological data, one can profit from several striking intuitions (Mary giving, in the name of all humanity, her consent to the coming to the Savior: *loco totius humanae naturae*).⁴⁷ In reality, we are always dealing with christology, and everything is seen in relation to Jesus' birth and to the various circumstances that were connected with it.

(2) The development (*progressus*) of his life in this world (QQ. 40–45). This is what one commonly calls the public life of Christ: the type of life that he led (*conuersatio*) and the teaching that one can draw from it for those who wish to announce his message today, his temptation in the desert and its meaning in salvation history, his teaching, his miracles, and his Transfiguration. Rather curiously, Thomas has connected Christ's baptism to his first section, but he sees it as also introducing the full manifestation of Christ.

(3) His departure (*exitus*) from this world, which is to say, His Passion and

⁴⁶. IIIa q.27 Prol.

⁴⁷. *ST* IIa a. 30 a. 1.

death (QQ. 46–52). Under some conventional scholastic headings, Thomas treats the most burning subjects in our contemporary theology of redemption. His consideration of the "efficient cause" of the Passion probes the responsibility of its authors—not only that of the Jews or the Romans, but our own, and even that of the Father. The "efficient modality" of the Passion—which is to say, the way in which it effects our salvation—puts precisely in place notions of merit, satisfaction, sacrifice, redemption, reserving for Christ alone the honor of being "the" Redeemer, for only the person of the Word could give such value to human acts. If it is necessary for the theologian who wants to use these texts today to work up a minimum of hermeneutic (as for all the texts of the past), it is no less certain that we find here practically all the elements of a soteriology.

(4) His exaltation (*exaltatio*), or His triumph after this life (QQ. 53–59). It is evidently here that the term *Life of Jesus* reaches its limits as a description of Thomas's undertaking, since we are from this point on beyond history. These last questions examine, therefore, the final unfolding of the mystery of Christ: the Resurrection, the Ascension, the sitting at the right hand of the Father, and the power then given to Jesus to be equal to the Father—and with His humanity, the judge of the living and the dead. Thomas discovers doubtless once again the order of the *Credo*, which is familiar to him, but it is also striking to observe the facility with which this theoretician, who has no problem with a christology "from above," also engages in the christology "from below" of the very first Christian generations.

This simple enumeration of some of the themes dealt with permits us to see a little better the author's real purpose. The unfolding of evangelical history has provided him with a precious historical framework, since it permitted him to pass in review all the events of Christ's life, the smallest as well as the greatest, giving him also occasion to deal with subjects rather badly understood by a number of theologians, such as baptism, Christ's temptations, or the way in which He lived amid the crowd. He wishes to show that the Word was made man in the most human way and that there is here material not only for theological reflection, but for spiritual meditation, repeated without ceasing in order to deepen the mystery of the Incarnation and to clarify the Christian life. This is a decided return to the Gospel as it had been defined with regard to the *Catena aurea*, for "it is there that has been transmitted to us the substance of the Catholic faith and the norm for our entire Christian life."⁴⁸

⁴⁸. "In evangelio precipue forma fidei catholicae traditur et totius vitae regula christiana," Dedicatory Letter to the *Catena aurea* addressed to Urban IV.

In contrast to those theologians who seem to reduce the work of salvation to the paroxysm of pain and death, Thomas does not think that the birth, the humble years of the hidden life are a superfluous preface to the death on the Cross, as if it were the only thing that counts. Nothing is more foreign to him than this focus on sorrow, and he repeats peacefully: "The least of Christ's sufferings [*minima passio*] would have sufficed to redeem the human race."⁴⁹ In many other places as well, the word *passio* has kept its etymological sense and does not necessarily signify "suffering": *acta et passa Christi* signifies indeed everything that the Word did and *endured*, experienced in our human condition. This theologian, who is believed to be abstract, knows the weight of the historical insertion of the Incarnate Word, and it is that he labors to take into account.

To give it its true name, what Thomas wished to do was a "theology of the mysteries" of the life of Jesus. We will easily understand what this means if we recall that the *mysterion* of Saint Paul sums up at once the divine plan for salvation and the way in which that plan was achieved in Jesus. If the entire life of Christ is itself the mystery of the love of God that reveals itself and acts in history, each one of His acts is also a "mystery" in the sense that it signifies and realizes this total "mystery."

Profoundly traditional, this perception of things already shows itself in Ignatius of Antioch and Meliton of Sardes, in Origen above all, who was the first to venerate Jesus' humanity with a true tenderness, but it is also from Ambrose and from Augustine, that Thomas has most directly received these ideas. These ideas were furthermore not unknown among the scholastics, both Thomas's predecessors and his contemporaries, but Thomas reveals himself profoundly original for he is the first and the only one for a long time (it would be necessary to wait until Suarez) to deal with these things apart from speculative christology and to organize them in a coherent fashion.⁵⁰ There is here certainly a deliberate will to construct what might be called a concrete or existential christology—quite close in intention to the attempts at a narrative theology that are flourishing toward the end of the twentieth century. We can regret that this has been misunderstood for such a long time by some Thomists.⁵¹

⁴⁹. *ST* IIIa q.46 a. 5 ad 3.

⁵⁰. We refer here to the remarkable study by L. Scheffczyk, "Die Stellung des Thomas von Aquin in der Entwicklung der Lehre von den *Mysteria Vitae Christi*," in M. Gerwing und G. Ruppert, eds., *Renovatio et Reformatio . . . Festschrift für Ludwig Hödl . . .* (Münster, 1986), pp. 44–70.

⁵¹. Things have changed in the past few years; we mention again L. Scheffczyk, "Die Bedeutung der Mysterien des Lebens Jesu für Glauben und Leben des Christen," in the same editor's

(footnote continued on next page)

By way of illustration of these last remarks, it would be useful to reproduce an example of the way in which Thomas proceeds in this last part of the *Summa*. He probes into the question of knowing if God would have had at his disposal a more suitable means than the Passion of Christ to save the human race:

A means is much more "convenient" to an end when it brings to that end a greater number of advantages. Now, from the fact that man was delivered by Christ's Passion, that Passion, beyond liberation from sin, has gained for him many advantages for his salvation.

1. Through it, we know how much God loved us and through that knowledge we have been moved to love God and it is in that love that consists the perfection of our salvation. Thus Saint Paul says (Romans 5:8): "The proof that God loves us is that Christ, while we were still sinners, died for us."
2. Through his Passion, Christ gave us the example of obedience, humility, constancy, justice, and other virtues necessary to our salvation. As Saint Peter says (1 Peter 2:21): "Christ suffered for us, leaving us a model so that we could follow in his steps."
3. Christ, through His Passion, not only delivered us from sin; He furthermore merited for us the grace of justification and the glory of beatitude, as we will speak of further on.
4. Through the fact of the Passion, we understand that we are obliged to keep ourselves pure from all sin, since we believe that we have been redeemed from sin by Christ's blood, according to Saint Paul (1 Corinthians 6:20): "You have been redeemed at great price! Therefore glorify God in your bodies."
5. The Passion conferred on us a higher dignity: conquered and deceived by the Devil, we must in turn conquer him; having merited death, it was necessary also, in dying, to dominate death itself, and Saint Paul says to us (1 Corinthians 15:57): "Render thanks unto God who has given us the victory through Jesus Christ."

For all these reasons, it was more "convenient" that we be liberated by Christ's Passion rather than by God's will alone.⁵²

Chosen from among many other texts that are also quite significant, this text has the interest of showing in action the theologian's method in this part. He does not try to *prove* the necessity of the Passion (he even said

(footnote continued from previous page)

Die Mysterien des Lebens Jesu und die christliche Existenz (Aschaffenburg, 1984), pp. 17–34; I. Biffi, in *I Misteri di Cristo in Tommaso d'Aquino* (Milan: Jaca Book, 1994), has investigated this question in all Thomas's works, thus showing its omnipresence and its fecundity.

⁵². *ST* IIIa q.46 a. 3.

that it was not "necessary" in the strict sense), it is for him a fact; he wishes solely to give full weight to that which he calls its "convenience."⁵³ Knowing everything that he otherwise knows about God's design for humanity, he labors to make effective all the reasons that permit us to understand it as the supreme act of Christ's and God's love with respect to humanity. He thus reconstructs a network of convergences that suggest that such an act, without doubt beyond reason, is not, however, without reasons. Theology here is no longer *demonstrative* (it rarely is, to tell the truth), it becomes *ostensive*. It *shows* to whoever wishes to see it that it is indeed this that the texts say in themselves and that is why we must adhere very closely to the data (here, four arguments out of five are directly taken from the New Testament; elsewhere, patristic texts will be used with the same profusion). In the same motion, theology becomes *exhortative* (following that which we have read in the Prologue of his course on the Psalms): that provocation to love on the part of God cannot remain without effect for the theologian—nor for his reader! So much is this true that for Thomas, theology, if well done, ends up being pastoral.

Thomas continued, however, to be very much taken up with other tasks than direct teaching and the completion of his *Summa theologiae*. We have already seen in the preceding chapter, he had to finish his *Sententia* on the *Metaphysics* and the *Expositio libri Posteriorum* and he also began various commentaries that he left unfinished (*De caelo et mundo*, *De generatione et corruptione*). He also continued to respond to friendly requests (*De motu cordis*, perhaps *De mixtione elementorum*), and notably to that of Reginald, for whom he returned to his labor on the *Compendium theologiae*, beginning then the *De spe* that he would also not finish. Finally, we know that he preached during this period, if not necessarily on the Decalogue and the *Credo*, as Mandonnet thought,⁵⁴ at least probably on the *Pater*, and to the faithful in his native language, as the witnesses at the process of canonization testified.⁵⁵ In short, if we are able to suppose a university year relatively leisurely compared with the ones at Paris, it certainly was not an idle one. Furthermore, his return to Naples, which brought him nearer to his family, did not occur without causing him some small additional worries.

⁵³. Although largely neglected until now, this type of reasoning finally is now drawing the interest that it deserves, cf. G. Narcisse, "Les enjeux épistémologiques de l'argument de convenance selon saint Thomas d'Aquin," in *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 143–67.

⁵⁴. Cf. above chap. IV, n. 75.

⁵⁵. Cf. *Collationes*, ed. Torrell, pp. 9–17; *La pratique*, pp. 215–17.

Chapter XIV— The Last Months and Death

Another Thomas begins to appear upon his return to Italy. Or at least an entirely new aspect of his personality, heretofore little known, connects us again to the first days of his childhood. It seems a little as if the fact of returning to his native soil made many familiar persons rise up around him. He had certainly not lost all contact with them during his years in Paris or Rome, but the messages, written or oral, which could have existed, have not come down to us.

The People Who Knew Thomas

The period that began at this point was, of his whole life, the one from which we have the greatest amount of concrete data. This is not an accident, because this period also presents us with names among his confreres or his friends and family members who are linked to Thomas as his disciples. We find them as witnesses at the two canonization proceedings.¹ Only the first of these two proceedings interests us here, the process at Naples (which was held from 21 July to 18 September 1319). At the second process (Fossanova, 10–20 November a 1321), the inquirers were not given the responsibility to look into the life and virtues of the saint, but were solely to inquire about miracles after his death.² The numbers that follow concern, therefore, only the depositions at the process in Naples.

Among the forty-two witnesses who gave testimony at the Naples

¹ WN, pp. 178ff. gives a complete list of them.

² Cf. the introductions by M.-H. Laurent: *Naples*, pp. 265–66; *Fossanova*, pp. 409–10.

proceedings, only sixteen were eyewitnesses; thirteen others were noneyewitnesses but had at least a part of their information from persons who knew Thomas directly. The thirteen remaining witnesses had their information at second or third hand. Among the eyewitnesses, we can identify eleven religious (six Dominicans, five Cistercians) and five lay people. Among the non-eyewitnesses who had firsthand information, the proportion is almost the same: five Dominicans, four Cistercians, four lay people. As we might expect, the number of religious witnesses or clerics is higher than the number of lay witnesses, but these latter are honorably enough represented.

Among the Dominicans, besides William of Tocco, of whom we will speak again more fully, there was Conrad of Suessa: priest, seventy-seven years old at the time of the process, he lived with Thomas at Naples, Rome, and Orvieto (in that order). This is entirely possible, though he may have mixed up his dates a little.³ Next in alphabetical order, comes Giacomo of Caiazzo, who was to become the provincial of the Roman province and who knew Thomas in Naples and in Capua; he gives some details on the regular observance carried out by the Master.⁴ John of Boiano, a priest, also gives his testimony to the regular life lead by Thomas: study, austerity, piety; he saw Reginald of Piperno give a relic of the saint (a thumb in a perfect state of preservation from the hand that had made its way to Dame Theodora) to Cardinal Hugh of Ostia.⁵ Similarly Leonard of Gaeta emphasizes Thomas's way of life and the little time he devoted to eating and sleep; he had heard Reginald recount the miracle of the Roman lady cured from her flux of blood on one of the days of Easter.⁶ Peter of San Felice, who ends this little series of witnesses, lived an entire year in Naples in Friar Thomas's company; he gives a physical portrait and applies himself to describing Thomas's exemplary life, both in religious observance and in study. He remarked that Thomas never wounded any person by haughty or injurious words.⁷ On the whole, these witnesses add only a few things at the historical level; principally they retained the memory of a religious man leading an exemplary life.⁸

³ *Naples* 47, pp. 126–27; we may read his text as a testimony to Thomas's sojourn in Naples between 1256 and 1261.

⁴ *Naples* 42, pp. 318–19.

⁵ *Naples* 89, pp. 393–94.

⁶ *Naples* 75, pp. 368–70.

⁷ *Naples* 45, pp. 322–23.

⁸ Many useful things concerning the people mentioned here may be found in I. Taurisano,

(footnote continued on next page)

The number of Cistercians among these eyewitnesses is not at all astonishing. They were with Thomas as he lay on his death bed: we are speaking of Nicholas, the future abbot of Fossanova, a priest; of Nicholas of Fresolino, a friar and chorister; of Nicholas of Piperno, a lay brother; of Octaviano of Babuco, a priest, and of Peter of Montesangiovanni, a priest. Although they knew Thomas only a short time, the interesting thing about their testimony is evident: they are the source of certain things that Bartholomew of Capua and Tocco know about only through them (and therefore transmit only at second hand). Where differences arise in accounts, it is to these Cistercians that we must give preference.⁹

As to the lay figures, we have four men of law and a *miles*. We shall encounter Bartholomew of Capua again quite soon, but we must present the four others briefly. John Blasio, judge at Naples, was a relative of Queen Maria of Sicily; his testimony has always raised much suspicion: he claims to have heard Thomas preach for more than ten years, including an entire Lent on the *Ave Maria*, all of which is quite simply a fantasy; he says that he witnessed the devil physically attack Thomas on the terrace near Thomas's cell.¹⁰ John Coppa of Naples presents himself as a *notarius*; he was still a boy when he met the saint going to visit his Dominican brother Bonofilio, who was in the service of the Master; he speaks about Thomas's preaching on the *Pater*.¹¹ John of Gaeta, too, remembers some preaching in Naples. John was a *zeccadenarius*, a doctor of law; he had also heard people speaking about various miracles.¹² Peter Brancaccio, *miles*, also recalls the preaching on the *Pater* when he was *multum iuuenis*; he also heard Reginald recount the nocturnal conversation that Thomas had with Saints Peter and Paul about a difficulty in the book of Isaiah.¹³

If we try to determine what, in this mass of material, presents the historian with something useful toward a better knowledge of Thomas's life and personality—i.e., if we subtract the miracles and the posthumous events—we would find about 36 per cent of the testimony useful. This does not mean that even this portion is entirely usable without reservations,

(footnote continued from previous page)

"Discepoli e biografi di S. Tommaso," in *S. Tommaso d'Aquino O.P., Miscellanea storicoartistica* (Rome, 1924), pp. 111–86.

⁹ In order the numbers of their respective depositions: *Naples* 8–9; 10–11; 19–21; 15–18; 49–55 (pp. 276–79; 280–82; 290–93; 285–90; 330–42).

¹⁰ *Naples* 70, pp. 361–63; cf. Torrell, "La pratique," p. 216.

¹¹ *Naples* 87, pp. 391–92; cf. Torrell, *ibid.*

¹² *Naples* 88, pp. 392–93.

¹³ *Naples* 93, PP. 399–400.

but it is here that we must seek some chance of approaching reality. We cannot go over all the other witnesses here; we will encounter them as we go along and we will learn something from their depositions. But it is necessary to introduce two to whom we owe a considerable debt.

We already know William of Tocco and we will soon see him at work in the process of canonization. He lived with Thomas during the last period; he does not appear to have been formally his student, given his age (he was around thirty). He may have attended lectures that Thomas may have given for the friars at the Naples priory (remember that all the brothers were obliged to follow the course on the Bible that was given there). Originally from Benevento, preacher general in 1288, Tocco would later fill various posts,¹⁴ but the thing for which he is best known to us is the biography of Thomas, which, despite its weaknesses, still remains an unrivaled source. We shall return to it soon.

Even more illustrious than William was Bartholomew of Capua (born in 1248 in Capua, died in 1328 at Naples). He was a doctor of law in 1278 and seems to have been a professor until 1289 (this professorial activity is only well established for 1282–84). A favorite of the Sicilian king, Charles I and his successors, Bartholomew was named by Charles II protonotary of the kingdom in 1290 and logothete (the equivalent of a prime minister) in 1296. He was given various diplomatic missions in the following years; he also played an important role in recasting the constitutions of the kingdom, when he tried to harmonize the centralizing traditions of the Angevin kings and the feudal structure in southern Italy.¹⁵

Bartholomew was therefore quite a considerable figure, but it is not any of this that gives value to his long deposition at the canonization process. Neither does his list of Saint Thomas's works; we have known for some time that this list has no right to the title "official catalogue," which it was given by Mandonnet. If his testimony remains precious, it is because he frequented the priory at Naples as a very young man (*multum iuuenis*) while Thomas was still alive and he claims to have *seen* him several times (quite strangely he does not say that he *heard* him); he therefore conveys several points that he assembled from people who knew Thomas well, notably: John of Caiazzo, who was Thomas's student in Paris; John of San

¹⁴ He will be prior in Naples in 1289, in Benevento (two times: 1287, 1319); he was also inquisitor for the kingdom of Naples and he is mentioned several times in this position between 1292 and 1300. Cf. Käppeli, *Scriptores*, vol. 2, pp. 135–67; Le Brun-Gouanvic, Introduction to *Ystoria*, passim.

¹⁵ Cf. G. Di Renzo Villata, "6. B. v. Capua," *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 1 (1980) 1493–1494.

Giuliano, a venerable old man who had once been Thomas's spiritual father; but especially Reginald of Piperno and John del Giudice, who was Thomas's confessor. Bartholomew thus knows things at times that Tocco does not, and sometimes the latter reports on things he has learned from Bartholomew.¹⁶

Among the people who were not able to testify at the process who are important figures for our research, we must mention Tolomeo degli Fiadoni, better known under his name Tolomeo of Lucca—as we will understand shortly. He may have been Thomas's student during the Orvieto or Roman period, but we have no certainty about this. We know only that he was Thomas's travel companion during a portion of the return trip from Paris to Naples—doubtless beginning in Rome, for he himself recounts a miracle performed at the castle of La Molarà where they had stopped. By means of the relics of Saint Agnes that he carried with him, Thomas had cured his companion Reginald, who was in the grip of a strong fever. To celebrate the memory of this event, Thomas declared that he wanted to give his students a good dinner each year for the saint's feast. He hardly had the time to do it once, remarks the storyteller, for he died the following year.¹⁷

Tolomeo says that he knew Thomas well, that he had lived long with him—at Naples evidently over some eighteen months—that he had been Thomas's *auditor* and frequently heard his confession.¹⁸ According to A. Dondaine, Tolomeo may also have been one of the young teaching colleagues of whose collaboration Thomas would have been assured upon his return.¹⁹ He would have been about twenty-eight at that time; we find him, among the diverse offices that he later filled, four times the prior at Santo Romano of Lucca in 1285 (the fourth time after a period as prior in Florence); he also was a professor and lived there for about thirty years. Elevated to a bishop's seat in 1318, he became the bishop of Torcello, and there he finished his life in some agitation (he died in the spring of 1327).²⁰ He was then about ninety years old and his contemporaries thought him senile;

¹⁶ *Naples* 76–86, pp. 370–391.

¹⁷ Tolomeo XXIII 10; the miracle therefore is situated in the spring or in early summer 1272; the feast day dinner on 21 January 1273; the next year Thomas was ill and already on the way to Lyon.

¹⁸ Tolomeo XXIII 8: "... quem ego probavi ... qui suam confessionem sepe audivi et cum ipso multo tempore conversatus sum familiari ministerio ac ipsius auditor fui."

¹⁹ This does not agree with what Tocco says at the process of canonization. He speaks of Tolomeo only as a *studens* of Thomas's (*Naples* 60, pp. 347–48).

²⁰ Cf. A. Dondaine, *Les Opuscula*, pp. 143–45.

his *Historia ecclesiastica*, written several years earlier, between 1312 and 1317, at a time when he was 75 or 80 years old, perhaps already betrays his advanced age, and that would excuse "numerous chronological errors and inexactitudes . . . lapses that escaped a memory in its decline."²¹ His memories are certainly precious and his list of Thomas's works is not without value, but this little biographical summary suffices to explain that, even though we have used his testimony several times, we also frequently have had to reject it.

We will pause here on only two other names, quite modest and different from all the other well known figures who were in Thomas's service. They were already dead at the time of the Neopolitan process and we cannot reach back to them except indirectly. First, Bonofilio Coppa, probably a lay brother in the order, who was a witness, with his visiting young brother John, to the miracle of the star resting above the sick Thomas's bed. It is John, become *notarius* in the meantime, who will later recount the fact to the inquirers at the process.²² Then, in the very last days, we meet up with Friar James of Salerno who, in Reginald's company, escorted Thomas on his journey first to San Severino, then in the final journey to Lyon.²³ Both of them, Bonofilio and James, are called "friars," but the texts also say *famulus* or *servitor*, which can only be translated "domestic servant."²⁴ Must we understand that the ill Thomas had received special favor in being thus accompanied? It seems more probable that, Reginald having assumed the labors of a secretary, another friar was put in charge of material needs. Of these two, we know only their names and their devotion to the man they served (they hid themselves in order to watch him pray). Small or great, it is because of them that we know the man as well as the author a little better.

Reginald of Piperno

Among all these more or less close witnesses, Reginald (or Raynald) of Piperno (a corruption of Privernum—currently Priverno—in southern Latium) warrants special mention. Numerous witnesses at the process in

²¹. A. Dondaine, "Les *Opuscula*," pp. 158–64; the same author reports (p. 169) the judgment by the doge of Venice, John Soranzo: "tunc ipse episcopus non erat in statu sensati hominis sed alieni a mente et in intellectu tanquam puer."

²². *Ystoria* 54, pp. 367–68 (Tocco 54, P. 127); *Naples* 87, pp. 391–92.

²³. *Ystoria* 33, pp. 307–308; *Naples* 50, p. 334: Peter of Montesangiovanni mentions "quidam famulus dicti fratris Thome qui vocabatur Iacobus de Salerno."

²⁴. *Famulus*, cf. preceding note; *servitoris*, cf. *Ystoria* 54.

Naples introduce him as Thomas's *socius continuus*.²⁵ According to Humbert of Romans, these "companions" whom the order put at the service of its lecturers and masters in theology followed them everywhere, on trips as well as in the priory, and helped them personally in the preparation of their lessons. They served not as domestics (we have just seen that Thomas had someone else for that task) but as assistants and secretaries.²⁶ In the present case, things went even further than that for, if we can believe Reginald, he exercised the role of Thomas's "nurse" (*quasi nutricis officium*), even to the point of watching over his diet and making him eat so that his distraction (*abstractio mentis*) would not be harmful to his health.²⁷

This continual closeness created some links of friendship between a master and his *socius*; we easily detect them between Thomas and Reginald. At the request of the latter, Thomas wrote and dedicated to him the *Compendium theologiae*, which is very explicit about the person for whom it was written, and describes him as "a very dear son." According to the catalogues of the opuscula, the *De substantiis separatis* and the *De iudiciis astrorum* were also written for him.²⁸ Reginald was not the only secretary to Thomas, but he was his only permanent *socius* and we see him at Thomas's disposition even in the middle of the night; some people even think that their collaboration goes back to the time when Thomas was still in Paris.²⁹ There is the celebrated anecdote about the difficult passage of the *Super Isaiam*, when Saints Peter and Paul explained the meaning to Thomas; the Leonine editors, following A. Dondaine, prudently infer from this that Reginald could have been with Thomas when he was composing the *Super Isaiam*.³⁰ But this matter becomes problematic if we accept the proposition, described earlier, that would put the composition of

²⁵ *Naples* 89, p. 394; cf. chaps. 27, 45, 53, 75, 78, 79, 81; cf. on him A. Dondaine, "Sermons de Réginald de Piperno," *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant* VI, Studi e Testi 236 (Vatican City, 1964), pp. 357–94, PP. 369–379 for the biographical data.

²⁶ *Opera* II, p. 255.

²⁷ Cf. the moving discourse that Tocco has him give to the monks at Fossanova at the moment of his master's death: *Ystoria* 63, p. 391 (Tocco 63, p. 136).

²⁸ *Compendium theologiae*, Leonine, vol. 42, pp. 1–205 (the work was never finished, as we have said); *De substantiis separatis*, Leonine, vol. 40, pp. D 1–87; *De iudiciis astrorum*, Leonine, vol. 43, pp. 187–201; in truth, these last two works are not dedicated explicitly to Reginald, but he is the person for whom they are most probably intended. See in earlier chapters what we have said about these works.

²⁹ *Naples* 59, PP. 346–47; repeated by Tocco: *Ystoria* 31, p. 302 (Tocco 31, pp. 105–6).

³⁰ Leonine, vol. 28, p. 18^{*}; A. Dondaine, *Secrétaires*, pp. 198–202; however calling him "son" in place of "brother" suggests that Reginald was younger than Thomas, and this would make it difficult for him to have been present in Paris during the first period of teaching.

the *Super Isaiam* during the Cologne period. It is not plausible that someone who was then a young friar would already have a *socius* at his disposal.

This detail takes nothing away from the strong friendship between Thomas and Reginald, and we recall that Thomas performed a miracle by healing Reginald from a high fever by the imposition of a relic of Saint Agnes that he always carried with him.³¹ It was Reginald, while they were both at the home of Thomas's sister, who was worried about his condition, and who received the poignant confidence of Thomas's last days: "omnia quae scripsi videntur michi palee."³² He also heard Thomas's last confession.³³ According to a manuscript that has disappeared, Reginald was, finally, Thomas's "heir," since he preserved all the manuscripts in Thomas's own handwritten copies (*habuit omnia scripta sua*),³⁴ and after Thomas's death he filled the office of lecturer in the priory at Naples. In 1275, he would be elected bishop of Marsico by the chapter of the cathedral, but his election was not confirmed, perhaps because John of Vercelli, the master of the order, did not want to free him for that task. In fact, we find him again a little later as the *socius* of the definitor of his province at the general chapter of Milan in 1278, but we do not know the exact date of his death (sometime between 1285 and 1295).

In addition to his invaluable memories, Reginald has also given us several *reportationes* on Thomas's work. First, the *Super Paulum ab XI capitulo prime Ad Corinthios usque in finem*, which is to say, practically all of Saint Paul, up to and including the epistle to the Hebrews.³⁵ Then, the *Lectura super Iohannem*, of which it is said that a better cannot be found (*qua non invenitur alia melior*); Bartholomew adds that it was revised by

³¹. Tolomeo XXIII 10; cf. *Naples* 60, p. 348.

³². *Naples* 79, p. 377; *Ystoria* 47, p. 347 (Tocco 47, p. 120).

³³. *Ystoria* 63, p. 390 (Tocco 63, p. 136); cf. *Ystoria* 27, pp. 287–88 (Tocco 27, pp. 100–101); we cannot conclude from this, as Weisheipl does (p. 320) that this mention of a confession *in ultimis* means Reginald was Thomas's habitual confessor.

³⁴. Cf. Leonine, vol. 28, p. 18*, n. 3, with the commentary by Father Gauthier, p. 14*; given that Dominican legislation on poverty was opposed to all personal possessions, we must understand that if Reginald used these manuscripts in Thomas's handwriting, they were in fact the property of the Naples monastery.

³⁵. We follow here the catalog of the Prague manuscript, *Metr. kap. A 17/1*, which is the oldest that we possess (probably before 1293; cf. on this subject R.-A. Gauthier, *Quelques questions*, pp. 454ff., or J.-P. Torrell, *Collationes*, p. 6; a complete list may be found in Grabmann, *Werke*, pp. 92–93). Despite Mandonnet's remarks about the "official" nature of Bartholomew of Capua's list (*Naples* 85, p. 389), it is from almost twenty years later and far from carrying the same weight. Tolomeo (XXIII 15, p. 155) believes that all the *reportationes* on Saint Paul were revised by Thomas with the exception of the one on the epistle to the Romans *quam ipse notavit*; we have seen the meaning that should be given to this remark.

Thomas himself (*correxuit eam frater Thomas*), and Tolomeo of Lucca even believes that Thomas annotated five chapters in his own hand (*de qua ipse super quinque capitula proprio stylo notavit*), but their assertions present difficulties that we have already mentioned. Reginald also reported on the *Lectura super tres nocturnos "Psalterii,"* the *collationes* on the *Pater* and the *Credo* and some collations for the Sundays and feasts of Lent. It was generally thought that the catalogues (including here the one in Prague also) mentioned a *Lectura super primum de anima*, but R.-A. Gauthier has shown that this is an error on the part of the compiler.³⁶

Even though Reginald has left several sermons and we perhaps owe to him the completion of the *Summa theologiae* by the addition of a supplement,³⁷ it goes without saying that the Master's celebrity had to eclipse his companion's. But it is only fair to remember that Thomas could not have done everything that he did, perhaps not even to have been all that he was, without this collaborator and confidant in all his various activities.

Thomas and His Family

We can settle here several matters that are historically well attested.³⁸ On 10 September 1272, King Charles I informed the administrator of the goods of the Crown that Friar Thomas Aquinas had been designated by his brother-in-law, Roger of Aquila, count of Traetto, as the executor of his will. Another document, dated 20 September, says that in this role he was to divide among the heirs, according to the instructions of the deceased, different types of goods: mules, mares, colts, saddles, tunics, robes, grain, etc. Several days later, on 2 October, the king wrote again to the administrator that the instructions left by Roger provided that Thomas should restore some lands that the deceased had unjustly appropriated and that, for some other restitutions, he could use the revenues of the Scauri mills. He is therefore authorized to keep control over that money until these operations are completed, and the officers of the Crown should not put obstacles in his way.

³⁶ R.-A. Gauthier, *Quelques questions*, pp. 454–63; we may also ask with the author (cf. Leonine, vol. 45/1, pp. 279^{*}–81^{*}) whether Reginald would have been capable of reporting on something in addition to the scriptural commentaries or the spiritual conferences; the parts of the commentary on the *Metaphysics* that were copied by him (an easier task than *reportatio*) bear witness to some "serious blunders."

³⁷ On the question of the authorship of the *Supplement*, see chapter VIII, n. 14; Reginald's sermons testify in particular to his knowledge of his master's work. Cf. A. Dondaine, "Sermons," PP. 379–94.

³⁸ Cf. *Documenta* 25–27, pp. 575–79.

One is a little surprised at first to see Thomas involved in this type of business, which requires a practical sense that we hardly expect from him. To satisfy everyone under these conditions requires dexterity, and if we know how to read the documents properly, we can see that Thomas knew how to use a certain diplomacy. He had to carry out some delicate negotiations over a trustworthy tutor for the children. Since he was dealing with a noble of the kingdom, the king had already entrusted the tutoring of the four children to the "master procurator of the tillage lands [Terra di Lavoro]," but for some understandable reasons, Friar Thomas preferred that this responsibility remain in the family. He therefore went to meet the king at Capua and obtained his agreement that the tutoring would be assigned to Roger of San Severino, count of Marsico, his other brother-in-law, who would exercise it jointly with Adelasia, the children's mother.³⁹

The king therefore had given in to the reasoning of the executor of the will, and that with rather good grace, if we can judge from the terms used about him (*dilectus amicus noster*). Did Thomas take advantage of this occasion to state his own case—or rather that of his priory of mendicants? We can only pose the question, but several days after this visit to the king, Thomas received from him a salary of an ounce of gold per month for teaching theology.⁴⁰ As Walz justly remarks, this sum was nothing extraordinary: "To appreciate this treatment we should know that King Conrad had already given 12 ounces of gold per year to a professor, and that Charles II, in the course of the years from 1302 to 1306, spent 150 ounces of gold annually for the teaching of theology in the three conventual schools in Naples."⁴¹ It would furthermore be wrong to imagine this salary as directly disbursed to Thomas himself who would then have used it in private life (miles from that poverty for which he had once fought); the text is very clear on this matter: the money would be disbursed to the prior of the Naples priory or to his representative (*ad requisitionem prioris fratrum . . . in Neapoli, vel certi nuncii eius*).

There is here, however, a strong and interesting parallel in the life of James of Viterbo. Some twenty years later, in 1294, the provincial chapter

³⁹. We find the royal document, dated 25 November 1272, in Scandone, "La vita," p. 67; see also the following pages; cf. pp. 21–26 for the other texts on this succession. Bartholomew, who was then a minor officer in the royal court, says that he saw Thomas at Capua only one time: he was told that Thomas went there to deal with the affairs of his nephew, the count of Fondi (*Naples* 77, P. 374).

⁴⁰. *Documenta* 28, pp. 579–80.

⁴¹. WN, p. 180.

of the Hermits of Saint Augustine granted him in his role as new master (*magistro nostro novo*) an annual provision of eight gold florins—to which it added a sum of twenty-five gold florins for the occasional expenses owing to his promotion to mastership. The annual provision was renewed the two following years, and the general chapter of 1295, taking a similar step, justified it in the following way: "Given that our intention and our will is that Friar James of Viterbo, master *in sacra theologia*, should write and make books (*debeat scribere et facere opera in sacra pagina*), we declare that he should receive each year a gold florin from each province of the order, for his secretaries, parchments, and other necessities."⁴² To our knowledge, we have no similar document concerning Friar Thomas Aquinas, but it is not implausible that he, too, would have received an allocation permitting him to defray the costs of his secular secretaries and also to offer the celebration on the Feast of Saint Agnes.

To return to the other affairs that occupied Thomas, the texts in their dryness do not say everything, but we can guess without difficulty the conversations that must have occurred over dividing the inheritance, the discussions about the tutoring of the children, the various trips to put these affairs in order. He had to go to Capua to see the king; he also had to go to Marsico to appraise things more precisely on the spot. We realize that all this had to cut deeply into his time for study and teaching. But the family did not hesitate to use this new relationship to obtain a passport from the king, through Thomas's intervention, so that his niece Francesca could go to take the cure at the waters of Pozzuoli.⁴³ Originally from the kingdom of Naples, she would not have needed this authorization, but she was the wife of Annibald of Ceccano who, having joined Conradin's party several years earlier, had been declared a traitor to the Angevin cause.⁴⁴ Her uncle's influence was useful to her then, but she fully repaid this service: during his illness several months later, it is at the home of the Ceccanos, in Maenza, that Thomas was sheltered. It was Francesca who first came to Fossanova upon learning of his death.⁴⁵ Were there other interventions of this kind? We do not know, but it is clear that we find here a man strongly linked to his familial milieu, as we have already found at the beginning of this book.

⁴² *Chartul.* II, no. 585, p. 68.

⁴³ *Documenta* 29, p. 581; the document is dated 3 April 1273 and the beneficiary designated as *neptis venerabilis fratris Thomasii de Aquino*, which is her recommendation.

⁴⁴ Cf. Scandone, "La vita," p. 81.

⁴⁵ *Ystoria* 62, p. 388 (Tocco 62, p. 135).

A Preliminary Portrait

If we may leave for a few moments the solid terrain of these texts and dates, we would now like to try assembling, from those who knew Thomas, some indications of him, both as a man and a saint. The task is not easy. We have long known the limits of hagiography and it has been justly emphasized that stories of that type have not been absent from the biography Tocco composed.⁴⁶ The same is true for the canonization process where, as we have said, the proportion of historically "useful" witnesses is weak compared with the stereotypical data. In many cases, we can only arrive at the idea that Thomas's contemporaries had of him, and the image was filtered through their conception of sanctity. But it would be wrong, we believe, to sin through excess of skepticism in refusing to examine systematically everything that we may learn along this path. Certain personal details, which do not at all harmonize with modern ideas of Aquinas, have perhaps some chance of being true.

First let us consider his physical portrait. The witnesses are in agreement: he was large and heavy and had a bald forehead: "*fuit magne stature et pinguis et calvus supra frontem*," says a Cistercian from Fossanova.⁴⁷ Thomas doubtless got his height from his Norman ancestors; his height, as well as his stoutness, were mentioned by a second witness who repeats: *fuit magne stature et calvus et quod fuit etiam grossus et brunus*.⁴⁸ Remigio of Florence, who was his student in Paris, does not balk at emphasizing that he was very fat: *pinguissimus*.⁴⁹

Tocco, delicately suggesting a certain corpulence, expresses himself more fully: "As to the natural disposition of his body and mind, it is said that he was large in body (*magnus in corpore*), tall and straight in stature, which corresponded to the rectitude of his soul; he was blond as the color of wheat (*coloris triticei*), an indication of his well-balanced temperament; he had a large head as the perfections of the sensory faculties in service to reason require. His hair was thin (*aliquantulum calvus*)."⁵⁰

⁴⁶W. P. Eckert, "Stilisierung und Umdeutung", E. Colledge, "The Legend"; Le BrunGouanvic, Introduction to *Ystoria*, pp. 72–97.

⁴⁷Octaviano of Babuco, a priest: *Naples* 15, p. 287; cf. *Naples* 42, p. 319; 45, P. 323.

⁴⁸Nicolas de Piperno, lay brother, *Naples* 19, p. 291.

⁴⁹In a sermon on Saint Jerome: "aliqui enim sunt pingues naturaliter, unde *pinguissimus* frater Thomas sapientissimus fuit," in E. Panella, "Note di biografia domenicana tra XIII e XIV secolo," *AFP* 54 (1984) 231–80, cf. p. 268.

⁵⁰*Ystoria* 38, p. 321 (Tocco 38, pp. 111–12): "Fuit magnus in corpore, procere et recte

(footnote continued on next page)

This noble portrait basically agrees with the more summary declarations by two monks,⁵¹ but Tocco also wishes to show that these physical traits are related to a spiritual physiognomy in that there is an ideal connection between moral perfection and beauty.⁵² We can recall here the anecdote already quoted and reported by Reginald's mother: "When Thomas was passing through the countryside, the people who were working in the fields left their labors and ran to meet him, admiring the imposing stature of his body and the beauty of his human features. They went before him more indeed because of his beauty than on account of his sanctity or noble origin."⁵³

In Tocco's text as well there is another episode in support of this ideal portrait. The biographer continues by emphasizing that Thomas's flesh, of a delicate complexion, revealed the capacity of his intellect.⁵⁴ And his soul, full of virile force, was capable of making this body obey it and to fear absolutely nothing. To illustrate this, Tocco reports the episode of a terrible storm at sea during a voyage to Paris, when the sailors themselves feared for their lives. Thomas trusted in providence and was not troubled in any way.

So far as we can grasp Thomas's portrait by means of these notations, he seems a man at once robust and delicate. His sensibility to pain struck his contemporaries: he asked that they warn him before proceeding with a cauterization or a bleeding, so that he might ward off the pain by concentrating on some elevated subject.⁵⁵ As to his robustness, we can deduce this from the rareness of any health problems. The bleeding just mentioned does not contradict this; bleeding was part of the regular health regime in the Middle Ages; the cauterization of his leg may make us think by contrast about a varicose ulcer. One episode shows him prey to the onset of a tertian

(footnote continued from previous page)

stature, que rectitudini anime responderet; coloris triticei, ad temperate eius complexionis indicium; magnum habens caput sicut perfectiones uirtutum animalium que rationi deseruiunt organa perfecta requirunt."

⁵¹ With the exception of his coloring! We may suppose, with Gauthier, that one speaks about hair and the other of skin color . . .

⁵² A. Vauchez, *La Sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du Moyen-Age d'après les procès de canonisation et les documents hagiographiques* (Rome, 1981), pp. 509–11.

⁵³ M.-H. Laurent, "Un légendier dominicain peu connu," p. 43.

⁵⁴ Father Gauthier, who gives an excellent commentary on this portrait (Leonine, vol 45/1, p. 287*), refers here to Aristotle (*De Anima* II 19, 421a25–26) for whom the softness of the flesh was a sign of intelligence.

⁵⁵ *Ystoria* 47, p. 349 (Tocco 47, P. 121): *miro modo passibilis et ideo subito lesiuo corporis turbabatur*; we might compare this notation with that of the portrait: *fuit tenerrime complexionis in carne*.

fever (a form of malaria?);⁵⁶ another more comical incident shows him bothered by a superfluous tooth that had suddenly sprouted and hindered his speech. Since he was afraid of extraction, he obtained liberation from it through prayer.⁵⁷ We are told elsewhere that he celebrated Mass every day, "if some infirmity did not prevent him."⁵⁸ Apart from the last week's of Thomas's life, when reports of this kind multiplied, they were rather rare.

His travels and especially the long walks he undertook to arrive at the places of his meetings argue for his robustness. If he had to cover on foot the distance from Naples to Paris, then to Cologne and back, then from Paris to Rome and back, and again from Paris to Naples, in addition to the various trips to go to provincial chapters, one would calculate that he must have covered 15,000 kilometers (9,000 miles) on foot.⁵⁹ This ignores the possibility—almost a certainty—that several of these trips could have been made at least in part by sea or by river. The storm he confronted (probably on the return to Paris in 1268) is a proof of this; an anecdote from the fourth version of Tocco, and plausibly from the same period, even shows him towing a boat by himself and against the current, when the sailors had great trouble pulling. This at least is a remembrance of a river voyage and an echo of Thomas's physical power.⁶⁰

If we could open a path through the accumulation of the usual commonplaces that claim to describe the sacred person in these passages, we might perceive something of Thomas the man here and there. Bartholomew reports this as the common opinion among everyone he had been able to question: "They believed that the Holy Spirit was truly with him, for he *always had a happy countenance, sweet and affable*. . . ." ⁶¹ Tocco reflects the infectious quality of this trait: he inspired joy in all those who looked upon him.⁶² In support of this supernatural joy, we can add an

⁵⁶ Tolomeo XXIII 10 (Ferrua, p. 363).

⁵⁷ *Ystoria* 51, pp. 358–59 (Tocco 51, pp. 124–25).

⁵⁸ *Ystoria* 29, p. 293 (Tocco 29, p. 103): *nisi eum infirmitas impedisset*.

⁵⁹ Vicaire, "L'homme que fut S. Thomas," p. 25 and n. 75.

⁶⁰ *Ystoria* 38, pp. 321–22 (not in Tocco); this episode immediately follows the story about the storm: Thomas and his companions are on the river and, the force of oars not sufficing against the current, some of the sailors pull the boat from the bank; seeing them weary, Thomas proposes to his companions that they help them.

⁶¹ *Naples* 77, p. 372: "Ipsi vere credebant Spiritum Sanctum esse cum eo, quia semper videbant ipsum habere alacrem vultum, mitem et suavem. . . ."

⁶² *Ystoria* 36, p. 315 (Tocco 36, p. 110); "quotiens predictum doctorem cum affectu deuotionis aspiceret, totiens ex eius aspectu et locutione gratiam letitie spiritualis auriret, quod sine Spiritus sancti presentia esse non poterat, de quo tanta gratia procedebat"; it may be that Tocco's source is the same as Bartholomew's, Eufranon of Salerno, who was the prior at Naples in 1269.

unusual detail (the only concrete echo, to our knowledge, that has come down to us from Thomas's courses!), which shows that he was not without a sense of humor. Remigio of Florence recounts that he made joking allusion to the exceptional solemnity of the liturgical celebrations of Saint Martin, when the peasants were so devoted they put Saint Martin above Saint Peter, since the harvest that autumn left them swimming in abundance.⁶³

We have no indication of the frequency of such sallies, but what we know from other sources about the vivacity of Thomas's reactions inclines us to think that they were not rare. However, it has also been said that he possessed a rare humility and patience and that he never hurt anyone through injurious words.⁶⁴ Bartholomew emphasizes that, even in disputes, where it is common to go too far, he was always sweet and humble, never using large, affected words.⁶⁵ During the difference of opinion with Pecham, the story happily contrasts the difference in the two protagonists' attitudes and justly attributes to Thomas's humble magnanimity a concern not to spoil the new master's *principium*.⁶⁶

This last episode permits us to return to a more familiar Thomas, the master whom his students trusted and who never forbade them to speak frankly or to joke with him. It also shows him to us among his young friars, out for a walk or coming from a solemn session at the university.⁶⁷ Sometimes these stories date from the first Parisian period: the episodes from Naples show Thomas more grudging of his time and not hesitating to leave common recreations if time would be lost there in frivolous conversa-

⁶³This is from the sermon on Saint Martin: "Et quomodo rustici propter beneficia pretulerunt beatum Martinum beato Petro apostolo, *ut lusorie referebat magister meus frater Thomas de Aquino*; in festo enim beati Petri omnia bona videntur deficere que in festo beati Martini inveniuntur habundare," quoted by E. Panella, "Note di biografia domenicana," p. 266. We refer here to M. Hubert, "L'humour de S. Thomas d'Aquin en face de la scolastique," in *1274 Année charnière*, pp. 727–39, but not without remarking along with the author that "the humor in question has nothing humorous about it"; it is a case rather of an attitude of critical detachment.

⁶⁴Peter of San Felice, *Naples* 45, p. 322: "Thomas fuit homo . . . mire humilitatis et patientie, adeo quod nunquam aliquem corruscavit aliquo verbo ampuloso aut contumelioso."

⁶⁵*Naples* 77 P. 373: "immo in disputationibus, in quibus consueverunt homines aliquando modum excedere, semper inveniebatur mitis et humilis, nullis verbis gloriosis et ampullosis utens."

⁶⁶*Ystoria* 26, p. 284 (Tocco 26, p. 99): "uir ille patientissimus . . . quasi vere humilis, *qui sui contemptum ut magnanimus contempnebat* . . ."

⁶⁷*Ystoria* 26, p. 284 (Tocco 26, p. 99: Thomas's students urged him to intervene against Pecham); *Ystoria* 42, p. 332 (Tocco 42, p. 115: returning from a walk with him at Saint-Denis, the students showed him Paris, which could be seen from afar and, being carried away about its richness, asked him if he would like to be the lord of such a city).

tions.⁶⁸ He much preferred walking alone in the cloisters or in the garden and returning there to his habitual reflections after he had expedited the business for which he was drawn into the parlor.⁶⁹

At this same time (and it had probably already been like this for a long period), he led a very retired life. He spent the least possible time in eating and sleeping; it even seems that he did not eat more than once a day.⁷⁰ At the awakening during the night (Matins), he was in the church before anyone else, but withdrew when he heard the others arrive;⁷¹ with few exceptions, we do not see him present at any other office than Compline.⁷² Though he celebrated Mass every day and heard a second Mass just as often, he returned immediately to his room to work.⁷³

This means that he did not attend the conventual Mass with the community, but we do not see here the sign of an asocial temperament; in this period the Dominican constitutions already provided for dispensation from the choir (as well as from various other normal obligations) for teachers—with the exception of Compline. Thomas was thus following the norm for his fellow lecturers.⁷⁴ We have seen that he did not refuse joyful communal celebrations such as the Saint Agnes Day dinner that he offered to his students to commemorate Reginald's recovery.

We should be cautious about judging Thomas's social life, as a religious of the thirteenth century, according to the model of our contemporary worldly relationships. We do not know of any relationships with women that help us see his emotions more fully (such as we can in the case of Jordan of Saxony and Diane d'Andalo⁷⁵). We think, nevertheless, that he knew what a deep friendship was and he had friends, including some of his relatives. Everything that we know of his family relations indicates that they were affectionate. As to his friends, it is enough to think of Reginald or Annibaldo d'Annibaldi, his former student and successor, later to be-

⁶⁸ *Ystoria* 29, p. 295 (Tocco 29, p. 104); 48, p. 351 (48, p. 122); *Naples* 77, p. 373; cf. Bouthillier-Torrell, "Quand S. Thomas," p. 46.

⁶⁹ *Ystoria* 29, p. 295 (Tocco 29, p. 104): " . . . reliquum si superfuisset tempus, priusquam ad cameram suam completa locutione redisset, sicut non aduertens diuinis intentus, discurrens per claustrum uel ortum, consuetis suis meditationibus et speculationibus expendebat."

⁷⁰ *Naples* 48, p. 328; *Naples* 70, p. 362: "semper comedebat in refectorio fratrum *et semel in die tantum*" (although this comes from John Blasio, this last trait is not very surprising).

⁷¹ *Naples* 77, p. 573; *Ystoria* 34, p. 309 (Tocco 34, p. 108).

⁷² *Ystoria* 29, p. 294 (Tocco 29, p. 103); 33, P. 307 (Tocco 33, p. 107).

⁷³ *Naples* 77, P. 373.

⁷⁴ Humbert of Romans, *Opera* II, pp. 29–30; p. 255.

⁷⁵ Cf. G. Emery, "Amitié et vie spirituelle: Jourdain de Saxe et Diane d'Andalo," *Sources* 18 (1992) 97–108.

come cardinal, to whom he speaks explicitly of the old friendship (*antiqua dilectio*) he feels for him. We must above all recall the fineness with which he commented on Books VIII and IX of the *Ethics*, where Aristotle explains his idea of friendship; we know that Thomas made friendship the key notion in his treatise on charity. His preaching itself refers with a delicate sensibility to the experience that we have of friendship to suggest the demanding quality of our links with God.⁷⁶ It is difficult to think that the man who spoke in this way had nothing but a literary knowledge of affection.

A Man of Great Contemplation

This southern Italian, with strong links to his family, had a very concrete, incarnate piety. We have just recalled the episode when he cured Reginald by the imposition of a relic of Saint Agnes, which he carried with him out of devotion.⁷⁷ We may have a hard time believing it, but he would have done the same thing about the extra tooth that was miraculously removed.⁷⁸ Except for Saint Paul, nothing is said about particular reverence for other saints; if the Virgin Mary is not absent, she is surely less present than in numerous other saints' lives. Thomas was without doubt committed to the Marian devotion of the Dominican Order (the sequence *Salve, Magnificat*, and office *De Beata*), but the witnesses at the process of canonization do not mention anything in particular in this regard.⁷⁹

⁷⁶ ST IIa IIae q.23 a. 1: *Utrum caritas sit amicitia*; for the preaching, cf. Torrell, "La pratique," p. 226.

⁷⁷ *Ystoria* 50, p. 356 (Tocco 50, p. 124; Tolomeo XXIII 10): "*reliquias dicte sancte, quas ad poctus suspensas ex deuotione portabat*." Weisheipl (p. 297) maintains that we should not see here a sign of Thomas's personal devotion; this is perhaps too much to claim, for it is surely not by chance that Thomas was carrying his relics with him; of Italian origin, Agnes was the object of a popular cult dating from the fourth century, which Thomas doubtless had known since childhood. We find in his work at least two mentions of Saint Agnes as an example of purity to the point of martyrdom (IV *Sent.*, d.49 q.5 qc.3 ad 9; *Quodl.* III q.6 a.3 [17] ad 3).

⁷⁸ *Ystoria* 51, p. 358 (Tocco 51, p. 124): "*Quem dentem, ad recolendum diuine beneficium pietatis, magno tempore secure detulit*."

