A STUDY OF SOME OXFORD SCHOOLMEN OF THE MIDDLE OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO WORCESTER CATHEDRAL MS.F.65.

Thesis submitted for the Degree of B.Litt.

by

STEPHEN L. FORTE

St.Catherine's Society

VOL.I.

B. Litt
10

A STUDY OF SOME OXFORD SCHOOLMEN

OF THE MIDDLE OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO

WORCESTER CATHEDRAL MS. F. 65.

by

STEPHEN L. FORTE

St. Catherine's Society.

[1947]

LIBRARY OXFORD
DEPOSITED
THESIS

MS. B. Lit. c. 10

Deposit

C O N T E N T S

Introduction. iii

List of MSS. cited or consulted. . . . . .

Select Bibliography. vi

PART I

MSS. WORCESTER CATHEDRAL LIBRARY F.65
and ST.JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE 103.

I. MS.Worcester F.65.

A. Description of the manuscript. 1

B. Contents " " " 3

C. Date of the exercises and writing. 9

D. Origin and ownership. 10

II. ST.John's College, Cambridge, MS.103.

A. Description of the manuscript. 12

B. Contents " " " 13

C. Date of the exercises and writing 16

D. Origin and ownership. 18

III. Collections and Collectors of Questiones

A. Collections of Questiones. 19

B. Collectors and reporters of Questiones. . . .25

PART II

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF THE MASTERS AND BACHELORS MENTIONED IN WORCESTER F.65 AND CAMBRIDGE 103.

I. MS.Worcester F.65. 29
John Tydishale, Nicholas Aston, Uthred of Boldon, Adam Easton, Nicholas Redclyf, William Trevelleys, Hatton, Botilsbone, Tonworth.

II. MS.Cambridge 103.. 66
Bekingham Edmund, Blaclow Robert, Camme Thomas, Chardesey Richard, Colby Thomas, Dudley John, Fawkes Nicholas, Gray John, Hendman Thomas, Merk Thomas, Rypon Robert, Tydir Philip, Hindon Robert.

PART III.

THE COURSE IN THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY AT OXFORD IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

I. Curriculum of studies in theology. 72

II. Scholastic exercises illustrated in MS.Worc.F.65...87

PART IV

I. Doctrinal synthesis of the Worcester MS.....99

II. Two special discussions:

A. The controversy of Uthred with the Friars at Oxford. 123

Appendix: Questio dni Uthredi monachi Dunelmensis. 144

B. The controversy on the doctrine of the Original Sin and the Immaculate Conception at Oxford. . 148

EDITION OF THE TEXT.(Worc.MS.F.65,ff.1-33)

i. List of Questiones. 1

ii. List of citations. x

iii. Text. 1-229

Appendix:

i. Extracts from MS.St.John's College,Cambridge,103, ff.117-136. 230

ii. Extract from MS.Bodley 692,ff.37v-38v. 277

111

INTRODUCTION

Worcester Cathedral Library MS.F.65 contains a collection of academic exercises held in the schools of Theology at Oxford, in the second half of the fourteenth century. Although perhaps this manuscript does not contain the richness of some other similar collections of Questiones, such as Assisi MSS. 158 and 196, there cannot be any doubt that it throws light on the academic life of the University of Oxford. It shows how the statutes were worked out in practice, how the disputations were held, and throws not a little light on the customs and Masters of the University of Oxford during the period covered by the collection. Naturally enough, one would have wished to find in this manuscript fuller information on these matters; however, I have had the good fortune of supplementing its data with the information met with in St.John's College, Cambridge, MS.103, and Bodley 692, even if these two are of a later date.

The whole work is divided into two separate volumes:

i. Introduction to the Worcester collection; ii. edition of the Text.

The first volume falls into four parts. In the first a detailed description is given of the Worcester and Cambridge collections; an attempt is made to fix the date of the actual holding of the exercises and the writing of them, and to suggest the owner and writer of both collections. Reference is also made to similar collections which have been studied already.

The second part contains the biographical data of the Masters and Bachelors mentioned in both collections. I have put those of the Worcester manuscript in chronological order according to the date of their Inception, but those of the Cambridge manuscript in alphabetical order, as there seems to be little difference in the date of their Inception.

Discussion of the literary activity especially of the Worcester personnel is also attempted and manuscripts indicated.

The third part reviews the scholastic procedure in the Faculty of Theology in the second half of the fourt enth century; main source are the Statutes of Oxford, supplemented occasionally by those of Paris and Bologna. The evidence of the different academic customs and exercises given by the Worcester and Cambridge collections is shown in detail in the second section.

The last part consists of two sections. In the first a doctrinal synthesis of the Worcester manuscript is attempted. The doctrinal matter is a little disappointing, because of the unsatisfactory reportation. The difficulties met with in making this much condensed and ,in a way, superficial synthesis are explained in the introductory part to the section.

In the second section two special discussions are given on the evidence of the Worcester manuscript. The first deals with the controversy of the Benedictine, Uthred of Boldon, with the friars at Oxford, of which evidence is afforded in the Worcester manuscript. Uthred's tract 'Contra Querelas Fratrum', and the letter of Simon Langham, Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Chancellor of Oxford, which contains Uthred's condemned articles, are used and related to the disputations reported in our manuscript.

In the second discussion I have collected the Questiones dealing with the doctrine of Original Sin, and the two on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and worked out a short account of the two much debated doctrines as represented in our manuscript and in relation to some fourteenth century theologians.

The second volume consists of the transcription of a part of the Worcester manuscript, with two appendices from the Cambridge and Bodley manuscripts. Originally I intended to give extracts of the most important items in the Worcester collection, but later I found it necessary to transcribe most of it. I have only edited that part of the manuscript which contains mainly scholastic exercises, such as disputations.

v

From the Cambridge manuscript I have transcribed in full most of the items in ff.109-150, but I have edited extracts, some in full and others not, the purpose of their edition being to show the external structure and the method of disputing. Of the Bodley manuscript, which needs more attention, I have given only a specimen of a 'Benedicciо', which used to be made in the Vesperies and Inception of the new doctors of theology.

In the transcription of the three manuscripts I have retained the medieval spelling, such as the ꝙ for the t= determinacio, and the ę for the diphtong ae and oe =celum, anime; but modern punctuation has been employed. Any editorial addition in the text is inserted in square brackets [ ], and interrogation marks are used to denote uncertain authorship and reading. To make cross reference easier I have added numbers to each item in square brackets. At the beginning of the text I have put two lists: one of the items and another of the citations in the Worcester manuscript.

Obviously enough, the present study is only an attempt, far from exhaustive, to illustrate the academic activity of candidates for the degree of doctor of theology at Oxford in the second half of the fourteenth century, with special reference to Worcester Cathedral Library MS.F.65, which from the doctrinal point of view needs a more careful and a longer examination. This I hope to attempt in the near future.

I wish to express my sincere thanks to the Librarians of Worcester Cathedral Library, St.John's College,Cambridge, and of Merton College,Oxford, who allowed manuscripts to be deposited in the Bodleian Library for examination; to the Librarian of Magdalen College, Oxford, for allowing free access to the library of that College; to the Librarian and staff of the Bodleian Library for their continued courtesy; to Dr.Daniel Callus O.P. for his suggestions and criticisms; and above all to my supervisor,Mr.W.A.Pantin, for his untiring assistance and help, and for all his kindnesses during my research study in Oxford.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. MANUSCRIPTS

(MSS. which I have myself seen are marked with an asterisk)

Assisi, Biblioteca communale, 158
" " " 196

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 74
" " " " 180
" " " " 347
" St.John's College, 103. . . . . ⊠
" " " 150
" Trinity College, O.5.8

Douai, Bibl.publ., 434

London, British Museum, Add. 6162
" " " " 24361
" " " Harley 635
" " " " 5398
" " " Roy. 6.D.X.
" " " " 10. D.X.
" Lambeth, Reg. Langham.
" " 221. . . . . ⊠

Munster, University Library, Cod.175

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 692 . . . . . ⊠
" " " Hamilton 7
" " " Seld. sup. 64
" " " Tanner 408. . . . . ⊠
" " " Wood Rolls, I.. . . . ⊠
" Balliol College, 149. . . . . ⊠
" " " 164 . . . . . ⊠
" " " 246 . . . . . ⊠
" " " 311. . . . . ⊠
" Lincoln College, 114
" Magdalen College, 38
" Merton College, 276. . . . . ⊠
" Oriel College, 15. . . . . ⊠
" " " 33. . . . . ⊠

Paris, Bibliotheque nationale latine 3183. . . . ⊠

Rome, Bibliotheca Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 411
" " " " " 1086
" " " " " 823

Worcester, Cathedral library, F.65 . . . . . ⊠
" " " F.73
" " " F.116
" " " F.118
" " " Q.31
" " " Q.41
" " " Q.71.

B. PRINTED TEXTS AND DOCUMENTS.

Anstey, H., Munimenta Academica, or Documents illustrative of Academical Life and Studies at Oxford, Rolls Series, 1868.

Aquinas, Th.(S), Summa Theologiae, ed. Leonina, Romae, 1888-1906.

Scriptum super IV libros Sententiarum, ed. Mandonnet-Moos, 4 vols., Paris, 1929-34.

Quaestiones Disputatae, ed. Mandonnet, Paris, 1926.

Baconthorp, J., Commentarium super IV libros Sententiarum, Mediolani, 1510.

Balic, C., Quaestiones disputatae de Conceptione Immaculata J. de Polliaco et J. de Neapoli, in Bibliotheca Mariana Medii Aevi, I (1931).

Blakiston, H.E.D., "Some Durham College Rolls", in Collectanea III (O.H.S. 1896)

Bonaventura, (S), Doctoris Seraphici S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia, vols. I-IV: Super IV Libros Sententiarum, ed. Quaracchi, 1882-1889.

Bradwardine, Th., De Causa Dei contra Pelagium, ed. H. Saville, London, 1618.

Denifle, H.-Chatelain, E., Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis, I-III, Parisiis, 1889-1891.

Ehrle, F., Statuta Facultatis Theologiae Bononiensis, Bologna, 1932.

Gibson, S., Statuta Antiqua Universitatis Oxoniensis, Oxford, 1931.

Hardy, T.H., Registrum Palatinum Dunelmense, III. (Rolls. Ser. 1875)

Henricus de Gandavo, Quodlibeta magistri Henrici Goethalis a Gandavo....Commentariis doctissimis illustrata M.V. Zuccoli, Venetiis 1613.

Hingeston-Randolph, Registers of the Bishops of Exeter, Exeter 1897.

Holcot, R., In librum Sapientiae Regis Salomonis Praelectiones, Basle, 1586.

Kaeppeli, T., Registrum Raymundi de Capua, in Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum Historica, xix (1937).

Leach, A.F., Documents illustrating early education in Worcester 685 to 1700, Worcestershire Historical Society, 1913

Little, A.-Pelster, F., Oxford Theology and theologians, c. 1282-1302. (O.H.S. 1934)

Lombard, Peter, IV Libri Sententiarum, ed. Quaracchi, 1916.

Ludolph of Saxony, Vita Christi, ed. Argentina, 1474.

Pantin, W.A., Documents illustrating the chapters of the English Black-monks, I-III, Camden Society, 1931

"Letters from Durham Registers c.1360-90", in Oxford Formularies, new series, I (1942) p.217 sq.

Pelster, F., See Lille and Pelster.

Quaracchi, Quaestiones disputatae de Immaculata Conceptione B.M.Virginis, ed. Quaracchi, in Bibliotheca Mariana Scholastica Medii Aevi, III (1904)

Riley, H.T., Gesta Abbatum S.Albani, III. (Rolls Ser. 1869)

Annales Monasterii S.Albani, III. (Rolls Ser. 1870)

Salter, H.E., Snappe's Formulary, (O.H.S. 1924)

Medieval Archives of the University of Oxford, (O.H.S. 1917)

Shirley, W.W., Fasciculi Zizaniorum, Rolls Seres, 1858.

Wilkins, D., Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae, 4vols., London, 1737.

Wyclif, J., Sermones, ed. Loserth, 4vols, for the Wyclif Society, 1887-90.

Xiberta, B.M., "Fragments d'una qüestió inèdita de Tomàs Bradwardine", in Beiträge zur Geschichte de Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, iii, 2, p.1170-79.

Calendars.

Calender of entries in the Papal Register relating to Great Britain and Ireland:
Papal Letters (ed. Bliss, 1833 etc....)
Papal Petitions (Ed. Bliss 1896)

Calendar of Patent Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office.
Calendar of Close Rolls....
Calendar of Fine Rolls.....

Bishops' Registers:

Registrum Johannis de Trillek, Canterbury and York Society, 1911-12.
Registrum Thomae de Charlton, C. and Y. Soc. 1913.
Registrum Willelmi Courtenay, C. and Y. Soc. 1914.
Registrum Johannis Trefnant, C. and Y. Soc. 1916.
Registrum Simonis de Sudbiria, C. and Y. Soc. 1929-30.

Raine, J., The Charters of endowments, inventories and account rolls of the Priory of Finchale in the County of Durham Surtees Society Bublication, 6.

Liber Vitae Ecclesiae Dunelmensis nec non obituarie duo eiusdem ecclesiae, Surtees Soc. Publ. 13.

Fowler, Extracts from the Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham from the original MSS., 3vols., Surt. Soc. Publ., 99, 100, 103

C. BIOGRAPHICAL AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL WORKS.

Archer,T.A.,"Acton,Ralph", a ticle in Dictionary of National Biography,I,68-9.

Bale,J., Scriptorum illustium Maioris Britanniae Catalogus, Basle,1557.

Index Britanniae Scriptorum,ed.R.L.Poole-M.Bateson, Oxford,1902.

Boase,C.W., Registrum Collegii Exoniensis,(O.H.S.1894)

Brodrick,G.C., Memorials of Merton College,(O.H.S.1885)

Chenu,M., "Maîtres et bacheliers de l'université de Paris vers 1240", in Etudes d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du xiiie siècle,Ottawa,1932,pp.11-39.

Clark,A., Registrum Universitatis Oxoniensis,(O.H.S.1887-89) 2 vols.

Cooper,T.,"Crashaw,William", in D.N.B.,111,36-38.

Cosmas de Villiers, Bibliotheca Carmelitana

Echard J.-Quetif J., Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum,Parisiis, 1719.

Eubel C., Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevi, Monasterii,1898-1910.

Fabricius,J.A., Bibliotheca Latina Mediae et Infimae Aetatis, Patavii,1754.

Glorieux P., "Sentences, commentaire sur les", article in Dictionaire de Theologie Catholique,xiv,1860-1884

Hahn,S., Thomas Bradwardinus, und seine lehre von der menschlichen willensfrieheit, in Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters,v,2,(Munster 1905)

Hepple,R.B., "Uthred of Boldon", in Archeologia Aeliana, third series,xvii(1920)pp.153-160.

Kingsford,C.L.,"Malverne,John", in D.N.B.,xii,893.

"Patrington,Stephen", in D.N.B.,xv,492-3.

Koch,J., Durandus de S.Porciano,O.P., Forschungen zum Streit um Thomas von Aquin,zu Beginn des 14 Jahrhunderts. Erstel Teil: Literargeschichtliche Grundlegung,Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters xxvi,Munster,1927.

Lee,S., "Acton,John", in D.N.B.,I,67.

Leland,J., Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis,Oxford,1709.

Little,A.,Greyfriars in Oxford.(O.H.S.1891)

"The Franciscan school at Oxford", in Archivum Franciscanum Historicum,xix,(1926)pp.803-74.

Little,A., See above Little and Pelster.

Lloyd,N.E.F.,"John Wyclif and the Prebend in Lincoln", in English Historical Review,lxi,(1946)388-94.

Luccius,P. Bibliotheca Carmelitana, Florence,1593.

Magrath,J.R., The Queen's College,2vols.,Oxford,1921.

Manning,B.L.,"John Wyclif", in Cambridge Medieval History, vii,486-505, 900-7.

Marcett, Uthred William Jordan and Piers Plowman, New York, 1938.

Neve,Le, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae,ed.T.B.Hardy,Oxford,1854

Oliver,J. Monasticon Dioecesis Exoniensis,Exeter,1846.

Lives of the Bishops of Exeter,Exeter,1861.

Pearce,E.H., The Monks of Westminster,Cambridge,1916.

Pelster,F. See above Little and Pelster.

Pitts,J. De Rebus Anglicis,Paris,1619.

Pollard.A.F., "Uthred of Boldon", in D.N.B.,xx,17-18.

"Brantingham, Thomas de", in D.N.B.,xxii,260-261.

Poole,R.L., "Fitzralph,Richard", in D.N.B. vii,194-198.

"Easton,Adam", in D.N.B.,vi,333.

Powicke,F.M., Medieval Books of Merton College,Oxford,1931.

Richards G.C.-Shadwell C.L., The Provosts and fellows of Oriel, College, Oxford,1922.

Salter,H.E.,Registrum Annalium Collegii Mertomensis, (O.H.S.1921)

Savage,H.E., Richard Fitzralph, some time dean of Lichfield, Lichfield,1928.

Tait,J., "Radclyf, Nicholas" in D.N.B.,xvi,576.

"Merk,Thomas," in D.N.B.,xiii,282-5.

Tanner,T. Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica,London,1748.

Trithemius,J., De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, Paris,1512.

De Obitu et progressu ac viris illustribus Ordinis Carmelitarum, Cologne,1543.

Wood-Stephens,W.R.,"Bradwardine, Thomas", in D.N.B. II,1086-98.

Workman, H.B., John Wyclif,2 vols., Oxford,1926.

Xiberta,B.M., De Scriptoribus sch lasticis saeculi xiv ex Ordine Carmelitarum, Louvain,1931.

Catalogues.

A summary catalogue of the Western MSS.in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, by F.Madan-H.H.Craster,

Catalogi librorum MSS.Angliae et Hiberniae,Oxford, 1697.

Catalogue of the MSS. preserved in the Chapter library of Worcester Cathedral, by J.K.Floyer, Oxford,1906.

Catalogus librorum MSS.Ecclesiae Cathedralis apud Wygorniam 1860, by R.Serjeant.

Catalogus librorum MSS. Bibliothecae Wygorniensis, by P.Young, ed. I.Atkins and N.Ker, Cambridge,1944.

A descriptive catalogue of the MSS. in the library of St.John's College, Cambridge, by M.R.James, Cambridge,1913.

"Catalogue of the books of Durham College,Oxford, c.1390-1400", by W.A.Pantin, in Oxford Formularies new series,I(1942)240-245.

C. GENERAL SOURCES.

Amann, See below Hedde et Amann.

Bishop,E., Liturgica Historica,Oxford,1918.

Buxton L.H.-Gibson S., Oxford University Ceremonies, Oxford, 1935.

Caillemer,E., "Les disputationes dan les écoles de droit aux xiiie et xive siècles", in Mémoire de l'Académie de Caen,(1879).

Cough,J., A complete history of the County of Cornwall,Truro, 1867-72.

Destrez,J., La pecia dans les manuscrits du xiiie et xive siecle, Paris,1935.

Ekwall Eilert, The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Palce-names,Oxford,1940.

Gibson,S., "The order of disputations", in Bodleian Quarterly vi,no.65,(1930) pp.107-112.

See above Buxton and Gibson

Glorieux,P., La littérature quodlibétique de 1260 à 1320, 2 vols. Paris,1925.

"Le manuscrit d'Assise,Bibl.comm.158. Date et mode de composition", in Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et mediévale,viii(1936) pp.272-295.

"Les 572 questiones du manuscrit de Douai 334. Description du tome I et II", in Rech.Th.An.Med. x(1938)p.123-152; 225-267.

Gwynn,A., The English Austin Friars at the time of Wyclif, Oxford, 1940.

"Date of the B-Text of Piers Plowman", in The Review of English Studies, xix(1943)pp.1-24.

"Richard Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh", in the Irish quarterly review, Studies, xxii(1933)389-405.

"Richard Fitzralph and the Friars", Studies, xxvi, (1937)p.50-67.

Hedde R.-Amann E., "Pelagianisme", in Dictionaire de Théologie Catholique, xii, 675-715.

Hutchins,J., History of the County of Dorset, 4vols., Westminster 1861-73.

Kaeppeli,T., "La raccolta dei discorsi e di tti scolastici di Simone da Cascina O.P.", in Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, xii(1942) 185-246.

Kantorowicz,H. "The Questiones Disputatae of the Glossators", Revue d'histoire du droit, xvi(1937/8) extrait,p.1-67.

Kirkpatrick,J. History of the Religious Orders and Communities and of the hospitals and castle of Norwich, Yarmouth,1845.

Lottin,D.O., "Quelques questiones de maîtres Parisiens aux environs de 1225-1235", in Rech.Th.Anc.Med., v(1933)pp.79-95.

Mallet,C., A History of the University of Oxford, 3vols., London 1924-27.

Mandonnet,R., "Chronologie des écrits scripturaires de S.Thomas D'Aquin", in Revue Thomiste, xi(1928) pp.27-45; xii(1929)pp.53-69;132-145;489-519.

Martin, R., Le controverse sur le péché originel, Louvain,1930

Masnovo,A., Da Guglielmo d'Auvergne a S.Tommaso D'Aquino, 3vols. Milano,1946.

Maxwell Lyte,H.C., History of the University of Oxford, London, 1886.

Michalski,C., "Le criticisme et le scepticisme dans la philosophie du xive siecle", in Bulletin de l'Academie Polonaise des Sciences et des Lettres; Classe d'histoire et de philosophie,(1926)

"La Probleme de la volonté a Oxford et a Paris au xive siècle", in Studia Philosophica, ii(1936) pp.233-364.

Owst,G.R., Preaching in medieval England, Cambridge,1926.

Literature and pulpit in Medieval England, Cambridge, 1933.

Pantin,W.A., "Medieval treatise on letter writing", in Bulletin of John Ryland's Library,xiii(1929) 326-382.

"The defensorium of Adam Easton", in English Historical Review,xli(1936)675-80.

Paetow,L.J., The arts course at Medieval Universities with special reference to Grammar and Rhetoric, Campaign,Illinois,1910.

Pelster,F.,"Eine kontroverse zwischen englischen Dominicanern und Minoriten uber einige Punkte der ordensregel", Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum,iii(1933)

"Heinrich von Harclay,Kanzler von Oxford,u seine Quastionen", in Miscellanea Ehrle,ii(1924)

"An Oxford collection of sermons of the end of the thirteenth century,(MS.Laud.Misc.511.Sc.969)", in Bodleian Quarterly,vi(1930)no.67,pp.168-172.

Pelzer,A.,"Prosper de Reggio Emilia des Ermites de Saint Augustin et le manuscrit latin 1086 de la Bibliothèque Vaticane", in Revue Néo-Scolastique de Philosophie, Louvain,(1928)pp.316-351.

Pouillon,D.H., "Le manuscrit d'Assise,Bibl.comm.196", in Rech.Th.Anc.Med.,xii(1940)pp.329-358.

Rashdall,H., The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, 3vols., new edition by F.M.Powicke and A.B.emden Oxford,1936.

Savigny,von F.C., Geschichte des römischen Rechts im Mittelalters iii(Heidelberg,1834)pp.579-83,643-54.

Snalley B., The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages,Oxford, 1941.

Vigneaux P., Justification et predestination au xive siècle, (Bibliotheque de l'ecole des hautes etudes,xlviii) 1934.

"Nominalisme", in Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique,xi,717-784.

Wells,J., Oxford Degree Ceremony, Oxford,1906.

Wood.A., The History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford, ed.J.Gutch,1792.

Wood's History of the City of Oxford , new edition in 3 vols., by A.Clark.(O.H.S.1889,1890,1899)

Xiberta B.M., "Joan Baconthorp i el dogma de la Immaculada Concepció de Maria", in Estudi Franciscani, (Barcelona,1928)p.89.

ABBREVIATIONS

Acta Cap.Gen.O.P. = Acta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum, ed.B.M.Reichert, in Monumenta Ordinis Praedicatorum Historica.

A.F.H. = Archivum Franciscanum Historicum, (Quaracchi)

Arch.Frat.Praed. = Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, (Istituto Storico Domenicano, S.Sabina, Roma.)

Bale, Index = Index Britanniae Scriptorum quos... collegit Joannes Baleus, ed.R.L.Poole-M.Bateson, Oxford, 1902.

* Catalogus = Scriptorum illustrium Maioris Britanniae Catalogus, Basle, 1557.

Cal.Pap.Reg:Let.Pet. = Calendar of entries in the Papal Register relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal Letters, ed.Bliss, 1893 etc. Papal Pebitions, ed.Bliss, 1896.

Cal.Pat.Rolls = Calendar of Patent Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office, prepared under the superintendence of the Deputy Keeper of the Records.

Cant.York Soc. = Canterbury and York Society Publication

Chart.Univ.Par. = Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis, ed.Denifle-Chatelain, Paris, 1889 etc.

D.N.B. = Dictionary of National Biography

D.T.C. = Dictionaire de Theologique Catholique

Ehrle, Statuti = Statuti della facolta Theologica di Bologn ed.F.Ehrle, 1932

Gibson, Statuta. = Statuta Antiqua Universitatis Oxoniensis ed.S.Gibson, Oxford, 1931

Little and Pelster = Oxford Theology and Theologians, O.H.S. 1934

Mun. Acad. = Muniments Academica, or Documents illustrative of Academical Life and Studies at Oxford, by H.Anstey (Rolls Ser. 1868)

O.H.S. = Oxford Historical Society

P.L. = Migne, Patrologia Latina

Rolls Series = Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages, published.... under the direction of the Master of the Rolls.

Rech.Th.Anc.Med. = Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale.

PART I

MSS. WORCESTER CATHEDRAL LIBRARY, F.65.

AND ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, 103.

I. MS. WORCESTER F.65.

(A) DESCRIPTION

The first, though incorrect, description of the Worcester manuscript was made by Patrick Young, librarian to King James I, in 1622-23; it says: Questiones quedam in predicamenta et sermones quidam. 'Papier', fol.rec. (1)

In 1690 the then librarian of Worcester, Dr. William Hopkins, (Prebendary of Worcester 1675 - 1700) made another catalogue, which is incomplete and is more or less a reproduction of the titles on the parchment labels, pasted to the covers of the books, and written probably in the early sixteenth century. It was in 1906 embodied by Floyer in his Worcester Cathedral Library Catalogue. (2)

Floyer describes our manuscript thus:

'F.65. I. Quedam questiones.
On fol.14 Expositio compendiosa super Matheum.
II. Quedam argumenta.
III. Quidam sermones.
Apparently a simple notebook wherein propositions are discussed, amongst others, some of Wyclif. (f.22)
On fol.25b. Determinacio Mag. Trevelleys, and on fol.26. 'Determinacio Tydishale'.
Rebound in white. On paper throughout in chancery hand. Ink a little faded. 12 ff. missing at beginning, also ff.17,18, and possibly others.
Some notes on two vellum fly-leaves at end.
Good watermarks on paper. XV.cent.'

---

(1) Catalogus Librorum MSS.Bibliothecae Wigorniensis, made in 1622-23 by Patrick Young, librarian to the King James I, edited by Ivor Atkins and Neil Ker, (Cambridge 1944) p.55.

(2) Catalogue of Manuscripts preserved in the Chapter Library of Worcester Cathedral, compiled by Rev.J.K.Floyer,(Oxford 1906) p.31.
The catalogue of Hopkins was in 1697 printed in the Oxford collection Catalogi Librorum Manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae, (Oxford 1697) p.17, no. 740.
In addition to these there is another: Catalogus Librorum MSS. Ecclesiae Cathedralis apud Wigorniam 1860, by the then Librarian of Worcester Rev.R.Serjeant, which is really a reprint of Hopkins' catalogue.
The old parchment label affixed to the flyleaf reads:
In isto libro pauperio continentur quedam questiones, quedam argumenta et quidam sermones.
It is worth noting that all the catalogues give that description.

In view of the incompleteness of the above data it will not be out of place to give here a fuller description. The manuscript consists of 11 quires of 12,8,10, and 6 folios. There are two numberings: the old, written at the top of each recto, and the recent, written at the top right side and bottom left side of each recto.

A comparison of the two numberings shows at once that the manuscript as we have it is incomplete. The following scheme will make this evident at a glance. The first foliation refers to the modern pagination, and the second, in brackets, to the old.

Quire 1:ff.1-7 (ff.13n16,19,20,22) remains of quire of 12ff.
" 2:ff.8-13 (ff.25-28,30,31).....".....".../".../"..12ff.
" 3:ff.14-18 (ff.37-41)..... 8ff.
" 4:ff.19-26 (ff.44-51)..... 8ff.
" 5:ff.27-33 (ff.53-59)..... 8ff.
" 6:ff.34-42 (ff.63-71).....12ff.
" 7:ff.43-52 (ff.75-84).....10ff.
" 8:ff.53-64 (ff.85-96).....12ff.
" 9:ff.65-76 (ff.97-108).....12ff.
" 10:ff.77-83 (ff.109-114)..... 6ff.
" 11:ff.84-92 (ff.115-126).....12ff.

(fo.80. is accidentally omitted in modern numbering)

Collation: 1^{12} (lacks 5,6,9,11,12), 2^{12} (lacks 5,8-12), 3^{8} (lacks 6-8), 4^{8}, 5^{8} (lacks 8), 6^{12} (lacks 10-12), 7^{10}, 8^{12}, 9^{12}, 10^{6}, 11^{12} (lacks 9-11).

The whole collection is a paper volume of 92 (according to the old numbering 126) leaves, of the size of 12X9 ins.

Some of the leaves are torn in half, for instahce, fol.7,13; and some are blank, such as ff.5v, 6v, 7v, 12v, 32r.

It should be remarked that in some quires (ff.14-18, 27-92) the folios are numbered at the bottom of the page, thus i, ii, iii, iiii etc. It is perhaps not unimportant to note that these quires correspond to the parts of the manuscript which contain not scholastic exercises, but mainly lectures. It is very likely that these represent a copy from a <u>scriptum</u>, rather than a <u>reportatio</u>.

The amount of writing on each page varies very much; sometimes the whole page is covered in a very small handwriting, and very often we find inserted a few arguments or conclusions or a short questio, as on ff.3v, 4, 4v, 8, 10v, 13v.

It is very difficult to say whether the manuscript was written by one or more scribes, probably by one, as the writing appears the same throughout, except for a few lines, where the difference may be due to a change of pen or to their being the work of a student inexperienced in writing. It is almost certain that the whole collection was not written by a professional scribe, but it is the notebook wherein a benedictine student of theology jotted down all that seemed to him useful for his study, during the period when he was bound to attend the different scholastic exercises, as lectures, disputations. This may account for the small and at times almost illegible handwriting, and for the scattered, miscellaneous material.

(B) CONTENTS

Worcester MS.F.65 contains questiones connected with the faculty of theology at Oxford. It falls into two main divisions: I. reportations, i.e. notes taken during the theological disputations; II. fully reported lectures, the greater number of which belong to an earlier period. Before entering into a detailed description, we give here a summary of the contents.

(a) (i) ff.1-13; (ii) ff.17v-25. This part is miscellaneous, and contains various questiones, conclusiones and opiniones.

(b) ff.25-33: Two determinationes of the Carmelite John Tydishale.

(c) ff.14-17: Expositio compendiosa super Matheum.

(d) ff.34-42: Eight questiones, each questio being divided into articles. At the top right side of fo.34 there is scribbled P f ū d. (Profundus ?)

(e) ff.43-63: This part contains thirteen questiones, eleven of which certainly belong to Nicholas Aston.

(f) ff.63-92: Contains 5 questiones, each questio being divided into articles, belonging to Richard Fitzralph.

(a) This group is miscellaneous, and contains several scholastic exercises, some of which are headed: Q[uestio] S[olemnis] R[esponsio] S[olemnis], and Determinacio. The first two headings refer, as we shall see later on, to the same type of disputation viewed from different aspects, namely, the disputacio ordinaria of the masters, in which the bachelors had to make their statutory responsions. What made the scribe give these two names to the same disputation, we cannot tell. Many other disputations have no title at all, but from their structure we conclude that they belong to the same type..

These items are anonymous with the exception of two which refer to the same persons: (i) fo.20v: Q[uestio] Estone et R[esponsio] Redclyf. I take this to mean the question of Easton, the master who was holding the disputation, and the reply of Radclyf, his bachelor who was responding. (ii) fo.31: 'Questio disputata in vesperiis domini Ade de Estone monachi Norwyci, responsali Nicholao Redclyf.', which is the disputation held on the day of the vesperies of the benedictine Adam Easton, in which Nicholas Redclyf, another benedictine, another benedictine, took the part of the respondent bachelor.

In addition to these disputations, known as responsions, we have several determinations.

ff.1v,25v, two by Atton or Hatton.

ff.5,25v, three by William Trevelleys.

ff.13, one by Adam Easton.

ff.18v; 'Conclusiones Tydishale in determinacione sua'

23,27: two by Tydishale.

ff.[illegible]2v: 'Proposiciones Wyclif in determinacione sua.'

Most probably those on f.2:Atton; f.6: Botilston; f.19: Tonworthe, are also determinations, and perhaps there are still more but this conjecture so far lacks evidence.

It is worth noting that the first group of disputations, namely the responsions, were given by the bachelors, whereas the determinations belonged to the masters, whose exclusive right it was to determine the question, and thus close the discussion. Moreover the name of the master is given with all the

determinations, which clearly shows the importance attached to the latter as authoritative solutions of the questions.

(b) John Tydishale is said by Leland, and all the bibliographers after him, to have written several determinations: Determinationes theologicae: Utrum quelibet noticia creata....etc. In our manuscript we find three determinations, two of which (ff.23,27) are fully reported, whereas of the third (f.18v) only the conclusions are given. The incipit of the question of f.27 is identical with that given by Leland; we know for certain that this determination is incomplete because, firstly, it ends abruptly, and secondly there is a conventional mark indicating continuation. At the top of f.33ra, there is:'Hic finit Tydishale which, taking into account the mark of continuation, means, in all probability, not the end of Tydishale's questiones, but of the portion copied by the scribe who apparently expected more to follow.

(c) Expositio compendiosa super Matheum.

It would seem that this expositio represents either a biblical lectio or more likely the principium of a master. It is an interesting short sketch of St Matthew's gospel. The writer tells us that St Matthew's aim in writing his Gospel was to show to his 'fratribus Judeis conversis ad Christum', that Christ was the true Messiah promised by God in the Old Testament. St Matthew's argument is thus expressed in scholastic form:

The true Messiah is that man in whom all the prophecies of the Old Testament were fulfilled. In Christ were fulfilled all the prophecies of the Old Testament without any exception. Christ therefore was the true Messiah. The minor of the argument is proved by the twenty two general conditions, which, according to prediction, would be satisfied by the true Messiah; correspondingly St Matthew's Gospel is divided into twenty two principal parts.

The writer takes up these twenty two conditions one by one, giving the prophet and his saying on the Messiah, with the appropriate reference in St Matthew. At the end of the

exposition, the writer re-asserts the minor, namely, that in Christ were fulfilled all the prophecies of the Old Testament, enumerating the given conditions, and concludes:- '<u>Ergo Ipse est vere Christus nec est alius expectandus. Et sic patet Mathei processus.</u>' The argument (cf. Text p.72,L.1, to p.73,L.3) and the conclusion (p.87,L.2 to the end) are identical with the <u>Vita Christi</u>, chapter 83, of Ludolph of Saxony (editio Argentina 1474, fo.251). There are two possibilities:- either the author borrowed from Ludolph of Saxony (1295-1377) or both borrowed from a common source, which I have not been able to detect. The personal work of the writer of the present exposition seems to have been confined to the gathering of the various prophecies of the Old Testament, with their corresponding section in St Matthew's Gospel. The following chart will show at a glance the general plan of the exposition.

<u>Exposicio compendiosa super Matheum</u>

<u>Condicio</u>	<u>Propheta</u>	<u>Matheus</u>
(1) Davidica et regia propagacio.	Is.xi,1,10; Jer.xxiii,5. Ezec.xxxvi,22-25; Amos ix,11; Agg.ii,24; Zach.iv,7.	I,1-18.
(2) Virginea gravidacio partus et gignicio.	Is.vii,14.	I,18-25.
(3) Syderea apparicio et regum direccio.	Num.xxiv,17; Is.lxvi,	II,1-13.
(4) Nazaria ac florida nuncupacio.	Is.xi, ; Mich.v,2; Jer.xxxi,5; Osee xi,1.	II,13-23.
(5) Previa acclamacio.	Is.xl,3; Malech.iii,1;	III.
(6) Angelica ministracio.	Ps.xc,11.	IV,1-11.
(7) Primaria conversacio.	Is.viii,16,18; ix,1,2;viii,1;	IV,12-25.
(8) Autentica legislativa lacio et justissima et verissima explicacio preceptorum justicie qui in decalogo continentur.	Is.xi,5; Jer.xxxiii,15; Os.x,12; Jer.xxxi,31,32.	V; VI; VII.
(9) Deifica operacio et mirifica coruscacio miraculorum.	Is.xxxv,4-6.	VIII;IX;X;XI.
(10) Pacifica et humillima conversacio.	Is.xlii,1.	XII.
(11) Parabolica erudicio	Ps.lxxvii,2; Is.vi,9,10; Jer.xix,8.	XIII
(12) Provida et benevola enutricio.	Ezech.xxxix,23.	XIV.
(13) Ipocrisis et cerimoniarum omnimoda destestacio.	Is.xi,3,4; xxix,13.	XV; XVI,1-13.

Exposicio compendiosa super Matheum
(ctd)

Condicio	Propheta	Matheus
(14) Genuina colligacio duarum naturarum in una persona	Is.ix,6; Mich.v,2; Is.xlviii,16; Ps.xl,7,8,12.	XVI,13-28; XVII.
(15) Ecclesiastica disposicio et ierarchica ordinacio.	Is.ix,7; Dan.vii;	XVIII; XIX; XX.
(16) Pauperrima et humillima exhibicio.	Zach.ix,9.	XXI,1-18.
(17) Judaica excecacio.	Is.vi,10; ii,6; xxix,10,18.	XXI,18-46; XXII; XXIII.
(18) Prophetica reservacio omnium arcanorum futurorum.	Deut.xviii,15.	XXIV; XXV.
(19) Mirabilis et insolita institucio novi sacrifici et sacramenti in pane et vino.	Gen.xiv,16; Ps.cix,5; Zach.ix,17.	XXVI,1-30.
(20) Salutifera et amara passio.	Is.liii,7,8,12; l.6; Zach.ix,1; Jer.xi,19; Zach.xii,10.	XXVI,31-75; XXVII.
(21) Magnifica resurreccio et triumphus de morte.	Osee.vi,3; xiii,14; Ps.xv,9,10.	XXVIII,1-19.
(22) Multimoda convocacio gencium.	Jacob.xliv,10; Is.xi,10; ii,2; xlix,6; xlii,4; Zach.viii,23; Malach.i,19.	XXVIII,29,30.

(d) This group contains eight questiones (ff.34-42v) some of which are numbered 'Questio 3', 'Questio 4', 'Questio 7', 'Questio 6', showing that they belong to the same master. At the top right hand side of fol.34, there is a word scribbled P f ū n d, which, one may surmise, stands for Bradwardine, who as is well known, was called 'Doctor Profundus'. As I have not seen any other manuscript which contains these questiones and ascribes them to him, I have no means of making certain that they are his. However we may take for granted that he held disputations; alternatively, the questions may occur in his lectures on the Sentences, which are not known to be extant. The discovery of a fragment of a questio by Xiberta, makes this more likely. (1). Against this supposition, however, there is the fact that the second question (f.36-37) refers explicitly to the 'De Questionibus

(1) B.M.Xiberta, Fragments d'una qüestió inedità de Tomàs Bradwardine in Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, Supplementband iii,2, Halbrand, p. 1169-1180.
Xiberta says that this questio, which is in MS.Vat.Lat.813, ff.13r-20r, is anterior to Bradwardine's De Causa Dei, written in 1344.

Armenorum' of Richard Fitzralph, dated at the earliest in 1357, whereas Bradwardine died sometime in 1349.

(e) The question of the authorship of these fourteen questions will be fully discussed in the biographical notice of Nicholas Aston. (Cf.p.39 sq.)

(f) The third group contains five anonymous questiones, each divided into articles. These represent a selection of five questiones taken from Richard Fitzralph's Commentary on the Sentences. They correspond to questions three, four, seven, twenty-eight and twenty-nine in Oriel MS.15.

