

STEFANO L. FORTE O.P., *A late thirteenth century collection of Questions in Ms. Vat. Lat 14013*, in «Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum» (ISSN 0391-7320), 19, (1949), pp. 95-121.

Url: <https://heyjoe.fbk.eu/index.php/afp>

Questo articolo è stato digitalizzato della Biblioteca Fondazione Bruno Kessler, in collaborazione con l'Institutum Historicum Ordinis Praedicatorum all'interno del portale [HeyJoe](#) - *History, Religion and Philosophy Journals Online Access*. HeyJoe è un progetto di digitalizzazione di riviste storiche, delle discipline filosofico-religiose e affini per le quali non esiste una versione elettronica.

This article was digitized by the Bruno Kessler Foundation Library in collaboration with the Institutum Historicum Ordinis Praedicatorum as part of the [HeyJoe](#) portal - *History, Religion, and Philosophy Journals Online Access*. HeyJoe is a project dedicated to digitizing historical journals in the fields of philosophy, religion, and related disciplines for which no electronic version exists.



## Nota copyright

Tutto il materiale contenuto nel sito [HeyJoe](#), compreso il presente PDF, è rilasciato sotto licenza [Creative Commons](#) [Attribuzione-Non commerciale-Non opere derivate 4.0 Internazionale](#). Pertanto è possibile liberamente scaricare, stampare, fotocopiare e distribuire questo articolo e gli altri presenti nel sito, purché si attribuisca in maniera corretta la paternità dell'opera, non la si utilizzi per fini commerciali e non la si trasformi o modifichi.

## Copyright notice

All materials on the [HeyJoe](#) website, including the present PDF file, are made available under a [Creative Commons](#) [Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](#). You are free to download, print, copy, and share this file and any other on this website, as long as you give appropriate credit. You may not use this material for commercial purposes. If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you may not distribute the modified material.



# A LATE THIRTEENTH CENTURY COLLECTION OF QUESTIONS IN MS. VAT. LAT. 14013

BY  
STEPHEN L. FORTE<sup>o</sup>. P.

---

The intellectual activity in the Medieval Universities is now very well known. This, apart from the extant statutes and other documents of the universities, is largely due to the discovery and careful study of a number of collections of scholastic exercises which fully illustrate, and show the medieval university — masters and students — in action, which has been fully illustrated, as regards the English Universities, by A. G. Little and Fr. Pelster<sup>1</sup>.

These collections are of two kinds: some are the reports of purely scholastic exercises of students and newly made masters required by the statutes for a particular degree in each faculty: we find in fact disputations of bachelors with other bachelors, and also with masters; sometimes the names of the disputants, and of the master directing the disputation are given. Consequently the interest of this kind of collection is evident, both from the biographical and the doctrinal aspect.

Other collections do not strictly speaking contain scholastic exercises, but rather what may be called the fruits of post-graduate activity, such as the Quodlibets and other disputations or short treatises on a particular intellectual problem of the day.

To this type belongs the yet unknown collection of the thirteenth century questions in MS. Vat. Lat. 14013; this is a fairly recent acquisition by the Vatican Library, which has not yet been catalogued. In the present article we shall give a detailed description of the manuscript, the list of the contents, and an edition of the "questio" of the anonymous Dominican on the unity of being in Christ.

## I - Description

Cod. Vat. Lat. 14013 is a vellum volume of 55 leaves, 32×22 cm., written in double columns. Six different hands can be distinguished, all of Italian origin: a) two main hands wrote the whole collection: i.

---

<sup>1</sup> A. G. Little-F. Pelster, *Oxford Theology and Theologians c. A. D. 1282-1302*, (O. H. S. xcvi), Oxford, 1934.

ff. 2<sup>ra</sup>-38<sup>vb</sup>; ii. ff. 39<sup>ra</sup>-55<sup>vb</sup>; *b*) the list of questions on fol. 1<sup>a-b</sup>, is also by two hands: i. qq. 1-37; ii. qq. 38-43; *c*) almost all the marginal notes are by one hand of the same period; the addition of fol. 43<sup>r</sup> is also by another hand, but a little later than the others.

Initials of the items in the text are in red and blue respectively and some of the questions have rubrics in red. The volume originally consisted of six quires of twelve folios each, some of which have been cut off before anything had been written on them (last quire); others afterwards (second and third quires). Collation of the quires: I: 12; II: 6; III: 7; IV: 12; V: 12; VI: 5.

In the manuscript we find two numerations: the modern, which includes the first folio, with an index of contents; and this brings the total to 55 leaves; and the original, which leaves out the first folio, and brings the total to 65 leaves, thus showing that the manuscript as we now have it is lacking 10 leaves, ff. 19-29 (old num.). We shall touch this point later on.

The collection is very faulty: corrections have been inserted all along the margins of some questions, by a hand of the same period. The marginal notes have different purpose: *a*) some are corrections to the text; *b*) others are indication of the division of the text; *c*) others give names of the authors cited: Augustinus, Hugo, Boethius. Of the profane authors we find only: Tullius, cited in the margin. Of the contemporaries, we find Henry of Ghent, to whom is attributed an opinion which is in the text: fol. 19<sup>rb</sup>: Hoc dicit Henricus de Candavo.

It is worth noting that the annotator was a very attentive student; he not only corrects the text, but gives references either to the same text, or even to other works, where the same matter is treated. For instance in the margin of the question: "Utrum anima rationalis sit ex traduce", (fol. 3<sup>rb</sup>) he writes: "Require hanc questionem libro 2<sup>o</sup> dist. 18<sup>a</sup> questione 6<sup>a</sup>", which corresponds to St. Thomas, II Sent., d. 18, qu. 6 (modern division: qu. 2, a. 3.); *b*) on fol. 17<sup>r</sup> in the margin: "Require carta 14<sup>a</sup>". and "De hoc require carta XI<sup>a</sup>", where the same matter is dealt with; *c*) fol. 16<sup>vb</sup> in the margin: "Hic deficit", to denote that the text is incomplete; *d*) fol. 13<sup>vb</sup>, in the text we find: "Et videtur quod non secundum Damascenum", and in the margin he gives the correct reference: "3<sup>o</sup> libro, 5<sup>o</sup> capitulo".

These and other minute observations, though apparently without importance, show the diligence of the annotator. Who was he? It is almost impossible to know, but his reference to the Commentary on the Sentences of St. Thomas may suggest that he was a Dominican student.