⁷⁹ For Saint Paul, it is enough to think about the stories already mentioned of apparitions linked to difficulties in exegesis; *Ystoria* 32, p. 306 (Tocco 32, p. 107), mentions an apparition of the Virgin Mary, who assures Thomas that everything he asked *deliberate* through her intervention has been granted him (this lets us suppose a spontaneous and more frequent kind of prayer); we might also recall here the preaching on the *Ave Maria* (*Naples* 70, p. 362; cf. Torrell, "La pratique," p. 216), but there is no lingering over the scene of a baby fiercely holding on to a piece of parchment on which *Ave Maria* was written: even among those who report it, the story is not at all interpreted as a Marian event (cf. *Ystoria* 4, P. 198; Tocco 3, P. 68; *Naples* 90, p. 395). We are not obliged to follow Colledge ("The Legend," pp. 20–21) who sees here a borrowing from the legend of Saint Nicholas of Bari.

Remembering, no doubt, the episode when his young sister had been killed by lightning as he slept by her side, he had the habit of making the sign of the cross during storms and repeating "God came in the flesh, God suffered for us."⁸⁰ If we remember that this occurred during the terrible tempest that he endured and that only he remained tranquil, while the sailors themselves were frightened, we will see here not a sign of fear but indeed the expression of a faith that did not refrain from showing itself in visible gestures.

The witnesses enjoy repeating that Thomas was a man of contemplation and prayer.⁸¹ There is scarcely a saint who is not described in this way; it is more enlightening for us to say that, most frequently, we see him praying in direct relation to his intellectual work: "Every time that he wished to study, to undertake a dispute, to teach, to write or dictate, he first withdrew into secret prayer and prayed pouring out tears, in order to obtain understanding of the divine mysteries."⁸² This might still be nothing but a pious banality, if the insistent repetition in the text did not assure us that we have here a constant practice, fleshed out in specific acts that allow us to grasp the incarnate reality in a sometimes striking way.

The most telling thing, without doubt, is the following—even if the occasion, the way Tocco reports it, seems quite implausible. The masters of Paris, having noticed disagreements in their way of speaking about the permanence of the eucharistic accidents *sine subiecto*, asked Thomas, according to the story, to pronounce *sententialiter* on this subject, promising to hold afterward whatever he would say on the subject. This special circumstance (otherwise unknown), would thus have led Thomas to reflect on the metaphysical difficulties presented by the subject. But before daring to speak about it to an audience, he wanted to consult the principal person involved; he therefore put himself before the cross and, placing in front of himself, and before his Master, the open notebook in which he had written, he prayed with his arms in a cross.⁸³

The historical reality of the episode, in precisely these circumstances,

⁸⁰. *Ystoria* 38, p. 321 (Tocco 38, p. 112).

⁸¹. *Naples* 40, p. 317 (*Homo magnae contemplationis et orationis*); 42, p. 319 (*hominem contemplativum*); 45, P. 322.

⁸². *Ystoria* 30, p. 300 (Tocco 30, p. 105); the fourth edition of Tocco places here the recollection of a revelation obtained from Saint Paul through prayer on the meaning of one difficulty (cf. above chap. 13). See some similar notes in *Naples* 58, p. 346 (Tocco); 81, p. 381 (Bartholomew, who refers here directly to Reginald, speaks of praying prostrate in front of the altar).

⁸³. Tocco 52, pp. 125–26.

is at least doubtful. The climate of sharp rivalry that reigned at Paris between mendicants and seculars renders quite implausible this consultation by colleagues supposedly full of veneration for Thomas's knowledge. It would be more believable if some Dominican brothers had taken the initiative in this event. We would retain from this anecdote at least the expressive simplicity of the gesture—sublime in its naïveté—and the deep intention of the saint's attempt at "verifying" in prayer the solidity of his intellectual construction. It will not be without precedents.

This way of praying prostrate before the altar with the arms outstretched in a cross irresistibly evokes the *Nine Ways of Praying of Saint Dominic*, the founder of the Order of Preachers.⁸⁴ We should doubtless look at miniatures like those that we find in this manuscript if we wish to know what the image was like before which Thomas prayed. Not Grünwald's tortured man, but majesty suffering in dignity, which had not yet entirely disappeared from the pantocrators of Byzantine mosaic; highly stylized, the expression of sorrow resides almost solely in the facial features, the blood that gushes from the side being rather the symbolic expression of the sacraments that gave birth to the Church.

It is precisely to this context that the following story refers, which is situated at Naples, during the time when Thomas was writing the questions on the Passion and Resurrection of the Lord.⁸⁵ As was his habit, he prayed quite early in the morning in the chapel of Saint Nicholas; Dominic of Caserta, the sacristan who observed him, saw him in levitation and heard a voice coming from the crucifix: "You have spoken well of me, Thomas, what should be your reward?"—"Nothing other than Thee, Lord." This episode is better known than the preceding one; certain scholars even think it rings truer because it is more sober; we cannot, however, guarantee its

⁸⁴. We know that a short Latin text was designated by this title, accompanied with miniatures, contained in the manuscript *Rossianus* 3, in the Vatican Library. A very faulty edition was once prepared by I. Taurisano, "Quomodo sanctus Patriarcha Dominicus orabat," *Analecta S. O. P.* 30 (1922) 93–106 (although it was corrected the following year, 1923, the faulty edition regrettably has been used in modern translations); unfortunately, the miniatures are reproduced in black, but they give an idea of the original. A French translation of this text with some color reproductions may be found in M.-H. Vicaire, *Saint Dominique de Caleruega d'après les documents du XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1955), pp. 261–71. S. Tugwell, "The Nine Ways of Prayer of Saint Dominic: A Textual Study and Critical Edition," *MS* 47 (1985) 1–124, has accomplished a remarkable critical study and editing of the text, in which he concludes that, if not believable in all its details, this work has a good chance of going back to an original dating from the 1230s, which conveys to us some authentic indications of Saint Dominic's way of praying.

⁸⁵. *Ystoria* 34, p. 309 (Tocco 34, p. 108): "Et tunc scribebat Tertiam partem Summe de Christi passione et resurrectione"; cf. *ST* IIIa qq.46–56, and cf. what we have said above on the *Life of Jesus*.

strict historicity (the relative similarity of the two stories leads us to think that one of the two is a doubling).⁸⁶

Without pushing this question of historicity further, we think it at least plausible that Thomas would have prayed before a crucifix. But it would not be entirely out of line to emphasize a common element in the two cases: those present report a vision—audition, of which they themselves were the beneficiaries. Neither Thomas nor his prayer before the altar or the crucifix are in any way compromised. This is one of those typical cases in which the witnesses reveal the way they approach the saint. But the saint, whose piety we may imagine to be more cerebral, did not fear to write that Christ's humanity was a pedagogy supremely adapted to enabling us to arrive at his divinity.⁸⁷ We know that the thirteenth-century hagiographical stories are full of similar events. We do not do well to assume that Thomas is here speaking from experience.

Without taking an inventory of all the stories or witnesses,⁸⁸ it seems that we can identify, with at least a modicum of certitude, three characteristic traits of Thomas's way of praying. The linking of prayer with study is clearly the first trait; Tocco, for once quite inspired, nicely summed it up as being one of the points of struggle with the seculars who could not understand that we can be saved *in sola studii contemplatione*.⁸⁹ The second point certainly is his devotion to the Eucharist, not to the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament as it will be understood later, but indeed to the sacrament celebrated each day. The testimony to his attendance at two masses daily—the one that he celebrated, the other at which he was present—is too frequently repeated for us to doubt it.⁹⁰ He also had, it seems, the habit of reciting at the moment of the elevation the second part of the *Te Deum*: *Tu rex glorie Christe, Tu Patris sempiternus es Filius*, to the end.⁹¹ This matter can be rather well understood if we recall that, the

⁸⁶ Cf. WN, p. 190; Colledge, "The Legend," pp. 23–24.

⁸⁷ *ST IIa IIae* q. 82 a. 3 ad 2: "Et ideo ea quae pertinent ad Christi humanitatem, per modum cuiusdam manuductionis, maxime devotionem excitant; cum tamen devotio principaliter circa ea quae sunt divinitatis consistat."

⁸⁸ We see also Thomas praying for chastity (*Naples* 61, p. 349; *Ystoria* 11, p. 220; Tocco 10, p. 75), for God's wisdom (*Ystoria* 30, p. 299; Tocco 30, p. 104), for perseverance in his state of life (*Naples* 78, p. 375; *Ystoria* 32, p. 306; Tocco 32, p. 107), for Reginald's recovery (*Naples* 90, p. 348; *Ystoria* 50, p. 356; Tocco 50, pp. 123–24), for the eternal repose of his relatives (*Naples* 78 and 81, pp. 374 and 381), the conversion of two Jews on Christmas Day (*Naples* 86, p. 389; *Ystoria* 23, p. 278; Tocco 22, p. 96), etc.

⁸⁹ *Ystoria* 20, p. 262 (Tocco 19, p. 91).

⁹⁰ *Naples* 6, 8, 40 (p. 273, 278, 317), etc.; *Ystoria* 29, p. 293 (Tocco 29, p. 103).

⁹¹ *Ystoria* 58, p. 381 (Tocco 58, p. 132): "Dicitur . . . quod in elevatione . . . consueverat dicere. . . ."

canticle recalls at that moment the whole set of "mysteries" of Christ's life. It was particularly during the celebration of the Mass that Thomas had the prolonged ecstasies of his last months: the one that occurred on Passion Sunday (26 March 1273) and the one on the feast of Saint Nicholas eight months later (6 December 1273).⁹²

Since Thomas had reached Q.90 of the *Tertia Pars*, the composition of the treatise on the Eucharist (completed earlier) had therefore occurred approximately between these two dates. The evolution already seen at Orvieto, at the time of the composition of the Office of the Blessed Sacrament, came to its end here also and the author experienced in his own person what he had written: "By the power of this sacrament, the soul is spiritually restored by the fact that it rejoices spiritually and, in a certain way, it is intoxicated by the sweetness of the divine goodness, according to the word of the Canticle (5:1): *Eat my friends, and drink; drink deep my well-beloved*."⁹³ Pruned of their rhetoric, these stories and witnesses ultimately confirm that the Thomas of the *Ystoria* and of the process at Naples is not much different from the one we glimpse in his theological writings.⁹⁴

We get similar verification of the third trait, which stands out even more forcefully, his devotion to the crucifix: when he is presented in prayer or in levitation, it is before the image of the crucified one or in front of the altar, liturgical symbol of Christ.⁹⁵ If there were need for further justification of this last point, it would suffice to report how he speaks of Christ in his teaching or in his preaching:

Whoever wishes to lead a perfect life has nothing other to do than scorn what Christ scorned on the Cross and to desire what he desired. There is not in fact a single example of virtue that the Cross does not give to us. You seek an example of charity? *There is no greater love than to give up his life for his friends*, and Christ did it on the Cross . . . Are you looking for an example of patience? The most perfect patience is found on the Cross . . . Are you seeking an example of humility? Look at the Crucified One . . .

⁹². *Ystoria* 29, pp. 293–94 (Tocco 29, p. 103); *Naples* 79, p. 376.

⁹³. *ST IIIa* q. 79 a. 1 ad 2.

⁹⁴. Apart from the Eucharist, we have only penance attested in his sacramental practice; during the first Parisian period (1252–59), we know that Thomas confessed every day before Mass to Raymond Severi, who was probably one of his secretaries; it seems indeed that the practice was reciprocal (cf. *Ystoria* 27 and *Naples* 92, pp. 397–98). Tolomeo was his confessor during the Naples period, but does not give us to understand that reciprocity existed (XXIII 8).

⁹⁵. *Ystoria* 34, P. 309; 52, p. 309 (Tocco 34 and 52, pp. 108 and 126); on praying in front of the altar: *Naples* 81, p. 381; 49, p. 331 (he has a dream when he is sleeping in front of the altar).

An example of obedience? Begin following Him who was obedient even until death . . . An example of scorn for earthly things? Follow behind Him who is King of Kings, Lord of Lords, in whom are found all the treasures of wisdom and who, nevertheless, on the Cross, appears naked, the object of mockery, spat on, beaten, crowned with thorns, given gall and vinegar to drink, and put to death.⁹⁶

We will have to return to this omnipresence of Christ as the absolute model of the Christian life; it suffices for us here that Thomas never stops reminding us that "every one of Christ's actions is instruction for us,"⁹⁷ and that this was his rule of life for himself.

Thomas's absent-mindedness was legendary. Lost in thought, he continued his reflections wherever he found himself: in the refectory, where his dishes might be taken away from him without his noticing,⁹⁸ or at Saint Louis's table, if one gives credence to the well-known anecdote.⁹⁹ When he was thus absorbed, he could even hold a candle without noticing the flame that burned him. During his last months, this *abstractio mentis* became even more accentuated: in the parlor, where he had been led to meet some distinguished visitors, he did not even perceive their presence, and it was necessary to tug on his clothes to make him come back to himself.¹⁰⁰ This also showed itself during prayer: during the Mass on Passion Sunday 1273, with many participants present, his ecstasy continued so long that it was necessary to intervene so that he could finish the celebration. And in the evenings, at Compline, his face was bathed in tears during the singing of the *Media vita*.¹⁰¹

⁹⁶. *Expositio in Symbol.*, art. 4, nos. 920–24.

⁹⁷. Cf. R. Schenk, "*Omnis Christi actio nostra est instructio*. The Deeds and Sayings of Jesus as Revelation in the View of Aquinas," in L. Elders, ed., *La doctrine de la révélation divine de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Studi Tomistici 37 (Rome, 1990), pp. 104–31.

⁹⁸. Peter of San Felice (eyewitness): *Naples* 45, p. 323; *Ystoria* 63, p. 391 (Tocco 63, p. 136).

⁹⁹. *Ystoria* 43, p. 335 (Tocco 43, p. 117); this is the third time that the *Ystoria* mentions King Louis IX; certainly, his friendship for the mendicants is well known, but we cannot say that it is to him that we owe the creation of the two Dominican schools of theology, as the *Ystoria* has it (20, p. 264; Tocco 19, p. 93); as to stating that King Louis *semper in rebus arduis dicti Doctoris requirebat consilium* (35, p. 312; Tocco 35, p. 109), we have no other witnesses for it. If it truly took place, the dinner of which *Ystoria* 43 speaks could have taken place during the second Parisian sojourn, between September 1268, the date of Thomas's return, and March 1270, the date of Saint Louis's departure for the second crusade. We must not in any case press the reference to the *Summa*; the dates that we know do not at all lend themselves to this. Though the settling of the accounts with the Manicheans has led some people to believe that Thomas was working on the *Summa contra Gentiles* III 15 at the time, that is no more plausible: we know that Book III of that work was composed in Italy around 1265, which would exclude the possibility of a meeting with King Louis at that time.

¹⁰⁰. *Ystoria* 43, p. 335 (Tocco 43, p. 117).

¹⁰¹. *Ystoria* 29, p. 294 (Tocco 29, p. 103); the *Media uita* is a sung response like the anthem

(footnote continued on next page)

In order to excuse him to a visiting cardinal, one of his familiars explained: "Do not be surprised! That happens *often* to him" ("Non miremini, quia *frequenter* sic abstrahitur"). In the same fashion, Reginald would later tell Thomas's sister Theodora, who was disturbed about his silence: "The Master is *frequently* lost in spirit when he is absorbed in contemplation. But never have I seen him out of his senses for as long as today."¹⁰² The way to make him return to himself is always the same—someone pulls strongly on his cape. Clearly he comes out of it, but only with regret for the loss of that interior world.

The Final Illness and Death

The context that we have just established perhaps clarifies the history of Thomas's last weeks. On 29 September 1273, Thomas again participated in the chapter of his province in Rome as a definitor.¹⁰³ But several weeks later, according to Bartholomew of Capua, who had this story from John of Giudice who learned about it from Reginald himself—while he was celebrating Mass in the chapel of Saint Nicholas, Thomas underwent an astonishing transformation (*fuit mira mutatione commotus*): "After that Mass, he never wrote further or even dictated anything, and he even got rid of his writing material [*organa scriptionis*]; he was working on the third part of the *Summa*, on the treatise concerning penance." To Reginald, who was stupefied and did not understand why Thomas was abandoning his work, the Master responded simply: "I cannot do any more." Returning to his charge a little later, Reginald received the same response: "I cannot do any more. Everything I have written seems to me as straw in comparison with what I have seen."¹⁰⁴

Starting with that date—around 6 December (*a festo beati Nicolai circa*)—Thomas appeared profoundly changed. He, whom we have known

(footnote continued from previous page)

Nunc dimittis of Compline in the Dominican liturgy for Lent. Thomas's tears flowed most during the singing of the verse "do not reject us in our time of old age" (*Ne proicias nos in tempore senectutis*).

¹⁰² *Ystoria* 47, p. 347 (Tocco 47, p. 120): "*Frequenter* Magister in spiritu rapitur, cum aliqua contemplatur, sed nunquam tanto tempore sicut nunc uidi ipsum sic a sensibus alienatum."

¹⁰³ *Documenta* 30, p. 583 (according to Masetti); abridged texts, the Acts of the Chapter do not mention Thomas's name, nor that of any other definitor (*MOPH* 20, pp. 41–43); elected by the members of the chapter, the four definitors constitute a type of directorate chosen, with the provincial, to make concrete decisions after the plenary assembly breaks up; they remain active until the following chapter.

¹⁰⁴ *Naples* 79, pp. 376–77; Tocco (*Ystoria* 47, 347; Tocco 47, p. 120), who depends here on Bartholomew, does not mention the Mass, but gives the same explanation (except that he weakens *paleae* into *modica*).

as robust and who not long before still was getting up to pray before anyone else, had to take to his bed,¹⁰⁵ and he was sent to rest at the home of his sister (the Countess Theodora) in the castle of San Severino, southeast of Naples, a little above Salerno. He arrived there only with great effort (*properavit cum difficultate magna*); shortly after Thomas had greeted his sister, who was disturbed to see him so quiet, Reginald confided to Theodora that he had never seen the Master out of his senses for so long. It is difficult to evaluate the length of this sojourn, but after a little while, Thomas and his socius returned to Naples—without doubt at the end of December 1273 or the beginning of January 1274.¹⁰⁶

At the end of January or the beginning of February, they had to set out again for the council that Gregory X had convoked for May 1 in Lyons to seek an understanding with the Greeks. Thomas thus took with him the *Contra errores grecorum* that he had composed at Urban IV's request.¹⁰⁷ A little beyond Teano, absorbed in his thoughts, Thomas did not notice a tree fallen across the road and struck his head against a branch. Since he was stunned by the blow (*fere stupefactus*), people rushed to help him, but he assured them that he was only slightly bruised. He continued to walk while chatting with Reginald, who tried to distract him by speaking of the appointment as a cardinal that he would surely receive at the council, as would Friar Bonaventure. Thomas did not much appreciate these predictions, and imposed silence on his companion.¹⁰⁸

The traveller's reputation traveled more quickly than he did himself, and it was probably at San Germano (today's Cassino) that an envoy from Bernard Ayglie, the abbot of Monte Cassino, waited for him. This envoy invited Thomas to take a small detour through the abbey to enlighten the religious on the meaning of a passage in Saint Gregory. The climb was long and harsh (the ascent is some 480 meters, which the current road covers in 9 kilometers [about 5 1/2 miles]); Thomas declined the offer to pass through the monastery—perhaps he already felt himself too tired—

¹⁰⁵ *Naples* 87, pp. 391–92: *Thomam iacentem in cella . . . discrasiatum*; *Ystoria* 54, p. 367 (Tocco 54, P. 127): *debilis decumbens in lecto*.

¹⁰⁶ Scandone, "La vita," pp. 30 and 57.

¹⁰⁷ *Ystoria* 56, p. 371 (Tocco 56, p. 129); of. our chapter 7; see on this point A. Walz, "Le dernier voyage de saint Thomas d'Aquin, Itinéraires of saint Thomas," *Nova et Vetera* 36 (1961) 289–97.

¹⁰⁸ *Naples* 78, pp. 374–76; Tocco does not know of this incident, Bartholomew of Capua has it from the abbé Roffrido, the dean of Teano, who was present at the scene in the company of his uncle, William, then dean and later bishop of Teano; these two figures had clearly hosted the little group the preceding night and accompanied them a bit of the way.

and argued that a written response would have the advantage of being useful to future readers and not only to the hearers present (in fact, his response would be recopied in the margin of the disputed passage).

The monks were troubled by the interpretation of a text that concerns the connections between the infallibility of the divine foreknowledge and human liberty. Thomas reaffirms these two facts, but he emphasizes that the difference of plane between the two terms under consideration does not entail any necessity of the one on the other: to see someone sit down is not to oblige him to sit down. Thus God cannot be deceived in his knowledge, which sees all things in the present of his eternity, and man is free in his activity as a temporally situated creature. We note in passing that this little text dictated to Reginald is perhaps the clearest explanation that the author gave of this problem; it witnesses to the fact that, even if his body was already weakened, the Master's intellectual faculties were still intact.¹⁰⁹

After several days traveling, in the second half of February (it was already Lent, which, that year, had begun on February 14), they reached the castle of Maenza, a little north of Terracina, where Francesca lived, the niece whom we have already encountered. It was there that he fell ill and totally lost his appetite; the doctor called to take care of him—John of Guido, from Piperno—asked what he would like to eat and received a disconcerting response: some fresh herring, which he once enjoyed when he was in the ile de France. Miraculously, some were found. But according to Tocco, it was the others who ate them, since the patient no longer wanted them.¹¹⁰ An eyewitness assures us, however, that he ate some of it: *de quibus etiam arengis comedit dictus frater Thomas*.¹¹¹

Tocco also says that, feeling a little better after several days, he tried to begin the trek toward Rome again, but he had to stop at the abbey of Fossanova to regather his forces. According to an eyewitness, Nicholas, the future abbot of Fossanova, Thomas had himself taken from his niece's home to the abbey: "If the Lord must visit me, it is better for him to find me in a religious house than in a house of lay people."¹¹² Another eye-

¹⁰⁹ The text of this letter may be found in the Leonine, vol. 42, pp. 395–415, with A. Dondaine's introduction; see above, chapter I, note 72, for other information.

¹¹⁰ *Ystoria* 56, p. 374 (Tocco 56, p. 129); if the invalid had truly desired this dish, so strange for that region, this desire is entirely exceptional for him, because we know that he never demanded special meals: *nunquam petens speciales cibos* (Naples 42, p. 319); *singularitates ciborum non petebat* (Naples 47, p. 326).

¹¹¹ *Naples* 50, p. 333 (testimony by Peter of Montesangiovanni).

¹¹² *Naples* 8, pp. 276–77; 49, pp. 330–31; 80, pp. 378–79; Tocco 57, pp. 130–31).

witness, Peter of Montesangiovanni, recounts perhaps more precisely what happened. In company with the prior of Fossanova and two other friars from the monastery, he went to Maenza to pay a visit to Thomas, whom he had known for a long time; after four days at the castle, the monks departed, taking the sick Thomas and his companions with them. Thomas was on a mount (*equitavit*), a sign of his weakness and of the seriousness of his condition, since the Dominicans were forbidden to travel on horseback.¹¹³

Thomas survived there for some time (*iacuit infirmus quasi per mensem*), confused but grateful for the trouble that the monks were taking on his behalf. They even carried wood on their backs to keep him warm. According to Tocco, at that time he briefly commented on the *Canticle of Canticles*, to thank them for everything, but Abbot Nicholas, who was there, does not say anything about this, nor do any of the Cistercians still surviving at the time of the Naples process.¹¹⁴ Though it is not implausible that Thomas would have addressed several edifying words to the religious who were coming to see him, his state of health hardly permits us to think that he would have composed a complete commentary on the *Canticle*. If a written text of it ever existed (Bartholomew and several catalogues speak about it, but the Prague lists do not) it has not come down to us.¹¹⁵

After confessing to Reginald, Thomas received the viaticum on March 4 or 5; as was the custom, he pronounced then a profession of Eucharistic faith. According to an eyewitness, Peter of Montesangiovanni, he pronounced before the assembled monastery many beautiful words on the subject of the body of Christ, among which were these: "I have written and taught much about this very holy Body, and about the other sacraments in the faith of Christ, and about the Holy Roman Church, to whose correction I expose and submit everything I have written."¹¹⁶ John of Adelasia, another monk from Fossanova but not an eyewitness, transmits a briefer formula with exactly the same meaning.¹¹⁷

We know further the amplified formulation by Bartholomew that ends with the same submission to the Church's judgment. It is doubtless from

¹¹³ *Naples* 49, pp. 330–32; Tocco speaks of a *mulus* (Ystoria 62, p. 388; Tocco 62, p. 135); for the interdiction of traveling on horseback, cf. *Constitutions primitives* of the order, Dist. I 22, 13 (trans. Vicaire, *Saint Dominique de Caleruega*, p. 156).

¹¹⁴ *Ystoria* 57, p. 376 (Tocco 57, pp. 130–31).

¹¹⁵ Leonine, vol. 26, p. 1*, n. 2; cf. *Naples* 85, p. 388; Grabmann, *Werke*, pp. 254–57.

¹¹⁶ *Naples* 49, p. 332.

¹¹⁷ *Naples* 27, p. 301.

Bartholomew that Tocco received the story, and he reproduces it fully. It is also here that he inserts the *Adoro Te* in his fourth version. The passage deserves to be reproduced, for it reestablishes a little of the judgment that the dying man bore toward his work:

I receive you, price of my soul's redemption, I receive you, viaticum of my pilgrimage, *for love of whom I have studied, watched, labored; I have preached you, I have taught you;* never have I said anything against you, and if I have done so it is through ignorance and I do not grow stubborn in my error; if I have taught ill on this sacrament or the others, I submit it to the judgment of the Holy Roman Church, in obedience to which I leave now this life.¹¹⁸

It is entirely permissible to refer to this declaration for a more positive—and therefore more exact—appreciation of Thomas's expression: "Everything I have written seems to me as straw."¹¹⁹ Straw is a stock expression used to distinguish, by giving it proper weight, the grain of reality within the chaff of the words; the words are not the reality, but they designate it and they lead to it. Having arrived at reality itself, Thomas had a certain right to feel himself detached with respect to the words, but this does not at all signify that he considers his work as without value. Simply put, he had gone beyond it.

Thomas received the anointing of the sick the following day, responding himself to the ritual prayers. He died three days later having received the Body of the Lord, on Wednesday, 7 March, in the early hours of the morning.¹²⁰

This succinct story has posed two large questions for historians. The first concerns the nature of the final illness; it seems hardly probable that it had a direct link with the 6 December experience. The unlucky blow of the branch along the way may have set off a series of events whose nature we do not know, but this is not the place to expatiate on that subject.¹²¹ On the contrary, from time to time a popular rumor has arisen, propagated by the enemies of Charles of Anjou (notably the numerous members of the Aquinas family quarelling with him, exiled from their lands in the

¹¹⁸ *Naples* 80, p. 379; *Ystoria* 58, pp. 379–80 (Tocco 58, pp. 131–32); for the *Adoro Te*, cf. chap. VII above.

¹¹⁹ Tugwell, p. 267, suggests this reading.

¹²⁰ *Naples* 49, p. 332; *Ystoria* 65, p. 395 (Tocco 65, p. 138).

¹²¹ Weisheipl, p. 328, suggests an internal hemorrhage.

Papal States, as were Francesca and her husband Ceccano), according to which Thomas was poisoned by a doctor on the king's payroll (recall John of Guido, who visited him at Maenza) for reasons that we can only guess. The rumor must have circulated rather widely; the chronicler Giovanni Villani and Dante Alighieri himself echo it. It seems that all the historians are in agreement today in discarding this rumor as without serious foundation.¹²²

The second large question has given rise to many speculations. What exactly occurred around 6 December 1273? Was it only a matter of a mystical experience that further accentuated the *abstractio mentis* habitual to Thomas—thus provoking a near total detachment about his work, accompanied by a lack of will to live, whose clearest sign is the anorexia mentioned several times? In place of this explanation, which has been commonly accepted until now by the hagiographical tradition, various attempts have appeared in recent years to give an account of this sudden interruption of Thomas's literary activity.

For someone who sees Thomas as anxious, prey to increasing doubts about the value of his work (notably the "theoretical weakness of the analogy of being"), the explanation is essentially psychological: the growing reality of the *theologia negativa* would be the source of his will not to finish the *Summa*, to avoid seeing the intuition with which he began it be transformed into a closed system.¹²³ Another view posits a serious cerebral stroke, a diagnosis offered by some doctors on the basis of symptoms that may be gathered from the texts: difficulty in speaking and moving, anxiety about further attacks, deep psychological disturbance.¹²⁴ Without entirely denying this last explanation, Weisheipl prefers to speak of a physical and psychological breakdown as a consequence of the overwork that Thomas had imposed on himself for a long time. The 6 December experience, in accentuating still further his desire for the true homeland, only exacerbated

¹²² Cf. Scandone, "La vita," pp. 32–34; *Divine Comedy, Purgatorio* XX 67–69: "Carlo venne in Italia, e per ammenda / Vittima fe' di Corradino, e poi / Ripinse al ciel Tommaso, per ammenda." To study the file on this subject in depth, see M. Sanchez, "Como y de qué murió Santo Tomás de Aquino," *Studium* 16 (1976) 369–404; by the same author, "Murió envenenado santo Tomás de Aquino?," *Studium* 18 (1978) 3–37.

¹²³ G. M. Pizzuti, "Per una interpretazione storicizzata di Tommaso d'Aquino. Senso e limite di una prospettiva," *Sapienza* 29 (1976) 429–64. We mention that following Ch.-D. Boulogne, *Saint Thomas d'Aquin ou le génie intelligent* (Paris, 1968), pp. 190–92, the author does not entirely discard the poison theory and makes Thomas's general superiors responsible for his departure from Paris in 1272; Boulogne's reconstructions are, however, scarcely credible.

¹²⁴ Colledge, "The Legend," p. 26.

to the point of *taedium uitae* his detachment from the things of this world, including what he held closest to his heart.¹²⁵

Before these attempts at explanation, the reader can only suspend judgment. It is true that Thomas changed his opinion on analogy—but that evolution may be placed rather early in his career and ought to have made its effects felt a good deal earlier. Furthermore, this is not the only point on which he evolved, and his intellectual robustness put him rather at ease in recognizing changes without a problem and in informing his readers of it when he thought it necessary. Though it is not implausible, a diminution of his intellectual faculties following an attack, *after* the Teano accident, is scarcely manifest in what he expressed to Reginald or in the letter he addressed to Bernard Ayglier several days before his death—to say nothing of the possible commentary on the *Canticle of Canticles*. It is also difficult to conceive that he would have been allowed to leave for Lyons if he had been ill and showing diminished faculties.

After we have gone step by step, as we have just done, through emphasizing his astonishing intellectual output, the hypothesis about his physical and nervous exhaustion is easier to allow. Yet, if we bear in mind his natural robustness and exceptional intelligence, which made easier for him problems that would have been difficult for others, that hypothesis is not irrefutable. (Even in his last days we see Thomas still arising very early.) We must have the honesty to recognize that none of these explanations is entirely convincing. But if we have to choose among them, Weisheipl's thesis, which suggests an extreme physical and nervous fatigue, coupled with mystical experiences that marked his last year, may be the most plausible.

¹²⁵. Weisheipl, pp. 320–23.

**Chapter XV—
Difficult Sequels:
Cult, Process, Disputes**

After his death, Thomas's history continues in two different registers, partly parallel, partly intersecting with one another: a cult of the saint began quickly at the place of his death, and an opposition arose at Paris and Oxford that was not disarmed by his theological thought. The harsh and tenacious struggles that followed were sometimes carried out in the name of the faith, and led to intervention by episcopal authority. They also sometimes expressed different religious or intellectual options, and we find at the time in all its sharpness the already ancient rivalry that arose so often between the order of Saint Francis and the order of Saint Dominic. In all this, we are present not only at the birth of a school of thought that without doubt owes its legendary combativeness to these difficult beginnings, but also at the birth of a development that will find its epilogue—at least provisionally—in canonization.

The Beginnings of the Cult

At Fossanova the funeral rite was celebrated by the monastery with all the requisite solemnity, naturally in the presence of brother Dominicans, but also with the Franciscan bishop Francis of Terracina, who was there in the company of several brothers of his order. Numerous noblemen from the region were also present, as well as Dame Francesca, the niece of the deceased who, not being able to enter because of the cloister, obtained

permission from the abbot to venerate the body at the door of the church.¹ After the office, it fell to Reginald as faithful companion to pronounce the eulogy of the deceased and to extol his virtues before that noble audience; we cannot fault him if the sincerity of his pain made him speak more of himself than about his master.²

In the meantime, even before the body had been buried—or even washed—the saint had already accomplished a miracle: the subprior of the monastery, John of Ferentino, was healed of an eye affliction from which he had suffered for several months.³ This was the first sign of the veneration already directed toward Thomas—since the ill person had been laid on the body of the deceased, applying his eyes to Thomas's. That veneration could only grow in light of the miracles that were accomplished and the pilgrimages that were organized.⁴

Conscious of the treasure that had fallen into their hands, all the monks of Fossanova emphasized that, even before his death, Thomas had declared that the abbey would be the place of his eternal repose: *Haec requies mea in saeculum saeculi, hic habitabo quoniam elegi eam*.⁵ Fearing that the Dominicans might want to recover the relics or, worse, that the relics might be stolen from them, the Cistercians secretly transported the remains, first buried near the main altar in the chapel of Saint Stephen, to the interior of the cloister. But the deceased appeared in a dream to the prior of the monastery—Brother James of Ferentino, one of those who had gone to visit Thomas at Maenza—and conveyed to him his desire to be returned to his first place of burial.

Seven months after his death, the monks attempted to carry out that request. On that occasion, the winding sheet was opened and it was verified that the body was in a perfect state of preservation (a verification that was carried out again in 1281 and in 1288). Ravished by the sweet odor that came from it and filled with joy, they bore it back into the great church. Judging that it was not appropriate to celebrate a *Requiem* Mass for this translation of the body, they sang the Mass *Os justi*, the one for holy confessors.⁶

¹ *Ystoria* 62, p. 388 (Tocco 62, p. 135).

² *Ystoria* 63, pp. 390–92 (Tocco 63, 136–37); we have already used many passages from this text.

³ *Ystoria* 61, p. 387 (Tocco 61, pp. 134–35); the biographer reports here a fact attested by two eyewitnesses: Octaviano of Babuco (*Naples* 17, p. 289) and Peter of Montesangiovanni (*Naples* 51, p. 335).

⁴ *Naples* 41, pp. 317–18; 51, pp. 335–36; 53–55, pp. 338–42.

⁵ Ps. 131:14; cf. *Naples* 10, p. 280; 15, p. 286; 19, p. 291; 49, p. 332; *Ystoria* 57, p. 375 (Tocco 57, p. 130).

⁶ *Naples* 8, p. 278; cf. 10, 15, 20, 52 (pp. 280–81; 287; 291; 338); *Ystoria* 66, pp. 396–99

(footnote continued on next page)

Let us say here in order not to have to return to it later, these comings and goings in the monastery were only the beginning of the complex history of the relics. Instead of following the incredible and hardly appetizing detail of their tribulations during a good part of the fourteenth century, let us mention simply that in 1369 they were sent to Toulouse—rather than to Paris, where the university claimed them—at the behest of Urban V, and that they resided there in the church of the Order of Preachers until the French Revolution.⁷ Provisionally translated to the Basilica of Saint-Sernin, on 7 June 1791, they remained there until 7 March 1974, when they were returned to the restored church of the Jacobins, where they would from then on be venerated.⁸

March 1277 in Paris

While the popular devotion to Saint Thomas had begun in Italy, in Paris doctrinal agitation, which pitted the Neo-Augustinian conservatives in the theology faculty against the radical Aristotelians in the arts faculty, had hardly ceased since Thomas's departure in 1272; indeed it had even grown.⁹ A few months after Thomas's departure, Bonaventure gave, on his return to Paris, a series of conferences during Easter 1273, the *Collationes in Hexaemeron*, in which he reacted strongly against Aristotelianism.¹⁰ The opusculum *De erroribus philosophorum* (by Giles of Rome?) is itself an eloquent testimony to the inquietude that the theses of Arabic and Jewish Aristotelianism had caused.¹¹ Giles of Lessines, too, submitted to Albertus Magnus a list of fifteen propositions "which the most reputable masters in philosophy teach at Paris in the schools." The fact that the first thirteen are a simple repetition of errors condemned on 10 December 1270 and that we encounter them again in the condemnation of 1277 shows

(footnote continued from previous page)

(Tocco 66, pp. 138–40); Bull of Canonization no. V (*Fontes*, p. 524); according to Tocco, the deceased appeared to the abbot of the monastery, Nicholas, but the latter clearly explained that it was the prior, James, who was the recipient.

⁷ C. Douais, *Les reliques de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Textes originaux* (Paris, 1903) (notably with the chronicle of the translation from Piperno to Toulouse by Raymond Hugues); E. Delaruelle, "La translation des reliques de saint Thomas d'Aquin à Toulouse (1369) et la politique universitaire d'Urban V," *BLE* 56 (1955) 129–46.

⁸ *Institut catholique de Toulouse. Chronique* (1975), fasc. 4, pp. 29–30 and 43–45.

⁹ See on this the brief account by F. Van Steenberghen, *La Philosophie au XIII^e siècle*, pp. 474–83 (2d ed. 1991, pp. 414–22).

¹⁰ We refer here to the fine analysis by Joseph Ratzinger, *The Theology of History in St. Bonaventure*, trans. Zachary Hayes (Chicago, 1971), pp. 120–63, who underlines the prophetic and apocalyptic point of Bonaventure's growing opposition to Aristotelianism.

¹¹ Giles of Rome, *Errores philosophorum*, ed. J. Koch (Milwaukee, 1944) (Latin text with English translation).

indeed the persistence of these radical positions. Albert will respond to this consultation through his *De quindecim problematibus*, but we must say that the old master of Cologne does not show himself in his best light here.¹²

The echoes of this ferment, which even reached Viterbo, disquieted the former Parisian master Peter of Spain, recently elected pope under the name John XXI. He therefore wrote to the bishop of Paris, Stephen Tempier, on 18 January 1277, directing him to inquire into the persons and places that were propagating these errors prejudicial to the faith and to give him a report on it as soon as possible. The bishop's response to the pope has not come down to us, but we know that he brought together a commission of sixteen theologians who wished to work as soon as possible toward eliminating the suspect literature coming from the arts faculty. This "hasty and incoherent inquiry" concluded in less than a month with submitting to the bishop a list of 219 propositions judged to be heterodox. And the bishop, going beyond the mission of acquiring information that the pope had conferred upon him, proceeded to condemn them on 7 March 1277.¹³ The pope does not seem to have been angry about this measure, since several weeks later, 28 April, he asked Tempier to continue the purification already begun *tam in artibus quam in theologica . . . facultate*.¹⁴

This condemnation, which included without distinction heretical theses and theological opinions that were perfectly legitimate, has been severely judged since its first promulgation. In the twentieth century, it has been the object of diverse appreciations and interpretations; from Pierre Duhem to Edward Grant, from Mandonnet and Chenu to Jacques Le Goff, or from Kurt Flasch to Luca Bianchi and Alain de Libera, the historians have not ceased returning to it in order to evaluate its bearing and consequences-sometimes not without anachronism.¹⁵

¹². The text can be found in Albertus Magnus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 17/1 (Cologne, 1975), pp. 30–44; cf. also F. Van Steenberghen, "Le *De quindecim problematibus* d'Albert le Grand," in *Mélanges Auguste Pelzer* (Louvain, 1947), pp. 415–39.

¹³. *Chartul.*, no. 471, p. 541; no. 473, pp. 453–558; in addition to the few pages by F. Van Steenberghen (p. 483–88; 2d ed. 1991, pp. 422–26), see principally the fundamental studies by R. Hissette, *Enquête sur les 219 articles condamnés à Paris le 7 mars 1277*, *Philosophes médiévaux* 22, (Louvain-Paris, 1977), and of L. Bianchi, *Il vescovo e i filosofi. La condanna parigina del 1277 e l'evoluzione dell'aristotelismo scolastico* (Bergamo, 1990); J. F. Wippel, "The Condemnations of 1270 and 1277 at Paris," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 7 (1977) 169–201, who was still unaware of Hissette's and Wielockx's work, remains a good study.

¹⁴. This text has been edited by A. Callebaut, "Jean Pecham O.F.M. et l'augustinisme. Aperçus historiques (1263–1285)," *AFH* 18 (1925) 441–72 (cf. pp. 458–61).

¹⁵. J. E. Murdoch, "Pierre Duhem and the History of Late Medieval Science and Philosophy

(footnote continued on next page)

Without getting involved in a debate that would lead us too far away from our purposes, it is certain that if this authoritarian intervention stopped radical Aristotelianism for a time in Paris, it also served as a considerable brake on the evolution of independent thought. A mind as free as Godfrey of Fontaines avowed that he could not pronounce on the way angels were present in a place, out of fear of excommunication.¹⁶ We have to wait until 1325—almost fifty years later and two years after Thomas's canonization—for one of Tempier's successors to annul what in the condemnation might touch on Thomist theses.¹⁷ But in the meantime, many other events occurred, and these from the days immediately after 7 March.

The most recent studies have notably modified the approach to this period. From the beginning until a short while ago, it was basically admitted that Thomas was included in the condemnation of the 219 articles. Two of his theses in particular were aimed at: the thesis about the unicity of substantial form in man (*Quod in homine est tantum una forma substantialis, scilicet anima intellectiva*),¹⁸ and the thesis about the impossibility for God to create a material without a corresponding form (*Deum non posse facere materiam sine forma*).¹⁹

Now, quite curiously, these two propositions are not found in the list of the 219 articles condemned by Tempier. This matter is even more surprising since, if we are to believe Pecham, Thomas opposed himself directly to the bishop precisely on the point about the unique form.²⁰ We must therefore conclude from this with Roland Hissette that the 7 March condemnation—bearing essentially on some theses issued by the arts faculty (as the introduction says clearly)—does involve some of Thomas's positions, but he is not *directly* a target.²¹

(footnote continued from previous page)

in the Latin West," in R. Imbach and A. Maieru, eds., *Gli Studi di Filosofia Medievale fra Otto e Novecento*, pp. 253–302; E. Grant, "The Condemnation of 1277, God's Absolute Power, and Physical Thought in the Late Middle Ages," *Viator* 10 (1979) 211–44; J. Le Coff, *Les intellectuels au Moyen Age*, Points Histoire 78 (Paris, 1985); K. Flasch, *Aufklärung im Mittelalter? Die Verurteilung von 1277. Das Dokument des Bischofs von Paris übersetzt und erklärt*, Excerpta classica 6 (Mayence, 1989); A. de Libera, *Penser au Moyen Age*, (Paris, 1991).

¹⁶ *Quodl.* XIII, 4, Les Philosophes belges 5 (1935), p. 221: "Hoc etiam est difficile determinare propter articulos circa hoc condemnatos, quia contrarii videntur ad invicem; et contra quos nihil intendo dicere propter periculum excommunicationis"; cf. p. Glorieux, "Tempier," *DTC* 15 (1946), col. 104.

¹⁷ *Chartul.* II, no. 838, pp. 280–81.

¹⁸ Cf. *ST* Ia q. 76 a.4.

¹⁹ Cf. *Quodl.* III q. 1 a. 1 sc.

²⁰ *Chartul.*, no. 523, p. 634.

²¹ R. Hissette, *Enquête sur les 219 articles*, which should be supplemented with the same

(footnote continued on next page)

That he would have been implicated is no less certain, for we know quite well that Thomas was read in the arts faculty.²² What then is the reason for this silence when we are dealing with a notorious fact that was right at the heart of the controversy? . . . It was thought that a plausible answer had been found by positing the respect that already existed in Paris for Thomas Aquinas's memory, which would have imposed a relative moderation on the bishop. In reality, we must find another explanation, for the events that followed show that Stephen Tempier did not hesitate to quarrel directly with Thomas.

Very soon after 7 March (and before 28 March of that very year, 1277), Giles of Rome who, without being a disciple of the Dominican master, had perhaps been his student and shared several of his positions, was refused the *licentia docendi* by Bishop Tempier. And he was condemned in a list of fifty-one propositions extracted from his commentary on the first book of the *Sentences*. Now thirty-one of these propositions aim and strike indirectly at Thomas through Giles, and his censors knew it quite well. Supported by the legate Simon of Brion, Tempier, after waging war against the arts faculty, was then planning the purification of the theology faculty, which John XXI was going to ask of him on 28 April. Furthermore, as has been shown in an irrefutable way, this censuring of Giles of Rome in 1277 is essentially the revenge of the theology faculty against one of its members who was judged too independent and was considered an "ally of Thomas Aquinas."²³

In reality, this censuring of Giles of Rome fits into an orchestrated plan in which Thomas himself is the target, as the process that was put in mo-

(footnote continued from previous page)

author's important article: "Etienne Tempier et ses condamnations," *RTAM* 47 (1980) 231–70, which mentions and discusses a number of studies that appeared on the occasion of the seventh centenary; see on this also his response to the critics who arose in reaction to his thesis which was too new to be received without difficulties by those holding the common opinion: "Albert le Grand et Thomas d'Aquin dans la censure parisienne du 7 mars 1277," *MM* 15 (1982) 226–46; cf. also Hissette, "Note sur le syllabus 'antirationaliste' du 7 mars 1277," *RPL* 88 (1990) 404–16 (with regard to K. Flasch).

²² We can add to the example of Siger of Brabant the slightly later example of certain masters who also drew heavily from the *Ila Ilae* as well as the Commentary on the *Ethics*: O. Lottin, "Saint Thomas d'Aquin à la faculté des arts de Paris aux approches de 1277," *RTAM* 16 (1949) 292–313.

²³ R. Wielockx, *Commentaire in Aegidii Romani Opera omnia*, III, 1 *Apologia* (Florence, 1985), cf. p. 223; the author adds (p. 224) that this is also "the revenge of Henry of Ghent on Giles of Rome." See in particular chapter 7: "Les 51 articles à la lumière des doctrines de Thomas d'Aquin," pp. 179–224, but the history and understanding of these years receives much more light from the whole commentary, which gives, according to R. Imbach's expression, a superb example of microanalysis of a text in all its aspects.

tion against him between 7 and 28 March 1277 witnesses. Several contemporary theologians allude to it: John Pecham, Henry of Ghent, and William de la Mare.²⁴ John Pecham is the clearest and one of the best-informed people, since he was present in the Roman curia during that time (between 22 May 1276 and 12 March 1279). In a letter dated 7 December 1284, he informs us that Stephen Tempier had thought to introduce a procedure against Thomas Aquinas, but that, owing to the intervention of several eminent persons, action was taken away from the bishop of Paris and referred to Rome, where it was suspended during the vacancy in the Apostolic Seat between 20 May 1277 (death of John XXI) and 25 November 1277 (election of Nicholas III).²⁵

Henry of Ghent, for his part, alludes to a meeting called (between 7 and 28 March 1277) by Bishop Tempier and the papal legate, Simon of Brion; the Parisian masters examined a certain number of theses there, one that literally repeats Thomas's terms: *Quod in homine est tantum una forma substantialis, scilicet anima intellectiva*; a proposition condemned by all the masters, he says, except for two—it appears to have been the two Dominican masters who abstained.²⁶ As for William de la Mare, he confirms and completes these data in his celebrated *Correctorium* (around 1279) where, to the first thesis, which he reproduces, he adds a second: *Deus non potest dare actu esse materiae sine forma*.²⁷ These are indeed the two theses whose absence intrigued the researchers into the condemnation of 7 March and about which William states that they have been reproved *recently* by all the masters.²⁸

Here therefore was the beginning of the procedure begun directly against Thomas; Pecham deplores this interruption so strongly that he insists on 1 January 1285 that Martin IV (the former papal legate Simon

²⁴ R. Wielockx, "Autour du procès de Thomas d'Aquin," *MM* 19 (1988) 413–38, has remarkably clarified this history.

²⁵ *Chartul.*, no. 517, pp. 624–26.

²⁶ *ST* Ia q.76 a.4; cf. Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. X*, in *Opera omnia*, ed. R. Macken, vol. 14, pp. 127–28 (note to lines 60–80 of the critical apparatus that reproduces the original tenor of Henry's proposals); Henry also recounts how he had been called several days earlier by the bishop and the legate, who wanted to be assured about his opinion in favor of the plurality of forms, engaging him to hold firmly and not hesitating to threaten him should he take the contrary view; cf. L. Hödl, "Neue Nachrichten über die Pariser Verurteilungen der Thomasischen Formlehre," *Scholastik* 39 (1964) 178–96, for the identification of the two recalitrants.

²⁷ Cf. Thomas, *Quodl.* III q.1 a.1.

²⁸ P. Glorieux, *Le correctorium Corruptorii "Quare"*, p. 129: *reprobatur a magistris* (for the first thesis); p. 114: *omnes magistri concordaverunt nuper quod est erroneum dicere* (for the second thesis).

of Brion) finally deign to pay attention to this affair. But it will only be Honorius IV (who will succeed Martin on 2 April 1285) who will bring an end to this litigation. Far from exaggerating its gravity, he relinquished it and referred the decision to Paris, not to the bishop, but to the other masters in the theology faculty, who took up the question on a date before 14 April 1286, but did not arrive at any censure.

The referral to the theologians rather than to the bishop means that the pope considered the debate a scholastic question, in which the faith is not at stake. After 1285, Giles of Rome was himself rehabilitated and authorized to teach again by a *determinatio magistrorum*; he made his beginning as a master in the autumn of 1285. After everything we have recalled here, it is clear that this new episode ought to be understood as a stage in the process leading to the complete rehabilitation of Thomas: if the implication of his objective ally was thought to compromise him, the lifting of the censure that struck that ally would show indeed that Thomas himself was no longer implicated.²⁹

To all appearances, it was the intervention of John of Vercelli, the general of the Dominicans, present in Paris between 15 October 1276 and 1278 as the legate of John XXI that was behind the referral to Rome of the proceeding against Thomas. But he had some support among the Roman curia, where it seems that the interventions of Cardinal Giovanni Gaetano Orsini and especially Giacomo Savelli, friends of the Dominican order, explain the suspension of the trial. In fact, it is the latter, who became pope under the name Honorius IV, who would impose the solution already mentioned.³⁰ Let us add here that a part of the strategy being carried out by John of Vercelli (of which other indications exist) was Saint Albert's arrival in Paris in 1277 to defend Thomas's memory. Though disputed not long ago by Weisheipl, this is considered plausible by the most recent scholarship.³¹

Dominicans and Franciscans

In spite of the pacts concluded between the Franciscan and Dominican generals, Jerome of Ascoli and John of Vercelli, notably in 1274 and

²⁹ Cf. Wielockx, "Les 51 articles," in *Commentaire* (see note 23, above), pp. 219–23.

³⁰ Cf. Wielockx, *Autour du procès*, pp. 419–22.

³¹ J. A. Weisheipl, "The Life and Works of St. Albert the Great," in *Albertus Magnus and the Sciences. Commemorative Essays. 1980*, ed. J. A. Weisheipl (Toronto, 1980), pp. 12–51 (cf. pp. 44–45); R. Hissette, *Albert le Grand et Thomas d'Aquin*, pp. 244–45; R. Wielockx, *Commentaire* on Giles of Rome, p. 217, takes very seriously the argumentation of the last.

1277,³² the hostility of the Franciscans toward Thomas did not cease. They were, moreover, generously returned. The common front that had provisionally gathered together the two orders in a common defense against the seculars had given way to a fratricidal battle that was as unglorious as it was unproductive.