It is not easy to see why the writer of the Worcester manuscript selected only these five questiones out of the whole Commentary, which, at least as we have it now, in the Oriel text, comprises no less than twenty-nine questions. Perhaps they show the writer's interest at the moment.

In the old parchment label, which is affixed to the fly-leaf, and in all the earliest descriptions, we find among the contents of the collection: 'et quidam sermones'. Of these sermons there is no trace. There are two possible explanations: they may have been inserted in the now missing folios; or the lectures may have been miscalled "sermons".

In fol.33v. there are a few lines of devotional matter or notes of a sermon: 'Dic preces tuas cum devocione, nam iuxta scripturam oracio facta sine devocione est tamquam rugitus boum in conspectu domini; unde mo^{a} dicende hore vox assit corde et ore. Nam vox frustratur dum mens proculmodo vagatur. Ego adnotabo verba que dixi in presencia vestra coram aliquo magnate infra regnum Anglorum existente rege Edwardo et fratribus suis. Homo irretitus peccatis similatur avi deprehenso in laqueo ad volandum tante ferocius obligatur. Sciencia est arbor altissima cuius radix est amarissima, scilicet, qui timet radicis amaritudinem, non gustabit fructus suavitatem. Vomar usitatus nitidior est, et pari omni dato fac hilarem cultim de malo debitori annona..... .....pro frumento inusitatus umbrymosus est..... quam parentes infestant similantur pedicubus fluvius qui dans vite

colligit lutum plumbii et lapis yma petant.'

These lines may have induced the describer of the collection to conclude that all the rest of the manuscript consisted of sermons.

(C) DATE OF THE EXERCISES AND WRITING

This question is twofold: we have first to determine the date of the exercises, and then that of the writing of the collection. All the masters and bachelors mentioned in the Worcester manuscript, except Richard Fitzralph and probably also John Tydishale, belong as far as we know, to the second half of the fourteenth century. Aston and Uthred belong to the 50's; Easton, Radclyf, Trevelleys, and the two Tonworths to the 60's; Wyclif to the early 70's. (1) Uthred may be considered as the starting point, and Wyclif as the end of the period covered by the collection. We know that Uthred incepted D.D. sometime in 1357, and most probably he was already master at the date of these exercises; in fact the questions on ff.11,18, and 7, contain an attack against some of his opinions, which are supposed to have been collected by the friars from his lectures and disputations at Oxford, presumably as master. This quarrel with the friars took place not very long before 1368, when the controversy was under official examination by the Archbishop. (2)

On the other hand Wyclif, who is the last master mentioned by name in our collection, most probably incepted D.D. sometime in 1372. (3) Thus, allowing some years for the anonymous <u>questiones</u>,

---

(1) Cf. <u>Biographical data</u> below p.28 sq.

(2) Cf. the discussion on the controversy of Uthred with the friars below p.123-147.

(3) Cf. H. Workman, <u>John Wyclif</u>, I, p.98. The chronology of Wyclif's scholastic career is not certain, and the biographers do not always agree, but this date seems very likely. See also the note by M.E.H.Lloyd, John Wyclif and the prebend of Lincoln, in <u>The English Historical Review</u>,61(1946) p.388-394, where she says that Wyclif became doctor between 1371-3, and thus was able to retain the two benefices of Lincoln and Westbury, which he would not be allowed as bachelor.

we can safely say that the period of the exercises lies between 1357 and 1380, most probably from the early 60's to the early 70's. They cannot be dated earlier than 1357 because we find in the questiones (f.20vb.) two references to the De Pauperie Salvatoris of Richard Fitzralph, which was written sometime in or after 1357; and they must be later than 1365-6, because they include a disputation which took place on the Vesperies of Adam Easton who incepted c.1365-66. Moreover, Easton and Nicholas Radclyf are mentioned several times in our collection, on two occasions together, presumably as a master and his student.

The other question is about the actual date of the writing of this collection. Floyer ascribes this manuscript to the fifteenth century; but the editors of Young's Catalogue ascribe it to the end of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century. Considering the nature of the manuscript, namely, as a collection of material which would be useful for a student preparing for his degree, it would seem reasonable to suggest that it is closely connected with the lecture-room, and that the writing of it coincides with the period of the exercises, namely, from the early 60's to the early 70's. Obviously we do not exclude the possibility that some of the questiones may have been copied and not necessarily attended in the schools; but the bulk of the collection, especially the disputations and determinations, seem to consist of notes taken by the student collector during or shortly after the lectures or other scholastic exercises.

(D) ORIGIN AND OWNERSHIP

The fact that all the persons mentioned in the manuscript are Oxford masters of the second half of the fourteenth century shows clearly that the disputations and the lectures took place at Oxford. This conclusion leads to the other, that the writer of compiler of the manuscript is an Oxford student; thus it appears to illustrate exclusively Oxford scholastic activity.

The writer did not necessarily attend all the disputations and lectures reported, but he could get copies, especially of the

lectures, which were very often circulated by the masters themselves through the stationarius. It was the aim of the student to collect as much material as possible for his own use during the course, and for the use of other monk-students who would follow him.

The manuscript does not give any clue to the writer or compiler or owner, but the fact that it was found in the library of a monastery which used to send monks to study at Oxford would suggest that one of the Worcester monk-scholars is the collector. Worcester Priory was fairly constant, especially after 1377, in sending two monks to Oxford. (1) One is inclined to suggest that John Malverne or John Hatfield may have been the writer, but Malverne is the more likely. We find Malverne already at Oxford in 1355-6 [when he was paid three pounds 'existenti apud Oxoniam'] in company with Hatfield. He left Oxford probably before 1373, when we find him precentor and proctor of Worcester. (2)

Mr. Leach says that Hatfield continued alone till 1377 when he was joined by John Greene. (3) It is reasonable to suppose that Malverne's stay at Oxford in 1355-6 was for study, and that he continued there intermittently till 1371-2. (4)

The departure of Malverne from Oxford about 1372 would explain the scanty notice of Wyclif. Obviously it is almost impossible to discover the author of the short conclusions, propositions or disputations: consequently we can never know how many items are to be attributed to Wyclif. The brevity of the propositions attributed to Wyclif and supposed to have been taken from one of

---

(1) Documents illustrating early education in Worcester 685 to 1700, (Worcestershire Historical Society 1913) by A.F. Leach, p.xxxviii, and text.

(2) Chapters of the Black monks, III, p.210. For further notice on him see Ibid. p.209, and D.N.B., xii,893.

(3) Leach, op.cit., p.xli.

(4) Ibid. where he says that in 1369-70 there was no Worcester scholar at Oxford, that in 1371-2 there were Malverne and Hatfield, and then from 1370 to 1373 there was only one scholar. This perhaps means that one of them had been called to the monastery for business or ill-health. These dates betray some confusion.

his determinations, makes it impossible to draw any conclusion from them.

II. ST.JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, MS.103.

(a)) DESCRIPTION

James, in his catalogue of the library of St John's College, Cambridge, gives an accurate description of this manuscript. (1) We shall attempt to amplify this, and supply omissions from some of the items.

This miscellaneous collection is written on a paper volume of 161 folios of the size of $11^{5/8} \times 8^{3/4}$ ins., double-columned, except ff.142-143v., with an average number of lines of 49,67,45,60,70. It is in three different hands, the first of which, in ff.1-108, is painfully contracted.

The folios are not numbered, but at the beginning of each quire there is a recent pagination, and except quires 5,6,10,14,15,16, each quire has the old numeration and a catchword at the last verso.

Ten or eleven folios are missing from the volume as can be seen from the following collation:

Collation: 1^{10}, 2^{10}, 3^{12}, 4^{12}, 5^{10}, 6^{10}, 7^{10}, 8^{10}, 9^{10} (lacks 1-3) 10^{10}, 11^{7} (lacks 5 at end) 12^{8}, 13^{12} (lacks 1,2 ?) 14^{8} (lacks 1 ?) 15^{8}, 16^{8}, 17^{12} (?).

At the top of folio 1r. there is a 16th century inscription, which says: 'Papam cum eius auctoritate abrenuntio' (2) , and at the bottom in recent hand: 'Stephani de Patrington Repertorium, et alia Scholastica exercitia. Oxonii.'

Y

---

(1) A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge, by M.R.James, p.137.

(2) James says that this inscription occurs also in MS.150 and elsewhere, and is accompanied in Trinity College MS. O.5.8. by the signature of 'Henricus Smyth.'

(B) CONTENTS

We can distinguish three parts in this manuscript:

(a) ff.1-108: the Repertorium of the Carmelite Stephen Patrington.

(b) ff.109-150: several scholastic exercises.

(c) ff.150-161: nine anonymous questions.

(a)---ff.1-108. (Repertorium Stephani de Patrington)

Inc: Quod viator non potest per aliquem esse certus de existencia alicuius rei a se distincte loco et subiecto.....

Expl: .....nam aliter posset licite desperare, cum ergo meriti presciti sint non habituri vitam eternam. Explicit repertorium Mag. Stephani de Patrington, quod collegit Oxon. et alibi antequem ad gradum assumptus fuerat doctoralem.

This comprises questions, disputations and arguments, on various theological matters, said to have been collected at Oxford and elsewhere by Stephen Patrington, before he became doctor of theology. Many of the scholastic exercises contained in it may have been attended by Patrington, but some items are certainly copied from earlier writers; for instance, the questiones de Sacramento altaris of William Occham, as we shall see presently.

A note in fo.15r. shows that this repertorium is not the original but a copy of it. It reads:

'Nota pro tabula in quo videtur deficeere, et qualiter corrigere potes eam. Require partes illas que continentur sub 17 a et b, usque ad 24 b inclusive, post illas partes que continentur sub 114 b. Et nota quod ab 29 a usque ad 31 b partes intermedie contente sub numeris et litteris intermediis, sunt questiones Ocham de Sacramento altaris, lib.4. Sententiarum, quas quia bone videbantur ei qui hoc repertorium fecit, scripsit in eodem et tabulavit, michi autem non videbatur ex causa expediens hic eas inserere, et ideo cum in tabula illos numeros inveneris non hic sed in 4 Scripto Ocham poteris eorum quilibet invenire.'

From this it follows that :

(i) there is a misplacement of some of the items; those which were contained in fos.17a-24b, are now inserted after fol.114b of the pagination of the original repertorium, now fos.103-108v.

(ii) the questions on the De Sacramento altaris of Ocham, which were inserted in the original in ff.29a-31b, were left out by the scribe, because it did not seem expedient to him to copy them.

(iii) the table of contents ff.109-116: Abbas-Yperdulia; belong

to the original made by Patrington.

Further evidence that this is not the original but a copy, can be gathered from certain numbers inserted on the margins: for instance 1ma, 1^{b}, 2ma, 2^{b}, 3ma, 3^{b}, 4ma, 4^{b}, and so on to the end 114^{b}.

It seems natural to suppose that these numbers indicate the beginning of each folio of the original, and consequently we can conclude that the whole repertorium consisted of 114 folios.

A confirmation of this is found in the above note of the scribe:

'et nota quod ab 29^{a} usque ad 31^{b} partes intermedie contente sub numeris et litteris intermediis.....'

As a matter of fact the text which should have been included between 29a-31b is omitted, and the numeration goes straight from 28b to 32a.

This repertorium would require a very careful study by itself, and would prove of great interest, and throw light on the intellectual activity of Oxford masters between the periods covered by the Worcester collection and the rest of the scholastic exercises of the Cambridge manuscript.

(b) This second part contains several scholastic exercises of a bachelor of theology who was lecturing on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Presumably they belong to one and the same bachelor, who was probably the scribe of the whole collection.

f. 117: Questio pro introitu.

f. 118: Introitus primi libri.

f. 119v: Responsio ad argumenta Bekynham.

f. 120v: Cessacio sentenciarum.

f. 121: Replicacio.

f. 122: Cessacio primi libri.

f. 123: Pro incepcione secundi libri.

f. 124: Replicacio contra dnum. T. Merk.

f. 125: Introitus tercii libri.

f. 130: Replicacio contra Colby.

ff. 132v-133: Five responsions in which Nicholas Fawkes, benedictine of Glastonbury appears as respondent under five different masters, of whom four, Camme, Dudley,

Rypon and Blaklow are Benedictine, and one, Gray, is a Dominican.

ff.129, 136-141v: notes of disputations.

f. 127va-128vb: Exposicio litteralis: Senior Gayo carissimo. Hec est epistula 3ª Johannis apostoli quam scripsit cuidam viro sancto et pleno operibus pietatis, cuius nomen proprium erat Gayus, de quo eciam facta est mensio ad Rom., ultime, et prima ad Cor. primo.....

Expl. .....Igitur in fine epistule dicit: saluta tu amicos nominatim, quasi diceret, doce alios qui sunt amici ecclesie, sicut doceo te, et sicut tu a me et ceteris amicis corditer salutaris sic et tu eos qui apud te sunt amicos saluta, et sic omnes in una pace et salute letabimur sine fine, quam pacem atque salutem nobis concedat qui sine fine vivit et regnat. Amen.

This seems to be a biblical lecture, most probably given by a bachelor. We know that the bachelors had to lecture 'cursorie seu textualiter' on one book of the Old and another of the New Testament. A similar exposition on the same epistle of St John is found in MS.Bodley 692,ff.14-15, which ends with:'Explicit lectura biblie Johannis Lawerne'. They are both textual expositions, but differently treated.

ff.142-143v: Presentis operis intencio est pro novellis ac novis respodentibus theologis aliqua preambula, grosso modo ponere, ex quibus cum modico studio subsequenti cognoscere valeant que proposiciones sunt concedende, et que catholice sunt negande.....

Epl. .....Christus assumpsit humanam naturam que sic fuit unita nature divine, servata utriusque nature proprietate, quod ex illa unione Christus, qui est divinum suppositum, est eciam suppositum humanum, cuius liberalitasiet immensitas dent nobis gaudia eterna. Amen.

This is meant to be a sort of Vademecum for the newly made bachelors, who had to take part in the disputations in the faculty of theology. It safeguards the bachelor from errors in the use of theological terminology in the disputations.

> .!.... a terminis de Deo predicabilibus est racionabiliter inchoandum. Primo ergo dicetur de nominibus, postmodum de verbis, quibus notis satis constabit de aliis partibus oracionis qualiter in proposicionibus theologicis se habent.. .....De adverbiis generaliter tenendum est.....De coniuncionibus eciam et proposicionibus non sunt alique regule.....Interiecciones autem que signant mentis affectum de Deo non predicantur.....Hiis premissis videndum est que proposiciones sunt catholice concedende de Deo, et que negande.....'

This tract is anonymous, and does not give any clue to its writer, or to whether it is the original or a copy.

ff.144-146v: another table of contents gathered under different ubjects.

(c) ff.150-151: contains nine anonymous questiones, written in a different hand from the rest of the manuscript. They seem to belong to an earlier date.

1. Utrum fides incarnacionis et ecclesie sit sufficienter ad salutem hominum revelata.
2. Utrum fides ecclesie sufficienter revelata omnes fideles et infideles obliget ad credendum.
3. Utrum non credere articulis fidei sufficienter revelatis sit Deo volente demeritorium.
4. Utrum Deum temporaliter mundum produxisse sit articulus fidei prophete revelatus.
5. Utrum discredere fidei incarnacionis sit essencialiter ex Dei ordinacione demeritorium.
6. Utrum pueris non credere articulis fidei sit ex Dei ordinacione demeritorium.
7. Utrum homo per animam intellectivam essencialiter in humana specie reponatur.
8. Utrum non credere articulis fidei sit ex Deo auctore demeritorium.
9. Utrum habitus fidei ex accionibus meritoriis posset augeri.

(C) DATE

James assigns this manuscript to the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century. The question of the date of the writing of the manuscript is closely connected with that of the date of the exercises. The writer seems to have been the scholar himself who was collecting material for his use with great caution and discrimination, as is clear from the already mentioned note, in which he says: 'michi non videbatur ex causa expediens hic eas inserere'; and rightly so, since he could easily find them elsewhere. His preoccupation at the moment seems to have been to collect material for his immediate use, namely, disputations and arguments. We know that the repertorium of Patrington was written before he incepted D.D. at Oxford, namely, before 1389, when he first appears as doctor of theology, (1), but the

(1) For Stephen Patrington see D.N.B., xv, 492-3; and authorities cited.

present copy probably belongs to the same period as the exercises. Judging from the masters and bachelors mentioned, who belong to the 90's, and taking into consideration the evidence we have that Nicholas Fawkes appears as respondent bachelor in the five responsions, we can probably date the exercises sometime after 1390. Moreover Thomas Hendman, who was already master in theology, and against whom Fawkes disputed, is reported as Dean of St Crantock. We know for certain that he was appointed to that office on December 8, 1390. (1) Further we may place them not later than 1393, because we know that the Dominican master John Gray who is mentioned therein, was regent master at Oxford in 1392-3. (2) Thomas Merk appears as S.T.B. in the General Chapter of 1393, but was already D.D. by November 2, 1395. (3) Finally Fawkes is found S.T.P. by February 27, 1396-7, (4) so that the five disputations known as responsions can be safely assigned to the year 1392-3.

The other exercises, namely, the '<u>introitus</u>', '<u>repliecacio</u>' '<u>cessacio sententiarum</u>', etc. were performed during the course of lectures on the Sentences. They almost certainly belong to the same person as the responsions; consequently, on the evidence from Thomas Hendman, who appears in one of these exercises as Dean of St Crantock (1390) and taking into consideration that between the end of the lectures on the Sentences and the beginning of the responsions by the bachelors one complete year had to elapse, we may suggest 1390-1 as the date. The lecture on the Bible was given probably sometime during that year between the Sentences and the responsions.

We may therefore definitely assign the manuscript to the last

---

(1) Cf. Biography, p.68 . . . . . .

(2) Cf. Biography, p.60 . . . . . .

(3) Cf. Biography, p.69 . . . . . .

(4) Cf. Biography, p.68 . . . . . .

decade of the fourteenth century.

(D) ORIGIN AND OWNERSHIP

From a recent label it appears that the manuscript originally belonged to William Crashaw A.M., (1) fellow of St John's College (1572-1625) and was bought together with 166 other manuscripts, and given to the same college by 'Thomas Comes Southamptonensis A.D.1635'.

James says that the inscription renouncing the authority of the Pope, which appears with the signature of Henry Smith in MS.O.5.8. of Trinity College, Cambridge, suggests that the manuscript passed into possession of Smith after the death of Crashaw. Considering his feeling towards Rome, we may conjecture that the inscription was written by Crashaw himself.

But who was the original owner ? We are inclined to think that Nicholas Fawkes, the monk of Glastonbury, was its owner and probably the writer also of most of it, but certainly not Stephen Patrington, as James would seem to imply. On the top of f.118r. we find: JESUS-MARIA-NICHOLAUS; which superscription accords well with Nicholas Fawkes and suggests his ownership. In Oriel MS.15,f.210rb. there is a note which is now erased but can be read with ultraviolet light; it says of the manuscript:

> 'Scriptus fuit iste liber de industria fratris Nicholai Fawkes, monachi Glastonie, anno Domini millesimo trecentesimo octogesimo nono, quo tempore plures questiones de opere Holkoth grave fuerat invenire.'

This shows that the manuscript was written by or for Nicholas Fawkes; it contains commentaries and questiones on the Sentences of famous fourteenth century Oxford theologians, such as, Richard Fitzralph, the dominican Robert Holcot, Nicholas Aston, John Wyclif, and Roger Swinshead, which seem to have been arranged in chronological order. There is no doubt that St John's manuscript comes from a Benedictine milieu: most of the masters mentioned are benedictines, as also the bachelor respondent.

---

(1) For William Crashaw see D.N.B., iii, 33.

Taking all the data into account we have strong circumstantial evidence that the owner of the manuscript was a Benedictine scholar.

III. COLLECTIONS AND COLLECTORS OF QUESTIONES.

(A) COLLECTIONS OF QUESTIONES

In his concise and excellent article on the commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, Glorieux, speaking of the value of the commentaries made by the bachelors for their statutory course of lectures, points out that these commentaries represent, not a hurried improvisation but the fruit of long and painstaking preparation. The bachelor had such a Commentary already in view when as a scholar, he attended the different lectures given by the masters and bachelors, who during those years of study took in turn the chair of the Sentences. He reflected on, collated and took notes of these lectures, and this active participation served as preparation for his own commentary. (1)

We have now not only the commentaries, but also the preparatory work, which consists of collections and repertations of questiones, lectures and disputations, either reported by the bachelor or transcribed from the published copies. Naturally the value of these collections depends on, and reflects, the intellect and discrimination of the bachelor, who either took full notes or made excerpts which would be of use in the coming years of his course. In fact, among the items of these collections we find arguments, definitions, opinions and objections with their answers.

Examples of these collections have come down to us, and are found in the different libraries both in England and on the continent. Some of them have been carefully examined and studied, and found to be of great interest, and to throw much light on the

---

(1) Cf. the article in the Dictionaire de Théologie Catholique, T.xiv, cols. 1860-1884, particularly 1865.

intellectual activity of the medieval schoolmen of Paris and Oxford in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Such are the MSS. Paris Bibl.Nat.Lat.15702, and 15652, (1), Bibl.Vat.Lat.1086, (2), Bibl.Comm.Assisi 158, (3), Worcester Cathedral Libr.Q.99, (4), Douai 434, (5), Assisi Bibl.Comm,196,(6). Each collection illustrates some aspect of the medieval university life; some are interesting on account of the masters whose questiones they contain, others for the controversial matter, and finally others for the evidence which they afford on the academic life and customs of the university to which they belong. For instance, Pelster, from the careful examination of MS.Assisi 158 has shown that some customs, such as the holding of vesperias and inception, and the different parts taken by the masters and bachelors in these ceremonies were already in existence at Oxford by the end of the thirteenth century; consequently this manuscript, being the earliest of the kind, has proved of great interest for the history of the university of Oxford. Almost all the above mentioned collections belong to the twelfth, thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, and great value attaches to them as illustrative of the period known as the golden age.

For the later fourteenth century, which is regarded by many

---

(1) M.Chenu,'Maîtres et bacheliers de l'Université de Paris vers 1240; in Etudes d'hist.litter.et doctrinale du xiii siècle, Ottawa, 1932, p.11-39.

(2) A.Pelzer,'Prosper de Reggio Emilia des Ermites de saint Augustin et le manuscript latin 1086 de la bibliothèque Vaticane; in Revue Néo-Scolastique de Philosophie, Louvain, 1938, p.316-351. P.Glorieux,'A propos de Vatic.Lat.1086. Le personnel enseignant de Paris vers 1311-14; in Rech.Th.Anc.Med. 5, (1933), p.23-39.

(3) E. Pelster, in Oxford Theology and Theologians,p.3-145. P.Glorieux,'Les Manuscrit d'Assise, Bibliot.comm.158.Date et mode de composition; in Rech.Th.Anc.Med.,8(1936),p.282-295.

(4) Little, in Oxford Theology and Theologians, p.219-362.

(5) D.O.Lottin,'Quelques Questiones de maîtres Parisiens aux environs de 1225-1235; in Rech.Th.Anc.Med.,5 (1933),p.79-95. P.Glorieux,'Les 572 questiones du manuscrit de Douai 434. Description du tome I,'in Rech.Th.Anc.Med.10,(1938)p.123-152 ..... tome II; in Rech.Th.Anc.Med.....225-267.

(6) D.H.Pouillon,'Le manuscrit d'Assise, Bibl.comm. 196. Description'in Rech.Th.Anc.Med.,12 (1940) p.329-358.

scholars as the period of decline, there are left also some collections, which although not of so much interest as regards the personnel mentioned, who were not great masters, or as regards the theological matter, which is not original and perhaps shows clear signs of the decline, yet remain valuable from the historical point of view, for the details the give of the personnel, customs and activity of the university.

MSS. Worcester Cathedral Library F.65, and St John's College, Cambridge, 103, belong to the second half of the fourteenth century, and in a way supplement each other as the Assisi MSS. 158 and 196 do. The Worcester manuscript is of the same type as the Assisi manuscripts but is on a smaller scale, and has less detail as to the personnel and nature of the questiones; they are both miscellaneous. The Cambridge manuscript, apart from the Repertorium which is certainly not the original, and perhaps a few other questiones at the end, is a purely personal notebook, in the sense that all the scholastic exercises contained in it are the work of one man. Moreover it has more details regarding the nature of the questiones, and in this it completes the Worcester collection. For instance some of the items of the Worcester collection are reported very concisely and bare of all descriptive detail with only Q[uestio] S[olemnis] or R[esponsio] S[olemnis] as signs for identification. It would have been very difficult to say what they stood for unless we compared them with the Cambridge collection, where similar disputations, known as responsions, are reported with the name of the master and of the bachelor responding, and other details concerning the ceremonial addresses made by the bachelor to the master.

Another collection more interesting still than the Cambridge manuscript, and perhaps of a more personal character, is the Bodley MS. 692 (formerly Misc.2508) which contains nearly all the scholastic exercises of John Lawerne, monk of Worcester, from the time he started his lectures on the Sentences to the time of taking his doctorate c.1449. This collection gives additional

evidence on the university customs at Oxford during the first half of the fifteenth century, and thus confirms and explains the entries in the Cambridge manuscript. For instance, the 'Collatio' is only mentioned in the Cambridge collection, but we find it in full in the Lawerne manuscript, and it stands for a short address before the disputation on the subject contained in it.

It will not be out of place to give a short description of this collection of scholastic exercises of the Benedictine, John Lawerne. (1) MS.Bodley 692 is a paper volume of 167 leaves of the size of $12\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{5}{8}$ ins. written carelessly in chancery hand, probably by one person, except for some items, like letters which may have been inserted later on. It is the notebook of John Lawerne, monk of Worcester, who studied and graduated at Oxford. He started his lectures on the Sentences on October 6, 1445, and became doctor in 1448. (2)

It was formerly among the miscellaneous manuscripts, no. 2508, and was probably acquired between 1605-1611.

In f.1-2v there is a sermon preached by Lawerne 'coram rege, Natali Oxon'

3r-v. 'Proposicio excusatoria de antedictis per Bernardum scribam Oxon. Natali per Johannem Lawerne.'

It seems to ba an apology for the mistakes which Bernard, the scribe, had made in writing the sermon.

F.4r. 'Incipiunt actus scholastici Joh.Lawerne,monachi beate Marie Wygornie in Universitate Oxon. completi.'

There is a long disputation in which several masters took part, as is clearly shown by the answers and addresses of the respondent, probably Lawerne himself, either in his vesperies or inception.

---

(1) For other descriptions of this manuscript see Summary Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts, pt.I.p.402-3; and Catalogi librorum Manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae, (Oxford 1697) vol.I,p.130-1 MS.Langbaine 5,p.638.

(2) Cf. MS.Bodley 692,f.119 for his protestation of faith before the lectures on the Sentences; and ff.36,163v. for the supplicat for the degree, and a letter mentioning Lawerne as having incepted on that date.

f.6v-12v: 'Incipiunt introitus et replicaciones in libros sentenciarum'.

There is first a general introductory lecture for the four books of the Sentences, then an introitus and a replicacio for each book, except the fourth book which has no replicacio.

12v-14: 'Introitus Biblie'

An introductory lecture on the Bible with a disputation.

14-15: 'Senior Gayo Carissimo, quem ego diligo.....Hec est tercia epistula Johannis cuius auctor fuit Johannes Apostolus, presbyter, ut quidam putaverunt, ut patet ex similitudine sermonis et affeccionis... .... et sic finis terminatur huius exposicionis verumptamen quia modus est ut lecto textu cum sufficienti exposicione huius, sequenter legatur nude absque exposicione, ideo iam legam plane lecturam sine exposicione que sic incipit: Senior Gayo etc. Explicit lectura biblie Joh.Lawerne.

15-24v: notes, a disputation, a question discussed on the day of inception, some other notes connected with the previous scholastic exercises.

24v-29v: Two biblical lectures, one of them incomplete, a disputation in vesperies or inception, some notes.

29v-33v: 'Incipiunt epistule notabiles' - a large number of letters to, and from, different important persons.

ff.34-41v: Some benedictiones or laudatio inceptoris which used to be made on the day of the vesperies, when the disputations were over, by the master presenting the new inceptor to the chancellor. There is also a supplicat of Lawerne to incept; the grace was granted on condition that he should preach a sermon after receiving his doctorate. It is dated 1438, but obviously it should be 1448. Some more letters follow.

ff.42-120v: 'In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Incipiunt lecciones ordinarie et disputaciones Mag.Lawerne in scolis theologie Oxon.'

This part contains a mixed collection of lectures by Lawerne on the Sentences and on the Bible, and some more

letters.(ff.42-54,69v-113v,123v-145v,154-160v) There are about forty-two lectures on the first chapter of St Luke, on the origin of St John the Baptist. They are all numbered up to the 37th. (ff.54v-69,71-72,74-85,86-90,97-99v, 100-112v,114v-116,117-120v).

'Incipit lectura libri sentenciarum secundum Joh.Lawerne monachum beate Marie Wygornie.....In domo'

The lectures on the four books of the Sentences given in domo, namely, in the Benedictine College at Oxford.

'Explicit lectura Sentenciarum secundum Joh.Lawerne monachum beate Marie Wygornie.'

ff.121-123v 'Primus sermo dompni Joh. Lawerne, monachi beate Marie Wygornie, in vigilia Assumpcionis beate Marie in domo capitulari.....Explicit primus sermo.'

ff.152-153v: 'Ista sunt quattuor puncta quondam a Papa romano publice damnata in curia romana.
Primus punctus est de sacramento altaris qui ponit, quod in sacramento altaris quod manibus sacerdotum et ministerios ostenditur populo christiano non est realiter et veraciter corpus Christi.....
Secundus punctus est quod lex continencie et castitatis et sancta virginitas indicta sacerdotibus et virginibus, est causa maximorum introitus peccatorum...
Tercius punctus est quod exorcismi et benedicciones in ecclesia facte super vinum, panem, aquam, oleum, sal, ceram, incensum, altaris, lapides, muros, ecclesiarum, vestimenta, mitras et baculos pastorales seu eciam perrerinorum sunt vera practica nigromancie..
Quartus punctus est quod speciales oraciones pro fidelibus defunctis facte in ecclesia preponendo unum nomine speciali ante alium est falsum elemosine fundamentum.....
Explicit notabilis actus contra quattuor puncta ingraciosa compilatus per magistrum Joh. Lawerne, D. Sacre.Theol., et monachus Wygornie Ecclesie.'

These four conclusions correspond to the third, fourth, fifth and seventh of the XII Conclusiones, affixed to the door of Westminster Abbey and St Paul by the Lollards in 1395. (cf.Fasciculi Zizaniorum,p.360-68). The writer says that 'dominus tunc archiepiscopus Cantuaris misit estate mihi unum mandatum, quod predicarem opposita istarum opinionum.'

ff.143-147,161-163: disputations.

'Expliciunt lecciones ordinarie Mag.Joh.Lawerne,S.P.P., edite et publice lecte in scolis theologie Oxon. anno Domini 1448-9.'

f.163v: A letter to Lawerne 'elemosinario ecclesie Wygornie'; and another in which Lawerne and John Ledbury are mentioned as having incepted in April 1448-9; there is also a

dispensation to Lawerne to leave Oxford on his

'anno secundo regencie, videlicet, a festo sancti Georgii martyris ad festum.....totaliter ac quiete a regencia sua Oxon. cessavit.'

Written in a later hand we find:

'Expliciunt lecture Joh.Lawerne, monachi Wygornie et doctoris Oxon.S.Theol., Collegii Gloucestr. quondam alumpni. Eiusdem actus contra quattuor puncta. Benedicciones et laudationes in vesperiis Oxon. Variarum rerum epistule.'

(B) Collectors and Reporters of Questiones.

Literary publication and circulation of books was done in this period through the so-called stationarius under the control of the University. Students who wanted to copy some published questiones or treatises had either to borrow them from the stationarii, or from the masters or even from companions. The so-called pecia system, namely, the borrowing of the treatise or questiones in quires at a time, made circulation easier.(1) In addition to these published works of the masters, which were of great importance and value, being the fruit of long years of teaching, the scholars kept private notebooks, in which they took down notes of lectures and disputations and other scholastic exercises, made either by themselves or by others.

All the above mentioned collections and reportations were made by members of monastic orders, either monks or friars, particularly by monks. A glance at the catalogue of the library of x Worcester Cathedral shows clearly how rich it is in these collections; in addition to our MS.F.65, there are MSS.F.73;Questiones variorum'; F.116:'Sophistrie libellus'; F.118:'Sophistria secundum usum Oxonie'; Q.31:'Questiones philosophicae et theologicae';Q46:'Reportaciones Joh.Dombletone....de sermonibus Oxonie; Q.71:'Questiones diverse in theologia', and perhaps many others.(2)

---

(1) For the pecia sydtem in the Middle Ages, see F.C.Savigny, Geschichte des romischen Rechts in Mittelalter, III,579-83, 643-54,(Heidelberg,1834); and Destrez,I, La pecia dans les manuscrits universitaires du xiiie et du xive siècle, (Paris 1935) particularly on p.63.

(2) Cf.Floyer, Catalogue.....pp.35,37,58,125,131,146.

Other collections originally belonging to monastic libraries are now found in public and private libraries. For instance, as we have already mentioned, St John's College, Cambridge, MS.103, originally belonged to Nicholas Fawkes, monk of Glastonbury, for whom or by whom, MS.15 of Oriel College, Oxford was written. MS.Bodley 692 belonged to another Benedictine monk of Worcester, John Laverne.

Such facts show undoubtedly that the monk-scholars were very much interested in these collections. Curiously enough Worcester Priory has excelled all the other monasteries in preserving these manuscripts. It is surprising that only the monastic collections have survived, and little or nothing is known of others belonging to the friars or secular clergy.

Several reasons may account for this:

i. The monk-scholars were in a better position for procuring whatever material they needed for their study and having it transcribed by other monks in their own house, where some may have been specially charged with the work of copying manuscripts.

ii. The purpose of sending monks to study at Oxford and other universities was to train them so as to be able to give lectures in their own monastery. We have evidence of this in the Bodley MS.692, where we find:

f.54v: Incipit lectura libri sentenciarum secundum Johannem Laverne, monachum beate Marie Wygornie.... In domo.'

and:

f.99v: Introitus pro lectura in domo.....
(Protestacio) Ego frater Johannes de Prestone Junior, monachus Wygornie, per venerabilem patrem meum reverendum Johannem de Evesham, Dei gracia Wygorniensis monasterii priorem, ad legendum librum Sentenciarum in eodem monasterio deputatus, et 24 die mensis Novembris anno MCCC , ipsius lecturam incepi in presencis venerabilis patris mei et domini prioris predicti, et conventus eiusdem loci ac aliorum quamplurium secularium.....'

iii. The preservation of these collections may be explained by the fact that the monks, unlike either the friars or the secular clergy, were bound to remain in the same monastery:

consequently all their belongings, such as the books used during their period of study at any university, would be taken back with them to their own monastery and probably placed at the disposal of the younger monks looking forward to study at one of the universities, and ultimately, incorporated in the monastic library.

Floyer, in the introduction to the catalogue of Worcester Cathedral, rightly points out that:'the Worcester students went chiefly to Gloucester Hall, now Worcester College, where they learned the art of writing after the newer models, they became authors, and added to the library by bringin home their books of study for their degress.' (1)

With the friars and secular clergy scholars it was quite different; they were liable to be removed from their priory or church at any moment, and consequently their belongings were liable to be lost or dispersed. Naturally we do not exclude the possibility that many manuscripts of those collections may still be hidden, or completely unnoticed in various libraries.

---

(1) Cf. Floyer, Catalogue.....p.xiii

PART II

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF THE MASTERS AND BACHELORS MENTIONED IN WORCESTER MS.F.65, AND CAMBRIDGE 103.

The present chapter will contain the biographical notices of the masters and bachelors in the two collections of Worcester and Cambridge. We shall give fuller and more elaborate biographies of the persons in the Worcester collection than of those in the Cambridge manuscript which occupies a secondary place in our study. We shall deal first with the Worcester names putting them, as far as possible, in order of seniority in inception. The names of disputants are only given with the 'determinations', which were the 'actus magisterialis'; consequently the list will be predominantly of masters. A bachelor is mentioned only on one occasion, in the vesperies of Adam Easton, Redclyf being the bachelor responding. We shall leave out Richard Fitzralph and John Wyclif, as they are well known and notice on their lives and activity is easily obtainable from published sources. (1) Hatton or Atton and Botilston, to whom we can find practically no certain reference, will be put at the end of the list.
The notices of the persons in the Cambridge collection will be dealt with more succinctly; and considering the short time covered by the collection, and the difficulty of determining the date of the inception of each disputant, it will be probably more convenient to put them in alphabetical order.
It is worth noting that these masters and bachelors mentioned in both collections were not necessarily great and famous

---

(1) For Richard Fitzralph see the article in D.N.B., vii,194-198; the supplement to the D.N.B. by H.C.H. in Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vii (1929) p.122-125; H.E.Savage, Richard Fitzralph some time dean, (Lichfield 1928) H.B.Workman, John Wyclif, I, 126-132; Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, III,passim; and the articles by A.Gwynn in Studies, xxii(1933) p.389-405; xxvi (1937) p.50-67.
For Wyclif see H.B.Workman, John Wyclif, 2 vols.(Oxford 1937); the chapter in Cambridge Medieval History,vii,486-505,900-7,by B.L.Manning.

theologians, or ones whose teaching attracted the attention of the collector of their quæstiones, but they represent a small portion of the constant succession of teaching staff and students in the periods covered by the two collections, i.e. from the early 60's to the early 70's, and in the early 90's.

I. MS. WORCESTER F.65.

1. John Tydishale

In dealing with John Tydishale we meet with the difficulty of a duplicate personality. Some of the bibliographers speak of Tydishale and Tacesphale as different persons separated by a century and yet assign to each the same priory, official positions, works and even place of death. Thus in order to resolve the apparent contradiction we must show that the fourteenth century Tydishale is identical with the alleged fifteenth century Tacesphale; and distinguish Tacesphale from the Carmelite master 'John', mentioned in the letter of Pope Martin V, which was probably the cause of the confusion of Tydishale and Tacesphale.

John Grossi, the first bibliographer of the famous members of the Carmelite Order of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, mentions master John Tydishale among the friar-doctors of the English Province, and says:

> 'Magister Joannes Tyleshale (Tyteshale, Tycesphale) de conventu Norwici, scripsit super Lib.Sententiarum notabiliter Item composuit postillam bonam super Apocalypsim. Qui obiit in Romana Curia.' (1)

This sober and authoritative notice was used as a basis by all the later bibliographers, who amplified it, and some of them so inaccurately that out of one person they made two.

---

(1) For Grossi's life and works see B.MXiberta, De Scriptoribus Scholasticis saeculi xiv ex Ordine Carmelitum, (Louvain 1931) pp.4-5, 42. Xiberta says that Grossi's work is very authoritative, because having been Prior General, he could get reliable information during the visitations concerning the famous members of each Province of his Order; and furthermore, that his work is the only one of its kind dealing with the period before 1415.

It seems that Trithemius (1) started this confusion; he gives a short notice of Tacesphale in both of his works, and mentions Titleshale only in the Index of all the Carmelite masters. He puts Titleshale in 1354, and Tacesphale in 1420.

Trithemius was faithfully followed by the Carmelite Peter Luccius, who amplified Trithemius' Catalogus, inserted it in his Bibliotheca Carmelitana (2), and added to the confusion by identifying Tacesphale with the 'Joannes' mentioned by Pope Martin V in his letter to Walden. Pitts also followed Trithemius, but apparently by way of Luccius' edition and thus inherited all the inaccuracies of Luccius. (3) Leland, Bale, Tanner, Fabricius and others, either mention only Titleshale, or identify Titleshale with the Tacesphale of Trithemius. (4) Fabricius expressly states that Tacesphale is the same person as Titleshale, Titleshalus, Didveshale, as he is differently called by bibliographers.

The complete solution of this problem depends very much on the answer we give to the question: was Tacesphale the John mentioned by Pope Martin V in his letter to Walden ? Peter Luccius in his Bibliotheca says that he intends to examine this matter elsewhere : 'alibi examinabitur'; it does not appear in his Bibliotheca so probably he meant his Commentarium which unfortunately I have not been able to see. (5) It would seem that he came to the conclusion that Tacesphale was the same with John, which opinion was followed by Pitts.