On fol. 1<sup>a-b</sup> (mod. num.) there is an index of the questions contained in the collection, written by a different hand from that of the collection, but of the same period. It gives the titles, folio and column where each question begins; counting the verso of a folio with the recto of the following — thus: 2 a-b-c-d, which corresponds to: ff. 1<sup>va-b</sup>, 2<sup>ra-b</sup>. In this index we have 43 titles of questions, whereas the text has only 38; that is, five questions less than is shown by the index. But in reality the text lacks only three questions: qq. 29, 30, 31, which are indicated in the index by: *vacat* in the margin alongside the three questions, which correspond to the three questions which have been cut off from the collection. Both the note *vacat* and the cutting off of the folios seem to be contemporary with the collection. Another question q. 27: “Utrum in Christo fuerit duplex esse vel unum tantum”, is incorporated in the previous question: “Utrum persona divina...”, and is marked in the margin of fol. 18<sup>va</sup>: “*Questio de duplici esse in Christo*”. It consists of only three reasons for the plurality of the “esse” in Christ.

The other question, q. 25. is incorporated in the preceding question 24; a mark indicates it: *Alia quaestio non completa*.

We give here the whole index of the questions to be compared with the list of the questions found in the text.

#### (INDEX QUAESTIONUM)

1. Utrum Deus cognoscat res aliter quam in ydeis (1<sup>a</sup>).
2. Utrum anima Christi cognoscat res in Verbo et in proprio genere (1<sup>b</sup>).
3. Utrum post annum magnum revertantur omnia eadem numero (2<sup>b</sup>).
4. Utrum sit unum tempus omnium temporalium (2<sup>o</sup>).
5. Utrum anima rationalis sit ex traduce, i. e. utrum sit producta per propagationem (2<sup>d</sup>).
6. Utrum aliqua creatura sit omnino simplex vel sit factibilis omnino simplex (3<sup>a</sup>).
7. Utrum angelus sit compositus ex materia et forma (3<sup>b</sup>).
8. Utrum virtus possit cognosci (ms. cognoscit) ab habente eam, i. e. utrum tantum cognoscatur per actus (3<sup>o</sup>).
9. Utrum voluntas possit esse subiectum virtutis (3<sup>o</sup>).
10. Utrum in voluntate sint ponendi aliqui habitus virtutum (3<sup>d</sup>).
11. Utrum voluntas illud quod vult de necessitate velit (5<sup>o</sup>).
12. Utrum voluntas habeat a se vel a ratione quod sit libera (5<sup>d</sup>).
13. Utrum ista possint simul stare, scilicet, quod natura et suppositum differant realiter, et quod unum non addat super aliud rem aliquam (6<sup>b</sup>).
14. Utrum una natura creata possit assumere aliam naturam creatam in unitate suppositi. Responso quod non potest (6<sup>d</sup>).

15. Utrum Filius Dei assumpserit vel assumere potuerit naturam peccabilem (7<sup>b</sup>).
16. Utrum suppositum divinum assumpserit naturam humanam cum defectu alicuius scientie, quam nata erat habere in processu temporis, et hoc est querere: utrum Christus secundum quod homo acquisierit aliquam scientiam per usum sensuum et actionem intellectus super fantasmata sicut ceteri homines naturaliter acquirunt (8<sup>o</sup>).
17. Utrum anima Christi eliciat actus fruitionis mediante aliquo habitu creato, vel per se sit sufficiens Verbum eternum ad hoc eliciendum (9<sup>o</sup>).
18. Utrum Filius Dei possit assumere naturam incapacem beatitudinis, vel solum natura rationalis, puta angelica vel humana sit assumptibilis (xi<sup>a</sup>).
19. Utrum ponendo unum suppositum absolutum in divinis sicut pagani ponebant, esset possibile Deum incarnari (12<sup>o</sup>).
20. Utrum ad hoc quod natura divina et humana uniantur in unione suppositi (requiratur) unio earum inter se (13<sup>b</sup>).
21. Utrum una persona possit sine alia incarnari (14<sup>b</sup>).
22. Utrum assumptio humane nature ponat novam relationem in assumente (14<sup>d</sup>).
23. Utrum una persona divina possit assumere diversas humanitates (15<sup>b</sup>).
24. Utrum natura humana sit per se assumptibilis. Et primo et partes per eam, vel econtrario partes, primo et per se et natura humana per partes (15<sup>d</sup>).
25. Utrum omnes persone divine possint assumere simul eandem naturam (16<sup>b</sup>).
26. Utrum persona divina possit assumere naturam alicuius suppositi preexistentis, ut meam vel tuam, non assumendo ipsum suppositum (17<sup>b</sup>).
27. Utrum in Christo fuerit duplex esse vel unum tantum (18<sup>a</sup>).
28. Utrum facta suppositione quod Spiritus Sanctus non procedat a Filio queritur: utrum possit distingui ab eo (18<sup>b</sup>).
29. Queritur an panis possit a Deo converti in corpus Christi, et an panem conversum in corpus eius possit idem reducere ut sit eadem numero substantia panis que prius erat (19<sup>a</sup>).
30. An sit possibile corpus Christi simul esse in omnibus locis sine (ms. seu) accidentibus panis qui convertuntur aut converti possunt in ipsum. Et an sic quod sit tantum in qualibet parte ipsorum (24<sup>o</sup>).
31. Utrum Deus possit facere quod accidentia remaneant sine subiecto. Responsio quod potest (29<sup>a</sup>).
32. Utrum forma verborum super panem transubstantiandum prolata sit competens; que est secundum articulum in libro de sacramentis (30<sup>d</sup>).
33. Utrum sit unus intellectus omnium hominum (31<sup>a</sup>).
34. Questio de gradibus formarum. Utrum scilicet plures forme perficiant eandem materiam, et est questio ubi probant contradictores veritatis quod corpus Christi vivum et mortuum non fuit omnino idem numero quod falsum est (35<sup>a</sup>).

35. Utrum esse et essentia sint idem vel realiter differant (40<sup>a</sup>).
36. Utrum angelus intelligat se per essentiam suam (45<sup>b</sup>).
37. Utrum intellectus angelicus intelligat per species innatas vel a rebus acceptas (47<sup>a</sup>).
38. De multiplici esse in Christo (52<sup>a</sup>).
39. Utrum in Christo sit tantum unum esse (53<sup>b</sup>).
40. Utrum in Christo sint plura esse vel unum tantum (54<sup>b</sup>).
41. Utrum materia in essentia sua sub omnimoda possibilitate potuerit produci a principio creante, i. e. utrum materia fuerit creata sine omni forma (56<sup>b</sup>).
42. Utrum materia in sua essentia habeat aliquid entitatis ab activo generante (59<sup>c</sup>).
43. Utrum materia sit una numero in omni essentia habente esse (63<sup>a</sup>).

## II - Date, origin and collector

The collection, as we have stated above, belongs to the beginning of the fourteenth century. The questions are those of different persons, and were disputed or written at different times.