We must first take a small step backward and speak once again about John Pecham. Strangely, he walks here in the footsteps of a Dominican and this should be noted because it is one of the data in a highly complex situation: not all Thomas's adversaries were found among the Franciscans. Several days after Tempier's condemnation, the Dominican archbishop of Canterbury, Robert Kilwardby, issued a similar condemnation 18 March 1277, but this time with a will to strike directly at certain theses of Thomist inspiration, notably the one on the unicity of substantial form.³³

Contrary to what is sometimes said, we cannot consider this censure as *complementary* to the one in Paris, since the second one makes no allusion to the first, which it does not repeat. Also, each has only a local bearing. Furthermore, while the Paris condemnation pits the bishop and the theology faculty against the arts faculty, at Oxford, Kilwardby could draw support from the consensus among all the masters, regents and nonregents. Robert's condemnation would be repeated by John Pecham, his successor beginning on 19 February 1279. Thomas's old adversary will confirm his predecessor's censure on 29 October 1284, and will complete it on 30 April 1286 with eight new propositions, particularly concerning the unicity of substantial form.³⁴

Richard Knapwell, on whom Pecham wanted to impose the retraction of these eight theses, voluntarily abstained from participating in the solemn assembly convened at London by the archbishop, but he was splendidly

³². There had already been a common exhortation of the generals of the two orders in 1255 inviting their brothers to cease from internal discord to form a better front against their exterior enemies, and there were several others, cf. G. Meersseman, "Concordia inter quatuor ordines mendicantes," *AFP* 4 (1934) 75–97.

³³. *Chartul.*, no. 474, pp. 558–59.

³⁴. The text of these propositions with an enlightening account of the context is found in P. Glorieux, "Comment les thèses thomistes furent proscrites à Oxford," *RT* 32, N.S. 10 (1927) 259–91, and in F. Pelster, "Die Sätze der Londoner Verurteilung von 1286 und die Schriften des Magister Richard von Knapwell O. P.," *AFP* 16 (1946) 83–106; the most enlightening explanation of the philosophical and theological engagement during this affair probably remains D. A. Callus, *The Condemnation of St. Thomas at Oxford* (The Aquinas Society of London, Aquinas Paper no. 5), (London, 1955). See on this F. J. Roensch, *Early Thomistic School* (Dubuque, Iowa, 1964), pp. 170–99, and T. Crowley, "John Peckham, O.F.M., Archbishop of Canterbury, versus the New Aristotelianism," *Bull. of the J. Rylands Library* 33 (1950) 241–55, who tries to see things from Pecham's point of view.

defended there by his provincial, William of Hothum, who also interjected an appeal of the sentence of excommunication against him. Excommunicated all the same, Richard left for Rome to plead his case. The person who dealt with it was none other than Jerome of Ascoli, the former minister general of the Franciscans, who became pope under the name Nicholas IV. He removed the excommunication without doubt, but imposed perpetual silence on Richard. Withdrawing to Bologna, where he would have continued to teach the proscribed theses, Knapwell is thought to have died there insane in 1289.³⁵ In addition to other considerations, his case illustrates rather well the implacable nature of the confrontation.

After Pecham, we must mention the English Franciscan William de la Mare—first regent in Paris, then at Oxford—who, around 1279, published his *Correctorium*.³⁶ Instead of merely deploring or condemning Thomas's ideas, he judged it more useful to propose how to rectify them by noting the dangerous theses and the censures of which they had been the target. And he also adds a critique and refutation. The whole was conceived in the form of annotations to be introduced by masters and students in the margin of the suspected texts. This series of 118 corrections to add to as many passages in Thomas's works was very quickly considered an official document by the Franciscans, since, during the chapter they held in Strasbourg in 1282, the minister general, Bongrazia Fielci, prescribed that Thomas's *Summa* could be made available only to the most able (*notabiliter* or *rationabiliter intelligentes*) readers, and then only if it was provided with William's clarifications.³⁷

³⁵. Cf. Glorieux, *Comment*, pp. 265–82; D. A. Callus, "The Problem of the Unity of Form and Richard Knapwell," in *Mélanges offerts à Etienne Gilson* (Toronto-Paris, 1959), pp. 123–60; Roensch, *Early Thomistic School*, pp. 34–40; 200–223; F. E. Kelley, ed., Richard Knapwell, *Quaestio disputata de unitate formae* (Paris, 1982).

³⁶. The text of the *Correctorium* may be found in the edition of its refutation by Richard Knapwell in P. Glorieux, *Les premières polémiques thomistes I. Le correctorium Corruptorii "Quare"*, Bibliothèque thomiste 9 (Le Saulchoir-Kain, 1927). Three of William's discussions bearing on the *De ueritate* may also be read in the edition by R. Hissette, "Trois articles de la seconde rédaction du *Correctorium* de Guillaume de la Mare," *RTAM* 51 (1984) 230–41 (with some comments on the recent literature). About this figure, of whom ultimately we know rather little, see H. Kraml's editor's introduction to *Guillelmus de La Mare, Scriptum in primum librum Sententiarum* (Munich, 1989).

³⁷. G. Fussenegger, ed., "Definitiones Capituli generalis Argentinae celebrati anno 1282," *AFH* 26 (1933) 127–40, cf. p. 139: "Generalis minister imponit ministris provincialibus quod non permittant multiplicari summam fratris Thome nisi apud lectores rationabiliter <al. notabiliter> intelligentes, et hoc nisi cum declarationibus fratris Guillelmi de Mara, non in marginibus positus, sed in quaternis et huiusmodi declarationes non scribantur per aliquos seculares" (cf. *Documenta* 43, pp. 624–25; Glorieux, *Premières polémiques*, p. ix, n. 2; idem, "Non in marginibus positus," *RTAM* 15 (1948), 182–84.

This involuntary homage recalls what James of Viterbo, the future archbishop of Naples, reported to Bartholomew of Capua as coming from Giles of Rome himself: "Friar James, if the Preachers wish it, it is they who will be knowledgeable and intelligent and we ignorant [*idiote*]; [all they have to do] is not spread around Friar Thomas's writings."³⁸ The diffusion of this *Correctorium* is an evident sign of its success. We have today twelve manuscripts of this work by William, without counting the sixteen others that have come down in Knapwell's refutation of it.

For their part, the Dominicans did not remain inactive. William's *Correctorium*—rebaptized by them the *Corruptorium*—provoked no fewer than five immediate replies by Thomas's confreres. According to custom, our enumeration distinguishes them on the basis of their *incipit*. The first, around 1282–83, is Richard Knapwell's *Correctorium Quare*, which would not take long in attracting Pecham's thundering.³⁹ Next came the *Correctorium Sciendum*, which is very close to the earlier text in date (around 1283) and place of origin. Its author also seems to have been an English Dominican, very probably Robert of Orford.⁴⁰

We move to Paris with the *Correctorium* entitled *Circa*, whose author is John Quidort (or John of Paris) who seems to know of his two English predecessors. But he did not finish his work (it leaves off at article 60). The date is very close to those of the earlier texts (around 1282–84).⁴¹ We return to England with the fourth *Correctorium*, called *Quaestione*. Its author is still unknown, but without doubt he was an English Dominican (some researchers believe William of Macclesfield). He, too, did not finish and stopped at article 31. Close to the *Quare*, which it uses sometimes, it must be slightly later.⁴² The fifth is the work of Rambert of the Primadizzi (also said to be from Bologna), then at Saint-Jacques, who also did not finish

³⁸ Naples 83, pp. 383–84; Giles deserves some credit for speaking this way for, like Henry of Ghent or Godfrey of Fontaines, he was hardly spared by Thomas's confreres. We have only to think of the attacks on him by Robert of Offord. We refer to P. Glorieux's valuable study, "*Pro et contra Thomam: Un survol de cinquante années*," in *Sapientiae Procerum Amore. Mélanges . . . J.-P. Müller*, Studia Anselmiana 63 (Rome, 1974), pp. 255–87. Cf. pp. 271–72.

³⁹ The edition is in Glorieux, *Les premières polémiques thomistes*; though Glorieux hesitates about the authorship of *Quare* (Pelster even more so, who thought it was Thomas of Sutton) today there is no doubt after Kelley's work, cf. L.-J. Bataillon, *RSPT* 75 (1991) 509.

⁴⁰ P. Glorieux, ed., *Le Correctorium Corruptorii* "Sciendum," Bibl. Thomiste 31 (Paris, 1956). Cf. Roensch, *Early Thomistic School*, pp. 40–42; 223–30.

⁴¹ J.-P. Müllet, ed., *Le Correctorium Corruptorii de Jean Quidort de Paris*, Studia Anselmiana 12–13 (Rome, 1941).

⁴² J.-P. Müller, ed., *Le Correctorium Corruptorii* "Quaestione," Studia Anselmiana 35 (Rome, 1954).

(he stops at article 31). He has the distinction of replying not only to William de la Mare but to other authors also "of great renown" (*qui magni sunt et magni reputantur*), who appear to have been Henry of Ghent, Giles of Rome, and Richard of Mediavilla.⁴³ This discussion will have a last outburst around 1315–20 from the pen of an anonymous Franciscan who undertook to reply to the various contradictors of William de la Mare.⁴⁴

The refutations evidently stem from a whole polemical and apologetic literature. They first try to exonerate Thomas from all accusations of error. He was never condemned by the Church or the University. And just as much time is spent justifying his positions as in refuting William's. It would be wrong, however, to consider these writings simply as works responding to circumstances and, therefore, of the second order. It has been said with perspicacity that they reveal a speculative self-consciousness, specifically of one school coming to birth in confrontation with another.⁴⁵

In support of this remark, we note that these works all came from young Dominicans (none of them was yet regent-master at the time of writing). They are doubtless more sensitive than their elders to the newness of the stakes. If we try to verify what this controversy implies about the use of reason in the domain debated by everyone on the eternity of the world, we easily detect among the five young Dominicans the clear awareness—completely in the Thomist line—of a sharp distinction between the realms of faith and reason. This distinction also carries with it a strong reservation about the possibilities of reason, which cannot in any case prove what belongs to faith. Inversely, it is Rambert who most happily formulates William's claim to arrive at a veritable *scientia* of the things of the faith and points out this rationalist intemperance.

It is the deep irony of the controversy that Jordan underlines strongly. For our part, we would add something that every reader can see for himself: on the whole, Thomas himself is most quoted in these replies. Thus, the author who is attacked defends himself through the pen of his first disciples. Without yet knowing it, they were practicing the method that will be

⁴³ J.-P. Müller, ed., *Rambertus de' Primadizzi de Bologne, Apologeticum veritatis contra corruptorium*, Studi e Testi 108 (Vatican City, 1943).

⁴⁴ Cf. Glorieux, "Pro et contra," p. 285. For good measure, we also note (with Glorieux, p. 268) some lists that must have circulated in the decade 1280–90 and that emphasize the *Articuli in quibus dissentiunt Bonaventura et Thomas* or again the *Articuli in quibus Minores contradicunt Thome in Ila Ilae*. This literature is almost inexhaustible.

⁴⁵ M. D. Jordan, "The Controversy of the *Correctoria* and the Limits of Metaphysics," *Speculum* 57 (1982) 292–314. Beyond the remarks repeated in our text, the most up-to-date work on the subject can be found in this study.

summed up later in the celebrated formula *Thomas suiipsius interpres*. This maxim was fecund, as these beginnings show, but it also became heavy with a repetitive sclerosis whose results have not always been happy.

To conclude this glimpse of the frictions between the Franciscans and Dominicans, it is not useless to recall that they did not confine themselves to a strictly intellectual plane. The most prominent of these apples of discord, the understanding of the vow of poverty, remained at the heart of the debate. It was in this regard that the leader of the spiritual Franciscans, Peter Olivi, is found several years later (around 1290) among the most resolute of Thomas's adversaries, as his commentary on Matthew 10:9–10 bears witness.⁴⁶ We need not spend much time on this point to understand that we return here to the old field of battle on which Thomas and Pecham once faced each other. The new fact here is that the Franciscans, though divided between Augustinian followers of Bonaventure and partisans of total poverty, nevertheless gathered in "a formidable anti-Thomist front which, until the last moment, tried to block the penetration of Thomist doctrine and the canonization of the Common Doctor."⁴⁷

In support of this assertion, we might remark that this struggle found an echo in the process at Naples. Several witnesses confirm that they saw Saint Augustine in a dream saying to them that not only was Thomas's teaching in conformity with his own, but also that he was superior in saintliness because of his virginity. It is not without importance that it was from the mouths of two Hermits of Saint Augustine that we find the most lively praises of Thomas's teaching. We have already mentioned the testimony by Giles of Rome, but James of Viterbo does not fear to put Thomas on the same level with Saint Paul and Saint Augustine and to say that there will not be another such until the end of time, because we find in his writing *communis ueritas, communis claritas, communis illuminatio, communis ordo et doctrina*.⁴⁸

Defense of Thomas by the Dominican Order

Faced with these massive attacks from outside, Thomas's confreres, we might naturally suppose, just as massively closed ranks to defend his mem-

⁴⁶ M.-Th. D'Alverny, "Un adversaire de saint Thomas: Petrus Iohannis Olivi," in *Commemorative Studies II*, pp. 179–218.

⁴⁷ A. Vauchez, "Les canonisations de S. Thomas et de S. Bonaventure: pourquoi deux siècles d'écart?" in *1274-Année-charnière—Mutations et continuités*, Colloques internationaux du CNRS 558 (Paris, 1977), pp. 753–67, cf. p. 760.

⁴⁸ *Naples* 66, pp. 356–57; 67, p. 358; 83, pp. 383–84.

ory. The reality was more nuanced than that. Very quickly, it is true, the general chapters began to be agitated over the discredit that threatened to rebound on the order if it allowed Friar Thomas's memory to be darkened. Although the chapter that opened in Bordeaux on 16 May 1277 (two months after Tempier's condemnation) still maintained a prudent silence (the time, no doubt, for John of Vercelli to perfect his strategy), the chapter held at Milan a year later in 1278 vigorously intervened in the matter and dispatched two special envoys to England with the mission of inquiring into *friars* who had allowed themselves to criticize Thomas's writings and punishing them as a consequence.⁴⁹ The historians opportunely remark that Robert Kilwardby, created a cardinal, had left Oxford the preceding March 12. He must have left behind supporters who did not share the Thomist ideas of Hothum and Knapwell.

In 1279, the general chapter held in Paris intervened to the same purpose: "Given that Friar Thomas Aquinas, that venerable man whose memory should be celebrated, has greatly honored our order by his praiseworthy life and writings, we can in no way allow certain people to treat him, himself and his writings, in an irreverent and indecent way—even if they think differently than he did. We enjoin on the provincial and conventual priors, on their vicars, and on all visitors to punish severely without delay those who are found at fault on this point."⁵⁰

As may be seen, the order's position is still measured: you may think differently than Friar Thomas, you may not fail to show him respect. The Paris chapter in 1286 will go much further: "We prescribe and strictly order that each and every friar work efficaciously in promoting the doctrine of the venerable Master Friar Thomas Aquinas of blessed memory—at least as a defensible opinion. If someone tries to teach formally (*assertive*) the contrary—be he master or bachelor, lector, prior, or other, and even if he thinks differently—let him be suspended *ipso facto* from his own office and the privileges of the order until he be restored by the master of the order or the general chapter."⁵¹

⁴⁹. *MOPH* 3, p. 99: "Iniungimus districte fratri Raymundo de Medullione et fratri Iohanni Vigorosi lectori Montispezzulani, quod cure festinacione vadant ad Angliam inquisituri diligenter super facto fratrum, qui in scandalum ordinis detraxerunt de scriptis venerabilis patris fratris Thorne de Aquino. quibus ex nunc plenam damus auctoritatem in capite et in membris, qui quos culpabiles invenerint in predictis, puniendi. extra provinciam emittendi, et omni officio privandi, plenam habeant potestatem."

⁵⁰. *MOPH* 3, p. 204.

⁵¹. *Moph* 3, p. 233; in 1287, i.e., the following year, the general chapter of the Hermits of

(footnote continued on next page)

The Saragossa chapter in 1309 will make a similar recommendation, itself quite strong, and will take an eloquent step: it permits friars who are abroad to sell their books in case of need, with the exception of the Bible and Thomas's works.⁵² Until the canonization, a whole series of chapters will intervene again in this way to recommend the study of his teachings, which is generally considered as *sanior et communior*, but they also speak now and again of those who do not follow these recommendations (Metz 1313; London 1314; Bologna 1315; Rouen 1320); in 1324 at Vienna, the chapter adopts for the order the Office of the Blessed Sacrament composed by Thomas; the chapter of Bordeaux in 1324 gives him the title of saint and prescribes the celebration of his liturgical feast by the whole order on 7 March, the day of his death—and of the celebrated condemnation of 1277.⁵³

Disciples and Confreres

The strong and repetitive terms of the general chapters might give the impression that all the theologians of the Dominican order recognized themselves without difficulty in Thomas's doctrine. Far from it! Without returning to the instructive case of Kilwardby, we must keep in mind the first interventions of the chapters aiming at imposing silence on overly virulent detractors. They did not all disappear.

The most famous remains Durandus of Saint-Pourçain who, beginning with his lectures on the *Sentences* (1307–1308), showed himself a resolute adversary. He was not authorized to present himself for the license except under the promise of revising and amending his *Commentary*. He so employed himself, probably during the year 1312–13, when he gave a course at Saint-Jacques. It was in echo of his controverted teaching that the chapter of Metz in 1313 recommends Thomas's doctrine once more and institutes a commission of twelve members under the presidency of Hervé Nédellec to examine Durandus's work. Peter de la Palud and John of Naples are specially charged with sifting Durandus's *Commentary* and they

(footnote continued from previous page)

Saint Augustine will take (in imitation?) an exactly similar measure in canonizing in still stronger terms Giles of Rome's doctrine (*Chartul.* II, no. 542, p. 12); rehabilitated two years earlier, Giles was just forty.

⁵². *MOPH* 4, pp. 38 and 40 (= *Documenta* 50, pp. 655–56, which speaks mistakenly of Cologne).

⁵³. *MOPH* 4, pp. 64–65, 72, 81, 123, 138, 151 (= *Documenta* 50, pp. 656–60); the collected texts of these chapters may be found, with commentary, in English. See M. Burbach, "Early Dominican and Franciscan Legislation Regarding St. Thomas," *MS* (1942) 139–58.

drew from it ninety-three censured propositions (heretical, erroneous, etc.).

Durandus, already master of the Sacred Palace when the commission finished its work, replied through his *Excusationes* which were in turn submitted to Hervé Néellec's examination. The latter continued the polemic until Durandus was named bishop of Limoux in 1317 and Hervé himself became master general in 1318. But Peter de la Palud and John of Naples published in 1316–17 a selection of 235 articles, which drew to the attention of Thomas's readers the points on which Durandus deviated from the Master's doctrine.⁵⁴ Durandus, however, was not alone (he was following here his master, James of Metz, who also had to deal with Hervé Néellec),⁵⁵ and other lords of lesser importance also saw themselves called to order by the provincial chapters.⁵⁶

These cases alone would suffice to weaken the beautiful façade of unity that the chapter generals' pronouncements present. Without trying to be exhaustive, we must recall here something of the diversity that remained part of the wealth of the Dominican order. We have to say in passing: though we must briefly present the *Correctoria* literature in the framework of this story, it is important not to commit an error of perspective and reduce the prodigious intellectual vitality of this period to the vivacity of this one controversy.

In Thomas's immediate wake there were, first, some faithful readers who noticed that the master had not always said the same thing in the same way and who busied themselves with harmonizing these differences, thus creating what might be called the literature of the "*better said*." As Glorieux summarizes it: "The aim is diametrically opposite to that of William de la Mare. The latter wanted to arm Franciscan readers against the doctrines thought erroneous or dangerous in Saint Thomas. The list of the 'better saids' on the contrary was put forward to help the Dominicans better

⁵⁴ Cf. J. Koch, "Die Verteidigung der Theologie des hl. Thomas von Aquin durch den Dominikanerorden gegenüber Durandus de S. Porciano O. Pr.," in *Xenia Thomistica* III, pp. 327–62; Koch, *Durandus de S. Porciano O. P., Forschungen zum Streit um Thomas von Aquin zu Beginn des 14. Jahrhunderts*, BGPTM 36/1 (Münster i. W., 1927). Cf. a brief account of the facts in Glorieux, "*Pro et contra*," pp. 278–84, and the complete literature in Käppeli, *Scriptores* I, p. 340.

⁵⁵ Cf. Glorieux, "*Pro et contra*," p. 284.

⁵⁶ In 1315, at Arezzo, the chapter of the Roman province inflicted a penitence on Friar Hubert Guidi, who was guilty of having criticized Friar Thomas Aquinas's doctrine (*MOPH* 20, p. 197; *Documenta* 51, p. 661). In 1316, at Orthez, it was the chapter of the Toulouse province that interdicted deviating from Thomas (*Documenta* 52, p. 662).

understand and use Saint Thomas's writings, particularly his *Commentary on the Sentences* . . . [by pointing out], in the order, the improvements Saint Thomas made in the *Summa* . . . [in order to] clarify the development of his thought."⁵⁷

We have already mentioned the "Articles in which Friar Thomas is better in the *Summa* than in the *Sentences*."⁵⁸ The author's aim is not to catch him contradicting himself in *flagrante delicto*, but rather to mark the dynamism of his thought and development. That work would be followed several years later by the *Concordance "Volens complecti"* (around 1290–1300), which extended the enterprise beyond the *Summa* to the *Contra Gentiles*, the *Questiones disputatae*, the *Quodlibets*, and to other works like the commentaries on Romans and on Aristotle. The number of articles treated went from 32 to 41, and the point of view is a little different, for it is no longer a case of pointing out passages *melius dixit* as much as harmonizing the apparent contradictions. That is why it bears the title: "*Aliter dixit in Summa quam in Scriptis*." This work will undergo as many as ten reworkings, all more or less extensive.⁵⁹ Without going through the whole list of works, we might still remark in the immediate neighborhood of the *Articuli* in its earliest form (around 1280) the *De concordantiis in seipsum* (perhaps by Thomas Sutton) where, through a literary procedure borrowed from Saint Augustine's *Retractationes*, the author makes Thomas himself speak directly in order to dispel the apparent contradictions that may be seen in his writings.⁶⁰

Without wishing to be pejorative, these might be described less as disciples than epigones; Thomas had still other disciples and even other contradictors among his own Dominican confreres, and he also had among them some authors whose work developed independently from his own. We find all this in what has been called the Rhine school or the German Dominican scholastics.⁶¹ It is even more important to say a few words about

⁵⁷. Glorieux, "*Pro et contra*," p. 267.

⁵⁸. Cf. above, chapter III, note 42, with Gauthier's article, "Les Articuli in quibus."

⁵⁹. Cf. Glorieux, "*Pro et contra*," p. 275 and Gauthier, "Les Articuli in quibus," for an edition of the texts.

⁶⁰. Edited among Saint Thomas's opuscula: Vivès, vol. 28, 560–74; cf. P. Mandonnet, "Premiers travaux de polémique thomiste," *RSPT* 7 (1913) 46–70; 245–262, cf. pp. 252–55.

⁶¹. See the summary of some hesitations about the justness of these descriptions in A. de Libera, *Introduction à la mystique rhénane d'Albert le Grand à Maître Eckhart* (Paris, 1984), pp. 9–23, in which will also be found the essential matters concerning these too little known thinkers. De Libera, *Albert le Grand et la philosophie* (Paris, 1990), pp. 21–36 and passim, on Albert's influence. There are also many relevant data in the second colloquium of the collabo-

(footnote continued on next page)

them here since they have remained entirely outside of the otherwise excellent overview by Glorieux.

Thomas did not stay long enough in Cologne—and at the time he was only a beginner—for his influence to have been established as solidly as was Master Albert's. Instead, the latter's Neoplatonism, marked by Avicenna and Pseudo-Dionysius, gave rise to a family, and if we cannot say that the whole school of Cologne is Albertinian, it is certain that Thomas's influence was less there than in Paris. In fact, we can say without question that the Neoplatonism of that school is Albertus Magnus's legacy—as was also the Thomism that departed from it little by little.

The best known of these thinkers is certainly Meister Eckhart, bachelor and master in Paris at the times of the sharpest controversies with the Franciscans. Though not a Thomist, he nevertheless defended some of Thomas's theses on the beatific vision.⁶² Among the disciples proper, we must mention John of Fribourg, about whom we have already spoken, John and Gerard of Sterngassen, Jean Picard of Lichtenberg ("representing without question the most eminent Cologne Thomism," says de Libera), Henry of Lübeck, and Nicholas of Strasbourg.

The last is the author of a *Summa*, without real scientific value if truth be told, but that draws its inspiration from Thomas and Albert (and from various other authors, among them Giles of Rome and Hervé Nédellec). Ruedi Imbach has brought to light his importance for the history of thought in this period.⁶³ Submitted for the approval of the master of the order, Nicholas's *Summa* seems to have been composed to respond to the recommendations of the general chapters and with an eye on becoming a manual for use by the friars in formation. It is interesting to note that the authors it refers to are all foreign to the nascent Cologne school. Completely ignored by Glorieux in his *Pro et contra Thomam*, it has rightly

(footnote continued from previous page)

rators on the *Corpus philosophorum teutonicorum medii aevi* held at Fribourg, Switzerland in October 1984: *Albert der Grosse und die deutsche Dominikaner schule. Philosophische Aspekte*, in *FZPT* 32 (1985) 3–271; we now have as well Maarten Hoenen and A. de Libera's *Albertus Magnus und der Albertismus*, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, vol. 48 (Leiden/New York/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1995).

⁶² For the links between Eckhart and Thomas, see R. Imbach, *Deus est intelligere. Das Verhältnis von Sein und Denken in seiner Bedeutung für das Gottesverständnis bei Thomas von Aquin und in den Pariser Quaestionen Meister Eckharts*, Studia Friburgensia, N. F. 53 (Fribourg, 1976).

⁶³ R. Imbach and U. Lindblad, "Compilatio rudis ac puerilis. Hinweise und Materialien zu Nikolaus von Strassburg und seiner *Summa*," *FZPT* 32 (1985) 155–233. The introductory remarks that we summarize above are followed by several appendixes that give, among other things, the plan for Nicholas's *Summa* as well as extracts that bring out the sources used.

returned amid the great attempt at clarification caused by so many contradictory positions in the period after Thomas.

With Nicholas, we are already at the beginning of the second quarter of the fourteenth century. Among those closer in time (he was master-regent in Paris probably between 1296 and 1298) and among the adversaries, the most eminent is certainly Dietrich of Freiburg, an unacknowledged precursor of modern philosophy in his discovery of subjectivity.⁶⁴ He was also the most virulent of the anti-Thomists and did nothing to hide it, so that we can easily identify the numerous points on which he shows his disagreement: from the real distinction between being and essence to the whole doctrine of the intellect, and in particular on the beatific vision; on the Eucharist, he criticizes without restraint the theory of accidents used by Thomas. But he also finds something to say against Thomas's theory of individuation through matter and against his angelology. Frequently, he piles up scornful qualifications: not only does he put Thomas and his disciples among the *communiter loquentes*, but their doctrine seems "elementary" to him, "ridiculous," "false," and even "sophistical." Under these conditions, we may rightly be astonished that Dietrich was never the object of the same "attention" that was paid to Durandus of Saint-Pourçain. In any case, it is certain that it is hardly possible to read him and, especially, to understand him in the abstract, apart from the internal conflicts within the Dominican order.

Among the indifferent figures, we must mention Ulrich of Strasbourg—who was a fellow student of Thomas in 1248 at Albert's school and is almost Thomas's exact contemporary both in birth and death. His *De Summo Bono* draws inspiration primarily from their common Master, Albert, and seems completely unaware of Thomas's work.⁶⁵ Grabmann earlier made known the majority of these names,⁶⁶ but the studies about them have not

⁶⁴ In addition to the chapter de Libera devotes to him (*La mystique rhénane*, pp. 163–229), see especially the important study by R. Imbach, "Gravis iactura verae doctrinae. Prolegomena zu einer Interpretation der Schrift *De ente et essentia* Dietrichs von Freiberg, O.P.," *FZPT* 26 (1979) 369–425. In French, a shorter but illuminating study is "Prétendue primauté de l'être sur le connaître. Perspectives cavalières sur Thomas d'Aquin et l'école dominicaine allemande," in *Lectionum varietates. Hommage à Paul Vignaux*, Etudes de Phil. méd. 65 (Paris, 1991), pp. 121–32. See also the chapter relating to Dietrich in the book, so new in many ways, by F. X. Putallaz, *La connaissance de soi au XIIIe siècle. De Matthieu d'Aquasparta à Thierry de Freiberg*, Etudes de Phil. médiévale 67 (Paris, 1991), a lovely example of a renewed approach to the literature of the period. Cf. R. Imbach, *Gravis iactura*, pp. 386–91.

⁶⁵ Cf. A. de Libera, *Introduction à la mystique rhénane*, pp. 99–162, and "Ulrich de Strasbourg, lecteur d'Albert le Grand," *FZPT* 32 (1985) 105–36.

⁶⁶ M. Grabmann, "Forschungen zur Geschichte der ältesten deutschen Thomistenschule

(footnote continued on next page)

ceased since the publication of their texts—unavailable until a short while ago—made them more accessible.⁶⁷

Doubtless, nowhere else do we know of a school of so strong a stamp as the one at Cologne. But it would be wrong to think that other countries were without intellectual representatives of high quality. In addition to the English authors we have already met,⁶⁸ we should recall the existence of several others from diverse regions of the France of that day. Without going too far beyond the beginning of the fourteenth century, there were John Quidort, Giles of Lessines, and Hervé Nédellec (already mentioned), to whom we must add Bernard of La Treille (or of Trilia), Peter of Auvergne (a non-Dominican and former student of Henry of Ghent and of Godfrey of Fontaines), who completed the commentary on the *Politics*, and Bernard of Auvergne (or of Gannat) who vigorously opposed Henry of Ghent and Godfrey of Fontaines.⁶⁹

Among the Italians, we know well Tolomeo of Lucca—who wrote not only the *Historia ecclesiastica*, but many other things, and probably finished the *De regno*. We have also already met Romano of Rome, Thomas's successor at Paris, Rambert of Bologna, author of a reply to William de la Mare. We will soon encounter John of Naples, who worked for the canonization.⁷⁰ But we should especially mention Remigio of Florence (Remigio dei Girolami) who is one of the best known because of his twofold distinction as "disciple of saint Thomas and master of Dante."⁷¹ It is prob-

(footnote continued from previous page)

des Dominikanerordens," in *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben* I, pp. 392–431 (reprinted from *Xenia Thomistica* III, pp. 189–231). We refer also to the valuable *status questionis* by R. Imbach, "(Néo)platonisme médiéval, Proclus latin et l'école dominicaine allemande," *Rev. Théol. phil.* 110 (1978) 427–48, who updates the bibliography of Grabmann's study and notably enlarges its perspectives.

⁶⁷. We cannot go through that literature here, but we must at least mention the *Corpus philosophorum teutonicorum medii aevi*, under the direction of K. Flasch and L. Sturlese, which has already published several of these texts. The edition is not yet complete, but the four volumes of Dietrich of Freiberg's *Opera omnia* have already appeared.

⁶⁸. We should add, at a slightly later date, Thomas of Wylton, secular master, regent in Paris from 1312 to 1323, who will be Thomas's great defender against Duns Scotus: Glorieux, "Pro et contra," pp. 281–83.

⁶⁹. A good first orientation to each of them may be found in F. J. Roensch, *Early Thomistic School*, pp. 84–117. This may be completed by consulting the bibliographical indications on each author in Käppeli.

⁷⁰. A first orientation on these figures is M. Grabmann's study "Die italienische Thomistenschule des XIII. und beginnenden XIV. Jahrhunderts," *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben* I, pp. 332–91. This should be complemented with Käppeli's bibliographical notes about each author.

⁷¹. This is the title of the study M. Grabmann dedicated to him (see the preceding note). Remigio certainly attended Thomas's courses during the second period of teaching in Paris, but

(footnote continued on next page)

able that Thomas's disciples in Italy were numerous and enthusiastic enough to call forth a reprimand from the 1308 Perugia chapter. They had dared to take the *Summa* as the basic text for teaching. They were firmly told to stick with the *Sentences*.⁷²

Since we are in Italy, it is not without interest to know that Thomas found there not only disciples in the proper sense of the term, but an unexpected diffusion among Jewish thinkers of the time. We can cite here Hillel of Verona, who might be called "the first Jewish Thomist." He translated into Hebrew the first part of the *De unitate intellectus* twenty years after its appearance and adopted Thomas's position on the immortality of the individual soul, not fearing to salute him as "the Maimonides of his age, even capable of responding to questions that the Master had left undecided."⁷³ In the following generation, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, we can also mention Jehudah ben Daniel Romano, who translated into Hebrew a whole series of "selected passages" of the scholastics of his time—Albertus Magnus and Giles of Rome notably—but especially Thomas Aquinas, from whom he reproduces 38 extracts from different works (especially from the two *Summa* and the *Super de causis*).⁷⁴

It will suffice for our purposes to have noted these few names so that the period immediately after Thomas will not be too incomplete. The young medieval scholar reading these lines—Thomist or not—should understand that the publication of critical editions of new texts as well as the revived reading of those that are already known both still contain many happy surprises, and the field open to investigation remains immense.⁷⁵

(footnote continued from previous page)

it is less certain that he had Dante among his own students, although this is entirely possible. See on this point the superb labors of E. Panella, *Per lo studio di fra Remigio dei Girolami (+ 1319). Contra falsos professores ecclesiae, Memorie Domenicane* N.S. 10 (1979) 11–313, cf. pp. 191–92 (Thomas), p. 212 (Dante); Panella, "Un'introduzione alla filosofia in uno 'studium' dei frati Predicatori del XIII secolo. *Diuisio scientie* di Remigio dei Girolami," *ibid.*, 12 (1981) 27–126.

⁷² MOPH 20, p. 169.

⁷³ A. Wohlman, *Thomas d'Aquin et Maïmonide*, pp. 325–26, and note 11, pp. 394–95. On Hillel, see C. Sirat, *La philosophie juive médiévale en terre de chrétienté* (Paris, 1988), pp. 83–84.

⁷⁴ Cf. G. Sermoneta, "Jehudah ben Moseh ben Daniel Romano, traducteur de saint Thomas," in *Hommage à Georges Vajda. Etudes d'histoire et de pensée juives*, ed. by (3. Nahon and (C. Touati (Louvain, 1980), pp. 235–62; Sermoneta, "Pour une histoire du thomisme juif," in *Aquinas and his Time*, pp. 150–35; (C. Sirat, *La philosophie juive*, pp. 84–86.

⁷⁵ It is easy to catch up with the relevant research and literature thanks to the useful bibliographic survey by (C. Viola, "L'Ecole thomiste au Moyen Age," in G. Floistad, ed., *La philosophie contemporaine. Chroniques nouvelles*, vol. 6/1, Philosophie et science au Moyen Age (Dordrecht/Boston/London, 1990), pp. 345–77.

Chapter XVI—

Epilogue:

The Canonization in Avignon

We come now to the last stage of this story. While the disciples and adversaries were confronting one another, other forces were at work—sometimes the same figures—who were occupied no longer solely with the intellectual but with the man of God. We should not be surprised, therefore, to see appear in these final pages some things as heterogeneous as a polemical literature and a bull of canonization, an apology arguing for Thomas's sanctity and an accusation directed against the Avignon papacy for having canonized in Thomas his brother's murderer.

A Well-Conducted Development

The canonization process was set in motion by John XXII himself. Jacques Duèse, elected pope 7 August 1316, wished to show his gratitude to the Dominican order, which had hosted the conclave at Lyon for two years, by canonizing one of its members. Raymond of Peñafort, who had been proposed by the king of Aragon, was not considered by the new pope, whose sympathies were with the House of Anjou.¹ An admirer of Thomas, he had bought from several suppliers an entire series of his works in 1317.

¹ A. Walz, "Papst Johannes XXII. und Thomas von Aquin. Zur Geschichte der Heiligsprechung des Aquinaten," in *Commemorative Studies* I, pp. 29–47, cf. p. 36; idem., "Historia canonizationis sancti Thomae de Aquino," *Xenia Thomistica* III, pp. 105–72; cf. pp. 118–22; L. V. Gerulaitis, "The Canonization of Saint Thomas Aquinas," *Vivarium* 5 (1967) 25–46.

We still have the list and the prices.² There have also been found in the Vatican Library a series of fourteen beautiful volumes recopied for him between 1316 and 1324. And annotations in his hand attest the use he made of them.³

On the Dominican side, the initiative came from the Sicilian province (independent of the Roman province beginning in 1294), whose chapter meeting at Gaeta, probably in September 1317, entrusted William of Tocco, then prior of the priory at Benevento, and Robert of Benevento, his socius, to promote the canonization.⁴ Various indications allow us to think that Tocco had already occupied himself for a long time in gathering together documents and memories among the Aquinas family. Thus, we see him in Salerno in 1316, with Friar Thomas of Aversa, at the home of the count of Marsico who, we recall, was the son of Theodora, the second sister of Friar Thomas Aquinas.⁵ Tocco will see him again in the Abruzzi in November 1317 and in February 1318, he will also meet there with the aged Lady Catherine de Morra—daughter of Maria, the saint's third sister—who provided him with some recollections that she said she got from her grandmother Theodora, Thomas's own mother.⁶

Tocco was evidently known for this activity as an inquirer, and Bartholomew of Capua says that he was eager to convey to him a fact that he had learned from John of Giudice. William himself tells how he learned certain things from Tolomeo of Lucca.⁷ We also know that he went to Fossanova where, prior to the beginning of the process in Naples, he passed four months (from the Easter octave until, 15 or 17 July), questioning witnesses about Thomas's final days and the beneficiaries of various healings.⁸

He recounts himself how he went to Avignon and was received by the pope in August 1318. He was the bearer of a first list of miracles performed

² *Documenta* 54, pp. 664–66.

³ A. Dondaine, "La Collection des oeuvres de saint Thomas dite de Jean XXII et Jaquet Maci," *Scriptorium* 29 (1975) 127–52 (with plates), cf. pp. 127–28 with bibliography.

⁴ Tocco, miracle 10, p. 147, recalls the mission he received at the point where he introduces a miracle from which he benefitted during a sea voyage to the Curia, then at Avignon. Tocco was still prior in 1319 during his deposition at the canonization process (*Naples* 58, p. 345).

⁵ *Ystoria* 70, pp. 408–10 (Tocco 70, p. 144), and *Naples* 95, pp. 402–4 (testimony by Thomas of Aversa that permits the dating of Tocco's story); *Ystoria* 37, pp. 317–20 (Tocco 37, pp. 110–11); cf. Le Brun-Gouanvic, *Introduction à l'Ystoria*, pp. 6ff; P. Mandonnet, "La canonisation de saint Thomas d'Aquin, 1317–1323," in *Mélanges Thomistes*, Bibl. thom. 3 (Paris, 1923), pp. 1–48, cf. pp. 21–25.

⁶ *Naples* 60 and 62, pp. 347–48 and 350–51.

⁷ *Naples* 79, p. 378; 60, pp. 347–48.

⁸ *Naples* 73–75, pp. 351–55; Tocco, miracle 13, p. 149.

through Thomas's intercession, a letter from the nobles of the kingdom of Sicily who asked for Thomas's canonization, and a first version of his *Ystoria*.⁹ After Tocco explained his mission to the consistory of cardinals at the pope's request, the latter officially introduced the cause on 13 September 1318 and designated three delegates to conduct the preliminary inquest.¹⁰ This took place in Naples from 21 July to 18 September 1319. It heard 42 witnesses, 16 of whom—as we have already seen—knew the saint personally. Tocco was in Naples for the whole length of the process, having full leisure to meet with each witness and to note his recollections, thus completing the inquiry that he had conducted in the region around Fossanova.

At the end of 1320 or at the beginning of 1321, Tocco, constantly accompanied by Robert of Benevento, was again in Avignon with another collection of miracles that had occurred at Fossanova. The last version of the text—as it was re-established by Claire Le Brun-Gouanvic—shows that this new collection of miracles resulted from an enquiry made by the archbishop of Viterbo upon his return from Naples.¹¹ Since he was not accompanied by the archbishop of Naples, his co-assessor, the canonical forms were not, strictly, observed. The pope, therefore, ordered a second official inquest on 1 June 1321 and named three new delegates for the proceedings: Peter Ferri, bishop of Anagni; Andrew, bishop of Terracina; and Pandolpho Savelli, the pontifical notary assigned to the first process who had not been able to attend.¹² This new procedure unfolded in Fossanova from 10 to 20 November 1321. It heard 112 people, but, dedicated solely to the *miracula post mortem*, it did not bring forward any new details about Thomas's biography. Tocco, then quite old, had to decline the carrying of this dossier to the pope. He was followed in this second phase of the affair by John of Naples, another faithful supporter of Thomas, who had begun teaching several years earlier in Paris and continued in Naples in the autumn of 1317.¹³ He himself would not be able to come to Avignon

⁹ Tocco, miracle 12, pp. 148–49; cf. *Naples* 60, p. 348, which allows us to specify the date; in his fourth version Tocco put ahead of the story about his reception by the pope another concerning a miracle whose beneficiary was his companion (*Ystoria*, p. 9).

¹⁰ *Naples* 3, pp. 269–71; the three delegates were Humberto, archbishop of Naples; Angelo, bishop of Viterbo; and Pandolpho of Savelli, the pontifical notary. For reasons we do not know, the last was not present, and the other two alone conducted the process. Tocco would have wished this to be at Fossanova (he waited for the delegates there), but because the archbishop was not able to travel, the hearings were held in Naples, cf. Mandonnet, "La canonisation," pp. 28–29.

¹¹ Cf. *Introduction à l'Ystoria*, pp. 13ff.

¹² *Fossanova* III, 412–15.

¹³ Giovanni Regina, better known by the name John of Naples, began teaching the *Sen-*

(footnote continued on next page)

for the ceremony, and it was Friar Peter Canterii who gave the discourse that John had prepared.¹⁴ But according to Le Brun-Gouanvic, Tocco continued to work on the final text of his history until after the canonization (he recounts that he heard the news while he was in Naples), at least until August 1323.¹⁵

The two stories about the festivities that took place in Avignon as well as the bull of canonization allow us to confirm that in this process and its conclusion a remarkable conjunction of causes converged.¹⁶

The spontaneous spread of the saint's cult in the earliest days was very quickly relayed into the mustering of the Dominican order around Thomas's doctrine. For several figures just mentioned, it was doubtless not hard to be identified with it (as an abundant literature attests). This was accompanied by the support of three Dominican cardinals (Nicholas Alberti, Nicholas of Frâauville, and William Peter Godin) and of the procurator general of the order in Avignon, Bernard Gui, who effectively supports Tocco, whose biography he will soon have to rewrite in his own way. As to the relevant expenses, they were borne by the contribution of a florin per priory, decreed by the Rouen general chapter in 1320.¹⁷

To this was added the support of the nobles of the kingdom of Sicily, who saw themselves being exalted in one of their own. André Vauchez has justly emphasized the presence of a hagiographical commonplace in Tocco that is highly significant in the present case: "Thomas was predestined for sainthood by the nobility of his ancestors."¹⁸ An entire chapter of the *Ystoria* strongly insists on this theme and explicitly mentions Theodora, Thomas's sister, and her son Thomas, the count of Marsico. By obtaining from the abbot of Fossanova in 1288 an important relic (the right hand), Theodora doubtless satisfied her own personal devotion, but when

(footnote continued from previous page)

tences in Paris, probably in the fall of 1309. He received his license there in November 1315, and was master-regent for the two following years. After Hervé Nédellec's death (1323), he became one of the most influential theologians in John XXII's circle. Cf. T. Käppeli, "Note sugli scrittori domenicani di nome Giovanni di Napoli, I. Giovanni Regina di Napoli," *AFP* 10 (1940) 48–71; T. Turley, "An Unnoticed Quaestio of Giovanni Regina di Napoli," *AFP* 54 (1984) 281–91.

¹⁴. *Fontes*, p. 514.

¹⁵. *Introduction* to the *Ystoria*, pp. 18 and 162–64.

¹⁶. *Fontes*, pp. 511–18. The two stories—one anonymous, the other from a Dominican friar named Bentius—are reproduced in parallel. The second adds valuable material to the first. The bull of canonization may be found in *Fontes*, pp. 519–30, or in *Xenia Thomistica*, vol. 3, pp. 173–88.

¹⁷. *MOPH* 4, p. 123.

¹⁸. *Ystoria* 37, pp. 317–19 (Tocco 37, pp. 110–11); cf. Vauchez, "Les canonisations," p. 756; Vauchez, *La sainteté en Occident*, pp. 209–15.

in 1309 she conveyed it to the Dominican priory at Salerno where so many miracles were accomplished, she effectively contributed to the spread of Thomas's cult.¹⁹ We may also think that the count of Marsico and his cousin Catherine did not entrust their recollections exclusively to Tocco. We also recall that the process at Naples allowed several lay persons to testify about Thomas's position "among the great and the lettered" doubtless—let us say the intellectual aristocracy—but not only among them, since "even educated lay people are trying to get his works," because each person can teach himself with them according to his capacities.²⁰ The political will of King Robert (who, present at the canonization, was satisfied with the part he had played in the happy conclusion) was thus well supported by a true groundswell of public opinion.²¹

The Canonization and Its Consequences

The final determination evidently came from John XXII. It was he who proclaimed the canonization on 18 July 1323 and who extolled the 300 miracles by the new saint. The pope has been furnished with a celebrated saying that he seems never to have said: "As many miracles as articles" (*et quod tot fecerat miracula quot scripserat articulos*).²² In fact, one is a little surprised that the bull *Redemptionem misit* is not more explicit on Thomas's intellectual work. The text does mention his having been master in *sacra pagina* and his teaching. But if we remember that the intellectual dimension of sainthood had hardly been taken into account up to that time, then we can truly appreciate John XXII's allusion to Thomas's devotion to study and the care he took to prepare himself through prayer for teaching as some of the reasons for the canonization.²³ We also know that

¹⁹. *Ystoria* 68 and 70, pp. 402 and 408 (Tocco 68 and 70, pp. 141 and 144); *Naples* 95, p. 402.

²⁰. *Naples* 84, p. 385: Thomas's sanctity was of public notoriety "specialiter apud magnates, bonos et litteratos viros." *Naples* 83, *ibid.*: "quilibet secundum modulum seu cogitationis seu capacitatis potest facile capere fructum ex scriptis eiusdem, et propterea etiam layci et parum intelligentes querunt et appetunt ipsa scripta habere."

²¹. According to the anonymous story of the canonization (*Fontes*, p. 517), when the Dominican friars went to thank him for his persistent labors in this matter (*qui fideliter laboraverat in facto sancti Thome*), the king replied: "Nos ira efficaciter laboravimus et laborasse volumus. . . ." See some of the indications about his discourse on the vigil in Walz, *Historia canonisationis*, pp. 169–72.

²². According to Mandonnet, "La canonization," pp. 38–39, Percin, the seventeenth-century editor, did not create the saying. It already existed well before him and we can find the equivalent in Getson: *tot miracula fecit, quot quaestiones determinavit* (cf. *Fontes*, p. 514).

²³. *Documenta*, pp. 520 and 521: "ad theologie . . . magisterium . . . assumptus . . . per

(footnote continued on next page)

the pope had his doctrine examined and that the *Concordantia dictorum fratris Thomae*, attributed to Benedict of Asinago, could have been put together for this purpose.²⁴ Except for this, the bull essentially consists in a summary biography and an accurate account of the saint's virtues as they may be seen through the depositions at the process in Naples or in Tocco's biography. The composer of the bull made it a virtual tissue of reminiscences and simply added a selection of nine miracles.²⁵

The doctrinal perspective was not, however, absent from John XXII's thought. The bull is happy to be able to put forward in Thomas a model of fidelity to the Roman Church. But it is especially one of the sermons given on the vigil of the canonization that celebrates in well-grounded terms Thomas's teaching on religious poverty: "It gave a remarkable encomium as much of the order as of the saint. It said among other things that the saint led the apostolic life in the Order of Preachers, since in the order one possesses nothing on his own or in private, though there is property in common. Adding then: 'It is this that we think to be the apostolic life' (*Et hanc vitam apostolicam reputamus*)."²⁶ It was not unintentionally that, in his fourth version, Tocco introduced a charge against the eternal and spiritual gospel of Gerard de Borgo San Donnino.²⁷

Furthermore, this was not mistaken. In the exalted atmosphere of the spiritual Franciscans, this canonization was considered "a veritable provocation by the adepts of voluntary poverty."²⁸ We have an astonishing echo of this in the confession of Dame Prous Boneta, a Beguine from Montpellier. Arrested under suspicion of heresy, she was brought before the tribunal of the Inquisition at Carcassonne on 6 August 1325, probably before dying at the stake. Speaking of her revelations, she compares Peter

(footnote continued from previous page)

multorum annorum curricula cathedram (regit) magistralem (. . .) profecro vacans studio, intendebat Deo. . premittebat divina ut roboraretur in scola . . . " See A. Vauchez, "Culture et canonisation après les procès de canonisation des XIII^e et XIV^e siècles," in *Le scuole degli Ordini mendicanti* (Todi, 1978), pp. 151–72, for the evolution in this direction. It seems to have been a policy of the Avignon popes to canonize theologians.

²⁴ R.-A. Gauthier, *BT* 9, no. 1800, pp. 941–43 (for a hesitant attribution); Walz *Papst Johannes XXII.*, p. 42; Grabmann, *Werke*, pp. 411–12; T. Käppeli, "Benedetto di Asinago da Como (+ 1339)," *AFP* 11 (1941) 83–94; cf. pp. 90–91.

²⁵ Vauchez errs therefore and must be thinking of another document when he says that the Bull "is among the most explicit: against the unfurling of heretical doctrines—those of the spirituals, the averroists, and the nominalists" ("Les canonisations," p. 761).

²⁶ Anonymous account: *Fontes*, pp. 513–14. Friar Bentius's account says the same thing more briefly (*ibid.*).

²⁷ *Ystoria* 21, p. 270.

²⁸ Vauchez, "Les canonisations," p. 761.

Olivi and Thomas Aquinas to the two brothers Abel and Cain. The original Cain had killed his brother bodily; the second Cain, recently canonized, killed his brother spiritually, which is to say, with respect to his writings.²⁹ Prous Boneta had certainly not read the scholarly works of the two authors, but her deposition surely reflects the opinion of the spiritual Franciscan friars with whom she must have conversed.³⁰

The reverberation of this canonization was no less considerable in intellectual circles.³¹ We must not imagine that the March 1277 condemnation had paralyzed Parisian intellectual life. The *Correctoria* literature shows the opposite, and we also know that Thomas's works continued to be diffused. The booksellers' lists witness to this after 1275 with certainty (these are the most ancient catalogues that we possess).³² The English origin (one from before 1293) of the Prague lists testifies that, in Oxford too, Thomas's works continued to be studied and recopied.

Some voices began to be raised that Thomas be absolved of the accusation of heterodoxy laid more or less openly on him after Tempier's condemnation. Giles of Rome's rehabilitation in 1285 was a first favorable sign. Several years later, in 1295, in a quodlibet session—which is to say, with all the publicity that could be desired—a famous master, Godfrey of Fontaines was asked—or had himself asked—about a delicate question: "Doesn't the bishop of Paris commit a sin if he fails to correct certain articles condemned by his predecessor?" He replied with remarkable praise for the "very reverend and very excellent Friar Thomas," concluding without condemning the bishop—who in his opinion, he says, is a better jurist than a theologian—that he does not himself see how someone could excuse him from not making that rectification, for he conceded that the articles in question well deserved to be corrected.³³

²⁹ This text has been edited by W. H. May, "The Confession of Prous Boneta, Heretic and Heresiarch," in *Essays in Medieval Life and Thought Presented in Honor of A. P. Evans* (New York, 1955), pp. 3–30; cf. p. 24. This text is mentioned by d'Alverny, "Un adversaire," p. 178. Cf. Vauchez, "Les canonizations," p. 761.

³⁰ If we might temper this tragedy with a picturesque note, we should recall an echo of the canonization ceremony as seen by the anonymous writer: "No one pronounced so many praises of Saint Thomas as he did," he says in speaking of John of Tixanderie, the Franciscan bishop of Lodève (*Fontes*, p. 515).