Pope Martin V in his letter to Walden, says: 'Recepimus enim

---

(1) J.Trithemius, De Scriptoribus Ecclesiaticis, (Paris 1512) p.115 and De Obitu et Progressu ac viris illustribus Ord. Carm. (Cologne 1543) pp.45,82-3.

(2) P.Luccius, Bibliotheca Carmelitana, (Florence 1593) 56-7.

(3) Pitts, De Rebus Anglicis, (Paris 1619) 480,608.

(4) J.Leland, Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis, p.361 J.Bale, Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Brittaniae Ctalogus, (Basle 1557) lxxxiii,433; T.Tanner, Bibliotheca Brit.Hibernica, (London 1748) 730; Fabricius, Bibliotheca Latina Mediae et Infimae Aetatis, vol.iv, p.435 (Patavii 1754).

(5) There seems to be no copy of this work in the Bodleian Library.

nuper de manu dilecti filii Joannis ordinis B.M. de monte Carmeli magistri in sacra pagina, latoris presentium, volumen secundum de Sacramentis.....' (1)

From this letter we cannot determine who this Joannes was but Bale in his Extracts from the letters of Walden (2) seems to identify him with another fifteenth century Carmelite master, John Keninghale. (3)

Here is the extract:

'ii. Ex epistula Martini papae ad eundem TH.Walden. Delatus autem et per manus dilecti filii Joanneis Keninghale Ord.B.M. de monte Carmeli, magistri in sacra pagina, nobis liber ipse fuit presentatus tempore quo venerabilis frater noster Jordanus episcopus Albanensis (quem cum pleno legationis officio ad hanc perfidam et crudelem haeresim exstirpandam transmisimus in Germaniam) erat de Urbe recessurus.'

Moreover, we have facts which confirm this conclusion. According to some bibliographers, Tacesphale was still alive at the time of the approbation of Walden's work by Pope Martin V, (as is shown by his letter 'de manu Joannis.....latoris presentium') namely, on July 23, (X kal.Aug.), 1427; and that he died at about this time. It is said also, that Keninghale took the third volume of the Doctrinale Ecclesie to Rome in the same year, and that he was present at the Norwich Synod which condemned the Lollard, William White, in September 13, 1428. This is doubtful: Walden had hardly time to receive the letter of approbation of the second volume, when we find Keninghale already in Rome with the third volume, to which was affixed Walden's letter thanking Pope Martin V for the honour shown to him by his letter of approval and encouragement.

Further, in this letter (which he is supposed to have received after the approval of the second volume, taken to Rome by

---

(1) This letter was published in the first and third volumes of the Doctrinale Ecclesiae of Walden. (Venice 1571).

(2) Zimmerman, in Monumenta Historica Carmelitana, fasc.,5,(1907) 482 - 482. This seems to be extracted from the above mentioned letter, and thus one inclines to suggest that the John mentioned in the letters of Martin V was really Keninghale and not Tydishale.

(3) For John Keninghale see Bale, VIII,17,p.592-3;and XI,p.60.

Tacesphale, who died there just after presenting it to the Pope) Walden does not mention Tacesphale at all, nor his recent unexpected death, to which, if it really happened, he surely would have made some reference. On the contrary we know that Keninghale was an intimate friend of Walden, in whose letters he was frequently mentioned, and by whom he was very often sent with messages to important persons in Rome and elsewhere. All these points suggest that "Tacesphale" is a mistake for "Keninghale", due perhaps to the fact that both Keninghale and Tydishale were sent to Rome or to the Curia Romana on business for their Order. This would confirm the statement of Bale in his notice on John Keninghale that Walden

> 'hoc usus consilio, ut munus illud egregium (i.e. Doctrinale Ecclesie) ab aliquo insigne viro vel Romam usque deferendum curavit. Visus est huic negotio Keningalum maxime utilis.'

Tydishale : Life and Works

John Tydishale is said to have taken his name from his birthplace, 'Lichamo vicina' in Norfolk. (1) Of his early years and education we know nothing, and no date is given except the uncertain one of his death. Most probably he joined the Carmelites at Norwich to which Priory he is said to have belonged, possibly did his philosophical and part of his theological studies in the same priory, where there was at that time a famous studium, and then came to Oxford to prepare for his degree.

All the bibliographers say that he studied at, and owed his fame to, Oxford, '<u>at famae suae partem maximam Isiacae debet Academiae</u>' where he achieved the doctorate in theology and canon law. The fact that he was well versed in canon law suggests the reason why he was chosen, some time before 1349, to defend the privileges of his Order at the Roman Curia, against the usurpations of the bishop and clergy. In fact, about this time Pope Clement VI, who was at Avignon, wrote to the bishop of York, telling him that he had received complaints from the Carmelite Friars who

---

For note (1) see below.

had been persecuted by some prelates and rectors of churches because of their privileges. (2)

Having fulfilled his mission at the Roman Curia, Tydishale is said to have died there circa 1354; but there is great confusion about his burial place. Bale and Pitts say that he was buried 'in schola vel collegio Anglorum' in Rome. He was certainly not buried in the Norwich Priory, as Trithemius says; it was Keninghale who died and was buried therein. (3)

Tydishale is also said to have been prior of Norwich; there is no evidence that he ever held this office, but Keninghale is said to have been twenty-fourth prior provincial of the English Carmelites 1430-44, and to have resided at Norwich to which he bequeathed a famous library.

Works.

Grossi says that Tydishale wrote a Commentary on the Sentences and another on the Apocalypse. To these Trithemius adds the Sermones, Leland, the Determinationes, Bale the Preelectiones Bibliorum, Pitts the Questiones de Anima and various commentaries on the Bible. In all Tydishale is credited with:-

(i) Commentarium Sententiarum, lib. I: Utrum a Verbo incarnato secundum.

(ii) Determinationes theologicae: Utrum quelibet noticia creata.

(iii) Commentarium in Apocalypsi: Est autem Apocalypsis graecus fermo.

(iv) Commentariorum libri plures.

(v) Preelectiones Bibliorum, lib. I.

(vi) Questiones super Aristotelis de Anima: Philosophus libro secundo Physicorum.....

(vii) Sacrarum concionum, lib. II. (de sanctis et de tempore)

(viii) Questiones super 19 libros de animalibus, ascribed to

---

(1) A certain John de Tytengale died about 1289, and was fellow of Merton. (Brodrick, Memorials of Merton College, 184). Another master John de Detenshale on Nov. 9, 1289, was given dispensation by the Pope Nicholas IV, to be ordained notwithstanding the defect in his ring finger, and also to minister in his orders notwithstanding his illegitimacy. (Cal. Pap. Reg. Lett. I, 505

(2) Cosmas de Villiers, Bibliotheca Carmelitana, II, 126

(3) J. Kirkpatrick, History of the religious orders and communities and of the hospitals and castle of Norwich, (Yarmouth, 1845) 174.

Tydishale by Balliol MS.311.

Of all the above mentioned works three only are known to be extant:-

I. Determinationes theologicae. Worcester Cath. Lib.MS.F.65 contains

f.18v: Conclusiones Tydishale in determinacione sua. (10 conclusions)

f.26: Determinacio Tydishale: Intellectus creatus per intuitum cercius quam [per] evidenciam que nata est facere fidem, cognoscere potest quod obiectum est.....Ex his patet quod licet fides patrie sit perfeccior fide vie, non tamen excedit fidem quin est fides, vel saltim non cercior noticia probabili, quamquam certitudinem faciat supranaturalem astronomicam, patebit in sequenti.

f.27: Determinacio Tydishale: Utrum quelibet creata noticia intellectualis sit proporcionata evidencie raciones. Quod non videtur..... ..... Conclusio ex his videtur quod ad hoc quod res sensibilis intelligatur distincte sub differencia secundi sensibilis requiritur naturaliter..... .....(f.33. incomplete)

II. Questiones de anima:

These questiones are ascribed to Tydishale by Pitts, and are found in MS.Balliol 311 and Oriel 33. I have collated MS.Merton 276 and found no resemblance to the other two manuscripts. It has three questions only. (1)

These questiones are explicitly ascribed to Tydishale in MSS. Balliol and Oriel. The Balliol copy is complete and has about 103 questions, whereas in the Oriel MS. there are only 42. They are substantially the same, except for the last six questions which differ.

MS.Balliol 311, ff.148-181.(Oriel 33,ff.163-183v.)

Hic incipiunt questiones super librum de anima a magistro Joanne Dedneshale.
Honorum honorabilium etc. Philosophus in secundo Physicorum volens investigare terminos et limites consideracionis philosophice sive naturalis sic ait..... ..... Ad tercium argumentum dicendum est quod licet anima moveatur motu dilatacionis in letando, et compressionis in dolendo, hoc est natura sicut ignis movet deorsum, nec iste motus erit eiusdem racionis cum eo motu quo moveat alia.

---

(1) For this manuscript see, The Medieval books of Merton College, by F.M.Powicke,Oxford,1931,p.136.

III. Questiones super 19 libros de Animalibus. (1)

These questiones are found in MS..Balliol 311 and Oriel 33. In the Balliol manuscript they are anonymous and incomplete, whereas in the Oriel MS. they are explicitly ascribed to 'Tydenshale', and seem to be complete. The Balliol questions are substantially the same with those in Oriel ff.273-278.

MS.Oriel 33, ff.173-323. (Balliol 311, ff.182-187vb.)

> Quedam partes corporum animalium etc. Circa istum librum primo queritur utrum sit de animalibus sicut de subiecto, et videtur quod non.....
> .....et hoc ex ordinacione nature, quod est sicut ars prime que unumquodque ordinat quodquod melius est, cui sit gloria in infinita secula seculorum. Expliciunt questiones super librum de Animalibus, disputate a magistro Johanne de Tydenshale.

---

2. Nicholas Aston (Aston , [illegible])

Aston is a common place-name. (2) For lack of definite information it is almost impossible to determine where Nicholas Aston was born. The date of his birth is also not given, but taking into account the first certain date, 1350, when he became fellow of Queen's, while still a bachelor of theology, (as we shall see later) and the long medieval university course, we may with probability put his birth sometime between 1315-1320.

The first notice of Aston is given by Bale in his Catalogus (3) as follows:

> Ex Oriel.Coll.
> Nicholaus Astonus, Oxonii adolescens in Orialensi collegio quod Edwardus secundus Anglorum rex condidit, philosopiae Aristotelicae operam olim dedisse dicitur. In quaquum fecisset largiter animum ad altiora, Petri nomirum Longobardi sentencias adiecit, ita ut earum supremus doctor et interpres sit inde effectus. Et hoc ad coronidem addo quod post solemnes in ea academia lectiones,

---

(1) Bale (viii,17) and Pitts (p.647) ascribe to John Keninghale 'In Aristotelis de animalibus', lib.I., but they give no evidence for this. Tanner says: 'MS.extat in Bibliotheca regis christianissimi ut refert Elechus Medicorum, editus ab Israele Sparebio Argentinensi, p.167'.

(2) The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names, by Eilert Ekwall, (Oxford, 1940) p.16-17.

(3) J.Bale, Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Brittanniae Catalogus, XII, 18, p.81. (Basle, 1557).

scripserit:

Quaest.Sententiarum, lib.4.
Lecturas ordinarias, lib.1.

Haec sola se mihi obtulerunt in predicti collegii bibliotheca, caeteris eius operibus in abdiro sepultis.

We must note here that this is the usual amplification of the sober notice of the INDEX: (1)

Nicholaus Astone, doctor oxoniensis scripsit:
Quaest. seu Lecturam Sententiarum, lib.4. Utrum veritatem creatam poterit veritas creata ypostatice...etc.
Ex Oriel.Coll.Oxon.

Thus we are told on the sole authority of Bale that Aston was a member of Oriel, before he became fellow of Queen's: but apparently Bale has drawn this conclusion from the fact that some of Aston's works were found at Oriel.

Two recent guthorities who accepted or recorded this view, J.R.Magrath and G.C.Richards, mention as their source A.Wood's quotation from Bale. (2) Still, the connection of Aston with Oriel remains very doubtful. His connection with Queen's is certain, and we have ample evidence. On April 30th, 1350, we find him mentioned in the Long Roll as having been credited with the sum of £28-8-9, received from William Cundale; (3) we may as well state here that Aston and John de Stanton were Cundale's executors, and as such came into conflict with the College; in fact, in the Long Roll of 1351-2 we find a payment of 3s.4. to 'Galphrido de Botilston procuratori domus contra executores Cundale.' (4) Again, on June 18th, 1350, he was one of the senior fellows who elected and presented John Hotham, bachelor of theology, to William la Zouche, Archbishop of York, for confirmation as Provost. (5)

---

(1) J.Bale, Index Brittanniae Scriptorum, ed. R.L.Poole and M.Bateson.(Oxford,1902),p.298. In Bale's manuscript Aston is inserted twice, first under Aston, where Nicolaus is added above the line, and then under Nicolaus.

(2) J.R.Magrath: 'The Queen's College',ii (Oxford 1921)p.12ln.5
G.C.Richards and C.L.Shadwell: 'The Provosts and fellows of Oriel College.(Oxford 1922) xv.
A.Wood: 'Hist. et Antiq. Oxon., ii(Oxford 1792) p.117.

(3) J.R.Magrath, op. cit.i.p.91 n7.

(4) " ..... "..........

(5) J.R. Magrath, op.cit. i,p.99. and Wood,op.cit. ii (1792).145.

From these documents we can draw some conclusions:

1. The fact that Aston was already senior fellow in 1350 shows clearly that he must have been fellow for some years, and that he was nearing his final degree.
   If he was elected fellow at the same time as Hotham, who was chancellor in 1357, he must have obtained the doctorate soon after 1350, but certainly not later than 1357.
2. He must have been ordained priest before 1350, because according to the College Statutes, every fellow theologian had to be ordained priest within the second year of his theological study. (1)

We do not know the exact date when Aston became chancellor of Oxford, but he was in office on May,4,1360 (2) and on November 13, of the same year, when the 'ordinacio ciste de Seltone', was passed in congragation. (3) By June 16,1362 he had relinquished the chancellorship, as we learn from a letter sent by the king to the University, in which he is called 'nuper cancellarius dicte universitatis'.(4)

Dr.Salter is of opinion that Aston held the chancellorship for two years, from Whitsun 1359 to Whitsun 1361. He places Aston between John Hotham, who came out of office some time in 1359, and John de Renham, of whom he says(referring to the list of masters of Oxford presented to the Pope for promotion)that

---

(1) J.R.Magrath,op.cit., I,p.39. The founder's Statutes expressly require that the fellows should take holy orders. As for the theologians 'inter quos quidem magistros illos qui theologie intendunt volo infra secundum annum statim sequentem assumere ordinem sacerdotis.'

(2) Snappe's Formulary, ed.Salter (O.H.S.1924) p.329 n.

(3) Munimenta Academica,I,219; Cal.Pat.Rolls(Edw.III,1361-64) p.282.

(4) Medieval Archives of the University of Oxford,ed.Salter (O.H.S.1917-19)p.189. In this letter the king speaks of a certain John Norton, Carmelite Friar, who was summoned by the chancellor to answer for trespasses against the peace of the University, not only refused to appear, but caused the said chancellor to be summoned before the court of christianity; hence the king prohibits all ecclesiastical persons from prosecuting appeals against the liberties and privileges of the chancellor of Oxford.

he occurs as chancellor in 1369. (1) Wood, on the contrary, asserts that Aston was chancellor for three years but that for the greater part of the last year, i.e. 1362, the next chancellor was in office. (2) Salter's statement must be due to an oversight, as the Calendar of Papal Petitions clearly shows that the list mentioned by him was drawn up, not in 1361 but in 1362. (3) This tallies well with all the known facts: Whitsun in 1362 occurred on June 5, and on June 16, Aston is designated in the king's letter as '<u>nuper cancellarius</u>' .

Sometime before August 15, 1362, he was sent to Rome on behalf of the University, in connection with the promotion of the Oxford masters. (4) In 1361, while chancellor, he was still fellow of Queen's, and what is more, he was one of the only three fellows who survived the pestilence. Thus in fear lest there should be no fellow left, the three remaining fellows elected three more, Henry de Upton, William Trevelleys,M.A., B.Theol., and William de Wilton, to be admitted in succession into the vacancies thus caused. (5)

<u>Ecclesiastical career.</u>

Aston, as we have already seen, was probably ordained priest before 1350. The first we hear of him is 'as parson of the church of Stone' in December 3, 1361, when he was granted permission to go over-seas, and had letters nominating

---

(1) <u>Snappe's Formulary</u>, 329 The election of the chancellor was held 'de biennio in biennium ante Pentecosten.' If the election take place after Pentecost, but before Christmas, the remaining time till the next Pentecost will be counted as a year. But if it take place after Christmas, the two years' period will begin from the next Pentecost, and the short time before the election will not be counted. <u>Mun.Acad.</u>, 106-7; <u>Statuta Univ Oxon.</u>,122.

(2) Wood, (<u>Fasti Oxon.</u>,307) puts Aston as chancellor in 1360-61-62 and says that:'quem quidem id muneris per integrum triennium administrare refert scriptor quidam, mihi tamen veri sit similius, Cancellario proximo maiorem istius anni partem tribuendam esse.'

(3) For the list of masters, see <u>Cal.Pap.Reg.</u>(Pet.I.) 390.

(4) <u>Cal.Pap.Reg.</u> (Petitions I) p.385-6.

(5) Magrath, <u>op.cit.</u>, I.p.102.

Richard de Tyssington, clerk, and Henry Spencer, as his attorneys.

(1). On February 28th, 1338, a certain Nicholas de Astone was presented by the crown to the benefice of Pembridge, but whether this is the same Nicholas Aston or another we are not sure. (2) On the feast of the Assumption, August 15, 1362, while at the papal court with the list of the Oxford masters, he was promised 'by word of mouth' the deanery of Chichester, but unfortunately Innocent VI died before the grant could be executed. When the Pope, Urban V, , was elected Aston again asked for the promised deanery, and for the annexed canonry and prebend, and they were granted to him. (3) On June , 1363 in a grant of indulgence to those who would help him to restore his church, he was still addressed as 'Nicholas de Aston master of theology, rector of Stone', but no mention is made of the deanery. (4) The last we hear of him is on May 18, 1366 when he was called 'dean of the church of the Holy Trinity, Chichester'. (5)

Works.

Aston's literary reputation, as Magrath rightly says, 'depends on a book on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. (6) He is mentioned together with other Oxford men, i.e. Fitzralph, Billingham, Buchingham, Swineshed and Brinkel, in a Commentary on the Sentences by the Carmelite, John Brammart who was reading the Sentences at Paris in 1379. (7)

Bale in the Index attributes to Aston one work only:

Quaest. seu lectura sententiarum lib.iiii.

---

(1) Cal.Pat.Rolls.(Edw.III,1361-64) 124.

(2) Reg.Thomae de Charlton.(Cant.York.Soc.) p.80.

(3) Cal Pap.Reg.(Petitions I) p.385-6. On the same occasion he asked for the church of Stone, on behalf of his clerk, John Pays S.C.L. of the diocese of Durham.

(4) Cal.Pap.Reg. (Petitions I) p.421-2.

(5) Cal.Pat.Rolls.(Edw.III,1364-67) 246.

(6) Magrath, op.cit.,I,p.122.

(7) Xiberta, De Scriptoribus Scholasticis saec.XIV ex Ord.Carm. p.431. He is also mentioned as one of the disputants in the disputations of the Carmelite,Osbert Pichengham. Ibid.252

In the Catalogus he makes two works out of this:-

Quaest.Sententiarum lib.iiii.

Lecturas ordinarias lib.i.

Pitts (1) could not fail to copy Bale, but he doubted the survival of Aston's works:'diu servata fuerunt', perhaps because he had not seen them in T. James' Eclogæ.

Tanner (2) attributes three works to Aston:

Quaestiones super Mag.Sent.lib.i.(a correction of Bale's lib.iv)

Quaestiones huius 12.'Utrum veritatem....

Lecturas ordinarias, lib.i.

He leaves to Bale the responsibility for asserting the existenced of the "Lecturae ordinariae",:'Bale dicit esse in Oriel'. We gather from the incipit that his information comes either from MS.Oriel xv, or from the catalogue of Oriel MSS. which was in his possession.

It seems quite clear that the sober notice of Bale's Index is correct, and all the others are mere amplifications.

The Worcester MS.F.65 (ff.42-63) contains fourteen questiones. They are all anonymous, but eight of them are substantially identical with the questiones definitely ascribed to Aston in Oriel MS.15(ff.210-222). In Oriel f.210rb. there is the list of the questions headed:

"12 questiones Mag.Nicholai Aston Oxonii disputate."

The Worcester manuscript contains, in addition to these, another question anonymously and separately inserted in f.22-24, which corresponds to the third question in the Oriel: "Utrum veromnem accionem....."

Moreover, the Munster University Library Cod.175 has one

---

(1) Pitts J., Relationes Historicae...(Paris,1619)Appendix,p.888

(2) Tanner,T., Bibliotheca Brittannico-Hibernica (London1748),54

question "Utrum veritatem...." (1)

We give the list of all the questions in the Worcester order, beginning with those which are certainly Aston's, and leaving to the end those which probably belong to him, and those which are found in one manuscript and not in the other.

W = Worcester; O = Oriel; M = Munster.

(1) Utrum veritatem creatam poterit veritas increata ypostatice sustentare. W.O.M.

(2) Utrum inter necesse esse et impossibile esse mediat possibile e esse. W.O.

(3) Utrum cuiuslibet futuricionis et pretericionis Deus sit causa. W.O.

(4) Utrum certa previsio futurorum contingencium sit ex predestinacione voluntatis divine. W.O.

(5) Utrum omne pretertum necessario sit preteritum. W.O.

(6) Utrum privaciones et negaciones sint a Deo. W.O.

(7) Utrum positivum vel privativum formaliter opponatur peccato. W.O.

(8) Utrum Antichristus possit esse diabolus incarnatus. W.O.

(9) Utrum diabolum esse sit naturali racione probabile. W.O.

(10) Utrum ad omnem accionem cause secunde efficiencis cause prime necessario requiratur. W.O.

(11) Utrum illud quod nunc est, pro nunc sit possibile quod non est nunc. O. (referred to in W.)

(12) Utrum aliqua proposicio significans precise Deum non esse contradiccionem includat. O.(referred to in W.)

(13) Utrum voluntas data quodcumque obiectum possit essencialiter declinare fidem in illud tendere. W.

(14) Utrum universum sit totum in toto et totum in qualibet parte . W. (referred to in O.)

(15) Utrum beate Virgo fuit concepta in originali peccato. W.

(16) Ad rogatum cuiusdam socii reverendi tractabo istum articulum. Utrum aliqua sit distincio que non est racionis nec realis. W.

---

(1) Cf. article by Pelster in Miscellanea Ehrle, p.336. Munster University Library Cod.175 contains miscellaneous questiones of Crathorn, Henry Hager, John of Paris, Erveus Nedellec, and others not yet identified.
For a fuller description of this manuscript see, J. Koch, 'Durandus de S. Porciano O.P.,'in Beitrage zur geschichte der philosophie des Mittelalters,xxvi,1 (Munster 1927)p.149-50.

The questions (11) and (12) although not found in full, are referred to in the Worcester manuscript. On f.43ra we read :

> 'Iuxta materias tactas intribus argumentis factis ad partem affirmativam questionis formo michi tres articulos. Isto die pretractandus est iste: Utrum omnem veritatem creatam..... .....Articulus secundus est iste: Numquid veritas increata sit contingencia antecedens respectu actus sui ad extra.....Trecius articulus tractandus est iste: Utrum aliqua proposicio significans precise veritatem increatam non esse contradiccionem includat.....

which corresponds to question (12).

On f.50rn we find:

> 'Alias posui talem conclusionem quod est nunc et pro nunc, est possibile quod non sit nunc.....'

which is a reference to question (11). In the same way question (14) Utrum universum..... is merely referred to in the Oriel manuscript. On f.210vb we read:

> 'patebit in declaracione illius questionis: Totum universum in toto et totum in qualibet parte cuili et catholico dub a est conclusio.'

Question (13) Utrum voluntas.....though not found in the Oriel Manuscript is intimately connected with the question: Utrum positivum... explicitly ascribed to Aston in Oriel. We read, in the Worcester text, these words: 'Pro declaracione istius questionis etc. quaero istum articulum: Utrum positivum...' There cannot be any doubt, therefore, that this questio is also his. There is no external evidence that the last two questions (15), (16), belong to Aston; from the fact that they are intermingled with his questions we may infer that they are his, but we cannot assert this with certainty. Aston's interest in the controversy on 'relations' supports the attribution of question (16) to his authorship. In fact he relates in Worcester f.43 the discussions on the matter:

> 'In primo articulo declarabitur numquid relaciones sunt res vel non quia magna altercacio est inter doctores de relacionibus, et non in arcium inscriptis doctorum, quod videtur uni probare distincionem respectuum ab absolutis, quod non videtur alteri probare. Et multi hiis diebus negantes aliquas relaciones distingui ab absolutis incidunt in magna inconveneincia, concedentes proposicionem falsam signare precise sicut est. Et plures dicentes relaciones distingui ab absolutis concedunt maiorem inconvenienciam, puta, quod tot fuerunt res ante creacionem mundi sicut iam sunt. Et isto die veritas demonstrabitur ita quod non oportet amplius esitare numquid sint res vel non.'

Thus we possess 14 questions which belong certainly to Aston. Question (1) is found in the three manuscripts; (2) to (10) in the Worcester and Oriel; (11) and (12) in Oriel only; (13) and (14) in Worcester only.

A comparison between the Worcester and the Oriel manuscripts shows that the text of the Worcester is earlier and represents more faithfully Aston's actual lectures. This can be illustrated by question (10) which is transcribed in the Text, pp.142-163. Moreover the order of the questions in the Worcester manuscript is logical and connected, whereas in the Oriel it betrays some confusion. For instance we read in Oriel f.212rb:

> 'loquendo de persona sicut locutus fui in declaracione illius questionis, quod quilibet habet de socio suo dubitare numquid sit Antichristus'

which presupposes that the question has already taken place; in the Oriel manuscript it is met with two questions later. In Worcester manuscript it is found in its right place. (f.60vb-61vb) The conclusion suggests itself that the Worcester <u>questiones</u> are closer to the lecture-room, and imply a more careful redaction, and that the Oriel <u>questiones</u> may have been a copy of the published version in which direct references to the lecture-room were eliminated. For instance in Worcester f.43rc we read

> 'et possibilitas casus patet per Magistrum reverendum qui tercio loco intravit ad sentencias isto anno, qui dicit quod idem corpus....'

whereas in the Oriel f.211va: 'patet pet opinantem quod idem corpus.....'

Besides these <u>questiones</u> Aston refers to a treatise 'De Insolubilibus' which he had probably written. In Worcester f.49va:

> 'Ideo negandum quod nulla negativa proposicio signat sicut est, ut alias probam in tractatu de insolubilibus.'

and in Oriel f.211va:

> 'Sed transeo quia alias tradam solucionem insolubilium in quodam tractatu ad hoc specialiter deputato.'

No bibliographer mentions this treatise, and therefore we cannot

assert anything without further evidence.

---

3. Uthred of Boldon (? Bolton) O.S.B.

Uthred, the greatest and most interesting of the Durham monk-scholars, (1) has come down to us as a controversialist against the mendicant friars in the second half of the fourteenth century, which is why he was mistakenly regarded as a follower of Wyclif. (2) The main source for the biography of Uthred is the early fifteenth century 'Vita Compendiosa Uthredi, monachi Dunelmensis', written probably by John Wessington, Oxford graduate and prior of Durham, 1416-28: it gives the main chronology of the activities, both monastic and scholastic, of Uthred. (3)

For the sake of clarity we give it in full:

'Vita compendiosa Uthredi, monachi Dunelmensis.
Memorandum quod anno dni 1333 primo ad Bolton ad festum Michaelis.
Item anno etc. 34' ad Newark ad festum Michaelis.
Item anno etc. 37' ad festum Purificacionis ad London, et in
Quadragesima ante festum Sti.Cuthberti ad Oxon.
Item anno etc. 41' in crastino Ebbe ad habitum monachorum.
Item anno etc. 44' ad festum Michaelis ad Stamford.
Item anno etc. 47' ad festum etiam S. Michaelis ad Oxon.
Item anno etc. 52' in crastino Mathie licenciatus ad opponendum.
Item anno etc. 54' licenciatus ad lecturam sentenciarum circa
festum Symonis et Jude.
Et continuavit etc. anno etc. 56'.
Item anno etc. 57' circa Pascha intravit ad lecturam Biblie et
statim post ad librum alium Biblie breviorem.
Item anno etc. 57' incepit post festum Dionisii 13 die Octobris.
Item anno etc. 67' primo prior de Fynchall ad festum Laurencii
Item anno etc. 68' supprior post festum Purificacionis.
Item anno etc. 73' ultra mare post Pentecostem.
Item anno etc. 75' secundo prior de Fynchall ad Pentecostem.
Item anno etc. 81' secundo supprior ante festum Ascencionsis.
Item anno etc. 83' iterum Oxon. ad morandum ad festum Michaelis.
Item anno etc. 86' tercio prior de Fynchall ad Pentecostem.
Item anno etc. 92' in crastino Ebbe annus jubileus.
Obiit vero 5 Kal. Februarii anno Dni etc. 1396.
Sepultus est in ecclesia celle de Fynchall ante introitum chori.'

The date of Uthred's birth is usually given as 1315, but Marcett

---

(1) Chapters of the English Black Monks, ed. W.A.Pantin (Camden Soc.) II, xviii

(2) A.Wood, History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford, (Oxford, 1792), II, p.491.

(3) Brit.Mus.Add.MS.6162, fo.31b. It was printed by Hearne in the Vita Ricardi II, app.p.357; and in the Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, July 1925, p.46. Other sources are Leland 392-3 ; Bale, vi,53; Index 462-4; Pitts, 528; Tanner 743; R.B.Hepple 'Uthred of Boldon', in Archeologia Aeliana, third series, xvii(1920)153-168; D.N.B., xx, 17-18;

states without evidence, that the date has no validity.(1) A.F.Pollard and others give 1315 as the year of his birth, on the supposition that by the first known date, 1333, when he seems to have been already connected with Durham, he was 18 years of age.

The first three dates given in the Vita show his journeys to Bolton in 1333, to Newark on the feast of St. Michael, September 29,1334, and to London on the feast of the Purification, February 2, 1337. Pollard says that Uthred was sent to the cell of Bolton, belonging to Durham, and supposes that he joined the benedictines a year earlier; but Marcett rightly points out that there was no cell at Bolton at that time. The mystery of these dates is further intensified by the fact that Uthred is said to have been sent to Oxford in Lent of 1337, and that he received the benedictine habit on the morrow of the feast of St Ebbe in 1341. This latter date is confirmed by the fact that in 1392 he celebrated the jubilee, presumably of his profession. But what about the other dates ? It is very difficult to explain the connection with Durham before 1341, and this seems to have been the reason for recording the above d dates - unless we suggest the possibility that while still a secular he was under the care of, or studying at, Durham monastery. (2) He may have been sent as a secular to study arts

---

(1) Marcett, Utred of Bolton, William Jordan and Piers Plowman New York,1938,p.2. This is the first complete biography besides the article by Pollard in the D.N.B., and that of Hepple in Archeolgia Aeliana, and Pantin, op cit. III,318.

(2) Mr. Pantin has published some Durham letters in which monk-scholars at Oxford interceded for some secular students, who were studying under their care, and whom they were maintaining. One of the students seems to have been maintained for eight years by a monk at Oxford. These students would belong to the same class as the eight secular scholars or pueri drawn from Durham, Allertonshire and Howdenshire, who figure in Bishop Hatfield's constitution for Durham College. W.A.Pantin, Letters from Durham Registers c.1360-90, in Oxford Formularies, (new series ; I,p.217. For the letters relating to our matter see nos.9,12,13,14,15 and 17.

at Oxford and then later on have become a benedictine. We cannot be sure of this without further evidence.

We know for certain that he became monk in 1341, and in less than three years attained to the priesthood. (1) On the feast of St Michael 1344 he went to Stamford, and on the same date in 1347 he went to Oxford and most probably started his theological course at the University, because five years later exactly, according to the statutes, i.e. in 1352, he was licenced to oppose, and then in 1354 to lecture on the sentences; this he began to do on the feast of St Simon and Jude, Oct. 28, 1355, continuing during 1356, presumably for the three statutory terms; by Easter, 1357, he begun his biblical lectures, on one book of the Old and another of the New Testament. Then he had to preach and oppose all the masters in theology; finally after the feast of St Denis Oct. 1357, he incepted. His stay at Oxford during his theological course is easily traced from the Durham account rolls, especially during the years 1348-9, when expenses were paid for Uthred and the scholars studying at Oxford, and 1357, when contributions were made by Durham, Jarrow and Wearmouth monasteries for the inception of Uthred. (2) From 1347 to 1357 he was probably at Oxford, where he spent some time after his inception as warden of Durham College, except for short intervals during which he was occupied with the business of his order; thus he took part in the general chapters of 1358 and 1360 at Northampton, in 1363 he acted as definitor, and in 1364 he went to Alverton to confer with the bishop.(3) During

---

(1) Reg. Palatinum Dunelmense (Rolls Ser.) III, pp. 118, 131, 139, 143. Uthred was ordained acolyte at Durham Cathedral on the feast of St Mathias, October 1342; subdeacon Dec. 20, 1343; deacon Feb. 28, 1344; and priest on the vigil of the Holy Trinity 1344, by Richard, bishop of Bizaccia.

(2) Cf. Marcett, op. cit. p. 9; Hepple, op. cit., p. 153; the article on 'Some Durham College Rolls' in Collectanea III, p. 23, by H. E. D. Blakiston, where he says that in 1359 Jarrow paid 20s. for the inception of Uthred, and adds that such payment was seldom made except to the Prior or Warden.

(3) Cf. Tantin, op. cit., III, 318; Marcett, op. cit.,

his stay at Oxford he was engaged in some controversies with the friars. They opened with the usual attack on the mendicant state of the friars, but came to a serious end, when the friars accused Uthred of holding heretical opinions. He wrote a short treatise on mendicancy and another, in which he refuted the charge of heresy. (1)

On 25 August 1367 he was elected prior of Finchale, in 1371 subprior of Durham, went to Avignon as a member of the commission in 1373, attended the famous council at Westminster at which he maintained the temporal authority of the Pope, only to retract the following day; was reappointed prior of Finchale in 1375, and subprior of Durham in 1381, reelected prior of Finchale in 1386 and 1392, and probably according to Wessington, died in office on January 28, 1396. (2). He was buried before the entrance to the choir in the church at Finchale.

Writings. (3)

This list is taken from Marcett's book, where she gives full details of the manuscripts where they are to be found.

Non extant.
1. De Divina Predestinatione.
2. Contra Blasphemos in Christum.
3. De Regia Dignitate Christi.
4. De Variacione professionis monachorum et aliorum.
5. De non auferendis ecclesie possessionibus ministris abutentibus.
6. De Diligendis inimicis.

Extant.
7. De Regalia et sacerdocio.
8. De naturali et necessaria connexione ac ordine sacerdotalis officii et regalis.
9. De Dotacione ecclesie Christi.
10. Contra garrulos dotacionem ecclesie impugnantes.
11. De Ecclesia Militante.
12. De Perfeccione ecclesie draduali.
13. De Eucharistie Sacramento.
14. De Esu et abstinencia carnium.
15. De Precepto et dispensacione.
16. De Substancialibus regule monachalis.

---

(1) We shall treat this matter elsewhere, and give a summary of the first work. Cf.123 sq., and for the summary, p.144.

(2) For the list of the priors of Finchale, see Surtees Society 6,p.xxv-xxxii. Uthred is said to have been prior in 1390, (Ibid.p.xxvii,xxviii) but we have the compotus up to 1395, and a report on the state of Finchale priory left by Uthred on the feast of St Dunstan, 1397. He may have died just after this date and not in 1396.

(3) Cf.W.A.Pantin,"Catalogue of the books of Durham College,Oxford c.1390-1400". in Oxford Formularies.I(1942)p.240-245

17. De perfectione vivendi.
18. Meditaciones devote.
19. Pro Monachis veris.
20. Contra Querelas Fratrum.

In addition to these works we know of two more, one of which belongs to the scholastic period, the other, to the controversy with the friars after his inception, some time before 1368.

I. The first is a disputation of which only the conclusions are reported, and is found in Worcester Cathedral Library MS.F.65 f.91v.

> 'Utrum pro via et pro patria sit status hominis suis intrinsecis correspondens'

The name 'Utredus' is written in the margin. Three of the conclusions deal with his favourite theme of man's knowledge of his end, and the remediability or irremediability of the sin committed with or without this clear vision. They are connected with the articles which the friars collected from his disputations and lectures at Oxford.

On the same folio there is a conclusion probably belonging to Uthred, on the theory of annihilation, which he rejected.

> 'Conclusio:Etsi aliqua sit creatura creabilis a Deo quam non potest Deus in esse conservare, aliqua tamen potest esse creatura non plus ens quam illa data, quam non potest Deus adnichilare.'

In the same manuscript ff.7r. and 11v. there are two disputations directed against Uthred, and in which some of his opinions are attacked. The second is explicitly ascribed to Hatton or Atton, and probably also the first.

F.7r:'Utrum quodlibet suppositum nature humane videbit Verbum incarnatum Dei salutar.'

F.11v:'Contra Utredum. Replicacio eiusdem(Atton) in materia clare visionis, ubi dicitur quod nullus potest subito mori.'

II. The second is the <u>questio</u> against the friars on the subject of mendicancy; this escaped the notice of Marcett, who said that it was not extant. It is found in <u>Paris Bibl.Nat.Lat. 3183</u> (Regius 3911) ff.160v-168. and on f.169r. there are '<u>Argumenta Utredi de mendicitate</u>.'

The treatment is purely scholastic, and Uthred does not seem to have had in mind any particular adversary, although

f.165, he says: 'Sed forsan dicet adversarius'. This is too vague to support any conclusion. He speaks in general of the mendicant friars. It is very surprising not to find any reference to Richard Fitzralph.

---

4. Adam Easton

The life of the famous Benedictine, Cardinal Adam Easton, falls into two periods:- the first, from his birth to 1368, includes his student life, doctorate and the appointment to the Roman Curia in 1368; the second, from this date, when he probably went to Rome, till his death in 1397. The second period is well known, both because of his prominent position as Cardinal of the Church, and also because it coincided with the schism and many other events, which have been recorded in detail. So we shall concentrate mainly on the first period which is not well known, and the study which is in these biographical notices of the students mentioned in our manuscript will serve to throw light on the period covered by it.

All Easton's bibliographers say that he was of humble parentage, and that his name may denote his birthplace, a village six or seven miles north west of Norwich, where he became a Benedictine. (1) He went to study at Oxford some time before 1356-7, when he journeyed back to Norwich to preach. (2) It seems that he was called several times to preach in his monastery, so that his course of study may have often been interrupted. We have some evidence of this from a letter found in the notebook of John Lawerne, monk of Worcester, who incepted D.D. in 1448. (3)

---

(1) ; Bale, Index, 4-6; Catalogus, vi, 15, 516-17; Pitts, 548; and the article by R.L. Poole in D.N.B., vi, 333.

(2) Chapters of the English Black Monks, 1215-1540, edited W.A. Pantin, (Camden Series xlvii) ii, 28, where he gives a selected biographical notice on several prominent benedictine monks. We shall make extensive use of the results of the research of Mr. Pantin on the English Benedictines.

(3) MS. Bodley 692, fol. 116. It was edited by Mr. Pantin in the above mentioned work, III, 28-9.

From this letter it appears that Easton had been called back to his monastery, because there was a shortage of good, qualified preachers among the Norwich monks who might repel the attacks of the mendicant friars. At this time, Easton was one of the only three monk bachelors at Oxford, and was called 'seniorem et.....proximiorem ad bravium doctorale.'