The first we know of is the Franciscan Walter of Bruges, who is said to have written his "Quaestiones Disputatae" during his years of regency, sometime in 1267-69<sup>2</sup>; the second, the Franciscan Peter J. Olieu was still a student in 1268<sup>3</sup>; Giles of Rome wrote his "Quaestiones disputatae de Ente et Essentia", qq. 1-2, between 1285-86<sup>4</sup>; Pecham was teaching already in 1269<sup>5</sup>; the anonymous Dominican disputed his question "tempore Martini quarti" at Perugia, sometime in 1284-85<sup>6</sup>; Matthew of Aquasparta disputed this question, while "lector in curia" in 1279-87<sup>7</sup>; and finally the Franciscan Peter de Falco's teaching career was after 1270, may be 1277-87<sup>8</sup>. Thus taking into

<sup>2</sup> E. Longpré, *Quaestiones Disputatae du B. Gauthier de Bruges*, in *Les Philosophes Belges*, t. x, p. ii; P. Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, II, Paris 1934, n. 315, p. 84.

<sup>3</sup> P. Glorieux, *Répertoire...*, II, n. 327, p. 127.

<sup>4</sup> E. Hocedez, *Introduction to the Edition of "Theoremata de esse et essentia"*, Louvain, 1930, p. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Glorieux, *Répertoire...*, II, n. 316, p. 87.

<sup>6</sup> The colophon says incorrectly: "Martini Tertii", but it is evidently a mistake.

<sup>7</sup> Glorieux, *Répertoire...*, II, n. 318, p. 102; Little-Pelster, *op. cit.*, pp. 95, 123.

<sup>8</sup> Glorieux, *Répertoire...*, II, n. 321, p. 112; and his article, *Mâtres Franciscains de Paris: Pierre de Falco*, in *France Franciscaine*, XII (1929) p. 269; A. Théry, *De vita et operibus Petri de Falco*, in *Sophia*, VIII (1940) Fasc. I. p. 34.

consideration the first group of anonymous questions which may have taken place a little earlier, we may safely conclude that the period covered by the collection may be dated in 1260-1290; and consequently the present collection must have been made during the last years of the thirteenth century, or beginning of the fourteenth.

The other questions about the origin and collector are more difficult to answer. On the last folio (fol. 55<sup>v</sup>) we find an indication of the possession of the manuscript, which says: "Iste liber est conventus de Cortona ord. fratrum predicatorum". This is written in a fourteenth century hand. Would this suggest besides the possession, also the origin of the collection? It is difficult to explain the coincidence of the writing of the collection, and of its entering into a Dominican library, unless we suggest a Dominican origin.

The second question about the collector is impossible to answer. No clue is given in the collection itself, and thus, as in the case of other such collections, the collector remains unknown. But as we have suggested above, he may have been a Dominican student.

#### [INDEX QUAESTIONUM]

##### A. [QUAESTIONES ANONYMAE]

1. Utrum Deus cognoscat res aliter quam in ydeis. Responsio. Ad istam questionem tria prenotanda sunt: Primo quid dicatur nomine ydee. Secundo quas conditiones includit. Tertio quas conditiones includunt res temporales... que sunt et possunt fieri ab eo; non enim requiritur ad perfectam cognitionem rei quod res sit actu (fol. 2<sup>ra-b</sup>).
2. Utrum anima Christi cognoscat in Verbo res et in proprio genere. Responsio. Circa istam questionem primo considerandum est quas conditiones habet intellectus... et in proprio genere obiectum comprehenditur sub obiecto, et lumen sub lumine et modum sub modo cognoscendi, possunt iste cognitiones simul esse (fol. 2<sup>rb-vb</sup>).
3. Supposito illo magno anno quem posuit Plato, scilicet, quod in 36 milia annorum primum mobile faciat cursum suum vel celum stellatum, queritur: Utrum facta tali revolutione revertantur omnia eadem numero. Responsio. Ista questio secundum fidem est heretica... quod nullo modo poterunt produci idem effectus, qui fuerunt producti, ergo non poterunt eadem numero produci (fol. 2<sup>vb-3<sup>ra</sup></sup>).
4. Utrum sit unum tempus omnium temporalium. Responsio. Tempus et est accidens, et est numerus... nota quod tempus non est in anima realiter, sed non est sine anima percipiente (fol. 3<sup>ra-b</sup>).
5. Utrum anima rationalis sit ex traduce. Responsio. Quod non, et hoc potest patere quattuor viis. Et primo ex ordine agentium... dicebat per hoc

esse diversitatem intellectus speculativi in diversis hominibus, et quod per hoc diversa intelligebant (fol. 3<sup>rb-v<sup>a</sup></sup>).

6. Utrum aliqua creatura sit omnino simplex, vel sit factibilis omnino simplex. Responsio. Quod nulla creatura sit omnino simplex. Probat Augustinus... et tu ponas quod productio creature, que est a Deo, et operatio creature sit in eodem instanti (fol. 3<sup>va-b</sup>).
7. Utrum angelus sit compositus ex materia et forma. Probo quod non: Angelus est ymago Dei, sed ymago expresse representat ymaginatum, ergo... in angelis enim materia unius est divisa a materia alterius, non ratione quantitatis, sed ratione forme sue et ratione terminus creationis (fol. 3<sup>vb-4<sup>ra</sup></sup>).

B. [GUALTERUS DE BRUGIS: QUAEST. DISP.]

8. Queritur quomodo virtus possit cognosci ab habente eam. Responsio. Hec questio triplex est: una est an virtus ab habente cognoscatur per essentialiam... potest simplici intuitione vel visione per speciem cognoscere animam, potentias eius et habitus, non reducendo ad actus earum (fol. 4<sup>ra-vb</sup>; Ed. Longpré, pp. 8-15).
9. Utrum voluntas possit esse subiectum virtutis. Et videtur quod non: Potentior est rectitudo naturalis quam acquisita... non oportet quod que libet particularis virtus sit in voluntate, quia non oportet quod effectus sit semper in eodem cum causa (fol. 4<sup>vb-5<sup>rb</sup></sup>; Ed. cit. pp. 23-32).
10. Utrum in voluntate sint ponendi aliqui habitus virtutum. Et videtur quod non: virtus enim non requiritur in potentia nisi ut ordinet ipsam... tunc in statu innocentie, ubi nulla fuit difficultas in voluntate, non fuissent virtutes in voluntate. Cogita super hoc (fol. 5<sup>rb-6<sup>ra</sup></sup>).
11. Utrum voluntas illud quod vult de necessitate velit. Responsio. Duplex est necessitas, scilicet, coactionis et immutabilitatis... ponendo felicitatem in divitiis vel in honoribus etcetera. Sed circa primum modum non contingit errare (fol. 6<sup>ra-vb</sup>; Ed. cit. pp. 34-47).
12. Utrum voluntas habeat a se vel a ratione quod sit libera. Responsio. Ratio sive rationale sumitur tripliciter... unde ratio ut potentia ostendit sibi libertatis materiam sed ratio ut essentia dat sibi indifferentiam (fol. 6<sup>rb-vb</sup>; Ed. cit. pp. 47-53).