³¹ Cf. M. Grabmann, "Die Kanonisation des hl. Thomas von Aquin in ihrer Bedeutung für die Ausbreitung und Verteidigung seiner Lehre im 14. Jahrhundert," *DT* (Fr.) 1 (1923) 233–49.

³² *Chartul.* no. 540, p. 646 (cf. above on the *De malo*).

³³ Godfrey of Fontaines, *Quodlibet XII*, q. 5, ed. J. Hoffmans, *Les Quodlibets onze-quatorze de Godefroid de Fontaines*, Les Philosophes belges, vol. V, fasc. I–II (Louvain, 1932), pp. 100–

(footnote continued on next page)

It was a magnanimous gesture, for Godfrey was hardly being spared by Thomas's confreres.³⁴ The Dominicans did not lag behind, and we must at least remember the remarkable intervention by John of Naples who, during the time of his Parisian regency, disputed two quodlibets, one of which contained a question that remained celebrated: "Can one licitly teach in Paris Friar Thomas's doctrine in all its implications?"³⁵ The response evidently did not leave any doubt.

The step called for by a growing number of theologians was taken on 14 February 1325 by the bishop of Paris, Stephen Bourret, who annulled his predecessor's condemnation *to the extent that it affects Saint Thomas*. In the forefront of the considerations that he put forward figures evidently the fact that by canonizing him the Roman Church, *mater et magistra* of all the faithful, had put forward the saint as an example for the whole world for the purity of his life and his doctrine. But it should be noted that the bishop had the articles concerned reexamined and it was after having received the opinion of his experts that he took this step. He added, however, that it constituted neither approval nor rejection, but that it simply restored them to discussion in the schools.³⁶

Doctor Ecclesiae

The way was then open for the career that we know and for the hyperboles that his disciples have long taken delight in. Are these only a question of personal judgments or must we already speak of "titles" among the most ancient testimonies, such as *Doctor eximius* (around 1282–83 in Knapwell)³⁷ or of *Venerabilis doctor* (*pater, uir, magister*) in the Acts of the General Chapters (starting in 1278) and in Thomas of Sutton?³⁸ The ques-

(footnote continued from previous page)

105; cf. pp. 102–3. This text had already been edited with a less summary commentary by M.-H. Laurent, "Godefroid de Fontaines et la condamnation de 1277," *RT* 35 (1930) 273–81; the bishop at the time was Simon Matifas, the second successor to Tempier, after Ranulphe de La Houblonnière.

³⁴. We recall here only the attacks by Bernard of Auvergne against him: Glorieux, "Pro et contra," p. 273.

³⁵. *Quodl.* VI (I) a. 2; cf. P. Glorieux, *Littérature quodlibétique*, vol. 2, p. 164. The text has been edited by C. Jellouschek, "Quaestio Magistri Ioannis de Neapoli O. Pr.: *Utrum licite possit doceri Parisius doctrina fratris Thomae quantum ad omnes conclusiones ejus* hic primum in lucem edita," in *Xenia Thomistica III*, pp. 73–104. In addition to Käppeli's study mentioned above (note 13), see also P. Mandonnet, "Premiers travaux," pp. 255–58.

³⁶. *Chartul.* II, no. 838, pp. 280–81.

³⁷. Cf. Glorieux, *Premières polémiques*, p. 208; cf. P. Mandonnet, "Les titres doctoraux de saint Thomas d'Aquin," *RT* (1909) 597–608.

³⁸. Cf. A. Dondaine, "*Venerabilis Doctor*," in *Mélanges offerts à Etienne Gilson* (Toronto, Paris, 1959), 211–25.

tion has only a relative importance. Tolomeo of Lucca says in 1317, however, that Thomas was already called *communis Doctor* at the University of Paris.³⁹ As to the title *Doctor angelicus*, it was attributed to him only in the second half of the fifteenth century,⁴⁰ and it was another hundred years later, 15 April 1567, that Saint Pius V, a Dominican pope, proclaimed him Doctor of the Church.⁴¹

Everyone may choose according to his own taste from these titles. *Friar* Thomas would probably have been preferred by Thomas himself—as is said of the founder of his order: "Friar Dominic." Objectively, it seems that *doctor ecclesiae* would be the most significant, but there is no immediate evidence for it.

The liturgy today celebrates more than thirty "Doctors of the Church,"⁴² which is to say that the title is not very exclusive. At the time when Saint Thomas received it, there were four—Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory the Great—and their liturgical celebrations became definitive for the universal church only under Boniface VIII in 1295. When Pius V accorded the same honor to Thomas, he introduced at the same time into the breviary the four great doctors of the Eastern Church: Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and John Chrysostom.

It was thus an act that was not without meaning on the part of John XXII to choose for the ordinary of the Mass that followed the canonization some passages already used for the Doctors of the Church. And we may even see in this and in many other indications the place that he thus recognized for Thomas. The Introit *In medio ecclesiae* and the response *Os iusti* (Jerome and Augustine), as well as the Gospel *You are the light of the world* (used for all four) are explicitly as one would have it. Friar Bentius, from whom we have this description, adds for the information of his correspondent a couple of details: it was like the Mass of Saint Dominic (*sicut de beato Dominico*); the *alleluia* was new, very beautiful, but a little long.⁴³

³⁹. Tolomeo XXIII 9 (Ferrua, p. 362); cf. already James of Viterbo: *Naples* 83, p. 384.

⁴⁰. Mandonnet, "Les Titres doctoraux," p. 606, refers to Saint Antoninus (+ 1459) for its first use

⁴¹. Walz, "Historia canonizationis," pp. 162–64; idem., "San Tommaso d'Aquino dichiarato dottore della Chiesa nel 1567," *Angelicum* 44 (1967) 145–73.

⁴². A list of twenty-one names that goes from Saint Bonaventure (1588) to Saint Lawrence of Brindisi may be found in Walz, "San Tommaso," *Angelicum* 44 (1967) 146. We must add here the four great doctors of the West and the four great doctors of the East, as well as Saint Theresa of Avila and Saint Catherine of Siena.

⁴³. *Fontes*, p. 516: *alleluia pucherissimum novum sed longum*.

Nothing about all this is, however, specific. We must say this as well about the proper parts of the Mass, the Preface and Collect of the beginning of Mass: they are beautiful, certainly, and of an entirely Roman concision, but without very much originality. More significant, perhaps, as to the intentions of those who wished to honor Thomas, the choice for the first lesson abandons the text of Saint Paul, universally used for the four preceding doctors and for Saint Dominic,⁴⁴ and prefers instead a reading from the Book of Wisdom, which celebrates the just man who, from all the goods that are offered to him, chooses wisdom: "I have held riches as nothing compared to her . . . More than health and beauty I have loved her. . . . What I have learned in all sincerity, I have handed on without envy. . . . Those who acquired wisdom became the friends of God."⁴⁵ These sentences take on particular importance for anyone who has followed the life of the new saint, step by step. The seeker is there without question, as well as the master *in sacra pagina*, but also the mystic glimpsed through the depositions at the process in Naples. Without facilely harmonizing all those elements, this is surely the image that we too can retain of him.

⁴⁴. 2 Timothy 4:1–8: "I beseech you before God and Christ Jesus . . . proclaim the Word. . . ."

⁴⁵. Wisdom 7:7–14.

Brief Chronology

Note: Matters that directly concern Thomas are in italics. Unless otherwise indicated, the dates that refer to him and that straddle two different years should be understood to reflect the length of the academic year. There is an intellectual chronology of this period in F. Van Steenberghen, *La Philosophie au XIII^e siècle*, which is very detailed but less precise on Thomas.

1215 (Toulouse)

Foundation of the Order of Preachers (Dominicans).

1217 (Sept.–Oct.)

Foundation of the Dominican priory in Paris.

1218 (August)

The friars settle in Saint-Jacques.

1220 (22 Nov.)

Crowning of Emperor Frederick II.

1221 (6 August)

Death of Saint Dominic.

1222–1237

Jordan of Saxony, master of the Dominican Order.

1224

Foundation of the university at Naples.

1224/1225

Thomas's birth at Roccasecca (region of Naples).

1229

Roland of Cremona, first Dominican regent-master at Paris (first chair).

1239

John of Saint-Gilles, second Dominican regent-master at Paris (second chair).

ca. 1230–1239

Thomas an oblate at the Benedictine abbey of Monte Cassino.

1238–1240

Raymond of Peñafort, master of the order.

1239–1244

Studies at Naples.

1241–1252

John of Wildeshausen (John the Teuton), master of the order.

1243/44

Albertus Magnus arrives in Paris.

1244 (April)

Thomas takes the Dominican habit.

1244–1245

Forced detention at Roccasecca by Thomas's family.

1245 (17 July)

Frederick II deposed.

1245 (Fall)

Thomas is able to return to the Dominicans.

1245–1248

Studies in Paris with Saint Albertus Magnus.

1248–1252

Studying and assisting Saint Albert in Cologne: *Super Isaiaam*.

1252–1256

First period of teaching in Paris as bachelor of the Sentences: *Scriptum super Sententiis*; *De ente et essentia*; *De principiis naturae*.

1254–1263

Humbert of Romans, master of the Order of Preachers.

1256 (spring)

Thomas becomes a master in theology.

1256–1259

Regent-master in Paris: *Q. D. De ueritate*; *Quodlibet VII–XI*; *Super Boetium de Trin.*; *C. impugnantes*.

1257 (15 August)

Thomas and Bonaventure are admitted to the *consortium magistrorum*.

1259 (June)

General Chapter in Valenciennes.

1259 (autumn?)

Return to Italy.

1259–1261

Naples (?): *Summa Contra Gentiles* (begun)

1261–1265

Conventual Lector in Orvieto: *Summa Contra Gentiles* (finished); *Super Iob*; *Catena aurea* (Matthew); *C. errores Graecorum*; etc.

1264–1283

John of Vercelli, master of the Order of Preachers.

1265–1268

Regent-master at Rome: *Prima Pars*; *Catena aurea* (Mark, Luke, John); *De potentia*; *Sententia libri De anima*; *Compendium theologiae*; etc.

1268–1272

Second regency in Paris: *Secunda Pars*; *In Matthaum*; *In Ioannem*; *De malo*; *De unitate intellectus*; *De aeternitate mundi*; *Comment. on Aristotle*; *Quodlibet I–VI and XII*; etc.

1268 (7 October)

Stephen Tempier becomes bishop of Paris.

1269 (June)

General chapter in Paris. (*De secreto*).

1270 (10 December)

Bishop's condemnation of radical Aristotelianism.

1272–1273 (Dec.)

Regent-master in Naples: *Tertia Pars*, qq. 1–90; *In Ad Romanos*(?); *Super Psalmos 1–54*(?).

1274 (7 March)

Death in Fossanova (south of Rome, on the way to the council of Lyon).

1274 (2 May)

Letter from the arts faculty to the general chapter of Lyon reclaiming some of Thomas's writing.

1277 (7 March)

Condemnation by Stephen Tempier, bishop of Paris, of 219 heterodox propositions; a process is opened against Thomas's doctrine.

1277 (18 March)

Condemnation in Oxford, by Robert Kilwardby, Dominican archbishop of Canterbury, of propositions inspired by Thomas's work.

1284 (29 October)

John Pecham, Franciscan archbishop of Canterbury, confirms his predecessor's condemnations.

1319 (summer)

First canonization process (Naples).

1321 (November)

Second canonization process (Fossanova).

1323 (18 July)

Canonization in Avignon by John XXII.

1325 (14 Feb.)

Stephen Bourret, bishop of Paris, revokes the condemnation of March 1277.

1567 (15 April)

Thomas is proclaimed "Doctor ecclesiae" by Pope Pius V.

Brief Catalogue of the Works of Saint Thomas Aquinas

by G. Emery, O.P.

Adapted for the English Edition

The following catalogue briefly summarizes the main indications given in the course of this book concerning Saint Thomas's works, the dates and places of their composition, their essential purpose, as well as the principal editions and translations of them that have been completed. The classification of these works, for which there does not exist a commonly accepted system, presents a certain difficulty. The order of the following list is inspired by, even as it adapts, the one established by J. A. Weisheipl, following I. T. Eschmann¹:

- Theological Syntheses
- Disputed Questions
- Biblical Commentaries
- Commentaries on Aristotle
- Other Commentaries
- Polemical Writings
- Treatises
- Letters and Requests for Expert Opinion
- Liturgical Work, Sermons, Prayers

Numerous unauthentic works have been assigned to Thomas by a tradition frequently generous in its attributions. The principal texts in this category will be indicated at the end of this catalogue.

¹ J. A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino: His Life, Thought, and Work* (New York: Doubleday, 1974; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1983), 355–405.
I. T. Eschmann, "A Catalogue of St. Thomas's Works," in E. Gilson, *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*," translated by L. K. Shook, New York, 1956, p. 381–437.

Main Editions of Saint Thomas's Works

The Leonine Edition: *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis doctoris angelici Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII. O. M. edita*, cura et studio fratrum praedicatorum, Romae, 1882–(29 volumes had appeared by 1996)

Parma: *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis Doctoris angelici ordinis predicatorum Opera omnia ad fidem optimarum editionum accurate recognita*, Parmae typis Petri Fiaccadori, 25 vols., 1852–73; Reprint: New York, Musurgia, 1948–50

Vivès: *Doctoris angelici divi Thomae Aquinatis sacri Ordinis F.F. Praedicatorum Opera omnia sive antehac excusa, sive etiam anecdota . . .*, studio ac labore Stanislai Eduardi Fretté et Pauli Maré Sacerdotum, Scholaeque thomisticae Alumnorum, Parisiis apud Ludovicum Vivès, 34 vols., 1871–72.

To facilitate the use of this last edition, consult the table drawn up by C. Viola, "Table générale et index analytique des oeuvres complètes de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Un guide pour l'édition Vivès," *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale SIEPM* 29 (1987) 178–92. For the connections between the Parma edition and the Vivès edition as well as earlier editions, see L.-J. Bataillon, "Le edizioni di Opera omnia degli scolastici e l'edizione leonina," in *Gli studi di filosofia medievale fra otto e novecento*, Contributo a un bilancio storiografico, Atti del convegno internazionale, Rome, 21–23 September 1989, edited by R. Imbach and A. Maierù, Rome, 1991 (printed in 1992), pp. 141–54.

We also point out the volumes that have appeared in the Marietti edition in Turin, the works edited by P. Mandonnet as well as the principal separate editions. For the opuscula in particular see: *S. Thomae Aquinatis, Opuscula omnia*, P. Mandonnet ed., 6 vols., Paris, Lethielleux, 1927; ed. Marietti: *Opuscula philosophica*, R. M. Spiazzi, ed., 1954; *Opuscula theologica*, R. A. Verardo and R. M. Spiazzi, eds., 2 vols., 1954. The opuscula have been translated into French by M. Védérine, M. Bandel, and M. Fournet: *Opuscules de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, 7 vols., Paris, Vivès, 1856–58; Reprint, 6 vols., Paris, 1984.

Finally, let us point out the edition established for the *Index Thomisticus*: *S. Thomae Aquinatis Opera omnia ut sunt in Indice Thomistico . . .*, curante R. Busa, 7 vols., Stuttgart—Bad Cannstatt, 1980. We recommend it particularly for the text of the sermons and of the *Lectura super Psalmos*.

Translations

In addition to the English and French translations, we will indicate some of the main translations into other languages for the works of theological synthesis, the disputed questions, and the commentaries. Other translations have been mentioned in the course of this book.²

² Lists may be found of the English translations in the catalogue of works by Weisheipl, *ibid.* For Italian: S. Vanni Rovighi, *Introduzione a Tommaso d'Aquino*, Rome-Bari,² 1981, p. 164. For the philosophical opuscula, *San Tommaso d'Aquino, L'uomo e l'universo, Opuscoli filosofici*, A. Tognolo ed., Milan 1982. *Opuscoli filosofici: l'ente e l'essenzia, l'unità dell'intelletto, le sostanze separate*, translation, introduction, and notes by A. Lobato, Rome 1989.

(footnote continued on next page)

Theological Syntheses

Scriptum super libros Sententiarum: see chapter 3.

The commentary on the four books of Peter Lombard's *Sentences* is the first major work by Thomas; fruit of his teaching as bachelor of *Sentences* at the beginning of his first stay in Paris (1252–54), its composition was not yet complete when Thomas began his activities as a master (1256). More than a simple commentary, we must see in this vast collection of questions raised by Lombard's text, encompassing all of theology, an original theological work in its own right, a revelation of Thomas's thought and decisions.

Editions: *Scriptum super Sententiis*, P. Mandonnet ed., 2 vols., Paris, 1929 (Books I and II); M. F. Moos, ed., 2 vols., Paris, 1933 and 1947 (Book III; Book IV up to distinction 22); Parma vols. 6–7, 1/2; Vivès vols. 7–11. Until a critical edition appears, see also: P.-M. Gils, "Textes inédits de S. Thomas: les premières rédactions du *Scriptum super Tertio Sententiarum*," *RSPT* 45 (1961) 201–28; 46 (1962) 445–62 and 609–28. Editing of the Leonine edition of Books II and III (vols. 18 and 19, respectively) is nearing completion.

There is no English or French translation.

According to Tolomeo of Lucca, Thomas would return to his commentary on the *Sentences* in Rome, before abandoning it for the *Summa theologiae*. That return is attested in an Oxford manuscript (*Lincoln College*, lat. 95) that Leonard Boyle was able to identify as being a *reportatio* on this revision of the first Book of the *Sentences* in Rome (1265–66). While we await the complete edition, there is an edition of 15 relevant passages by H.-F. Dondaine: "Alia lectura fratris Thome" (Super I Sent.), *MS* 42 (1980) 308–36. (Before Boyle's examination, H.-F. Dondaine's conclusion was negative about the Thomistic authenticity of this manuscript.) For an idea of the content, see the list of the *incipits* and the *explicits* by M. F. Johnson, "Alia lectura fratris thome": A List of the New Texts Found in Lincoln College, Oxford, MS Lat. 95," *RTAM* 57 (1990) 34–61.

Summa contra Gentiles: see chapter 6.

The *Summa contra Gentiles* is Thomas's second great work, which he reread, modified, and corrected several times. We still have his handwritten manuscripts for a good part of the text, from I, 13 to III, 20. The earliest version of chapter 53 of Book I goes back to the last year of his first teaching assignment in Paris (prior to the summer of 1259). In Italy, starting in 1260, Thomas revised these 53 chapters and composed the rest of the work, which was completed with the composition of the fourth Book in 1264–65, very probably before Thomas's departure for Rome (1265). The first three Books are dedicated to the truths accessible to human reason: what reason can know

(footnote continued from previous page)

For German: O. H. Pesch, *Thomas von Aquin, Grenze und Grösse mittelalterlichen Theologie*, Mayence, 1988, p. 406–408. Among the Spanish translations of the opuscula, we mention in particular *Santo Tomás de Aquino, Escritos de Cataquesis*, edition directed by J. I. Saranyana, Madrid, 1974 (translation of the sermons on the *Credo*, *Pater*, *Ave Maria*: *De articulis fidei et ecclesiae sacramentis*); *Compendio de teologia*, translation and notes by J. I. Saranyana and J. Restrepo Escobar, Madrid, 1980.

about God (I); the act of creation and its effects (II); providence and divine governance (III). The truths of the Christian faith that exceed the realm of natural knowledge make up the material of the fourth Book (the mysteries of the Trinity and of the Incarnation, the sacraments, and the last ends).

Editions: Leonine, vols. 13–15 (with commentary by Sylvester of Ferrara), Rome, 1918, 1926, and 1930; Leonine, manual edition, Rome, 1934; Parma, vol. 5; Vivès, vol. 12; Marietti (*Textus Leoninus diligenter recognitus*), C. Pera, P. Marc, P. Caramello, eds., 3 vols. (vols. 2–3: 1961; vol. 1: 1967).

English translations: *Saint Thomas Aquinas, On the Truth of the Catholic Faith*, A. C. Pegis, J. F. Anderson, V. J. Bourke, C.J. O'Neil, eds., 5 vols., New York, 1955–57, repr. Notre Dame, 1975. *Summa Contra Gentiles*, trans. English Dominican Fathers. London, 1934; *Of God and His Creatures*, trans. J. Rickaby, Westminster, MD., 1950. French translations: *Somme contre les gentils*, ed. Henri Hude, Paris, 1993, with Introduction by R.-A. Gauthier. *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Contra Gentiles*, Leonine edition text and translation: vol. 1, trans. R. Bernier and M. Corvez, Paris, 1961; vol. 2, trans. M. Corvez and L.-J. Moreau, 1954; vol. 3, trans. M.-J. Gerlaud, 1951; vol. 4, trans. R. Bernier and F. Kerouanton, 1957; *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Somme de la foi catholique contre les Gentils*, trans. Abbé P.-F. Ecalle, 3 vols., Paris, Vivès, 1854–56. Italian translation: *San Tommaso d'Aquino, Somma contro i Gentili*, T. S. Centi, ed., "Classici delle Religioni 28," Turin, 1975. Spanish translation: *Santo Tomás de Aquino, Suma contra los Gentiles*, J. M. Pla Castellano, ed., 2 vols., "Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos 94, 102," Madrid 1952–53. German translations: *Des heiligen Thomas von Aquin, Summa contra Gentiles*, H. Fahsel, ed., 6 vols., Zurich, 1942–60; *Thomas von Aquin, Summe gegen die Heiden*, vols. 1–2, K. Albert and P. Engelhardt, eds., Darmstadt, 1974 (2nd 1987)–1982; vol. 3/1, K. Allgaier, ed., Darmstadt, 1990 (the remainder to appear).

Summa theologiae: see chapter 8.

The *Summa theologiae* is Thomas's greatest work, on which he worked for the last seven years of his life. Started after Thomas decided not to pursue a second commentary on the *Sentences* (1265–66), the *Prima Pars* was composed during the Rome period (that is, until September 1268). The *Secunda Pars* was put together in Paris: the *Prima Secundae* in 1271, followed by the *Secunda Secundae* (1271–72). As to the *Tertia Pars*, probably begun in Paris at the end of the winter 1271–72, its composition was pursued in Naples until 6 December 1273, the date Thomas stopped writing. Broken off in the treatise on penitence (*Tertia*, q. 90), the *Summa* was completed by a *Supplement* composed by Thomas's disciples based on the commentary on the *Sentences*. The work of the Leonine commission on this text, which dates from the years 1888 to 1903, is still only beginning. On the *Tertia Pars*, cf. M. Turrini, "Raynald de Piperno et le texte original de la *Tertia Pars* de la *Somme de Théologie* de S. Thomas d'Aquin," *RSPT* 73 (1989) 233–47. Cf. also P.-M. Gy, "Le texte original de la *Tertia pars* de la *Somme Théologique* de S. Thomas d'Aquin dans l'apparat critique de l'édition léonine: le cas de l'eucharistie," *RSPT* 65 (1981) 608–16. For a view of the plan and the vast contents of the *Summa theologiae*, see above, chapter 8.

Editions: Leonine, vols. 4–11 (*Ia*: vols. 4–5; *Ia IIae*: vols. 6–7; *IIa–IIae*, vols. 8–10; *IIIa*, vol. 11. Thomas's text is accompanied by Cajetan's commentary. The *Sup-*

plement makes up vol. 12); Parma, vols. 1–4; Vivès, vols. 1–6. Among the numerous manual editions using the Leonine text: Studium dominicain, Ottawa, 1941–45, 5 vols.; Editions Paulines, Rome, 1962 (in one volume); Marietti, 1963, 4 vols. (several earlier editions); "Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos 77, 80, 81, 83, 87," Madrid, 1963ff., 5 vols. (several editions).

English translations: Blackfriars, *Summa theologiae*, T. Gilby and T. C. O'Brien, eds., 60 volumes, London-New York, 1964–73. *Summa Theologiae. A Concise Translation*, by Timothy McDermott (Westminster, MD: 1989). French translations: *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Somme Théologique*, edition of the "Revue des jeunes," 68 vols., Paris-Tournai-Rome, 1925ff.; *Thomas d'Aquin, Somme théologique*, 4 vols., Paris, 1984–86. German translation by the "Philosophisch-Theologische Hochschule Walberberg": *Summa Theologica*, "Die Deutsche Thomas-Ausgabe," (Heidelberg) Graz, Vienna, Cologne, 1933ff.; Italian, by the Dominicans, *La Somma Teologica*, 35 volumes, Florence, 1949–75, and Bologna, 1985; Spanish, by the Dominicans: *Summa de Teologia*, "Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos," 16 volumes, 1947ff.

Disputed Questions

Quaestiones disputatae de ueritate: see chapter 4.

The disputed questions *De ueritate* date from the three years of Thomas's first period teaching as a master in Paris, from 1256 to 1259. We still have the dictated original for questions 2–22. This ensemble of 253 articles is grouped into 29 questions; the first gave its name to the whole series, but the others are only more or less connected with it. Two large categories may be seen in it: truth and knowledge (qq. 1–20), the good and the appetite for the good (qq. 21–29; see above, chapter 4]. These disputed questions *De ueritate* are of considerable interest for grasping the evolution of the young master's thought and his genius, which increasingly asserts itself.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 22 (3 vols.); Parma, vol. 9, pp. 1–458; Vivès, vol. 14, pp. 315–640 and vol. 15, pp. 1–356; Mandonnet, *Quaestiones disputatae*, vol. 1, Paris, 1925; Marietti, *Quaestiones disputatae*, vol. 1, R. Spiazzi, ed., 1964 and other dates.

English translation: *Saint Thomas, On Truth*, vol. 1, trans. R. W. Mulligan; vol. 2, trans. J. V. McGlynn; vol. 3, trans. R. W. Schmidt, Chicago, 1952–54; French translations: "Thomas d'Aquin, Question disputée de la vérité (Question I, articles 1–2, 8–9)," introduction and translation by F.-X. Putallaz, in *Philosophes médiévaux. Anthologie de textes philosophiques (XIIe–XIVe siècles)*, R. Imbach and M.-H. Méléard, ed., "10/18," Paris, 1986, pp. 69–94; *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Questions disputées sur la vérité, Question XI: Le Maître (De magistro), Question IV, Le Verbe (De Verbo)*, "Bibliothèque des textes philosophiques," introduction, translation, and notes by B. Jollès, Paris, 1983 and 1992; S.-Th. Bonino, *Quaestiones disputatae De veritate. Saint Thomas d'Aquin Question 12: La prophétie, Présentation, traduction et notes*, Mémoire de licence dactyl., Fribourg (Switzerland), 1989; idem., *La Question 2 des "Quaestiones disputatae De veritate" de Thomas d'Aquin*, Introduction, translation, and commentary, 2 vols., Diss. Univ. Fribourg (Switzerland), 1992 (the author is preparing a complete translation of the *De veritate*). Italian translations: *San Tommaso, La Verità (Quaestio I De Veritate)*, intro., trans., and commentary by M. Mamiani,

Padua, 1970; *De magistro*, T. Gregory, ed., Rome 1965; idem., C. Scurati, ed., Padua 1970; S. Tommaso d'Aquino, *Le Questioni disputatae*, Testo latino dell'Edizione Leonina e traduzione italiana, vol. 1, *La verità (Questioni 1–9)*, vol. 2, *La Verità (Questioni 10–20)*, vol. 3, *La Verità (Questioni 21–29)*, V. O. Benetollo and R. Coggi, eds., intro. by A. Lobato, Bologna, 1992–93; Spanish translations: J. Garcia López, *Doctrina de Santo Tomás sobre la verdad. Comentarios a la cuestión primera "De Veritate" y traducción castellana de la misma*, Pamplona, 1967; Santo Tomás de Aquino, *De Veritate*, H. Giannini and O. Velásquez eds., Santiago, Chile, 1978 (trans. of Q. 1); German translations: *Des hl. Thomas von Aquino Untersuchungen über die Wahrheit (Quaestiones disputatae De veritate)*, trans. Edith Stein, 2 vols., Breslau, 1931–32; Louvain-Fribourg, 1952–55; Darmstadt, 1970; *Thomas von Aquin, Von der Wahrheit, De veritate (Quaestio I)*, A. Zimmermann, ed., Hamburg, 1986; *Thomas von Aquin, Über den Lehrer. De Magistro, Quaestiones disputatae, De veritate quaestio XI*, G. Jüssen, G. Krieger, J. H. J. Schneider, eds., Hamburg, 1988.

Quaestiones disputatae De potentia: see chapter 9.

The disputed questions *De potentia* date from Thomas's sojourn in Rome, very probably in the first year of that period (1265–66), before the composition of the *Prima Pars* of the *Summa theologiae*. The title of the first question gave its name to the ensemble, which may be divided into two groups of questions: the first six are connected with the theme of God's power, the other four belong to Trinitarian theology.

Editions: Parma, vol. 8, pp. 1–218; Vivès, vol. 13, pp. 1–319; Mandonnet, *Quaestiones disputatae*, vol. 2, Paris, 1925, pp. 1–370; Marietti, *Quaestiones disputatae*, vol. 22, P. Bazzi et al., eds., ¹⁰1965, pp. 7–276.

No French translation. English translation: *Saint Thomas Aquinas, On the Power of God*, trans. English Dominican Fathers, L. Shapcote, ed., 3 vols., London, 1932–34; idem., 1 vol. Westminster, Maryland, 1952; Italian translation in progress: *Tommaso d'Aquino, La Potenza di Dio*, Questioni I–III, A. Campodonico, ed., trans. L. Tuninetti, Florence, 1991.

Quaestio disputata De anima: see chapter 9.

There is now agreement on the dating of the question *De anima* to the time of the Roman sojourn, very probably during the year 1265–66, before QQ. 75–89 of the *Prima Pars*, which it prepares for by deepening various problems relating to the human soul.

Editions: Parma, vol. 8, pp. 465–532; Vivès, vol. 14, pp. 61–160; Mandonnet, *Quaestiones disputatae*, 3 vols., Paris, 1925, pp. 91–206; Marietti, *Quaestiones disputatae*, 2 vols., P. Bazzi, et al., eds., ¹⁰1965, pp. 281–362; *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Quaestiones de anima*, A Newly Established Edition of the Latin Text with an Introduction and Notes, J. H. Robb, ed., Toronto, 1968. The Leonine edition (ed. Bazán, in vol. 24, no. 1) is expected in 1996.

No French translation. English translations: *Saint Thomas Aquinas, The Soul*, trans. J. P. Rowan, Saint Louis, 1949; *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Questions on the Soul*, trans. J. H. Robb, Milwaukee, 1984.

Quaestio disputata De spiritualibus creaturis: see above, chapter 9.

This disputed question dates from Thomas's Roman sojourn. We can situate it

around the years 1267–68, most probably between November 1267 and September 1268. The problems argued in it concern men and angels as spiritual creatures.

Editions. Parma, vol. 8, pp. 425–64; Vivès, vol. 14, pp. 1–61; Mandonnet, *Quaestiones disputatae*, 3 vols., Paris 1925, pp. 23–91; *S. Thomae Aquinatis Tractatus de spiritualibus creaturis*, L. W. Keeler, ed., Rome, 1937; Marietti, *Quaestiones disputatae*, 2 vols., P. Bazzi et al., eds., ¹⁰1965, pp. 367–415. The Leonine edition (ed. Cos, vol. 24, no. 1) is expected in 1996.

No French translation. English translation: *Saint Thomas Aquinas, On Spiritual Creatures*, trans. M. C. Fitzpatrick and J. J. Wellmuth, Milwaukee, 1949.

Quaestiones disputatae De malo: see chapter 11.

The date of the disputation of the Questions *De malo* remains difficult to establish. But it is certain that the composition of Q. 1 took place after March 1266, and article 12 of Q. 16 after November 1267. As to Q. 6, it must be put a little before or after the condemnation of December 1270. We can be more precise about the publication date for these questions, probably around 1270 for the QQ. 1–15 and around 1272 for Q. 16. Given that Thomas's works written in Paris were very quickly and widely circulated, we may guess that the Questions *De malo* would have been disputed in Paris during the two academic years 1269–71. The first question in the series gave its name to the ensemble; the other questions deal with special problems linked to the problem of evil: sin and its causes (QQ. 2–3), original sin and its punishment (QQ. 4–5), human election (Q. 6), venial sin (Q. 7), the deadly sins (QQ. 8–15) and finally devils (Q. 16).

Editions: Leonine, vol. 23; Parma, vol. 8, pp. 219–424; Vivès, vol. 13, pp. 320–618; Mandonnet, *Quaestiones disputatae*, vol. 2, Paris, 1925, pp. 370–719; Marietti, *Quaestiones disputatae*, vol. 2, P. Bazzi et al., eds., ¹⁰1965, pp. 445–699.

No French translation. English translation: *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Disputed Questions on Evil*, trans. J. and J. Oesterle, Notre Dame, 1983.

Quaestiones disputatae De uirtutibus: see chapter 11.

The disputed questions *De uirtutibus* must be dated from Thomas's second period of teaching in Paris, at the end of that period in 1271–72, at the same time as the *Secunda Secundae*. This whole consists of 36 articles dedicated to the virtues and includes the QQ. *De uirtutibus in communi*, *De caritate*, *De correctione fraterna*, *De spe*, *De uirtutibus cardinalibus*.

Editions: Parma, vol. 8, pp. 545–638; Vivès, vol. 14, Pp. 178–314; Mandonnet, *Quaestiones disputatae*, vol. 3, Paris 1925, pp. 208–365; Marietti, *Quaestiones disputatae*, vol. 2, P. Bazzi et al., eds., ¹⁰1965, pp. 707–828. The Leonine edition (vol. 24, no. 2) is expected in 1996.

English translations: *On the Virtues (in general)*, trans. J. P. Reid, Providence, 1951; *On Charity (De caritate)*, trans. L. H. Kendzierski, Milwaukee, 1960. No complete translation in French; partial translation (*sed contra* and the body of articles) of the 13 articles of the disputed question *De caritate* in *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Bref résumé de la foi chrétienne—Compendium theologiae*, trans. J. Kreit, Paris, 1985, pp. 495–539.

Quaestio disputat *De unione uerbi incarnati*: see chapter 11.

The disputed question *De unione uerbi incarnati* must be situated very probably toward the end of the second period of teaching in Paris, before Easter, early in April,

or perhaps in May 1272. Given the doctrinal issues at stake in a.4 and their connection to *Illā* q. 17 a. 2, concerning the unity of *esse* in Christ, the two writings are practically contemporaneous.

Editions: Parma, vol. 8, pp. 533–44; Vivè, vol. 14, pp. 161–78; Mandonnet, *Quaestiones disputatae*, vol. 3, Paris, 1925, 1925, pp. 1–22; Marietti, *Quaestiones disputatae*, vol. 2, P. Bazzi et al., eds., ¹⁰1965, pp. 421–35. The Leonine edition (vol. 24, no. 2) is expected in 1996.

No English or French translation.

Quaestiones de quodlibet I–XII: see chapter 11.

Thomas's Quodlibets can be divided into two groups, according to the two periods of teaching in Paris., Quodlibets I–VI and XII (the *reportatio* of the latter was not revised by Thomas) come from the second period (1268–72); beyond this general framework, it is often difficult to situate them with certainty in Lent or in Advent of this or that year (see the table on p. 211). The numerous subjects dealt with (there are 260 of them) concern highly speculative questions as well as practical problems.

Editions: Leonine vol. 25; Parma vol. 9, pp. 459–631; Vivès, vol. 15, pp. 357–611; Mandonnet, Paris, 1926; Marietti, R. Spiazzi, ed., ⁹1956.

No French translation. English translation: *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Quodlibetal Questions 1 and 2*, intro., trans., and notes by S. Edwards, "Medieval Sources in Translation 27," Toronto, 1983.

Commentaries on the Bible

Expositio super Isaiaem ad litteram: see chapter 2.

The first theological work by Thomas as a biblical bachelor, this commentary has often been dated from the first years of his teaching in Paris, but it was quite probably composed before then, toward the end of the sojourn in Cologne, where he was Albertus Magnus's bachelor, prior to his departure for Paris in 1252. It is a rapid ("cursory") reading of Isaiah, focussed on the literal sense, with some marginal notations ("collationes") with a view to pastoral and spiritual applications.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 28; Parma, vol. 14, pp. 427–576; Vivès, vol. 18, pp. 688–821, and vol. 19, pp. 1–65.

For a presentation and translation of the 24 *collationes* from the portion in Thomas's handwriting: D. Bouthillier and J.-P. Torrell, "Quand saint Thomas méditait sur le prophète Isaïe," *RT* 90 (1990) 5–47.

No English or French translation.

Super Ieremiam et Threnos: see chapter 2.

The commentaries on Jeremiah and Lamentations belong to the same genre of "cursory" reading of the Bible, focussed on the literal sense, as the commentary on Isaiah. The commentary on Jeremiah is also accompanied by *collationes* similar to those found in the *Super Isaiaem*. Like the latter, these commentaries must be dated very probably to the end of the Cologne sojourn when Thomas was Albert's biblical bachelor, before his departure for Paris in 1252.

Editions: Parma, vol. 14, pp. 577–667; 668–685; Vivès, vol. 19, pp. 66–198; 199–225.

No English or French translation.

Principium "Rigans montes de superioribus" and "Hic est liber mandatorum Dei": see chapter 3.

The two *Principia*, i.e., inaugural lectures, were discourses held on the occasion of the *inceptio* of the new *magister in actu regens* in Paris between 3 March and 17 June 1256. The first is based on the passage "Rigans montes de superioribus," (Psalm 103:13). Its theme, clearly inspired by Dionysius the Areopagite, is the communication of wisdom through a whole series of intermediaries. The second, in continuity with the first, which it completes and extends, could have been given during the *resumptio*, which is to say the first *dies legibilis* following the *inceptio*. There is a *Commendatio* of Sacred Scripture, based on the passage "Hic est liber mandatorum Dei" (Baruch 4:1) and followed by an explanation of the way in which the different books of the Bible are divided.

Editions: Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 4, pp. 481–96; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, pp. 435–43.

No English translation. French translation: Th. Pègues and F.-X. Maquart, *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Sa vie*, Toulouse-Paris, 1924, pp. 365–77. Spanish translation: G. A. Piemonte, "La classe inaugural de Santo Tomás de Aquino come maestro de Teología en la Universidad de Paris," *Sapientia* 21 (1966) 49–54 (trans. of the *Principium* "Rigans montes").

Expositio super Iob ad litteram: see chapter 7.

According to the witness of Tolomeo of Lucca, accepted by the scholars, the *Expositio* of the Book of Job is the fruit of Thomas's teaching of his brothers in Orvieto (1261–65). Contemporaneous with the third Book of the *Summa contra Gentiles*, the *Expositio super Iob* develops the same central theme: Providence. The work focuses on the literal sense of Job: the story of Job, the problem of Providence and of the suffering of the just, the human condition and divine governance.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 26; Parma, vol. 14, pp. 1–147; Vivès, vol. 18, pp. 1–227.

English translation: *The Literal Exposition on Job: A Scriptural Commentary concerning Providence*, trans. A. Damico, Classics in Religious Studies 7, Atlanta, 1989. French translation: *Job, un homme pour notre temps. De saint Thomas d'Aquin, exposition littérale sur le Livre de Job*, trans. J. Kreit, Paris, 1982.

Glossa continua super Evangelia (Catena aurea): see chapter 7.

Undertaken at the request of Urban IV at the end of 1262 or the beginning of 1263, the *Catena* on Matthew could have been offered to the pope before his death, on 2 October 1264. The commentary on the other three evangelists, which Thomas dedicated to his friend and former student Annibaldo d'Annibaldi (who became a cardinal), was finished in Rome between 1265 and 1268. The *Catena* presents itself as a vast collection of exegetical quotations from the Church Fathers, arranged in a continuous exposition, verse by verse, of the totality of the four Gospels. More than a simple compilation, this work shows Thomas's critical sense and his remarkable knowledge of the Greek Fathers. Thomas later drew on this text himself more than once, and the work had a significant diffusion.

Editions: Parma, vols. 11–12; Vivès, vol. 16–17; Marietti, 2 vols., A. Guarienti, ed., 1953.

English translation: *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Catena aurea, Commentary on the Four Gospels*, trans. M. Pattison, J.D. Dalgairns, and T. D. Ryder, 4 vols., Oxford, 1841–45 (Preface by John Henry Newman); partial translation in *The Golden Chain*, by a religious of C. X. M. V., London, 1956. French translation: *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Exposition suivie des quatre Evangiles . . . La chaîne d'Or*, translated by E. Castan, 8 vols., Paris, Vivès, 1854–55. Italian translation: *S. Tommaso d'Aquino, Catena aurea*, E. Logi, ed., 3 vols., Siena, 1954–60.

Lectura super Matthaeum: see chapter 4.

The *Lectura* on Saint Matthew is the fruit of the second of Thomas's Parisian sojourns. We can situate it with high probability during the academic year 1269–70. The text of this *reportatio*, as it is currently transmitted in printed editions, is not only incomplete but erroneous. It lacks Thomas's commentary for a good part of the Sermon on the Mount, which his first editor, Bartholomew of Spina (1527) replaced with a part of the commentary of Peter of Scala, who was a Dominican at the end of the thirteenth century. The interpolated passages extend in Matthew from 5:11 to 6:8 and from 6:14 to 6:19 (lects. 13–17 and 19; nos. 444–582 and 603–10 in the Marietti edition). The labors of the Leonine commission have allowed the discovery of a new manuscript that contains the complete text of Thomas's commentary (MS, Basel, *Bibl. Univ. B. V. 12.*). Only some fragments have been published: H.-V. Shooner, "La *Lectura in Matthaeum* de S. Thomas (Deux fragments inédits et la *Reportatio* de Pierre d'Andria)," *Angelicum* 33 (1956) 121–42; J.-P. Renard, *La Lectura super Matthaeum* V, 20–48 de Thomas d'Aquin," *RTAM* 50 (1983) 145–90.

Editions: Parma, vol. 10, pp. 1–278; Vivès, vol. 19, pp. 226–668; Marietti, ⁵1951 and other dates.

No English or French translation.

Lectura super Ioannem: see chapter 11.

The *Lectura super Ioannem* can be dated with reasonable certainty to the second period of teaching in Paris, probably during the years 1270–72. The *reportatio* on it was done by Reginald of Piperno at the request of the friars and the provost of Saint-Omer, Adenulf of Anagni. It seems hardly probable that Thomas himself reviewed the text. The theological exegesis of the Gospel of Saint John—a model of the contemplative who places Christ's divinity in the foreground in a special way, as Thomas explains in his Prologue—is certainly among the most finished and most profound of the commentaries that Thomas left.

Editions: Parma, vol. 10, pp. 279–645; Vivès, vol. 19, pp. 669–842 and vol. 20, pp. 1–376; Marietti, R. Cai, ed., ⁵1952 and other dates.

English translation: *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Commentary on the Gospel of Saint John*, Part I, trans. J. A. Weisheipl and F. R. Larcher, Albany, 1980 (Ch. I–VIII). French translation: *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Commentaire sur l'Evangile de saint Jean*, Preface by M.-D. Philippe, O.P., translation and notes under the direction, Versailles-Buxy, 3 vols. in print (up to chapter VIII), 1981, 1982, 1987; "Prooemium de Saint Jean," trans. B. d'Avezac de Castera, *Cahiers IPC* 1973, no. 8, pp. 86–96. German translations: *Thomas von Aquin, Das Wort*, Die ersten elf Lesungen des 1. Kapitels aus dem Johannes-Kommentar, trans. J. Pieper, Munich, ³1955; *Thomas von Aquin*,

Der Prolog des Johannes-Evangeliums, Super evangelium S. Joannis lectura (caput I, lectio I–XI), W.-U. Klünker, ed., Stuttgart, 1986. Italian translation: *Tommaso d'Aquino, Commento al Vangelo di San Giovanni*, vol. 1: Cap. I–VI, T. S. Centi, ed., Rome, 1990; vol. 2: Cap. VII–XII, idem., ed., Rome, 1992 (the remainder to appear).

Expositio et Lectura super Epistolas Pauli Apostoli: see chapter 13.

It is not easy to say with precision to what years of Thomas's teaching the courses on Saint Paul belong. Thomas could have taught Paul in two stages, first in Italy (perhaps in Rome, between 1265 and 1268), then in Paris and Naples. It is, however, not at all probable that he would have given the same courses in their entirety two times. According to the best attested data in current scholarship, Thomas's Pauline corpus presents itself as follows: (1) The part in which his hand is rather directly perceptible includes the first eight chapters of Romans. The rest of the commentary on Romans has not been corrected. This course dates very probably from the last years of his life, in Naples from 1272–73 (it is not impossible that it dates from the last year in Paris—1271–72—but the amount of work already attributed to that period renders this hypothesis hardly plausible). (2) We cannot say anything precise concerning the course on the first ten chapters of the First Letter to the Corinthians, if only because the commentary is missing from 1 Cor. 7:10 to the end of chapter 10. It was replaced very early with a text borrowed from Peter of Tarentaise (nos. 336–581 in the Marietti edition). (3) the *reportatio* made by Reginald of Piperno, which goes from 1 Cor. 11 through the epistle to the Hebrews, may be the fruit of teaching during the years 1265–68 in Rome. Despite the diversity of these pieces, it is nevertheless certain that Thomas thought of his commentary as a whole, as the Prologue placed at the head of this group of texts shows.

Editions: Parma, vol. 13; Vivès, vol. 20, pp. 381–752 and vol. 21; Marietti, 2 vols., R. Cai, ed., ⁸1953. Editing of the Leonine edition of *In Epistolam ad Romanos* (vol. 32) is nearing completion.

English translations: *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Commentary on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. Vol. 1 of *The Aquinas Scripture Series*, trans. F. R. Larcher, Albany, N.Y.: Magi Books, 1966; *Commentary on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*. Vol. 2 of *The Aquinas Scripture Series*, trans. M. L. Lamb, Albany, N.Y.: Magi Books, 1966; *Commentary on Saint Paul's First Letter to the Thessalonians*. Vol. 3 of *The Aquinas Scripture Series*, trans. F. R. Larcher and M. Duffy, Albany, N.Y.: Magi Books, 1969; *Commentary on St. Paul's Letter to the Philippians*, trans. F. R. Larcher, Albany, N.Y.: Magi Books, 1969. French translations: *Commentaires de saint Thomas d'Aquin sur toutes les épîtres de S. Paul*, trans. abbé Bralé, 6 vols., Paris, Vivès, 1869–74; *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Commentaire de la seconde épître aux Corinthiens*, intro., trans., and notes by A. Charlier, 3 vols., Paris, 1980. German translation: *Des heiligen Thomas von Aquin Kommentar zum Römerbrief*, trans. H. Fahsel, Freiburg i. B., 1927.

Postilla super Psalmos: see chapter 13.

The date of the course on the Psalms is uncertain. Since Mandonnet, it has generally been said that the course was interrupted by Thomas's sickness and death. We must think of it, perhaps, as from the start of the academic year in September–October

1273, during the final weeks of Thomas's teaching. As Reginald of Piperno reports, Thomas's unfinished commentary comprises the first 54 psalms.

Editions: Parma, vol. 14, pp. 148–553; Vivès, vol. 18, pp. 228–556 (Psalms 1–51); P.-A. Uccelli, *S. Thomae Aquinatis in Isaiam prophetam, in tres psalmos David, in Boetium de Hebdomadibus et de Trinitate expositiones*, Rome, 1880, pp. 241–54 (Psalms 52–54); Busa, vol. 6, pp. 48–130 (text from the Parma edition for Psalms 1–51 and from the Uccelli edition for Psalms 52–54).

No English translation. No French translation except for the partial translation of the commentary on the first three Psalms: J.-E. Stroobant, "Prier à l'école du commentateur du Psautier de Saint Thomas," *Thomas Aquinas* 1985, no. 10, pp. 1–15; no. 11, pp. 1–7; no. 12, pp. 1–8 (intro. and commentary on Psalm 1); 1986, no. 13, pp. 1–8 (Psalm 2); no. 14, pp. 1–7 (Psalm 3).

Super Cantica Canticorum: See Weisheipl, p. 369; no English translation.

Commendatio Sacrae Scripturae: See Weisheipl, p. 373; no English translation.

Commentaries on Aristotle

Sentencia Libri De anima: see above, chapter 9.

The commentary on the first three books of the *De anima* began the series of commentaries on Aristotle on which Thomas worked from the end of the Roman period. This work can be dated precisely between the end of 1267 and the summer of 1268, prior to the author's leaving Rome for Paris. This commentary is contemporaneous with QQ. 75–89 of the *Prima Pars*, which are dedicated to the study of the human soul.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 45/1; Parma, vol. 20, pp. 1–144; Vivès, vol. 24, pp. 1–196; Marietti, A. M. Pierotta, ed., 1959, and other dates.

No French translation. English translation: *Aristotle's De Anima with the Commentary of St. Thomas Aquinas*, K. Foster and S. Humphries, eds., New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951; reprinted, with Introduction by Ralph McInerney, by Dumb Ox Books, Notre Dame, 1994. A new translation, based on the Leonine edition of 1984, is being prepared by Norman Kretzmann and Robert Pasnau. Spanish translation: *Santo Tomás de Aquino, Comentario al "Libro del Alma" de Aristóteles*, trans. and notes by A. Caparelo, 2 vols., Rome 1975. German translation of all the Prologues to the commentaries on Aristotle: *Thomas von Aquin, Prologe zu den Aristoteleskommentaren*, F. Cheneval and R. Imbach, eds., Frankfurt am Main, 1992.

Sentencia Libri De sensu et sensato: see chapter 9.

The commentary on the *De sensu et sensato*, which is later than the one on *De anima*, could have been started in Rome before the departure for Paris (September 1268) and finished in 1269 in Paris, before the *De unitate intellectus* (1270). Thomas's *Sentencia* consists of two treatises grouped as if they were two parts of a single work: *De sensu exteriori*, a commentary on Aristotle's *De sensu et sensato*; *De memoria et reminiscencia*, on the treatise of the same name.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 45/2; Parma, vol. 20, pp. 145–214; Vivès, vol. 24, pp. 198–292; Marietti, third ed., completely revised, R. M. Spiazzi, ed., 1949, and other dates.

English translation by K. White and E. M. Macierowski is forthcoming in Thomas

Aquinas in Translation Series. No French translation apart from the *Prooemium*: F. and B. d'Avezac de Castera, "Traduction du Prooemium de saint Thomas à son commentaire du *De sensu et sensato* d'Aristote," *Cahiers IPC* 1981, no. 24, pp. 69–79.

Sententia super Physicam: see chapter 12.

Contrary to what Weisheipl (led into error by the hesitations of the Leonine editors about the numbering of Book *Lambda* of the *Metaphysics*) says, the composition of the commentary on the eight books of the *Physics* seems to date from the beginning of the second period of teaching in Paris (1268–69). Following Aristotle, Thomas opens his commentary with the study of the principles of becoming and finishes with a demonstration of the existence of a Prime Mover.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 2 (1884; the Latin text of Aristotle reproduced here is not the one Thomas knew); Parma, vol. 18, pp. 226–538; Vivès, vol. 22, pp. 292–709; Marietti, M. Maggiolo, ed., 1965, and other dates.

No French translation. English translation: *Thomas de Aquino: Commentary on Aristotle's Physics*, trans. R. J. Blackwell et al., New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Sententia super Meteora: see chapter 12.

The latest discoveries lead us to date this commentary to the second period of teaching in Paris, before 1270. The work was left unfinished at Book II; the Leonine edition (1886) removed some spurious additions to the text from earlier editions, but does not reproduce the text in its entirety. Thomas's commentary stops at chapter II, 5 (Bekker 363a20), but it appears certain today that Thomas expounded the *Meteora* up to the penultimate chapter of Book II (Bekker 369a9), the commentary on chapter 6 being lost. Cf. A. Dondaine and L.-J. Bataillon, "Le commentaire de saint Thomas sur les Météores," *AFP* 36 (1966) 81–152.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 3, preface pp. XXIX–XL, text pp. 325–421; Parma, vol. 19, pp. 300–441 (with the unauthentic parts); Vivès, vol. 23, pp. 387–571 (idem); Marietti, R. M. Spiazzi, ed., 1952. In an appendix to the Leonine (pp. LXIII–CXLV) and the Marietti (pp. 584–685) editions may be found the unauthentic *continuatio* with which Thomas's unfinished commentary was completed. The three missing lessons have been published by K. White, who is preparing the new Leonine edition of the work: "Three Previously Unpublished Chapters from St. Thomas Aquinas's Commentary on Aristotle's *Meteora*: *Sententia super Meteora* 2, 13–15," *MS* 54 (1992) 49–93.