The students at Oxford had asked the Prior to send him back to continue his studies, but he replied that he could not spare him till the next year 'anno proximo futuro', because there was no other sufficiently learned to repel the attacks of the mendicant friars. The date of this letter is not given, but we can make some conjectures. We know that Brinton his fellow student and bachelor at the time of the letter was already D.D. and proctor at the Curia in Jan.31,1364, presumably after he had finished his regency 1362-3; in 1362-3 Easton was at Oxford when, no doubt, the stipulated year had elapsed; then, in 1365-6 we find a contribution from his monastery for his inception. Taking into account all these dates, and the difference of the time between the inception of Easton and of Brinton, who was his junior, we incline to date the letter before or about 1360, (1) but certainly not later than 1364.

Are the complaints against the friars part of the widespread quarrel between seculars and monks on one hand, and the mendicants on the other ? At that time the quarrel was at its height, and both parties were anxious for a decision in the process which was being conducted in the Papal Curia by the representative of the seculars, Richard Fitzralph, archbishop of Armagh, who died toward the end of 1360.

In a letter from the abbot of St Albans, Set.30,1366, Easton is mentioned as Prior of the students at Oxford; how long before and after this date he was prior we cannot tell, but we know that

---

(1) For Brinton see Ibid., iii, 52., and for the other dates, Ibid., 28

on May 3, 1368, he was in Rome, when he was sent by the Pope with letters to Edward III. (1) From this date begins his public career at the court of Rome; we find him there on May 27, 1370, and he probably succeeded Brinton as proctor c.1373. (2) For the last twenty years of Easton's career we need only refer to the already mentioned works of Mr Pantin and R.L.Poole, and the sources therein cited.

Easton was a very active proctor in defence of his order, became Cardinal in 1381, and was involved in the conspiracy against Pope Urban VI; for this he was imprisoned and deprived of all his benefices in 1385, but was reinstated by the next pope, Gregory IX, in 1389; he died in Rome on Oct. 20, 1397, and was buried in the church of St Cecilia. (3)

Writings

A long list of biblical, apologetical and spiritual writings are attributed to Easton by his bibliographers. Since the appearance of the article in which Mr. Poole states that none of these works is known to be extant, Mr. Pantin with great probability has identified as Easton's the Defensorium Ecclesie, which is in the Vatican Library MS.4116, ff.1-336. This manuscript contains only one book of the whole work, which according to the prologue, consisted of six books. The prologue throws light on both the life and writings of Easton. He states there that he is a master of theology and resident at the court of Pope Urban VI who invited him to assist in judging the views, recently set forth - probably by Wyclif - on

---

(1) Cal.Pap.Reg. (Letters) iv, 27.

(2) Pantin, op.cit., iii, 28.

(3) Eubel, Hierarchia Catholica, I, c.XXVII, 26. Suffrages were asked for the soul of Easton in the General Chapter of the Dominicans held in Udine in 1401. cf. Acta Capitulorum Generalium O.P., ed. Reichert, III, 110.

the doctrine of the spiritual and temporal power of the Church; that he is a Hebrew scholar, has for twenty years been engaged on the study of the Bible and has translated parts of it from the Hebrew into Latin 'de verbo in verbum'. These facts confirm our previous knowledge, particularly in regard to his biblical writings. Mr. Pantin thinks that the Defensorium may really be identical with the Dialogus Regis et Episcopi; they are both in form of a dialogue, and may have been confused by Bale. He says also that it was possibly written between 1376-80; in confirmation of the first date we have the letter sent by Easton to the Abbot of Westminster, asking for the works written by Wyclif against the order and the Church; the second is confirmed by the fact that he dedicated his work to Urban VI, who made him Cardinal in 1381, partly perhaps because of this apologetic work.

Besides the Defensorium, we have some Questiones which belong to his student period, and one disputation on the day of his Inception, in Worcester Cathedral Library, MS.F.65:-

> F.13:'Determinacio Ade de Estone
> Utrum Adam pro statu innocencie visionem habuit immediatam divine essencie'.

This may have been the corresponding determination of the following disputation. Unfortunately there is no reference to either of them. Besides this determination we have two other Questiones, but it is difficult to tell how much really belongs to Easton; possibly they should be ascribed to Nicholas Redclyf who was respondent bachelor in both cases, while Easton was the master and inceptor, holding the disputation.

> f.20v:' Q[uestio] Estone et R[esponsio] Redeclyf
> Utrum Adam ex lege status innocencie visionem immediatam Dei essencie habuerat, sicud natura angelica optinebat.'

....f.21: 'Questio disputata in vesperiis domini Ade de Estone, monachi Norwyci, responsali Nicholao Redclyf. Utrum omne votum recte factum Deo debite sit solvendum'.

List of writings.

1. De potestate ecclesie.
2. Defensorium Ecclesie.
3. De electione Pontificis. (1)
4. De modo conferendi beneficia.
5. De forma procedendi contra hereticos.
6. Opus vitae contra hereticos.
7. De diversitate translationum.
8. Perfectio vitae spiritualis.
9. De veritate Catholica, graece.
10. Meteora Aristotelis, graece.
11. Expositio Levitici.
12. Hebraica Saraceni.
13. Epistulae duae de canonizatione Sanctae Brigidae. (Lincoln College, Oxford, M.S. 114; Bodl.Hamilton 7)
14. Defensorium illustris Sanctae Brigidae.....articulis xlii (MSS.ut supra.)

Easton is stated also to have translated the whole Bible with the exception of the Psalter, and composed the office for the feast of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin.

At Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, there are three manuscripts which seem to have belonged to Easton: (2)

i. MS.74, Beregarii Biterrensis inventarium, where we find this note: 'Liber Ecclesie Norwycensis per Mag.Adam de Eston, monachum dicti loci.'

ii. MS.180: De pauperie Salvatoris, of Richard Fitzralph, where we find: 'liber domini Ade Estone, monachi Norwycensis.'

iii. MS.347:Almanach Prophacii Judaici: Incipit exposicio quorundam terminorum astrologorum, quos scripsit frater Adam de Estone, monachus Norwycensis.'

This may be either his own work, or a copy made by him.

---

5. Nicholas Redclyf

About Redclyf's birthplace and early education we know nothing, except that he joined the Benedictines of St Albans. (3) After his study of 'arts' probably in his monastery, he was sent to Oxford and stayed at Gloucester Hall, which was the hostel of

---

(2) Catalogus MSS. of C.C.C.Cambridge,I,153,428; II,181.

(3) J.Leland, 395-6; Bale, Index,307, and Catal., vi,80,495-96; Tanner 612-13; D.N.B., XVI,576.

(1) This entry and the 'De communicatione idiomatum' appear to be later insertions. Cf.Balem 5 n.1.

the Benedictines of St Albans; we know for certain that he did his theological studies and took the doctorate at Oxford, where, as Leland says 'noctes ac dies libris incumbebat.'

In the Worcester MS.F.65, we find him bachelor respondent in the Vesperies of another Benedictine of Norwich, Adam Easton, who incepted D.D. some time in 1365-6. Taking into account this date and also the custom in the theological faculty of Oxford, according to which the bachelor respondent in the vesperies was generally the one next to incept, we may suggest that he incepted D.D. some time in 1366, adding one year of regency after the inception we arrive at the year 1368, when we find him elected prior of Wymundham. (1) He spent twelve years, i.e. up to 1380 at Wymundham in Norfolk, and then was recalled to his monastery. The clergy in a convocation at St Paul's in 1380, decreed the raising of a subsidy for the king 'pro salvacione et defensione regni sui Angliae ac Ecclesiae Anglicanae', and Henry le Despenser, bishop of Norwich, appointed Redclyf to be one of the collectors. The abbot of St Albans resented this action of the bishop for he claimed absolute jurisdiction over the prior of Wymundham, and the right to remove him from his office at will. In fact he recalled Redclyf to St Albans and appointed him archdeacon. (2) After an interchange of letters between the king, the bishop and the abbot, the quarrel was decided in favour of the monks of St Albans, whom the king, by a decree of August 21, 1380, exempted from the appointment as collectors of the subsidy. (3) Redclyf was a prominent literary antagonist of John Wyclif, whom he must have known at Oxford; when Redclyf

---

(1) Worcester Cathedral Library, MS.F.65.f.21. For Adam Easton see supra, pp.49-53. For the regency at Oxford see Little and Pelster, op.cit., p.46, 233.

(2) Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, (ed.T.B.Hardy, Oxford, 1854) II, 27n., 344n., where he says that the register of the archdeacons of St Albans starts from 1420, and also that the archdeaconry, like other offices of the monastery, depended only on the will of the abbot.

(3) For the whole quarrel see Gesta Abbatum S.Albani, (Rolls Ser.) iii, 123, 281-5, 396; Chronicon Angliae, 258; Cal.Fine Rolls., (Richard II, 1377-83) 207.

incepted some time in 1366, Wyclif was still a scholar of theology, probably in the second or third year, since he incepted in 1372. (1)

He wrote several treatises against the teaching of Wyclif, notably one on the doctrine of the Eucharist, in the form of a dialogue between himself and the Carmelite doctor, Peter Stokes, whom Wyclif called the 'black and white dogs'. (2)

He was present for the condemnation of Wyclif at the Blackfriars' Council in 1382; he also took a large part in convincing of his errors the lollard, John Aston, who was confined for some time at St Albans. (3)

In the Provincial Chapter of his order, held probably in 1393, he was elected definitor for the next chapter, together with Robert Blaclow, an Oxford D.D., and some others. (4)

He was alive for the election of the new abbot John de la Moote in October 9, 1396, when he preached a sermon in the Chapter house; he does not appear to have taken part in the election of the next abbot, William Heyworth in 1401, when Nicholas Titlynton appears as archdeacon, so he probably died somewhere between 1396 and 1401. (5) He was buried 'in ala vero australi versus cemeterium sive capitulum monachorum', next to William Heron, late prior of Wallingford. (6) The chronicler of St Albans writes of him that he was 'vir vitae venerabilis et inter doctores suis temporibus contra Johannem Wyclif, hereticum, expugnator fortissimus et doctor eximius.' (7). Leland laments 'illud aegre fero quod apud monachos albanenses ita eius gloria

---

(1) H.B.Workman, John Wyclif, I, 98; D.N.B., xxi, 1121.

(2) J.Bale, I, 495.

(3) Fasciculi Zizaniorum, 289, 332.

(4) Chapters of the English Black Monks, vol. ii, 94.

(5) Gesta Abbatum. (Rolls Series). iii, 425-6, 456; For Titlynton see Tanner 613, where he refers to Regist. Norwich, v, 84.

(6) and (7) Annales Monasterii S. Albani (Rolls Ser.) i. 436, appendix; ii, 305, appendix E.

obliterata sit, ut ne de nomine quidem istius quamvis olim archidiaconus, iam cognitus.'

Works

I. De Viatico salutari animae immortalis.....magistri Nicholai de Radclyf, doctoris eximii archidiaconi S.Albani.. Brit.Mus.Roy.MS.6Dx.f.144.
Harley MS.635,f.202b(art.12) contains some extracts, and on f.205 there is an 'Invectio contra errores Wyclif'. Leland says that he saw it in Queen's College, Cambridge. cf.Collectanea iii,18.

II. Questiones, which include three treatises:

i.De voto religionis: Utrum vota religionis castitatis et virginitatis preter legem evangelican a sanctis patribus introducta et iura ecclesiastica approbata sint licite et meritorie observanda.....f.229
ii.De imaginum cultu: Utrum sit licitum christiano ymagines crucifixi et piissime sue matris ac aliorum sanctorum devota instancia adorare.....f.274.
Another copy of this is in 10Dx.art.2 in the Brit.Mus.
iii. De Schismate: Utrum pro scandalo schismatis pravitatis cedando dominus papa Bonifacius una cum antipapa cedere teneatur.....f.227b.
Brit.Mus.Roy.MS.6Dx.

III. Dialogue in six treatises between Nicholas and Peter on the following subjects:-

Inc.(f.2.) Petrus. Reverende magister et domine prout auribus meis.....
i. De primo homine: Petrus. Reverende magister.....
ii.De dominio naturali: Nicolaus. Petrus finito primo...
iii.De obediencial dominio: Petrus. dominium naturale..
iv.De dominio regali et iudiciali: Petrus. Totis...
v.De potestate Petri apostoli et successorum: Petrus. Salvatorem nostrum pro statu.....
vi.De eodem argumento:contra Wiclevum: Petrus.Perge quero ulterius.....
Brit.Mus.Roy.MS.6Dx.

Nearly all the extant works of Redclyf appear to have been directed against the different teachings of Wyclif: thus we may conclude that they were not written before 1378, when Wyclif published his first theological treatise, De Veritate S. Scriptu-re; all the other works attacked by Redclyf were published after that date. This conclusion is also applicable to the treatise on the schism, which began in 1378.
Besides these contraversial works written when he was master of theology, we have some disputations which belong to the period when he was a bachelor, presumably during the last year before the doctorate.

Worcester Cath. Library MS.F.65.

fol.1v: Redclyf: Conclusio prima in materia propheciarum.
(contains five conclusions)

fol.8v: Redclyf. Primus articulus. Utrum sicud in homine es eteromogeneis resultat forma una, sic ex compositis in mundo resultet una forma que dicitur anima mundi.....
Secundus articulus est: Utrum Salvator pro statu vie mediante specie creata naturalem intuicionem divine essencie obtinebat.....
Tercius articulus est: Utrum tam sensitiva quam intellectiva intuicio qua in patria quis premiabitur, terminetur ad divinam essenciam obiective.....

fol.20v: Questio Estone et Responsio Redeclif.
Utrum Adam ex lege status innocencie visionem immediatam Dei essencie habuerat sicud natura angelica optinebat.....

fol.21: Questio disputata in vesperiis domini Ade de Estone, monachi Norwyci, responsali Nicholao Redclyf.
Utrum omne votum recte factum Deo debite sit solvendum....

---

6. William Trevelleys

William Trevelleys is not mentioned by any bibliographer; the only record we have is the short notice given by J. Magrath in the history of Queen's College, Oxford. His long and uninterrupted connection with Exeter, certainly since 1354, suggests that he was a Devonshireman, but we ahve no record of his actual birthplace. He was probably born some time about 1330; we know that in 1361 he was master of arts and bachelor of theology; assuming considerable breaks in his study due to the Black Death and the Great slaughter, we may suggest that he came to Oxford at some time before 1350, when he was between 16 and 20 years old. Of his early years and study we know nothing. The first date recorded is 1354, when a 'master William Trevelleys, subdeacon,' was given dimissorial letters for his ordination to the diaconate and priesthood. (1) He was eventually ordained deacon on May 30, 1355, by the Bishop of Winchester in the chapel of Southwark Manor. (2)

---

(1) The Register of John de Grandisson, (ed. F.C. Hingeston-Randolph 1897) II, 1134. 'ad ordines diaconatus et presbiteratus....ad titulum abbatis et conventus Tavystochie penes regestrum residentem.' (Chudleigh Sept. 21, 1354)

(2) Ibidem II, 1157.

We know for certain that in 1361, when he was M.A. and bachelor of theology, he was chosen together with Henry Upton and William de Wilton to be admitted fellows of Queen's one after the other, the vacancies being caused by the plague. (1) He is found a fellow before July 12, 1362, and as late as 1367. (2)
In 1363, while still a bachelor, he was on the list of Oxford masters presented to the Pope for benefices, and a canonry with expectation of a prebend at Exeter was petitioned for him. (3) Probably this was granted not very long after, because on July 18, 1366, a certain William Trevelleys, king's clerk, was ratified as prebendary in the church of Exeter. (4) He received his doctorate probably in 1365-6 and left Oxford between 1367 and 1372, most probably in 1369. On May 4, 1369, in a citation against Adam Tonworth the newly elected chancellor of Oxford, he is mentioned as 'magister et rector medietatis ecclesie de Westburgh'. (5) On August 28, 1372, as canon of Exeter, he and two other canons were nominated by the dean and chapter to visit their farms and the clergy and people; (6) and on August 20, 1373, when for the first time he is recorded as an S.T.P., he was appointed 'ad gubernandum et regendum hospitale Sancti Gabrielis de Clist.....et presbiteros aliasque personas debiles inibi degentes.' (7) This may imply that he was then a resident canon, because as custos or warden of the hospital he had 'to guard the interests and superintend the administration

---

(1) J. Magrath, The Queen's College, (Oxford 1921), I, 103, n.1.

(2) Ibidem, I, 104. He is to be found in the Long Rolls 1360-1, 1361-2. See also p.79, n.1.

(3) Cal. Pap. Reg. (Pet. I.) 403.

(4) Cal. Pat. Rolls (1366) 229.

(5) Snappe's Formulary (ed. H. E. Salter, O.H.S. vol. 80.) p. 86.

(6) Reg. Brantingham, I, 143.

(7) Ibid. 150. For this hospital see Oliver's Monasticon Exoniense 253-7. He says that frequently a canon of Exeter Cathedral or some respectable ecclesiastic, occasionally the rector of Sowton, was appointed by the bishop warden of this hospital.

of this valuable and benevolent institution.'

On October 2, 1376, he exchanged the rectory of Westborough for that of Stoke Climsland, which he kept till March 10, 1377, when he exchanged it for that of Hemyock. (1) In August 1377, he was appointed vicar general during the Bishop's absence from the diocese on the king's service; (2) on April 7, 1378, while still vicar, he was dispensed from residence for five years. (3) Why was this ? Certainly it was not for the purpose of study, nor even for reasons of health, because he was very active during these years. It is very surprising to find that before the close of the five years' dispensation and previous to March 1383, he resigned the rectory of Hemyock. During the years 1377-82 he was fully engaged in the business of the diocese, (5) and was apparently still vicar in 1381, when a list of benefices was filled up by 'mag. Willelmum Trevelleys, vicarium domini in hac parte in beneficiis suis.' (6) During the visitation of the diocese by Archbishop Courtenay of Canterbury, on February 23, 1383/4, he was listed as resident canon, and on August 3, 1384 was 'custos hospitalis Sancti Johannis' for the election of the master of the same hospital. (7) According to Le Neve, (8) Trevelleys became treasurer of Exeter in 1387, in

---

(1) Reg. Brantingham, I, 45,53.

(2) Ibid. 154. For Brantingham see J.Oliver, Lives of the Bishops of Exeter,89-94; H.B.Workman,John Wyclif,II,259; and D.N.B. Suppl.260-1 article by A.F.Pollard.

(3) Ibid.386.

(4) Ibid.76.

(5) Ibid.63-4., 156, 412-3, 435. He was a member of the commission for the election of the abbot of Tavistock; he was sent to investigate on the observance of the collegiate church of Ottery St Mary,and on some other minor business.

(6) Ibid. 73.

(7) Ibid.516,552. For this hospital see Oliver, Monasticon,399-11. where he says that Richard Wodeford was elected.

(8) Le Neve, Fasti...I,415. He says that Trevelleys held this office in 1387 and 1389, giving as sources Reg.Heref.et MS. penes Dec.et Cap.Exon.; Oliver, Lives of the Bishops of Exeter, 283; and Reg. Stafford,356.

succession to Robert Br oke. In this capacity he took part in the condemnation of the Lollard, Walter Brut, on October 3, 1393; with him there was another doctor of Oxford, the Benedictine John Greene, prior of Worcester. (1)

Trevelleys must have died some time before September 1399, because on the 25th of the same month, John Doyntton is said to have succeeded him on his death. (2) He is not mentioned in the Obituary Book of Queen's College. Trevelleys did not forget his college; he left it a 'portiphorium'; in fact in the Long Rolls 1399-1400, we find that a sum of 7s.8d. was paid to R. Brown 'pro portacione magni portiphorii de Exonia.' (3)

From these scanty notices we can surmise with some probability that Trevelleys was an ecclesiastical dignitary rather than a schoolman. There is no record which mentions him as having taken any part in the government of his college or university, or having held any academical office. That is perhaps the reason why he was not mentioned by any bibliographer. Either none of his works are extant or none have yet been identified. We have only the three determinations in Worcester MS.F.65,

f.5: 'Determinacio Trevelleys.
Utrum prophecie et dicta sacre Scripture de die judicii et adventu Antichristi sint vera et infallibiliter asserenda.'

f.25v: 'Determinacio Magistri W. Trevelleys.
Preter scienciam Christi qua est ipse Deus, et preter scienciam in Verbo, habuit Christus scienciam aliam adquisitam in qua proficiebat.'

f.25v: 'Alia determinacio eiusdem.
Utrum necesse sit omnia assertive dicta a Johanne in Apocalypsi et aliis prophetiis in Sacra Scriptura esse, fore vel fuisse vera.'

---

(1) Reg.Joh.Trefnant, Ep.Heref. (Cant. and York Soc. 20), 359.

(2) See note (8) supra.

(3) Magrath, op.cit., I, 74n.3.

7. Tonworth Adam ? Richard ?

MS. Worcester Cath.Lib.F.65 ascribes a question to Tonworthe without giving any hint as to his identity. We know of two Oxford masters, Adam and Richard Tonworth, who both came from the diocese of Worcester and were scholars of theology at the same period; thus it is very difficult to determine without further evidence to whom the question should be ascribed. We give a short account of the career of each.

Adam de Tonworth

Not one of the bibliographers mentions Adam, and of his early years and education we know absolutely nothing, except that he belonged to the diocese of Worcester. The first date we have is 1372 when he was already Rector of Whitechurch in Worcester, and was given by the Pope a canonry and prebend of Lichfield. (1) In the list presented by the university to the Pope, he appears as master of arts and doctor of medicine; he is among the non-regent masters, which together with the fact that he incepted some time before 1366, shows that he had already commenced his theological course. In this year, 1366, he succeeded John de Edingham as chancellor of the university, and was still chancellor in June 3, 1367, when he resigned. (2) He was elected for the second period before May 4, 1369; contrary to custom, he did not ask for the confirmation of the bishop, and was therefore cited to appear before the latter on the ground that he had made use of ecclesiastical censures without authority which was automatically conferred by the confirmation. He refused to appear and firmly withstood the bishop. At last the Pope intervened. In June 10, 1370, he issued a Bull by which

---

(1) Cal.Pap. Reg.(Pet.I) 390.

(2) Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae,III, 465; Wood, Fasti Oxon.,328; Cal.Pat.Rolls(1364-67)278. As chancellor of the university he was directed by the king to deliver a Spanish dominican friar, Michael de Polo, who was wndering from one country to another, to Robert, prior provincial of the same order in England; Snappe's Formulary, 86n87, 329-33. Mun.Acad. I,226.

he exempted in perpetuity the chancellor of the university from the confirmation of the bishop; with this privilege a longstanding quarrel between the chancellor and the bishop came to an end. (1) From a letter to the Dean of the Arches in February 27, 1377, Tonworth appears to have been elected chancellor for the third period, and was still in office on October 20 of the same year.(2) As to his ecclesiastical career, Le Neve states that Tonworth was said to have been prebendary of Sandiacre in Lichfield, and died in possession of the benefice in 1382; but he adds, that John Cheyne who filled this office in June 1382, was said to have been collated on the deat of Mastang, their predecessor.(3) Of his literary activity we know nothing. Apparently he was more of an official than a writer, and this is perhaps the reason why none of the bibliographers mention him.

Richard Tonworth

Richard, like Adam, came from the diocese of Worcester. He is said to have been a fellow of Merton College in 1352 and 1360. (4) He also took part in the government of the university, and especially of some of the Halls. He was proctor, together with Robert Derby, in 1358 under the chancellorship of Humphrid de Charlton, and also in 1360, under Nicholas Aston. (5) In 1359-60 he was bursar, and afterwards, till 1378, principal of Hart Hall and Black Hall, where some of the Wykamist scholars were sheltered

---

(1) Snappe's Formulary,45; Rashdall, History of the Universities of Europe,...., III, 124,n.3; Mun.Acad.,229;Cal.Pap.Reg. IV,66, 83

(2) Snappe's Formulary, 311,329,34; Le Neve, op.cit.,III,465; Woody Fasti Oxon.,328, where he says that Tonworth was chancellor also in 1378; Collectanea,III,143.

(3) Le Neve, op.cit., II,624.

(4) Brodrick, Memorials of Merton College,(O.H.S.1885) 214.

(5) S.Gibson, Statuta.....127, 158, 163; Brodrick, op.cit.,214; Wood, Fasti.....,397; Mun Acad.,I, 201.

while New College was being built, which is the reason why he is sometimes reckoned as first warden of the College. (1)

In 1362, while he was a scholar of theology, he was granted a benefice of the gift of the bishop of Winchester; and in 1366 he was still called 'scholar of theology.' (2)

While rector of Brightwall, in the diocese of Salisbury, he was ordained deacon on Feb. 28, 1366, and priest on March 13, 1367, by Simon Sudbury, bishop of London, in the chapel of St Mary in the Cathedral. (3) In 1374 he was admitted prebendary of Colwich and Lichfield, and is said to have died in 1379, probably while still principal of Hart Hall, since we then find notice of his successor. (4)

Of his literary activity nothing is known.

From these few notices we can easily see that it is very difficult to say to which of the two Tonworths the question of the Worcester collection should be ascribed, for they were both at Oxford at the same time. One inclines to the view that Adam is the author, but without further evidence, no final decision is possible.

Worc. Cath. Lib. MS. F. 65, f. 19r. Tonworthe

'Item adnichilacio est maxima pena que potest esse.....'

---

8. Atton or Hatton

Atton or Hatton was a very common name in the fourteenth century, and therefore it is difficult to identify the person mentioned in the Worcester MS. His active part in the controversy between the Friars and the Benedictine, Uthred of

---

(1) Brodrick, op. cit. 214; Wood, History of the University of Oxford, (ed. Gutch 1792) 187; Maxwell Lyte, History of the University of Oxford, 185; Rashdall, History....., III, 214; Le Neve, op. cit., III, 581, 554.

(2) Cal. Pap. Reg. (Pet. I) 392, 515.

(3) Register of Simon Sudbury, (Cant. and York Soc.) II, 40, 46

(4) Brodrick, op. cit., 214; Le Neve, op. cit., II, 591.

Boldon, suggests that he was a Friar. He must have been one of the Friar Regent masters who disputed hotly in the schools against Uthred. The <u>questiones</u> attributed to him in the Worcester MS. show clearly his controversial spirit.

I. <u>John Acton</u> was a writer on canon law; was canon of Lincoln and prebendary of Welton Royal, and died some time in 1350. (Cf. <u>D.N.B.</u>, I, 67.)

II. <u>Ralph Acton</u> lived in the first half of the 14th century, was probably educated at Oxford, graduated in Philosophy and Theology, and was a biblical scholar. (Cf.<u>D.N.B.</u>, I, 68-9)

III.<u>John Acton, the Dominican</u>, is most likely to be the 'Atton' of the Worcester manuscript. He was probably educated at Oxford and graduated there and was well versed in theology.

He is said to have written a treatise 'Pro Pace Ecclesie,lib.I and some 'Conciones et lectiones, lib.I.' (Cf. <u>Leland</u> ,414; <u>Bale</u>, VII,46; <u>Pitts</u>, 592; <u>Tanner</u>, 3; and <u>Quetif Echard</u>,I, 721.) In the chapter of the Dominicans under the obedience of Clement VII, held at Avignon on the feast of Pentecost, May 17, 1388, he was one of the masters of theology who were appointed proctors and sent to Clement VII, in connection with the controversy between the Dominicans and the University of Paris on the question of Montesono's errors, particularly on the Immaculate Conception. (<u>Chart.Univ.Par.</u>,III,p.500, no.1562, and Add. p.663; <u>Quetif Echard</u>, I, 693). At this time he was penitentiary of Pope Clement VII who in 1390, sent him with 'Egidio episc. Vaurensi', to Philip, duke of Burgundy in connection with the schism. (<u>Chart.</u>... III, Add.667). He is said to have written against the letter about the schism sent by the University of Paris to the king of France in 1394 (<u>Chart.</u>....III, Add.624n.) This may be his treatise on the question of the schism.

<u>Questiones attributed to Atton in Worcester MS.F.65</u>

f.11v: <u>Determinacio Hatton.</u>
Questio: Utrum Christus sua simpla morte nobis meruit duplam vitam.

f.11v. <u>Determinacio Atton.</u>
Opinio quod natura humana in Christo est persona.

f.11v. Contra Utredum.
Replicacio eisudem in materia clare visionis ubi dicitur quod nullus potest subito mori.

f. 12r. Atton
Utrum Verbum incarnatum per sacramentum penitencie deleat reatum culpe.

f.7r. /Atton/ ?
Utrum quodlibet suppositum nature humane videbit Verbum incarnatum Dei salutare.

---

9. Botilston

Botilston seems to have been a common name in the fourteenth century. I have traced three Botilstons in the second half of the fourteenth century, but I cannot say without further evidence which is the one mentioned in the Worcester MS. The first was contemporary with Nicholas Aston, and belongs to the same College.

I. Galphridus Botilstone, apparently proctor of Queen's College; in the Long Roll of 1351-2 there is a payment to:'Galphrido de Botilston procuratori domus contra executorer Cundale.' Magrath says that it is probably he, who as proctor, accompanied Provost Hotham, the chancellor, to London in January 1357-8, in connection with a dispute about John de Kedyngton, Austin Friar. (Magrath, Queen's College, I,91,n.7; and Salter, Medieval Archives, I,175.)

II. Roger de Botilstone, a Friar Minor, who was ordained acolyte Dec.15,1350, and subdeacon March 12, 1357. (Reg.Joh.de Trillek, Cant.and York Soc.,p.456)

III. Robert de Botilstone, a Benedictine monk of Clifford, who was ordained priest Dec.20, 1380. (Reg.Joh.de.Trillek,Cant.and York Soc., p.48).

Questio attributed to Botilston in Worcester MS.F.65.

f.6r. Botilston
Utrum anima beatissime Marie post incarnacionis in ea celebratum misterium meritorie magnificavit Deum.

II. MS. CAMBRIDGE 103.

Bekingham Edmund.

Fellow of Merton Dec., 1381-90; Warden 1398-1416. (Wood A., History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford, ed.Gutch, III, 6; Memorials of Merton College, by G.C.Brodrick, 158; Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, III, 543; Cal.Close Rolls,(Henry IV, II, 375).

D.D. of Oxford by 1405; present for the visitation of Bishop Repyngdon March 4, 1413; acted as vice-regent of the chancellor in 1414, when he was senior theologus; died in office as Warden of Merton, 1416. (Brodrick, op.cit.; Snappe's Formulary, ed. Salter, 183.)

A certain Ed. de Bikenham, S.T.P., was rector of Frythyndenne of the diocese of Canterbury, in Sept.7, 1403. (Cal.Pap.Reg., letters V, p.571).

Blaclow Robert.

Monk of Durham; at Durham College, Oxford 1379-80; Subprior Oct. 1382 and 1384-5; Prior of Durham College 1392-3; Proctor and Prior of Durham College 1402; c. 1389-1404 appears to have been appointed first Warden of the new foundation shortly before John de Berington ceased to administer the endowment; elected definitor in 1393; commissary of the visitor; on the evidence of S.St Johns Coll., Cambridge, Oxford D.D. some time before 1392; was a great preacher; died sometime c.1404, when a contribution was made 'pro animabus dominorum Rob.Blaclawe et Johannis de Houghton 20 s.' (Collectanea, III, 18-24, 56-60; Surtees Society 99, p.264; 103, p.592-3; 99,p.605 and other places; Chapters of the English Black Monks, ed. W.A.Pantin, III, 206, 212, 247-8, 314; II, 94-5.)

Cane Thomas.

Monk of St Peter's, Gloucester; ordained subdeacon by William Courtenay bishop of Hereford, in the cathedral on the Eve of Trinity Sunday, May 22, 1373. (Reg.Will.Courtenay,Cant.and York Soc.,p.36.)

In the chapter of 1393 he was already S.T.P. and elector of the president in the next chapter. (Pantin, op.cit., II, 93.)

Chardesey, Richard.

Richard Chardesey monk of St Oswald, Gloucester, was ordained acolyte on April 3, 1400, deacon April 17, 1400 and priest June 12, 1400. (Reg. Trefnant, Cant. and York Soc., p. 227)

A certain Walter Chadisley, Austin monk, was present for the condemnation of the Lollard Walter Brut in 1393. (Reg. Trefnant, 359)

The first Chardesey seems a little late, and the second, although with different name, coincides with the period of the collection.

Colby, Thomas.

Carmelite Friar; S.T.P. of Oxford before April 18, 1412, when he was provided to the see of Elphin; tr anslated to the see of Lisnor and Waterford Feb.3, 1413; died c.Feb.5, 1429. (Cal.Pap. Reg., letters VI, pp.240, 310, 443, 453; VII, p.95, 111.) For his works see Bibliothoca Carmelitana by Cosma de Villiers, ; Bale, Index, VII, 534.)

On the evidence of MS.Cambridge we know that in 1392-3 he was Prior of the Carmelites at Oxford, and was bachelor of theology.

Dudley, John.

Monk of Worcester; at Oxford c.1392-3; was sent to Oxford together with another monk Fordham in 1408 to defend the church against the attacks of divers heretics. (Leach, Early Education at Worcester, p.54-62;) Scholar at Oxford at the time of the election of the new prior Aug.22,1388; commissary of the visitor in 1399; definitor in 1399; and c.1417-20; proctor 1399, 1402; elector of the president in the chapter of July 8, 1420; and subprior of Worcester till c.1423. (Pantin, op.cit., II, 97; III, 146, 183, 189, 212, 319, 348;). Took part, as master of theology, in the condemnation of the Lollard Walter Brut in 1393 (Reg.Joh. Trefnant, Cant. and York Soc., p.359).

Fawkes, Nicholas.

Monk of Glastonbury; studied at Oxford; D.D. before Feb. 27, 1396-7; (Snappe's Formulary, p.147) Commissary of the University during the chancellorship of Thomas Hendman in 1395-6. (Wood, op.cit. III, app.34 and I, 529,532, where he mentions and attacks the opinion of William Prynne about the quarrel, in his University of Oxford's plea refuted, London, 1647, p.6,9.)

In MS.Oriel 15, f.210rb, there is a note which says that the manuscript was written 'de industria fratris Nicholai Fawkes, monachi Glastonie anno domini 1389..' And in MS.Cambridge 103, he appears as respondent in all the responsions, and most probably the other scholastic exercises belong to him.

Gray, John.

Dominican Friar; Regent master at Oxford in March, 1392-3; (Snappe's Formulary, p.9) A certain John Gray was ordained subdeacon by John Bishop Ayobanensis for the London Convent on March 27, 1372, and deacon at Stortford in London diocese on May 22, 1372, by bishop Sudbury. (Register of Simon of Sudbury, bishop of London, Cant. and York Soc. pp.113,114) A John Gray S.T.P. member of the Carlisle convent was licenced to hear confession for one year 1409-10. (Palmer, Anglia Dominicana vol. IV.D.no.4970) and (Reg.Ray.Capua, ed.Kappeli in M.O.F.P. vol.XIX, p.193)

Hendman, Thomas.

Studied at Oxford; D.D. by July 1395. (Snappe's Formulary, 36) Follow of Exeter 1383; chancellor of Oxford July 6, 1395 and resigned on or shortly after Feb.27, 1397; elected for the second period and was still in office in June 8, 1400. (Boase, Registrum Collegii Exoniensis p.21; Snappe's Formulary, 331,333; Cal.Pat.Rolls, Henry IV, 1399-1401/583; Wood, op.cit., III, app.34, and I, 528,532.) Dean of St Crantock in Cornwall Dec. 8, 1390 .
(Monasticon Diocesis Exoniensis, by G. Oliver; A complete history of the County of Cornwall, by Jonathan Cough, vol.I, 255)

Archdeacon of Exeter March 28,1409, resigned the office for the chancellorship of the same,Jan.10,1416-17,(Le Neve,Fasti..... II,418,394). He held and exchanged several benefices, such as Warden of Cemetery at Hurtell Feb.25,1403/10; Clare portion Tiverton December 11,1398; Stamford Court, March 12,1403/4; Widecombe-in-the-Moor August 27,1412; Farway October 26,1412; Prebendary of Howes in Exeter Castle September 3,1413; Vicar of South Winnow January 2,1411/12; Rector of South Malyn April 13,1415; Rector of South Perrot,Dorset June 12,1428; Rector of the first portion of Crukern,January 1428;(Cal.Pap.Reg., Lett. v,vi, passim; Cal.Pat.Rolls,Henry iv,1399-1401,pp.563 and passim; Hutchins, History of the County of Dorset,II,169; Stafford's Register, passim; Boase,op.cit.,21, and authorities therein cited)

Merk, Thomas.

Monk of Westminster; student at Oxford in 1392-4; expenses paid for his introitum ad sententias in 1392-3; was still an S.T.B. in the provincial chhpter of 1393, but became doctor before Nov.2,1395;(E.H.Pearce,The Monks of Westminster,116; Pantin, op.cit.,II,89-93; III,248) In April 23,1397 he became bishop of Carlisle, and after come troublesome years, during which he lost everything, including his bishopric, and was even in danger of losing his head, he died in 1409.(For the period after he became bisho till his death, see D.N.B.,xiii,202-5; Cal.Close Rolls, Rich.ii,1392-96, 402; Ibid.1396-99,p.[illegible]; Stubbs Register, 83.)

After he lostk his bishopric and all benefices he is said to have retired for a short time to Oxford, where he engaged in scholastic activity and 'studuit, legit, predicavit, determinavit, disputavit et docuit'. These scholastic acts were mentioned in the letter which the University sent to the Cardinals in favour of Merk.(Oxford Formularies,I,199,and passim.)

He is said to have written a Dictamen, which is found in six

manuscripts, for instance: Brit.Mus.MS.Harl.5398,f.133; Add.24361, f.44v; Bodl.Seld.Supra 65. (Cf.Medieval treatise in letter writing, by W.A.Pantin, in Bulletin of John Ryland's Library, XIII,328).

Rypon, Robert.

Monk of Durham; professed c.1358 or 1368; almoner 1390-91; 1391-2; Prior of Finchale 1397-1405; Subprior of Durham c. 1406-16; (Surtees Soc.,6,p.xxviii; 13,p.117; 100p.423,457; 103 p.596; Oxford Formularies,I,243-5.)

A preacher of some importance, whose sermons are found in the British Mus.MS.Harl.4894. (For the study of these sermons see G.R.Owst, Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England,Cambridge 1933, and Preaching in Medieval England, Cambridge, 1926.)

Tydir, Philip.

Dominican Friar; was present as bachelor of theology in the condemnation of the Lollard Walter Brut in 1393. (Reg.Joannis Trefnant, 359).

Hindon (Hindon ?) Robertus.

Friar Minor; appears as bachelor in MS.St John's College, Cambridge, 103.

PART III

THE COURSE IN THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY AT OXFORD IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

In the present chapter we propose to give a short account of the curriculum of studies in the faculty of theology at Oxford, during the second half of the fourteenth century. The extant statutes of the university of Oxford will be the main source, but we shall also refer to those of Paris and Bologna for further information and clarification. Obviously this account is introductory to the study of the Worcester MS.F.65, and its aim is to set forth and explain, as far as possible, the different scholastic customs in use during the period covered by the latter. The Worcester manuscript gives only scanty details concerning the several academic acts contained in it; fortunately, we can supplement it from the plentiful information found in St John's College, Cambridge, MS.103, and in Bodley MS.692, although the latter, as we have already remarked, belongs to a later date. This chapter falls into two parts: in the first section we shall give an account of the curriculum in the faculty of theology; in the second, we shall examine how far the manuscripts represent the different scholastic customs, in relation to the statutory requirements for the doctorate in theology.

I. CURRICULUM OF STUDIES IN THEOLOGY.

A candidate for the degree of master in arts had to spend seven or eight years in the faculty of arts, and fulfil all the requirements for the determination, licence and inception; he was then supposed to lecture for at least two years as regent master. (1) After two or more years of regency he was expected to proceed to one of the higher faculties, namely, theology, canon law or medicine. (2) Our concern here is solely with the faculty of theology; we shall attempt to give a short account of the whole curriculum.

The textbooks in the faculty of theology were the Bible and Peter Lombard's Sentences. The lectures on the Bible were of two kinds, lectiones ordinariae, given in the morning by the masters, and lectiones cursoriae, given by the bachelors at any time when the masters were not lecturing. The lectures on the Sentences were given by the bachelors. All the lectures given by the bachelors were lectures pro forma, that is, on the set books, according to the requirements of the statutes.