C. [QUAEST. ANONYMAE: DE VERBO INCARNATO]

13. Utrum ista possint simul stare, scilicet quod natura et suppositum differant realiter, et quod unum non addat super aliud rem aliquam. Et quod non videtur... Ad argumentum patet, quia differunt per modum realem, non per rem distinctam (fol. 6<sup>vb-7<sup>rb</sup></sup>).
14. Utrum una natura creata possit assumere aliam [naturam] creatam in unitate suppositi. Et quod sic videtur; unio est ratione convenientie... anima autem non habet rationem suppositi vel persone respectu corporis,

- immo cum corpore constituit unum suppositum, ideo non est simile (fol. 7<sup>rb-vb</sup>).
15. Utrum Filius Dei assumpserit vel assumere potuerit naturam peccabilem. Videtur quod sic, quia quod potest assumere effectum, potest assumere causam... Ad aliud quod potest non agere sicut potest unitam deponere, sed stante unione non post (fol. 7<sup>vb-9<sup>ra</sup></sup>).
  16. Utrum suppositum divinum assumpserit naturam humanam cum defectu alicuius scientie, quam nata erat habere in processu temporis, et hoc est querere: Utrum Christus secundum quod homo acquisierit aliquam scientiam per usum sensuum, et actionem intellectus super fantasmata, sicut ceteri homines naturaliter acquirunt. Et videtur quod non, quia impossibile est eidem inesse scientiam et ignorantiam de eodem... quia non potest esse ut non sit motus in celo, et loquens cum loquitur, de necessitate loqui, quia non potest esse, dum aliquis loquitur, quod non loquatur nunc (fol. 9<sup>ra-10<sup>ra</sup></sup>).
  17. Utrum Verbum eternum assumpserit naturam humanam, cuius nature humane anima frueretur mediante alico habitu creato; et hoc est querere: supposito, ut supra ostensum est, quod anima Christi ab instanti sue conceptionis fruatur et fuerit beata, cum ad fruitionem concurrat duplex actus, scilicet, visio clara divine essentie, qui est actus intellectus, et amor vel dilectio, qui est actus voluntatis: Utrum anima Christi unita Verbo et fruatur eo eliciat actus illos mediante habitu alico creato, ut aliquem actum visionis per habitum scientie create, et actum delectationis per habitum caritatis create... Verbum autem eternum elicit actum fruitionis creatum, secundum quod est unum cum anima et principium suum formale, quod est divina essentia. Ad aliud patet per idem (fol. 10<sup>ra-11<sup>va</sup></sup>).
  18. Utrum Filius Dei possit assumere naturam incapacem beatitudinis, vel solum natura rationalis, puta, angelica vel humana sit assumptibilis. Quod autem naturam irrationalem non possit assumere videtur... quod res per formam per quam est, per illam agit, ideo non sunt re separabilia, quamvis secundum intellectum (fol. 11<sup>va-13<sup>ra</sup></sup>).
  19. Utrum ponendo unum suppositum absolutum in divinis, sicut pagani ponebant, esset possibile Deum incarnari. Et videtur quod sic: ad hoc quod aliquis possit incarnari non videtur requiri nisi duo... tamen sic est bene communicabile, ut alterum ad suam communicabilitatem trahat; et sic est hic (fol. 13<sup>ra-vb</sup>).
  20. Utrum ad hoc quod natura divina et humana uniantur in unione suppositi requiratur unio earum inter se. Et videtur quod non: secundum Damascenum sicut se habent tres persone ad essentiam divinam sic se habent in Christo... sed natura divina et humana sunt unibiles, et uniuntur in uno supposito, tamen nullo modo inter se (fol. 13<sup>vb-14<sup>vb</sup></sup>).
  21. Utrum una persona possit sine alia incarnari. Et videtur quod non: quia actus incarnationis aut est essentialis aut notionalis... Ad aliud non est

- simile, quia talia accidentia conveniunt in uno supposito agente, et sic persone, sed tantum in essentia, que non agit, sed magis est in aliquibus personis ratione respectu agendi(!) (fol. 14<sup>vb</sup>-15<sup>rb</sup>).
22. Utrum assumptio humane nature ponat novam relationem in assumente. Et videtur quod non: Impossibile est fieri novam relationem in alico, nisi per essentialem mutationem alicuius absoluti... sic ista fundatur super eternam voluntatem Filii, et ideo sicut illa est eterna sic et ista. Ad argumenta responsio patet per iam dicta (fol. 15<sup>rb</sup>-<sup>vb</sup>).
23. Utrum una persona divina possit assumere diversas humanitates. Videtur quod non, quia tunc hoc esset per diversas assumptiones et uniones... Ad quartum patet: visum enim est quomodo forma est prius, similiter homo hic ab efficiente in supposito, ergo a supposito (fol. 15<sup>vb</sup>-16<sup>rb</sup>).
24. Utrum natura humana sit per se assumptibilis. Et primo et partes per eam, vel econtrario partes, scilicet, primo et per se... stat pro persona, non ratione li hominis, ratione cuius dicitur homo, non ratione persone (fol. 16<sup>rb</sup>-17<sup>vb</sup>).
25. Utrum persona divina possit assumere naturam alicuius suppositi preexistentis, ut meam vel tuam, non assumendo ipsum suppositum. Et videtur quod sic, quia quod accidit rei in generationem, accidit rei in generato esse... et secundum rationem huius nature potest assumi, quamvis non assumatur suppositum in ratione suppositi licet accipiatur secundum rem (fol. 17<sup>vb</sup>-18<sup>vb</sup>).
26. Utrum facta suppositione quod Spiritus Sanctus non procedat a Filio queritur: Utrum possit distingui ab eo. Ad quod dicendum quod impossibile est Spiritum Sanctum non procedere a Filio... et hoc est quod dicit Ricardus, lib. 5, cap. 8: Si idem est posse ambobus commune, consequens est tertiam et trinitate personarum, etcetera (fol. 18<sup>vb</sup>-19<sup>va</sup>).

D. [PETRUS I. OLIVI: TRACTATUS DE SACRAMENTO EUCHARISTIAE]

27. Utrum forma verborum super panem transubstantiandum prolata sit competens, quod est secundum articulum in libro de Sacramentis et ponitur in canone misse, et est hoc: Hoc est enim corpus meum. Responsio, quod ista forma adeo est plena sapientia et ratione cum sit immediate ab invisibili sapientia promulgata... est etiam finaliter propalativa, et ideo congruit addi meum. Explicit tractatus de sacramento venerabili eucharistie editus a fratre... de ordine... (fol. 20<sup>rb</sup>-<sup>va</sup>).