No French translation. English translations: I, lect. 8–10, by L. Thorndike, *Latin Treatises on Comets*, University of Chicago Press, 1950, 77–86. *De Meteorologicorum*, trans. E. W. Webster, vol. 1 of *The Works of Aristotle*, ed. W. D. Ross, Oxford, 1930; *On Meteorology*, trans. P. Conway and F. R. Larcher, 1964 College of St. Mary of the Springs, Columbus, Ohio. Photocopy.

Expositio Libri Peryermenias: see chapter 12.

The composition of the commentary on Aristotle's *Peryermenias*, dedicated to Guillaume Berthout, provost of Louvain, must be situated between the condemnation of 10 December 1270 and mid-October 1271. Unfinished, the commentary stops at Chapter II, 2 (Bekker 19b26); the manuscript was sent from Naples, with the exposition

of the *Posterior Analytics*, to the masters of the arts faculty in Paris, who desired to have these two books after Thomas's death. As to content and method, this work of logic and hermeneutics follows rather closely the letter of Aristotle's text.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 1^o/I (Editio altera retractata, 1989; the first edition dates from 1882); Parma, vol. 18, pp. 1–83; Vivès, vol. 22, pp. 1–102; Marietti, R. M. Spiazzi, ed., ²1964.

English translation: *Aristotle on Interpretation: Commentary by St. Thomas and Cajetan (Peri Hermeneias)*, trans. J. T. Oesterle, Milwaukee, 1962. No French translation except for the *Prooemium*: P. Oswald and B. d'Avezac de Castera, "Traduction du Prooemium du Commentaire de S. Thomas d'Aquin in Peri Hermeneias," *Cahiers IPC* 1974, no. 10, pp. 111–13.

Expositio Libri Posteriorum: see chapter 12.

The commentary on the *Posterior Analytics* was begun about the same time as the commentary on the *Peryermenias*, which it apparently followed (October 1271). A first part was thus composed in Paris (I, 1–26), following James of Venice's translation. The work was continued in Naples, where Thomas comments on Moerbeke's translation (I 27–II 20) from then on, until the end of 1272. After his death, it was sent to the masters in the arts faculty in Paris with the commentary on the *Peryermenias*.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 1^o/2 (Editio altera retractata, 1989; the first edition dates from 1882); Parma, vol. 18, pp. 84–225; Vivès, vol. 22, pp. 103–291; Marietti, R. M. Spiazzi, ed., ²1964.

English translations: *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Exposition of the Posterior Analytics of Aristotle*, trans. P. Conway, Quebec, 1956; Thomas Aquinas, *Commentary on the Posterior Analytics of Aristotle*, trans. F. R. Larcher, Albany, N. Y.: Magi Books, 1970. No French translation except for the *Prooemium*: "Thomas d'Aquin Prooemium du commentaire des Seconds Analytiques d'Aristote," trans. P. Oswald and B. d'Avezac de Castera, *Cahiers IPC* 1975, no. 11, pp. 99–105.

Sententia Libri Ethicorum: see chapter 12.

The commentary on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* was composed in Paris, 1271–72. It is a *sententia*, which is to say, a summary and rather doctrinal exposition of Aristotle's text, contemporaneous with the composition of the *Secunda Secundae*, for which it prepares the way.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 47 (2 vols.); Parma, vol. 21, pp. 1–363; Vivès, vol. 25, pp. 231–614 and vol. 26, pp. 1–89; Marietti, R. M. Spiazzi, ed., ³1964.

No French translation. English translation: *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Commentary on the Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. C. I. Litzinger, 2 vols., Chicago, 1964; reprinted by Dumb Ox Books, Notre Dame, 1993.

Tabula Libri Ethicorum: see chapter 12.

Composed around 1270, at the moment when Thomas was preparing himself to write his commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics and the Secunda Pars of the Summa theologiae*, this *Tabula* constitutes an index of the principal themes in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and in the commentary that Albertus Magnus earlier wrote on it. It was constructed initially in the form of files by his secretaries, and Thomas never revised the fair copy; it remained an unfinished work.

Editions: fallen into oblivion since the end of the fifteenth century, the *Tabula* was edited for the first time in the Leonine Edition of 1971, vol. 48 B.

No English or French translation.

Sententia Libri Politicorum: see chapter 12.

To all appearances, the commentary on Aristotle's *Politics* belongs, like the preceding commentaries, to the second period of teaching in Paris (1269–72). The work remained unfinished, its authentic part stopping at Book III 6 (Bekker 1280a7). The printed editions other than the Leonine give a text in eight Books (it was completed by Peter of Auvergne), but the text of the first three Books is not reliable, for it reproduces the humanist edition by Louis of Valencia, who significantly altered Thomas's text.

Editions: Leonine vol. 48 A; Parma, vol. 21, pp. 364–716; Vivès, vol. 26, pp. 89–513; Marietti, R. M. Spiazzi, ed., 1951, and other dates.

English translations: "Commentary on Aristotle's *Politics*." In *Medieval Political Philosophy: A Sourcebook*, ed. Ralph Lerner, trans. Ernest L. Fortin and Peter D. O'Neill. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963; translation by E. Fortin forthcoming from The Catholic University of America Press. No complete French translation; *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Préface à la Politique*, Avant-propos, translation, and explanations by H. Kéraly, Docteur Commun, Paris, 1974.

Sententia super Metaphysicam: see chapter 12.

The date and place of composition for the commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* pose numerous problems. The designation of Book *Lambda* as Book XII, a title that Thomas adopted toward the middle of 1271, invites us to date the commentary on Books VII–XII after that date. The beginning of the commentary may date from the academic year 1270–71. The commentary on Books II and III may be the fruit of self-correction or of later editing. Begun in Paris, the composition of this work may have been finished in Naples. The only sure thing, in the current state of research, is that this text is earlier than the *De caelo et mundo*, probably composed in Naples, 1272–73.

Editions: Parma vol. 20, pp. 245–654; Vivès, vol. 24, pp. 333–649 and vol. 25, pp. 1–229; Marietti, R. M. Spiazzi, ed., 1950. The Leonine edition (vol. 46) is expected within the next two years.

No French translation. English translation: *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Commentary on the Metaphysics of Aristotle*, trans. J. P. Rowan, 2 vols., Chicago, 1964; reprinted by Dumb Ox Books, Notre Dame, 1995. Spanish translation: *Comentario de Santo Tomás al libro Gamma de la Metafísica*, trans. J. de C. Sola, Burgos, 1958.

Sententia super librum De caelo et mundo: see chapter 12.

Later than the *Metaphysics*, the commentary on Aristotle's *De caelo et mundo* was very likely composed at Naples in 1272–73. This work of cosmology was never finished, having been interrupted a little after the beginning of Book III (Bekker 302b29).

Editions: Leonine, vol. 3, preface pp. V–XVIII, text, pp. 1–257; Parma, vol. 19, pp. 1–207; Vivès, vol. 23, pp. 1–266; Marietti, R. M. Spiazzi, ed., 1952.

No French translation. English translations: *De Caelo*, trans. J. L. Stocks, vol. 2 of *The Works of Aristotle*, ed. W. D. Ross, Oxford, 1930; *Exposition of Aristotle's Treatise On the Heavens*, trans. P. Conway and F. R. Larcher, College of St. Mary of the Springs, Ohio, 1963–64.

Sententia super libros De generatione et corruptione: see chapter 12.

Later than the commentaries on the *De caelo et mundo* and on the *Physics*, this commentary on Aristotle's *De generatione et corruptione* must be situated in Naples in 1272 or 1273, during the last months of Thomas's activity (before December 1273). Thomas's commentary, unfinished, stops at the fifth chapter of Book I (Bekker 322a33).

Editions: Leonine, vol. 3, preface pp. XIX–XXIX, text pp. 261–322; Parma, vol. 19, pp. 208–99 (with the unauthentic parts); Vivès, vol. 23, pp. 267–386 (also with unauthentic parts); Marietti, R. M. Spiazzi, ed., 1952. The apocrypha drawing on Saint Albert, with which Thomas's unfinished commentary was completed, may be found in appendixes to the Leonine (pp. I–LXI) and Marietti (pp. 539–83) editions.

No French translation. English translations: *De Generatione et Corruptione*, trans. H. H. Joachim, vol. 2 of *The Works of Aristotle*, ed. W. D. Ross, Oxford, 1930; *On Generation and Corruption*, trans. P. Conway and W. H. Kane, Columbus, Ohio n.d.

Other Commentaries

Super Boetium De Trinitate: see chapter 4.

This work, for which we possess one of the rare texts in Thomas's own handwriting, was composed during his first period teaching in Paris, in the years 1257–58, or at the beginning of 1259, between the middle of the *De ueritate* and the beginning of the *Contra Gentiles*. Thomas is the only thirteenth-century author to have commented on this text. The work is unfinished, and the exposition of the text of the *De Trinitate* by Boethius (down to the first lines of chapter 2) is short. The questions developed deal with human knowledge of God; it was on this occasion that Thomas produced his most elaborate reflections on the epistemology of the sciences.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 50, preface, pp. 1–67, text, pp. 75–171; *Sancti Thomae de Aquino, Expositio super Librum Boethii de Trinitate*, B. Decker, ed., Leiden, 1959, reprinted 1965 (new edition with *corrigenda et addenda*, pp. 244–45); Parma, vol. 17, pp. 349–96; Vivès, vol. 28, pp. 482–550; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 3, pp. 19–141; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 2, pp. 313–89.

English translations: *Saint Thomas Aquinas, The Trinity and the Unicity of the Intellect*, trans. R. E. Brennan, St. Louis, 1946; *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Faith, Reason, and Theology. Questions I–IV of His Commentary on the De Trinitate of Boethius*, intro., trans., and notes by A. Maurer, Toronto, 1987; *Saint Thomas Aquinas, The Division and Methods of the Sciences. Questions V and VI of his Commentary of the De Trinitate of Boethius*, intro., trans., and notes by A. Maurer, *Mediaeval Sources in Translation*, vol. 32, Toronto, 1986; *On Searching into God* (q.2), trans. V. White (Oxford: Blackfriars, 1947). French translation: *Opusculs de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. by abbé Védrine, Vivès, vol. 7, Paris, 1858, pp. 326–511. Spanish translation, *Santo Tomás de Aquino, expositio del 'De Trinitate' de Boecio*, intro., trans., and notes by A. García Marques and J. A. Fernandez, Pamplona, 1986. German translation: *Thomas von Aquin, Über die Trinität, Eine Auslegung der gleichnamigen Schrift des Boethius*, trans. and notes by H. Lentz, intro. by W.-U. Klunker, Stuttgart, 1988.

Expositio libri Boetii De ebdomadibus: see chapter 4.

The date of this work is doubtless later than that of the other commentary on Boethius, but the current state of research does not allow us to specify the date further,

nor its circumstances. The subject dealt with is essentially metaphysical, principally concerning the doctrine of participation.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 50, preface, pp. 235–64, text, pp. 267–82; Parma, vol. 17, pp. 339–48; Vivès, vol. 28, pp. 468–81; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 1, pp. 165–92; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 2, pp. 391–408.

No English translation. French translation: *Opusculum de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Védrine, Vivès, vol. 7, Paris, 1858, pp. 293–325.

Super Librum Dionysii De divinis nominibus: see chapter 7.

The precise date of composition for the *expositio* of Pseudo-Dionysius's *De divinis nominibus* remains uncertain. It may come from the sojourn in Orvieto (1261–65) or the following period in Rome (1265–68). It is equally uncertain whether this text had been the object of oral teaching. The work shows the importance of Neoplatonist strains in the thought of Thomas, who integrates a number of its elements into his own synthesis.

Editions: Parma, vol. 15, pp. 259–405; Vivès, vol. 29, 374–580; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 2, pp. 220–654; Marietti, C. Pera, ed., (with Greek and Latin from Pseudo-Dionysius), 1950.

There is no English or French translation.

Super Librum De causis: see chapter 11.

The *expositio* of the *Liber De causis* may be dated with sufficient certainty to the first half of 1272. Thomas was the first to identify the author of this work, which was generally attributed to Aristotle, as an Arab philosopher who had borrowed a great deal from Proclus's *Elementatio theologica* and from Dionysius, and who had deepened the dialogue with Neoplatonist philosophy at numerous points.

Editions: *Sancti Thomae de Aquino super Librum De Causis Expositio*, H. D. Saffrey, ed., Textus philosophici Friburgenses 4/5, Fribourg (Switzerland), 1954; Parma, vol. 21, pp. 717–60; Vivès, vol. 26, pp. 514–70; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 1, pp. 193–311; Marietti, C. Pera, ed., 1955.

No French translation. English translation: St. Thomas Aquinas, *Commentary on the Book of Causes*, translated and annotated by V. A. Guagliardo, C. R. Hess, and R. C. Taylor, Thomas Aquinas in Translation Series, Washington, 1996. Italian translation: *Tommaso d'Aquino, Commento al "libro delle cause,"* C. D'Ancona Costa, ed., I classici del pensiero, Milan, 1986.

Polemical Writings

Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem: see chapter 5.

This first work dedicated to the defense of the mendicant religious life was composed at the time of the first year of magisterial teaching in Paris. It had probably already been begun in the spring of 1256, and was finished before William of Saint-Amour's condemnation was known in Paris (5 October 1256). After defining the religious life and legitimizing the new orders, notably as concerns the ministry of teaching, preaching, and confession, as well as mendicant poverty, Thomas continues and refutes in detail William of Saint-Amour's *Tractatus de periculis nouissimorum temporum*.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 41 A; Parma, vol. 15, pp. 1–75; Vivès, vol. 29, pp. 1–116; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 4, pp. 1–195; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 2, pp. 5–110.

English translation: *An Apology for the Religious Orders*, trans. J. Procter (London, 1902; St. Louis: Herder, 1902; repr. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1950). French translation: *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Vrin-Reprise, vol. 5, Paris, 1984 (reprinted, with the same pagination, from the translation by abbé Fournet, Vivès, Paris, 1857, vol. 2, pp. 519–639; vol. 3, pp. 1–205).

De perfectione spiritualis uitae: see chapter 5.

In tiffs second opusculum of polemics on the mendicant religious life, Thomas responds to the attacks brought by Gerard of Abbeville aganist this new form of religious life. Begun rather early in 1269 (Gerard's *Contra adversarium perfectionis christianae* was published in the course of the summer of 1269), the work was finished at the beginning of 1270, the last chapters still echoing the *Quodlibet XIV* by Gerard of Abbeville held at Christmas 1269. The interest of the *De perfectione*, however, goes beyond the history of the polemics. Thomas wishes to present objectively here the doctrine on religious life and Christian perfection. This opusculum thus prepares the way for the treatise that will find a place at the end of the *IIa-IIae*.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 41 B; Parma, vol. 15, pp. 76–102; Vivès, vol. 29, pp. 117–56; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 4, pp. 196–264; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 2, pp. 115–53.

English translation: *The Religious State, the Episcopate, the Priestly Office*, trans. J. Procter, London, 1902; repr. Westminster, Md., Newman Press, 1950; Also trans. by G. J. Guenther, C. G. Kloster, and J. X. Schmitt, in three unpublished Master's theses, St. Louis University, 1942–44. French translations: *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Vrin-Reprise, vol. 4, Paris, 1982, pp. 404–518 (reprint, with the same pagination, of the translation by abbé Fournet, Vivès, vol. 2, Paris, 1857); *Thomas d'Aquin, Vets la perfection de la vie spirituelle*, trans. H. Maréchal, Paris, 1932 (partial trans. by the same author in *La Vie Spirituelle* 18 (1928) 498–506; 619–624; 19 (1928) 85–97; 223–28; 342–52).

Contra doctrinam retrahentium a religione: see chapter 5.

According to its conclusion, this work—commonly called the *Contra retrahentes*—is directed "against the erroneous and pernicious doctrine of those who deter men from entering into the religious life." Later than the *De perfectione* (1269–70), and contemporaneous with the *Quodlibet IV* (Lent 1272)—whose article 23 repeats the theme of young peoples's entry into the religious life and article 24 the relation between precepts and counsels—its composition may be placed between Lent and Christmas 1271. According to R.-A. Gauthier, however, the *Contra retrahentes* would have been prior to the *Quodlibet*, which still places it, within a few months, in that same period. Among the strong points in this response, which prepares the way for the exposition in *IIa-IIae*, we should note the absolute primacy given to charity and the importance accorded voluntary and mendicant poverty, as a means of arriving at Christian perfection in following Christ.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 41 C; Parma, vol. 15, pp. 103–25; Vivès, vol. 29, pp. 175–90; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 4, pp. 265–322; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 2, pp. 159–90.

English translation: *An Apology for the Religious Orders*, trans. J. Procter (London, 1902; St. Louis: Herder, 1902; Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1950). French translation: *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Vrin-Reprise, vol. 4, Paris, 1984,

pp. 311–404 (reprinted, with the same pagination, from the translation by abbé Fournet, Vivès, vol. 2, Paris, 1857); *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, l'entrée en religion*, trans. H. Maréchal, Paris, 1935.

De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas: see chapter 10.

This opusculum had a place in the Parisian controversy about "Averroism" among the masters of the arts faculty. There is agreement in dating it to 1270, a little before the episcopal condemnation of 10 December. Thomas refutes here the doctrine that makes the possible intellect a substance separated from the body and the same for all men, a doctrine contrary to both Aristotle's teaching and the Christian faith.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 43, preface pp. 247–87, text pp. 291–314; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 208–24; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 311–55; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 1, pp. 33–69; Marietti, *Opuscula philosophica*, pp. 63–90, which reprints, without critical apparatus, the text of the edition established by L. W. Keeler, *S. Thomae Aquinatis Tractatus de unitate intellectus contra averroistas*, Textus et documenta, Series philosophica 12, Rome, 1936; F. Van Steenberghen, "Corrections au texte du *De unitate intellectus* de Thomas d'Aquin," *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale SIEPM* 19 (1977) 65–67.

English translations: *The Trinity and the Unicity of the Intellect* (based on text in Parma ed.), trans. R. E. Brennan (St. Louis Univ., 1946); *On the Unity of the Intellect Against the Averroists*, trans. B. Zedler, Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1968; *On the Unity of the Intellect*, trans. B. Zedler, Milwaukee, Marquette University Press, 1968; *On the Uniqueness of the Intellect against the Averroists*, trans. Ralph McInerny, forthcoming, Purdue University Press. French translations: *Opuscules de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Vrin-Reprise, vol. 3, Paris, 1984, pp. 248–310 (reprint, with the same pagination, of the translation by abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 2, Paris, 1857); *Thomas d'Aquin. L'unité de l'intellect contre les Averroïstes, suivi des Textes contre Averroès antérieurs à 1270*, trans. A. de Libera, Paris: GF-Flammarion, 1994.

De aeternitate mundi: see chapter 10.

The composition of this opusculum belongs to Thomas's second period teaching in Paris, very probably to 1271. Contrary to a good number of theologians who were upset over the strong presence of Aristotle in this field, Thomas shows here that only faith can make us hold that the world had a beginning, and that it is not possible to prove the contrary.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 43, preface, pp. 53–81, text pp. 85–89; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 318–20; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 450–53; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 1, pp. 22–27; Marietti, *Opuscula philosophica*, pp. 105–8.

English translation: In St. Thomas Aquinas, Siger of Brabant, and St. Bonaventure, *On the Eternity of the World*, trans. C. Vollert, L. A. Kendzierski, and P. M. Byrne, Milwaukee, Marquette University Press, 1964. French translation: *Opuscules de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Vrin-Reprise, vol. 6, Paris, 1984, pp. 551–60 (reprint, with the same pagination, of the translation by abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 3, Paris, 1857).

Treatises

De ente et essentia: see chapter 3.

Composed, according to Tolomeo, "for his brothers and companions while he was not yet a master," it is generally agreed to date this opusculum by Thomas to 1252–56 in Paris. This little treatise, dedicated to the notion of *essentia* and to clarifying its

connections with reality and logical intentions, had remarkable success and very numerous editions.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 43, preface pp. 319–65, text pp. 369–81; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 330–37; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 468–79; *S. Thomas Aquinatis sermo sive tractatus de ente et essentia*, L. Baur, ed., Münster 1926,² 1933; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 1, pp. 145–64; *S. Thomas Aquinatis opusculum De ente et essentia, introductione et notis auctum*, C. Boyer, ed., Rome, 1933, re-edited 1946, 1950, and 1970; Marietti, *Opuscula philosophica*, pp. 5–18; Marietti, I. Sestili, ed.,³ 1957; M.-D. Roland-Gosselin, *Le "De ente et Essentia" de S. Thomas d'Aquin*. Text established according to the manuscripts. Introduction, notes, and historical studies, Bibliothèque thomiste 8, Paris, 1948.

English translations: *Aquinas on Being and Essence*, trans. A. A. Maurer, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1949, 1968; trans. G. Leckie, New York, Appleton, 1957; trans. A. H. Bachhuber, St. Louis: *The Modern Schoolman*, 1957; trans. J. Bobick, *Aquinas on Being and Essence*, Notre Dame, 1965. French translation: *S. Thomas d'Aquin, L'être et l'essence*, text, translation, and notes by C. Capelle, Bibliothèque des textes philosophiques, Paris,⁹1991.

De principiis naturae: see chapter 3.

This youthful little work was composed for a certain Friar Sylvester, who is otherwise unknown to us. Thomas composed it before becoming a master, but the date is uncertain: during the years when he was bachelor of sentences (1252–561), or even earlier, at the time of his studies. At issue here was the question of the principles of change: matter, form, privation, and the causes of change in nature.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 43, preface, pp. 5–33, text pp. 39–47; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 338–42; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 480–86; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 1, pp. 8–18; Marietti, *Opuscula philosophica*, pp. 121–28; *Saint Thomas Aquinas, De principiis naturae*, Introduction and critical text by J. J. Pauson, Textus philosophici Friburgenses 2, Fribourg-Louvain, 1950.

English translations: R. I. Henle and V. I. Bourke, Latin text and English translation, St. Louis University, 1947; complete translation by V. J. Bourke in *The Pocket Aquinas*, New York, Pocket Books, 1973; *De principiis naturae ad fratrem Sylvestrum*, trans. R. A. Kocourek, St. Paul: North Central, 1948. French translations: *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Les principes de la nature (De principiis naturae)*, trans. and notes by R. Bernier, Montreal, 1962; *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Les principes de la réalité naturelle*, intro., trans., and notes by J. Madiran, Docteur Commun, Paris, 1963; *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Vrin-Reprise, vol. 6, Paris 1984, pp. 594–612 (reprint, with the same pagination, of the translation by the abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 3, Paris, 1857, pp. 594–612).

Compendium theologiae seu brevis compilatio theologiae ad fratrem Raynaldum: see chapter 9.

Written at Reginald's request, the *Compendium theologiae* is structured according to the order of the theological virtues and is presented as an exposition of Christian doctrine mindful of simplicity and brevity. The first part belongs to the Roman period, probably the years 1265–67, which is to say a little after the *Summa contra Gentiles*; Thomas explains here Christian doctrine on faith, drawing for support on the articles of the *Credo*. Obligated to interrupt this work, the author would have gone back to writing

it upon his return to Naples; the second part deals with Christian hope in relation to the petitions in the *Pater*. The work remained unfinished, broken off in chapter 10 of this second part.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 42, preface, pp. 5–73, text pp. 83–191; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 1–85; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 1–127; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 2, 1–219; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, pp. 13–138.

English translation: L. Lynch, trans., New York, 1947; *Compendium of Theology*, trans. C. Vollert, St. Louis Univ., 1952. French translations: *Opusculs de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Vrin-Reprise, vol. 1, Paris, 1984 (reprint, with the same pagination, of the translation by abbe Védrine, Vivès, vol. 1, Paris, 1856, pp. 76–411); *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Bref résumé de la foi chrétienne—Compendium theologiae*, trans. J. Kreit, Docteur angélique 6, Paris, 1985 (the Latin text follows an earlier edition than the Leonine; the unfinished *Compendium* is "completed" here by borrowing from other works by Thomas).

De regno ad regem Cypri: see chapter 9.

Addressed to the king of Cyprus, probably Hugh II of Lusignan, the *De regno* may date from around 1267. This writing, also known by the name *De regimine principum*, is a pedagogical and moral opusculum for the use of a prince more than a true treatise on political theory. Unfinished, its authentic portion stops in the middle of chapter II, 8 (formerly II, 4).

Editions: Leonine, vol. 42, preface pp. 421–44, text pp. 449–71; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 225–91; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 336–412; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 1, pp. 312–487; Marietti, *Opuscula philosophica*, pp. 257–358.

English translation: *On Kingship, to the King of Cyprus*, trans. G. B. Phelan and I. T. Eschmann (Toronto: PIMS, 1949). French translations: *Opusculs de saint Thomas d'Aquin* trans. abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 3, Paris 1857, pp. 205–466; *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Du gouvernement royal*, trans. Cl. Roguet and preface by Ch. Jourmet, Paris, 1931; *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Du Royaume. De Regno*, trans. M.-M. Cottier, Paris, 1946.

De substantiis separatis: see chapter 11.

According to the ancient catalogues, this treatise was addressed to Reginald and is later than the first half of 1271, without our being able to say whether it was written in Paris or in Naples. Dedicated to the doctrine concerning the angels, the work is divided into two parts: what the ancients thought on the subject (ch. 1–17) and the teaching of the Catholic faith; unfinished, this second part breaks off in the middle of the exposition on the sin of the angels (ch. 20).

Editions: Leonine, vol. 40 D; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 183–207; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 273–310; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 1, pp. 70–144; Marietti, *Opuscula philosophica*, pp. 21–58; *Saint Thomas Aquinas's Treatise on Separate Substances*, F. J. Lescoe, ed., West Hartford, Connecticut, 1963.

English translation: *Treatise on Separate Substances*, trans. F. J. Lescoe, West Hartford, Conn. St. Joseph's College, 1959. French translation: *Opusculs de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Vrin-Reprise, vol. 3, Paris, 1984 (reprint, with the same pagination, of the translation by the abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 2, Paris, 1857, pp. 153–248).

Letters and Requests for Expert Opinion

De emptione et uenditione ad tempus: see chapter 7.

This short letter, "About buying and selling on credit," composed around 1262, gives Thomas's reply to the question that the Florentine conventual lector, a certain James of Viterbo, had posed to him about what was then called usury but what today we designate as financial speculation. Showing Thomas's entry into the world and the problems of his time, it also shows the care he took in checking his positions—on this question consulting his confrere Hugh of Saint-Cher, and the chaplain to Urban IV, Marin of Eboli.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 42, preface pp. 383–90, text pp. 393–94; Parma, vol. 17, PP. 337; Vivès, vol. 28, pp. 465–66; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 3, pp. 178–79; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, pp. 1185–86 (text and critical apparatus established by A. O'Rahilly, "Notes on St. Thomas, III. St. Thomas on Credit," *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 64 (1928), pp. 159–68).

English translation: "On Buying and Selling on Credit," trans. A. O'Rahilly, *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 31 (1928): 159–65. French translation: *Opusculs de S. Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Védrine, Vivès, vol. 7, Paris, 1858, pp. 289–91.

Contra errores Graecorum: see chapter 7.

Rather badly named the *Contra errores Graecorum*, this work composed at Urban IV's request is the examination of a collection of texts from the Greek Fathers (*Libellus* or *Liber de fide Trinitatis*), probably compiled by Nicholas of Durazzo, bishop of the former Cotrone; it must be dated from 1263 or the beginning of 1264. Thomas uses the first part to explain the equivocal texts: he notes the frequently doubtful way they are used and the defective translations, seeking to detach the doctrinal content from the teaching of the Greek Fathers. The second part examines more closely four precise questions (the procession of the Holy Spirit *a Filio*, the primacy of the pope, unleavened bread in the eucharistic celebration, the question of purgatory). This opusculum manifests Thomas's clear regard for the texts compiled and his confidence in the teaching of the Greek Fathers in matters of faith, but it suffers from its almost exclusive dependance on the *Libellus* submitted for his examination.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 40 A (with the text of the *Libellus* pp. 107–51); Parma, vol. 15, PP. 239–58; Vivès, vol. 29, pp. 344–73; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 3, PP. 279–328; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, pp. 315–46 and text of the *Libellus* pp. 347–413; *S. Thomas d'Aquin, Contra errores Graecorum*, Text presented and edited with notes, references, and related documents by Msgr. P. Glorieux, Monumenta christiana selecta, Tournai-Paris-Rome-New York, 1957.

No English translation French translation: *Opusculs de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Vrin-Reprise, vol. 2, Paris 1984, pp. 1–76 (reprint, with the same pagination, from the translation by abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 1, Paris, 1856).

De rationibus fidei ad Cantorem Antiochenum: see chapter 7.

This little work responds to various questions put to Thomas by a certain "cantor of Antioch" (whom nothing helps us identify) who had contacts with various circles in the Near East: the Saracens, who laughed at (*irrisores fidei*) the Christian dogmas of the Trinity, Incarnation, Redemption, and Eucharist; the Greeks and Armenians, who did not believe in Purgatory, and other peoples (*alias nationes*) who shared with the

Muslims a conception of the divine presence that questions free will and merit. Thomas reminds his correspondent, who asks for some rational arguments, that we must argue only on the basis of authorities accepted by our interlocutors. The Christian arguer cannot aim at proving the faith, but only at defending it and showing that it is not false. The references to the *Summa contra Gentiles* invite us to date this text little later than 1265.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 40 B; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 86–96; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 128–43; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 3, PP. 252–78; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, pp. 253–68.

French translation: *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Vrin-Reprise, vol. 2, Paris, 1984, pp. 411–53 (reprint, with the same pagination, from the translation by abbé Fournet, Vivès, vol. 1, Paris, 1856). No complete English version, but see "Why Did God the Son Become Man?" trans. H. Nash, chap. 5 in *Life of the Spirit*, London, Blackfriars, 1952.

Expositio super primam et secundam Decretalem ad Archidiaconum Tudertinum: see chapter 7.

The *Expositio* of these two decretals seems to be dedicated to Giffredus of Anagni, archdeacon of Todi and *socius* of the provost of Saint-Omer, Thomas's friend Adenulf of Anagni, at whose request Reginald of Piperno published the *Lectura in Ioannem*; this dedication invites us to situate the opusculum during the Orvieto period (1261–65). The first decretal on which Thomas presents a doctrinal commentary is the profession of faith known under the name *Firmiter*, formulated by the Lateran Council in 1215. The second decretal, *Damnatus*, of which Thomas is content to make a paraphrase, is a text from the same council that explains, refutes, and condemns the booklet in which Joachim of Fiore had attacked the trinitarian doctrine of Peter Lombard.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 40 E; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 300–309; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 424–38; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 4, PP. 324–48; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, pp. 417–31.

No English translation. French translation: *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 3, Paris, 1857, pp. 492–524.

De articulis fidei et ecclesiae sacramentis ad archiepiscopum Panormitanum: see chapter 7.

This opusculum was composed at the request of Leonard, archbishop of Palermo from 1261 to 1270, dates within which we must also situate its composition. In the first part, Thomas expounds the *Credo*; the second part is dedicated to the seven sacraments. For each of the articles of the faith and the sacraments, Thomas follows a similar method: a brief explanation that he gives is followed by the principal errors on these subjects that Scripture permits us to refute. This little work found a considerable diffusion.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 42, preface pp. 209–41, text pp. 245–57; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 115–22; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 171–82; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 3, PP. 1–18; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. I, pp. 141–51; D. Mongillo, "L'opuscolo di Tommaso d'Aquino per l'arcivescovo di Palermo," *O Theologos* 2 (1975) 111–25; C. Militello, "De articulis fidei et Ecclesiae sacramentis ad archiepiscopum Panormitanum,"

ibid., pp. 127–206 (Latin text, with Italian translation and index of citations and of errors denounced).

English translation: The second treatise only, *On the Sacraments*, in *Catechetical Instructions of St. Thomas*, trans. J. B. Collins, New York: Wagner, 1939; 1953.
French translation: *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Fournet, Vivès, vol. 1, Paris, 1856, pp. 532–62.

Responsio ad magistrum Ioannem de Vercellis de 108 articulis: see chapter 9. This expert opinion was requested of Thomas by the master of the order, John of Vercelli. He examines here 108 propositions drawn from the commentaries on the *Sentences* by his confrere, Peter of Tarentaise, the future Innocent V, all suspected of error by a detractor. Thomas explains here the author's thought by disengaging it from the false or tendentious interpretations of the objector. The work belongs to the Roman period, though we cannot narrow the date any further (1265–66 or 1265–67).

Editions: Leonine, vol. 42, preface pp. 263–75, text pp. 279–94; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 151–62; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 230–47; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 3, pp. 211–45; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, pp. 223–40.

No English translation. French translation: *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 2, Paris, 1857, pp. 50–92.

De forma absolutionis: see chapter 9.

The master of the order, John of Vercelli, had solicited Thomas's opinion on a *Libellus* whose author contests the use of the formula indicating sacramental absolution ("Ego te absolvo"). Thomas's examination, dated 22 February (probably 1269), responds to the difficulties the objector raised in the name of the deprecativ formula.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 40 C; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 295–99; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 417–23; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 3, pp. 163–77; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, pp. 173–80 (reprint of the text established by P. Castagnoli, *L'opuscolo De forma absolutionis di San Tommaso d'Aquino*, Plaisance 1933).

No English translation. French translation: *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 3, Paris, 1857, pp. 474–91.

De secreto: see chapter 11.

This opusculum is not, properly speaking, a work of Thomas's, but the report of a commission in which he took part: the 1269 Paris general chapter asked some masters to give their opinion about six cases concerning the power of a religious superior over the conscience of a subordinate accused of a secret fault or knowing the unknown author of some fault. Thomas's opinion is reported on two questions where, contrary to the opinion of the other masters, he defends the right of the superior to demand from one of his subordinates, in certain cases, the confession of a secret.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 42, preface pp. 475–83, text, pp. 487–88; Parma, vol. 24, pp. 235–36; Vivès, vol. 32, pp. 816–18; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 4, pp. 497–501; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, pp. 447–48.

No French translation. For an English summary, see V. J. Bourke, *Aquinas' Search for Wisdom*. 143–46.

Liber De sortibus ad dominum Iacobum de Tonengo: see chapter 11.

Addressed to James of Tonengo, chaplain to the pope, this opusculum was probably composed during the summer of 1270 or 1271. In five chapters, Thomas examines the reasons, aims, modes, and efficacy of recourse to casting lots; as to the discernment of the legitimacy of questioning lots, it rests on the doctrine of free will and providence.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 43, preface, pp. 207–26, text pp. 229–38; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 310–16; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 439–48; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 3, pp. 144–62; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, pp. 159–67.

No English translation. French translation: *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 3, Paris, 1857, pp. 525–48.

Responsiones ad lectorem Venetum de 30 et 36 articulis: see chapter 9.

These two *Responsiones*, dated from 1271, are addressed to a Friar Baxianus of Lodi, lector of the Venetian priory, who had solicited Thomas's opinion on various problems of cosmology (the influence of the celestial bodies, action of the angels, the location of Hell, etc.). The first response examines 30 articles; following the intervention of the Venetian students, who submitted some supplementary difficulties, Thomas recast his response in 36 articles, integrating into them some elements of his response to John of Vercelli, *De 43 articulis*, which had been written in the intervening time (2 April 1271).

Editions: Leonine, vol. 42, preface pp. 299–320 text pp. 321–24 and 339–46; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 169–74 (*Resp. de 36 art.*); Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 256–63 (*Resp. de 36 art.*); Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 3, pp. 180–95 (*Resp. de 35 art.*); Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, pp. 193–97; 199–208.

No English translation. French translation: *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 2, Paris, 1857, pp. 113–32 (*Resp. de 36 art.*).

Responsio ad magistrum Ioannem de Vercellis de 43 articulis: see chapter 9. Dated with precision to Holy Thursday, 2 April 1271, this letter is an expert opinion composed at the request of the master of the order, John of Vercelli, bearing on disputed points of doctrine where questions of cosmology hold an important place: this response belongs to the same file as those addressed to the lector at Venice, *De 30 et 36 articulis*. John of Vercelli also consulted Albertus Magnus and Robert Kilwardby, whose responses have been preserved.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 42, preface pp. 299–320, text pp. 327–35; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 163–68; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 248–55; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 3, pp. 196–210; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, pp. 211–18. (Some editions prior to the Leonine, on the basis of faulty manuscripts and printed texts, erroneously indicated 42 instead of 43 articles.)

No English translation. French translation: *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 2, Paris, 1857, pp. 93–112.

Responsio ad lectorem Bisuntinum de 6 articulis: see chapter 9.

A certain Friar Gerard, lector at the priory of Besançon, consulted Thomas on six articles; five concerned remarks by preachers—Did the star appearing to the Magi have the form of a cross, or of a human figure, or of a crucifix? Did the little hands of the baby Jesus create the stars? Was the prophecy of Simeon to the Virgin Mary accomplished seven times each day until the Resurrection? Thomas's response firmly coun-

seled not becoming involved in the frivolity and uselessness of such matters. A sixth question concerns sacramental confession. Of uncertain date, this consultation may have been in 1271.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 42, preface, pp. 349–52, text pp. 355–56; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 175–76; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 264–65; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 3, pp. 246–48; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, pp. 243–44.

No English translation. French translation: *Opusculum de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 2, Paris, 1857, pp. 132–36.

Epistola ad ducissam Brabantiae: see chapter 11.

The letter to the duchess of Brabant, which it would be better to designate now as "Letter to the *Countess* of Flanders," as do certain manuscripts along with Tolomeo, who entitles it *ad comitissam Flandrie*, is also known under the improper name *De regimine iudeorum* (more than half of this short text speaks of non-Jewish subjects); it is a response to some questions that principally concern the financial administration of the prince's subjects; Thomas here bases the legitimacy of collecting taxes on the principle of public utility. As to the recipient, recent research leads us to think she is Margaret of Constantinople, countess of Flanders and daughter of Baudouin I, count of Flanders and first emperor of Constantinople; the text must thus be placed at Paris in 1271.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 42, preface pp. 361–71, text pp. 375–78; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 292–94; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 413–16; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 1, pp. 488–94; Marietti, *Opuscula philosophica*, pp. 249–52.

English translation: "On the Government of Jews in Aquinas," *Selected Political Writings*, ed., intro. A. P. d'Entrèves, trans. J. G. Dawson, Oxford, 1948, pp. 84–95. French translation: *Opusculum de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 3, Paris, 1857, pp. 467–74.

De mixtione elementorum ad magistrum Philippum de Castro Caeli: see chapter 11.

This little treatise is addressed to Master Phillip de Castro Caeli, professor of medicine in Bologna and Naples, who consulted Thomas on the question of the four elements and their qualities, following the role that ancient medicine had them play in the theory of humors and of temperaments. The exact date of this opusculum is uncertain; we can situate it during the second sojourn in Paris, perhaps before the 1270 discussion on the unicity of substantial form, of which it bears no trace.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 43, preface pp. 135–52, text pp. 155–57; Parma vol. 16, pp. 353–54; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 502–3; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 1, pp. 19–21; Marietti, *Opuscula philosophica*, pp. 155–56.

English translations: "On the Combining of the Elements," trans. V. R. Larkin, *Isis* 51 (1960), 67–72; "On the Mixture of the Elements, to Master Philip," trans. P. V. Spade, Oklahoma State University, Trans. Clearing House, 1990, 1–5. A-40-75s. French translation: *Opusculum de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 4, Paris, 1857, pp. 41–45.

De motu cordis ad magistrum Philippum de Castro Caeli: see chapter 11.

Addressed to the same recipient as the previous treatise, this opusculum holds that

the movement of the heart, in man as in animals, is a natural movement, and not a violent one, as Alfred of Sareshel held. This little treatise, whose exact date is uncertain, may have been composed in Naples in 1273.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 43, preface pp. 95–123, text pp. 127–30; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 358–60; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 508–11; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 1, pp. 28–32; Marietti, *Opuscula philosophica*, pp. 165–68.

English translation: *On the Movement of the Heart*, trans. V. R. Larkin, in "Thomas Aquinas on the Heart," *Journal of the History of Medicine* 15 (1960) 22–30. French translation: *Opusculum de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. by abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 4, Paris, 1857, pp. 55–62.

De operationibus occultis naturae ad quendam militem ultramontanum: see chapter 11.

Dedicated to the "hidden operations of nature," this opusculum tries to discern that which derives from natural causes and that which can be attributed to demonic intervention in magic practices, whose claims Thomas denounces. The parallels in this exposition invite dating it to the second period teaching in Paris (1268–72); the knight "from beyond the mountains" to whom it is addressed, otherwise unknown, would then be someone located in Italy.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 43, pp. 163–79, text pp. 183–86; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 355–57; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 504–7; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 1, pp. 1–7; Marietti, *Opuscula philosophica*, pp. 159–62.

English translation: *The Letter of St. Thomas Aquinas De occultis operibus naturae ad quendam militem ultramontanum*, in *Philosophical Studies* 42 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University, 1939), trans. J. B. McAllister. French translation: *Opusculum de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 4, Paris, 1857, pp. 46–54.

De iudiciis astrorum: see chapter 11.

The recipient of this short letter, who may have been Reginald, asked Thomas if it is permitted to use astrology. Without denying the bodily effects of the stars on our world, Thomas's response firmly excludes human acts from the domain of their influence, and he concludes that consulting the stars about what depends on the human will is, therefore, a serious sin. The opusculum appears to date from the second sojourn in Paris (1269–72).

Editions: Leonine, vol. 43, preface pp. 189–97, text p. 201; Parma, vol. 16, p. 317; Vivès, vol. 27, p. 449; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 3, pp. 142–43; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, p. 155.

No English translation. French translation: *Opusculum de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 3, Paris, 1857, pp. 549–50.

Epistola ad Bernardum abbatem casinensem: see chapters 1 and 14.

Addressed to Bernard Ayglier, abbot of Monte Cassino, this letter explains the meaning of a passage in Saint Gregory's *Moralia* relating to the infallibility of divine foreknowledge and its links with human liberty. Last in date among Thomas's works, it was written toward mid-February 1274 in Aquino or in the castle of Maenza, while he was on his way to attend the council of Lyon.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 42, preface pp. 399–409, text pp. 413–15; Vivès, vol. 32,

pp. 834–835; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 3, PP. 249–51; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 1, pp. 249–50; A Dondaine, "La lettre de saint Thomas à l'abbé du Montcassin," in *Saint Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974 Commemorative Studies*, A. Maurer, ed., vol. 1, Toronto, 1974, pp. 87–108.

Partial English translation: In V. J. Bourke, *Aquinas' Search for Wisdom*, pp. 114–15. French translation: P. Renaudin, "Saint Thomas d'Aquin et saint Benoît," *RT* 17 (1909) 513–37; cf. pp. 533–35 (text prior to the critical edition).

Liturgical Works, Sermons, Prayers

Officium de festo Corporis Christi ad mandatum Urbani Papae: see chapter 7.

The authenticity of this work has long presented difficulties, but after P.-M. Gy's work, its attribution to Saint Thomas is no longer doubtful. It is the Office *Sacerdos* of the mass *Cibavit*, both promulgated by Urban IV on 11 August 1264 with the bull *Transiturus*, which instituted this feast for the universal Church. Its composition, thus goes back to the Orvieto period, a little before this date.

Editions: Parma, vol. 15, PP. 233–38; Vivès, vol. 29, pp. 335–43; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 4, PP. 461–76; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 2, pp. 275–81.

French translations: *Opuscules de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Fournet, Vivès, vol. 5, Paris, 1858, pp. 416–34; selected portions in *Prières de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, translated and presented by A.-D. Sertillanges, Paris, 1920, reprint 1954; *Prières de Saint Thomas*, presentation, translation, and commentaries by D. Sureau, Paris, 1992, pp. 45–58.

Hymn "Adoro Te": see chapter 7.

Despite A. Wilmart's labors, which seemed to conclude against the authenticity of the *Adoro Te*, recent research has strong arguments in favor of this prayer's authenticity, which is attested in the fourth version of Tocco and already widespread before Thomas's canonization.

Editions: Parma, vol 24, pp. 243–44; Vivès, vol. 32, p. 823; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 4, PP. 544–45; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 2, p. 287.

French translations: *Prières de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, translated and presented by A.-D. Sertillanges, Paris, 1920, Reprint 1954, pp. 42–43; *Prières de Saint Thomas*, D. Sureau, ed., Paris, 1992, pp. 59–60.

Collationes in decem precepta: see chapter 4.

It is difficult to specify with certitude the date and place of composition of the homilies on the ten commandments. Given in Thomas's mother tongue in Italy (1261–68, or 1273?), they were collected by Peter of Andria; the fair copy was late, contemporary with that of the *Lectura* on Saint Matthew. This preaching by Thomas bears on the double commandment of charity and then on the ten commandments.

Editions: J.-P. Torrell, "Les *Collationes in decem preceptis* de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Edition critique avec introduction et notes," *RSPT* 69 (1985) 5–40 and 227–63; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 97–114; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 144–70; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 4, PP. 413–55; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 2, 245–71.

English translations: *The Commandments of God*, trans. L. Shapeote (London, 1937); also in J. B. Collins, *Catechetical Instructions*, New York, Wagner, 1953.

French translations: *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Les commandements*, Intro., trans., and notes by a monk of Fontgombault, Docteur Commun, Paris, 1970 (the Latin text is not the one of the critical edition); *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans, abbé Fournet, Vivès, vol. 1, Paris, 1856, pp. 453–531.

Collationes in orationem dominicam, in Symbolum Apostolorum, in salutationem angelicam: see chapters 4 and 13.

It is difficult to specify with certitude the date and place of composition of this series of homilies. The sermons on the *Pater* were probably given in Naples during Lent of 1273; their *reportatio* is the work of Reginald of Piperno, as is that of the sermons on the *Credo*, whose attribution to this same period is not certain. The sermon on the first petition of the *Pater* in the printed editions, borrowed from Aldobrandinus de Toscanella, is unauthentic, cf. B.-G. Guyot, "Aldobrandinus de Toscanella: source de la la *Petitio* des éditions du commentaire de S. Thomas sur le Pater," *AFP* 53 (1983) 175–201. As to the homilies on the *Ave Maria*, this is probably an ordinary sermon with its *collatio*, preached during the second sojourn at Paris.

Editions: Parma, vol. 16, pp. 123–51; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 183–229; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 4, PP. 349–411; 456–60; Marietti, *Opuscula theologica*, vol. 2, pp. 193–241; I. F. Rossi, *S. Thomae Aquinatis Expositio Salutationis Angelicae. Introductio et textus*, Plaisance, 1931, reprinted in *Divus Thomas* (Plaisance) 34 (1931) 445–79.

English translations: *The Sermon-Conferences of St. Thomas Aquinas on the Apostles' Creed*, trans. from the Leonine text, ed. and intro. by Nicholas Ayo, C.S.C. (Notre Dame, 1988); *The Three Greatest Prayers*, trans. L. Shapcote, London, 1937; J. B. Collins, *Catechetical Instructions of St. Thomas Aquinas*, New York, 1953; L. Every, *Dominicaria* 39 (1954), 31ff. French translations: *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Le Pater et l'Ave*, Intro. and trans. by a monk of Fontgombault, "Docteur Commun," Paris, 1967; Saint Thomas d'Aquin, le Credo, Intro., trans., and notes by a monk of Fontgombault, Docteur Commun, Paris, 1969; *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans, abbé Fournet, Vivès, vol. 1, Paris 1856, pp. 563–632; vol. 2, 1857, pp. 1–49.

Other Sermons: see chapter 4.

The editions of Thomas's works generally contain a good number of sermons attributed to him, for the most part falsely. We indicate here, in alphabetical order, the list of 19 authentic sermons established by L.-J. Bataillon, "Les sermons attribués à saint Thomas: questions d'authenticité," *MM* 19 (1988) 325–41, cf. pp. 339–40 (Father Bataillon's list also contains the sermon on the *Ave Maria* which has been mentioned above along with the ones on the *Pater* and *Credo*). The 10 sermons bearing a *collatio* are indicated in italics. As to the dates when these sermons were preached, it is often difficult to be precise; we could infer from the places that are sometimes indicated: Bologna, Milan; Paris is the probable place for at least 12 of them.

Abiciamus: Vivès, vol. 32, p. 693; J. B. Raulx, ed., *Divi Thomae Aquinatis Sermones et opuscula concionatoria*, vol. 1, Paris, 1881, p. 416; Busa, vol. 6, p. 38a.

Attendite: Parma, vol. 24, p. 226; Vivès, vol. 32, p. 673; Raulx, p. 483; Busa, vol. 6, p. 35a.

Beata gens: Vivès, vol. 32, p. 797; Raulx, p. 516; Busa, vol. 6, p. 39c.

Beati qui habitant: Th. Käppeli, "Una raccolta di prediche attribuite a S. Tommaso d'Aquino," *AFP* 13 (1943), pp. 59–94, cf. p. 88; Busa, vol. 6, p. 44a.

Beatus uir: Vivès, vol. 32, p. 803; Raulx, p. 525; Busa, vol. 6, p. 41a.

Celum et terra: Vivès, vol. 32, p. 692; Raulx, p. 425; Busa, vol. 6, p. 37c.

Ecce ego mitto: Vivès, vol. 32, p. 815; Raulx, p. 417; Busa, vol. 6, p. 42a.

Ecce rex tuus: J. Leclercq, "Un sermon inédit de Saint Thomas sur la royauté du Christ," *RT* 46 (1946) 152–66, cf. pp. 156–66; Busa, vol. 6, p. 45a.

Emitte Spiritum: unpublished.

Exiit qui seminar: Käppeli, art. cit., p. 75; Busa, vol. 6, p. 42b.

Germinet terra: P. A. Uccelli, *I Gigli a Maria* 12 (1874) 126–43; Busa, vol. 6, p. 38a.

Homo quidam erat: Vivès, vol. 32, p. 791; Raulx, p. 493; Busa, vol. 6, p. 38a.

Homo quidam fecit: L.-J. Bataillon, "Le sermon inédit de saint Thomas *Homo quidam fecit cenam magnam*. Introduction et édition," *RSPT* 67 (1983) 353–68.

Lauda et letare: unpublished.

Lux orta est: Parma, vol. 24, p. 231; Vivès, vol. 32, p. 682; Raulx, p. 508; Busa, vol. 6, p. 36b.

Osanna filio David: Käppeli, art. cit., p. 72; Busa, vol. 6, p. 42a (partial).

Puer Iesus: Parma, vol. 24, p. 220; Vivès, vol. 32, p. 663; Raulx, p. 418; Busa, vol. 6, p. 33a.

Seraphim stabant: unpublished.

Veniet desideratus: unpublished.

No complete French translation; S. Pinckaers, "Un sermon inédit de saint Thomas," *Sources* 12 (1986) 9–22 (trans. of the sermon *Homo quidam fecit cenam magnam*).

Unauthentic Works

De fallacis: see chapter 1.

This little treatise on logic for beginners, which examines faulty reasoning, was considered until the beginning of the twentieth century as one of Thomas's youthful works. It was generally thought that he would have composed it during his detention at Roccasecca in 1244–45. Dependant on several authors, notably Peter of Spain, it is in reality later than the Roccasecca date and today is recognized as unauthentic. Gauthier suggests looking for its author among the masters of arts in the south of France toward the end of the thirteenth century.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 43, preface pp. 385–400, text pp. 403–18; Parma, vol. 16, PP. 377–87; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 533–48; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 4, PP. 508–34; Marietti, *Opuscula philosophica*, pp. 225–40.