The curriculum of studies in the faculty of theology took at least eight years for an M.A. student, with two additional years for all other candidates. (3) A student would begin by attending lectures for at least four years; in addition he would attend the disputations held by the masters, and other scholastic exercises, but he might not take an active part, as respondent or opponent. These four years were obviously the period of preparation 'in statu pupillari' during which the student eagerly collected as much material as possible, in the way of lectures,

---

(1) On the faculty of arts see L.J.Paetow, The Arts Course at Medieval Universities with special reference to Grammar and Rhetoric, (Champaign Illinois, 1910); and H.Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, (Oxford 1936) III, 140 sq., 153-5.

(2) S.Gibson, Statuta Antiqua Universitatis Oxoniensis, (Oxford 1931) xlviii.

(3) Ibid. This statute was made some time before 1350. At Paris in 1366 the theological course took more or less the same time as at Oxford; sixteen years covered the two courses of arts and theology. cf. Chart. Univ. Par. ed. Denifle-Chatelain, III, 143-8.

dispatations, arguments and notes, which would be useful for the coming years when he himself would be lecturing and taking an active part in the scholastic exercises. (1) At the end of the four years, (six years for a non M.A.) of which three should be spent in aquainting himself with the Bible 'bibliam biblice per tres annos audivisse', (2) the student would supplicate the chancellor to be admitted 'to oppose' , and two years later 'to respond'; 'ad opponendum et respondendum.'

He has first to be presented by his regent master to the chancellor and the proctors, who, after a special inquiry as to his knowledge, his morals, age and stature, admitted him to oppose or to respond. (3) Responsions and opponencies were two sides of the same scholastic exercise called disputation, which, as Dr. Pelster points out, in the later middle ages was kernel and apex of the whole scientific instruction, and was zealously cultivated not only among the artists and theologians, but in the faculties of law and medicine also. (4)

---

(1) Many collections of these scholastic exercises are still extant and have been studied and found to be of great interest. See above p. ,n. .

(2) Gibson, 49.

(3) Gibson, op.cit.,p.48:157.'Quia sacre scripture professores ac ipsius auditores maturitas maior decet, ordinatum est quod qui in disputacione magistrorum theologie opponere voluerint, si prius in artibus rexerint, ante quintum annum audicionis theologie opponere non presumant, aut ante septimum respondere. Qui vero in artibus magistralem non sunt honorem adepti, ante septimum annum opponere, aut ante nonum respondere aliqualiter non attemptent.'
This statute shows that at Oxford, the respondent and opponent in the disputations were not always bachelors, whereas at Paris they were always bachelors who had lectured, or were qualified to lecture, on the Sentences. cf. Chart. Univ. Par. II,692.

(4) Little and Pelster, Oxford Theology and Theologians,(O.H.S. 1934) p.29; and see E.Caillemer,Les Disputationes dans les écoles de droit aux xii et xiv siècles, in Memoire de l'académie de Caen, (1879) p.421 sq.; Hermann Kantorowicz, The Quaestiones disputatae of the Glossators, in Revue d'Histoire du droit, xvi,1, (1937/8) p. .

By a statute of the middle of the fourteenth century (1350) every student was bound to respond once, (1) and probably to oppose once, before being admitted to lecture on the Sentences; we know that by the end of the fifteenth century the candidates for B.D. were not required to make more than one opponency and responsion. (2) Moreover, this statute determines that the responsion shall be made in 'disputacione magistrorum theologie', the so-called 'disputacio ordinaria', which each regent master at Oxford held publicly, according to the customary right, on a definite day and in regular sequence. It was apparently reserved to bachelors and students, the other regent masters being, as a rule, excluded. (3) The name ordinaria was probably given to these disputations to distinguish them both from the other solemn disputations which were held on the day of the vesperies and inception, when all the masters, bachelors and students were bound to attend, and in which most of them had to take active part either as respondent or opponent; and also from the private disputations between the master and his pupils. After seven years (9 years for non-M.A. candidates) of

---

(1) Gibson, 51:'....et quod sufficiat una responsio bachilario pro lectura sentenciarum.' This statute was re-enacted in 1419. cf. Ibid.,226.
In 1558 it was decreed that no religious who had not graduated in arts should presume to read the Sentences until he had opposed publicly a whole year in the ordinary disputations of the masters. Gibson, 157.
The General Chapter of the Dominicans held in Bourges in 1376, reminds the friars who were assigned 'ad legendum sentencias in universitatibus Oxonie et Cantabrigie', of the above statute 'ut quicumque habet ibidem legere sentencias, opponat per unum annum, antequam intret ad ipsam lecturam', and orders its observance without any opposition. cf. Acta.Cap.Gen.O.P., II,(1304-1378)p.434.

(2) Rashdall, op.cit. III,159,n.1; and Registrum Annalium Collegii Mertonensis, ed. H.E.Salter (O.H.S.1921) pp.xxvi-xxvii.Dr. Salter gives a careful account of the length of time required for the D.D. and the various stages to be passed, in the late fifteenth century. cf. Ibid.,pp.xxvi-xxix.

(3) These disputations are differently named in the statutes, for instance 'disputaciones ordinarie magistrorum', 'disputacio solemnis', 'disputacio magistrorum theologie'. Cf.Gibson,48, 157, 226. At Paris participation in these disputations was compulsory for the 'baccalaurii formati'.cf.Chart.,II,p.700, no.1189,(41); Little and Pelster, op.cit.37.

theological study and the fulfilment of the duty of responsion and opponency, the candidate applied for the licence to lecture on the Sentences. The chancellor made an enquiry from all the regent masters, one of whom swore that he knew, the others, that they believed the student to be suitable from the point of view of learning and morals.(1) After this leponing, the chancellor admitted the candidate to lecture on the Sentences, 'admissio ad lecturam Sententiarum'. From then onwards the student was called bachelor (2) and led a more active scholastic life; he had to begin his lectures on the Sentences within a year from the granting of the licence, and continue them for one whole scholastic year, i.e. three terms, 'per tres anni terminos suam lecturam continuet.' (3)

---

(1) Gibson, op.cit. 48: Quia vero magistrorum presentacionem sequitur eorumdem deposicionem, statuit dicta universitas et decrevit ut nullus de cetero ad **lecturam** libri sentenciarum per Cancellarium admittatur, nisi unus saltem magistrorum deponencium pro eodem utatur verbo sciencie deponendo, ceteris de credulitate saltem deponentibus, ut est moris'. and again: 'Presentacionis autem illius qui sententiarum librum de cetero est lecturus, forma hactenus consueta, ut videlicet ad tantum onus ydoneus magistrorum in ipsa facultate regencium testimonio comprobatur, diligenter in omnibus observetur,'

(2) It is not clear when the degree of B. Theol. was conferred. Dr. Rashdall says that the admissio ad **lecturam** libri sentenciarum seems to confer the style baccalaureus in theologia, though this is not quite clear. Dr. Little says that within a year from this time (licence) the new bachelor had to begin his lectures. And Dr. Pelster says that a master of arts, after seven years of study might begin to lecture on the sentences: this constituted him a 'bachelor'; in another place he identifies the degree of bachelor with the right to lecture on the Sentences. It is therefore reasonable to believe that a student became a bachelor in theology with his admission to lecture on the Sentences. Rashdall, op.cit. III, 158 n.2; Little, Greyfriars in Oxford, (O.H.S. 1891) 46; Little and Pelster, op.cit. 34, 45n.5. At a later date the student in the faculty of arts was said to be creatus baccalaureus artium with the admission to the degree of B.A. although he had to fulfil the statutable determination as a completion of the degree. cf. Registrum Universitatis Oxoniensis, II, pt. I, 48, 50.

(3) Gibson, 195. Most of the extant commentaries on the sentences are lectures given by the bachelors. Sometimes these lectures were revised and improved by the writer himself after he had attained the degree of master in theology. Michalski says that we have two sets of manuscripts of the Commentary of the Sentences of Richard Fitzralph-the reportatum, i.e. the lectures as they were delivered, and the ordinatum or the copy as revised by the writer himself; he seems to be of the opinion that the Oriel 15 is the ordinatum and the more complete. Cf. Michalski, La Problème de la volonté à Oxford et à Paris, in Studia Philosophica, II, p. 241.

A statute of 1407, or earlier, prescribe the method of lecturing and the further duties of the bachelors. It says, in short, that those who wish to lecture on the Sentences should read the text with the questions and arguments on the actual subject-matter, and give the accepted interpretation; they should not attack the opinions of others, more than once a term, besides in the first and last lecture of each book; these exercises (introitus et cessacio sententiarum) would not be considered as 'replicaciones' if they were not advertised as such beforehand. (1) In this statute we find mention of three different scholastic exercises, the 'introitus', the 'cessacio', and the 'replicacio', which took place in every term, during the course of lectures on the Sentences. The 'introitus' probably corresponds to the 'principium' of Paris and Bologna. We shall deal with these scholastic exercises later on.

The lectures on the Sentences being finished, a year had to elapse before the bachelor was allowed to attempt the statutory responsions required for the doctorate; if anyone dared to undertake these responsion before the completion of the year, they would not be considered 'pro forma'. (2)

Another statute required the bachelor to spend two years 'in sutdio' between the completion of the lectures on the Sentences and the Inception. (3) At some time during this period, the

---

(1) Gibson,195:'Statutum est quod quilibet lecturus librum Sententciarum qui prius in artibus non rexerit Oxonie, ad quod huiusmodi lectura sibi cedat pro forma, per tres anni terminos suam lecturam continuet, per cuiuslibet termini maiorem partem dierum legibilium in legendo textum cum questionibus vel argumentis rite secundum exigenciam materie; non replicet pluriesquam semel ultra introitus librorum et cessaciones earundem; introitus enim et cessaciones librorum ac recitacio locorum ad materiam propriam pertinens, non facta super hoc proclamacione previa, pro replicacionibus minime computantur..

(2) Gibson, 51,195;'Statutum est quod bachilario in eadem facultate minime valeant responsiones facte magistris ante completum annum post lecturam Sententiarum.'

(3) Gibson 50:'post lecturam insuper libri sententiarum, ad minus per biennium vel fere studio incepturus insistat antequam scandat cathedram magistralem....

bachelor had to deliver two courses of lectures one on the Old, the other on the New Testament; the statutes do not say when these lectures were to be given, but it was most probably during the first year after the completion of the Sentences. The statutes of Oxford do not determine the length of the period allowed for the lectures on the Bible, but considering that bachelors were required to 'read' on one book of the Old and one of the New Testament, we may infer that it was for one academic year. The following extract from the statutes of Bologna confirms this suggestion:-

> 'et Bibliam cursorie ante vel post lecturam sententiarum per unum annum, ut Parisius et in Anglie studiis est consuetum.

(1). In order to stress the difference between the biblical lectures given by the bachelors, 'biblice seu cursorie', and those given by the masters, 'magistraliter', and to expedite the progress of all such lectures, it was prescribed that the bachelor should deal with textual questions only. (2) A bachelor was at liberty to lecture 'cursorie seu biblice' during the long vacation, but

---

(1) Ehrle, Statuti....App.I,p.cciii(4). The words 'ante vel post.... ut Parisius et in Anglie studiis...' would be an allusion to the custom of Paris of lecturing on the Bible before lecturing on the Sentences whereas in Oxford the opposite custom prevailed

(2) Gibson,50:'Ne autem lecture varie confundentur, et ut expedicius in lectura Biblie procedatur, statutm est ut Bibliam biblice seu cursorie legentes questiones non dicant nisi tantummodo litterales...'
For these expressions in biblical lectures see Mandonnet, Chronologie des écrits scripturaires de S.Thomas d'Aquin,in Revue Thomiste,XII,(1929),pp.489-519. He says that the expressions Bibliam biblice textualiter, were equivalent to 'secundum usum Parisiensem' which really meant the explanation of the Bible by means of the Glosses. Rashdall in op.cit.III,71n.1 says that 'legere biblice' sometimes explained as 'sive textualiter' as opposed to the scholastic discussion of questiones arising out of the text. Ehrle, Statuti.....,p.clxxxiv, says that:'ad essi (biblici) incombeva approfondire la conoscenza superficiale del sacro testo ottenuta con la lettura cursoria, e con l'esposizione delle magre Glosse tradizionali aggiunte ai testi biblici. Quindi dovevano impinguarli con ulteriori materiali esegetici e teologici, inquanto la loro scienza teologica lo permetteva.' B.Smalley, The study of the Bible in the Middle Ages,(Oxford, 1941) p.245, says that th elementary work of reading and construing the text with the Glosses devolved, in the course of the century (thirteenth) on the bachelarius biblicus, the commentary proper being reserved for the masters.

these lectures were not regarded as fulfilling the statutes for the degree, 'non cedat alicui pro forma'. (1)

After a year from the end of the lectures on the Sentences, the bachelor was free to begin his responsions and opponencies. He was to respond and oppose eight times in all, in the schools of the various masters in theology; if there were fewer than eight masters, the number of responsions and opponencies was correspondingly reduced. A bachelor might not respond twice to the same master. (2) This is clearly illustrated by the Cambridge manuscript where we find the benedictine, Nicholas Pawkes, responding under different masters of his order and also under a dominican, John Gray.

These responsions and opponencies had to be 'ordinariae vel minime concursivae'. (3) The former clearly refer to the ordinary disputations of the masters, of which we have spoken before, but it is very difficult to say what is implied by 'concursivae'. Dr. Little did not see the precise meaning of the word.(4)

We know that two masters might, if they wished, dispute concurrently, 'concurrere disputando' (5) that is, presumably, on the same day. It appears that the disputations were 'ordinary' if held on fixed days, by one master, 'concursivae', if two masters

---

(1) Gibson, 52: 'Item statutum est quod liceat bachilario theologie legere Bibliam biblicein magna vacacione, sic tamen quod illa lectura non cedat alicui pro forma. Item statutum est quod non liceat alicui preterquam bachilario theologie leger Bibliam biblice.'. Another statute (p.50) required from the candidate for the D.D. that 'aliquem librum de canone Biblie vel sentenciarum Oxonie legat'. This probably does not mean that the candidate might read either one or the other, but it seems to be directed to students from other universities, or to the friars, who, having already lectured on the Bible might now lecture on the Sentences and proceed to the D.D.; the reverse order of lecturing on the Bible and the Sentences at Oxford and Paris is here envisaged.

(2) Gibson, 179: 'Statutum est quod quilibet incepturo in theologia sufficiant octo responsiones, ita tamen quod omnes vel maiorn pars eorum sint ordinarie vel minime concursivae, responsionibus in vesperiis et in inceptionibus theologie in ordinariis computatis. Quod si pauciores quam octo sint in theologia regentes tunc sufficiant incepturo eorum singulis respondere, nulli tamen magistro respondeatur bis vel pluries ita quod respondenti cedat pro forma.'

(3) Gibson, op.cit., 179.

(4) Little, Grey friars in Oxford. 47 n.1.

disputed on the same day, and that the statute admitted concurrive responsions as the only alternative to the ordinary.

The responsions and opponencies made at the Vesperies or inception of the new doctors were also counted among the eight; it is worth noting that the part of the 'responsalis' in the Vesperies was usually taken by the bachelor who would be next to incept.(1) Another statute forbade a bachelor to begin his responsions before the expiration of one year from the end of the lectures on the Sentences; first, to avoid confusion; and secondly, to ensure that those who were about to incept or begin the lectures on the Sentences had time to make the statutory responsions required for their respective scholastic exercise.(2) Dr. Little says that it is very difficult to see exactly how these results followed. (3) The bachelor had also to preach, 'publice predicare'. (4) The extant statutes mention only two sermons, to be preached on Sunday by every bachelor before his inception; examinatorius seu generalis, and non examinatorius; but we know of another which had to be preached in the church of the Dominicans. By a statute of 1303 the Vesperies of all the doctors was to be held, and the examinatory sermon was to be preached, at the university church of St Mary. Before this date, the examinatory sermon was delivered

---

(5) Gibson,51:'Statutum est quod duo magistri in theologia regentes possunt concurrere disputando.'

(1) Ibid.35:'Item qui ultimo inciperunt primi incipientibus respondeant in incepcionibus in eadem facultate, preterquam in theologia, in qua bachelari noviter incepturi solent respondere Little and Pelster, op.cit.,50.

(2) Gibson,51:'Quia bachilari in theologia quam pluries tempus anticipando in responsionibus alios noviter in eadem facultate incepturos ac eciam librum sentenciarum lecturos, solent impedire, statutum est.....'

(3) Little, The Franciscan School at Oxford, in Archivum Franciscanum Historicum, xix (1926) p.326.

(4) Gibson, 49,50,116sq. A good account of the university sermons is given by L.H.D.Buxton and S.Gibson in Oxford University Ceremonies, (Oxford 1935) 104-109.

in the church of the Dominicans or of the Franciscans. The removal of these scholastic exercises from the church of the friars was one of the grievances of the Dominicans in the quarrel with the university of Oxford. After a time the quarrel ceased, but this particular statute remained, and by a compromise between the university and the friars in 1314 it was decreed that every bachelor should, before inception, preach a sermon in the church of the Dominicans. (1)

Moreover, every doctor and bachelor, who had lectured on the Sentences, had to preach a sermon on a Sunday, except during the long vacation, at St Mary's or some other church to be determined by the university. The chancellor and two secular bachelors or 'collatores' of the theological faculty, who had already lectured on the Sentences, 'quorum unus sit borialis et alius australis', were in charge of these sermons. They had to give to each doctor and bachelor forty days' notice of the date of his sermon. If the preacher, for legitimate reasons approved by the chancellor and the two collatores, was unable to preach his sermon, the bachelors in charge had to provide another doctor or bachelor to preach on that day. If by a sudden and unforeseen circumstance the preacher was prevented from giving his sermon then one of the collatores had to preach in his stead. (2)

---

(1) Gibson,52:'Statutum est quod singuli doctores theologie teneantur in Ecclesia Beate Virginis sue facultatis vesperias celebrare.....'
p.50:'Quamquam statuto caveatur expresse bachilarium...debere sermonem facere generalem, de loco tamen nequaquam extitit ordinatum, ideo statuit universitas, ut sicut in ecclesia Virginis gloriose honorem recipit magistralem, ita ipsam sua predicacione previa honorare teneatur....'
For the full account of the quarrel between the friars and the university see Rashdall in Oxford Collectanea, II, 195sq., 217 sq.

(2) Gibson, 52:For the sermons and preachers at Oxford in the years 1290-92 see Little and Pelster, op.cit. pp.165-183; and the article by Pelster, 'An Oxford collection of sermons of the end of the thirteenth century (MS.Laud.Misc. 511, Sc.963)', in Bodleian Quarterly, VI (1930) no.67, pp.168-172.

A statute of 1432 enacted that a copy of the sermon preached on the first Sunday of Lent and Septuagesima Sunday by the doctors and of the examinatory sermon preached on Sundays by the bachelors, should be given to the university library 'infra octo dies proximo post eorum predicacionem sequentis'. These sermons were preached in latin (1) but a later statute of 1549 required the bachelor to preach three sermons one of which had to be in English 'in academia templo'. (2)

After the completion of these exercises, three further conditions were necessary that the bachelor might become a doctor of theology: a favourable deposition by all the masters as to his fitness, the licence of the chancellor and the inception. All the regent masters in theology, (and if there was only one, then the eldest non-regent masters) were required to depone before the proctors and the chancellor, that the said bachelor had completed the statutory lectures on the Sentences, the sermons, the responsions and opponencies and the lectures on the Bible; that they knew him to be of honest life and conversation and free from physcical deformity. Then the bachelor was presented to the chancellor by his master, who had to swear that he knew him to be a suitable condidate; if the deposition was considered favourable, the chancellor conferred on the bachelor the licence to incept in theology within a year. The day of inception was assigned to each bachelor. A statute passed at some time before 1380, allowed more than one bachelor to incept on the same day, whereas previously only one bachelor might incept on any

---

(1) Gibson, 244.336-37:'quod singulis diebus dominicis in pleno termino per annum.....in latinis, a doctore S.Theologie seu bachilario eiusdem facultatis publicus fiat sermo.' For later statutes on sermons see Registrum Univ.Oxon.,II,130-1, 133; Reg.Ann.Coll.Mert.p.xxviii, where we find three kinds of sermons:pro forma bachilarii,examinatorius,pro forma doctoris.

(2) Gibson, 345:'Latine bis, semel Anglice, concionabitur in academiae templo.'

particular day. (1) The inception, which at Paris was called Principium, consisted of two acts: the vesperies and the inception properly so-called. These two scholastic ceremonies were, as Dr. Little has shown, introduced at Oxford quite early, and were held with great solemnity. (2)

The vesperies -- so called from the hour of Vespers, at which time it took place-- was held at St Mary's on the eve of the inception. The latter might be held on any dies legibilis of the faculty of arts, and had to be finished on the same day. Dr. Pelster says that the last part of the statute 'quod nullus duobus diebus tenet vesperias unius incepcionis nisi ex speciali gracia', very likely means that a master who was presiding over the vesperies of several bachelors had to hold all these vesperies on one day. (3)

Before the day of the vesperies, the bachelor had to ask all the masters to be present, and the master who was to preside had to inform them in congregation about the questions to be discussed in in the vesperies, and send his servant to request them to attend;

---

(1) Gibson 28:'De bachilariis licenciandis et incepturis in quacunque facultate, innovando prius statutum et optentum ita per universitatem est provisum et ordinatum quod cancellarius qui pro tempore fuerit, nullum licenciet in aliqua facultate nisi auditis deposicionibus magistrorum ipsius facultatis in presencia procuratorum universitatis, tam in sciencia quam in vita.....'
Ibid.40:'Quod si premissa (scil:opposiciones,responsiones, praedicaciones,lecturam libri sacrae scripturae vel libri sentenciarum) laudabiliter compleverint, et bone vite et conversacionis honeste inventi fuerint, nec corpore viciati,ad deposicionem magistrorum regencium in ea facultate,vel prius regencium, si non fuerit nisi unus regens, et die sibi,ut moris est, assignata, legittime incipere poterunt in eadem.'
Ibid.179:'Item statutum est quod plures theologi de cetero simul incipere poterunt eodem die,antiquo statuto super incepcione theologorum edito non obstante.'

(2) Little in A.F.H.XIX,828, where he mentions a treatise of Robert Grossetete now lost, which bore the title 'in vesperiis Ade', Probably the Franciscan, Adam Marsh.

(3) Gibson,p.33:'Consuetudo est quod nullus duobus diebus tenet vesperias unius incepcionis nisi ex speciali gracia.... ...Quia vero dubitari consuevit quibus diebus vesperie et incepciones celebrari possent et teneri, idcirco statuit universitas vesperias in facultatibus quibuscumque posse indistincte teneri in die quolibet apud arcistas legibili,horis consuetis in sungulis facultatibus observatis.....

he usually invited some non-regent masters also. (1) All the bachelors and students were bound to attend, hence lectures were suspended. The statutes of Oxford say nothing about the procedure and the disputations during the vesperies, except that in the vesperies of the theologians the senior master had to oppose, or argue against, the incepting bachelor. (2)

At Paris the vesperies consisted of two disputations: the first, called expectatoria, between the master presiding and a bachelor, was held while the masters and others were assembling; in the second, the vesperiand himself took the part of the respondent. The disputation mentioned in the statutes of Oxford corresponds to the latter; they make no reference to the former. In the Worcester manuscript we find:'Questio disputata in vesperiis Ade de Estone responsali Nicholao Redclyf'. This may mean that Easton was the presiding master, Redclyf the respondent bachelor and that the name of the vesperiand has been omitted, or that Easton was the vesperiand, Redclyf the respondent bachelor, and that the name of the presiding master has been omitted; it cannot mean however that the vesperiand was acting responsalis. Whatever part Easton may have taken, the first and the second suppositions correspond exactly to the Parisian expectatoria, and go to prove that the latter was in use at Oxford also, in the fourteenth, as in the thirteenth

---

(1) Gibson, p.36:'Item consuetudo est quod omnes incipientes cum fuerint licenciati in quacunque facultate, per scolas omnium magistrorum, quatenus intersint suis incepcionibus debeant supplicare. Serviens eciam illius facultatis, nomine magistri vesperias tenentis, debet illo tempore dicere quod talis magister supplicat magistro illarum scolarum, quatenus suis intersit vesperiis, si debeat interesse. Quod si incipiens festum teneat magistris in suis hospiciis, quatenus sue intersint incepcioni, debet similiter supplicare.'
Ibid.37:'Regentes eciam tenentes vesperias, ante diem vesperiarum omnibus regentibus in illo facultate debent dicere suas questiones in aliqua congregacione, hora prima vel alias.....debent eciam omnes tenentes vesperias supplicare quibusdam non regentibus ut sue intersint disputacioni.'

(2) Ibid.36:'In vesperiis eciam theologorum bachilario incepturo senior opponere teneatur.' MS.Magdalen College, Oxford, 38, contains disputations in vespers in the faculty of arts about the year 1420. On these disputations see the article by S.Gibson, 'The order of disputations' in Bodleian Quarterly, VI (1930) no.65, pp.107-112.

century. (1)

At Paris, after the two questions had been disputed, the master holding the vesperies made a speech in which he praised the Holy Scriptures and the inceptor. There is evidence, in the manuscript of John Laverne, that a similar custom prevailed at Oxford; he gives several examples: 'Benedicio' or 'Commendacio Inceptoris', which took place 'in scholis theologie' or 'in ecclesia beate Virginis'. In his speech the presiding master praised the new inceptor, and ended by fixing the date and place of inception and the questions to be discussed. (2)

The Oxford statutes are more explicit on the inception than on the vesperies. We know that, in our period, two theological bachelors might incept on the same day; that they had to request personally each master to attend the inception; that the inception must be held at St Mary's on a 'dies disputabilis' or 'festive legibilis' in the faculty of arts. The inceptor read his lecture, then proposed his questions and finally disputed them with the masters and other bachelors; in the first part of the disputation, the inceptor disputed with a responsalis, who in the theological faculty, was the bachelor who was next to incept; in the second part, the inceptor argues in support of the opposite view of the same question against that master who had last incepted but had not yet acted as respondent at an inception; if all the masters had responded, then the inceptor argued against the senior master, and at the end of the disputation, he re-stated his question, delivered an argument in

---

(1) Dr. Pelster, op.cit.,51, has shown on the evidence of MS. Assisi 158, that in the thirteenth century there was in the 'vesperies' at Oxford, as at Paris and Bologna, a question in which not the vesperiand but another bachelor was the responsalis. The Oxford statutes mention only a question in which the vesperiand is the responsalis. For confirmation of this on the evidence of MS.Bodley 692, see below, p.91.

(2) For further discussion on this sunject see below, p.91-92, and Appendix II, p.277-281.

support of his own solution; then, as a gesture of respect to the masters who had just responded, he concluded 'quasi determinando', with the words: 'ad hec et ad alia sufficiat responsio magistrorum' (1) At Paris and Bologna, two questions were disputed at the inception; the second or resumpta, does not seem to have been in use at Oxford; the statutes make no mention of it.

The inception and its festivities over, the new master entered upon the necessary regency which, in the case of seculars, lasted for one year, exclusive of the remainder of the year of inception. It seems that, in the fourteenth century, regency for regular masters also lasted for a year. In one of the chapters of the Benedictines held in 1343, we find a reference to the Oxford statute on the subject:

> 'Cui quidem magistro si iuxta statutum universitatis Oxonie a tempore incepcionis sue annum compleverit in legendo, singulis annis quibus postea cathedram in loco nostro communi de Stocwellestrete situato occupaverit, de communi collecta solvendas fore decernimus decem libras.'

This was repeated in the chapters of 1363 and 1444. (2)

But a difficulty arises from another document; in a letter to John Lawerne, some time after 1448, which is unfortunately damaged by damp, and in some parts unreadable, we find a dispensation to leave the university in his second year of regency on account of

---

(1) Gibson, 179; 36;
36: 'Incepciones vero nonnisi die disputabili vel saltem apud arcistas festine legibili celebrentur.'
38: 'Incepturi quidem suas legant in principio lectiones, deinde questiones, quas disputare voluerint, proponentes magistris opponant, ac iidem magistri respondeant, qui in eadem facultate in precedentibus incepcionibus ultimo inceperunt...Licet autem hec incepturi in artibus, medicina, iure civili et canonico soleant observare, incepturis tamen in sacra scriptura non magistri sed bachelarii noviter incepturi respondeere solent. In theologia quidem vel in artibus incipientibus multis, solet primus incipientium, questione inter eum et suum responsalem pro una parte primitus ventilata, magistro theologice facultatis de parte altera opponere questionis. Si vero omnes respondisse contigerit, opponat incipiens seniori. Questione siquidem disputata solet incipiens quasi determinando questionem cum uno saltim argumento repetere, et ob reverenciam prius respondencium dicere: Ad hec et ad alia sufficiat responsio magistrorum.'

(2) Chanters of the English Black Monks, II, 56, 81, 211.

his health; it says:

> 'salva conscioncia potest se absentare libere ab universitate.....anno suo secundo regencie, videlicet, a festo S. Georgii martyris usque ad festum..... totaliter ac quiete a regencia Oxon. cessavit.' (1)

We know that, in 1478, regency for regulars was prescribed for 24 months after inception; and although the statutes usually confirm already existing customs, we cannot say, without further evidence, how far back this particular custom dates.(2)
During the necessary regency, each master had to give ordinary lectures, presumably on the Bible, hold ordinary disputations on definite days, take part in the vesperies and inceptions, preach at St Mary's on some Sunday prescribed by the collatores, and attend the congregation. At the ordinary disputations, students before being licenced, and bachelors before the inception, had to make their statutory responsions and opponencies.
The statutes do not say how often a master had to hold disputations but we know that masters in the faculty of arts had to dispute 'per quadraginta dies disputabiles proximo sequentes eorum incepcionem;' and in the faculty of medicine every doctor had to dispute 'singulis hebdomadibus disputabilibus vice sua disputare....ad minus semel in quindena.' (3) According to statute, two masters might hold disputations on the same day; if a master was unable to hold his disputation on the prescribed day, another might replace him, but he had to fulfil the obligation at a later date.
After the peridd of regency, the master was permitted to lecture

---

(1) MS.Bodley 692,f.163v.

(2) Gibson,290;'ita quod quilibet eorum taliter incepturus teneatur necessario regere per 24 menses a die incepcionis suc continue numerandas, vacacionibus in eisdem computatis.'

(3) Gibson,39:'Consuetudo est quod in artibus incipentes et in medicina per quadraginta dies post incepcionem quolibet die disputabili disputent, et pallium debent portare in prima disputacione'.
Ibid,42:'Statutum est quod si fuerint plures regentes in medicina teneatur quilibet illorum singulis ebdomadis disputarelibus vice sua disputare,et si fuerit tantummodo unus regens in illa facultate teneatur ad minus semel in quindena disputare.'

at his pleasure; a friar for instance, might continue his lectures in his own or another priory at the discretion of his superiors. Dr. Little says that there seem to have been no rules regulating the duration of regency, as distinct from the necessary regency; it is possible that as in Bologna, non-regent masters might occasionally hold ordinary disputations as they might hold vesperies. (1) Finally non-regent masters — those who did not continue to lecture — had a share in the government of the university and enjoyed the same privilèges as the regent masters. (2)

II. SCHOLASTIC EXERCISES ILLUSTRATED IN MS. WORCESTER F.65.

Having acquainted ourselves with the curriculum in the theological faculty and the requirements which the scholar had to fulfil before he could attain the much coveted degree of master in sacred theology, we turn now for illustrations to the Worcester collection. This collection, unlike the manuscripts studied by Pelster and Little, for instance, gives few details as to the masters and students who took part in the reported disputations. This would seem reasonable if we bear in mind that the monk-collector's aim was to make for himself an extensive collection of questions with answers and counter arguments which would be useful for his future study; he did not as a rule, concern himself with unnecessary details.

It is very interesting to notice that reports of determinations, which were always given by the masters, bear the author's name; this may indicate the importance attached to a master's decision on a certain theological matter.

In this second part we shall use the evidence of the Cambridge

---

(1) Little and Pelster, op.cit.p.233,where Dr. Little has given an accurate account of the regency of the regulars.

(2) Gibson,p.52:'Item statutum est quod singuli doctores non regentes S.Theologie, gaudeant eisdem beneficiis, tam in vita quam in morte quibus gaudent alii non rggentes scolares cuiuscumque facultatis.'

and Bodley manuscripts to exemplify the whole range of scholastic exercises. Repetition is unavoidable, especially in the case of the statutes to which we shall have to refer.

The scholastic exercises are as follows:-

1. Q[uestio] S[olemnis] and R[esponsio] S[olemnis]

2. Determinacio.

3. Questio disputata in vesperiis.

4. Collacio

5. Commendacio.

6. Introitus and Cessacio Sententiarum.

7. Replicatio.

1. Questio and Responsio solemnis.

Dr. Pelster is of the opinion that the questio solemnis, ordinaris and disputata may be identical. (1) The statutes of Oxford do not really make any distinction; in fact they use the terms 'disputacio solemnis' and 'disputacio ordinaria' in reference to the same exercise. (2) The students before the licence, and the bachelors before their inception, had to respond to the masters in these disputations; the statutes say that they had to respond 'solempniter et non furtive.' (3). MS. Worcester F.65 gives plenty of evidence on this matter; in fact it seems that most of the collection consists of these acts. We must bear in mind that the terms 'questio solemnis' and 'responsio solemnis' refer to the same solemn disputation, and signify that responsion which was 'pro forma'. This is confirmed and clearly illustrated by the Cambridge collection, where we find five responsions in full academical array, differing in this

---

(1) Little and Pelster, op.cit., 36-7.

(2) Gibson, op.cit., 48,157,226.

(3) Mons. Pelzer finds some responsions of bachelors in MS. Vat. Lat. 1086. cf. his article: 'Prosper de Reggio Emilia des Ermites de Saint Augustin et le manuscrit latin 1086 de la Bibliotheque Vaticane', in Revue Neo-Scolastique de Philosophie. (Louvain 1928) pp. 316-351, especially pp. 336, 341, 344.

respect only, from the Worcester collection; so we shall give a description of one of them, which will serve as an example. The bachelor respondent in our example is the Benedictine, Nicholas Fawkes, and he responds to one Dominican and four Benedictine masters, who belong to the late fourteenth century. The ordinary disputation is held in the master's school. The master proposes a question to the bachelor, with some arguments pro and contra. The bachelor repeats the question preceded by the formula:

> 'Doctor reverendus et dominus ac magister sui gracia specialis proponit questionem suam difficilem disputandam sub hac forma: Utrum.....'

Next he makes a ceremonial speech in which he praises his master, and humiliates himself, with many amusing allegorical allusions to each and to the audience. Then he makes the protestation of faith, avowing his intention to avoid saying anything contrary to faith, morals or the determinations of Holy Church, or which might offend pious hearers; declares his willingness, should he unwittingly give offence, to receive correction from the chancellor or any other to whom the duty belongs. After this he replies to the objections by means of conclusions, the last of which is a re-statement of the actual question proposed by the master; he does not bring any argument to prove it, but refers to the ad oppositum of the master in these words:-

> 'Quarta conclusio doctor reverende est questio vestra in terminis, hec videlicet: Utrum.....Pro qua michi sufficiunt per vos primitus allegata.'

At the end of the disputation he addresses the master thus:-

> 'Hec doctor reverende sint dicta sub spe supportacionis vestre benigne.'

A large number of the Worcester disputations are of this type, but only the arguments pro and contra, and the conclusions are given.

2. Determinacio.

In the thirteenth century, every questio disputata was followed by its determination; it was the duty of the master

holding the disputation, to give the final decision and clarify the problem under discussion by answering any remaining objections. It used to take place on the same day as the disputation, but Dr. Pelster has shown, from the complaints of the Dominican, Hugh of Sutton, against Henry Harclay and Robert Walsingham that, at Oxford in the early fourteenth century, the disputation and determination were seperate functions; that there might be a disputation without a determination; and that formal determinations and the corresponding disputations were held on different days.(1) Worcester manuscript contains some determinations together with the name of the master:-

f.1v: Determinacio Hatton.
f.5 : Determinacio Trevelleys.
f.11v: Determinacio Atton.
f.13 : Determinacio Ade de Estone.
f.18v: Conclusiones Tydishale in determinacione sua.
f.22 : Conclusiones Wyclif in determinacione sua.
f.25v: Determinacio mag.W.Trevelleys.
f.25v: Alia determinacio eiusdem.
f.26 : Determinacio Tydishale.
f.27 : Determinacio Tydishale.

Three more questions, probably determinations, bear the master's name:f.6:Botilston; f.12:Atton; f.19:Tonworthe.

There does not appear to be any relation between these determinations and any of the disputations, except that of Adam Easton on Adam's vision of God before the fall, which Nicholas Redclyf seems to have disputed or rather responded under his guidance; it is reported as: 'Q/uestio/ Estone R/esponsio/ Redclyf!' The external form of the determinations as reported in the manuscript does not differ from that of the other disputations, and there is no distinctive feature, except the term Determinacio and the name of the writer. It may be that there was no real

(1) Little and Pelster, op.cit.,41.Examples of determinations without the disputation are frequent in the late fourteenth century at the time of the Wycliffite controversy. See the determinations of the Carmelite J.Kenyngham,Wyclif and Walden in Fasciculi Zizaniorum pp.14-72,453-80. We find expressions for instance:'determinavit contra eum publice in scholis';'non fuerunt amicabiles doctoribus determinantibus contra..';'in ultima determinatione mea';'et in uno die in publica sua determinatione'. etc.

difference in the external construction of the determination and the other disputations except that the former was the reply given by a master, whereas the latter were the bachelor's reply or responsion.

3. Vesperies.

We know that at Paris there used to be two disputations in the vesperies, one between the master holding the vesperies and a bachelor; the other, between the vesperiand and the senior master. The Oxford statutes speak only of the second, but it does not follow that there was one disputation in the vesperies. On the contrary, the Worcester manuscript gives evidence that both disputations used to take place; in fact we find a disputation held in the vesperies of the Benedictine, Adam Easton, in which another Benedictine, Nicholas Redolyf, acted as responsalis. This obviously corresponds to the first disputation about which the statutes of Oxford are completely silent; otherwise, it would be very difficult to explain it. The existence of this disputation is confirmed by Bodley MS.692. On f.27v. we meet with the scholastic act, which begins:

> 'Disputata prima questione inter venerabilem cetum doctorum et bacalarium responsalem, doctor meus reverendus inter doctores senior proponit questionem suam secundam difficilem sub hac forma.....'

This is a clear reference to the two disputations in the vesperies; and although this manuscript belongs to a later date than the Worcester, still we may safely presume that, in the fourteenth century, the vesperies was performed at Oxford in the same manner as at Paris.

4. Commendacio inceptoris.

An interesting ceremony in the vesperies was the commendacio or benediccio of the inceptor by the master holding the vesperies. After the second disputation, between the vesperiand and the masters, the master presiding was required by the statutes to make a short speech in praise of Holy Scripture and of the inceptor, and to announce the day and place of the inception. MS.Bodley 692 affords several examples, one of which will be

found in Appendix II. We find no mention of these speeches in either the Worcester of the Cambridge manuscripts, but most probably the custom already existed in the late fourteenth century. In the fifteenth century these speeches developed into amusing addresses, in which certain events of the inceptor's life were narrated with playful exaggeration. The address given by the bachelor in his statutory resposion had also the touch of comedy, but with this difference, that the bachelor extolled the master and humiliated himself. Examples will be found in Appendix I. We find this sort of speech in the university of Pisa also, in the fifteenth century. The Dominican master, Simon of Cascina taught there for many years, and left a collection of scholastic exercises, among which are several speeches in the vesperies and inception of his students. In one of his addresses he explains that amusing things are told about the inceptor on these solemn occasions, first, to humiliate the new inceptor lest he should be tempted to pride in seeing himself adorned with the master's degree; secondly, to amuse the audience, lest they should be wearied by the length of the ceremony. (1)

---

(1) MS. Lambeth 221, ff. 247-252 contains several commendations in the faculty of law at Oxford. We may also refer to MS. Magdalen for the faculty of arts. For the commendations in the faculty of arts at Oxford see the article by S. Gibson in the Bodleian Quarterly, VI, no. 65, (1930) p. 107-112, where he says that 'a comic element is introduced both at vespers and comitia... which is absent from the earliest recorded commendations at vespers.' See also the article by T. Kappeli, La raccolta di discorsi e di atti scolastici di Simone da Cascina, O. P. (c. 1420) in Archivum Fratrum Predicatorum, XII (1924) p. 185-246. He says of these commendations 'Questio discorso aveva per scopo non soltanto di far l'elogio e la commendazione del candidato, ma anche, e questo in primo luogo, di umiliarlo et renderlo ridicolo, raccontando alla solenne assistemza fatti inventati o veri ma comunque esagerati della sua vita passata. La ragione che induce l'oratore a questo e' duplice. riguardo al candidato egli vuole impedire che l'alta dignita' conferita al novello maestro lo insuperbisca; riguardo gli assistenti stanchi dalla lunga disputa, questa parte umoristica doveva scuoterli dalla sonnolenza, et togliere loro il tedio della prolissita dell'atto.' It is worth noting that these commendations are the origin of the modern speeches by the public orator in the solemn university ceremonies. The well-known 'Terrae Filius' the licenced jester of the Solemn Act, as Wells, J., calls him in his Oxford Degree Ceremony, (Oxford 1906) p. 54, 80 who delighted the public present at the vespers and comitia with solemn fooling is evidence of the scurrility of the act in later centuries. This was the main reason for the removal of these academic acts from St Mary's to the Sheldonian theatre. See on this matter Bodleian Quarterly, III, 123-4; Mallet, History of the University of Oxford, 283, 131, sq; and Buxton-Gibson, Oxford University Ceremonies, (Oxford 1935).