E. [ÆGIDIUS ROMANUS: QUÆSTIO]

28. (Rub.) *Incipit tractatus de unitate intellectus editus et disputatus a fratre Egidio de Roma, ordinis S. Augustini. Questio: Quia nonnulli dubitant quomodo intellectus... ex hac autem apparet dare solutionem ad obiecta omnium. Explicit tractatus de unitate intellectus editus a fratre Egidio. Deo gratias. Amen* (fol. 20<sup>va</sup>-24<sup>va</sup>; Ed. Veneti 1552, fol. 55<sup>v</sup>-61<sup>v</sup>).

## F. [THOMAS SUTTON: QUAESTIO]

29. (Rub.) *Questio sive tractatus de gradibus formarum ubi habetur quod corpus Christi mortuum non fuit idem numero cum vivo.*

Quoniam sanctum est honorare veritatem pre ceteris amicis, ut ait Philosophus (I Ethic.,) ideo virtuosi naturaliter (vel viriliter) impugnant ea que contraria reputant veritati... que est forma pura et actus purus et exemplar omnium, cui sit honor in secula. Amen (fol. 24<sup>va</sup>-30<sup>rb</sup>).

## G. [ÆGIDIUS ROMANUS: QUAEST. DISP.]

30. (Rub.) *Utrum essentia creature sit suum esse, id est, utrum esse et essentia differant.* Queritur utrum essentia creature sit suum esse, vel realiter differant ab essentia eius. Et videtur quod idem sit essentia realiter quod esse... huius autem essentie et huius forme est perfectio ipsum esse de quo loquitur, et ideo est differens ab utrisque (fol. 30<sup>rb</sup>-34<sup>vb</sup>; Ed. Venetiis 1503, fol. 17<sup>vb</sup>-22<sup>rb</sup>).
31. *Utrum angelus intelligat se per essentiam suam.* Et videtur quod non, quia si aliqua est causa... sed in questionibus sequentibus cum queremus, Utrum possit intelligere plura simul hoc clarius ostendetur (fol. 34<sup>vb</sup>-37<sup>rb</sup>; Ed. Venet. fol. 76<sup>rb</sup>-78<sup>vb</sup>).
32. *Queritur utrum intellectus angelicus intelligat per species innatas vel a rebus acceptas.* Et videtur quod angelus non habeat species rerum apud se... sunt in potentia quantum ad intellectionem, sive quantum ad actum intelligendi (fol. 37<sup>rb</sup>-41<sup>va</sup>; Ed. Venet., fol. 88<sup>va</sup>-92<sup>vb</sup>).

## H. [JOHANNES PECHAM: QUAESTIO]

33. (Rub.) *Questio de multiplici esse in Christo.* Probatum quod in Christo sunt plura esse, quia scribitur in Joh. X: Ego et Pater unum sumus... ita in proposito sed dissimiliter, ut supra patet. *Explicit questio de multiplici esse in Christo disputata a fratre Iohanne de Peçamo, archiepiscopo Ca[n]tu[a]riensi* (fol. 41<sup>va</sup>-42<sup>vb</sup>).

## I. [ANONYMUS O. P. QUAESTIO]

34. (Rub.) *Questio de uno esse in Christo.*  
Utrum in Christo sit tantum unum esse. Et videtur quod non: Illa enim que sunt diversa et unum non se habet pro informatione... sed tantum in illo triduo mortis desiit esse humane nature. *Explicit questio de uno esse tantum in Christo, quam disputavit quidam frater predicator Perusii tempore domini Martini pape tertii* (fol. 42<sup>vb</sup>-43<sup>vb</sup>; Firenze, Bibl. Naz. J. VIII. 47, ff. 28<sup>va</sup>-29<sup>vb</sup>).

## J. [MATTHAEUS AB AQUASPARTA: QUAESTIO]

35. Queritur utrum in Christo sit tantum unum esse vel plura. Quod autem in Christo sit tantum unum esse videtur: si enim sunt in Christo plura esse, aut sunt simul aut successive... non habet rationem persone, nec est persona (fol. 43<sup>vb</sup>-45<sup>vb</sup>; Ed. Ad Claras Aquas, 1914, II, pp. 159-176; E. Hocedez, Textus et Doc., 14 (Rom. 1933) pp. 44-58).

## K. [PETRUS DE FALCO: QUAEST. DISP.]

36. (Rub.) *Utrum materia possit esse sine forma.* Queritur: Utrum materia in essentia sua sub omnimoda possibilitate poterit produci a principio creante. Et quod sic videtur: Plus potest Deus facere... et quoad esse essentiale in se fieri potuit, ita etiam et conservari (fol. 45<sup>vb</sup>-49<sup>ra</sup>; Arch. Franc. Hist., 33 (1940) pp. 248-49).
37. (Rub.) *Questio.* Secundo queritur: Utrum materia in sua natura habeat aliquid entitatis ab activo generante. Et arguo (ms. argo) quod sic: Secundum Commentatorem... aliquid entitatis ab activo generante, et probatum est quod sic (fol. 49<sup>ra</sup>-52<sup>vb</sup>).
38. Queritur 3<sup>o</sup>: Utrum materia sit una numero in omni substantia habente eam. Et arguo quod sic: Illud quod de se nullas habet partes... sunt materie distincte, non tantum formaliter per ipsas formas perficientes, immo essentialiter per seipsas. Explicit determinatio questionis (fol. 52<sup>va</sup>-55<sup>vb</sup>).

## III - Literary considerations on the collection

We shall make use of letters to indicate the groups or independent questions, and numbers to denote each question, as they are found in the list.

[A] (qq. 1-7). These seven questions are all anonymous, and we have not been able to identify them. Whether the whole group belongs to one person or more, and whether they represent a Quodlibet or just disputations, is not clear. But we can probably say for certain that: i. Some of the questions show a resemblance which may suggest the same author. In fact the way of answering is characteristic: q. 1: Responsio. Ad istam questionem tria prenotanda sunt... q. 2: Responsio. Circa istam questionem, primo considerandum est quas condiciones habet intellectus...

QQ. 4, 5, also show the same meticulous division of reasons in the answers, though not so clearly as in the first two.

ii. The author of at least one of the questions was a Franciscan or belonged to the Franciscan school. In fact in q. 7, he holds the Franciscan theory that matter is found also in angels.

[B] (qq. 8-12). We have identified these five anonymous questions as those of the Franciscan Walter of Bruges. The *Quaestiones Disputatae* of Walter de Bruges are published by E. Longpré<sup>9</sup>; thus we were able to identify for certain four of our questions (8, 9, 11, 12), but the tenth question with all probability belongs to him also, as we shall see presently. First of all the fact that this question is among the questions certainly belonging to Walter de Bruges, suggests, though does not prove, that it belongs also to him.