French translation: *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans. abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol., 4, Paris, 1857, pp. 116–59.

De propositionibus modalibus: see chapter 1.

Considered for a long time along with the *De fallaciis* as a work of Thomas's youth that he composed during his detention at Roccasecca and directed to his fellow students in Naples (1244–45), this little logical treatise is today, like the preceding entry, recognized as unauthentic.

Editions: Leonine, vol. 43, preface, pp. 385–400, text, pp. 421–22; Parma, vol. 16, pp. 388–89; Vivès, vol. 27, pp. 549–50; Mandonnet, *Opuscula*, vol. 4, pp. 505–7; I. M. Bochenski, "Sancti Thomae Aquinatis De modalibus opusculum et doctrina," *Angelicum* 17 (1940) 180–218; Marietti, *Opuscula philosophica*, pp. 243–45.

French translation: *Opuscles de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, trans, abbé Bandel, Vivès, vol. 4, 1857, pp. 160–63.

Numerous other unauthentic works or works of doubtful authenticity have been attributed to Thomas, as, for example, the treatise *De demonstratione* or the opuscula *De instantibus*, *De natura verbi intellectus*, *De principio individuationis*, *De natura generis*, *De natura accidentis*, *De natura materiae*, *De quattuor oppositis*, etc., that may be found in current editions (Mandonnet *Opuscula*, vol. 4; Marietti, *Opuscula philosophica*, see index). Others are extracts from authentic works that circulated as independent works. That was the case, for example, of the opuscula *De differentia verbi divini et humani* (extract from the *Lectura in Iohannem* c. 1, lect. 1), *De sensu respectu singularium* (extract from the *Sententia Libri de anima*, lib. 2, lect. 14), etc. The following list of opuscula of one or the other kind is drawn from the list of opuscula in the *Tabula aurea* and the *Piana* edition established by B.-G. Guyot:³

Concordantiae "Pertransibunt plurimi"

De beatitudine

De demonstratione

De differentia verbi divini et humani

De dilectione Dei et proximi

De dimensionibus indeterminatis

De divinis moribus

De eruditione principis

De expositione missae

De fallaciis

De fato

De humanitate Christi

De instantibus

De intellectu et intelligibili

De inventione medii

De modo studendi

De natura accidentis

De natura generis

De natura loci

De natura luminis

De natura materiae

De natura syllogismorum

³ B.-G. Guyot, *BT* 12 (1963–1965), p. 207–208; this list is reproduced in the introduction to *Petrus a Bergamo O.P., Concordantiae Textuum discordantium Divi Thomae Aquinatis* Editio fototypica, I. Colosio, ed., Florence, 1982, no pagination. This text also indicates some probable authors for some of the unauthentic works, as well as the authentic sources for the extracts.

De natura verbi intellectus

De officio sacerdotis

De potentiis animae

De principio individuationis

De propositionibus modalibus

De puritate conscientiae et modo confitendi

De quatuor oppositis

De quo est et quod est

De sensu respectu singularium et intellectu respectu universalium

De tempore

De unitate vel pluralitate formarum

De usuris in communi

De venerabili sacramento altaris ad modum decem praedicamentorum

De venerabili sacramento altaris ad modum sermonum

De virtutibus et vitiis

Primus tractatus de universalibus

Secundus tractatus de universalibus

Summa totius logicae

Abbreviations

Below are the abbreviations frequently used in the notes and bibliography. Abbreviations of frequently cited works are mentioned after the Preface. Full information on books and articles cited in abbreviated form is to be found in the bibliography.

AFH	Archivum franciscanum historicum, Quaracchi and Grottaferrata (Rome).
AFP	Archivum fratrum praedicatorum, Rome.
AHDLMA	Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge, Paris.
ALMA	Archivum Latinitatis medii aevi, Brussels.
BA	Bibliothèque augustinienne (Oeuvres de saint Augustin), Paris.
BFSMAe	Bibliotheca franciscana scholastica Medii Aevi, Quaracchi and Grottaferrata (Rome).
BGPTMA	Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, Münster.
BLE	Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique, Toulouse.
BTAM	Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale, Louvain.
BT	Bulletin thomiste, Le Saulchoir, Kain and Etolles.
Cahiers IPC	Cahiers de l'Institut de philosophie comparée, Paris.
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum—Series Latina, Turnhout.
CIVICIMA	Comité international du vocabulaire des institutions et de la communication intellectuelles au moyen âge, Turnhout.
DHGE	Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique, Paris.
DS	Dictionnaire de spiritualité, Paris.
DTC	Dictionnaire de théologie catholique, Paris.
DTP	Divus Thomas, Plaisance.
DT (Fr.)	Divus Thomas, Fribourg (Switzerland).
ETL	Ephemerides theologiae lovanienses, Louvain.
FZPT	Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie, Fribourg (Switzerland).
MM	Miscellanea mediaevalia, Berlin.

MOPH	Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum historica, Rome.
MS	Mediaeval Studies, Toronto.
MSR	Mélanges de science religieuse, Lille.
MThZ	Münchener theologische Zeitschrift, Munich.
NRT	Nouvelle revue théologique, Louvain.
NS	New Scholasticism, Washington.
NV	Nova et vetera, Geneva.
PL	Patrologia latina (J. P. Migne), Paris.
RFNS	Rivista di filosofia neoscolastica, Milan.
RLT	Rassegna di letteratura tomistica (new series of the "Bulletin thomiste"), Naples.
RPL	Revue philosophique de Louvain, Louvain.
RSPT	Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques, Paris.
RSR	Recherches de science religieuse, Paris.
RT	Revue thomiste, Toulouse.
RTAM	Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, Louvain.
SIEPM	Société internationale pour l'étude de la philosophie médiévale, Louvain.
STGMA	Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, Leiden.
VS	Vie spirituelle, Paris.
ZKT	Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, Vienna.

Bibliography

by Gilles Emery, O.P.

adapted for the English edition with the assistance of Kevin White

This list is a compilation of the works, contributions, and articles used and indicated in this book. Editions of Thomas's works as well as translations of them are not mentioned here. They may be found in the Catalogue.

1274—*Année-charnière—Mutations et continuités*. Colloques internationaux du C.N.R.S. 558. Paris, 1977.

Acta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum. Ed. B. M. Reichert. Vol. I (1220–1303); vol. II (1304–1378), *MOPH* 3–4. Rome, 1898 and 1899.

Acta Capitulorum Provincialium Provinciae Romanae (1243–1344), ed. Th. Käppeli and A. Dondaine. *MOPH* 20. Rome, 1941.

Aertsen, J. A. "The Circulation-Motive and Man in the Thought of Thomas Aquinas." In *L'homme et son univers au Moyen Age*, vol. 1, pp. 432–39. Actes du septième congrès international de philosophie médiévale (30 August–4 September 1982), ed. Chr. Wenin. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1986.

———. *Nature and Creature. Thomas Aquinas's Way of Thought*. STGMA 21, Leiden, 1988.

———. "The Eternity of the World: The Believing and the Philosophical Thomas. Some Comments." In *The Eternity of the World*, pp. 9–19.

———. "Natur, Mensch und der Kreislauf der Dinge bei Thomas von Aquin." *MM* 21/1 (1991) 143–60.

Albert & Thomas: Selected Writings. Trans., ed., and intro. S. Tugwell, O.P.; preface by L. E. Boyle, O.P., New York-Mahwah, 1988.

Albertus Magnus (Saint). *Opera omnia* . . . cura ac labore A. Borgnet. 38 vols. Paris, 1890–1899.

———. *Opera omnia ad fidem codicum manuscriptorum edenda* . . . Ed. Institutum Alberti Magni coloniense. Aschendorff, 1951–.

Alexander of Hales. *Glossa in quatuor Libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi*. Studio et cura P. Collegii S. Bonaventurae. 4 vols. BFSMAe 12–15. Quaracchi, 1951–57.

Alvermy, M.-Th. d'. "Un adversaire de saint Thomas: Petrus Iohannis Olivi." In *St. Thomas Aquinas: 1274–1974 Commemorative Studies*, vol. 2, pp. 179–218.

Amargier, A. "Innocent V." *Catholicisme* 5 (1962) 1661–64.

Andereggen, I. E. M. *La metafísica de santo Tomás en la Exposición sobre el "De divinis Nominibus" de Dionisio Areopagita*. Diss. Pont. Univ. Gregoriana. Rome, 1988.

Anonymi, Magistri Artium (c. 1245–50). *Lectura in Librum De anima a quodam discipulo reportata* (Ms. Roma Naz. V. E. 828), ed. R.-A. Gauthier. Spicilegium Bonaventurianum, vol. 24. Grottaferrata, 1985.

Aquinas and Problems of His Time. Ed. G. Verbeke and D. Verhelst. Leuven—The Hague, 1976.

Argerami, O., ed. See *Medieval Latin Texts on the Eternity of the World*.

Arges, M. "New Evidence concerning the Date of Thomas Aquinas' *Lectura* on Matthew." *MS* 49 (1987) 517–23.

Arias Reyero, M. *Thomas von Aquin als Exeget. Die Prinzipien seiner Schriftdeutung und seine Lehre von den Schriftsinnen*. Einsiedeln, 1971.

Aristote et saint Thomas d'Aquin. Journées d'études internationales. Louvain-Paris, 1957.

Aubert, J.-M. *Le droit romain dans l'oeuvre de saint Thomas*. Paris, 1955.

Ausin, S. "La providencia divina en el libro de Job. Estudio sobre la 'Expositio in Job' de Santo Tomás de Aquino." *Scripta Theologica* 8 (1976) 477–550.

Backes, I. *Die Christologie des hl. Thomas von Aquin und die griechischen Kirchenväter*. Paderborn, 1931.

Bataillon, L.-J. "Les sermons de saint Thomas et la *Catena aurea*." In *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*, vol. 1, pp. 67–75.

———. "Un sermon de S. Thomas sur la parabole du festin." *RSPT* 58 (1974) 451–56.

———. "Les crises de l'université de Paris d'après les sermons universitaires." *MM* 10 (1976) 155–69.

———. "'Status quaestionis' sur les instruments et techniques de travail de S. Thomas et S. Bonaventure." In *1274—Année-charnière*, pp. 647–58.

———. "Intermédiaires entre les traités de morale pratique et les sermons: les *distinctiones* bibliques alphabétiques." In *Les genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales. Définition, critique et exploitation*, pp. 213–26. Actes du Colloque international de Louvain-la-Neuve, 25–27 May 1981. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982.

———. "L'édition léonine des oeuvres de saint Thomas et les études médiévales." In *Atti dell' VIII Congresso Tomistico Internazionale*, pp. 452–64, vol. 1: *L'enciclica Aeterni Patris nell' arco di un secolo*. Studi Tomistici 10. Vatican City, 1981.

———. "L'emploi du langage philosophique dans les sermons du treizième siècle." *MM* 13/2 (1981) 983–91.

———. "Les instruments de travail des prédicateurs au XIII^e siècle." In *Culture et travail intellectuel dans l'Occident médiéval*, ed. G. Hasenohr and J. Longère, pp. 197–209. Paris, 1981.

———. "Le sermon inédit de S. Thomas *Homo quidam fecit cenam magnam*. Introduction et édition," *RSPT* 67 (1983) 353–69.

———. "*Similitudines et exempla* dans les sermons du XIII^e siècle." In *The Bible in*

- the Medieval World. Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, ed. K. Walsh and D. Wood, pp. 191–205. Subsidia 4. Oxford—New York, 1985.
- . "De la *lectio* à la *praedicatio*. Commentaires bibliques et sermons au XIII^e siècle." *RSPT* 70 (1986) 559–75.
- . "Exemplar, Pecia, Quaternus." In *Vocabulaire du livre et de l'écriture au Moyen âge*, pp. 206–19.
- , ed. See *La production du livre universitaire*.
- . "Les sermons attribués à saint Thomas. Questions d'authenticité." *MM* 19 (1988) 325–41.
- . "Le edizioni di *Opera omnia* degli scolastici e l'edizione leonina." In *Gli Studi di filosofia medievale fra otto e novecento*, pp. 141–54.
- . "Le Père M.-D. Chenu et la théologie du Moyen Age." *RSPT* 75 (1991) 449–56.
- . "Saint Thomas et les Pères: de la *Catena* à la *Tertia Pars*." In *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 15–36.
- , and A. Dondaine. See Dondaine, A., and L.-J. Bataillon, "Le commentaire de saint Thomas sur les Météores."
- Bäumker, C. *Petrus von Hibernia der Jugendlehrer des Thomas von Aquin und seine Disputation vor König Manfred*. Sitzungsberichte d. Bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos. u. hist. Klasse. Munich, 1920.
- Bazán, B. C. "Pluralisme de formes ou dualisme de substances? La pensée pré-thomiste touchant la nature de l'âme." *RPL* 67 (1969) 31–73.
- , ed. See Siger of Brabant, *Quaestiones in Tertium De anima. De anima intellectiva. De aeternitate mundi*.
- . "Le dialogue philosophique entre Siger de Brabant et Thomas d'Aquin. A propos d'un ouvrage récent de E. H. Wéber O.P.," *RPL* 72 (1974) 53–155.
- . "Les questions disputées, principalement dans les facultés de théologie." In B. C. Bazán, G. Franssen, J. F. Wippel, D. Jacquart, *Les questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les facultés de théologie de droit et de médecine*, pp. 12–149. Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 44–45. Turnhout, 1985.
- . "Le Commentaire de S. Thomas d'Aquin sur le *Traité de l'âme*." *RSPT* 69 (1985) 521–47.
- Bedouelle, G. *L'histoire de l'Eglise. Science humaine ou théologie?* Paris, 1992.
- Berceville, G. "L'*Expositio continua* sur les quatre Evangiles de Saint Thomas d'Aquin (*Catena aurea*): le commentaire de Marc." *Mémoire de D.E.A.*, 1988, deposited at Le Saulchoir.
- Bernt, G., L. Hödl, and H. Schipperges. "Artes liberales." *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 1 (1980) 1058–63.
- Berthier, J.-J., ed. See Humbert of Romans, *Opera de vita regulari*.
- . *Tabulae . . . Summae Theologicae*. Paris, 1903.
- Bianchi, L. *L'errore di Aristotele. La polemica contro l'eternità del mondo nel XIII secolo*. Florence, 1984.
- . *Il vescovo e i filosofi. La condanna parigina del 1277 e l'evoluzione dell' aristotelismo scolastico*. Bergamo, 1990.

- Biffi, I., "Saggio bibliografico sui misteri della vita di Cristo in S. Tommaso d'Aquino." *La Scuola Cattolica* 99 (1971) 175–246.
- . "Misteri di Cristo, sacramenti, escatologia nello Scriptum super Sententiis di San Tommaso d'Aquino." *La Scuola Cattolica* 102 (1974) 569–623.
- . "I Misteri della vita di Cristo nei Commentari biblici di San Tommaso d'Aquino." *DTP* 79 (1976) 217–54.
- . *I Misteri di Cristo in Tommaso d'Aquino*. Preface by M.-D. Chenu. Milan, 1994.
- Blumenkranz, B. "Le *De regimine Judaeorum*: ses modèles, son exemple." In *Aquinas and the Problems of His Time*, pp. 101–17.
- Boethius of Dacia. *Modi significandi sive quaestiones super Priscianum Maiorem*, ed. J. Pinborg, H. Roos, S. S. Jensen. Corpus Philosophicorum Danicorum Medii Aevi, IV/I. Copenhagen, 1969.
- . *De aeternitate mundi*, ed. N. G. Green-Pedersen. Corpus Philosophicorum Danicorum Medii Aevi, VI/II. Copenhagen, 1976.
- Bonaventure (Saint). *Opera omnia*. Studio et cura pp. Collegii a S. Bonaventura. 10 vols. Quaracchi, 1882–1902.
- . *Quaestio reportata de mendicitate cure annotationibus Gulielmi de S. Amore*. In *Collationes in Hexaëmeron et Bonaventuriana quaedam selecta*, ed. F. Delorme, pp. 328–56. BFSMAe 8. Quaracchi, 1934.
- . *Sermones dominicales*, ed. J. G. Bougerol. BFSMAe 27. Grottaferrata, 1977. Bonino, S.-Th. *Quaestiones disputatae De veritate. Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Question 12: La prophétie*. Licentiate thesis. Fribourg, 1989.
- . *Thomas d'Aquin. De la vérité. Question 2 (La science en Dieu)*. Fribourg-Paris, 1995.
- Borgnet, A., ed. See Albert Magnus. *Opera omnia*.
- Bos, E. P., ed. See *On Proclus and His Influence in Medieval Philosophy*.
- Bougerol, J. G., ed. See Bonaventure (Saint). *Sermones dominicales*.
- Bouillard, H. *Conversion et grâce chez S. Thomas d'Aquin. Etude historique*. Théologie, vol. 1. Paris, 1944.
- Boulogne, Ch.-D. *Saint Thomas d'Aquin ou le génie intelligent*. Paris, 1968.
- Bouthillier, D. "Le Christ en son mystère dans les *Collationes du Super Isaiam* de saint Thomas d'Aquin." In *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 37–64.
- , and J.-P. Torrell. "De la légende à l'histoire. Le traitement du *miraculum* chez Pierre le Vénérable et chez son biographe Raoul de Sully." *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 25 (1982) 81–99.
- , and J.-P. Torrell. "Quand saint Thomas méditait sur le prophète Isaïe," *RT* 90 (1990) 547.
- Bouyges, M. "L'idée génératrice du *De potentia* de S. Thomas." *Revue de philosophie* 31 (1931) 113–31; 246–68.
- Boyle, L. E. "The *De regno* and the Two Powers." In *Essays in Honour of A. C. Pegis*, ed. J. R. O'Donnell, pp. 237–47. Toronto, 1974. Reprinted in Boyle, *Pastoral Care*, Study 13.
- . "The Quodlibets of St. Thomas and Pastoral Care." *The Thomist* 38 (1974) 232–56. Reprinted in *Pastoral Care*, Study 2.

- . "The *Summa confessorum* of John of Freiburg and the Popularization of the Moral Teaching of St. Thomas and of Some of His Contemporaries." In *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*, vol. 2, pp. 245–68. Reprinted in *Pastoral Care*, Study 3.
- . "Notes on the Education of the *Fratres communes* in the Dominican Order in the Thirteenth Century." In *Xenia medii aevi historiam illustrantia oblata Th. Käppeli O.P.*, ed. R. Creytens and P. Künzle, pp. 249–67. Vol. 1, Storia e Letteratura, Raccolta di Studi e Testi 141. Rome, 1978. Reprinted in *Pastoral Care*, Study 6.
- . *Pastoral Care, Clerical Education and Canon Law, 1200–1400*. Variorum Reprints, London, 1981.
- . *The Setting of the Summa Theologiae of Saint Thomas*. Etienne Gilson Series, vol. 5. Toronto, 1982.
- . "Alia lectura fratris Thome." *MS* 45 (1983) 418–29.
- . "Thomas Aquinas and the Duchess of Brabant." *Proceedings of the PMR Conference* 8 (1983) 23–35.
- . "An Autograph of St. Thomas at Salerno." In *Littera Sensus, Sententia: Studi in onore del Prof. Clemente J. Vansteenkiste*, ed. A. Lobato, pp. 117–34. Milan, 1991.
- Brady, I. "Jean Pecham." *DS* 8 (1974) 645–49.
- . "John Pecham and the Background of Aquinas's *De Aeternitate Mundi*." In *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*, vol. 2, pp. 141–178.
- . "Pierre Lombard." *DS* 12/2 (1986) 1604–12.
- Brams, J. "Guillaume de Moerbeke et Aristote." In *Rencontre de cultures dans la philosophie médiévale. Traductions et traducteurs de l'antiquité tardive au XIVe siècle*, ed. J. Hamesse and M. Fattori, pp. 317–36. Louvain-la-Neuve-Cassino, 1990.
- , ed. See *Guillaume de Moerbeke*. Recueil d'études.
- Brown, S. F. "The Eternity of the World Discussion in Early Oxford." *MM* 21/1 (1991) 259–80.
- Bukovski, Th. P. "Rejecting Mandonnet's Dating of St. Thomas's *De aeternitate mundi*." *Gregorianum* 71 (1990) 763–75.
- . "Understanding St. Thomas on the Eternity of the World: Help from Giles of Rome." *RTAM* 58 (1991) 113–25.
- Burbach, M. "Early Dominican and Franciscan Legislation regarding St. Thomas." *MS* 4 (1942) 139–58.
- Callebaut, A. "Jean Pecham O.F.M. et l'augustinisme. Aperçus historiques (1263–1285)." *AFH* 18 (1925) 441–72.
- Callus, D. A. *The Introduction of Aristotelian Learning at Oxford*. Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. 29. London, 1944.
- . *The Condemnation of St Thomas at Oxford*. The Aquinas Society of London, Aquinas Paper no. 5. London, 1955.
- . "Les sources de saint Thomas. Etat de la question." In *Aristote et saint Thomas d'Aquin*, pp. 93–174.
- . "The Problem of the Unity of Form and Richard Knapwell." In *Mélanges offerts à Etienne Gilson*, pp. 123–60.

- . "Une oeuvre récemment decouverte de S. Albert le Grand: *De XLIII problematibus ad Magistrum Ordinis* (1271)." *RSPT* 44 (1960) 243–61.
- . "The Origins of the Problem of the Unity of Form." *The Thomist* 24 (1961) 256–85.
- Caparello, A. "Terminologia greca tomista nel 'Commentarium ad Meteorologica.'" *Sacra Doctrina* 23 (1978) no. 87, 243–87.
- . "La terminologia greca nel Commentario al *De caelo*: Tommaso d'Aquino e lingua greca." *Angelicum* 55 (1978) 414–57.
- Cappelluti, G. "Fra Pietro di Andria e i Segretari di S. Tommaso." *Memorie Domenicane* 6 (1975) 151–65.
- Casciaro Ramirez, J. M. *Las fuentes arabes y rabinicas en la doctrina de Sto. Tomás sobre la Profecía*. Rome, 1971.
- Casey, G. "An Explication of the *De Hebdomadibus* of Boethius in the Light of St. Thomas's Commentary." *The Thomist* 51 (1987) 419–34.
- Castagnoli, P. "Regesta Thomistica. Saggio di cronologia della vita e scritti di S. Tommaso." *DTP* 4 (1927) 704–24; 5 (1928) 110–25; 249–68; 6 (1929) 57–66; 444–58.
- Catalogus Stamsensis*, ed. G. Meersseman. *MOPH* 18 (1936) 56–67.
- Cavarnos, J. P. "Greek Translations of the 'Adoro Te devote' and the 'Ave rerum'." *Traditio* 8 (1952) 418–23.
- Cessario, R. "Is Aquinas's *Summa* Only about Grace?" In *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 197–209.
- Chacon, A. C. "El tratado sobre la gracia en la 'Summa contra Gentiles.'" *Scripta Theologica* 16 (1984) 113–46.
- Chardonens, D. "L'espérance de la résurrection selon Thomas d'Aquin, commentateur du Livre de Job. 'Dans ma chair, je verrai Dieu.'" In *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 65–83.
- . *Dei providentia circa hominem. Providence divine et condition humaine selon l'Expositio super Iob ad litteram de Thomas d'Aquin*. Dissertation. Fribourg (Switzerland), 1995.
- Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, ed. H. Denifle and E. Chatelain. Vols. 1 and 2. Paris, 1889 and 1891.
- Chatelain, E., ed. See *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*.
- Cheneval, F., and R. Imbach. See *Thomas von Aquin, Prologe*.
- Chenu, M.-D. "Les réponses de S. Thomas et de Kilwardby à la consultation de Jean de Verceil (1271)." In *Mélanges Mandonnet*, vol. 1, pp. 191–221.
- . "Le plan de la Somme théologique de saint Thomas." *RT* 47 (1939) 93–107.
- . *Introduction à l'étude de saint Thomas d'Aquin*. Publications de l'Institut d'études médiévales, vol. 11. Montréal-Paris, ²1954 (fourth printing 1984).
- . *La théologie comme science au XIIIe siècle*. Bibliothèque thomiste. Vol. 33. Paris, ³1957.
- . *St. Thomas d'Aquin et la théologie*. Maîtres spirituels. Vol. 17. Paris, 1959.
- . *Toward Understanding Saint Thomas*, trans. A.-M. Landry and D. Hughes. Chicago, 1964.
- . Preface to *I Misteri di Cristo in Tommaso d'Aquino* by I. Biffi. Milan, 1994. Chesterton, G. K. *Saint Thomas Aquinas: The Dumb Ox* New York, 1933; New York,

- 1955; reprinted in *G. K. Chesterton: Collected Works*, vol. 2, ed. G. Marlin, R. Rabatlin, and J. Swan, pp. 419–540. San Francisco, 1986.
- Cipriani, S. "Riflessioni esegetiche su 'Super S. Joannis Evangelium lectura' di S. Tommaso." In *Tommaso d'Aquino nel suo settimo Centenario*, vol. 4, PP. 41–59.
- Cirillo, A. *Cristo Rivelatore del Padre nel Vangelo di S. Giovanni secondo il Commento di San Tommaso d'Aquino*. Diss. Angelicum. Rome, 1988.
- Clark, F. *The Pseudo-Gregorian Dialogues*. Studies in the History of Christian Thought 37. 2 vols. Leiden, 1987.
- Clasen, S., ed. See Gerard of Abbeville, *Contra adversarium perfectionis christianae*.
- Codices manuscripti operum Thomae de Aquino*. Vol. 1, ed. H.-F. Dondaine and H.-V. Shooner. Rome, 1967; vol. 2, ed. H.-V. Shooner. Rome, 1973; vol. 3, ed. H.-V. Shooner. Montreal-Paris, 1985.
- Coggi, R. "Dolore, Provvidenza, Risurrezione nel libro di Giobbe. Validità di un'intuizione esegetica di S. Tommaso." *Sacra Doctrina* 27 (1982) 215–310.
- Colledge, E. "The Legend of St. Thomas Aquinas." In *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*, vol. 1, 13–28.
- Colosio, I., ed. See Petrus a Bergamo, O.P. *Concordantiae Textuum discordantium Divi Thomae Aquinatis*.
- Congar, Y. M.-J. "Théologie." *DTC* 15/1 (1946) 342–502.
- . "Le sens de l'Economie salutaire dans la 'Théologie' de S. Thomas d'Aquin (Somme théologique)." In *Festgabe J. Lortz*, vol. 2, pp. 59–82. Baden-Baden, 1957.
- . "Saint Thomas et les archidiacres." *RT* 57 (1957) 657–71.
- . "Aspects ecclésiologiques de la querelle entre mendiants et séculiers dans la seconde moitié du XIII^e et le début du XIV^e." *AHDLMA* 28 (1961) 34–151.
- . "Le moment 'économique' et le moment 'ontologique' dans la *Sacra Doctrina* (Révélation, Théologie, Somme théologique)." In *Mélanges offerts à M.-D. Chenu*, pp. 135–87.
- . "Valeur et portée oecuménique de quelques principes herméneutiques de saint Thomas d'Aquin." *RSPT* 57 (1973) 611–26.
- . "*In dulcedine societatis quaerere veritatem*. Note sur le travail en équipe chez S. Albert et chez les Prêcheurs au XIII^e siècle." In *Albertus Magnus—Doctor Universalis 1280/1980*, ed. G. Meyer and A. Zimmermann, pp. 47–57. Mayence, 1980.
- Constitutiones antiquae O. P.*, See A. H. Thomas, *De Oudste Constituties van de Dominicanen*.
- Contenson, P.-M. de. "Documents sur les origines et les premières années de la Commission Léonine." In *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*, vol. 2, pp. 331–88.
- Conticello, C. G. "San Tommaso ed i Padri: La *Catena aurea super Ioannem*." *AHDLMA* 65 (1990) 31–92.
- Copleston, F. A *History of Philosophy*. Vol. 2: *Mediaeval Philosophy. Augustine to Scotus*. London, 1959.
- Corbin, M. *Le chemin de la théologie chez Thomas d'Aquin*. Bibliothèque des Archives de Philosophie, n.s. 16. Paris, 1974.

Correctorium: See P. Glorieux, *Les premières polémiques thomistes I et II*; J.-P. Müller, ed., *Le Correctorium Corruptorii de Jean Quidort de Paris*; J.-P. Müller, ed., *Le Correctorium Corruptorii "Quaestione."*

Corte, M. de. "Themistius et saint Thomas d'Aquin." *AHDLMA* 7 (1932) 47–83.

Coulon, R. "Annibaldi ou Annibaldeschi della Molara." *DHGE* 3 (1924) 387–88.

Creytens, R. "Les Constitutions des Frères Prêcheurs dans la rédaction de S. Raymond de Peñafort (1241)." *AFP* 18 (1948) 5–68.

———. "Le *Studium Romanae Curiae* et le Maître du Sacré Palais." *AFP* 12 (1942) 5–83.

Crowe, M. B. "Peter of Ireland's Approach to Metaphysics." *MM* 2 (1963) 154–60.

———. "Peter of Ireland: Aquinas' Teacher of the Artes Liberales" in *Arts libéraux et Philosophie au Moyen Age*, pp. 617–26. Actes du quatrième congrès international de philosophie médiévale (27 August–2 September 1967). Montreal-Paris, 1969.

Crowley, T. "John Peckham, O.F.M., Archbishop of Canterbury, versus the New Aristotelianism." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 33 (1950) 241–55.

Dales, R. C. *Medieval Discussion of the Eternity of the World*. Leiden, 1990.

———, ed. See *Medieval Latin Texts on the Eternity of the World*.

D'Ancona Costa, C. "Saint Thomas lecteur du 'Liber de Causis'. Bilan des recherches contemporaines concernant le 'De Causis' et analyse de l'interprétation thomiste." *RT* 92 (1992) 785–817.

———. *Recherches sur le Liber de causis*. Etudes de philosophie médiévale, vol. 72. Paris, 1995.

Dawson, J. D. "William of Saint-Amour and the Apostolic Tradition." *MS* 40 (1978) 223–38.

Definitiones Capituli generalis Argentinae celebrati anno 1282, ed. G. Fussenegger. *AFH* 26 (1933) 127–40.

De Ghellinck, J. "Pierre Lombard." *DTC* 12/2 (1935) 1941–2019.

De Grijis, F. J. A. "The Theological Character of Aquinas' *De Aeternitate Mundi*." In *The Eternity of the World*, pp. 1–8.

Delaruelle, E. "La translation des reliques de saint Thomas d'Aquin à Toulouse (1369) et la politique universitaire d'Urbain V." *BLE* 56 (1955) 129–46.

Delhaye, Ph. "Guillaume de Saint-Amour." *DS* 6 (1967) 1237–1240.

Delorme, F., ed. See Bonaventure (saint), *Quaestio reportata de mendicitate*; Jean Pecham, *De perfectione evangelica*.

Denifle, H. "Das Evangelium aeternum und die Commission zu Anagni." In *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters* 1 (1885) 49–142.

———. *Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*. Berlin, 1885.

———. "Quel livre servait de base à l'enseignement des maîtres en théologie dans l'université de Paris?" *RT* 2 (1894) 149–61.

———, ed. See *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*.

Destrez, J. "Les disputes quodlibétiques de saint Thomas d'après la tradition manuscrite." In *Mélanges thomistes*, pp. 49–108.

———. *Etudes critiques sur les oeuvres de saint Thomas d'Aquin d'après la tradition manuscrite*. Bibliothèque thomiste, vol. 18. Paris, 1933.

- Doig, J. C. *Aquinas on the Metaphysics. A Historico-Doctrinal Study of the Commentary on the Metaphysics*. The Hague, 1972.
- Domanyi, Th. *Der Römerbriefkommentar des Thomas von Aquin. Ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung seiner Auslegungsmethoden*. Berne, 1979.
- Dondaine, A. "Saint Thomas a-t-il disputé à Rome la question des attributs divins? *BT* 3 (1930–33) 171*–82*.
- . "Saint Thomas et la dispute des attributs divins (*I Sent. d. 2, a. 3*)." *AFP* 8 (1938) 253–62.
- . "Un commentaire scripturaire de Roland de Cremona." *AFP* 11 (1941) 109–37.
- . *Secrétaires de saint Thomas*. Rome, 1956.
- . "*Venerabilis Doctor*." In *Mélanges offerts à Etienne Gilson*, pp. 211–25.
- . "*Les Opuscula fratris Thomae* chez Ptolémée de Lucques." *AFP* 31 (1961) 142–203.
- . "Sermons de Reginald de Piperno." In *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant* VI, pp. 357–94. *Studi e Testi* 236. Vatican City, 1964.
- . "La lettre de saint Thomas à l'abbé du Montcassin." In *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*, vol. 1, pp. 87–108.
- . "La Collection des oeuvres de saint Thomas dite de Jean XXII et Jaquet Maci." *Scriptorium* 29 (1975) 127–52.
- , and L.-J. Bataillon. "Le commentaire de saint Thomas sur les Météores." *AFP* 36 (1960) 81–152.
- , and Th. Käppeli, eds. See *Acta Capitulorum Provincialium Provinciae Romanae*.
- , and J. Peters. "Jacques de Tonengo et Giffredus d'Anagni auditeurs de saint Thomas." *AFP* 29 (1959) 52–72.
- Dondaine, H.-F. "Le *Contra errores Graecorum* de S. Thomas et le IV^e livre du *Contra Gentiles*." In *Les sciences philosophiques et théologiques, 1941–1942*, pp. 156–62.
- . "Les scolastiques citent-ils les Pères de première main?" *RSPT* 36 (1952) 231–43.
- . *Le Corpus dionysien de l'Université de Paris au XIII^e siècle*. Rome, 1953.
- . "Note sur la documentation patristique de saint Thomas à Paris en 1270." *RSPT* 47 (1963) 403–6.
- . "Le *De 43 quaestionibus* de Robert Kilwardby." *AFP* 47 (1977) 5–50.
- . "'Alia lectura fratris Thomae?' (Super I Sent.)." *MS* 42 (1980) 308–36.
- , and H.-V. Shooner. See *Codices manuscripti operum Thomae de Aquino*.
- Douais C. *Essai sur l'organisation des études dans l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs au treizième et quatorzième siècle (1216–1342)*. Paris-Toulouse, 1884.
- . *Les reliques de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Textes originaux*. Paris, 1903.
- Dozois, C. "Sources patristiques chez saint Thomas d'Aquin." *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 33 (1963) 28*–48* and 145*–67* 34 (1964) 231*–41* 35 (1965) 75*–90*.
- Dufeil, M.-M. "Evolution ou fixité des institutions ecclésiastiques: une controverse universitaire. L'édition critique de trois oeuvres polémiques de saint Thomas d'Aquin." *RSPT* 55 (1971) 464–79.

- . *Guillaume de Saint-Amour et la polémique universitaire parisienne 1250–1259*. Paris, 1972.
- . *Saint Thomas et l'histoire*. Senefiance 29. Aix-en-Provence, 1991.
- Duin, J. J. "Nouvelles précisions sur la chronologie du *Commentum in Metaphysicam* de S. Thomas." *RPL* 53 (1955) 511–24.
- Dumont, C. "La réflexion sur la méthode théologique. Un moment capital: le dilemme posé au XIII^e siècle." *NRT* 83 (1961) 1034–50; 84 (1962) 17–35.
- Dunphy, W., ed. See Siger of Brabant, *Quaestiones in Metaphysicam*.
- Durantal, J. *Saint Thomas et le Pseudo-Denis*. Paris, 1919.
- Duval, A. "L'étude dans la législation religieuse de saint Dominique." In *Mélanges offerts à M.-D. Chenu*, pp. 221–47.
- Echard, J. See J. Quétif and J. Echard. *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum*.
- Eckert, W. P. "Stilisierung und Umdeutung der Persönlichkeit des hl. Thomas von Aquino durch die frühen Biographen." *FZPT* 18 (1971) 7–28.
- Edgren, R., ed. See Mahieu le Vilain, *Les Metheores d'Aristote*.
- Ehrle, F. "Beiträge zur Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Scholastik. II: Der Augustinismus und der Aristotelismus in der Scholastik gegen Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts." *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters* 5 (1889) 603–13.
- . "L'agostinismo e l'aristotelismo nella scolastica del secolo XIII. Ulteriori discussioni e materiali." In *Xenia Tomistica* III, pp. 517–88.
- Elders, L. *Faith and Science. An Introduction to St. Thomas' Expositio in Boethii De Trinitate*. Rome, 1974.
- . "Le commentaire de saint Thomas d'Aquin sur le *De caelo* d'Aristote." In *Proceedings of the World Congress on Aristotle* (Thessaloniki August 7–14, 1978), vol. 2, pp. 173–87. Athens, 1981.
- . "Les citations de saint Augustin dans la *Somme Théologique* de saint Thomas d'Aquin." *Doctor communis* 40 (1987) 115–67.
- . *Autour de saint Thomas d'Aquin*. Recueil d'études sur sa pensée philosophique et théologique, 2 vols. Paris-Bruges, 1987.
- . "Le commentaire de saint Thomas d'Aquin sur le *De Anima* d'Aristote." In Elders, *Autour de saint Thomas*, vol. 1, pp. 55–76.
- . "St. Thomas Aquinas' Commentary on the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle." In Elders, *Autour de saint Thomas*, vol. 1, pp. 123–45.
- . "St. Thomas Aquinas' Commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics*." In Elders, *Autour de saint Thomas*, vol. 1, pp. 77–122.
- . "St. Thomas Aquinas' Commentary on the *Physics* of Aristotle." In Elders, *Autour de saint Thomas*, vol. 1, pp. 23–63.
- . "Saint Thomas d'Aquin et Aristote." *RT* 88 (1988) 357–76.
- . "Saint Thomas d'Aquin et la métaphysique du Liber de Causis." *RT* 89 (1989) 427–42.
- , ed. See *La doctrine de la révélation divine*.
- . "La méthode suivie par saint Thomas d'Aquin dans la composition de la Somme de théologie." *NV* 66 (1991) 178–92.
- . "Averroès et saint Thomas d'Aquin." *Doctor communis* 45 (1992) 46–56.

- Emery, G. "Amitié et vie spirituelle: Jourdain de Saxe et Diane d'Andalo." *Sources* 18 (1992) 97–108.
- . "Le Père et l'oeuvre de la création selon le Commentaire des Sentences de S. Thomas d'Aquin." In *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 85–117.
- . *La Trinité créatrice. Trinité et création dans les commentaires aux Sentences de Thomas d'Aquin et de ses précurseurs Albert le Grand et Bonaventure*. Bibliothèque thomiste, vol. 47. Paris, 1995.
- Endres, J. A. "Studien zur Biographie des hl. Thomas v. Aquin." *Historisches Jahrbuch* 29 (1908) 537–58, 774–89.
- Eschmann, I. T. "A Catalogue of St. Thomas's Works." In E. Gilson, *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*, trans. L. K. Shook, pp. 381–437. New York, 1956.
- . "The Quotations of Aristotle's Politics in St. Thomas' *Lectura super Matthaeum*." *MS* 18 (1956) 232–40.
- . "St. Thomas Aquinas on the Two Powers." *MS* 20 (1958) 177–205.
- The Eternity of the World in the Thought of Thomas Aquinas and His Contemporaries*, ed. J. B. M. Wissink. STGMA 27. Leiden, 1990.
- Etzkorn, G. J., ed. See John Pecham, *Quodlibeta quatuor*.
- Ewbank, M. B. "Remarks on Being in St. Thomas' *Expositio de divinis nominibus*." *AHDLMA* 56 (1989) 123–49.
- Fabro, C. *La nozione metafisica di partecipazione secondo S. Tommaso d'Aquino*. Turin, 1963.
- Faucon, P. *Aspects néoplatoniciens de la doctrine de saint Thomas d'Aquin*. Lille-Paris, 1975.
- Ferrua, A., ed. See *S. Thomae Aquinatis vitae fontes praecipuae*.
- Fitzgerald, L. P. "St. Thomas Aquinas and the Two Powers." *Angelicum* 56 (1979) 515–56.
- Flasch, K. *Aufklärung im Mittelalter? Die Verurteilung von 1277. Das Dokument des Bischofs von Paris übersetzt und erklärt*. Excerpta classica, vol. 6. Mayence, 1989.
- Fliche, A., C. Thouzellier, and Y. Azais. *La chrétienté romaine (1198–1274)*. Histoire de l'Eglise, vol. 10. Paris, 1950.
- Fontes Vitae S. Thomae Aquinatis notis historicis et criticis illustrati*, ed. D. Prümmer and M.-H. Laurent. Toulouse, n.d. (6 fasc. originally published in the *Revue thomiste* from 1911 to 1937).
- Fontes: see S. Thomae Aquinatis vitae fontes praecipuae*.
- Foster, K. *The Life of Saint Thomas Aquinas*. London, 1958.
- Fussenegger, G., ed. See *Definitiones Capituli generalis Argentinae*.
- Gardeil, H.-D. "Le plan de la Somme théologique." In *S. Thomas d'Aquin, Somme Théologique: La théologie (Ia, Prologue et Q. 1)*, pp. 171–202. Paris-Toumai-Rome, 1968.
- Gauthier, R.-A. "La date du Commentaire de Saint Thomas sur l'Ethique à Nicomaque." *RTAM* 18 (1951) 66–105.
- . "Les 'Articuli in quibus frater Thomas melius in Summa quam in Scriptis'." *RTAM* 19 (1952) 271–326.
- . *Introduction historique à S. Thomas d'Aquin. Contra Gentiles*, trans. R. Bernier and M. Corvez. Vol. 1, pp. 7–123. Paris, 1961.

- . *Aristote, L'Ethique à Nicomaque*. Vol. 1/1: *Introduction*. Louvain-Paris, ²1970.
- . "Quelques questions à propos du commentaire de S. Thomas sur le *De anima*." *Angelicum* 51 (1974) 419–72.
- . "Le cours sur l'*Ethica noua* d'un maître ès arts de Paris (1235–1240)." *AHDLMA* 43 (1975) 71–141.
- . "Le traité *De anima et de potentiis eius* d'un maître ès arts (vers 1225). Introduction et texte critique." *RSPT* 66 (1982) 3–55.
- . "Note sur les débuts (1225–1240) du 'premier averroïsme'." *RSPT* 66 (1982) 321–74.
- . "Notes sur Siger de Brabant. 1. Siger en 1265." *RSPT* 67 (1983), pp. 212–32.
- , ed. See Anonymi, *Magistri Artium*.
- . "Introduction" to Saint Thomas d'Aquin, *Somme contre les gentils*, ed. Henri Hude. Paris, 1993.
- Geenen, C. G. "Saint Thomas et les Pères." In "Thomas d'Aquin (saint)." *DTC* 15/1 (1946) 738–61.
- . "En marge du concile de Chalcédoine. Les textes du Quatrième Concile dans les oeuvres de saint Thomas." *Angelicum* 29 (1952) 43–59.
- . "Les *Sentences* de Pierre Lombard dans la *Somme* de saint Thomas." In *Miscellanea Lombardiana*, pp. 295–304. Novara, 1957.
- . "Le fonti patristiche come 'autorità' nella teologia di San Tommaso." *Sacra Doctrina* 20 (1975) no. 77, 7–17.
- Geiger, L.-B. *La participation dans la philosophie de S. Thomas d'Aquin*. Bibliothèque thomiste, vol. 23. Paris, 1942, ²1953.
- . "Saint Thomas et la métaphysique d'Aristote." In *Aristote et saint Thomas d'Aquin*, pp. 175–220.
- . "Les rédactions successives de *Contra Gentiles I*, 53 d'après l'autographe." In *Saint Thomas d'Aquin aujourd'hui*, pp. 221–40. Recherches de philosophie, vol. 6. Paris, 1963.
- Geiselman, J. R. "Christus und die Kirche nach Thomas von Aquin." *Theologische Quartalschrift* 107 (1926) 198–222; 108 (1927) 233–55.
- Genicot, L. "Le *De Regno*: spéculation ou réalisme?" In *Aquinas and Problems of His Time*, pp. 3–17.
- Gérard de Frachet, *Vitae Fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum . . .*, ed. B. M. Reichert. *MOPH* 1. Louvain, 1896.
- Gerard of Abbeville. *Contra adversarium perfectionis christianae*, ed. S. Clasen. *AFH* 31 (1938) 276–329; 32 (1939) 89–200.
- Gerken, A. "Bonaventura." *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 2 (1983) 402–7.
- Gerulaitis, L. V. "The Canonization of Saint Thomas Aquinas." *Vivarium* 5 (1967) 25–46.
- Ghellinck, J. See de Ghellinck, J.
- Giacon, C. "Il platonismo di Aristotele e S. Tommaso." *Doctor Communis* 28 (1975) 153–70.
- Giles of Rome. *Errores philosophorum*, ed. J. Koch. Milwaukee, 1944.
- . *Opera omnia*, vol. 3/1: *Apologia*, ed. R. Wielockx. Florence, 1985.

Gillon, L.-B. "La pluralité des formes." In "Thomas d'Aquin." *DTC* 15/1 (1946) 678–84.

Gils, P.-M. "Les *Collationes* marginales dans l'autographe du commentaire de S. Thomas sur Isaïe." *RSPT* 42 (1958) 253–64.

———. "Textes inédits de S. Thomas: les premières rédactions du *Scriptum super Tertio Sententiarum*." *RSPT* 45 (1961) 201–28; 46 (1962) 445–62 and 609–28.

———. "Le MS. *Napoli Biblioteca Nazionale I.B.54* est-il de la main de S. Thomas?" *RSPT* 49 (1965) 37–59.

———. "S. Thomas écrivain." Appendix to vol. 50 of the Leonine edition, pp. 175–209.

Gli studi di filosofia medievale fra otto e novecento, Contributo a un bilancio storiografico. Atti del convegno internazionale, Roma, 21–23 settembre 1989, a cura di R. Imbach e A. Maierù J, Rome, 1991 (printed 1992).

Glorieux, P. *La littérature quodlibétique de 1260 à 1320*, 2 vols. Bibliothèque thomiste, vols. 5 and 21. Paris, 1925 and 1935.

———. "Comment les thèses thomistes furent prosrites à Oxford." *RT* 32, n.s. 10 (1927) 259–91.

———. *Les premières polémiques thomistes I. Le Correctorium Corruptorii "Quare"*. Bibliothèque thomiste, vol. 9. Le Saulchoir-Kain, 1927.

———. "Le 'Contra impugnantes' de S. Thomas." In *Mélanges Mandonnet*, vol. 1, pp. 51–81.

———. "Pour qu'on lise le *De perfectione*." *Vie Spirituelle, Supplément* 23 (1930) 97–126.

———. "Les Questions Disputées de S. Thomas et leur suite chronologique." *RTAM* 4 (1932) 5–33.

———. Répertoire des Maîtres en Théologie de Paris au XIII^e siècle, 2 vols. Etudes de philosophie médiévale, vols. 17 and 18. Paris, 1933.

———. "Les polémiques 'contra Geraldinos'." *RTAM* 6 (1934) 5–41.

———. "Une offensive de Nicolas de Lisieux contre saint Thomas d'Aquin." *BLE* 39 (1938) 121–29.

———. "Sentences (Commentaires sur les)." *DTC* 14/2 (1941) 1860–84.

———. "Pour la chronologie de la Somme." *MSR* 2 (1945) 59–98.

———. "Tempier (Etienne)." *DTC* 15/1 (1946) 99–107.

———. "Les Quodlibets VII–XI de S. Thomas d'Aquin. Etude critique." *RTAM* 13 (1946) 282–303.

———. "Non in marginibus positus." *RTAM* 15 (1948) 182–84.

———. "Un maître polémiste: Thomas d'Aquin." *MSR* 5 (1948) 153–74.

———. "Essai sur les commentaires scripturaires de saint Thomas et leur chronologie." *RTAM* 17 (1950) 237–66.

———. *Les premières polémiques thomistes II. Le Correctorium Corruptorii "Sciendum"*. Bibliothèque thomiste, vol. 31. Paris, 1956.

———. "Le conflit de 1252–1257 à la lumière du Mémoire de Guillaume de Saint Amour." *RTAM* 24 (1957) 364–72.

———. "La Christologie du *Compendium theologiae*." *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 13 (1961) 7–34.

———. "L'enseignement au Moyen Age. Techniques et méthodes en usage à la Faculté de Théologie de Paris au XIII^e siècle." *AHDLMA* 35 (1968) 65–186.

———. "Pro et contra Thomam. Un survol de cinquante années." In *Sapientiae Procerum Amore. Mélanges . . . J.-P. Müller*, pp. 255–87. Studia Anselmiana 63. Rome, 1974.

Godfrey of Fontaines. *Quodlibets onze-quatorze*, ed. J. Hoffmans. Les Philosophes belges, vol. 5, fasc. 1–2. Louvain, 1932.

Godefroy, F. *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du IX^e au XV^e siècle*, 10 vols. Paris, 1880–1902.

Gomez Nogales, S. "Saint Thomas, Averroès et l'averroïsme." In *Aquinas and Problems of His Time*, pp. 161–77.

Grabmann, M. "Die Kanonisation des hl. Thomas von Aquin in ihrer Bedeutung für die Ausbreitung und Verteidigung seiner Lehre im 14. Jahrhundert." *DT* (Fr.) 1 (1923) 233–49.

———. "Forschungen zur Geschichte der ältesten deutschen Thomistenschule des Dominikanerordens." In *Xenia thomistica* III, pp. 189–231; reprinted in Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, I, pp. 392–431.

———. *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Scholastik und Mystik*, 3 vols. Munich, 1926, 1936, 1956.

———. "Die persönlichen Beziehungen des hl. Thomas von Aquin." *Historisches Jahrbuch* 57 (1937) 305–22.

———. *Die Werke des hl. Thomas von Aquin. Eine literarhistorische Untersuchung und Einführung*, "BGPTMA 22 1–2. Münster Westf.³ 1949.

Grand, Ph. "Le *Quodlibet* XIV de Gérard d'Abbeville. La vie de Gérard d'Abbeville." *AHDLMA* 39 (1964) 207–69.

———. "Gérard d'Abbeville." *DS* 6 (1967) 258–63.

Grant, E. "The Condemnation of 1277, God's Absolute Power, and Physical Thought in the Late Middle Ages." *Viator* 10 (1979) 211–44.

Green-Pedersen, N. G., ed. See Boethius of Dacia, *Modi significandi sive quaestiones super Priscianum Maiorem*.

Grijs, F. J. A. See De Grijs, F. J. A.

Guillaume de Moerbeke. *Recueil d'études à l'occasion du 700^e anniversaire de sa mort (1286)*. Ed. J. Brams and W. Vanhamel. Leuven, 1989.

Guyot, B. G., ed. See *La production du livre universitaire*.

Gy, P.-M. "L'Office du Corpus Christi et S. Thomas d'Aquin. Etat d'une recherche." *RSPT* 64 (1980) 491–507.

———. "Le texte original de la *Tertia Pars de la Somme Théologique* de S. Thomas d'Aquin dans l'apparat critique de l'Édition Léonine: le cas de l'Eucharistie." *RSPT* 65 (1981) 608–16.

———. "L'Office du Corpus Christi et la théologie des accidents eucharistiques." *RSPT* 66 (1982) 81–86.

———. "La relation au Christ dans l'Eucharistie selon S. Bonaventure et S. Thomas d'Aquin." In *Sacrements de Jesus-Christ*, ed. J. Doré, pp. 69–106. Paris, 1983; reprinted in Gy, *La liturgie dans l'histoire*, pp. 247–83. Paris, 1990.

———. "L'Office du Corpus Christi, oeuvre de S. Thomas d'Aquin." In Gy, *La Liturgie dans l'histoire*, pp. 223–45. Paris, 1990.

Hagemann, L. B. "Missionstheoretische Ansätze bei Thomas von Aquin in seiner Schrift *De rationibus fidei*." *MM* 19 (1988) 459–83.