5. Collatio.

What is the collatio ? It is not mentioned in the Worcester manuscript, but we find a reference to it in the Cambridge, and it is given fully in the Bodley manuscript. It was only part of a scholastic act, as we shall see presently.

At Paris the collatio was the sermon preached by a bachelor in the afternoon, on the same theme as the morning sermon of a master. Dr. Pelster has shown from the statutes of some religious houses of Paris in the thirteenth century, that the collatio has a kaleidoscopic meaning. It may mean a disputation, as in the case of MS.Assisi 158 and the Collationes Oxonienses of Scotus; or a conference, like the Collationes of Cassian. Its very name implies discussion of a theme or problem by several persons. Originally it was a kind of disputation, held in religious houses by their own members, and probably later on adopted in the colleges, where it became a regular and common scholastic exercise. (1)

The collatio, in its primary sense, consisted of an informal address and short sermon; academically it came to mean an address, or more usually, a disputation, in which the speaker discussed some matter freely without determining or coming to a formal conclusion. (2)

The Oxford statutes do not mention this scholastic act, but we find it clearly set forth in those of Bologna, which state that every bachelor must make a principium on each of the four books of the Sentences, and 'inquolibet trium principiorum facit sicut in primo principio, similem collacionem, protestacionem et questionem' (3). The Cambridge collection gives some evidence on this matter. On f.117 we find a 'Questio pro introitu', which begins with

---

(1) Little and Pelster, op.cit., 56-6.

(2) Rashdall, op.cit., I, 475n.

(3) Ehrle, op.cit., p.clxxxvii, 18.

these words:

> 'Iuxta materiam collec[illegible]nis sit iste titulus questionis de gracia vestra pro presenti [illegible]ine me[illegible]bris solis solumodo pertractandus;'

then follows a question with arguments pro and contra, a protestacio and several conclusions. This implies that the collatio had taken place already. Again on f.120v. there is a 'Cessacio Sententiarum' in which the bachelor states at the beginning:

> 'Primo suadebo [illegible]rtem affirmativam articuli, secundo respondebo ad argumento que fecit venerabilis pater dominus Richardus Chardesey contra suppositum in articulo, et tercio subinferam collacionem modicam, ut est moris.'

He then expounds the first and second point, but when he comes to the third, we find only a directive note which says:

> 'Post hec divertatur ad collacionem que sic incipit: Iam in terminando Sentencias sumo pro themate—Deo Gracias.'

These extracts suggest that by the end of the fourteenth century the collatio which we find at Oxford was not a disputation, but a kind of prefatory address, which supplied the subject for the disputation, and it was the custom 'ut est moris' to give the collatio in certain scholastic exercises. The Bodley collection gives plentiful evidence on this matter. It shows (i) that the collatio was a short address given at the beginning of certain scholastic acts, and that it provided the subject for the discussion, 'iuxta materiam...' as in the Cambridge collection, (ii) that it was customary 'ut est moris' to give these addresses, and that this custom went back at least to the end of the fourteenth century, that is the period covered by the Cambridge collection, (iii) that the collatio was a part of the academic act performed at the 'introitus' of each book of the Sentences, which at Paris and Bologna was called principium, (iv) that the collatio was a part of the act performed at the 'introitus' on the Bible. Finally the mention of the collatio at the end of the lectures on the Sentences, 'cessacio Sententiarum', as found in the Cambridge collection would suggest that it was customary to give a short address at the conclusion of the whole course of lectures on the Sentences. Evidence of this custom is given in

Oriel MS.15, ff.204rb-vb, where we find a collatio on the cessation of the lectures on the Sentences of the Dominican, Robert Holcot. It may not be out of place to give some extracts from it. Holcot takes as the theme of the collatio the verse from St John:xx/4:'ambo cucurrerunt,sed alius discipulus precucurrit Petro,' which he expounds alluding to the other bachelor who was lecturing with him, but finished the lectures before him:

> '....et licet de domo Predicatorum isto anno in lectura Sentenciarum cucurrerunt duo simul, ille tamen alius discipulus, qui gracia nominatur, usus favorem,i.e.graciam universitatis de cito terminando lecc[illegible]nibus habuit, cicius precucurrit, iuxta illud Johannis,20, Ambo....ad momumentum, i.e. ad quiescendi tempus et locum. Ego autem compotitus iusticia, laboribus non peperci, statutum tempus implevi, et multiplicitatem cursus feci inter omnes, ut estimo, qui hic vel alibi cursum consimilem /fecereunt/ .....In huius ergo cursus cessacione in primis Deo dante regracior... secundo toti reverende comitive, regracior, magistrorum dominorum et sociorum omnium qui cursui meo debili amicaliter constiterunt, suam honestam presenciam exhibuerunt,....Et omnis homo cum ad consummacionem pervenerit de suo recogitat successore, ideo bachilarium reverendum et cursorem de futuro qui michi non est!.

Holcot, as is well known, is a Cambridge graduate, so we have here a reference to a Cambridge custom, but we may safely presume that it obtained at Oxford also. (1)

6. Introitus and Cessatio Sententiarum, and replicatio.

At Paris the bachelors entered upon each of the four books of the Sentences with a solemn scholastic act, called principium. They followed one another in regular order; thus we find them disputing and attacking the opinions of fellow bachelors, and replying to attacks previously made by the latter upon themselves in the principia. (2) At Bologna too, the bachelors were bound to open their lectures on the Sentences with a principium, which comprised a 'collacio pro commendacione sacre scripture vel librorum Sentenciarum' followed by a 'protestacio' and a 'questio' which the bachelor 'proponit et studiose

---

(1) This collatio is not printed in the two editions of Holcot's Commentary on the Sentences, 1497 and 1510.

(2) Rashdall, op.cit.,I,477n.4, where he says that the bachelors might attack the opinions of other bachelors, but not those of the masters.



pertractat.' (1)

The statutes of Oxford do not speak of the principium of the bachelors but there is mention of the 'introitus' and 'cessacio sentenciarum'. In a statute of 1407 or earlier we read:

> 'Statutum est quod quilibet lecturus librum Sentenciarum..... non replicet pluries quam semel ultra introitus librorum et cessaciones eorundem; introitus enim et cessaciones librorum .....non facta super hoc proclamacione previa, pro replicacionibus minime computantur.' (2)

This shows clearly that at Oxford the introitus and cessatio of the Sentences and the replicatio were scholastic acts required from the bachelors; they were solemn disputations attended by scholars and bachelors. (3)

The Cambridge manuscript gives a very good illustration of these customs:-

f.117:'Questio pro introitu'
f.118:'Introitus primi libri'
f.120v:'Cessacio sentenciarum'
f.122:'Cessacio primi libri'
f.123:'Pro incepcione secundi libri'
f.125:'Introitus quarti libri'

The bachelor commences with the apparently prescribed formula:-

> 'Reverendi domini, patres et magistri, articulus pro incepcione huius secundi libri, de Dei gracia et vestra benevolencia pertractandus, est iste: Utrum....'

Next follows the discussion of the question with arguments pro et contra, to which the bachelor replies. Then comes the protestation of faith, which was made in all solemn scholastic

---

(1) Ehrle, Statuti della facolta teologica di Bologna,(Bologna, 1932)p.CLXXXVII,18. Ibid.p.22.n.13, we find the description of the order and period of the lectures on the Sentences:'..hoc ordine, scilicet, quod post festum nativitatis Domini debet legisse primum librum et secundum facere principium et non ante. Post kalendas aprilis debet legisse secundum librum et facere tertium principium et non ante. Et post medietatem mensis maii debet legisse tertium librum et quartum facere principium.Die autem quo aliquis bachalariorum facit aliquod principiorum suorum, teneantur omnes bachalarii interesse eis, aut concedere quod die eodem legere possint ante vel post si eis videbitur expedire.....(principium) debet pronuntiari per bidellum per dies ante vel per diem cuiuslibet ipsorum principiorum.

(2) Gibson, op.cit.,195.

(3) Notice the opening of the disputation with 'reverendi domini patres et magistri' which presumably stand for the scholars and bachelors only, the masters not being bound to attend.

acts:-

'Antequam descendam ad conclusiones protestor, ut alias, quod non est intencionis mee aliquid dicere, asserere pertinaciter, vel defendere quod sit sacrosancte matris ecclesie determinacioni contrarium, fidei catholice dissonum, vel quod merito possit offendere pias aures. Et si quid tale dixero illud ex nunc prout ex tunc revoco et retracto submittens me correccioni reverendi domini, domini cancellarii huius alme universitatis, magistris nostris ac aliorum a quos pertinet sic errantes corrigere et ad viam reducere veritatis catholice.'

He finishes, as was customary, by setting out his conclusions:-

'Qua protestacione premissa sit hec conclusio mea prima....'

The same formula is observed in the other introits and cessations of the four books of the Sentences as reported in the Cambridge collection.

The above mentioned statute shows first, that the bachelor might attack once in each term opinions expressed by the other bachelors; (this was over and above what he might say against them in the <u>introitus</u> and <u>cessacio</u> of each book of the Sentences) second, that the <u>introitus</u> and <u>cessacio</u> were to be considered as 'replicatio' only if advertised as such beforehand.

We have ample evidence of the 'replicatio' in both Worcester and Cambridge collections. For instance, in the Worcester manuscript we find: f.11v:Replicacio contra Utredum in materia clare visionis', which is an attack made by a certain Hatton, probably a friar, against some opinions of the Durham Benedictine, Uthred of Bolton, on the theory of the clear vision of God. In the Cambridge manuscript we find three 'replicationes' .two of which were probably given instead of the 'cessatio' of the second and the fourth book of the Sentences. The same opening formula is observed, with some modification, as in the introits and cessations; for instance:-

f.124r: Replicacio contra dominum T.Merk. Reverendi patres,domini et magistri, intendo hodie de Dei gracie et cum vestra sciencia graciosa replicare contra quandam conclusionem bonam et subtilem et catholicam, quam posuit pater meus reverendus, dominus Thomas Merk, monachus Westmonasterii, in introitu suo ad tercium quc conclusio fuit sic in forma...'

Then follow the arguments against the conclusion of the other bachelor.

CONCLUSION.

In this chapter we have attempted to follow a scholar in the theological faculty at Oxford in the second half of the fourteenth century, in the academic activities required from him by the statutes, before attaining the master's degree. Undoubtedly in many cases certainty has been impossible; and many items need still more elucidation.

The Cambridge and the Bodley collections have afforded great evidence on many customs, and this supplemented the less detailed collection of Worcester. Study of many more collections of *questiones*, and comparison of them with those which have been already examined, will throw more light on the varied activities of mediaval schools and schoolmen.

PART IV

I. DOCTRINAL SYNTHESIS OF WORCESTER MS.F.65.

Worcester MS.F.65, is, as we said in the description, a collection of disputations, determinations, lectures, arguments and propositions of vast theological range, the fruit of long and assiduous preparation of a benedictine monk-scholar at Oxford in the second half of the 14th century, between 1355 and 1372.

This Worcester monk-scholar, John Malverne, whom we have suggested as the collector, would obviously attend the lectures, not only of the regent masters of his own college, but also of the other regent masters in theology; this is certain in the case of the disputations, determinations and responsions which both scholars and bachelors in theology were bound to attend, in the capacity either of respondent or opponent.

It is clear, therefore, that the doctrinal synthesis of the present collection will present several difficulties. The first is the unsatisfactory reportation of the contents; it is well known that a treatise, a questio or any other scientific work may come down to us directly, from the pen of the writer himself, or indirectly, through his scholars or reporters. In the former case it is called Scriptum or ordinatio and represents the author's finished work as given to the stationarius for circulation among the students. It obviously embodies the clear and exact thought of the master on a particular theological question. In the latter, it is commonly called reportatio or reportatum and represents, either the notes taken by the student while the lecture was in progress or a summary written by the reporter. In either event, we are dependent on the accuracy and intellectual ability of the student or reporter for the true teaching of the master. Often, the reportatio was revised and corrected by the master himself, but it is doubtful if this happened with the manuscript under discussion. Here we have what we may call a private reportatio for the personal use of

the collector, and, in addition, a reportatio not only of published questions, but of disputations and determinations taken down during, or immediately after, their delivery. Another difficulty arises from the miscellaneous character of the collection, the contents of which cover a vast range of theological doctrines; some of these, as, for instance, the disputations, determinations and lectures are fairly adequately reported; others, like the arguments, opinions and propositions, most inadequately. The third difficulty is that the contents belong to several masters and bachelors of Oxford during the second half of the 14th century, many of whose names are unfortunately not given.

Taking into consideration these three main difficulties, it would obviously be incorrect to treat the doctrinal contents as a compact whole; such treatment would destroy the characteristic quality of the collection - the variety of subjects and of writers. The aim of this synthesis is, not to present a detailed account of each doctrine referred to in the manuscript, but to give an idea of the range of problems and questions, in which both masters and students were interested. Often such collections throw light on the political, as well as the intellectual condition of the period. This one seems to be of purely scholastic interest, but it reflects some of the problems which were warmly discussed in those days and some of the contemporary controversies. Among the subjects which occur most frequently are :- the doctrine of grace and its relation to free will, God's foreknowledge of future contingents, the part played by God in every action of the creature, justification and predestination. It may not be rash to assume that the predominant interest in such grave problems as the last-named was aroused by the famous 'De Causa Dei contra Pelagium' of Thomas Bradwardine.

It is surprising not to find any question on the relation of Church and State, the endowments of the clergy and the

mendicancy of the friars, all favourite topics of discussion during the period. Again, at a time of much preaching on reform, one might expect more discussion of moral subjects, whereas but two moral questions are dealt with:- the obligation of fulfilling vows and simony committed by those who give or receive money for admission to a monastery.

Instead of giving a dull list of bare propositions and titles of questions, we shall attempt to follow, as far as possible, the order of the four books of the Sentences of Peter Lombard; thiw will enable us to view the contents of our manuscript in the framework of the famous book which, together with the Bible, was the fundamental text-book in the theological faculty of all universities during the middle ages. The Lombard treats all theological doctrine under two aspects, res and signa. In the first three books, he deals with the res which are to be enjoyed and used; in the last, with the signa, that is, the sacraments and the last things.

As the collection is predominantly theological, we shall not deal with philosophical questions, such as those of John Tydishale on the proportion between intellectual knowledge and the evidence of reason.

BOOK I

In the first book, the Lombard considers the things which are to be enjoyed, namely, God, one in nature and three in persons.

God is one of the subjects most discussed in our collection, but He is considered mostly in relation to creatures and very little as He is in Himself. Thus, concerning the existence of God, we find a mere proposition, supposed to have been taken from a determination of John Wyclif, in which he says that the existence of God can be demonstrated infallibly by pure

philosophy. (n.101,p.136). (a) There are some anonymous conclusions on the Holy Trinity, mostly as to the relation of the three persons to each other and to the essence or nature of God, (b), for instance:- the Father is not the Son, still He does not differ from Him (n.55,p.104); the divine essence - which is really the three persons - in a way is distinct from the Father (n.58,p.104); the divine essence is not distinguished from the three persons, considered either individually or in common (n.61,p.104) - this seems to be contrary to the preceding proposition; it is impossible to enjoy one divine person without knowing or enjoying the others. (n.57,p.104).

The consideration of God in relation to His creatures seems to have been of more interest. The first question is:- Is it possible for rational creatures to have natural knowledge of God and of other spiritual beings substantias separatas ? The principal argument is based on the fact that Aristotle, in his Physics and Metaphysics, shows himself to have had a knowledge of God, which could only be natural, because he had no supernatural faith. The writer classifies the kinds of knowledge as:- perfect and imperfect, sensitive and intellectual, abstractive and intuitive; another kind of knowledge is that obtained, not through something distinct from the object, but from the thing itself or a simple concept elicited from it; or again, the thing may be known only in the concept attributed to it.

The answer is in the affirmative. He excludes the cognitio

(a) These references are to the Worcester Text in the second volume. The first number (n.....) refers to the question; the second to the page where the question is found.

(b) When reading these conclusions, one is reminded of the ten articles condemned by William of Auvergne, bishop of Paris, in 1241. St. Bonaventure gives them in full, in his Commentary on the Sentences, II Sent., dist.xxiii,q.2,§.3, (ed.Quaracchi, vol.II,p.547). See also Denifle-Chatelain, Cartularium Universitatis Parisiensis, Tom.I,n.128; and A. Masnovo, Da Guglielmo d'Auvergne a S.Tommaso d'Aquino, vol.II,p.71-2 (Milano 1946).

in se or intuitiva (a) of God in this life pro statu vie and affirms that knowledge of God is only possible through the compound concepts abstracted from created things, in other words, through sensible things and reasoning per discursum (n.43,p.100). This leads to two conclusions:- that though in the process we make use of composition, complexity and discussion, we finally apprehend God through a simple concept conceptu simplici (n.70, p.106), and that God who is indivisibiliter simplex is naturally knowable by man, but that the doctrine of the Trinity is not (n.74, p.106). An opposite conclusion states that the Holy Trinity is naturally knowable by man, because man can naturally know God, who is the Holy Trinity. The writer denies that a species of the Holy Trinity is impressed in the memory of man, but affirms that the intellective faculty can create such a species, just as the sensitive faculty can create for itself, imaginary forms (n.96,p.131).

Was man's knowledge of God the same before the Fall ? In other words, could Adam, in the state of innocence, see the essence of God immediately , immediate ? This question is discussed by two Benedictines, Adam Easton and Nicholas Redclif. Redclif at first pre-supposes that the immediate vision of God stands, in the present question, for the face-to-face intuitive vision; then, he excludes this vision because, according to St Augustine, it is reserved as a reward in heaven. He distinguishes between abstractive and intuitive vision of God and adds that Adam had the latter 'specie propria mediante'. Next, he points out the relation between acts of love and knowledge of God and says that the act of love presupposes the act of knowledge and that both

---

(a) Scotus, II lib., dist.,q.penultima, makes the distinction between intuitive and abstractive knowledge. Abstractive knowledge of a thing is independent of its actual existence; intuitive knowledge is knowledge of the thing present.

tend to the same object; he concludes that, in the state of innocence, the two acts were 'mediante specie terminante suum objectum', and that consequently, God was not seen directly, immediate (n.90,p.118).

In another question, Redclif expresses the same doctrine in different terminology. Adam, he says, had indirect but not direct intuition of the divine essence; in the latter, the divine essence terminates the intuition as its object, that is, the intuition is directed immediately to the divine essence; and because the divine essence is also the idea of all things created, they are seen in it indirectly, just as the idea of 'father' involves indirectly the idea'son'. There is also a respective intuition, in which the divine essence does not terminate the intuition as divine essence, but as the idea of all things, and thus, the things are seen directly, the divine essence indirectly (n.19,p.36).

The answer of Easton, which was probably the master's determination, is not given in full; we have only some arguments and the three main theories. The first belongs to Scotus (III Sent.,dist.14,q.11.schol.3) who claims that no creature, in any state whatever, can have naturally, ex se, an immediate vision of the divine essence, for that vision requires that the object be present or represented 'sub propria ratione per se cognoscibilis' whereas God's entity surpasses the intellectual capacity of all creatures. The second theory is that of Henry of Ghent, (3 Quodl.q.1,p.77-79b) and Richard Fitzralph (De Quest.Armen., lib.1, cap.1-6; lib.14,cap 14.) who say that no natural intellectual faculty can see clearly the divine essence.

The third belongs to St Thomas who maintains that no creature in the state of innocence has immediate vision of the divine essence because God is not an object proportionate to the created intellect, and proportion between the object and the faculty is required for all knowledge (Summa I,q.94,a.1.). We cannot say which opinion Easton holds; he argues against each (n.30,p.66).

Turning now to the questions on the knowledge and will of God in relation to His creatures, favourite subjects of discussion in the 14th century, we begin with the question:- Whether God sees future contingents ? The answer is that God foresees all future contingents, and can communicate this knowledge to man as He did, in fact, to the prophets. But from the fact that future contingents are foreseen by God, it does not follow that they will necessarily come to be, because God foresees them exactly as they are in themselves, that is, as things which may, or may not come to be; neither does it follow that in the mind of God there is something contingent, for the mind of God is His essence, from which all contingency is excluded (n.37,p.94). The doctrine of the divine prescience of future contingents and events is strictly connected with the doctrine of predestination, to which we shall turn our attention.

The doctrine most often represented in our collection is that of free will in God and man, especially in relation to grace and predestination; it was warmly debated in the 14th century, particularly from the time of Bradwardine to that of Wyclif. We find a question:- Whether the will of God is freer inwardly than outwardly ? 'ad intram quam ad extra', and the reply is that it is freer inwardly because inwardly, it is more perfect (n.93,p.126). A conclusion says that God is equally good to all His creatures (n.60,p.104).

What are predestination and reprobation ? Predestination and reprobation may be regarded as active and passive. Active predestination or reprobation means God predestining or reprobating; passive predestination or reprobation refers to the thing predestined or reprobated. To the question:- Whether God is the first cause of reward and punishment, and consequently, of reward and reprobation ?, the answer is that God is the first cause of both passive predestination and reprobation because He is the first cause of all positive things. (n.6,p.14). Granted that God is the first cause of passive predestination and

reprobation as positive things, it may still be asked, with regard to the active aspect:- Whether the will of God is the sole reason for the predestination and the reprobation of some creatures ?

We are now right in the heart of the problem, and the writer shows himself to have been a true follower of Scotus whom he quotes as his authority several times. The answer is that the will of God is the only reason why some men are predestined or reprobated and others are not. The fundamental reason is that the will of God is the source of all created goodness; things are good because they are accepted or approved by God. This doctrine agrees exactly with that of the 'acceptatio divina' of Scotus as the reason of justification. It is clearly illustrated in the election of Adam and the rejection of Lucifer; although the angelic nature is perfect and more noble than the human nature, still, neither was worthy of eternal life without divine acceptance and approbation; consequently Lucifer was never worthy of eternal life because he was never accepted by God; Adam was accepted and so made worthy; God is not an acceptor of persons who, in themselves, are equally unworthy of eternal life. In creating those whom He foresees will be damned, He shows justice and goodness, for as St Augustine says, it is better and more desirable to be miserable, <u>esse miserum</u>, than not to be at all; to be miserable includes at least, the goodness of existence; not to be, means not to participate in goodness at all. The writer continues that God does not predestine or reprobate man because of his merit or demerit, nor because He foresees that man will, or will not co-operate with Him in the execution of some good or evil action, for the temporal cannot be the cause of the eternal; and moreover, from the fact that God predestines or reprobates any individual, He foresees his good or evil action.

Some say, on the authority of St Anselm and St Gregory, that if Adam had not fallen, all his descendants would have been impeccable, and thus all would have been saved; this is not

correct, because St Anselm and St Gregory were not speaking 'per modum communem'; they suggest that, had Adam not fallen, God would have preserved the innocence of his posterity through grace, or even without grace; in the latter case, Adam's sons would have been neither the sons of the kingdom,'filii regni', nor of perdition 'filii ire', because the state of man in the purely natural order 'in puris naturalibus', is midway between the two. In conclusion, God is certainly wise in His actions, consequently, there must always be a reason why He predestines some men and reprobates others; this reason cannot be founded on merit or demerit, nor on the co-operation or non-co-operation of the creature with the will of God, but exclusively on His will; hence He predestines the elect volendo, but does not reprobate the damned'volendo, nec nolendo, sed non volendo quia in Deo non cadit nolle nec potest cadere.' This argument proves that the will of God is the exclusive cause of predestination and reprobation, and demonstrates well the theory of divine acceptance in predestination and justification.(n.10),p.159)

Another question belated to the theory of divine acceptance is:-(a) Whether charity is required for every meritorious act ? The reply is that charity is absolutely required in every meritorious act, because no man can act meritoriously unless he is loved by God 'Deo carus', and no one can be loved by God unless he is habitually in charity 'in caritate constitutus'. A disordered act, that is, one contrary to the law 'inordinatus ex lege', can be meritorious through charity, because merit is accidental and may indifferently accompany, or not accompany the act. (n.7,p.15)

(a) For the theory of divine acceptance discussed in the first half of the fourteenth century, see P.Vigneaux, Justification et Predestination au xiv siecle, in Bibliotheque de l'ecole des hautes etudes, T.xlviii,(1934) where he studies the theory of justification and predestination in Scotus, Peter Aureolus, William Occham and Gregory of Rimini.

There is a further conclusion, the reverse of the preceding:- that it is possible that a man who has not, and who never had charity, and in whom there will never be a disposition to grace, beyond what he actually possesses, should merit eternal life. (n.13,p.21) Another opinion on the doctrine of charity says that it is the merit of the creature; the author explains that the same thing may be considered as merit proper,' uod meremur', or as a reward, 'quo meremur'; thus a virtuous habit acquired by acts is 'caritas quedam' by which man merits, but in respect to the acts by which it is merited, it is a reward. (n.22,p.53) Concerning the will of God we find two questions:- Whether every rational creature is bound to will what God wills ?; Whether every rational ~~creature~~ will should be confirmed to the divine will ? Of the second question there are only few arguments (n.79,p.110). With regard to the first we are told that not every rational creature is bound to will what God wills, namely what is just and right, because it may happen that good men want good things which God does not will at that particular time; also, because the rational creature may desire things which are indifferent, that is, neither good nor evil. But every rational creature which has attained the perfect use of reason, is bound to will what God wills, because it knows that God wills what is just and right. In the eternal life every rational creature is so confirmed in God that it does not desire anything that is not willed by Him. Fibally no rational creature can, without sin, knowingly and freely will what is contrary to the will of God, because to do so would be to act knowingly against justice.(n.110,p.164)

BOOK II

In the second book, the Lombard deals with those things which are to be used; he first discusses their origin. There are two questions on creation, the term signifying, in both cases, the original production of something out of nothing. The first

question is:- Whether, notwithstanding the existence of creatures and their actions, God can still create ? The first creation is presupposed, and it is argued that God has now the same power as when He originally created the world out of nothing; therefore He can still create (n.20, p.48). In the second question, which is incomplete and very obscure, it is argued that because God causes independently. therefore He creates, for no other method of producing is appliacable to Him; hence every creature is created by God, notwithstanding that the agens secundum or second cause cooperates with Him and draws the form out of the potentiality of matter.

Two opinions are given on the question:- Whether and how God can supply for the material cause 'supplet vicem causae materialis! The first, which seems to have been held by Richard Fitzralph, says that if God takes the part of the material cause, it does not follow that He is part of the compound; matter and form are the elements of the compound, and when we say that the matter terminates the dependence of the form, we mean that the matter is a part of the compound and vice versa. The other opinion asserts that if God supplies for the material cause, He is part of the compound. Those who hold this opinion reply to the arguments of Fitzralph that, according to their view, the compound would be more perfect than God, which is not seemly. It would be unfitting to argue that the compound, which is not God or whose part is not God, is more perfect than God. As the reportation is deficient, the meaning is obscure. (n.38,p.95). Fitzralph treats of this matter in his commentary on the Sentences, questio 18: 'Utrum creacio soli Deo conveniat'. (a). He says that creation may be considered in three ways: first, 'pro facere vel agere', secondly, 'pro informacione per aliquam formam de novo', thirdly, 'dicitur creacio proprie produccio alicuius nova non ex materia presupposita produccione et sic loquuntur

---

(a) Ric. Fitzralph, Commentarium in Sententiis, P.Lombardi, MS. Oriel.15, ff.69vb, 72ra.

communiter doctores nostri majores et minores et sic loquendo de creacione, creacio soli Deo convenit'.

Closely related to the afore-mentioned arguments of Fitzralph is that in his tenth objection and the reply to it; speaking of creation proprie in contradistinction to production ex aliqo, he says that God cannot concur with the natural agent 'cum agente naturali', supplying for another natural agent by means of creation; that would mean that the two natural agents would produce two different effects and not one in common.

There are some conclusions in relation to the power of God; one belongs to John Wyclif who says that God is as powerful as one can be without repugnance, 'sine repugnancia', and that, from the process of Aristotle, it follows that God is infinitely powerful, but not 'infinite intensive' (n.101,p.136): (a) also, that God can produce naturally, what the creature produces freely (n.72,p.106). A further conclusion states that, although God can make the present not to be present, and the future not to be future, He cannot make the past not to be past, because in the past there is no positive term, 'non est terminus positivus, sed deficit extremum respectu eiusdem' (n.64,p.105). (b)

The interesting doctrine on divine dominion is also included. (c) Whether full dominion of God over creatures is acquired mainly through creation ? This question may have belonged to John Wyclif who, as is well known, wrote a book De Dominio Divino. The writer follows Richard Fitzralph who, in his

---

(a) cf.John Baconthorp, I Sent.,dist.43,q.1,(ed. Mediolani 1510) where he says 'quod processus Philosophi circa hoc habet intelligi de infinito in duratione'.

(b) Nicholas Aston has a special question on this matter in MS.Oriel 15,f.214,vb:'Utrum omne preteritum necessario preteritum?' He gives substantially the same conclusion. cf. also MS.Worcester Cath.Library,F.35,f.52va.

(c) For the development of the theory of dominion as applied to God and man see the chapters in 'The Austin Friars at the time of Wyclif', (Oxford 1940) pp.59-73, by A.Gwynn.

'De Pauperie Salvatoris', lib.I,cap.III, says that not governemant, nor sustenance or preservation but only creation is the act of God's full dominion over things. (cf.Wyclif's De Dominio Divino, lib.I, cap.v., where he refers to Fitzralph). Replying to objections, the writer says that if creatures were created from eternity, God would have been their Lord only in part. St Basil and St Ambrose hold that God created things successively, in order to show that He is Lord of everything; hence not government nor preservation but creation shows full dominion over creatures. Government and preservation can be exercised by kings, emperors, fathers and many others, but creation by God only. To the objection on annihilation, the writer replies that annihilation does not show full dominion; moreover it is not true that God annihilates. For instance, grace in the sinner is not annihilated by the commission of sin; but it ceases to exist as grace and remains a mere quality which owing to the difference of the circumstances, no longer disposes the sinner to good. In fact, the same habit may be virtuous in one person, vicious in another, because of different circumstances. And although a quality may be supernatural, it does not dispose supernaturally; thus, faith is a supernatural quality and is found in devils and the damned, but it does not dispose them supernaturally; they believe but do not merit. (n.91,p.121). A conclusion, probably belonging to Uthred of Bolton who is known to have been opposed to annihilation, says that although there may be a creature whom God cannot preserve in existence, there may also be a creature, not a lesser being than the other, whom God cannot annihilate (n.83,p.112). Another Oxford master, either Richard or Adam Tonworth, says that annihilation is the greatest punishment because it is 'passio generalis quia nihil ab ea excipitur' (n.77,p.108).

ANGELS.

Coming now to the question of particular creatures, we begin with the nobler spiritual beings, the angels. 'Whether an angel

is distinguished specifically from the human soul ' ? The answer is in the affirmative and the reasons given are, that the essential operations of the angel and the soul are naturally diverse, that the angel is naturally and specifically more perfect than the soul but that, notwithstanding its inferiority, the soul can excel the angel in grace and glory, as is the case with the Blessed Virgin (n.35,p.90). 'Whether the angels have knowledge of future contingents ' ? The angels have some knowledge of future contingents, because they have clear vision of the divine essence, wherein they see all future contingents; from this it does not follow that these contingents will certainly and necessarily come into existence;(a) the angels see them in the divine essence as they really are, that is, as things which may or may not come to be. The writer says that the lapsed angels could see their own fall because they were in clara sciencia; moreover, the guardian angels who have the care of particular men, foresee or can foresee, through immediate and evident, though not necessary causes, whether those under their care will be saved or lost.(n.5,p.12). There is a distinction between the inferior and superior angels, hence the question:-'Whether the inferior angels lack knowledge of something' ? The answer is that the angel does not get his knowledge through the species, and that the superior angel causes knowledge in the inferior angel by means of speech per loquelam. The angel understands, either in verbo or in proprio genere, only with supernatural light in lumine supernaturali; but it is possible that he understands abstractive without supernatural light. (n.54,p.103).

The movement of the angel is also discussed:-'Whether the angel moves suddenly or successively by means of its intrinsic nature ?' The angel, like other created natures, is intrinsically

---

(a) For the same argument see (n.37,p.94): 'Whether God foresees future contingents ?'

movable and in potentia ad aliquid; although, properly speaking, the angel cannot be in loco because he is not corporal, still not only he can move successively since/'quantum et dimensionatum' are in place, and again, when the angel is in one place, he is in potentia to move to another by local and successive movement - there is no other way (n.7,p.1).

Lastly there is a conclusion as to the relation between the angel and the prophet; it states that the angel communicates the future to the prophet, directly or indirectly, but cannot cause the act of understanding in the mind of the prophet because it is imminent (n.63,p.105).

MAN.

Man is composed of soul and body; the soul, as we have already seen is distinguished specifically from the other spiritual beings or angels. (n.35,p.90). Concerning the origin of the soul, there is an opinion which maintains that the soul is neither created nor, physically speaking, drawn out of the potentialities of matter, but that it emanates. The argument is:- Every natural philosopher must admit what is, or can be perfect in the universe and not repugnant to it. Now, in the universe, there is a form which depends on matter and gives existence to it; such is the brute form; there is another which depends on, but does not give being to matter - such is the animal form; hence there should be a form which does not depend on, but gives being to matter - this is the rational form, which is neither created nor drawn out of the potentiality of matter and therefore emanates, as there is no other alternative. This may be illustrated by reference to light which is not created nor drawn out of the potentiality of matter but emanates. (n.114,p.174).

About the knowledge of the soul, Master William Trevelleys asks:- 'Whether the soul understands anything which the man, to whom the soul belongs, does not understand ?' He replies that it does, and explains that the active intellect is the essence of

the soul, the passive intellect, the supreme fantastic power or supprema organizata; this fantastic power is the superior imagination and memory, and in it, there can be universal and particular species, through the medium of the active intellect which abstracts them and puts them in the fantastic power. In answer to objections, he says that the soul is limited in its nature and operation, and does not understand anything except what God, by means of His concursus, bids it to understand; this is the cause and reason why it may understand one thing and not another. He admits that every soul is equally sciens.(n.118,p.178).

Having dealt with man's knowledge of God before (19,90) and after the Fall (13), and the obligation of conforming his will with that of God (n.79,p.110), we proceed to see the more important questions on the freedom of the will:- 'Whether the rational will is contradictorily free', that is, whether man, in this life, can do or not do as he wishes ? The answer is in the affirmative, because knowledge of an object does not necessitate its being chosen; the angels had clear knowledge of the beatific object but did not choose it. He adds that if, in this life, the will were limited or necessitated by its object, merit or demerit would perish, 'eo quod tunc precise naturaliter tenderet in objectum' just as the earth 'in centrum movetur' (n.8,p.18). In another place we are told that the will is free regarding those things which lead to the end, consequently it is free with regard to the end itself (n.8,p).

'Confirmation' and 'obstination' refer to those things, towards which the will is changeable; a thing is said to be confirmed or obstinate when it cannot alter its adhesion from one object to another. The will is said to be free because it is master of its actions intrinsically; in this, it differs from the natural faculty which is moved extrinsically. Rational beings are free to do or not to do a certain thing, the brute cannot refrain from responding to a stimulus. From this it follows

that confirmation is contrary to freedom of the will as it is unable to do anything contrary to that in which it is confirmed (n.88,p.114).

About external influence on the will, we have the question:- 'Whether the will is moved by the object ?' There are three opinions, first, that the object moves the will to the determination to act, but the will moves itself to execute the act; second that the object moves the will by impressing in it a species, as it does in the intellect, but the will is free to act or not to act; third, that the will does not receive either species or anything else from the object, because if it did, the will would be forced, as the passive power is forced by its active principle. Which of these opinions the writer holds, we cannot tell, as he argues against all of them. (n.89,p.115).

We now pass on to the relation of the human will to God. An anonymous conclusion says that there is nothing in Holy Scripture to show that God concurs effectively with the rational creature in the production of acts of the will (n.73,p.106). The following question is discussed at length by an Oxford master and ex-chancellor of the University, Nicholas Aston:- 'Whether the concurrence of the first cause, that is, God, is necessarily required for every action of the second cause, that is, the creature?' He adduces several arguments pro and contra and finally supports the affirmative, in the sense that, when we say the creature acts, it follows that God co-operates or wills the act, because it is impossible that the creature should produce any effect unless He willed that effect and willed the creature to produce it. He says that, according to the doctors he has read, if the creature were able to act without the concurrence of God, it would no longer be a contradiction to say that the creature exists and God does not exist. Moreover, God can communicate to the creature, his activity, his power and manner of acting but not the ability to act independently of God, because God, whose power is infinite, can

alone act independently; and although He concurs with the creature in an infinite way, it does not follow that the effect will be infinite, as the creature is free to determine the degree of intensity of the act. In relation to sin, he says that God concurs in the act of sin but does not will the sin; when the creature commits sin, it is acting contrary to His will. The writer argues against the opinion of those who say that God wills the sin of the creature:- Sin is not desired by God, for, as sin, there is nothing of good in it. If God willed the creature to sin, He could reveal this and command the sin; hence would follow an absurdity - the creature, in performing the sinful act, would be guilty of that sin; at the same time, it would be obeying the will of God and consequently, would not sin. (n.108,p.142).

On the subject of sin, we have several conclusions and questions; here, we shall discuss only sin in general. No question on sin is discussed fully; some questions are stated but more conclusions:- 'Whether any sin is, in itself, irremediable?' (n.33,p.89). Whether the divine Word deletes the guilt of sin by means of the sacrament of Penance (n.26,p.60); that it is possible to find a sin, infinitely intensive, which God cannot forgive through the sacraments, (n.28,p.65); that the sacraments do not change eternal punishment into temporal (n.97,p.132); that greater punishment is due to the first mortal sin committed by a person than to those committed later by the same person. (n.65,p.105). Finally, there is an interesting classification of the conditions which render sin forgivable or the reverse. The writer says that sin is made irremediable in three ways:-

<u>negative</u>, when all possibility of remission is removed, as in the case of the fallen angels,

<u>privative</u>, when all worthiness of remission is lacking, as in a person in mortal sin,

<u>contrarie</u> when the faculty is so disposed by sin, that

remission is rendered impossible, as in the sin against the Holy Ghost.

He concludes that the causes for remission of sin are six in number. Two derive from God - hope of divine pity and fear of divine justice, two from the gifts of God - divine grace and knowledge of the truth, and two from the consideration of sin - its ugliness and the brief pleasure it affords. The sin against the Holy Ghost is opposed to these six causes and so rendered irremediable (n.18,p.34).

On the problem of grace there are some conclusions:- that it is possible for a rational creature to be without sin and without grace (n.98,p.132); the good act, proceeding from grace, may be as good as the mortal guilt is bad (n.99,p.132) and others. We shall discuss the doctrine of original sin later.

BOOK III

In the third book, the Lombard deals primarily with the Incarnation of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, and secondarily, with the virtues and their contrary habits.