This is confirmed by the fact that this question fits in very well with the other questions, and that the doctrine contained in it does not contradict in any way the doctrine expressed in the others, on the contrary it is very similar to that in question nine (ed. q. III).

For instance we may note a great similarity between the second argument and its answer in our question with the sixth argument of the first part and its answer to question nine.

They refer to the same text of Tullius "virtus est modus nature consentaneus", and they give almost the same answer, explaining that virtue is not against the nature of the will; and when Tullius says that the virtue moves in the same way as nature, he does not mean that it moves necessarily, "non dicitur quia facit de necessitate potentiam fieri ad unum, sed quia inclinatur ad unum oppositorum", thus in the edited q. 9. In our question he says: "quia non dicitur quod virtus moveatur secundum naturam, sed quod habeat modum nature, quia inclinatur ad unum, et ideo quod voluntas habeat talem modum nature non est inconveniens".

Further examination of the doctrinal matter contained in these five questions will certainly throw more light on the identification of the tenth.

Question	8	corresponds to	edition Longpré	question	I.	p. 1
»	9	»	»	»	»	III. p. 23
»	11	»	»	»	»	IV. p. 34
»	12	»	»	»	»	V. p. 47

The reportation of these questions is very imperfect. Sometimes objections with their answers are left out, and whole phrases or even parts of an answer are not given. We may well illustrate this by an example. We take the eight question with its corresponding III

<sup>9</sup> E. Longpré, cf. *supra* n. 2.

question in the edition with its divisions and numbering of objections.  
 "Queritur quomodo virtus possit cognosci ab habente eam".

MS. Quaestio 8.	Ed. Quaestio I. p. 1.
Respondeo	Respondeo . . . . . p. 8
1. obiectio	I, 4 obiectio. . . . . p. 2
responsio.	responsio. . . . . p. 10
2. obi.	11 obi. . . . . p. 3
resp.	resp. . . . . p. 11
ad secundam quest.	ad sec. partem quaestionis pp. 13-14
ad primum	III, 1. ad prim. . . . . p. 15
ad secund.	3. ad tert. . . . . p. 15

Thus out of the thirteen arguments of the first part, we have only three. All the thirteen arguments of the second part are left out; but a general answer to this part is briefly summarized. He gives two arguments out of the ten of the third part, and omits the six arguments of the fourth part of the question. Thus of the whole question he gives only the responsion and the above arguments with their answers. The same method is shown with the other questions.

[C] (qq. 13-26). In this section we have fourteen anonymous questions, which we have so far been unable to identify. They are all but one on the incarnation and the hypostatic union of the Divine Word. Whether they are by the same author we cannot tell for certain without further evidence, but at first sight they would appear to come from the same source. For instance, the method characteristic of treatment in questions 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, suggests the same author.

- Q. 13: Respondeo. Hic sunt duo videnda...
- Q. 16: Respondeo. Circa istam questionem quattuor sunt attendenda...
- Q. 17: Respondeo. Circa istam questionem quattuor sunt intelligenda...
- Q. 19: Respondeo. Hic sunt quattuor declaranda...

The same method is also observed in group A. qq. 1, 2, 5. Do they belong to the same author?

Secondly it is always his habit to give the current opinions on the subject-matter, the "opiniones solempnes", as he calls them.

For instance:

- Q. 16: Secundo ponende sunt due opiniones solempnes... Alia opinio est huic contraria... Huic opinioni assentio...

- Q. 17: Secundo ponende sunt positiones due solempnes que hodie tenentur circa istam questionem... Item alia opinio subtilior cui sine preiudicio assentio.
- Q. 18: Respondeo in hac questione sunt due opiniones solempnes... Alia positio est... et huic positioni sine preiudicio assentio...

Thirdly we find also references to his previous determinations of other questions. For example:

- Q. 18: Et huic positioni sine preiudicio assentio propter tria: primo quia magis (hiis que in precedentibus determinavi hoc potest probari)... Primum patet, nam determinavi et probavi... Determinavi etiam in ultima questione... (this refers to q. 17).
- Q. 19: De tertio utrum in aliquo supposito sive persona possit fieri incarnatio, potest hoc intelligi per spiritualem incarnationem de qua in quadam alia questione dictum est, et sic potest ad beneplacitum dici, sed sic non loquimur nunc, sed proprie ut fiat veritas inter ea, credo quod non est possibile...

Since the whole group of questions treats of a single subject, which is developed progressively, it would seem that it is the work of a single author. We may also observe a similarity of treatment in questions 1, 2, 5, of the first anonymous group [A]. Do these also come from the same hand?

[D] (q. 27). This question as it stands is evidently incomplete and out of place. It has no relation whatever with the preceding nor with the following questions. The attribution of this question to the Franciscan Peter J. Olieu may seem rash at first sight, but the following circumstantial evidence seems to corroborate it. Blank and missing folios: Between the present fol. 19 (18 old num.) and 20 (30 old num.) there are eleven folios missing. Evidently there were questions written on. On parts of the two surviving folios we see seven lines on fol. 19<sup>v</sup>, where the preceding question ends, and six lines on fol. 20<sup>r</sup>, where the present question begins. All the writing which intervenes between these two surviving parts is erased. Now looking up the Index on fol. 1 we notice that between q. 26: "Utrum facta suppositione..." and the present q. 27: "Utrum forma..." there are indexed three more questions which are on the same eucharistic subject:

1. Queritur an panis possit a Deo converti in corpus Christi, et an panem conversum in corpus eius possit idem reducere ut sit eadem numero substantia panis que prius erat.

2. An sit possibile corpus Christi simul esse in omnibus locis seu (*corr. sine*) accidentibus panis que convertuntur aut converti possunt in ipsum, et an sic quod sit totum in qualibet parte ipsorum.
3. Utrum Deus possit facere quod accidentia remaneant sine subiecto. Responsio. Quod potest.

We have been able to identify these three questions with those of Peter J. Olieu in MSS. Vat. Lat. 4986, ff. 140<sup>r</sup>-155<sup>v</sup>, and Vat. Borgh. 13, ff. 17<sup>ra</sup>-33<sup>vb</sup>. This identification made us suspect that q. 27 together with the above three questions formed one group or treatise on the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and so we concluded that it belongs also to Peter Olieu. This is corroborated by the fact that the present question as it stands represents a concluding question of a treatise. No important doctrinal point is discussed; it deals only with the "convenientia" of the eucharistic form: "Hoc est enim corpus meum", and the treatment is superficial. Then at the end we read: "Explicit tractatus de sacramento venerabili eucharistie..".

It would seem that Olieu at a later date published the four questions in form of a treatise on the Blessed Sacrament.