- Hall, D.C. *The Trinity. An Analysis of St. Thomas Aquinas' Expositio of the De Trinitate of Boethius*. STGMA, vol. 33. Leiden, 1992.
- Hamesse, J. "Collatio et reportatio: deux vocables spécifiques de la vie intellectuelle au Moyen Age." In *Terminologie de la vie intellectuelle au Moyen Age*, ed. O. Weijers. CIVICIMA I. Turnhout, 1988, pp. 78–87.
- Harkins, B. *God in St. Thomas's Commentaries on Aristotle's Physics and Metaphysics*, Diss. Angelicum. Rome, 1986.
- Haskins, Ch. H. *Studies in the History of Medieval Science*. Cambridge, 1927.
- . *Studies in Medieval Culture*, Oxford, 1929.
- Hayen, A. "La structure de la Somme théologique et Jésus." *Sciences Ecclésiastiques* 12 (1960) 59–82.
- . *Saint Thomas d'Aquin et la vie de l'Eglise*, Louvain-Paris, 1952.
- Heath, T. R. "St. Thomas and the Aristotelian Metaphysics." *NS* 34 (1960) 428–60.
- Hendrickx, M. *Sagesse de Dieu et sagesse des hommes. Le commentaire de I Co 1–4 et sa confrontation avec la grande glose de Pierre Lombard*. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1987.
- Henle, R. J. *Saint Thomas and Platonism. A Study of the Plato and Platonici Texts in the Writings of Saint Thomas*. La Haye, 1956.
- Henry of Ghent. *Opera omnia*, vol. 14: *Quodlibet X*, ed. R. Macken. Leuven-Leiden, 1981.
- Henry of Herford. *Liber de rebus memorabilioribus sive Cronicon*. ed. A. Potthast. Göttingen, 1859.
- Hissette, R. *Enquête sur les 219 articles condamnés à Paris le 7 mars 1277*. *Philosophes médiévaux*, vol. 22. Louvain-Paris, 1977.
- . "Etienne Tempier et ses condamnations." *RTAM* 47 (1980) 231–70.
- . "Albert le Grand et Thomas d'Aquin dans la censure parisienne du 7 mars 1277." *MM* 15 (1982) 226–46.
- . "Nicolas de Lisieux." *Catholicisme* 9 (1982) 1254–55.
- . "Trois articles de la seconde rédaction du *Correctorium* de Guillaume de la Mare." *RTAM* 51 (1984) 230–41.
- . "Note sur le syllabus 'antirationaliste' du 7 mars 1277." *RPL* 88 (1990) 404–16.
- Hödl, L. "Neue Nachrichten über die Pariser Verurteilungen der Thomasischen Formlehre." *Scholastik* 39 (1964) 178–96.
- . See Beret, G., L. Hödl, and H. Schipperges, "Artes liberales."
- Hoffmans, J., ed. See Godfrey of Fontaines, *Quodlibets onze-quatorze*.
- Hommage au Père M.-D. Chenu*. *RSPT* 75 (1991) (special number, July).
- Hoenen, M. J. F. M., and A. de Libera. *Albertus Magnus und der Albertismus. Deutsche philosophische Kultur des Mittelalters*. STGMA, vol. 48. Leiden-New York-Cologne, 1995.
- Horst, U. "Über die Frage einer Heilsökonomischen Theologie bei Thomas von Aquin. Ergebnisse und Probleme der neueren Forschung." *MThZ* 12 (1961) 97–111; reprinted in *Thomas von Aquin, Chronologie und Werkanalyse*, pp. 373–95.
- . *Evangelische Armut und Kirche. Thomas von Aquin und die Armutskontroversen des 13. und beginnenden 14. Jahrhunderts*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Dominikanerordens, N.F. 1. Berlin, 1992.

- Hubert, M. "Note sur le vocabulaire gréco-latin d'un *Libellus*, '*Liber de fide Trinitatis*', édité par le Père Hyacinthe Dondaine." *ALMA* 37 (1970) 199–24.
- . "L'humour de S. Thomas d'Aquin en face de la scolastique." In 1274 *Annéecharnière*, pp. 725–39.
- Huerga, A. "Hypótesis sobre la génesis de la *Summa contra Gentiles y del Pugio fidei*." *Angelicum* 51 (1974) 533–57.
- Hugueny, E. "L'*Adoro Te* est-il de saint Thomas?" *AFP* 4 (1934) 221–25.
- Huillard-Breholles, J.-L.-A., *Historia diplomatica Frederici secundi*. Paris, 6 vols. 1852–61.
- . *Vie et correspondance de Pierre de la Vigne, ministre de l'empereur Frédéric II*. Paris, 1865.
- Huit, C. "Les éléments platoniciens de la doctrine de saint Thomas." *RT* 19 (1911) 724–66.
- Humbert of Romans. *Opera de vita regulari*, ed. J. J. Berthier. 2 vols. Rome 1888–89.
- Imbach R. *Deus est intelligere. Das Verhältnis von Sein und Denken in seiner Bedeutung für das Gottesverständnis bei Thomas von Aquin und in den Pariser Quaestionen Meister Eckharts*. Studia Friburgensia, N.F. 53. Fribourg (Switzerland), 1976.
- . "Le (néo-)platonisme médiéval, Proclus latin et l'Ecole dominicaine allemande." *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 110 (1978) 427–48.
- . "Gravis iactura verae doctrinae. Prolegomena zu einer Interpretation der Schrift *De ente et essentia* Dietrichs von Freiberg O. P." *FZPT* 26 (1979) 369–425.
- . "L'averroïsme latin du XIII^e siècle." In *Gli Studi di Filosofia Medievale fra Otto et Novecento*, pp. 191–208.
- . "Prétendue primauté de l'être sur le connaître. Perspectives cavalières sur Thomas d'Aquin et l'école dominicaine allemande." In *Lectionum varietates. Hommage à Paul Vignaux*, pp. 121–32. Etudes de Philosophie médiévale, vol. 65. Paris, 1991.
- , et al. "Albert der Grosse und die deutsche Dominikanerschule. Philosophische Aspekte." *FZPT* 32 (1985) 3–271.
- , and F. Cheneval. See *Thomas von Aquin, Prologe*.
- , and U. Lindblad. "*Compilatio rudis ac puerilis*. Hinweise und Materialien zu Nikolaus von Strassburg und seiner *Summa*." *FZPT* 32 (1985) 155–233.
- , and A. Maierù, eds. See *Gli Studi di filosofia medievale fra otto e novecento*.
- , and Méléard, M.-H. *Philosophes médiévaux. Anthologie de textes philosophiques (XIIe–XIVe siècles)* (10/18). Paris, 1986.
- Institut Catholique de Toulouse, *Chronique* 1975. Toulouse, 1975.
- Isaac, J. *Le Peri Hermeneias en Occident de Boèce à saint Thomas*. Bibliothèque thomiste, vol. 29. Paris, 1953.
- Ivanka, E. von. "S. Thomas platonisant." *Tommaso d'Aquino nel suo settimo centenario*, vol. 1, pp. 256–57.
- . *Plato christianus. La réception critique du platonisme chez les Pères de l'Eglise*. Paris, 1990.

- Jaffa, H. V. *Thomism and Aristotelianism. A Study of the Commentary by Thomas Aquinas on the Nicomachean Ethics*. Chicago, 1952.
- Janssens, E. "Les premiers historiens de la vie de Saint Thomas d'Aquin." *Revue néoscholastique de philosophie de Louvain* 26 (1924) 201–14; 325–52; 452–76.
- Jean Quidort of Paris, See J.-P. Müller, ed. *Le Correctorium Corruptorii de Jean Quidort de Paris*.
- Jellouschek, C. "Quaestio Magistri Ioannis de Neapoli O. Pr.: *Utrum licite possit doceri Parisius doctrina fratris Thomae quantum ad omnes conclusiones ejus hic primum in lucem edita*." In *Xenia thomistica* III, pp. 73–104.
- Jensen, S. S. ed. See Boethius of Dacia, *Modi significandi*.
- John of Naples. See C. Jellouschek, *Quaestio Magistri Ioannis de Neapoli O.P.*
- John Pecham. *De perfectione evangelica*, ed. F. Delorme. "Quatre chapitres inédits de Jean Pecham O.F.M. sur la perfection religieuse et autres états de perfection." *Collectanea Franciscana* 14 (1944) 84–120.
- . *Quodlibeta quattuor*, ed. G. J. Etzkorn. Grottaferrata, 1989.
- Johnson, M. F. "*Alia lectura fratris thome: A List of the New Texts found in Lincoln College, Oxford, MS. Lat. 95* ." *RTAM* 57 (1990) 34–61.
- . "A Note on the Dating of St. Thomas Aquinas's *Expositio super primam et secundam decretalem*." *RTAM* 59 (1992) 155–65.
- Jordan, M. D. "The Controversy of the *Correctoria* and the Limits of Metaphysics." *Speculum* 57 (1982) 292–314.
- . "The Protreptic Structure of the 'Summa contra Gentiles'." *The Thomist* 50 (1986) 173–209.
- . "Theological Exegesis and Aquinas's Treatise *Against the Greeks*." *Church History* 66 (1987) 445–56.
- Kantorowicz, E. *Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite*. Berlin, ²1928.
- . *Ergänzungsband*. Berlin, 1931.
- Käppeli, Th. "Note sugli scrittori domenicani di nome giovanni di Napoli, I. Giovanni Regina di Napoli." *AFP* 10 (1940) 48–71.
- . "Benedetto di Asinago da Como (+ 1339)." *AFP* 11 (1941) 83–94.
- . "Una raccolta di prediche attribuite a S. Tommaso d'Aquino." *AFP* 13 (1943) 59–94.
- . *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*. 3 vols. Rome, 1970–80.
- . "Guillaume d'Alton." *DHGE* 22 (1988) 836–37.
- , and A. Dondaine, eds. See *Acta Capitulorum Provincialium Provinciae Romanae*.
- Kelley, F. E., ed. See Richard Knapwell, *Quaestio disputata de unitate formae*.
- Koch, J. "Die Verteidigung der Theologie des hl. Thomas von Aquin durch den Dominikanerorden gegenüber Durandus de S. Porciano O. Pr." In *Xenia thomistica* III, pp. 327–62.
- . *Durandus de S. Porciano O.P. Forschungen zum Streit um Thomas von Aquin zu Beginn des 14. Jahrhundert*. BGPTMA 36/1. Münster i. W. 1927.
- , ed. See Giles of Rome, *Errores philosophorum*.
- Kraml, H., ed. See William De La Mare, *Scriptum in primum librum Sententiarum*.
- La doctrine de la révélation divine de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, ed. L. Elders. Studi Tomistici, vol. 37. Vatican City, 1990.

- Lafont, G. *Structures et méthode dans la Somme théologique de saint Thomas d'Aquin*. Paris-Bruges, 1961.
- . "Simbolo degli Apostoli e metodo teologico: Il *Compendium Theologiae* di San Tommaso." *La Scuola Cattolica* 102 (1974) 557–68.
- Landgraf, A. M. "Das Problem *Utrum Christus fuerit homo in triduo mortis* in der Frühscholastik." In *Mélanges Auguste Pelzer*, pp. 109–58.
- La production du livre universitaire au Moyen-Age, 'exemplar' et 'pecia'*. Actes du Symposium tenu au Collegio San Bonaventura de Grottaferrata en mai 1983. Textes réunis par L.-J. Bataillon, B. G. Guyot and R. H. Rouse. Paris, 1988.
- Laurent, M.-H. "Godefroid de Fontaines et la condamnation de 1277." *RT* 35 (1930) 273–81.
- . "Un légendier dominicain peu connu." *Analecta Bollandiana* 58 (1940) 28–47.
- . *Le bienheureux Innocent V (Pierre de Tarentaise) et son temps*. Studi e Testi, vol. 129. Rome, 1947.
- , and D. Prümmer, eds. See *Fontes Vitae S. Thomae Aquinatis*.
- Le Brun-Gouanvic, C. *Edition critique de l'Ystoria sancti Thome de Aquino de Guillaume de Tocco*. 2 Vols. Diss. Université de Montreal, 1987.
- Leccisotti, T. "Magister Erasmus." *Bollettino dell'istituto storico italiano per il medio evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 47 (1932) 209–16.
- . "Il Dottore angelico a Montecassino." *RFNS* 32 (1940) 519–47.
- . *San Tommaso e Montecassino*. Montecassino, 1965.
- Leclercq, J. "Le magistère du prédicateur au XIII^e siècle." *AHDLM* 21 (1946) 105–47.
- . "L'idéal du théologien au moyen âge. Textes inédits." *Revue des sciences religieuses* 21 (1947) 121–48.
- Lecuyer, J. "Les étapes de l'enseignement thomiste sur l'épiscopat." *RT* 57 (1957) 29–52.
- Left, G. *Paris and Oxford Universities in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. An Institutional and Intellectual History*. New York-London-Sydney, 1968.
- Le Goff, J. *Les intellectuels au Moyen Age*. Points Histoire, vol. 78. Paris, 1985. English translation: *Intellectuals in the Middle Ages*, trans. Teresa L. Fagan. Cambridge, Mass., 1993.
- Lescoe, F. J. "De substantiis separatis: Title and Date." In *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*, vol. 1, pp. 51–66.
- Libera, A. de. *Introduction à la mystique rhénane d'Albert le Grand à Maître Eckhart*. Paris, 1984.
- . "Ulrich de Strasbourg, lecteur d'Albert le Grand." *FZPT* 32 (1985) 105–36.
- . *Albert le Grand et la philosophie*. Paris, 1990.
- . "Albert le Grand et Thomas d'Aquin interprètes du *Liber de causis*." *RSPT* 74 (1990) 347–78.
- . *Penser au Moyen Age*. Paris, 1991.
- . *Thomas d'Aquin. L'Unité de l'intellect contre les averroïstes, suivi des Textes contre Averroès antérieurs à 1270*. Paris, 1994.
- , and M.-R. Ruben Hayoun. See Ruben Hayoun, M.-R. and A. de Libera, *Averroès et l'averroïsme*.

- Liebeschütz, H. "Judaism and Jewry in the Social Doctrine of Thomas Aquinas." *The Journal of Jewish Studies* 13 (1962) 57–81.
- Lindblad, U. See R. Imbach and U. Lindblad, *Compilatio rudis ac puerilis*.
- Litt, Th. *Les corps célestes dans l'univers de saint Thomas d'Aquin*. Louvain-Paris, 1963.
- Lobato Casado, A. "Santo Tomás, Magister in Sacra Teologia. El 'Principium' de su Magisterio." *Communio* (Seville) 21 (1988) 49–70.
- Loenertz, R. "Saint Dominique écrivain, maître en théologie, professeur à Rome et Maître du Sacré Palais d'après quelques auteurs du XIV^e et XV^e siècle." *AFP* 12 (1942) 84–97.
- Lohr, Ch. *St. Thomas Aquinas. "Scripture super Sententiis": An Index of Authorities Cited*. Avebury, 1980.
- Lorenz, Dietrich. *I fondamenti dell'ontologia tomista. Il trattato De ente et essentia*. Philosophia, vol. 10. Bologna, 1992.
- Lottin, O. "La pluralité des formes substantielles avant saint Thomas d'Aquin." *Revue néo-scholastique* 34 (1932) 449–67.
- . *Psychologie et Morale aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles*, 6 vols. Louvain-Gembloux, 1942–60.
- . "La date de la question disputée *De malo* de saint Thomas d'Aquin." In Lottin, *Psychologie et Morale*, vol. 6, pp. 353–72.
- . "Saint Thomas d'Aquin à la faculté des arts de Paris aux approches de 1277." *RTAM* 16 (1949) 292–313.
- Lubac, H. de. *Exégèse médiévale. Les quatre sens de l'Écriture*, vol. 4/2,2. Théologie 59. Paris, 1964.
- . *La postérité spirituelle de Joachim de Flore I. De Joachim à Schelling*. Paris, 1979.
- Lyonnet, S. "L'actualité de saint Thomas exégète." In *Tommaso d'Aquino nel suo settimo centenario*, vol. 4, pp. 9–28.
- Macken, R., ed. See Henry of Ghent, *Quodlibet X*.
- Mahieu Le Vilain. *Les Metheores d'Aristote: Traduction du XIII^e siècle publiée pour la première fois*, ed. R. Edgren. Uppsala, 1945.
- Maierù, A., and R. Imbach, eds. See *Gli Studi di filosofia medievale fra otto et novecento*.
- Mandonnet, P. "Les titres doctoraux de saint Thomas d'Aquin." *RT* 17 (1909) 597–608.
- . *Des écrits authentiques de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Fribourg, ²1910.
- . *Siger de Brabant et l'averroïsme latin au XIII^e siècle, I^{ère} Partie: Etude critique*. Louvain, ²1911.
- . "Pierre Calo et la légende de S. Thomas." *RT* 20 (1912) 508–16.
- . "Premiers travaux de polémique thomiste." *RSPT* 7 (1913) 46–70; 245–62.
- . "Date de naissance de S. Thomas d'Aquin." *RT* 22 (1914) 652–64.
- . "Chronologie des questions disputées de saint Thomas d'Aquin." *RT* 23, n.s. 1 (1918) 266–87; 340–71.
- . "Chronologie sommaire de la vie et des écrits de saint Thomas." *RSPT* 9 (1920) 142–52.

- . "La canonisation de saint Thomas d'Aquin, 1317–1323." In *Mélanges Thomistes*, pp. 1–48.
- . "Le Carême de saint Thomas d'Aquin à Naples (1273)." In *San Tommaso d'Aquino O.P. Miscellanea storico-artistica*, pp. 195–212.
- . "Thomas d'Aquin, novice prêcheur (1244–1246)." *RT* 29, n.s. 7 (1924) 243–67; 370–90; 529–547; 30, n.s. 8 (1925) 3–24; 222–49; 393–416; 489–533.
- . "Thomas d'Aquin lecteur à la curie romaine. Chronologie du séjour (1259–1268)." In *Xenia thomistica* III, pp. 9–40.
- . "Saint Thomas d'Aquin, créateur de la dispute quodlibétique." *RSPT* 15 (1926) 477–506; 16 (1927) 5–38.
- . "Les 'Opuscles' de saint Thomas d'Aquin." *RT* 32, n.s. 10 (1927) 121–57.
- . "Chronologie des écrits scripturaires de saint Thomas d'Aquin." *RT* 33, n.s. 11 (1928) 27–45; 116–55; 211–45; 34, n.s. 12 (1929) 53–69; 132–45; 489–519.
- Mansion, S. "L'intelligibilité métaphysique d'après le Prooemium du Commentaire de saint Thomas à la Métaphysique d'Aristote." *RFNS* 70 (1978) 49–62.
- Manteau-Bonnamy, H.-M. "La liberté de l'homme selon Thomas d'Aquin. La datation de la Question disputée *De malo*." *AHDLMA* 46 (1979) 7–34.
- Manzanedo, M. F. "La antropologia filosofica nel commentario tomista al libro de Job." *Angelicum* 62 (1985) 419–71.
- . "La antropologia teologica en el commentario tomista al libro de Job." *Angelicum* 64 (1987) 301–31.
- Marabelli, C. "Note preliminari allo studio del commento di S. Tommaso al 'Secondi Analitici' di Aristotele." *DTP* 88 (1985) 77–88.
- Marc, P. *Introductio à S. Thomae Aquinatis Liber de Veritate Catholicae Fidei contra errores Infidelium*, vol. 1. Turin, 1967.
- Maréchal, H. *Thomas d'Aquin. Vers la perfection de la vie spirituelle*. Paris, 1932.
- Marengo, G. *Trinità e Creazione*. Indagine sulla teologia di Tommaso d'Aquino, Rome, 1990.
- Marinelli, F. *Personalismo trinitario nella storia della salvezza* (Rapporti tra la SS.ma Trinità e le opere ad extra nello Scriptum super Sententiis di San Tommaso). Rome, 1969.
- Maritain, J. *Le Docteur angelique*, in J. and R. Maritain, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 4, Fribourg-Paris, 1983, pp. 10–191. English translation: *St. Thomas Aquinas*, trans. Joseph W. Evans and Peter O'Reilly. New York, 1958.
- Marlasca, A., ed. See Siger of Brabant, *Quaestiones super librum de causis*.
- Martin, C. "The Vulgate Text of Aquinas's Commentary on Aristotle's Politics." *Dominican Studies* 5 (1952) 35–64.
- Masetti, P.-T. *Monumenta et Antiquitates veteris disciplinae Ordinis Praedicatorum ab anno 1216 ad 1348 . . .*, vol. 2. Rome, 1864.
- Maurer, A., ed. See *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*; Siger of Brabant, *Quaestiones in Metaphysicam*.
- May, W. H. "The Confession of Prouss Boneta, Heretic and Heresiarch." In *Essays in Medieval Life and Thought Presented in Honor of A. P. Evans*, pp. 3–30. New York, 1955.

- McAllister, J. B. *The Letter of Saint Thomas Aquinas De occultis operationibus naturae ad quendam militem ultramontanum*. Washington, 1939.
- McInerny, R. *Boethius and Aquinas*. Washington, 1990.
- Medieval Latin Texts on the Eternity of the World*, ed. R. C. Dales and O. Argerami. Leiden, 1991.
- Meersseman, G. "Concordia inter quatuor ordines mendicantes." *AFP* 4 (1934) 75–97.
- , ed. See *Catalogus Stamsensis*.
- . "In libris gentilium non studeant. L'étude des classiques interdite aux clercs au moyen âge?" In *Italia medioevale e classica* I, pp. 1–13. Padua, 1958.
- Meijer, P. A., ed. See *On Proclus and His Influence in Medieval Philosophy*.
- Mélanges Auguste Pelzer. Etudes d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale de la Scolastique médiévale offertes à Monseigneur Auguste Pelzer à l'occasion de son soixantedixième anniversaire. Louvain, 1947.
- Mélanges Mandonnet. Etudes d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du moyen âge*. 2 vols. Bibliothèque thomiste, vols. 13 and 14. Paris, 1930.
- Mélanges offerts à Etienne Gilson de l'Académie française*. Etudes de philosophie médiévale. Toronto-Paris, 1959.
- Mélanges offerts à M.-D. Chenu*. Bibliothèque thomiste, vol. 37. Paris, 1967.
- Mélanges thomistes*, publiés par les Dominicains de la Province de France à l'occasion du VI^e centenaire de la canonisation de S. Thomas d'Aquin. Bibliothèque thomiste, vol. 3. Le Saulchoir, Kain, 1923.
- Mendez, J. R. *El amor fundamento de la participación metafísica. Hermeneutica de la "Summa contra Gentiles"*. Diss. Univ. Later. Rome, 1985.
- Meyvaert, P. "The Enigma of Gregory the Great's 'Dialogues'. A Response to Francis Clark." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 30 (1988) 335–81.
- Michaud-Quantin, P. "Guy de l'Aumône, premier Maître cistercien de L'Université de Paris." *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis* 15 (1959) 194–219.
- Miguel, J. J. de, "Los Padres de la Iglesia en la criteriología teológica de santo Tomas de Aquino." *Scripta theologica* 7 (1975) 125–61.
- Minio-Paluello, L. "Moerbeke, William of." *Dictionary of Scientific Biography* 9 (1974) 434–40.
- Mohr, W. "Bemerkungen zur Verfässherschaft von De regimine principum." In *Virtus Politica*, Festgabe . . . ed. A. Hufnagel, J. Möller, and H. Kohlenberger, pp. 127–45. Stuttgart, 1974.
- Moncho, J. R., ed. See Némésius d'Emèse, *De natura hominis*.
- Montagne, H.-A. "Notre programme." *RT* 17 (1909) 5–37.
- Montagnes, B. *La doctrine de l'analogie de l'être d'après saint Thomas d'Aquin*. Philosophes médiévaux, vol. 6. Paris-Louvain, 1963.
- . "Les deux fonctions de la sagesse: ordonner et juger." *RSPT* 53 (1969) 675–86.
- . "Les activités séculières et le mépris du monde chez S. Thomas d'Aquin. Les emplois du qualificatif 'saecularis'." *RSPT* 55 (1971) 231–49.
- Moreau, J. "Le platonisme dans la 'Somme théologique'." In *Tommaso d'Aquino nel suo settimo centenario*, vol. 1, pp. 238–47.

- Mtega, N. W. *Analogy and Theological Language in the Summa contra Gentiles*. A Textual Survey of the Concept of Analogy and its Theological Application by St. Thomas Aquinas. New York, 1984.
- Mückshoff, M. "Alexander v. Hales." *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 1 (1980) 377–78.
- Müller, J.-P., ed. *Le Correctorium Corruptorii de lean Quidort de Paris*. Studia Anselmiana, vols. 12–13. Rome, 1941.
- , ed. *Rambertus de' Primadizzi de Bologna, Apologeticum veritatis contra corruptorium*. Studi e Testi, vol. 108. Vatican City, 1943.
- , ed. *Le Correctorium Corruptorii "Quaestione"*. Studia Anselmiana, vol. 35. Rome, 1954.
- Mura, G. "Ermeneutica, gnoseologia e metafisica. Attualità del commento di S. Tommaso al Perihermeneias di Aristotele." *Euntes Docete* 40 (1987) 361–89.
- Murdoch, J. E. "Pierre Duhem and the History of Late Medieval Science and Philosophy in the Latin West." In *Gli Studi di Filosofia Medievale fra Otto e Novecento*, pp. 253–302.
- Narcisse, G. "Les enjeux épistémologiques de l'argument de convenance selon saint Thomas d'Aquin." In *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 143–67.
- Neidl, W. N. *Thearchia. Die Frage nach dem Sinn von Gott bei Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita und Thomas von Aquin*. Ratisbonne, 1976.
- Némésius d'Emèse. *De natura hominis*, ed. G. Verbeke and J. R. Moncho. Corpus latinum commentariorum in Aristotelem graecorum, Suppl. 1. Leyde, 1975.
- Novarina, P. See Walz, A. *Saint Thomas d'Aquin*.
- O'Meara, Th. F. "Grace as a Theological Structure in the *Summa Theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas." *RTAM* 55 (1988) 130–53.
- O'Neill, C. E. *Sacramental Realism. A General Theory of the Sacraments*. Wilmington, Del., 1983.
- O'Rourke, F. *Pseudo-Dionysius and the Metaphysics of Aquinas*. STGMA 32. Leiden, 1992.
- On Proclus and His Influence in Medieval Philosophy*, ed. P. Bos and P. A. Meijer. Philosophia Antiqua, vol. 53. Leiden, 1992.
- Ordo sapientiae et amoris*. Image et message de saint Thomas d'Aquin à travers les récentes études historiques, herméneutiques et doctrinales, Hommage au Professeur Jean-Pierre Torrell O.P. à l'occasion de son 65^e anniversaire, edited by C.-J. Pinto de Oliveira, Fribourg (Switzerland), 1993.
- Ott, L. "Das Opusculum des hl. Thomas von Aquin 'De forma absolutionis' in dogmengeschichtlicher Betrachtung." In *Festschrift Eichmann*, pp. 99–135. Paderborn, 1940.
- Owens, J. "Aquinas as Aristotelian Commentator." In *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*, vol. 1, pp. 213–38.
- Paissac, H. *Théologie du Verbe. Saint Augustin et saint Thomas*, Paris, 1951.
- Panella, E. "La *Lex nova* tra Storia ed Ermeneutica. Le occasioni dell'esegesi di s. Tommaso d'Aquino." *Memorie Domenicane* n.s. 6 (1975) 1–106.
- . "Per lo studio di fra Remigio dei Girolami (+ 1319). Contra falsos professores ecclesiae." *Memorie Domenicane* n.s. 10 (1979) 11–313.
- . "Un' introduzione alla filosofia in uno 'studium' dei frati Predicatori del XIII

- secolo. *Diuisio scientie di Remigio dei Girolami*." *Memorie Domenicane* n.s. 12 (1981) 27–126.
- . "I Quodlibeti di Remigio dei Girolami." *Memorie Domenicane* n.s. 14 (1983) 1–149.
- . "Note di biografia domenicana tra XIII e XIV secolo." *AFP* 54 (1984) 231–80.
- . "Nuove testimonianze su Guglielmo da Moerbeke." *AFP* 56 (1986) 49–55.
- . "Priori di Santa Maria Novella di Firenze 1221–1325." *Memorie Domenicane* n.s. 17 (1986) 253–84.
- . "Jacopo di Ranuccio da Castelbuono OP testimone dell'*alia lectura fratris Thome*." *Memorie domenicane* n.s. 19 (1988) 369–85.
- . "Il 'lector romane curiae' nelle cronache conventuali domenicane del XIII–XIV secolo." In *Vocabulaire des écoles et des méthodes d'enseignement au moyen âge*, ed. O. Weijers, pp. 130–39. Actes du colloque Rome 21–22 octobre 1989. CIVICIMA 5. Turnhout, 1992.
- Paravicini-Bagliani, A. "Nuovi documenti su Guglielmo da Moerbeke OP." *AFP* 52 (1982) 135–43.
- . "Guillaume de Moerbeke et la cour pontificale." In *Guillaume de Moerbeke*. Recueil d'études, pp. 23–52.
- Paschetta, E. "La natura del moto in base al De motu cordis di S. Tommaso." *MM* 19 (1988) 247–60.
- Patfoort, A. "L'unité de la *la Pars* et le mouvement interne de la Somme théologique de S. Thomas d'Aquin." *RSPT* 47 (1963) 513–44; reprinted in *Saint Thomas d'Aquin. Les clés*, pp. 49–70.
- . *L'unité d'être dans le Christ d'après S. Thomas. A la croisée de l'ontologie et de la christologie*. Paris, 1964.
- . *Saint Thomas d'Aquin. Les clés d'une théologie*. Paris, 1983.
- Pattin, A. "Notes concernant quelques écrits attribués à Siger de Brabant." *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale SIEPM* 29 (1987) 173–77.
- Péano, P. "Gérard de Borgo San Donnino." *DHGE* 20 (1984) 719–21.
- Pegis, A. C. "Qu'est-ce que la *Summa contra Gentiles*?" In *L'homme devant Dieu. Mélanges offerts au Père Henri de Lubac, II. Du moyen âge au siècle des Lumières*, pp. 169–82. Théologie, vol. 57. Paris, 1964.
- Pègues, Th., and F.-X. Maquart. *Saint Thomas d'Aquin. Sa vie par Guillaume de Tocco et les témoins au procès de canonisation*. Toulouse-Paris, 1924.
- Pelster, F. "Die älteren Biographien des hl. Thomas von Aquino. Eine kritische Studie." *ZKT* 44 (1920) 242–74; 366–97.
- . "La giovinezza di S. Tommaso d'Aquino. Studio critico sulle fonti." *La Civiltà Cattolica* 74 (1923), vol. 1, pp. 385–400.
- . "La famiglia di S. Tommaso d'Aquino. Studio sulle fonti." *La Civiltà Cattolica* 74 (1923), vol. 2, pp. 401–10.
- . "I parenti prossimi di S. Tommaso d'Aquino." *La Civiltà Cattolica* 74 (1923), vol. 4, pp. 299–313.
- . "La Quaestio disputata de saint Thomas *De unione verbi incarnati*." *Archives de Philosophie* 3 (1925) 198–245.

- . "Beiträge zur Chronologie der Quodlibeta des hl. Thomas von Aquin." *Gregorianum* 8 (1927) 508–38; 10 (1929) 52–71; 387–403.
- . "Die Sätze der Londoner Verurteilung von 1286 und die Schriften des Magister Richard von Knapwell O.P." *AFP* 16 (1946) 83–106.
- . "Literarhistorische Probleme der Quodlibeta des hl. Thomas von Aquin. I. Eine kritische übersicht; II. Die Datierung der Quodlibeta." *Gregorianum* 28 (1947) 78–100; 29 (1948) 62–87.
- Pelzer, A. "Le cours inédit d'Albert le Grand sur la morale à Nicomaque recueilli et rédigé par S. Thomas d'Aquin." *Revue néoscholastique de philosophie* 14 (1922) 333–61; 478–520.
- . *Etudes d'histoire littéraire sur la scolastique médiévale*. Philosophes médiévaux, vol. 8. Louvain-Paris, 1964.
- Perini, G. "Il commento di S. Tommaso alla Metafisica di Aristotele. Osservazioni critiche su una recente monografia." *DTP* 51 (1974) 106–45.
- Persson, P. E. "Le plan de la Somme théologique et le rapport *ratio-revelatio*." *RPL* 56 (1958) 545–75.
- Pesch, O. H. "Um den Plan der *Summa Theologiae* des hl. Thomas von Aquin." *MThZ* 16 (1965) 128–37; reprinted and completed in *Thomas von Aquin, Chronologie und Werkanalyse*, pp. 411–37.
- . "Paul as Professor of Theology. The Image of the Apostle in St. Thomas's Theology." *The Thomist* 38 (1974) 584–605.
- . *Thomas von Aquin. Grenze und Grösse mittelalterlicher Theologie. Eine Einführung*. Mayence, 1988.
- Peter of Bergamo, O.P. *Concordantie Textuum discordantium Divi Thomae Aquinatis*. Editio fototypica, ed. I. Colosio. Florence, 1982.
- Philippe, M.-D. *Préface à Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Commentaire sur l'Evangile de saint Jean*, vol. 1, pp. 7–49. Versailles-Buxy, ²1981.
- Philippe, P. "Le plan des Sentences de Pierre Lombard d'après S. Thomas." *BT* 3 (1930–33), Notes et communications, pp. 131–54.
- Pieper, J. "Kreatürlichkeit. Bemerkungen über die Elemente eines Grundbegriffs." In *Thomas von Aquin 1274/1974*, ed. L. Oeing-Hanhoff, pp. 47–71. Munich, 1974.
- Peter Lombard. *Sententiae in IV Libris distinctae*, 2 vols. ed. tertia ad fidem codicum antiquiorum restituta, Ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae Ad Claras Aquas. Spicilegium Bonaventurianum 4–5. Grottaferrata, 1971, 1981.
- Pinborg, J. *Die Entwicklung der Sprachtheorie im Mittelalter*. BGPTMA 42/2. Münster, 1967.
- , ed. See Boethius of Dacia, *Modi significandi*.
- Pinckaers, S. "Recherche de la signification véritable du terme 'spéculatif'." *NRT* 81 (1959) 673–95.
- . "La conception thomiste de la liberté et ses conséquences en morale." In *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Somme Théologique, Les actes humains*, vol. 2 (*Ia-IIae, QQ. 18–21*), pp. 249–73. Paris-Tournai-Rome, ²1966.
- . *Sources of Christian Ethics*, trans. St. Mary T. Noble, O.P. Washington, D.C., 1995.
- Pinto De Oliveira, C.-J. See *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*.

- Pizzuti, G.M. "Per una interpretazione storicizzata di Tommaso d'Aquino. Senso e limite di una prospettiva." *Sapienza* 29 (1976) 429–64.
- Pocini, W. *Roccasecca patria di San Tommaso d'Aquino*. Documentazione storico-bibliografica. Rome, 1974.
- Poncelet, A. "Le légendier de Pierre Calo." *Analecta Bollandiana* 29 (1910) 5–116.
- Portalupi, E. "Gregorio Magno nell'*Index Thomisticus*." *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale SIEPM* 31 (1989) 112–46.
- . *Studi sulla presenza di Gregorio Magno in Tommaso d'Aquino*. Dokimion, vol. 10. Fribourg, 1991.
- Potthast, A., ed. See Henry of Herford, *Liber de rebus memorabilioribus*.
- Principe, W. H. "Thomas Aquinas' Principles for Interpretation of Patristic Texts." In *Studies in Medieval Culture* VIII–IX, pp. 111–21. Western Michigan University, 1976.
- Prümmer, D. "Quelques observations à propos de la légende de S. Thomas, par Pierre Calo." In *RT* 20 (1912) 517–23.
- , ed. See *Fontes Vitae S. Thomae Aquinatis*.
- Putallaz, F.-X. *La connaissance de soi au XIIIe siècle. De Matthieu d'Aquasparta à Thierry de Freiberg*. Etudes de Philosophie médiévale, vol. 67. Paris, 1991.
- Quétif, J., and J. Echard. *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum*, vol. 1. Paris, 1719.
- Quillet, J. "L'art de la politique selon saint Thomas." *MM* 19 (1988) 278–85.
- Raby, F. J. E. "The Date and Authorship of the Poem Adoro Te Deute." *Speculum* 20 (1945) 236–38.
- Rambertus De' Primadizzi. See J.-P. Müller, ed., *Rambertus de' Primadizzi de Bologna, Apologeticum veritatis contra corruptorium*.
- Ramirez, J. M. *De hominis beatitudine. Tractatus theologicus*, vol. 3. Madrid, 1947.
- Ratzinger J. *The Theology of History in St. Bonaventure*, trans. Zachary Hayes, O.F.M. Franciscan Herald Press, 1971.
- Redigonda, A. "Agni, Tommaso." *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* 1 (1960) 445–47.
- Reichert, B. M., ed. See *Acta Capitulum Generalium*; Gérard de Frachet, *Vitae Fratrum*.
- Remigio Dei Girolami, *Contra falsos professores ecclesiae*. See Panella, A. "Per lo studio di fra Remigio dei Girolami;" *Diuisio scientie*, See Panella, "Un' introduzione alla filosofia."
- Renard, J.-P. "La Lectura super Matthaum V, 20–48 de Thomas d'Aquin." *RTAM* 50 (1983) 145–90.
- Renaudin, P. "Saint Thomas d'Aquin et saint Benoît." *RT* 17 (1909) 513–37.
- Renzo Villata, G. di. "Bartholomaeus v. Capua." *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 1 (1980) 1493–94.
- Richard de Mediavilla. See Zavalloni, R. *Richard de Mediavilla et la controverse sur la pluralité des formes*.
- Richard Knapwell. *Quaestio disputata de unitate formae*, ed. F. E. Kelley. Paris, 1982.
- Robles, L. "Un opusculo ignorado de Tomás de Aquino, El 'De mixtione elementorum.'" *Estudios Filosóficos* 23 (1974) 239–59.
- Roensch, F. J. *Early Thomistic School*. Dubuque, 1964.

Roland-Gosselin, M.-D. *Le "De Ente et Essentia" de S. Thomas d'Aquin*. Texte établi d'après les manuscrits. Introduction, notes et études historiques. Bibliothèque thomiste, vol. 8. Paris, 1948.

Roos, H., ed. See Boethius of Dacia, *Modi significandi*.

Rossi, M. M. *Teoria e metodo esegetici in S. Tommaso d'Aquino*. Analisi del *Super Epistolas Sancti Pauli Lectura Ad Romanos*, c. 1,1. 6. Diss. Angelicum. Rome, 1992.

Rouse, R. H., ed. See *La production du livre universitaire*.

Ruben Hayoun, M.-R., and A. de Libera. *Averroès et l'averroïsme*. Que Sais-Je? 2631. Paris, 1991.

Ruello, F. "Saint Thomas et Pierre Lombard. Les relations trinitaires et la structure du commentaire des Sentences de saint Thomas d'Aquin." In *San Tommaso, Fonti e riflessi del suo pensiero*, pp. 176–209. Studi Tomistici, vol. 1. Rome, 1974.

———. "La doctrine de l'illumination dans le traité *Super librum Boethii* de Trinitate de Thomas d'Aquin." *RSR* 64 (1976) 341–57.

———. *La christologie de Thomas d'Aquin*. Théologie historique, vol. 76. Paris, 1987. Russell, J. C. *Medieval Regions and Their Cities*. Newton Abbot, 1972.

Saffrey, H.-D. "Saint Thomas d'Aquin et l'héritage des anciens." In *VIIIe Centenaire de saint Thomas d'Aquin et restauration de l'église des Jacobins*, Chronique de L'Institut catholique de Toulouse, 1975, no. 4, pp. 73–90.

———. "Saint Thomas d'Aquin et ses secrétaires." *RSPT* 41 (1957) 49–74.

———. "Un panégyrique inédit de S. Thomas d'Aquin par Josse Clichtove." In *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 539–53.

Sajó, G. *Un traité récemment découvert de Boèce de Dacie De mundi aeternitate*. Budapest, 1954.

Sanchez, M. "Como y de qué murió Santo Tomás de Aquino." *Studium* 16 (1976) 369–404.

———. "Murió envenenado santo Tomás de Aquino?" *Studium* 18 (1978) 3–37.

Sanchis, A. "Escritos espirituales de Santo Tomás (1269–1272)." *Teologia espiritual* 6 (1962) 277–318.

San Cristobal-Sebastian, A. *Controversias acerca de la voluntad desde 1270 a 1300*. Madrid, 1958.

San Tommaso d'Aquino O.P. Miscellanea storico-artistica. Rome, 1924.

Saranyana, J. I. "Sobre el In Boethii de Trinitate de Tomás de Aquino." *MM* 19 (1988) 71–81.

Sassen, J. H. H. *Hugo von St. Cher, Seine Tätigkeit als Kardinal, 1244–1263*. Bonn, 1908.

Scandone, F. "La vita, la famiglia e la patria di S. Tommaso." In *San Tommaso d'Aquino O.P. Miscellanea storico-artistica*, pp. 1–110.

Scheffczyk, L. "Die Bedeutung der Mysterien des Lebens Jesu für Glauben und Leben des Christen." In *Die Mysterien des Lebens Jesu und die christliche Existenz*, ed. L. Scheffczyk, pp. 17–34. Aschaffenburg, 1984.

———. "Die Stellung des Thomas von Aquin in der Entwicklung der Lehre von den Mysteria Vitae Christi." In *Renovatio et Reformatio . . . Festschrift für Ludwig Hödl . . .*, ed. M. Gerwing and G. Ruppert, pp. 44–70. Münster, 1986.

- Schenk, R. "*Omnis Christi actio nostra est instructio*. The Deeds and Sayings of Jesus as Revelation in the View of Aquinas." In *La doctrine de la révélation divine de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, pp. 104–31.
- Schillebeeckx, H. *De sacramentele Heilseconomie*. Antwerp, 1952.
- Schipperges, H. See Bernt, G., L. Hödl, and H. Schipperges, "Artes liberales."
- Schwaiger, G. "Adenulf v. Anagni." *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 1 (1980) 149.
- Seckler, M. *Le salut et l'histoire. La pensée de saint Thomas d'Aquin sur la théologie de l'histoire*. Cogitatio fidei, vol. 21. Paris, 1967.
- Sentis, L. *Saint Thomas d'Aquin et le mal, Foi chrétienne et théodicée*. Paris, 1992.
- Sermoneta, G. "Pour une histoire du thomisme juif." In *Aquinas and Problems of His Time*, pp. 130–35.
- . "Jehudah ben Moseh ben Daniel Romano, traducteur de saint Thomas." In *Hommage à Georges Vajda. Etudes d'histoire et de pensée juives*, ed. G. Nahon and C. Touati, pp. 235–62. Louvain, 1980.
- Sertillanges, A.-D. *L'idée de création et ses retentissements en philosophie*. Paris, 1945.
- . *Notes et Appendices à Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Somme théologique, La création (Ia, QQ. 44–49)*. Paris-Tournai-Rome, 1963.
- Serverat, V. "L'*irrisio fidei* chez Raymond Lulle et S. Thomas d'Aquin." *RT* 90 (1990) 436–48.
- Shooner, H.-V. "La *Lectura in Matthaeum* de S. Thomas (Deux fragments inédits et la *Reportatio* de Pierre d'Andria)." *Angelicum* 33 (1956) 121–42.
- , ed. See *Codices manuscripti operum Thomae de Aquino*.
- . "La production du livre par la pecia." In *La production du livre universitaire*, pp. 17–37.
- Siedl, S. H. "Thomas von Aquin und die moderne Exegese." *ZKT* 93 (1971) 29–44.
- Siger of Brabant, *Quaestiones in Tertium De anima. De anima intellectiva. De aeternitate mundi*, ed. B. Bazán. Philosophes médiévaux, vol. 13. Louvain-Paris, 1972.
- . *Quaestiones super librum de causis*, ed. A. Marlasca. Philosophes médiévaux, vol. 12. Louvain-Paris, 1972.
- . *Quaestiones in Metaphysicam*, ed. W. Dunphy. Philosophes médiévaux, vol. 24. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1981.
- . *Quaestiones in Metaphysicam*, ed. A. Maurer. Philosophes médiévaux, vol. 25. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1983.
- Simon, P. *Prolegomena à S. Alberti Magni Opera omnia*, ed. colon. vol. 37/1: *Super Dionysium de divinis nominibus*, pp. v–xx. Bonn, 1972.
- Simonin, H.-D. "Les écrits de Pierre de Tarentaise." In *Beatus Innocentius pp. V (Petrus de Tarentasia O.P.)*, *Studia et Documenta*, pp. 163–335. Rome, 1943.
- Simplicius. *Commentaire sur les Catégories d'Aristote*, Traduction de Guillaume de Moerbeke, ed. A. Pattin. Louvain-Paris, 1971.
- Sirat, C. *La philosophie juive médiévale en terre de chrétienté*. Paris, 1988.
- . *A History of Jewish Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge-New York, 1985.
- Smalley, B. "Glossa ordinaria." *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 13 (1984) 452–57.
- . *The Gospels in the Schools c. 1100–c. 1280*. London-Ronceverte, 1985.

- . "Use of the 'Spiritual' Senses of Scripture in Persuasion and Arguments by Scholars in the Middle Ages." *RTAM* 52 (1985) 44–63.
- Spicq, C. *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge*. Bibliothèque thomiste, vol. 26. Paris, 1944.
- . "Saint Thomas d'Aquin exégète." In "Thomas d'Aquin (saint)" *DTC* 15/1 (1946) 694–738.
- S. Thomae Aquinatis vitae fontes praecipuae* (read: *praecipui*), ed. A. Ferrua. Alba, 1968.
- St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*, ed. A. Maurer. 2 vols. Toronto, 1974.
- Steel, C. "Guillaume de Moerbeke et saint Thomas." In *Guillaume de Moerbeke*, pp. 57–82.
- Stevaux, A. "La doctrine de la charité dans le commentaire des Sentences de saint Albert, de saint Bonaventure et de saint Thomas." *ETL* 24 (1948) 59–97.
- Stroick, C. "Die Ewigkeit der Welt in den Aristoteleskommentaren des Thomas von Aquin." *RTAM* 51 (1984) 43–68.
- Suermondt, Cl. *Introductio à S. Thomae Aquinatis Summa theologiae*, pp. v–xiv. Turin, 1963.
- Swierzawski, W. "God and the Mystery of His Wisdom in the Pauline Commentaries of Saint Thomas Aquinas." *DTP* 74 (1971) 466–500.
- Synan, E. A. "Aquinas and His Age." In *Calgary Aquinas Studies*, ed. A. Parel, pp. 1–25. Toronto, 1978.
- . "St. Thomas Aquinas and the Profession of Arms." *MS* 50 (1988) 404–37. Synave, P. "Les Commentaires scripturaires de saint Thomas d'Aquin." *VS* 8 (1923) 455–69.
- . "L'ordre des Quodlibets VII à XI de S. Thomas d'Aquin." *RT* 31 n.s. 9 (1926) 43–47.
- . "Le problème chronologique des questions disputées de saint Thomas d'Aquin." *RT* 31, n.s. 9 (1926) 154–59.
- . "La révélation des vérités divines naturelles d'après saint Thomas d'Aquin." In *Mélanges Mandonnet*, vol. 1, pp. 327–70.
- . "Le corps du Christ pendant les trois jours de sa mort." In *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Somme Théologique, Vie de Jésus*, vol. 4, pp. 345–54 (*IIIa, QQ. 50–59*). Paris-Toumai-Rome, 1931.
- Taurisano, I. "Discepoli e biografi di S. Tommaso." In *San Tommaso d'Aquino O.P. Miscellanea storico-artistica*, pp. 111–86.
- . "Quomodo sanctus Patriarcha Dominicus orabat." *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum* 30 (1922) 93–106.
- Teetaert, A. "Quatre questions inédites de Gérard d'Abbeville pour la défense de la supériorité du clergé séculier." In *Archivio italiano per la storia della pietà* 1 (1951) 83–178.
- Thémistius. *Commentaire sur le traité de l'âme d'Aristote, Traduction de Guillaume de Moerbeke*, ed. G. Verbeke. Louvain-Paris, 1957.
- Théry, G. "L'autographe de S. Thomas conservé à la Biblioteca Nazionale de Naples." *AFP* 1 (1931) 15–86.

- Thiry, A. "Saint Thomas et la morale d'Aristote." In *Aristote et saint Thomas d'Aquin*, pp. 229–58.
- Thomas, A. H. *De Oudste Constituties van de Dominicanen*. Voorgeschiedenis, Tekst, Bronnen, Ontstaan en ontwikkeling (1215–1237), Met uitgave van de tekst (with French summary). Bibliothèque de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, vol. 42. Leuven, 1965.
- Thomas Cantimpré. *Miraculorum et exemplorum memorabilium sui temporis Libri duo* (= *Bonum universale de apibus*). Douai, 1597.
- Thomas von Aquin. Vol. 1: *Chronologie und Werkanalyse*, ed. K. Bernath. Wege der Forschung, vol. 188. Darmstadt, 1978.
- Thomas von Aquin, *Prologe zu den Aristoteleskommentaren*, translated, edited, and introduced by F. Cheneval and R. Imbach. Klostermann-Texte: Philosophie. Frankfurt am Main, 1993.
- Thorndike, L. *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*. Vol. 2. New York, 1929.
- Ti-Ti Chen, J. *La unidad de la Iglesia según santo Tomás en la epístola a los Efesios*. Pamplona, 1979.
- Tolomeo of Lucca. *Ptolomaei Lucensis Historia ecclesiastica nova*, Lib. XXII 17–XXIII 16. In L. A. Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores*, vol. 11. Milan, 1724. Partial critical edition by A. Dondaine, "Les *Opuscula fratris Thomae* chez Ptolémée de Lucques." *AFP* 31 (1961) 142–203.
- Tommaso d'Aquino nel suo settimo centenario. Atti del congresso internazionale (Rome-Naples, 17/24 April 1974). 9 vols. Naples, n.d. (1975–78).
- Tonneau, J. "Le passage de la Prima Secundae à la Secunda Secundae." *Bulletin du Cercle Thomiste de Caen*, no. 69 (1975), pp. 29–46; no. 70, pp. 21–31.
- . *Introduction à Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Trois questions disputées du De Veritate*. Qu. XV: Raison supérieure et raison inférieure; Qu. XVI: De la syndérèse; Qu. XVII: De la conscience. Text, translation and notes. Paris, 1991.
- Torrell, J.-P. "Théologie et sainteté." *RT* 71 (1971) 205–21.
- . *Théorie de la prophétie et philosophie de la connaissance aux environs de 1230*. Spicilegium sacrum lovaniense, vol. 40. Louvain 1977.
- . "La pratique pastorale d'un théologien du XIII^e siècle: Thomas d'Aquin prédicateur." *RT* 82 (1982) 213–45.
- . "Les *Collationes in decem preceptis* de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Edition critique avec introduction et notes." *RSPT* 69 (1985) 5–40 and 227–63.
- . "Autorités théologiques et liberté du théologien. L'exemple de saint Thomas d'Aquin." *Les Echos de Saint-Maurice*, n.s. 18 (1988) 7–24.
- . "Le traité de la prophétie de S. Thomas d'Aquin et la théologie de la révélation." In *La doctrine de la révélation divine de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, pp. 171–95.
- . "Thomas d'Aquin (saint)" *DS* 15 (1991) 718–73.
- . *La théologie catholique*, Que sais-je? 1269. Paris, 1994.
- Touron, A. *La vie de St. Thomas d'Aquin, de l'Ordre des Frères prêcheurs, docteur de l'Eglise, avec un exposé de sa doctrine et de ses ouvrages*. Paris, 1740.
- Tugwell, S. "The Nine Ways of Prayer of St. Dominic: A Textual Study and Critical Edition." *MS* 47 (1985) 1–124
- , ed. See *Albert & Thomas: Selected Writings*.