In a determination of a certain Atton, we find a discussion of the opinion that the human nature in Christ is a person. Atton is not clear in his exposition and conclusions and we cannot say whether this opinion belonged to him or to others. We quote two conclusions:- The Son of God, who is a human person by the human personality, is not, formally speaking, a human person by the created, but by the increated personality; although the Son of God, who is a human person, is not, strictly speaking, a human person by the created personality, still He can be a human person by the created personality. (n.24,p.55). In an anonymous question:-'Whether the increated personality suffices to assume in person, both divine and human natures ?', the writer is somewhat obscure. In fact, at the end of the question, he says that he holds the negative view, but his conclusions suggest the affirmative. He says, for example, that using the term personare transubstantive, as it is used in the

schools, we must hold that no increated personality suffices to personate both natures of Christ; then, that every increated personality suffices to personate both natures in Christ; again, that only the increated personality suffices to personate the two natures in Christ; finally, that both God and a creature suffice to personate a rational creature. The anonymous writer is probably Atton, manifesting as he does, the same obscure and confused exposition which characterises the other questions attributed to him. (n.112,p.171).

In relation to the hypostatic union, there are two conclusions. The first says that the soul of Christ, notwithstanding the union, can sin. Against this, the anonymous writer argues that, to be perfectly present to God means impossibility to sin; the soul of Christ, through the hypostatic union, was perfectly present to God; therefore the soul of Christ could not sin. (n.115,p.175). In the second conclusion, the writer argues against the opinion of those who say that the soul of Christ, notwithstanding the union, is not happy. He replies that the soul of Christ is perfectly happy, through the union, because perfectly united to the beatific vision; happier than souls in heaven, because the hypostatic union confers grace and predestination as well (n.27,p.64). Another conclusion is directed against those who hold that Christ was a prophet and therefore could not doubt (n,21,p.51.).

About the knowledge of Christ while on earth, we have the opinion of two Oxford masters, the Benedictine,Nicholas Redclyf, and William Trevelleys. To the question:- 'Whether Christ, while on earth, had natural intuition of the divine essence through created species ?', Redclyf replies that Christ did not have natural intuition of the divine essence, not even through a created species, because He had knowledge, <u>notitiam</u>, which cannot be natural. Christ, he says, did not possess any scientific habit, because He possessed full happiness in which every scientific habit is rendered void 'vacuatur omnis habitus

scientiae naturalis' (n.19,p.36). As to whether Christ had any scientific habit, Trevelleys, in one of his determinations, says that, besides the knowledge sciencia by which He is God, and the science in Verbo, Christ had another, acquired knowledge in which He progressed. He then refers to three conclusions of a certain Frater Minor:- first, that Christ did not acquire knowledge by means of a species received through the organs; that Christ did not experience ignorance through some defect; thirdly, that in Christ, experimental knowledge was so called, not because it was generated by the senses, but because it was known by the senses (n.118,p.178).

On the doctrine of redemption, there are three questions. The first:- 'Whether Christ, by His death, gained for us two-fold life ?' , is Hatton's; he replies with ten conclusions, none of which answers the question. For instance he says in one conclusion:- Christ did not suffer death for the human race, because He did not suffer death in, before or after the instant of death. (n.3,p.8.).

There are two questions on the relation of Christ to creatures but only one reply. The first is:-'Whether the creature should be more grateful to God for creation than for redemption ?' (n.102,p.137). The second is:- 'Whether man should serve his Lord, that is, Christ, 'servitute obligetur', in acknowledgement of the benefit of redemption ?' The answer is 'Yes', because redemption is a benefit profitable to all; none are excepted, neither those of the Old Testament who, though in existence before its accomplishment, were graced in virtue of it; nor even the demons, the damned or those who have committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, because the obligation by which they were once bound to love God, obliges still. The fact that not everyone partakes of the benefit, does not imply defect in the benefit itself, but negligence on the part of those who do not wish to use it (n.18,p.34).

Two questions deal with the distribution of punishments and rewards by Christ:-'Whether Christ, the Wisdom of God the Father, distributes rewards and punishments according to justice ?' The writer says first, that Christ, who is the same eternal wisdom as the Father, began to exist in time as Christ, the God made man; secondly, that the reward, though acquired through grace, will be given as if a debt; thirdly, that Christ distributes rewards and punishments freely, 'contingenter' and 'libere Contradictorie'; He remunerates every man for his works, according to merit, but He does not predestine or reprobate because of merits; finally, Christ remunerates so justly that no reprobate will be unjustly punished, nor any predestined undeservedly rewarded. (n.42,94,95, pp.98,127,129).

BOOK IV

The last book of the Sentences deals with signs, that is, with the Sacraments and the last things. We find no questions on the Sacraments except that of Hatton:- 'Whether the Incarnate Word deletes the guilt of sin through the Sacrament of Penance ?' To this he replies that the Sacrament of Penance, in a strict sense, does not delete the guilt <u>de lege</u> but in a wider sense, it does, through the influence of the Incarnate Word, delete guilt. (n.25,p.60).

On the doctrine of vows, we have a disputation between Adam Easton and Nicholas Redolyf:- 'Whether every vow made to God should be fulfilled ?' Redolyf replies that every vow, rightly made, strictly binds the vower to its fulfilment; if a person performs an action by which he transgresses his vow and a precept of God, it does not follow that he commits two mortal sins, because one and the same act cannot constitute two sins. He adds that all those conditions which promote the better fulfilment of the vow, fall under the obligation of the vow, and that a person who makes a vow to enter religion without deciding on a particular order, will fulfil his vow by actual entry into any order (n.92,p.123).

Important doctrine on the Sacred Scriptures is discussed by William Trevelleys in two questions:- 'Whether all the things written by St John in the Apocalypse and by all the prophets in Holy Scripture are, will be or were true ?' (n.119,p.182), and:- 'Whether the prophecies and sayings of Sacred Scripture concerning the last judgement and the coming of Antichrist are true and therefore, to be asserted without error ?' (n.15, p.22). Trevelleys first distinguishes between the true and false prophet. The true prophet is he who tells, for the right purpose and with the right intention, all the things supernaturally revealed to him by God and correctly understood by him; or, the true prophet is he who announces, announced or will announce, for the right purpose, all secrets supernaturally revealed to him by God or by another good spirit. The false prophet is he who announces or will announce, with the intention of deceiving and for an evil purpose, all the secrets understood by him. He gives the characteristics of a good prophet:- 1, holiness of life; 2, the fulfilment, according to his mind, of all that he has asserted and not afterwards retracted; 3, retraction of what was wrongly asserted; 4, authentication by the Church; as the Holy Ghost inspired the prophets, so now, He inspires the Church and the Pope, in order to approve and preserve as authentic, all the sayings of the prophets; thus every prophecy must be 'cum exceptione mutacionis suppremi iudicis'. Trevelleys then explains the different kinds of knowledge possessed by Christ:- the first, of God Himself; the second, which the soul of Christ had <u>in Verbo</u>; the third, experimental, acquired through the exercise and operation of the senses. Finally, he replies to the two questions with several conclusions:-

1. Christ had three kinds of knowledge; by the first and second, He knew the day of the last judgement and the coming of Antichrist, but not by the third.

2. We cannot say for certain when the last judgement will be but from the words of Scripture and of the Saints, we may

conjecture that it will be forty days after the death of Antichrist.

3. Many heretics and persecutors of the Church whom the Scriptures call Antichrist, have passed, but the real Antichrist of whom the Acts of the Apostles, St Paul and Daniel speak, is either living now or will come in the future.

4. All the prophecies and sayings of Scripture on the last judgement and the coming of Antichrist are true and to be asserted without error.

5. In every prophetic assertion properly so called, the dispensation and prudence of the supreme judge is considered excepted.

6. Every prophecy, properly so called, is, was and will be infallibly true and the gift of prophecy may sometimes be found in a man in mortal sin. (n.119,15).

Redclyf, speaking of prophecy, says that the knowledge of the prophet is hindered by the dependence of the soul on the body; in order that a man may be disposed to prophesy, God imparts to him a supernatural quality. Prophecy is made by vision or by knowledge. Pharao had prophetic vision; he saw signs and prophesied accordingly. Daniel had prophetic knowledge; he interpreted signs which he had not seen. Perfect prophecy consists in seeing the sign and knowing how to interpret it (n.2,p.6). Richard Fitzralph, in his Commentary on the Sentences describes the different kinds of revelation, in similar terms: 'corporalis et spiritualis et intellectualis.' MS.Oriel 15, ff.58,va.

II SPECIAL DISCUSSIONS.

A. MASTER UTHRED AND THE FRIARS AT OXFORD.

1. The quarrel between the Friars and the secular clergy came to an end, at least for a short time, with the death of Archbishop Richard Fitzralph, great champion of the seculars at Oxford, in Avignon towards the end of 1360. (1)
The memory of it was still fresh when it was renewed by members of the monastic orders, amongst them Uthred of Bolton, monk of Durham. (2)
The subject of both quarrels was the lawfulness of mendicancy and its warrant in Scripture; but the second led to serious controversy on several other theological questions. In both, the decision was given in favour of the friars; as to the result of the first, we have the testimony of a bitter opponent of the friars, Walsingham, monk of St Albans; the condemnation of some of Uthred's opinions, supposed to have been collected by the friars from his lectures at Oxford and presented for examination to Simon Langham, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1368, provides the evidence in the second case.

The chief known disputants on the question of mendicancy were Uthred on the part of the monks, John Hilton, O.F.M., and William Jordan, O.P., on the part of the friars. (3)

It seems that Uthred first roused the friars with the attack on their mendicancy in his work : 'Contra eorum

---

(1) For this controversy and the part played by Fitzralph see The English Austin Friars, by A.Gwynn (Oxofrd, 1940), 80-89, and his article in Studies (1937) 50-68: also R.L.Poole in D.N.B., vii, 194-198.

(2) For Uthred see Biography, p.44.

(3) For John Hilton and his works see: J.Bale: Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Brittaniae Catalogus, (Basle, 1559), 483; A. Little, Greyfriars at Oxford, p. 243; Marcett, op.cit., p. 8. For William Jordan see Marcett, op.cit., p.49-56, where she gives the first full account of his life and works.

mendicitatem' . (1).

The first to answer in defence of his order was John Hilton who is said to have 'determined' in the schools against Uthred. These disputations are the 'Determinaciones de paupertate fratrum, et de statu minorum' mentioned by Bale. (2).

William Jordan replied to Uthred with his: Apologia fratrum mendicantium adversus Utredum Boldum, monachum nigrum. In this tract, or in another, Jordan must have attacked Uthred bitterly, because in the documents still extant he and Uthred are always associated as litigants. Unfortunately, Jordan's tract is not extant, or rather is not yet identified; it would have thrown much light on the controversy.

The controversy reached its culminating point when the friars drew up a list of opinions on several theological subjects, supposed to have been collected from the lectures and disputations of Uthred, and presented them to the Archbishop of Canterbury for examination. It is worth noting here that the friars, exasperated by the attacks of Uthred did not accuse him, as they did Fitzralph, of contempt for their mendicant state, but of holding heretical opinions, a charge which had no connection with the original quarrel. This was a wise step;

---

(1) This tract is still extant in Paris Bibl.Nat.MS.3183 (Regius 3911) ff.160v-168v, 169r. Pelster gives the full description of this manuscript in his article Eine Kontroverse zwischen englischen Dominicanern und Minoriten uber einige Punkte der ordensregel, in Arch.Frat.Praed.,III,(1933) p.59
The tract begins on f.160va: 'Questio Domini Uthredi monachi Dunelm. Utrum paupertas mendicitatis, que est ultima in divisione facta, in predicatoribus (MS.predicacionibus) ponat offendiculum verbo Dei'.....Explicit aliquid de dictis domini Utredi monachi Dunelmensis'. On f.169r there are some arguments which belong also to Uthred on the same matter. We shall give a summary of the questio at the end of the discussion of the theological teaching of Uthred.

(2) An Oxford Franciscan, Tryvytlam, wrote a poem 'De laude Universitatis Oxonie', in which he attacked the opponents of the mendicant orders. Uthred is one of the opponents, describes as 'armata bestia duobus cornibus'.. In verses 450-495 Tryvytlam attacks Uthred.
This poem is found among Gale's MSS, now O.9.38. It was first printed by Hearne in his 'Historia vitae et regni Ricardi II', H.Furneaux printed it again with notes in Collectanea III ,(O.H.S.1896)pp.195-209.

had they preferred the former charge, the authorities would probably have ignored the matter; whereas an accusation of heretical teaching demanded serious action, especially during that critical period before Wyclif's open attack on the church. This tract containing the list of Uthred's supposed errors was published and achieved great circulation.

The 'Liber Famosus', as Uthred calls it began thus:- 'Isti sunt articuli quos dominus Uthredus .....pro veris tenuit et contra impugnatores defendit in suis leccionibus et determinacionibus publice affirmando.....' And en ed:-'Preter autem istos articulos unum librum edidit, in quo non solum isti set multi alii continentur errores.'

Uthred seeing his fame and his orthodoxy in danger, replied with another tract:'Contra Querelas Fratrum'. (1) After a long introduction in which he shows from the Old and New Testament the danger of false brethren, he enumerates the twenty eight articles drawn up by the friars, takes them one by one and gives a short explanation, affirming or rejecting them as his opinions:'Ut autem expressius eorum latens falsitas convincatur.....ipsorum scripturam tem detestabilem, quoad puncta singula recitabo, et ubi mentiti fuerint ac ubi vera immiscuerint, declarabo.' Uthre does not mention his adversaries by name, but we have sufficient evidence to justify us in supposing, that William Jordan was the chief. (2) Bale reports that, in a letter to

---

(1) This tract is still extent in Brit.Mus.Royal MS.6DX. It was edited by Miss Hargett, op.cit., pp.25-37, but she made many inaccuracies. There are three other manscripts of this tract, one is complete in MS.Wood Rolls I, in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and two incomplete MS.Tanner 40°, f.83b, and Balliol 149, ff.63-64v. Hargett says that MS.Balliol begins on f.64 and omits the introduction of the tract, whereas it starts on f.63 which contains the introduction:'Periculis in falsis fratribus.....ergo Pater in divinis non est sapiencia.'

(2) Miss Hargett, top.cit., p.49, trying to prove that Uthred had in his mind one opponent, i.e. Jordan, made a little confusion Her first argument is not conclusive, because the passage in question has a general meaning. Her second argument is founded on a misunderstanding of the latin. The passagae referred to by her is the conclusion of the cedula, and refers to Uthred. In fact Uthred says 'Ad quod respondebo quod librum nondum edidi.....'

Simon Langham in 1368, (1), Adam, the Cistercian Abbot of Rewley, near Oxford, said of Uthred, 'Oxonii multas opiniones novas et subtiles invenit per studii laborem scolastici exercitii gratia... et adversarium molestissimum habebat Guillhelmum Jordan Dominicanum calumniatorem, qui eum ab ecclesie unitate proscindere nitebatur.' From this letter we may draw some conclusions, which throw light on the controversy: first, that the memory of the quarrel was still fresh in 1368; secondly, that the 'per laborem studii exercitii gratia' is a reference to the scholastic disputations, a time of speculation, in which everyone might express his opinions, even if hazardous, without incurring condemnation : (2) thirdly, it illustrates the behaviour of William Jordan during the dispute which took place in 1366, or shortly before, and proves that he was the author of, or at least the chief contributor to, the tract which aimed at the condemnation of Uthred: 'qui eum ab ecclesie unitate proscindere nitebatur.'

According to a letter, published by Mr. Pantin from a hitherto unnoticed Durham document (3) the quarrel began some time in 1366. This letter contains reports of events at Whitby subsequent to the visitation held by Uthred and the Abbot of St Mary's, York, during the summer and autumn of 1366. It was sent by a monk of St Mary's to a master of theology at Oxford. Mr. Pantin dates the letter c. December 8, 1366, and says that perhaps Uthred had already returned to Oxford when this letter was sent

---

(1) A part of this letter is reported by Bale in the Index, p.7,463. We do not know how much of the actual reportation by Bale belongs to Adam. It seems that Bale is citing the actual words, but we cannot say for certain as the letter is no longer extant.

(2) For these practices see G.Michalski: Le Criticisme et le Scepticisme du xiv siècle, in Bulletin de l'Academie Polonaise de sciences et lettres, (1926)

(3) W.A.Pantin, Documents Illustrating the chapters of the English Black Monks, (Camden Soc. 1937) III, p.308-9 and 309 n.2. and also on the Visitation, Ibid. 277-8

to him; he would then be better able to get in touch with the abbot of St Albans, as the letter urges. It concludes: 'De modo accessus et recessus fratris Willelmi Jordani de Oxonia...aliis (incidendus ? oportunis) libenter audirem. '

Unfortunately the end of the letter is fragmentary, but it suggests that Uthred was at Oxford in the autumn of 1366, and that the quarrel had already begun. E. Gwynn says (1) that it may even have beem concluded at this time, but it seems a little improbable that the imposition of silence on the disputants and the condemnation of one of them should have been postponed until 1368, i.e. for a period of two years.

In conclusion, the attack on Uthred was intended by the friars as a final check to his opposition to the mendicants. Uthred's fame was in danger '<u>fama mea penes personas graves ex eorum malicia denigratur</u>', so that he was obliged to defend himself against the charge of heresy, brought by the friars in his absence, '<u>isti vero fratres maledicti non in scolis, nec in locis aliis aptis pro veritate discucienda set a tergo resistunt veritati scolastice, ubi eorum mendacia per audientes non poterunt reprehendi.</u>' The friars accused him of publishing a book which contained several errors; Uthred denied this and said: '<u>librum nondum edidim set plura dixi et scripsi</u>' which might be attacked and opposed by the scholars ' <u>a clericis</u>' (2), but could not be refuted by all the false brethren: '<u>set ab omnibus falsis fratribus quantumcumque malevolis non poterunt infirmari.</u>'

Uthred's contemptuous treatment of the friars as uneducated, unlearned people and distinguished from the clerici, is exemplified again in art. xi, where he says: 'tales tamen in patria clerici reputantur, set inter scholasticos sunt laici ydioti.' He finishes his tract by protesting his willingness to

---

(1) A.Gwynn: in <u>Review of English Studies</u>,(Oxford 1943) p.20

(2) For the meaning of <u>clericus</u> in the Middle Ages, see <u>Rashdall</u>, III, p.391-376, 181-2.

discuss the matter with his fellow masters '<u>cedulam istam scripsi tam ecclesiasticis et prelatis exhibendam....tam scolasticis graduatis ob exercicium ostendendum, ut contra hec si velint arguant, ubi eorum opinionibus me viderint repugnasse.</u>' Did anyone accept his challenge ?

---

2. MS.WORCESTER F.65 AND UTHRED'S CONTROVERSY.

MS.Worcester F.65 contains four questions which are connected directly or indirectly with the controversy of Uthred with the Friars at Oxford. They represent the last phase, when the two parties disputed in the schools, and attacked one another, on several theological questions.

The disputants are a certain Hatton or Atton, who was apparently a friar, and Uthred. Two questions are attributed to Hatton, and another, which is anonymous, most probably belongs to him also; the fourth belongs to Uthred.

Questions disputed:

F.1. Determinacio Hatton: Utrum Christus sua simpla morte nobis meruit duplam vitam.

F.11v. Contra Utredum.
Replicacio eiusdem in materia clare visionis.

F.7. (Hatton ?)
Utrum quodlibet suppositum nature humane videbit Verbum incarnatum Dei salutare.

F.19. Utredus.
Utrum pro via et pro patria sit status hominis suis intrinsecis correspondens.

The importance of these questions to the controversy is evident; that of Uthred is the only extant work, besides the treatise <u>Contra Querelas Fratrum</u>, in which we find his special theory on the clear vision of our ultimate end '<u>finis ultimus</u>'; as to the other three they provide the only evidence, besides Uthred's treatise, of his opponents' view. The authorship of the question on f.7 is not certain, but we may say with great probability that it also belongs to Hatton; the arguments present a remarkable similarlity with those in his <u>replicacio</u>. For instance, on f.11v Hatton, after giving in full the opinion of

Uthred on the clear vision of our ultimate end, says that he intends to argue: first, against the replies (given no doubt by Uthred) 'et arguitur contra responsiones' ; secondly, as to the opinion of the church on the things necessary for salvation; 'et arguitur de ecclesia et eius opinione in necessariis ad salutem.'

The latter point is taken up by the anonymous writer of f.7, who says that if the theory of the clear vision were admitted it would follow that the church has failed to teach what is most necessary for salvation, and consequently that it was unknown to her and to the apostles : 'sequitur quod in necessariis ecclesia deficit, eo quod latuit ecclesiam et apostolos ante ista tempora quod fuit necessarium ad salutem' .

When did these disputations take place ? We have no direct clue to the answer but we may venture a few suggestions. Uthred wrote his Contra Querelas Fratrum in answer to the Liber Famosus, as he called it, which contained Uthred's opinions as collected by the friars from his lectures at Oxford. The Liber Famosus was sent to the Archbishop to be examined; after some time, in 1367-8 the Archbishop wrote to the chancellor of the University ordering him to silence both parties who were still disputing while the matter was on trial. It follows, therefore, that these questions belong to the period between the writing of the Liber Famosus and the Contra Querelas Fratrum, and the end of the trial. Two points strengthen this suggestion: first the close similarity between some opinions in F.11v, and the articles collected by the friars as found in the Contra Querelas Fratrum. For instance the third article as reported by the friars reads:'Quod quilibet de lege communi in via, tam adultus quam non adultus, habebit claram visionem ipsius Dei'. Uthred maintains that this view is correct and then proceeds to explain that the term ' lex communis', the common law, must not be restricted to the law of the Church, but should extend to all laws regarding man as such. Hatton gives the article in full together with Uthred's explanation, which goes to prove that the question is probably posterior to the treatise; secondly, Hatton, at the beginning

of his question, expresses his intention to argue against the replies: '<u>et arguitur contra responsiones</u>' . What are these responsiones ? Does he refer to the treatise in which Uthred replied to the <u>Liber Famosus</u> ? It seems very probable, for in his question we find most of the articles of the <u>Liber Famosus</u>; but a definite reply cannot be given without further evidence.

The probable order of these disputations was as follows:- the Friars collected the articles from Uthred's lectures and sent them to the Archbishop; Uthred replied with the <u>Contra Querelas Fratrum</u>, in order to exculpate himself from the charges; meanwhile the parties continued to dispute. Uthred must have been defending his theory that the clear vision of God is given as a general remedy to all men, whether christians or not, at the last moment before death. Hatton (?) replied with the question in f.7 in which he attacked several of Uthred's opinions and showed clearly that his "clear vision" theory is absolutely untenable, because it contradicts natural philosophy, the statutes of the Church and the sanctions of theology. Probably Uthred continued to teach his theory, and Hatton replied with another question (in F.11v) attacking several more of Uthred's opinions. In addition to these questions, there is a determination of Hatton (f.2v) of which the three conclusions - one on the clear vision, the other two on grace - are probably directed against the teaching of Uthred.

Most of the opinions attacked in the questions on f.7 and f.11v. correspond to the articles collected by the Friars; and it is worth noting that the articles attacked by Hatton correspond to those condemned by the Archbishop.

For the sake of clarity we give here a list of the articles with the corresponding number in the <u>Contra Querelas Fratrum</u>.

(1) Item in materia quod lignum fuit prohibitum quia malum et quia inconveniens ad esum. (art. 23).

(2) Item ubi dicitur quod in ista visione committitur peccatum ultimum. (art.4)

(3) Ttem ubi dicitur quod nullus potest peccare contra Patrem appropriate. (art.5)

(4) Item ubi dicitur quod Deus non potest immediate punire aliquem, eo quod Deus non potest esse tortor. (art.28).

(5) Item ubi dicitur quod est medium sufficiens in natura ad attingendum finem naturalem. (art.19).

(6) Item gracia nihil est nisi debita habitudo ad Deum per sic ponentes. (art.14,17).

(7) Item.....ergo propter peccatum commissum extra claram visionem foret quis iuste dampnatus. (art. 21).

3. QUESTIONS UNDER CONTROVERSY.

The main source in this brief study of the doctrines under controversy will be the treatise, Contra Querelas Fratrum, because it contains all the articles which are found both in Simon Langham's condemnation, and in our disputations. We shall follow this order: first, the opinion of Uthred as it is reported in our manuscript; then his doctrine taken from the treatise; lastly, the arguments in brief of his opponents, and when possible, the relation of these to the opinions of other theologians. We may gather the whole doctrine under three main headings:

GOD=====CLEAR VISION====GRACE

GOD

Item ubi dicitur quod Deus non potest immediate punire aliquem, eo quod Deus non est tortor. (art.xxviii)

Uthred does not give any explanation of this opinion, but re-affirms it dixi et dico, adding that 'God has many torturers in his kingdom', and ending with a jest at the expense of the friars, 'as also in this world he has innumerable false brethren to punish and purify his faithful'. The whole question rests clearly on the adverb immediate, whether God directly, or by means of others, inflicts punishment on the transgressors of his law.

Hatton takes up the theological distinction between poena dampni, the privation of the vision of God, and the poena sensus, the suffering of the senses involved in sin, and then argues in this way:-

Every mortal sin brings with it the poena dampni immediately, that is, the mortal sin, on its commission, deprives man of grace and consequently of the right to heaven and the vision of God, that is, of ultimate beatitude. These privations, especially the privation of the vision of God are inflicted directly by God, as is evident in the case of Lucifer and his companions "a quo immediate Deus substraxit se", i.e. He deprived them for ever of the beatific vision; in other words He condemned them to eternal perdition.

Therefore God may punish directly, without the intervention of second causes.

I cannot trace the source of this opinion ; it may have originated from the Lombard, IV Sent.D.xlvii c.v., where he discusses whether, after the last judgement, the devils, who are called by the Holy Scripture torturers of souls, will receive power to punish the damned in hell.

Item ubi dicitur quod nullus potest peccare contra Patrem appropriate. (art.i)

The friars' article continues 'eo quod non est possibile aliquem peccare ex impotencia.' Replying to this article Uthred gets exasperated and uses very strong phrases 'ideo a mendacio quod est proprium patris eorum incipiunt scriptum suum.' He states that the article is false, and that he does not hold it 'nec articulum hunc tenui' , then he explains himself. Apparently in one of his lectures he said (set dixi et persuasi) that only cognitive and free creatures can sin. Cognition and free will are indispensable for every human act.

Cognition is either clear or obscure, so man may be found in a state of clear knowledge, status scientiae, or in a state of obscure knowledge, status fidei. Every sin, then, is committed either with clear knowledge, i.e. through malice, or with obscure knowledge, i.e. through ignorance. Consequently malice and ignorance are the only possible sources of sins, 'tantum duo

prima genera peccatorum, scilicet, peccatum ignorancie.....et peccatum malicie.'

He continues that, as power is attributed to the Father, wisdom to the Son, and goodness to the Holy Ghost, the sin through ignorance is against the Son, the sin through malice against the Holy Ghost, but there can be no sin against the Father as represented by power. Our Lord speaks only of two kinds of sin, that against the Son, ex ignorancia, which is reparable, and that against the Holy Ghost, ex malicia which is irreparable. He does not mention a sin against the Father. We conclude therefore that noone can sin against the Father as personifying power, because every sin is due either to ignorance or malice. This does not mean that no one can sin against the Father at all, because as the three persons are one God, one power, one wisdom, one goodness, so a sin against power or wisdom or goodness, is a sin against the three persons, but not appropriatelh , i.e. as personifying power, wisdom and goodness.

OPPONENT.

> 'Whoever commits a sin which he cannot avoid, sins from impotency. Every child commits sins which he cannot avoid, therefore every child sins from impotency. The argument—sin of impotency is appropriately against the Father, therefore every child sins appropriately against the Father, consequently it is possible to sin against the Father appropriately

We must notice here that according to Uthred's doctrine it would follow logically that peccatum impotencie must always be under the genus peccatorum ignorancie, which belongs to the state of faith, that is the state of obscure vision or knowledge, and never under the genus peccatorum malicie, which belongs to the state of clear vision, and whose only source is obstinacy in evil. Peccatum impotencie as taken by the opponent means impossibility of avoiding sin, as in the case of children who, because of lack of perfect reason, cannot distinguish moral good and evil, and are therefore inculpable according to that moral principle 'nemo

tenetur ad impossibile.

Both definitions of the peccatum impotentie are inexact, and x against the traditional doctrine, clearly summed up in the Lombard's words:(1)

> 'Non itaque distinctio illa verborum sic accipienda est quasi trium personarum divisae sint offensae, sed ibi genera peccatorum distincta sunt; peccatum enim in Patrem id intelligitur, quod fit per infirmitatem, quia Patri Scriptura attribuit frequenter potentiam; peccatum in Filium quod fit per ignorantiam, quia sapientiax Filio attribuitur; tertium expositum est. Qui ergo peccat per infirmitatem vel per ignorantiam facile veniam adipiscitur, sed non ille qui peccat in Spiritum Sanctum. Cum autem una sit potentia, sapientia, bonitas trium, quare Patri potentia, Filio sapientia Spiritui Sancto bonitas saepius assignetur, superius dictum est.'(2)

St. Thomas says that only the sin against the Holy Ghost, which is ex industria is properly genus peccatorum, because both the cause and the effect are sins in themselves; whereas frailty and ignorance are not sins in themselves, but punishements or effects accruing to original sin. (3)

THE THEORY OF THE CLEAR VISION OF GOD.

I. Solet hic dici et specialiter per Utredum, quod quilibet habebit visionem claram /Dei/ de lege communi, que lex non est restringenda ad legem ecclesie, sed est generalis ad xxxxx omnem legem competentem homini prout homo. (art.iii)

II. Nullus potest subito mori.

III. Omissio boni est ultimum peccatum

IV. Pro nullo peccato commisso citra claram visionem /Dei/ est aliquis iuste dampnandus. (art.xxi,xii,xiii)

This is the most important, and perhaps the predominant, theory in Uthred's theological teaching. We cannot say whether it was a novelty taught exclusively by Uthred; probably others held the same opinion, 'solet dici', but it was certainly a

---

(1) II Sent.,dist.xliii,cap.unicum.(ed.Quarecchi,1916)

(2) I Sent.,dist.xxxiv,cap.4.

(3) St.Thomas,Comment.II Sent.,dist.xlii,q.i,ar .iii.

favourite theme with Uthred: 'et specialiter per Utredum'.
It must have been hotly debated at Oxford, and must have alarmed some orthodox theologians who abhorred novelties in dogmatic teaching. Most probably the De Clara Dei visione and the De libera electione ante mortem ascribed to the Dominican, William Jordan, the opponent of Uthred, belong to this period, and were connected with this controversy. Unfortunately they are not known to be extant.

Uthred's theory may be summed up thus: Every one, whether adult or not, will have, in this life, the clear vision of God. Hence he distinguishes two states - that of faith, status fidei in which man has no clear idea of God as his summum bonum, and therefore is in danger of making the wrong choice; and the state of clear knowledge, status sciencie or clare visionis, after the vision of God in which man clearly recognises God as the summum bonum. According to Uthred the remediability of sins is due to lack of clear vision of the summum bonum; in the state of obscure vision man is excused of his sin, i.e. of the rejection of God, because of ignorance; but in the state of clear vision the rejection of the summum bonum cannot be excused, because in that state man sees God clearly and the choice is purely voluntary; consequently the sin of rejection will be due to malice and not ignorance, and this makes it irremediable. It follows logically that the last sin will not be the commission of something evil, but the omission of something good, i.e. the refusal of the summum bonum. He makes it clear that when he speaks of election or choice, he means the final choice before death, and after the clear vision of God. He says that no one can die so suddenly as not to have time for this clear vision; consequently no one can be lost through original sin or through actual sins committed previous to the clear vision, but only through the sin committed in the clear vision, which will be the final election upon which depends eternal salvation or damnation.

OPPONENT.

Hatton attacks Uthred's theory with two determinations - (f.7) and '11v.). He begins with the attack on the morula ante mortem, or short time before death, in which the vision is supposed to be given, and illustrates his argument from the fate of Lot's wife who was instantly turned into a statue of salt, and of those who struck by lightning and dying instantly, have not time for this clear vision. Infants who die in their mother's womb are not able to adhere to the summum bonum, and those who are beheaded or burnt lost consciouness just before death and therefore cannot have time for this clear vision.

Against the election in this clear vision Hatton puts forth twelve arguments; for instance, clear vision of the summum bonum excludes all danger of making the wrong choice, hence no one can be lost; again it is impossible to be in via and in termino at the same time; but in this clear vision man is in via, because he is free to choose or reject God, and so can merit; on the other hand he is in termino, because clear vision confirms him either in good or evil, so that sin committed in its light is irremediable; finally, this opinion on the clear vision of God 'repugnat philosopie naturali, et canonibus et statutis ecclesie et sancionibus theologie et sacre scripture.' The theory is expressly contrary to the teaching of the Church which says that no one can see God unless he dieth or unless he be elevated from the senses, and unless he has faith.

Hatton sums up the whole question saying that if this doctrine on the clear vision were admitted as true, we should have to say that 'sequitur quod in necessariis ecclesiam defecit, eo quod lateret ecclesiam et apostolos ante ista tempora, unum quod fuit necessarium ad salutem.'

I cannot trace this theory in any other author. It was evidently a real novelty, one of the 'multas opiniones novas et subtiles'of Uthred, of which Adam the Cistercian speaks in his

letter to Simon Langham, Archbishop of Canterbury. No wonder that it was definitely condemned as 'error', because it was a very dangerous doctrine which might lead to disastrous conclusions.

GRACE.

I. Item ubi dicitur quod est medium sufficiens in natura ad attingendum finem naturalem.

II. Item gracia nil est nisi debita habitudo ad Deum, per sic ponentes.

Uthred's doctrine of grace is contained in six articles collected by the friars. In brief he teaches that: Grace is not something absolute, but relative; it means a relation - good relation to God: 'debita habitudo ad Deum'; thus when we say that a person is in grace 'in gratia est gratus', we mean that he is in good relation with God, and therefore in a state to merit. Grace in itself is the greatest benefit and the highest good 'maximum beneficium et optimum bonum', but it is not something infused and distinct from the man meriting; if it were, it would be of a higher order than he and thus superfluous; it is a necessary element, a good relation with God, without which man can never merit. Finally he says that natural means suffice to attain our natural end, and to enable the sinner, before the clear vision, to return to his former state lost by sin; although by sufficiency he does not exclude 'adiutorium supernaturale esse insuper requisitum', both in the state of innocence and of lapsed nature.

OPPONENT.

Hatton attacks only those opinions which appeared to him tainted with pelagianism:

1. That natural means suffice to attain the natural end.
2. Grace is nothing else than good relation with God.

1. Arg. 'There is sufficient means in nature to attain the natural
'end of man. The end of man is eternal life, therefore
'pure natural means suffice to attain eternal life.

We must notice here that the opponent is not exact in his terminology. In his argument he made a big jump from the natural order to the supernatural. The natural end of man is not vita eterna, which is wholly supernatural, consisting in the beatific vision of God, but natural beatitude, consisting in the clear vision of God as auctor nature, which can be acquired by natural means; it is called natural end in contradistinction to the supernatural end, attained only be supernatural means.

2. Arg. 'According to some, grace is only good relation with God.
'But this relation can be attained by purely natural means,
'therefore grace can be attained by purely natural means.

It is worth noting here that the intention of the opponent is very clear; he means to attack the pelagian doctrine. He did not attack the erroneous definition of grace, but the opinion that it is possible to acquire grace by natural means.

The controversy on the doctrine of grace is not a new one; it had been the source of many troubles in the Church since the 5th century, when the monk Pelagius (1) denied the necessity of grace or divine help for the observance of the commandments, and the exercise of virtues. Luther and Calvin denied the intrinsic value of grace, affirming only an external justification by faith. Baius denied the gratuity and the supernaturality of grace, and affirmed that it is something belonging to our nature and consequently natural, 'debitum naturae'. Rationalism, in our own times, rejects the existence of the supernatural order, and consequently any supernatural influence of God on the soul. What of the 14th century ? The problem of free will and its dependence on God, through grace, was discussed at Oxford by philosophers and theologians alike in the first quarter of the 14th century(2) These discussions on free will and grace were really a part of the pelagian movement at Oxford; its influence

---

(1) For Pelagius, see article by R.Hedde et E.Amann, 'Pelagianisme' in D.T.C., xii, 675-715.
(2) Michalski: La Problem de la volonte a Oxford et a Paris. in Studia Philosophica II (1937) pp.233-364.

is sufficiently described by the chief protagonist of the anti-pelagian party. Bradwardine shows how the pelagian errors were diffused and how he himself was entrapped in them, and then, by the grace of God, escaped from the snare.

He says (1) : 'I was at one time while still a student of philosophy, a vain fool, far from the true knowledge of God, and held captive in opposing error. From time to time I heard theologians treating of the questions of grace and freewill, and the party of Pelagius seemdd to me to have the best of the argument. For I rarely heard anything said of grace in the lectures of the philosophers, except in an ambiguous sense. But every day I heard them teach that we are the masters of our own free acts, and that it stands in our power to do either good or evil, to be either virtuous or vicious, and such like. And when I heard now and then in church a passage read from the apostle, which exalted grace, and humbled free will, such, for instance, as that word in Romans,ix.16, "Therefore it is not in him that willeth, nor in him that runneth, but in God that sheweth mercy", I had no liking for such teaching, for towards grace I was still graceless. I believed also with the Manicheans that the apostle, being a man, might possibly err from the path of truth in any point of doctrine. But afterwards, and before I had become a student of theology the truth before mentioned struck upon me like a beam of grace. It seemed to me as if I beheld in the distance, under a transparent image of truth, the grace of God as it is prevenient both in time and nature to all good works, that is to say, the gracious will of God, which precedently wills that he who merits salvation shall be saved, and precedently works salvation in him, God, in truth, being in all movements the primary mover. Wherefore I give thanks to Him who freely gave me this grace.'

---

(1) De Causa Dei, (ed. Savile, London 1618) ,I,308. The translation is taken from Workman John Wyclif, I,120-121.

This description will suffice to show the intellectual activity of the philosophers and theologians regarding the problem of the free will and grace nearly half a century before our controversy.

There is nothing explicitly pelagian in the doctrine of grace as expressed in these articles, although that was the impression left on the opponents. It is surprising how Uthred's three articles on the essence of grace entirely escaped condemnation; only article xviii was declared erroneous because 'male sonat'. The definition of grace as 'debita habitudo quoad Deum' is purely nominalistic and reduces grace to a mere relation between God and man. Grace is nothing else but 'respectus' something essentially relative and not absolute or quasi absolute. Surely here Uthred is confusing grace with its effect. It is grace that causes that good relation between God and man and not vice versa; consequently gratus is he in whom there is grace.
St Thomas tells us clearly: 'Sic igitur per hoc quod dicitur homo gratiam Dei habere, significatur quoddam supernaturale in homine a Deo proveniens'; and again 'in eo dicitur gratiam Dei habere, significatur esse quidam effectus gratuitae Dei vountatis'. (1) Grace is something supernatural, given by God to man; therefore it is not a mere relation. St Thomas continues to define the quoddam supernaturale, saying: 'grace is not a substance as matter or form: it cannot be a substance or substantial form, because grace is superior to human nature, and also because no composite can have two substances or two substantial forms, otherwise it would be unum per accidens and not per se.' (2)
It is an accidental form of the soul, a quality: 'gratia est in prima specie qualitatis, quamvis non proprie possit dici habitus

---

(1) S. Theol. I-II, q. cx, art. I→II.

(2) Ibidem, art. ii, ad secundum.

quia non immediate ordinatur ad actum, sed ad quondam esse spirituale quod anima facit, et est sicut dispositio quae est respectus gloriae quae est gratia consummata. Nihil tamen simili gratiae, in accidentibus animae quae philosophi sciverunt quae ordinantur ad actus naturae humanae proportionatos.' (1)

Therefore grace, according to St Thomas falls under <u>habitus</u> and <u>dispositio</u>, which is the first species in which quality is divided. It is a supernatural quality infused in man by God, by which all actions proceeding from it are supernaturally informed, and thus meritorious, because grace is the 'participatio divinae naturae'.

What about the relation of grace with our natural end ?

Art.xix 'quod est medium sufficiens in natura ad attingendum finem naturalem', was condemned as erroneous with the clausula 'if by natural end is meant the ultimate and eternal beatitude.'