Why were the questions erased? And why was the name of the author also erased from the colophon? To these queries we can give no answer without further evidence. The name of the author cannot be deciphered. The tractatus ends as follows: "Explicit tractatus de sacramento venerabili eucharistie editus a fratre... (erased)... de ordine... (erased)...". But a sign, which by accident has not been properly erased seems to betray the name of the order to which the author belonged. In fact the first and third letter must have been *m* and *n*, and in the centre above the second letter there still remains unerased a stroke usually put over the *i*. It must have been *min...* of the Franciscan Order. This fact corroborates the attribution of the question to the Franciscan Peter J. Olieu.

[E] (q. 28). This represents a copy of the treatise of Giles of Rome on the unity of the intellect. It is not mentioned in the list of manuscripts collected by G. Bruni<sup>10</sup>, and is explicitly attributed to Giles of Rome: "editus a fratre Egidio": it is substantially identical with the Venetian edition of 1552, except that the fourth argument of the edition

<sup>10</sup> G. Bruni, *Le opere di Egidio Romano*, Firenze 1936, pp. 73-74. This treatise has been edited several times. Bruni promised a critical edition from the Italian manuscripts, for which the present copy will be found useful.

is missing in this copy. The actual wording of the treatise is a little different in the edition and in our manuscript, but they correspond in all other respects.

[F] (Q. 29). We have here a copy of the treatise "De gradibus Formarum" of the Dominican Thomas Sutton. It has been published several times among the works of St. Thomas, but is certainly not his. We have collated this copy with the MSS. Vat. Lat. 484, and Ottob. 184, and found them to be substantially identical. It differs in many places from and is more complete than the Mandonnet edition<sup>11</sup>. In the index, this treatise is in a slightly different form from the text, we read: "Questio de gradibus formarum, utrum, scilicet, plures forme perficiant eandem materiam, et est questio ubi probant contradictores veritatis, quod corpus Christi vivum et mortuum non fuit omnino idem numero, quod falsum est".

[G] (QQ. 30, 31, 32). These are three questions which we have identified as those of Giles of Rome. The first corresponding to "Quaestiones disputatae de ente et essentia, q. IX". The other two corresponding to the "De cognitione angelorum", qq. I, VI; and they are identical with the Venetian Edition of 1503. It would not be out of place to note here that the first question, with other three questions from the "De ente et essentia", qq. IX, X, XI, XII, are found anonymous in the Bibliotheca Vallicelliana, ms. E. 30, ff. 153<sup>ra</sup>-159<sup>vb</sup><sup>12</sup>.

[H] (Q. 33). This question is explicitly attributed to the Franciscan controversialist John Pecham, archbishop of Canterbury.

It does not appear among the list of his works, attributed to him by Franciscan and non Franciscan Bibliographers. How it survived unnoticed, it is difficult to say, considering the importance of the problem dealt with, which was hotly discussed in that period.

Of its authorship there is little doubt, as it is explicitly attributed to him: "disputata a fratre Iohanne de Pecamo, archiepiscopo Cantuariensi". We shall discuss the doctrine later on.

[I] (q. 34). This question was disputed by a Dominican at Perugia during the time of Pope Martin IV. It must have taken place in 1284-85 during which time Martin IV was at Perugia, where he died in March.

<sup>11</sup> S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Opuscula Omnia*, ed. P. Mandonnet, t. V., Parisiis 1927, pp. 308-346.

<sup>12</sup> *Archivum fr. Praed.* 2 (1932) 360-361. Bruni does not mention this copy in his list of works of Giles of Rome, *op. cit.*

1285<sup>13</sup>. Who was the anonymous Dominican? Considering all the details given in the colophon, especially the mention of the Pope, one would naturally think of a Dominican "lector in curia". But unfortunately there is a big gap in the list of the lectors in curia during that period. In 1268 (?) we find Ambrose Sansedonius, who died in 1286; then comes the French Dominican, Hugh de Billom in 1286 (?), but in 1288 he was created cardinal<sup>14</sup>. Taking into consideration other facts Billom seems the more probable "lector in curia" during 1284-5. In fact we know that in November 1284 he left Paris, where he was teaching, and came to Italy. He taught at S. Sabina, and at Viterbo and in 1285 assisted at the Provincial chapter held at Anagni.<sup>15</sup>

Thus his stay in Italy, most probably as "lector in curia", in 1284-85, suggests him as the most probable author of the present disputation.

Another copy of this disputation, more complete than that of the Vatican collection, is in Florence at the Biblioteca Nazionale, Cod. J. VIII. 47, ff. 28<sup>va</sup>-29<sup>vb</sup>. At the end of the question there are four arguments, which defend the same opinion on the matter, written by the same hand, and thus with all probability belong to the same author. Here is a short description of the Florence manuscript<sup>16</sup>. The codex is a vellum volume, written at the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth century, it contains several works of St. Thomas, St. Albert, Hugh of St. Cher, Giles of Rome, and belonged to the Dominican Priory of St. Mark in Florence.

The present question comes between St. Thomas' Commentary on the "De memoria et reminiscencia" of Aristotle (fol. 28<sup>r</sup>), and his other work "De occultis operibus nature" (fol. 30<sup>v</sup>). It is interesting to find also the treatise of Giles of Rome "De unitate intellectus", which is also found in our collection.

[J] (q. 35). We have identified this question as that of the Franciscan Matthew of Aquasparta. It is found also in the collection contained in MS. Assisi 158, where it is said to have been disputed "in curia". We are told that the Assisi collection covers the period 1282-

<sup>13</sup> A. Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, t. II, Berolini 1875, pp. 1790-94. Martin IV reached Perugia in October 7, 1284, and died there in March 28, 1285.

<sup>14</sup> I. Taurisano, *Hierarchia Ordinis Praedicatorum, Romae* 1916, p. 33; M. D. Chapotin, *Histoire des Dominicains de la Province de France*, Rouen 1898, pp. 685-6.

<sup>15</sup> P. Glorieux, *Répertoire...* I, n. 40, p. 152.

<sup>16</sup> M. Grabmann, *Die Werke des hl. Thomas von Aquin*, Münster 1931, pp. 211-212.

1302, so that Matthew must have disputed this question between 1282, when he was "lector in curia", and 1287, when he became Minister General<sup>17</sup>. It has been published twice; first by the Quaracchi Editors, and then by E. Hocedez.<sup>18</sup> The present copy is identical with the edition with some minor variations.

[K] (qq. 36-38). These anonymous questions belong to the Franciscan Peter de Falco. The list of Peter's questions has been published by P. Glorieux, F. Delorme, A. Heysse, and A. Théry; but only Heysse has given extracts from some of the questions<sup>19</sup>. Our questions appear in the same order as in the list; moreover, in our manuscript they are connected together with the headings: *Secundo queritur...*; *Tertio queritur...* consequently there is no doubt that all the three belong to him. The extract of the first question given by Heysse is identical with our copy; no other copy is available, so we have only the evidence afforded by the list.