- Turiel, Q. "La intención de Santo Tomás en la *Summa contra Gentiles*." *Studium* 14 (1974) 371–401.
- Turley, T. "An Unnoticed *Quaestio* of Giovanni Regina di Napoli." *AFP* 54 (1984) 281–91.
- Turner, W. H. "St. Thomas's Exposition of Aristotle. A Rejoinder." *NS* 35 (1961) 210–24.
- Turrini, M. "Raynald de Piperno et le texte original de la *Tertia Pars* de la *Somme de Théologie* de S. Thomas d'Aquin." *RSPT* 73 (1989) 233–47.
- Valkenberg, W.G.B.M. *Did Not Our Hearts Burn? Place and Function of Holy Scripture in the Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Utrecht, 1990.
- Van Banning, J. "Saint Thomas et l'*Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*." In *Atti dell'VIII Congresso Tomistico Internazionale*, vol. 8: *San Tommaso nella storia del pensiero*, pp. 73–85. Studi Tomistici 17. Vatican City, 1982.
- . *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum. Praefatio*. CCSL 87. B. Turnhout, 1988.
- Vanhamel, W., ed. See *Guillaume de Moerbeke*. Recueil d'études.
- Vanni Rovighi, S. *Introduzione a Tommaso d'Aquino*. Rome-Bari, ²1981.
- Vansteenkiste, C. "San Tommaso d'Aquino ed Averroè." *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 32 (1957) 585–623.
- Van Steenberghen, F. *Siger de Brabant d'après ses oeuvres inédites* II. *Siger dans l'histoire de l'aristotélisme*. Les philosophes belges 13. Louvain, 1942.
- . *Aristote en Occident. Les origines de l'aristotélisme parisien*. Essais philosophiques, vol. 1. Paris, 1946. English translation: *Aristotle in the West: The Origins of Latin Aristotelianism*, trans. Leonard Johnston. Louvain, 1970.
- . "Le *De quindecim problematibus* d'Albert le Grand." In *Mélanges Auguste Pelzer*, pp. 415–39.
- . *Maître Siger de Brabant*. Louvain-Paris, 1977.
- . *La philosophie au XIII^e siècle*. Philosophes médiévaux, vol. 28. Louvain, ²1991.
- Van Uytven, R. "The Date of Thomas Aquinas's *Epistola ad Ducissam Brabantiae*." In *Pascua Mediaevalia*. Studies voor Prof. Dr. J. M. De Smet, ed. R. Lievens, E. Van Mingroot, and W. Verbeke, pp. 631–43. Leuven, 1983.
- Vauchez, A. "Les canonisations de S. Thomas et de S. Bonaventure: pourquoi deux siècles d'écart?" In 1274—*Année-charnière*, pp. 753–67.
- . "Culture et canonisation d'après les procès de canonisation des XIII^e et XIV^e siècles." In *Le scuole degli Ordini mendicanti*, pp. 151–72. Todi, 1978.
- . *La Sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du Moyen-Age d'après les procès de canonisation et les documents hagiographiques*. Rome, 1981.
- Verbeke, G. "Les sources et la chronologie du Commentaire de S. Thomas d'Aquin au *De anima* d'Aristote." *RPL* 45 (1947) 314–38.
- . "Note sur la date du Gommenaire de S. Thomas au *De anima* d'Aristote." *RPL* 50 (1952) 56–63.
- . *Jean Philopon. Commentaire sur le De Anima d'Aristote*, Louvain-Paris, 1966.
- , ed. See *Aquinas and Problems of His Time*; Némésius d'Emèse, *De natura hominis*; Thémistius, *Commentaire sur le traité de l'âme d' Aristote*.
- Verger, J. "Baccalarius." *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 1 (1980) 1323.

———. "L'exégèse de l'Université." In *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, under the direction of P. Riché and G. Lobrichon, pp. 199–232. Paris, 1984.

Verhelst, D. ed. See *Aquinas and Problems of His Time*.

Vernier, J.-M. "Physique aristotélicienne et métaphysique thomiste." *RT* 91 (1991) 5–33; 393–413.

Vicaire, M.-H. *Saint Dominique de Caleruega d'après les documents du XIII^e siècle*. Paris, 1955.

———. *Saint Dominique, La vie apostolique*. Textes présentés et annotés. Paris, 1965.

———. *Saint Dominique et ses frères: Evangile ou croisade?* Textes du XIII^e siècle, présentés et annotés. Paris, 1967.

———. "Roland de Crémone ou la position de la théologie à l'université de Toulouse." *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 5 (1970) 145–78.

———. "L'homme que fut saint Thomas." In *L'anthropologie de saint Thomas*, ed. N.A. Luyten, pp. 7–34. Fribourg, 1974.

———. "L'ordre de saint Dominique en 1215." *AFP* 54 (1984) 5–38.

Viola, C. "L'Ecole thomiste au Moyen Age." In *La philosophie contemporaine. Chroniques nouvelles*, ed. G. Fløistad, pp. 345–77. Vol. 6/1. Philosophie et science au Moyen Age. Dordrecht-Boston-London, 1990.

Vocabulaire du livre et de l'écriture au Moyen Age. Actes de la table ronde, Paris, 24–26 September 1987. Ed. O. Weijers. CIVICIMA 2. Turnhout, 1989.

Walsh, L. G. "The Divine and the Human in St. Thomas's Theology of Sacraments." In *Ordo sapientiae et amoris*, pp. 321–52.

Walz, A. "Historia canonizationis sancti Thomae de Aquino." In *Xenia thomistica*, vol. 3, pp. 105–72.

———. "De genuino titulo *Summae theologiae*." *Angelicum* 18 (1941) 142–51.

———. "L'Aquinate a Orvieto." *Angelicum* 29 (1952) 176–90.

———. "Wege des Aquinaten." *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1958) 221–28.

———. "Le dernier voyage de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Itinéraires de saint Thomas." *Nova et Vetera* 36 (1961) 289–97.

———. *Saint Thomas d'Aquin*. French adaptation by P. Novarina. Philosophes médiévaux, vol. 5. Louvain-Paris, 1962.

———. *Saint Thomas Aquinas: A Biographical Study*, trans. S. Bullough, O.P. Westminster, Md., 1951.

———. "San Tommaso d'Aquino dichiarato dottore della Chiesa nel 1567." *Angelicum* 44 (1967) 145–73.

———. "Papst Johannes XXII. und Thomas von Aquin. Zur Geschichte der Heiligsprechung des Aquinaten." In *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*, vol. 1, pp. 29–47.

———, et al. "Thomas d'Aquin (saint)." *DTC* 15/1 (1946) 618–761.

Wéber, E.-H. *L'homme en discussion à l'Université de Paris en 1270. La controverse de 1270 à l'Université de Paris et son retentissement sur la pensée de S. Thomas d'Aquin*. Bibliothèque thomiste, vol. 40. Paris, 1970.

———. *La personne humaine au XIII^e siècle*. Bibliothèque thomiste, vol. 46. Paris, 1991.

Weijers, O. ed. See *Vocabulaire du livre et de l'écriture au Moyen âge*.

- Weisheipl, J. A. "The *Problemata determinata XLIII* Ascribed to Albertus Magnus (1271)." *MS* 22 (1960) 303–54.
- . "Curriculum of the Faculty of Arts at Oxford in the Early Fourteenth Century." *MS* 26 (1964) 143–85.
- . *Friar Thomas d'Aquino. His Life, Thought and Works*. 2d edition. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1983.
- . "The Commentary of St. Thomas on the *De caelo* of Aristotle." *Sapientia* (Buenos Aires) 29 (1974) 11–34.
- . "An Introduction to the Commentary on the Gospel of Saint John." In *St. Thomas Aquinas, Commentary on the Gospel of St. John*, Part 1, ed. J. A. Weisheipl and F. R. Larcher, pp. 3–19. Albany, N.Y. 1980.
- . "The Life and Works of St. Albert the Great." In *Albertus Magnus and the Sciences. Commemorative Essays*, ed. J. A. Weisheipl, pp. 12–51. Toronto, 1980.
- . *Thomas d' Aquino and Albert His Teacher*. Toronto, 1980.
- . "The Date and Context of Aquinas' *De aeternitate mundi*." In *Graceful Reason. Essays . . . Presented to Joseph Owens*, ed. L. P. Gerson, pp. 239–71. Toronto, 1983.
- White, K. "Three Previously Unpublished Chapters from St. Thomas Aquinas's Commentary on Aristotle's *Metcora*: *Sentencia super Metcora* 2, 13–15." *MS* 54 (1992) 49–93.
- Wielockx, R. *Commentaire à Aegidii Romani Opera omnia*, vol. 3/1: *Apologia*, Florence, 1985.
- . "Thomas d'Aquin, commentateur du *De Sensu*." *Scriptorium* 41 (1987) 150–57.
- . "Autour du procès de Thomas d'Aquin." *MM* 19 (1988) 413–38.
- William de La Mare. *Scriptum in primum librum Sententiarum*, ed. H. Kraml. Munich, 1989.
- William of Moerbeke. See Thémistius, *Commentaire sur le traité de l' âme d' Aristote*.
- William of Tocco. See Le Brun-Gouanvic, *Edition critique de l' Ystoria sancti Thome de Aquino*.
- Wilmart, A. "La tradition littéraire et textuelle de l' Adoro Te devote." In *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du moyen âge latin*, ed. A. Wilmart, pp. 361–414. Paris, 1932. First published in *RTAM* 1 (1929) 21–40, 149–76.
- Wippel, J. F. "The Condemnations of 1270 and 1277 at Paris." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 7 (1977) 169–201.
- . "Did Thomas Aquinas Defend the Possibility of an Eternally Created World? (The *De aeternitate mundi* Revisited)." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 19 (1981) 21–37.
- . *Metaphysical Themes in Thomas Aquinas*, Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1984.
- . "Quodlibetal Questions, Chiefly in Theology Faculties." In B.C. Bazán, G. Fransen, J. F. Wippel, D. Jacquart. *Les questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les facultés de théologie, de droit et de médecine*, pp. 151–222. Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 44–45. Turnhout, 1985.

———. "The Latin Avicenna as a Source of Thomas Aquinas's Metaphysics." *FZPT* 37 (1990) 51–90.

Wissink, J. B. M. ed. See *The Eternity of the World*.

Wohlman, A. *Thomas d' Aquin et Maïmonide. Un dialogue exemplaire*. Paris, 1988.

Xenia thomistica a plurimis . . . praeparata . . ., ed. S. Szabo. 3 vols. Rome, 1925.

Zavalloni, R. *Richard de Mediavilla et la controverse sur la pluralité des formes. Textes inédits et études critiques*. Philosophes médiévaux, vol. 2. Louvain, 1951.

Zawilla, R. "Saint Thomas d' Aquin et la théologie biblique de l' Eucharistie du XI^e au XIII^e siècle." Communication to the Journée thomiste de Saint-Jacques, Paris, 24 November 1987 (unpublished).

———. *The Biblical Sources of the Historiae Corporis Christi attributed to Thomas Aquinas*. Diss. Toronto, 1985.

Index of the Works of Saint Thomas Aquinas

A

Adoro Te deuote, 132–35, 357

Attendite a falsis prophetis, 196

C

Catena aurea. See *Glossa continua super Evangelia*

Collatio in orationem dominicam:

Pater, 71–72, 165, 269, 275, 358;

Ave Maria, 71–72, 269, 358;

Credo, 71–72, 165, 266, 275, 349, 358

Collationes in decem precepta, 71–72, 165, 266, 357–58

Collationes in Isaiah. See *Expositio super Isaïam ad litteram*

Compendium theologiae, 103, 164–66, 266, 273, 349–50

Contra doctrinam retrahentium a religione, 84–90, 183, 240, 347–48

Contra errores graecorum, 103, 123–24, 290, 351

Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem, 79–84, 88, 90, 92, 346–47

D

De aeternitate mundi, 184–87, 240, 348

De angelis. See *De substantiis separatis*

De articulis fidei et ecclesiae sacramentis, 126, 164–65, 352–53

De emptione et uenditione ad tempus, 122–23, 351

De ente et essentia, 47–48, 348–49

De fallaeiis (apocryphe), 11, 359

De forma absolutionis, 168, 353

De iudiciis astrorum, 215, 273, 356

De mixtione elementorum, 213–14, 266

De motu cordis, 213–14, 355–56

De oprationibus occultis naturae, 214–15, 356

De perfectione spiritualis uitae, 56, 84–91, 183, 240, 347

De principiis naturae, 48–49, 349

De propitionibus modalibus (apocryphe), 11, 359

De rationibus fidei ad Cantorem Antiochehum, 103, 124–25, 351–52

De regno ad regem Cypri, 14, 169–71, 315, 350

De secreto, 217, 353

De substantiis separatis, 220–23, 240, 273, 350

De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas, 92, 173, 191–94, 240, 316, 341, 348

E

Epistola ad Bernardum abbatem casinensem, 14, 15, 295, 356–57

Epistola ad ducissam Brabantiae (*De regimine Iudeorum*, *De regimine Subditorum*), 218–20, 335

Expositio et Lectura super Epistolas Pauli Apostoli, 197, 250–74, 312, 340

Expositio Libri Boetii De ebdomadibus, 68, 345–46

Expositio Libri Peryermenias, 224–26, 342–43

Expositio Libri Posteriorum, 225–27, 266, 343

Expositio super Iob ad litteram, 55, 57, 59, 115, 120–21, 198–200, 251, 338

Expositio super Isaïam ad litteram, 27–35, 44, 55, 68, 241, 337

Expositio super primam et secundam Decretalem, 125–26, 352

G

Glossa continua super Evangelia (*Catena Aurea*), 47, 56, 70, 136–40, 160, 230, 242, 338–39

L

Laus Mariae, 32

Lectura super Ioannem, 55, 197–201, 240, 274, 339–40

Lectura super Matthaeum, 55–57, 197–201, 198, 240–41, 339, 357

Liber De sortibus, 215–17, 353–54

O

Officium de festo Corporis Christi, 129–31, 135–36, 246, 357

Other sermons, 358–59;

Osanno filio David, 183;

Exiit quiseminat, 183

P

Postilla super Psalmos, 256–57, 275, 340–41

Principium "Rigans montes de superioribus suis" and "Hic est liber mandatorum Dei," 51–53, 338

Q

Quaestio disputata De anima, 63, 102, 161–62, 172, 193, 201, 204–7, 335

Quaestio disputata De caritate, 201

Quaestio disputata De correctioni fraterna, 201

Quaestio disputata De Spe, 201, 336

Quaestio disputata De spiritualibus creaturis, 103, 161–62, 172, 201, 193, 204–7, 335–36

Quaestio disputata De unione Verbi incarnati, 201–7, 240, 336–37

Quaestio disputata De uirtutibus cardinalibus, 201

Quaestio disputata de uirtutibus in communi, 201

Quaestiones de quodlibet I–XII, 209–12, 312:

Quodlibet De ingressu puerorum, 86–87;

Quodlibet I, De opere manuali religiosorum, 81, 88, 179, 202, 217;

Quolibets I–VII, 240;

Quodlibet II, 242;

Quodlibets II–V, 183;

Quodlibet IV, 86–87, 107;

Quodlibets VII–XI, 61;

Quodlibets VII–XII, 210–12

Quaestiones disputatae De malo, 146, 20–21, 202–7, 225, 240, 244, 336

Quaestiones disputatae De potentia, 62, 103, 161–64, 204, 335

Quaestiones disputatae De ueritate, 62–66, 68, 163, 205, 242, 245, 334–35, 345

Quaestiones disputatae De uirtutibus, 201–7, 240, 336

Quodlibeta. See *Quaestiones de quolibet*

R

Responsio . . . de 108 articulis, 167, 353

Responsio . . . de 43 articulis, 168, 354

Responsio ad lectorem Bisuntinum de 6 articulis, 169, 354

Responsiones . . . de 30 et 36 articulis, 168, 354

Rigans montes. See *Principium*

S

Scripture super Libros Sententiarum, 13–14, 24, 28, 39–45, 66, 103, 108, 112, 116, 119, 134, 136, 139, 144, 147, 154, 158, 160, 185, 312, 316, 332

Sentencia Libri De anima, 103, 162, 171–74, 176, 181, 226, 229, 246, 341

Sentencia Libri De sensu et sensato, 173, 224, 341–42

Sententia Libri Ethicorum, 20, 25, 26, 170, 174, 227–29, 238, 283, 343–44

Sententia Libri Politicorum, 233–34, 266, 344

Sententia super Libros de generatione et corruptione, 235, 266, 345

Sententia super Librum De caelo et mundo, 234, 266, 344

Sententia super Metaphysicam, 154, 231–33, 238, 266, 344

Sententia super Meteora, 235–36, 342

Sententia super Physicam, 187, 194, 231–33, 235

Summa contra Gentiles, 68, 86, 88, 96–117, 120, 125, 126, 154, 163, 164, 172, 241, 251, 312, 332–33, 338, 345, 349, 352

Summa theologiae, 26, 44, 47, 63, 66, 86, 88, 102, 107–9, 111, 112, 115–16, 119–20, 126, 128, 131, 135, 136, 139, 144–60, 163, 166, 172, 174, 177, 185, 189–90, 194, 202, 206, 208, 211, 225, 227, 229, 230, 231, 234, 240, 242, 244–46, 261–65, 275, 289, 294, 305, 312, 316, 333–34, 335, 341, 343, 347

Super Boetium De Trinitate, 67–68, 84, 107, 108, 241, 345

Super Cantica Canticorum, 292, 295, 341

Super Epistolas Pauli Apostoli. See *Expositio et Lectura*

Super Ieremiam et Threnos, 27–28, 337

Super Ioannem. See *Lectura super Ioannem*

Super Iob. See *Expositio super Iob*

Super Isaiam. See *Expositio super Isaiam*

Super Librum De causis, 194, 222–23, 240, 346

Super Librum Dionysii De diuinis nominibus, 127–29, 346

T

Tabula Libri Ethicorum, 26, 229–31, 242

Traetatus fallaciarum, 11

Index of Names

A

- Abel, 323
- Acerra, Thomas I, Count, 3
- Adelasia de Aquino, 4, 12
- Adenulf of Anagni, 198–99
- Agnes, Saint, 271, 274, 282–83
- Aimeric of Veire, 50
- Aimo (Aimone) de Aquino, 3
- Al Farabi, 188
- Alain de Libera, 299
- Albert the Great (Albertus Magnus), Saint, xviii, 13, 18–22, 24–38, 41, 44, 49, 59, 96–97, 127, 140, 143, 168–69, 192–94, 229–30, 233, 298–99, 303, 313–14, 316;
- commentary on *Ethics*, 26, 229;
- commentary on *Physics*, 230;
- commentary on *Politics*, 233;
- commentary on *Sentences*, 193;
- De Caelesti hierarchia*, 21, 22;
- Dionysium de divinis nominibus*, 21, 25;
- Parua naturalia*, 230;
- Super De quindecim problematibus*, 299
- Alexander IV, Pope, 50, 71–72, 77, 80
- Alexander of Hales, 40, 76, 188
- Alexander, Master, 20
- Alfred de Sareshel, 213, 356
- Alix (Adelaide) of Burgundy, 218
- Ambrose, Saint, 264, 325
- Ambrosio Sansedoni of Siena, 143
- Ammonius, 226
- André Vauchez, 320
- Andrew, Bishop of Terracina, 319
- Annibaldo d'Annibaldi, 99, 137, 282
- Annibaldo of Ceccano, 277
- Aquinas, Thomas. *See* Thomas Aquinas
- Aristotle, 7, 38, 41, 93, 95, 105, 111, 115, 127–29, 132, 149, 154, 156, 169, 182, 184, 190, 192–94, 221, 222, 223, 237, 239, 245, 283;
- De anima*, 162, 171–77, 224, 246;
- De animalibus*, 102, 175;
- De caelo*, 175;
- Ethics*, 20, 227, 229, 246;
- Liber de bona fortuna*, 102;
- Metaphysics*, 39n, 41, 128, 225–27, 231–33, 246, 266, 275n;
- Physics*, 39n, 41, 186, 231–33, 246;
- Politics*, 102;
- Posterior Analytics*, 226;
- Rhetoric*, 102, 146, 202, 246
- Arius. *See* Arianism
- Arnoul de Provence, 20
- Athanasius, Saint, 137, 325
- Augustine, Saint, 39, 41, 44, 87, 128, 157, 165–66, 187–88, 199, 214, 222, 245, 260–61, 264, 308, 312, 325
- Averroes, 6–7, 49, 93, 104–5, 192–94. *See also* Averroism
- Avicbron (Ibn Gebirol), 188–89
- Avicenna, 48–49, 188, 192, 313
- B
- Bandel, M., 331
- Bartholomew of Capua, 8, 63, 185, 199, 241, 258, 259, 269, 270–71, 274, 280, 281, 289, 292–93, 306, 318
- Bartholomew of Pisa, 159
- Bartholomew of Spina, 57
- Bartholomew of Tours, 217
- Basil, Saint, 325
- Bataillon, L.–J., 23, 68, 71, 202-3, 236, 331, 342, 358
- Baudouin I of Flanders, 219
- Baxianus de Lodi, 168, 354
- Bazán, Bernardo, 61–63, 162, 193
- Beaudouin de Maflix, 217
- Bede, Venerable, 137
- Benedict, Saint, 4
- Benedict of Asinago:
- Concordanti a dictorum fratris Thomae*, 322
- Bentius, Friar, 325
- Bernard Ayglier, 14, 290, 295, 356
- Bernard Gui, xv, 8, 19, 320
- Bernard, Saint, 134
- Bernard of Auvergne, 315
- Bernard of La Treille, 315
- Berthier, J., 27

Bianchi, Luca, 299

Billot, 206

Boethius, 68, 226

Boethius of Dacia, 191

Bonaventure, Saint, 13, 39, 41, 45, 61, 71, 76, 78–79, 80, 182–84, 187, 192–93, 290, 298, 308;
 Collationes in Hexaemeron, 298;
 Commentary on the Sentences, 192

Bonhomme, 96, 217

Boniface VIII, Pope, 130, 325

Bonino, S. Th., 65

Bonofilio Coppa of Naples, 269, 272

Bouthillier, Denise, x, 30, 35, 51, 367

Boyle, Leonard, 22, 46, 119, 142, 144, 160, 208, 218–19

Brady, I., 185–86, 188

Bukovski, Th. P., 185

Burgundio of Pisa, 139

Busa, R., 240

C

Cajetan, Cardinal, 206

Capreolus, 47

Cassian, *Collationes*, 15

Castagnoli, 231

Catherina de Morra, xvii, 4, 318, 321

Catherine of Siena, Saint, 315n

Charles I, King of Sicily, 249, 270, 275

Charles II, King of Sicily, 270, 276

Charles of Anjou, 170, 249, 293

Chenu, M.-D., 19, 40–41, 45, 105, 127–29, 150–52, 155, 164, 171, 237, 299

Christian of Beauvais, 78

Chrysostom, John. *See* John Chrysostom

Claire LeBrun-Gouanvic, xvi, 319–20

Clement IV, Pope, 12, 162, 201

Conrad, King, 276–78

Conrad of Suessa, 101, 268

Conradin de Hohenstaufen, 181

Corbin, M., 106

Cyril of Alexandria, Saint, 137

D

Dahan, Gilbert, 219

Dante, 294, 315

de Corbeil, Renaud, 71, 80

De Corte, M., 172–73

De Groot, J. V., 19, 27

de Libera, Alain, 299

De Lubac, Henri, 59

De Rubeis, 99

Delaisse, L. M. J., 130

Denifle, 19, 100

Diane d'Andalo, 282

Dietrich of Freiberg, 314

Doig, James, 232

Dominic, Saint, 15, 33, 51, 90, 97, 285, 296, 325–26;
 The Nine Ways of Praying 285

Dominic of Caserta, 285

Dondaine, Antoine, 254, 342

Dondaine, Hyacinthe F., 11, 46, 48, 55–56, 61–62, 64, 65, 82, 86–87, 91, 99, 126, 164, 171, 193, 214, 216–18, 236, 271, 273

Dufeil, Marie-Michel, 45, 77, 80, 82, 83, 91

Duhén, Pierre, 299

Duin, J. J., 232

Durandus of Saint-Pourcain, 310–11, 314

E

Echard, J., 169–70

Eckhart, Meister, 313

Elias Brunet, 37, 56, 77, 96

Emery, Giles, xxii

Eschmann, I. T., 14, 19, 27, 55, 139, 146, 169, 170, 198, 214, 221, 231, 232, 234, 237, 246, 258, 261

Eudes Rigaud, 76

F

Ferrua, Angelo, xv

Flash, Kurt, 299

Fournet, M. 331

Francesca of Ceccano, 277, 291, 294, 296

Francesca of Maenza, 12. *See also* Francesca of Ceccano

Francis Ruello, 42

Francis of Assisi, Saint, 16, 42, 296

Francis of Terracina, Bishop, 296

Frederick II, Emperor, 2, 3, 6, 8–11, 18, 249

Freud, 157

Friar Philip, 142

G

Galien de Orto, 158

Garvit, Evan, 242

Gauthier, R.-A., xxii, 11, 20, 22, 25, 26, 81, 99, 101–8, 126, 146, 162, 164, 171, 173–74, 176–77, 180–81, 192, 193, 202, 204, 224, 226, 227–28, 230, 231, 237, 238, 245–46, 275

Gerard of Abbeville, 56, 84–86, 185, 207, 219;
 Contra adversarium perfectionis, 347;
 Quodlibet IV, 56, 347;
 Quodlibet XIV, 84, 347

Gérard de Frachet, xv, 19

Gerard of Besançon, 73, 354

Gerard of Sterngassen, 313

Giacomo Savelli, 303

Giacomo of Caiazzo, 268

Giffredus of Anagni, 125, 352

Gilbert of Ovis (Gilbert van Eyen), 217

Giles of Lessines, 298, 315

Giles of Rome, 298, 301, 303, 306–8, 313, 316, 323;

Commentary on the Sentences, 301;

De Erroribus Philosophorum, 298

Gils, P., 28–29, 67, 68, 94, 101, 104, 230

Gilson, E., 237

Giovanni Gaetano Orsini, Cardinal, 303

Giovanni Villani, 294

Glorieux, P., xix, 19, 53, 87, 146, 161, 198, 202, 204–5, 207, 218, 250, 258, 261, 311, 313

Godfrey of Fontaines, 207, 300, 315, 323–24

Grabmann, M., xix, 161, 164, 170, 231, 237, 314

Grant, Edward, 299

Gregory I, Pope (Saint), 15, 41, 57, 127, 260, 325;

Dialogues, 15;

Moralia, 356

Gregory IX, Pope, 3

Gregory X, Pope, 290

Gregory of Nazianzus, 325

Grunwald, 285

Gui, Bernard. *See* Bernard Gui

Guillaume Bertaut, 224–25

Guillot (beadle of the Picard nation), 71–72

Guyot, B. G., 358

Gy, Pierre-Marie, 130–32, 135

H

Hermann the German, 102

Hendrickx, 185

Henle, 221

Henry, Brother, 25

Henry III of Brabant, 218

Henry of Ghent, 207, 302, 307, 315

Henry of Lübeck, 313

Hervé Nédellec, 310, 313, 315

Hilary, Saint, 108

Hillel of Verona, 316

Honorius III, Pope, 119

Honorius IV, Pope, 303

Huerga, A., 106

Hugh II, King of Cyprus, 3, 350

Hugh II of Lusignan, 169

Hugh III of Antioch-Lusignan, 170

Hugh of Ostia, Cardinal, 268

Hugh of Saint-Cher, 37, 99, 119, 122, 351

Humbert of Romans, 78, 97, 273;

de vita regulari, 97

I

Ignatius of Antioch, 264

Imbach, R., 331

Innocent IV, Pope, 3, 10, 11, 18, 37, 77, 80, 118, 353

Innocent V, Pope, 92, 96, 217, 255, 99, 217, 340

Irenaeus, 261

J

Jacobinus of Asti, 28, 30, 241

Jacopone da Todi, 133

Jacques Duese, 317

James of Benevento, 143

James of Ferentino, 297

James of Metz, 311

James of Salerno, 272

James (Giacomo) of Tonengo, 215–16, 354

James of Venice, 226, 343

James of Viterbo, 122, 276–77, 306, 308, 351

Jean Picard of Lichtenberg, 313

John Quidort, 306, 315

Jehudan ben Daniel Romano, 316

Jerome, Saint, 59, 325

Joachim of Fiore, Abbot, 45, 126, 352

John XXI, Pope, 299, 301–3

John XXII, Pope, 317, 321–22, 325

John Blasio, 269

John Chrysostom, 56, 136–38, 140, 199, 261, 325

John Coppa of Naples, 269, 272, 310, 315, 319

John Damascene, 41

John Pecham, 89, 183–87, 195, 219, 281, 300, 302, 304–6, 308;

Quaestio, 183

John, Saint (Apostle), 199

John del Giudice, 271, 289, 318

John of Adelasia, 292

John of Boiano, 268

John of Caiazzo, 270

John of Ferentino, 297

John of Freiburg, 313;

Summa confessorum, 158, 208

John of Gaeta, 269

John of Guido, 291, 294

John of Pouilly, 207

John of Rochelle, 76, 188

John of St. Giles, 75

John of San Giuliano, 8, 10, 270

John of Sterngassen, 313

John of Vercelli, 49, 92, 158, 167–69, 217, 274, 303, 309, 353, 354

John the German (John of Wildeshausen), 8, 9, 18, 19, 24, 36, 96

Johnson, Mark, 46

Jordan, M.D., 106

Jordan of Saxony, 8, 15, 25, 282, 307

Jourdain, Charles, 237

Julienne of Mont-Cornillon, 130

L

Lafont, G., 126

Lambot, C., 130

Landulf, Count of Aquino, 2–5

Landulfo Sinnibaldo, Abbot, 4

Laurent, Marie-Hyacinthe, xv

Le Goff, Jacques, 299

Leccisotti, T., 5

Léger de Besançon, 197, 241

Leonard of Gaeta, 268

Leonard, Archbishop of Palermo, 126, 352

Leonine Editors, 11, 28, 35, 46, 48–49, 57, 64, 68, 82, 102, 120–21, 123, 130, 147, 161, 165, 170, 185, 201, 203, 206, 214, 218, 220, 224, 229, 233, 234, 236, 250, 273, 321–69

Leroy, M. V., 152–53

Lottin, O., xix, 146, 188, 237, 244

Louis IX, Saint, King of France, 78, 218, 288

Louis of Valencia, 233, 344

Luca Bianchi, 299

M

Mahieu le Vilain, 235–36

Maieru, A., 331

Mandonnet, P., xix, 3, 8, 19, 48, 53, 61–62, 68, 72, 99, 118, 120, 126, 164, 169, 177, 179–82, 185, 187, 192, 198, 201, 214, 215, 231, 237, 250, 251, 258, 266, 270, 299, 331–59

Manfred, King of Sicily, 7

Mansion, 231

Marc, P., 102, 104

Margaret of France, 218

Margaret of Constantinople, 219, 355

Maria, Queen of Sicily, 269

Marietti, 240, 254, 331–59

Marin d'Eboli, 122, 351

Marotta de Aquino, Abbess, 3–4, 11

Martin IV, Pope, 72, 175, 301–2

Martin, Saint, 281

Master Martin, 7

Master Philip, 213–14

Matthew of Aquasparta, 59

Mauer, Raban, 137

Meliton of Sardes, 264

Michael Scot, 6

Minio-Paluello, 177

Moerbeke, William of. *See* William of Moerbeke

Mongillo, 126

Montagnes, B., 49

Moses Maimonides, 7, 49, 112–13, 186;

Guide for the Perplexed, 112

Motte, 164

N

Napoleon Bonaparte, 242

Nicholas, Abbot of Fossanova, 269, 291–92

Nicholas Alberti, 320

Nicholas Gorran, 255

Nicholas Trevet, 56

Nicholas III, Pope, 302

Nicholas IV, Pope, 303–5

Nicholas de Cotrone:

Liber de procesione Spiritus sancti et fide Trinitatis contra errors Graecorum, 103

Nicholas de Durazzo, 123, 351

Nicholas de Lyre, 28, 59

Nicholas of Basur-Aube, 78

Nicholas of Fresolino, 269

Nicholas of Freauville, 320

Nicholas of Lisieux, 84;

Contra Pecham et Thomam, 183

Nicholas of Marsillac, 241

Nicholas of Piperno, 269

Nicholas of Strasbourg:

Summa, 313, 314

Nietzsche, 31

O

Octaviano of Babuco, 269

Orlon of Douai, 78

Origen, 264

P

Paissac, 103

Pandolpho Savelli, 319

Parma, 331–59

Patfoort, A., 106–7, 152

Paul, Saint (Apostle), 166, 239, 283, 308

Pecham, John. *See* John Pecham

Pegis, A. C., 105

Pelster, F., 3, 19, 27, 185, 202, 206

Pelzer, A., 25

Perrier, J., 164

Pesch, Otto Hermann, xviii

Peter Brancaccio, 269

Peter Calo, xv, 19

Peter Canterii, 320

Peter Cantor, 54, 69

Peter Ferri, 319

Peter Lombard, 39–45, 47, 60, 76, 126;

Sentences, 11, 24, 37, 39–41, 66n, 119n, 185, 301, 332, 333

Peter Mangiador:

Historia scholastica, 40;

Historia Ecclesiastica, 98

Peter Marsili, 105

Peter, Saint (Apostle), 281

Peter d'Andria, 197, 241, 357

Peter de la Palud, 310

Peter de Scala, 57

Peter of Auvergne, 233, 315, 344

Peter of Caputio, 51

Peter of Ireland, 7–8

Peter of Montesangiovanni, 51, 269, 292

Peter Olivi, 59, 308, 322–23

Peter of San Felice, 268

Peter of Spain, 11, 299, 359

Peter of Tarentaise. *See* Innocent V

Peter the Venerable, x

Philip the Chancellor, 188

Phillip de Castro Caeli, 355

Pier delle Vigne, 10

Pirenne, 218

Pius V, Pope, 325

Plato, 221–22

Plotinus, 155

Proclus, 128, 221–23;

Elementatio theologica, 23

Prous Boneta, 322–23

Prummer, Dominic, xv–xvi

Pseudo-Dionysius, 22, 25, 41, 51, 86, 127–28, 221–22, 313, 338, 346

Q

Quetif, Echard, 219

R

Rambert of Bologna, 306–7, 315

Ramirez, J. M., 245

Raymond Van Uyten, 218

Raymond of Peñafort, Saint, 97–98, 105, 119–20, 317;

Summa de casibus, 97, 119

Reginald of Piperno, 26, 29, 49, 51, 64, 172, 198–99, 215, 220, 241, 243, 250, 251, 254, 255, 258, 259, 266, 268, 269, 271, 272, 274, 282, 283, 289–92, 295, 297, 339, 340, 341, 349, 350, 352, 356, 358

Remigio of Florence, 278, 281, 315

Renan, 192

Renard, J. P., 57, 339

Reveri, Master Gerard, 182

Richard Knapwell, 304–6, 309, 324;

Correctorium Quare, 306;

Correctorium Sciendum, 306

Richard Rufus, 39n

Richard of Mediavilla, 307

Rinaldo (Reginaldo), 3, 10

Robb, J. H., 161

Robert de Sorbon, 84

Robert Grosseteste, 7

Robert Kilwardby, 39n, 168–69, 188, 192, 304, 309, 310

Robert of Benevento, 318–19

Robert of Orford, 306

Roger Bacon, 39n

Roger of Aquila, 4, 12, 275

Roger of San Severino, 4, 276

Roland Hissette, 300

Roland of Cremona, 37, 58, 75, 188

Roland-Gosselin, M.-D., 48

Rolfes, E., 237

Romano Orsini of Rome, 143, 248, 315

Ruedi Imbach, 313

Ruteboeuf, 80

S

Saffrey, Henri-Dominique, 222–23

Sanchis, A., 87

Scandone, F., 3

Scheeben, H. C., 27

Schillebeeckx, H., 152

Schutz, L., 237

Seckler, Max, 151

Shooner, H. V., xvi, 21, 55, 57

Siger of Brabant, 191–95;

De anima intellectiva, 194;

De unitate intellectus, 194;

Quaestiones in Tertium de anima, 193.

See also Averroism

Simon, Paul, 21–22

Simon, Richard, 59

Simon de Brion. *See* Martin IV

Simplicius, 175, 207, 234

Sixtus of Siena, 27–28

Smalley, Beryl, 58–59

Spiazzi, R. M., 331

Spicq, C., 59, 139

Steenberghen, F. Van. *See* Van Steenberghen, F.

Steel, C., 177

Stephen Bourret, 324

Stephen de Corbario, Abbot, 5

Stephen Tempier, Bishop of Paris, 107, 185, 191, 129, 299–302, 304, 309, 323

Suarez, 264

Sylvester, Brother, 48, 349

Synan, Edward, 59, 92

Synave, P., 248

T

Themistius, 171–72, 173, 175, 202

Theodora, Countess of San Severino, xvii, 4, 12, 289, 290, 320

Theodora de Aquino, xvii, 3–4, 9, 268, 318

Theophylactus, 139

Theresa of Avila, Saint, 315n.42

Thomas of Aversa, Friar, 318

Thomas, Saint (Apostle), xvii

Thomas Sutton, *De concordantiis in seipsum*, 312, 324

Thomas, Count of Marsico, 4, 318, 320–21

Thomas Aquinas, Saint:

Life: Birthdate, 1, 327;

birthplace, 1;

family history, 2–4;

Benedictine Oblate, 4–5,, 327

Studies at Naples, 5–8, 327

teachers in Naples, 7–8;

physical appearance, 26, 278–80;

alleged nickname, 26;

importance of learning for, 15, 31;

introduction to Aristotle, 7, 20;

enters Dominicans, 8–16, 327;

devotion to family, 12;

handwriting, 28, 93–94;

abduction episode, 9–11, 327;

affects on later

thought, 89, 91;

studies in Paris, 19–24, 328;

arts course in Paris, 20–23;

studies in Cologne, 24–27;

novitiate year, 24;

ordination, 25;

Bachelor in Paris, 36–50, 328;

master in theology, 50–53, 328;

Magister in Sacra Pagina, 54–74, 197;

daily routine at St. Jacques, 62;

admitted to Consortium of masters, 79, 328;

lector in Orvieto, 117–41, 328;

teaching in Rome, 142–78;

founds studium in Rome, 142–45, 328;

relation to Moerbeke, 174–77;

first regency in Paris, 179–96, 328;

second regency in Paris, 197–23, 328;

Naples: founds studium in, 247–49, 328;

regent at, 250–66, 328;

routine at, 244;

alleged debate with John Pecham, 185–87;

debate with John Vercelli, 167–69;

wrote against antimedicants, 75–95, 183;

composes lit. for Corpus Christi, 129–35;

executes Roger's will, 275–77;

salaried by King Charles I, 276–77;

physical collapse, 290–92;

last illness, 292–93;

possible cause of death, 290, 294–95;

death, 293;

miracles attributed to him, 297;

subject of popular cult, 296–98, 320–21;

dispositions of his corpse, 296–98;

teachings proposed for censure, 300–306;

Dominican defense of Thomas, 303, 306–10, 320;

controversy amongst Dominicans, 310–12;

canonization process, xv–xviii, 51, 235, 317–26;

process at Naples, 267–77, 308, 292;

procl. of sainthood, 310, 321;

procl. of orthodoxy, 323;

feast day, 310;

beginnings of Thomism, 296, 310–16;

Doctor Ecclesiae, 324–25;

personality: stubbornness, 16, 91–93, 217;

good nature, 179, 280–81;

personal virtue, 14, 33, 52, 73, 108, 118, 181;

genius: prodigy, 27, 36, 50–51;

intellectual simplicity, 72–73, 109;

powers of concentration, 67, 94, 122, 136–37, 140–41, 183, 231, 240–45, 282, 288–89, 294;

personal devotions, 13, 136, 283, 286–88;

maturation process, 47, 137, 163, 244–46, 311–12;

spiritual occurances, 253, 269, 272–73, 280, 285–87

Thomas of Cantimpré, xv

Thomas of Celano, 42

Thomas of Lentini, 8

Thomas of San Severino, 4

Tocco, William of. *See* William of Tocco

Tolomeo of Lucca, xv, 1, 19, 46, 47, 99, 120, 130, 160, 162, 170, 199, 201, 218, 219, 227, 233, 252–53, 271, 275, 315, 318, 325, 348

Tonneau, Jean, 153

Torrell, Jean-Pierre, ix–xiv, 30, 32, 51, 60, 72, 73, 157, 260, 367, 385, 392

Tugwell, S., xviii, 100, 181

Turiel, Q., 106

U

Uccelli, Paolo, 258

Ulrich of Strassburg, *De summo Bono*, 314

Urban V, Pope, 298

Urban IV, Pope, 49, 99, 103, 123, 130, 136, 162, 175, 290, 357

V

Van Banning, J., 138

Vedrine, M., 331

Van Steenberghen, F., 105–6, 164, 192

Verbeke, G., 171–73, 181, 182

Verardo, R. A., 331

Vincent of Beauvais, 63;

Speculam Maius, 119

Viola, C., 331

W

Walz, A., xviii, 3, 19, 100, 127–28, 181, 276

Weisheipl, ix, xviii, 3, 14, 22, 27, 28, 53, 81, 82, 99, 101, 126, 127, 139, 146, 169, 174, 182, 186, 188, 198, 201, 207, 214, 218, 231, 232, 246, 250, 251, 253, 258, 294–95, 303

William de la Mare, 47, 63, 302, 305–7, 311, 315;

Correctorium, 302, 305

William Hothum, 305, 309

William Macclesfield, 306

William Peter Godin, 320

William Peyraut, 119

William of Alton, 98–99

William of Auxerre, 7

William of Brabant. *See* William of Moerbeke

William of Cayeux-sur-mer, 158

William of Meliton, 76

William of Moerbeke, 49, 102, 146, 171–77, 221–23, 225, 226, 232, 234, 235

William of Saint-Amour, 16, 61, 72, 77–84, 90;

De Periculis, 346

William of Tocco, xvii, xxi, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 18, 19, 22, 33, 36, 37, 42, 44, 45–46, 50, 51, 58, 82, 117, 130, 132, 133, 140, 185, 235, 241, 242, 243, 253, 268, 269, 270, 271, 278, 279, 280, 281, 284 286, 291, 292, 293, 318, 319, 320–22, 357

Wippel, John F., 186

Wilmart, Dom André, 132, 133

Wohlman, Avital, 11

Index of Subjects

A

age of moral discretion, St. Thomas on, 16

Agnes, Saint, miracle attributed to, 271, 274

Anagni, 82, 117, 146

analogy, doctrine of, in St. Thomas, 113

angels, St. Thomas on, 221

Antichrist, religious orders identified with, 83

anti-mendicant controversy, 16, 50, 72, 75–79, 82;

St. Thomas on, 84–91, 190, 182;

Frederick II role in, 8

Apollinarians, 190

apostolic life, St. Thomas on, 89

Arianism, 138

Aristotelianism:

St. Thomas comments on, 171–74, 178, 224–39;

Thomas's use of, 38–39, 41;

soul as form of body, 115

astrology, St. Thomas on, 214–15

Augustinianism, scholastic, 39

Averroism: influence on St. Thomas, 192;

error of, 8, 182, 191–94;

condemnation of, 38, 191;

Latin Averroism, 192–93

B

Bollandists, xv–xvi, 129

C

Castrociela, 213

Causality:

Bonaventure on stars and, 183;

free will and, 215–17.

See also astrology; God, providence of

Chalcedon, Council of, 103n, 140n

Christ:

as Word, 103;

divinity of, 200;

humanity of, 189–90, 200;

grace of, 255–56;

hypostatic union, 190;

incarnation, 155;

role in salvation, 134, 152;

cause of grace, 66;

role in religious life, 89;

christology, 166, 261–65;

esse of, 200, 205–6.

See also Eucharist

church and state:

St. Thomas on, 13;

St. Thomas's family's allegiances to, 2n, 13–14, 18;

tension between, 11–12.

See also papacy, authority of

Cologne, University of, intellectual climate in, 19

Condemnation of 1270, 225, 298

Condemnation of 1277, 229, 298–304. *See also* Stephen Tempier, Robert Kilwardby

conciliar degrees, St. Thomas's use of, 103, 140

contemplative life, St. Thomas on, 89

Corpus Christi, feast of, 129–36

cosmology, St. Thomas on, 168

Councils of the church, teaching of. *See* conciliar decrees

creation, St. Thomas on, 43, 113–14, 163–64. *See also* God

D

divine providence. *See* God

Dominican Order. *See* Order of Friars Preachers

E

emenation. *See* Neoplatonism; participation

Ephesus, Council of, 103n27, 140n

equivocation. *See* analogy

essence, St. Thomas on, 48

eternity:

St. Thomas on, 114, 184–88;

Bonaventure on, 182, 184;

Aristotle on, 186

Eucharist, St. Thomas on, 123, 130–36. *See also* transubstantiation; sacraments

F

faith and reason, St. Thomas on relation between, 108–10, 158, 169, 195

filio controversy, 123

Florence, Council of, 127

Fossanova, 12, 277, 291–93, 296–97, 318;

second canonization process, 51, 267, 319

Franciscans, 39;

role in anti-mendicant controversy, 63, 76–77, 183

freewill, 291. *See also* causality

G

God:

cause of grace, 43, 73–74;

end of man, 43, 157;

existence of, 112;

Holy Spirit,

- 201;
- knowledge of, 65, 107, 291;
- perfections of, 113;
- power of, 162–63;
- providence of, 115, 120–21, 216;
- relations of persons within, 43, 123, 166;
- relation to creation, 43, 113–14, 163–64;
- subject of theology, 44;
- use of intermediaries, 51–52.

See also causality; man; knowledge; faith

government, St. Thomas on, 170–71, 219–20

grace, St. Thomas on, 66, 255–57

Greeks, St. Thomas influenced by, 72–74

H

hypostatic union. *See* Christ

I

intellect, human:

- controversy over unicity of, 187–94;
- Avicenna and Averroes on, 192;
- Bonaventure on, 183;
- St. Thomas on, 191–94;
- theory of separateness, 192

J

Joachimism, 77

Judaism, St. Thomas on, 32, 73, 219–20

L

Lateran IV, Council of, 126

Lyons II, Council of, xx, 11, 175, 290

M

Maenza, castle, 12, 277, 291

magic. *See* astrology

man:

- and sin, 203–4;
- free will, 215–16;
- image of God, 73–74;
- knowledge in general, 66;
- knowledge of God, 112–13;
- reason, limits of, 109–10, 112;
- relation to God, 33;
- salvation of, 151–53;
- senses and reason, relation between, 132–33;
- soul, 66, 115;
- suffering, 121.

See also intellect

Manichaeism, 80n, 124n, 188n, 288n

manual labor, St. Thomas on, 81

mariology, St. Thomas on, 13, 73, 262

Masters: functions of university, 54–55, 59–61, 207–8;

- duties as preachers, 69–70

metaphysics. *See* Neoplatonism; Aristotle

monopsychism, 193. *See also* intellect, unicity of

Monte Cassino, Abbey of, 2, 4, 9, 14–15, 23, 140, 290–91

N

Naples, University of:

- first canonization process, xv–xviii, 51, 235, 317–26, 267–77;
- founding of, 6, 249, 327;
- studium generale founded at, 247–50

nature, secret powers of, 214–15

Neoplatonism, influence of:

- on St. Thomas, 222–23, 151–55, 116, 127–29;
- on St. Albert, 313.

See also participation

O

Order of Friars Preachers:

- bleeding practices of, 51;
- commission to promote study, 97–98;
- courses of study, 22–23;
- duties as preachers, 70;
- formation of friars, 97–98, 118–20, 144;
- foundation of order, 327;
- importance of learning in, 31, 69, 80, 83–84, 96–97, 143;
- missionary efforts, 105.

See also anti-mendicant controversy; Saint-Jacques

Orvieto, 9, 56, 99–100, 117–41, 144–45, 175–76, 216, 246, 248, 250–51, 271, 287

P

papacy:

- authority of, 14, 18, 80–81, 123;
- conflict with secular power, 4.

See also church and state: relations

Papal Bulls:

- Etsi animarum*, 77;
- Nec insolitum*, 77;
- Quasi lignum vitae*, 50, 77–78;
- Redemptionem misit*, 321;
- Transiturus*, 130, 357

Paris, University of:

- structure, 76;
- intellectual climate, 62;
- opposition between arts and theology, 38;
- intellectual climate, 37–38, 75–78;
- strikes of 1272, 247;
- teaching of Aristotle in, 38

participation, theory of, 68–69, 128–29, 155; *See also* Neoplatonism

patristics, influence on St. Thomas, 34, 103, 123–23, 137–40, 199

Pelagianism, 126

Perugia, 117–15

Pistoia, 8

poverty, St. Thomas on, 16, 84, 87–89. *See also* anti-mendicant controversy

providence. *See* God

purgatory, St. Thomas on, 123

R

radical Aristotelianism, 300. *See also* Averroism

religious orders:

- evangelism of, 90;
- origins of, 89–90;
- perfection of, 56, 82–86, 90;
- power of superiors in, 217

Rome, studium in, 142–45;

- intellectual atmosphere of, 143

Roecasecca Castle, 2, 10, 13, 213

S

sabbath, St. Thomas on, 32

sacraments, St. Thomas on, 168–69

Saint-Jacques, Priory of, 24, 47, 75, 97, 137, 158, 212, 310;

- St. Thomas's daily routine at, 62;
- teaching practices at, 67, 99;
- involvement in anti-mendicant controversy, 50–51, 79

San Demetrio, Priory of, 6

San Germano, Treaty of, 4. *See also* Monte Cassino

San Severino, Castle, 12, 290

Santa Sabina, Priory of, 45, 142, 181

scholastic method. *See* university method

science, St. Thomas on, 213–14;
epistemology of, 67

Scripture:

- importance of in St. Thomas, 34–35;
- invalidating nature of literal senses of, 58;
- St. Thomas on, 259–60

secretaries, St. Thomas's use of, 64, 137, 229–30, 239–45. *See also* Reginald of Piperno

Sentences (Peter Lombard), teaching of, in Middle Ages, 28, 39–41, 47; *See also* bachelors, duties of

soul, as substantial form of body, 115, 137–90. *See also* man

spiritual substances, 168, 221

T

theology, St. Thomas on:

- apostolic, 109, 174, 239;
 - arguments for, 124–25, 156, 169, 195, 265–66;
 - as practical science, 51–32, 157;
 - as speculative science, 157;
 - method of, 156–57;
 - pastoral, 51–32, 209–12;
 - place of emotions in, 31;
 - place of Word of God in, 31–32;
 - purpose of, 109, 148.
- See also* faith and reason

Todi, 117

transcendentals, St. Thomas on, 65

translation, St. Thomas on purpose of, 124

Trinity. *See* God

U

unicity of substantial form, theory of, 187–90, 213–14, 300

university method:

- bachelor, duties of, 27–29, 39–40, 207;
- book copying, 21;
- commissions, 70;
- cursorie, 27;
- installation, academic ceremony of, 52–53;
- lectio*, 60;
- legere*, 55;
- praedicare*, 69;
- quaestio*, 60;
- quodlibet disputatio*, procedures for, 59–64, 207–8;
- reportationes*, 29;
- studium generale* and particular, 60, 19n

usury, St. Thomas on, 122, 219–20

V

Valenciennes, commission to promote studies, 96–97

via negationis, St. Thomas on, 112, 294,

via remotionis, 112;
St. Thomas's use in writing method, 165–66

virtue, supernatural, St. Thomas on, 83–87

Viterbo, 117, 171, 176–77, 180, 201

W

will, freedom of man's. *See* causality; God

wisdom, St. Thomas on, 107

Saint Thomas Aquinas, Volume I: The Person and His Work was composed in Electra by Brevis Press, Bethany, Connecticut; printed on 60-pound Glatfelter Supple Opaque Recycled and bound by Thomson-Shore, Dexter, Michigan; and designed and produced by Kachergis Book Design, Pittsboro, North Carolina.