But we must notice here that although strictly speaking natural means are sufficient for the attainment of the natural end, still in our present state of lapsed nature, after the fall of Adam, our natural faculties weakened by original sin require grace or at least an 'adiutorium supernaturale.'

Finally the article (xx) which states that there is a sufficient remedy in nature, by which the sinner can regain the state lost by sin committed in the state of obscure vision, was formally condemned without reservation. It is <u>de fide</u> that no one can gain justificiation or reinstatement in grace except by means of grace. No remedy in nature fulfils this purpose because it would be disproportionate. Grace and justification belong to the supernatural order. St Thomas says: 'Et ideo requiritur gratia ad hoc quod homo a peccato resurgat, et quantum ad habituale donum et quantum ad interiorem Dei motionem.....Sic igitur humana natura defluens per actum peccati, quia non manet integra sed

---

(1) <u>De Veritate</u>, q.27, art.2 ad 7.

corrumpitur, ut supra dictum est quaest.85, non potest per seipsam reparari neque ad bonum sibi connaturale, et multo minus ad bonum supernaturale justitiae.' (1)

POMUS VETITUS

Item in materia quod lignum fuit prohibitum quia malum et quia inconveniens ad esum.

This article follows from another which is also found in the friars' list. They were both condemned without reservation. Apparently Uthred was speaking about sin in relation to law: Whether the malice of sin is supposed by the law, or whether the law constitutes the malice of sin; in other words, whether a prohibition supposes evil in the thing prohibited, or whether the thing prohibited is evil in virtue of the prohibition. Uthred says that nothing can be considered wrong merely because it is prohibited: therefore, when anything is prohibited we must find some reason for the prohibition. Then, apparently, he brought forward the example of the forbidden apple and he was reported by the friars to have said that the apple was forbidden because it was an evil thing in itself and unsuitable for eating. In his tract Uthred replies that he did not say that the apple was an evil in itself; on the contrary he maintained that it was good in itself, but unsuitable for eating. Notwithstanding this explanation, the article was regarded as error and condemned.

END OF CONTROVERSY.

With Uthred's reply to the 'Liber Famosus' of the friars, the controversy was not exhausted, but it reached a climax and was brought forward for formal trial before the Archbishop, Simon Langham, who on February 18, 1368, ordered the chancellor of Oxford to silence both parties, while the matter was under examination. (2)

---

(1) S.Theol. I-II, q. cix, art. vii, in corp. et ad 3.

(2) Lambeth Reg. Langham, fo. 60v. I owe these references to the Langham register to the kindness of Mr. Pantin.

On November 9, 1368, the Archbishop informed the Chancellor that, after having consulted several doctors of divinity and of both laws, he had condemned thirty articles or propositions, and he forbade them to be taught and defended in schools under penalty of excommunication. (1) With this condemnation the controversy seemed to have ended, probably with loss to both parties since the thirty articles were taken from the opinions of both; of these twenty two belong to Uthred, and the remaining eight to the opposite party, perhaps to William Jordan, who is said to have denied holding certain of the conclusions condemned by Langham,'dampnatis per nos pridie'. This was on November 17, 1368. (2) Nothing is known of the aftermath of the controversy. Surely the condemnation proves that the '<u>Liber Famosus</u>' of the friars was not mere invention or altogether inaccurate; on the whole the articles were faithfully reported; in fact, out of the twenty eight, Uthred acknowledged fourteen as his opinions: 'hunc tenui et persuasi'; the remainder were founded either on misunderstanding or false report. We may say that Uthred:i.had nominalistic tendencies, especially as to the doctrine of grace; ii, expressed himself inaccurately and incompletely and at times confusedly.

---

(1) <u>Reg. Langham</u>, fo.70v; Wilkins, <u>Concilia</u> III,75.

(2) <u>Reg. Langham</u>, fO.72.

APPENDIX

'Questio domini Uthredi, monachi Dunelmensis.

Utrum paupertas mendicitatis, que est ultima in divisione facta, in predicatoribus ponat offendiculum verbo Dei.'

Summary: 'Whether mendicant poverty, which is last in the given division, is in the preachers an impediment to the word of God.'

Uthred replies to this question in a scholastic way with arguments pro and contra.

In the arguments pro (6. arg.) Uthred proves: first, that mendicancy, that is, the total renunciation of all temporal goods, which is a sign of perfect humility, renders the preacher more fitted to preach the word of God, than the partial renunciation; secondly, we have the example of St Paul, who is said to have spent whole days in preaching and disputing with the Gentiles, and consequently had no time to earn his living, otherwise than by alms; thirdly we have the example of our Lord who became poor for our salvation and instruction, because 'omnis accio Christi nostra est instruccio'. Therefore mendicant poverty is praiseworthy in the preachers of the word of God.

In the second part of the question Uthred brings up 53 arguments. The two letters of St Paul to the Thessalonians (I,ii,5-7; II,iii,6sq.) are the main source of Uthred's attack on mendicant poverty. In these two letters St Paul reminds the Thessalonians that when he was preaching to them, he never used 'the speech of flattery nor took occasion of covetousness'; he earned his living by his own work, 'in labour and toil we worked night and day, lest we should be chargeable to any of you.'

From these passages of St Paul Uthred argues in many ways that mendicancy in the preachers is cause and occasion of many evils to themselves and to their hearers, and thus mendicancy is to be abolished.

First, mendicant poverty is burdensome to the hearers, and an occasion of flattery and avarice to the preachers themselves,

and in this way they impede the good fruit which should follow the preaching of the word of God: 'et utinam non probetur per factum et experienciam cotidianam.' 'Quidam palliantes suum errorem' reply, that mendicant poverty is not necessarily burdensome to the hearers; in fact one can give alms to the preacher in thanksgiving for the spiritual good, such as repentance for sins, caused by his sermon. To this Uthred replies that St Paul urges us to avoid also the least occasion of flattery and avarice, such as is found in the state of mendicant poverty.

Secondly, mendicant poverty is sometimes occasion of theft, perjury and forgetfulness of God, because we know by experience that the lack of things necessary for life drives man to these vices.

Some, presumably the friars, reply to this, that they have accepted this state of poverty, not because driven by need, but out of humility; in fact many of them could live quite comfortably in the world. Uthred replies that it is true that most of the mendicant friars could live comfortably in the world, but now 'manu et voce' they show that they are in need of things necessary for life, and in this way they lie, and therefore their state of poverty 'mendicacio non est dicenda mendicitas a mendicando, sed mendacitas a mendiendo', because if they wanted, they could earn their living by their manual work.

Thirdly, mendicant poverty is also occasion of cupidity and avarice, because the mendicant preachers announce the word of God to the faithful, with the hope of acquiring temporal goods.

To this the friars reply that they preach only out of charity and for the salvation of the faithful.

Uthred replies that if that be so, they should rather go to convert 'infideles, saracenos, tartaros et alios', who have no chance of hearing the word of God, as the christians have. That is what the Apostles and the martyrs have done for the expansion of the Church of Christ. Moreover if the friars do not preach

for temporal goods, they should not make collections immediately after the sermon, or they should give away what is superfluous and keep only what is necessary for their living; but the best thing for them is to keep silence, which is a sign of great humility.

In addition to these occasions 'adulacionis, detraccionis, perjurii, furti, oblivionis Dei et avaricie atque cupiditatis.... videtur quod tales rei sunt homicidii, 2° sacrilegii, 3° iniusticie, et sic de ceteris,' because those who, while able to work, prefer to live on the alms of others, deprive the poor and sick, who are not able to earn their living by their work, of the alms which are due to them, and this privation may be the cause of acceleration of their death.

But Uthred's opponents still defend their cause: 'sed adhuc dicit adversarius.....eque habet Papa et eque habent episcopi, rectores et alii, et eciam monachi et alii religiosi possessionati non obstante quod sunt possessionati vivere de labore manuum suarum, et aliunde vivendo vi[illegible]entur peccare ut de possessionibus ecclesiarum suarum, quia Apostolus.....non magis excipit unum quam alium.'

Uthred replies: first, regarding the 'possessionatos seculares et rectores et tales', if their benefices are sufficient for their living they are not obliged to do manual work; but if they are not sufficient then 'cicius tenentur ad opus manuale quam verecundam mendicitatem.' Secondly, 'quantum vero ad monachos et alios religiosus possessionatos' we have to remember that at the beginning of their institution they were all bound to work manually, because their possessions were not sufficient for their living; but with the passing of time 'bona monasteriorum creverunt ad sufficiendiam.....et melius consuluit acclesia', that they should do no manual work, especially out of their monastery, lest their religious spirit should suffer any harm by the ever growing distractions and dangers of the outside world.

Moreover the Church has also ordered that no monastery should accept a larger number of religious than its possessions allow it to maintain.

Uthred argues also that the mendicant preachers tempt God for miracles. But 'ita concludunt adversarii' that the mendicant preachers do not tempt God for miracles, because they can easily be provided with food without any miracle. Uthred replies 'contra istam extortam responsionem' that although they can be provided for without miracles, still they do not provide for themselves by working, and this really means tempting God. Anyhow if mendicant poverty were a sign of great humility and perfection, the Church would have imposed it on her ministers, but the contrary happened. In fact the canons of the Church prohibit most strongly: first, any church to be consecrated unless there is adequate provision for its proper maintenance and the maintenance of its ministers; secondly the ordination of clerics who have not a sufficient benefice for their decent living.

Uthred finishes by saying that those who can, should earn their living by their work, and not live on alms. Then he refers to St Augustine's De Opere Monachorum, and finishes with an extract from the letter of St Jerome to Rusticum, saying:

> 'Si Apostoli habentes potestatem de Dei evangelio vivere, laborabant manibus suis ne quemquam gravarent, et aliis tribuerent refrigeria quorum pro spiritualibus deberent metere carnalia, cur tu in usus tuos non paras successura aut ficellam texe ex iuncto aut canistrum lentis virgulis ? Et infra eundem: "texantur lina, capiendis piscibus, scribantur libri, ut manus operetur cibis et anima saciętur lectione. '

II THE DOCTRINE OF THE ORIGINAL SIN AND THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION AT OXFORD IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY AS ILLUSTRATED BY WORCESTER MS.F.65.

Worcester MS.F.65 contains three questions on the doctrine of Original sin, and two more on that of the Immaculate Conception.

fo. 2: 'Utrum mors hominis corporalis sit pena peccati originalis'

fo.17v: 'Utrum a primo parente seminaliter propagati peccato primo eiusdem fuerint viciati'.

fo.19: 'Utrum peccatum primi parentis, ad similitudinem sui Creatoris facti, a porta paradisi sit exclusivum.'

fo.61: 'Utrum beata virgo fuit concepta in originali peccato.'

fo.68rb: 'Utrum quilibet homo concupiscencialiter propagatus concipiatur in peccato originali.....
Ad questionem principalem. Circa materiam de concepcione .....'

It is worth noting at the outset that the choice of these two particular doctrines does not mean necessarily that these questiones in the Worcester Manuscript were the remnants of a controversy, but they certainly show the special interest of the students at the period covered by the collection. The reason for grouping together these two doctrines is obvious. The Immaculate Conception, that privilege by which the B.V.Mary was preserved from the stain of original sin propagated through generation, presupposes original sin. The three questions on original sin are anonymous; of the other two, the first, (f.61) most probably belongs to Nicholas Aston, and the second without any doubt to Richard Fitzralph, because it is found in his Commentary on the Sentences in MS.Oriel 15,f.107rb-va. (1).

1. Original Sin

The doctrine of original sin, its nature, effects and transmission, has been under controversy since the early centuries of the Church. (2) Many of the Fathers have written on the

---

(1) For Nicholas Aston and the authorship of this questio, see above, p.39-43.

(2) For this controversy see D.T.C., XII, 275-624, 'Péché originel'

subject; St Augustine, by his important contribution to the Pelagian controversy, gained the title of Doctor of original sin and of grace. They all speak of some quality which is inherited through seminal generation, and which inclines man to evil. St Augustine speaks of original sin as 'concupiscentia', 'libido', which remains after baptism, not as 'culpa' but as 'pena. He was followed by almost all the theologians of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. St Anselm left out the quasi-identification of 'concupiscentia' with original sin and defined the latter as 'iustitiae debitae nuditas, per quam omnes filii sunt irae.' (1) Thus he prepared the way for the understanding of the fate of the infants, who die without baptism. The anselmian conception of original sin passed through Alexander of Hales to St Albert and was completed by St Thomas and St Bonaventure.

St Thomas by treating St Augustine's 'concupiscentia', and St Anselm's 'privatio justitiae originalis' as the formal and material elements respectively of original sin, made a great advance. The formal element may be considered as 'culpa', and the material as 'pena'. (2) After baptism it remains only as 'pena'. Its transmission, he says, takes place through the 'semen generativum.'

By the end of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth there was a revival of the augustinian doctrine. It was headed by Henry of Gand, who opposed especially the doctrine of the transmission of original sin, as taught by Aquinas. He says that this sin is propagated through an 'infectio morbosa existens in semine', or 'propter dispositionem morbosam naturae', (3) so that if an infant were made miraculously from any part of the body, and not by means of the semen, it would still have

---

(1) De Conceptu Virginali, cap.xxvii. (P.L.,clviii,461).

(2) I-II,q.lxxxii, a.3, ad 3m.

(3) Quodlibet I,q.xxi,p.31rb.

contracted original sin. The augustinian revival was carried on by several others, such as Mathew of Acquasparta, Peter Aurealus, Gregory of Rimini, Durand de S.Pourcain, who attacked the thomist explanation of both the nature and the propagation of original sin. They say that the formal element of original sin is not the 'privatio iustitiae originalis', but 'offensa formale est et odium Dei obiectivum'.

Many faithful followers of Aquinas, such as Herve de Nedellec, Robert of Orford or Collotorto, took up the defence of their master. In this controversy three currents were represented: Henry de Gand representing Augustinism; Herve de Nédellec, Thomism; and Durand de S.Pourcain, criticism. (1)

From this short account of the development of the doctrine of original sin, we may be able to determine to what school of thought our questiones belong.

In fo.17v. the anonymous writer states that original sin may be considered in two ways: 'uno modo prout est culpa' , which makes the soul hateful to God; 'vel ut est fomes', which is derived from parents, through generation.

This distinction may correspond to that made by St Thomas between the formal and material elements, considered as 'culpa' and 'pena'. According to the anonymous writer 'culpa' has a twofold significance:- voluntary commission of something vituperable, i.e. sin; or a penalty and effect of sin, and thus a natural consequence of the corrupted nature; original sin belongs to the latter. This is in accord with St Thomas's teaching that original sin is voluntary, in the sense that all human will being represented in the will of the first parents, it is reproduced in every human nature corrupted by the first disobedience, which resides in the will. Further our writer asserts that the 'iusticia' or

---

(1) For this controversy see R.M.Martin, 'La controverse sur le Peche Originel au debut du xiv siècle', textes inedits. (Louvain, 1930) p.ix; D.T.C., XII, 462-510

'iniusticia originalis' resides in the soul. This is purely the doctrine of Aquinas, who posits that original justice or injustice resides in the will, because to the will belongs the direction of the other potencies of the soul to their proper ends. (1)
As to the transmission of original sin, he maintains that it is only found in those propagated 'secundum communem cursum nature' 'que fuit cum repugnancia membrorum legi mentis.' (fo.2).
This again corresponds to Aquinas's teaching when he says that in the state of innocence before the fall 'corpus erat subiectum animae absque defectu'. This interpretation had already been given by St Augustine, when he said: 'Caro Adae et Abrahae habebat vulnus prevaricacionis in lege membrorum repugnante legi mentis, quae per omnem propagatem carnem seminali ratione quasi transcribitur' . (2)
Our anonymous writer makes it clear that this penalty is imposed on the descendants of Adam not to satisfy for his sin, but as a natural consequence of that sin. He stresses that the children are never punished for the sins of their parents, but God, because of the sins and demerits of the parents, leaves in the children their proneness to evil and in this way they may sin, and consequently they are punished for their own sins. (3)
Coming to the question of the effects of original sin, the anonymous writer says that death is caused by original sin, not essentially but accidentally; since before the fall inasmuch as the soul had sufficient power over the inferior faculties, and every part of them, it impeded not only the corruption but also the separation between each part, that is, it impeded infirmities and death.

---

(1) I-II, q.lxxxii,a.3; q.lxxxiii,a.2,ad 4m.

(2) St Augustine Super Genesim ad litteram, lib.10,c.26.(nunc c.10) (P.L.34,424).

(3) The same thought is expressed by St Thomas,I-II,q.lxxxvii,a.8, and Denys the Carthusian, II Sent.,D.xxxiii,q.1.

This accords with Aquinas, when he says: 'In this way the sin of our first parents is the cause of death and all such like defects in human nature, in so far as by the sin of our first parent original justice was taken away, whereby not only were the lower powers of the soul held together under the control of reason, without any disorder whatever, but also the whole body was held together in subjection to the soul, without any defect!(1)

Speaking of the propagation of original sin, our anonymous writer says, that it was not transmitted in all the descendants of Adam: the B.V. Mary was conceived without it, because she was not conceived 'cum repugnancia membrorum legi mentis' and 'non prefuit fomes', which are the two qualities of the common generation 'secundum communem cursum nature'.

Was this opinion on the B.V.Mary held by all theologians ?

We shall see in the next section.

2. Controversy on the Immaculate Conception.

Many of the dogmas of the Church have been, in the centuries before definition, hotly debated by the theologians, who by their investigations and the serious study of all the implications of a doctrine, have given to it, progressively, a clearer and more exact interpretation.

The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception has gone through many stages.

Holy Scripture, the Fathers and all ecclesiastical writers have ever spoken highly of the privileged and extraordinary purity and sanctity of the B.V.Mary, but they did not assert explicitly that she was conceived without original sin. This high estimation of the B.Virgin by the 'Ecclesia docens' was the expression of the general belief of the faithful up to the

---

(1) I-II, q.lxxxv, a.5. From the translation of the Summa made by the English Dominicans, London, 1915.

11th century; this was bound to manifest itself in some form or other, as it eventually did in the institution of the feast of the Immaculate Conception, whence arose the great controversy in the following century.

England was one of the first countries to honour the B.Virgin through this feast as early as the first half of the 11th century. (1) Neither was France late in celebrating the feast, as appears from the letter of St Bernard 'Ad Canonicos Lugdunenses', written in 1138; in which he prohibits its continuance; the feast 'quam ritus Ecclesia nescit non probat ratio, non commendat antiqua traditio'. (2) The propagation of the celebration of the feast met with great opposition.

St Bernard used every effort to put an end to it; and his influence, together with that of Peter Lombard, the future authority in theology, was responsible for the opposition of the University of Paris up to late 13th. century.

The question of the Immaculate Conception was not discussed by all the theologians in the same way; some spoke of the sanctification of the B. Virgin, others of purification, and others of preservation from original sin.

Alexander of Hales (1245) in his Summa Theologiae, III, q.ix, n.11, asks: Whether the B.V. was sanctified 'ante conceptionem, in conceptione, post conceptionem et ante infusionem animae', and he denies that she was sanctified before, in or after her conception 'quia caro ante animationem nullo modo potest sanctificari. Concedendum est quod gloriosa Virgo ante suam nativitatem post infusionem animae in suo corpore, fuit sanctificata in utero matris suae'. Alexander was followed with slight

---

(1) Bishop, E., Liturgica Historica, (Oxford, 1918) p.243 sq.; Vacandard, E., 'Les Origines de la fête et du dogme d'Immacula Conception', in Revue du Clergé Français (1910) LXII, p.15; and D.T.C, VII, 845-1218, and authorities cited therein.

(2) S.Bernard's Opera omnia, Epistula 147mVol.I, 389(ed.Paris 1839) For St Bernard see E.Vacandard, 'S.Bernard et la fête de la conception de la Sainte Vièrge', in La Science Catholique, VII, (1893) 897; D.T.C., VII, 1015.

modification by his disciple St Bonaventure (1274), by Richard de Mediavilla (c.1308), and by many other Franciscans up to the end of the 13th century. (1)

Among the Dominicans Albert the Great (1280) affirms that sanctification ' probabilius est, quod cito post animationem conferatur, quam longe expectatur.' (III Sent.,D.3,a.5) and then adds (art.5):'Dicimus quod B.Virgo non fuit sanctificata ante animationem et qui dicunt oppositum est haeresis condemnata a B.Bernado in epistula ad Lugdunenses, et a magistris omnibus Parisiensibus.' His disciple, St.Thomas, seems to have revised his opinion on the Immaculate Conception several times. We can distinguish three periods. In the first (1253-1254) he is in favour of the privilege.(I.Sent.d.44,q.1,a.3,ad 3^{m}). In the second he realises the difficulties arising from the universality of redemption, but does not think of a preservative redemption, so he denies the privilege.(III^{a},q.27,a.2). In the last period (1272/73) he returns to his original opinion. This is shown in his 'Exposi-tio super salutatione angelica', where he says:'Ipsa enim (B.V.) purissima fuit et quantum ad culpam, quia nec originale, nec mortale, nec veniale peccatum incurrit.' (2)

Such were the current opinions in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, based on the two traditional and correlative principles: i.universality of original sin; ii.universality of redemption. Fr. Balic says that:'Doctores Parisienses saeculi xii-xiii negabant Immaculatm B.V. Conceptionem, intimam persuasionem habentes tali modo agendi honorem Christi defendere. (3) Up to this time the

---

(1) Questiones de Immaculata Conceptione B.M.V.(ed.Quaracchi,1904) p.xi;'Discipuli S.Bonaventurae doctrinam suam repetierunt et hucusque nondum invenimus inter nostros theologos Parisienses saec.xiii,unum qui doctrinam de Immaculata Conceptione accep-taverit et defenderit.'

(2) R.Garrigou-Lagrange,O.P.DeCChristo Salvatore,(Torino 1946) pp. 505-507.The expositio has been recently edited by J.F.Rossi, C.M. in Divus Thomas (Plac) 1931, pp.445-497.

(3) Bibliotheca Mariana Medii Aevi,(1931) fasc.I,Questiones disputatae de Conceptione Immaculata J.de Polliaco et J.de Neapoli. cura C.Balic, p.xliv.

general opinion of the scholastics was that the B.V. Mary was by necessity conceived in original sin, but was purified after animation, that is, after she had begun to exist as a person capable of receiving grace.

By the end of the thirteenth century the doctrine had advanced another step. Henry of Gand, the doctor solemnis, (1293) in his Quodlibet, xv,q.12, deals with this question in a different way. He distinguishes two conceptions, carnal and spiritual. In the first, the B.V. was neither saint nor sanctified, because 'per peccatum originale quod contraxit, facta est filia irae'. In the second, it was possible and fitting that she was purified from original sin at the same moment in which she contracted it, but he does not assert this as fact: 'sed an ita factum sit Deus novit, quod nec sciô nec assero, sed rationabile mihi videtur et possibile, secundum predicta, quod ita factum fuisse.'(1)

This argument, 'potuit, decuit, ergo fecit' was adopted by William of Ware, perfected by John Duns Scotus and followed by all the Franciscans and followers of Scotus during the following centuries. William of Ware (III Sent.d.iii.MS.Merton) in his question first gives the three opinions on the subject, and adds 'est opinio quod non contraxit originale, quam volo tenere'; then he proves the possibility, seemliness and fact, of the Immaculate Conception. (2)

Duns Scotus mentions this questio first, in the Scriptum Oxoniense IV Sent.,lib.iii,d.3,q.1. He admits 'dicitur communiter quod sic', but argues against the traditional views the univserality of redemption, the existence of physical effects caused by original sin, and the infection caused by concupiscence

---

(2) Editio Quaracchi, where the questions of William of Ware, Scotus and Peter Aureolus are edited. On p.xii, we find of Ware that ' primus quem inter fratres Minores Oxonienses Immaculatam Conceptionem scriptes docuisse scimus. ' cf. also 'Theologiae Marianae Elementa Joannis Duns Scoti', edited Balic, in Bibliotheca Mariana, II (1933) pp.17-34.

(1) Henry of Ghent, 'Quodlibet.XV,q.12,(ed.Venet.1613)p.381.

in the body, and consequently in th soul when united with it. He says 'ipsa enim contraxisset originale peccatum ex ratione propagationis communis, nisi fuisset preventa per gratiam mediatoris.' And again 'potest enim Mediator reconciliare aliquen ut auferantur ab eo poenae sibi inutiles, et reliquantur in poenis utilibus; originalis culpa non fuisset utilis Mariae, poenae temporales tamen fuerunt utiles, quia in eis meruit, igitur etc.' In his Scriptum Parisiense, lib.iii,d.3,q.1., he is less explicit: 'Quid ergo tenendum in questione ? nihil assero', but his adherence to the doctrine is manifest from the context, and his manner of arguing.

The influence of Scotus was strongly felt both at Oxford and at Paris, and stirred up opponents and defenders in the following century.

3. Controversy on the Immaculate Conception at Oxford in the 14th. Century.

We confine our study of the fourteenth century Oxford controversy on the Immaculate Conception mainly to MS.F.55 of Worcester Cathedral Library, which contains three questions relating to it.

The first (fo.2) is anonymous, and the author speaks only briefly and incidentally of the B. Virgin. While speaking of original sin and its transmission, he says that the B. Virgin was exempt, because she was not conceived 'per cursum communem cum repugnancia membrorum legi mentis', and 'non prefuit fomes'. Though he gives no further explanation, his opinion is manifestly in favour of the Immaculate Conception. The other two questions are more important, first because they are given in full, and secondly because of the authors and their different points of view.

The first question belongs to Richard Fitzralph, called

Armacanus, who was lecturing at Oxford c.1320. (1). Fitzralph discusses the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception in his Commentary on the Sentences, Questio 28, where he asks the question: 'Utrum quilibet homo concupiscencialiter propagatus concipiatur in peccato originali.' He brings forward several arguments against the thesis; in the sixth, dealing with the conception of the B. Virgin he says that if the answer to the question be in the affirmative, we must admit that the B. Virgin was conceived in original sin. The whole discussion on this matter is found at the end of this reply to the sixth argument (2)

> 'Et 3o dicam ad questionem principalem, et in dicendo ad questionem principalem post responsionem ad 6m argumentum principale in quo argumento tractatur de B.Virgine, faciam decem argumenta ad suadendum quod B.Virgo fuit concepta in originali peccato.'

He says that 'videtur multis' that the B.Virgin was not conceived in original sin, because that would derogate from her dignity.

In opposing this opinion he cites the authority of St Paul, Augustine, Anselm and the Lombard. We must notice that the arguments are mainly the traditional ones based on the:-

i Conception 'lege propagacionis naturalis'.

ii Universality of redemption

iii Existence of the effects of original sin in Mary.

The B. Virgin was conceived in the common and natural way, 'lege propagacionis naturalis' and ' seminali racione', through which original sin is transmitted to all the descendants of Adam, who 'per peccatum corruptus, quos genuit nascentur cum peccato.' Human nature tainted with original sin had to be redeemed by Christ. so if we say that Mary was free from original sin, it would follow that she was not redeemed by Christ, because 'non habuit opus medico', and in that case even if Christ did not

---

(1) C. Michalski, in 'La Probleme de la volonté à Oxford et à Paris in Studia Philosophica, II,p.249, prefers the date 1320, rather than 1330, for the lectures of Fitzralph, because it is difficult to believe that he became fellow of Balliol before he had lectured on the Sentences, especially when we consider that he was chancellor in 1333.

(2) Besides Worcester MS.F.65,f.61rb-Vb, we have seen Oriel MS.15 f.107rb.

redeem the world, she would have gone to heaven all the same.'adhuc ipsa fuisset salvata, quia ipsa a principio fuit iusta, sicut Adam fuit a principio.'

That the B. Virgin incurred original sin appears also from the effects: according to the Apostle, death is a consequence of original sin. The B. Virgin died, therefore she had original sin on her soul, otherwise we must say that God inflicts penalty for nothing, 'nequaquam existimabit convenire ut creaturam quam fecit iustam ad beatitudinem, miseram esse sine culpam.' Fitzralph does not admit that the B. Virgin had committed any actual sin, because that was strongly denied by all the Fathers. He concludes by saying that original sin not only does not derogate from the dignity of the Virgin; on the contrary it accords well with the dignity and office for which she was made, that is, to be our mediatrix; in fact, the consideration that she was elevated over all the angels, through the merits of the Redeemer, from this our poor state, increases our trust in her; and her consciousness of her former state makes her intercede more earnestly for us.

> 'Immo multo magis congruit sue dignitati et officio.....quod ipsa de tam humili statu .....ad tantam dignitatem per mortem Filii sui redemptoris nostri super angelos exaltata, ut per hoc de illa magis confidamus, et ipsa occasionem habeat interpellandi pro nobis, sui status pristini recordata.'

His early opposition to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is manifest. (1) His opinion is the logical sequel to his doctrine on original sin and its propagation. He says that original sin is transmitted through the 'libido parentum', is necessarily found in every generation in the common course of nature; hence all those propagated in the common way

---

(1) In a sermon preached at the Council of Basle on the feast of the Immaculate Conception by John de Ronsay, canon of Amecy, MS.Balliol 164, fo.162, we find:'Item dicit iste vitalis quod Alexander de Hales, Dnus Armachanus, Prémias Hiberniae, et Richardus de Mediavilla, quamvis in suis sermonibus et scriptes adhaeserunt opinionis contrare, in sua tamen senectute se retraxerunt, et parti nostri adhaeserunt; videlicet....Dnus vero Armachanus 'Sapientia edificavit sibi domum'.....'

'concupiscencialiter' must contract original sin. Thus he would rather call the feast 'of the Sanctification' than of 'the Immaculate Conception': 'festum concepcionis celebrat Ecclesia racione sanctificacionis fetus et racione partus concepti, non racione concepcionis, licet festum secundum usum loquendi vocetur festum concepcionis.'

Before we pass on to consider the other question, it is worth seeing what some of Fitzralph's contemporaries have to say on the matter.

Robert Holcot, O.P. (+ 1349), in his commentary on the Sentences, does not discuss this doctrine, but touches on it in his Commentary on the Book of Wisdom. (1) He distinguishes two sanctifications of the B.Virgin: the first took place at her conception, i.e. when her soul was united to her body well-developed and organised 'ergo conceptio B.V. attenditur et sumitur penes instans infusionis animae in corpus sufficienter et debito modo organizatum'; in that instant the body was purified from the taint contracted 'ratione propagationis seminalis', 'et sic patet quod isto modo capiendo nomen conceptionis stricte et proprie B.V.non fuit concepta in originali peccato', because in the first moment of her existence as a person she was sanctified. In his time some employed the term 'conception' incorrectly 'pro seminis infusione in matricem', from which the body of the B.Virgin was to be formed, and thus held that she was conceived in original sin, or that the soul of the B. Virgin was united to the unpurified body. The second sanctification consisted in the new grace conferred upon her when Jesus was conceived.

---

(1) Holcot in Librum Sapientiae, (edit.Basle,1586) c.14,lect.161 R.L.Poole in D.N.B.,ix,1006, says that Holcot 'maintained the dominican view with respect to the Immaculate Conception so decidedly that his text (in the edition of the Comm. on Wisdom, Basle 1586) was amended by his discreet editor.' This seems strange as this edition is literally the same as the edition of Cologne c.1480 (probably the first edition) which means that there is a century between them and so any doubt of amendment by the ditor of 1586, at least in this place where Holcot speaks of the B.Virgin, may reasonably be rejected.

So far Holcot has spoken of sanctification itself, which really was purification in her own conception, and sanctification in the conception of Jesus. Next, considering the effects of original sin, he says that in the first sanctification 'ligatus est fomes' in such a way that she was continually inclined towards good, although she could fall into sin, if God did not preserve her; in the second sanctification, through the newly received grace, 'confirmata fuit sicut in via potuit', so that she could never sin. The explanation given by Holcot is really interesting; he follows the main traditional lines, or rather the thomistic teaching, for instance, that seminal propagation being the source of original sin, santification is impossible before animation, or before the person has been constituted; but then he postulates the purification of the well-formed body, so that the soul may not be tainted with original sin.

Scotus and all his followers do not stress the purification of the body, but rather the sanctification of the soul by means of a special grace preserving the B. Virgin from original sin; though Scotus gives it as an alternative: 'Potuit enim Deus in primo instanti illius animae infundere sibi gratiam.....aut potuit eam mundari ante infusionem animae, ut in illo instanti non esset infecta.' (1)

Peter Aureolus also refers to an opinion: 'tunc dicunt aliqui quod tempore formationis corporalis.....fuit illa materia purgata a morbida qualitate et impuritate omnimoda, ut in hora infusionis anima mundo corpori uniretur.' (2)

Holcot was known to be in favour of the Immaculate Conception, and was referred to as an authority on the subject. In fact Wood says that he found the following mention of Holcot in a

---

(1) Editio Quaracchi, p.17.

(2) Ibidem, p.48.

sermon on the Immaculate Conception preached in the Council of Basle:

> 'In sententiam huius propositionis (videlicet de Conceptione B.M. etc.) concordant doctores qui sequuntur: primo Alexander Nequam, doctor Oxoniensis, in sermone incipiente "Fiat lux". 2° Robertus Holkot, Ordinis Praedicatorum, in determinatione Oxoniensi quae incipit "Utrum doctrina Anselmi debeat rationabiliter reprobari", et determinat quod non.' (1)

Another contemporary John Bacon**m**thorpe, Carmelite, the 'doctor resolutus', (+1346) was not consistent in his opinion on the Immaculate Conception, but altered it considerably. In the second book on the Sentences (D.xxx,q.unica, ed. Mediolan,1511, f.cxxii,ra) he rejects the opinion in favour of the privilege and considers it almost heretical: 'Ista opinio nimis est adulatoria.....'. He says there are two kinds of heresies: 'una blasphematoria.....et alia adulatoria....sicut illa Euticen dicentis quod Christus non assumpsit naturam nostram miseram.... et de ista specie videtur ista opinio fore in proposito.' He still shows inconsistency in the III book on the Sentences, in the Postilla on St Matthew, and also in Quodlibet III, although he appears to be more disposed in favour of the privilege. Then in the IV book, written c. 1340, he accepts and defends the Immaculate Conception: 'licet alibi attendens ad ius commune aliter dixerim', and argues in support of the explanation given by Scotus and Aureolus. (2)

We pass now to consider the question (MS.Worc.F.65,f.67b-67**v**b)

---

(1) Wood Ant: City of Oxford, vol.II,p.320; cf. MS.Balliol 164 for the sermon of John Ronrayin the Council of Basle, where Holcot is mentioned as an upholder of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.
I was not able to find thersermon mentioned by Wood.Moreover Holcot in the above mentioned determination in MS.Balliol 246 ff.219 ra-b., does not deal with the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

(2) See articles by B.M.**X**berta, 'Joan Bacnothorp i el dogma de la Immaculada Concepcio de Maria' Estudis Franciscani (Barcelona) XL (1928),89; De Scriptoribus Scholasticis saec. XIV ex Ord. Carm. (Louvain) 1933,p.230; Doncoeur,Les Premiers Interventions du Saint Siege relative a l'Immaculee Conception. (xii-xiv) in the Revue d'histoire ecclesiastique VIII (1907) 266-285; 697-715; vol.IX, 278-293.

of Nicholas Aston, who was lecturing at Oxford c.1350. He puts the question: 'Utrum B. Virgo fuit concepta in originali peccato', adduces 12 arguments in support of the affirmative taking the proofs mainly from St Augustine, Anselm, Damascene, Leo and the Lombard. These arguments stress mainly the :-

i Universality of original sin.

ii Universality of redemption.

iii Existence of the effects of original sin in Mary.

iiii The teaching of the Fathers on the purification of Mary from sin, not actual, therefore original.

One of the objections says that there are reasons in favour of both opinions; the opinion which denies the privilege is supported by the authority of the Saints and doctors of the Church; the opinion which affirms it is without authoritative support, therefore it is more appropriate to say that the B. Virgin was conceived in original sin. Notwithstanding this, Aston determines the question in favour of the Immaculate Conception: '<u>Pro isto articulo sit hec conclusio sequens secundam Sentenciam</u>.' The reply is based on the special grace given by God to the B.Virgin in the first instant of her existence, bu which she was preserved from original sin; his first reason is taken from the incompatibility of grace and sin in the same individual. Moreover it is more fitting '<u>conveniens et deciens</u>' that God should give this grace to the B. Virgin in the first instant than that he should leave her, even for an instant, under the dominion of sin. Then, as regards the saying of the Fathers that the B. Virgin was '<u>mundata a culpa</u>', he replies that she was really purified '<u>a culpa que infuisset si gracia pro tunc non infuisset</u>.' The possible difficulty as to the time of conception did not escape his attention. He distinguishes three conceptions, which really correspond to those given by Peter Aureolus, and probably represent the three current opinions.

The first is the period before the infusion of the soul when the body of the B. Virgin was in process of formation. The second is at the infusion of the soul into the perfectly formed body. The

third is at the moment of the fusion of seeds and the infusion of the soul; which according to Holcot and Aureolus is improperly called conception.

In the first conception Mary was not yet in existence; her body-to-be was only in process of formation, therefore she was not conceived in original sin.

In the second conception we must say that God gave to the B. Virgin a special grace, by which she was preserved from original sin. In speaking of the third conception we must still say that God purified her soul at the instant in which it was infused. Aston is convinced of the doctrine, '<u>ita secundum veram logicam non debet concedi quod B.V. fuit concepta in originali peccato</u>, ergo etc. '

Throughout the argument he follows exactly the doctrine of Scotus and his followers. It seems that during the second half of the fourteenth century the controversy on the Immaculate Conception was revived. Pitts says (1) that: 'Per haec tempora gravis esse coepit controversia inter Dominicanos et Franciscanos de Conceptione B.M. Virginis.' It is not clear whether this assertion of Pitts is the usual introduction in his notices , and if the controversy really existed, whether it was widespread: we know for certain that two members of these orders were discussing the matter at this time. The Franciscan John Mardisley, who incepted at Oxford as D.D. before 1355, is said to have disputed early that year with the Dominican William Jordan, in the Chapter-house and the Chancellor's schools at York, on the Immaculate Conception. William Jordan opposedtthe doctrine, and it appears that either he or others were offended by the manner of disputation of Mardisley. (2) The Chapter of York in April 10, 1355, issued letters testifying to Mardisley's good conduct:

---

(1) Pitts, <u>De Rebus Anglicis</u>, 515.

(2) Tanner, 509; Wadding, 156; Pitts, 515; Little, <u>Greyfriars at Oxford</u>, 242; <u>D.N.B.</u> xxxvi,128.

'in putting forward his opinion he behaved amicably, modestly and courteously, without introducing any abuse or improprieties whatsoever.' Both disputants are said to have written on the Immaculate Conception, but unfortunately the writings have not survived, or have not yet been identified.

Before concluding we may set forth the views of two famous theologians of Oxford on the subject; the Dominican, John Bromyard, and John Wyclif.

Bromyard in his Summa Predicantium, under the heading 'Maria', following the old tradition, said that the sanctification of the B. Virgin took place 'in sua animatione i.e. in coniunctione animae cum corpore matris, et non ante, quia sanctificatio et mundatio fit per gratiam, cuius subiectum sit anima.' This is clearly the doctrine of Aquinas. Bromyard is said to have written a special work on this subject. (1)

John Wyclif in the treatise 'De Benedicta Incarnatione', which is his Commentary on the Sentences as Bachelor, (2) does not discuss the question, but we can gather his opinion from his later sermons. In a sermon on the Feast of the Purification, Wyclif touches on whether the B. Virgin was absolutely without sin, and closes with the words:

> 'Hic potest probabiliter teneri quod B.V. sicut fuit expers criminis actualis, sic fuit expers peccati originalis et cuiuscumque venialis; non tamen video quod oportet de necessitate salutis quemlibet salvandum hoc credere. Ideo videtur stulticia circa hoc nimium decertare.....'

Dr. Lechler says that the personal view of Wyclif was that the B. Virgin was probably without sin, but that he was not disposed to recognize her sinlessness as a matter of dogma. (3)

---

(1) Quetif-Echard, Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum, II, 695-699

(2) H.B. Workman, John Wyclif, I, 138-9. This treatise was edited in 1886 by E. Harris for the Wyclif Society publication.

(3) cf. Sermones of Wyclif, vol II, p.52. They were edited by Dr. Lorimer for the Wyclif Society; and Lechler, John Wyclif and his English Precursors, (trans. by Prof. Lorimer) p.273.