#### IV – Doctrinal considerations: Interest of the collection

From the above examination, superficial though it may be, one may see the interest of the present collection in relation to the literature of the thirteenth century.

The importance of the collection is twofold: biographical and doctrinal. First, the masters who are mentioned are well-known, and famous for their contribution to the advancement of philosophical and theological knowledge. We have John Pecham, Archbishop of Canterbury, an indefatigable defender of his school, Giles of Rome, Thomas Sutton, Matthew of Aquasparta, Walter de Bruges and Peter de Falco. They took active part in the controversies of the period, and strongly defended their own school of thought.

<sup>17</sup> Little and Pelster, *op. cit.*, p. 123. Glorieux, *Répertoire...*, II, n. 318, p. 102 says that he succeeded Pecham as "lector in curia" in 1279, whereas Little, *op. cit.*, p. 95, says that he succeeded him in 1281.

<sup>18</sup> Fr. Matthaei ab Aquasparta OFM, *Quaestiones disputatae selectae*, t. II, *Quaestiones de Christo*, Quaracchi 1914, pp. 159-176; E. Hocedez, *Quaestio de unico esse in Christo a doctoribus saec. XIII disputata*, *Textus et Documenta*, series theologica, 14, (Romae 1933, pp. 44-58).

<sup>19</sup> P. Glorieux, *Maîtres Franciscains de Paris: Pierre de Falco*, in *France Franciscaine*, XII (1929), p. 260; F. Delorme, I. Pecham, *Quodlibet Romanum*, Romae 1939, p. 172; A. Heysse, *Fr. Pierre de Falco ne peut être identifié avec Guillaume de Falgar OFM.*, in *Archivum Franc. Hist.*, 33 (1940) pp. 248-9; A. Théry, *De vita et operibus Petri de Falco*, in *Sophia*, VIII (1940), p. 40.

Secondly, and perhaps principally, the interest of the collection rests in the doctrinal matter which it contains, and which throws light on the theological problems disputed in the late thirteenth century.

It would take long to examine the miscellaneous doctrinal matter contained in the collection. This is not our intention in this section, in which we wish to consider only the disputations on the question of the plurality or unity of being in Christ, a question hotly debated in that period.

We have the questions of Pecham and Aquasparta on one side, and that of the anonymous Dominican on the other side, representing the two important currents of opinion on the problem.

This controversy depends fundamentally on another not less important on the plurality or unity of forms, similarly debated by the same schools. Of this we have the question of the Dominican Thomas Sutton. The first opinion is for the plurality of "esse" in Christ.

Pecham says: "Dico quod in Christo sunt plura esse". He gives the traditional and principal reason, because: "Sunt enim in Christo plura esse ex ratione duarum naturarum diversarum, create, scil., et increate".

The two natures, divine and human in Christ, according to this opinion, must preserve their own proper "esse"; nevertheless he acknowledges that the human "esse" in Christ is dependent in a way on the divine "esse" because the two natures are subsisted by one personality, the divine. For this he gives four reasons, which represent the traditional arguments of this opinion.

He says: "Quod patet quadruplici ratione: Primo ex consideratione proprii subiecti ipsius esse, quod est actus entis.

Item hoc patet secundo ex consideratione cause formalis.

Hoc idem tertio patet ex consideratione cause efficientis.

Item hoc patet quarto ex consideratione cause finalis".

Pecham concludes very strongly that: "Necesse est igitur dicere quod in Christo sunt plura esse absolute et proprie, et aliud dicere hereticum reputamus et equivaletur errori Entitis".

Matthew of Aquasparta defends the same opinion by means of three arguments; "Ista autem positio (de unico esse) quamvis magistrorum sit, et multum subtilis et probabilis videatur, tamen sine preiudicio, non est multum segura, quoniam repugnat veritati incarnationis, integritati perfectionis in Christo, et veritati vitae et mortis, que tria manifeste convincunt in Christo fuisse et esse plura esse, et ipsum plura esse habuisse".

Aquasparta is evidently clearer in his exposition, although not less dogmatic than Pecham. He says that the contrary opinion "omnino his (ra-

tionibus) repugnat". He goes to the source of the error of the other opinion and says: "supponit enim quod in uno non potest esse nisi unum esse, sicut nec una forma, cuius contrarium ostensum est, nam et in eodem ponimus plures formas, tamen ad invicem ordinatas, et plura esse eodem modo ad invicem ordinata, que tamen non plurificant ens sive existens. Et contrarium huius a magistris Parisiensibus est tamquam minus sanum et consonum fidei reprobatum".

The anonymous Dominican naturally holds the thomist view. He follows very closely the argumentation of St. Thomas, especially in his "Quaestiones Disputatae de unione Verbi Incarnati, quaest. 4. "

He distinguishes between the "illud quod est" and "illud quod est". "Illud quod est", i. e. the hypostasis or suppositum is that which really subsists by itself "Illud quo est", is the essentia, which exists "in alio", that is "in supposito", to which it contributes an "esse" accidental or substantial. Therefore the suppositum properly has the "esse", and not the essentia. He then distinguishes between those forms or natures which exist "in alio", and give to it an "esse" which does not belong to the suppositum, and consequently there may be more than one of such "esse" in the same suppositum; and those forms and natures which exist "in alio", but belong to the "esse substantiale vel ypostaticum ipsius ypostasis subsistentis"; and this "esse" results from all those which contribute to the unity of the suppositum. Therefore there cannot be more than one of such "esse", otherwise there will be more than one suppositum. Therefore in Christ we cannot admit more than one "esse substantiale", otherwise we would have to admit in Christ more than one personality, which is heretical.

The anonymous Dominican concludes his answer, saying: "Et hanc veritatem ponunt isti doctores: Innocentius V, frater Thomas, dominus Annibaldus, dominus Bonaventura, frater Albertus...".

These are in brief the two currents of opinion on the question of the unity of being in Christ, represented in our collection. They are of great interest to the history of that very important controversy in the late thirteenth century.

QUESTIO DE UNICO ESSE IN CHRISTO

Queritur utrum in Christo sit tantum unum esse et videtur quod non: Illa enim que sunt diversa, et unum non se habet per informationem ad aliud, oportet quod habeant duplex esse. Sed natura divina et humana sic se habent in Christo, quia divina natura non est humana nec e converso, ergo utraque natura in Christo habet suum esse. Ergo cum sint due nature, oportet quod in Christo sit duplex esse. 5

Preterea. Esse est actus entis. Sed utraque natura in Christo est ens per se, quia non potest dici quod una natura sit conversa in aliam, nec quod tertia natura sit constituta ex illis duabus naturis, ergo utraque habet suum esse. Ergo in Christo est etc. 10

Preterea. Unum est esse Dei Patris et Filii. Si ergo unum est esse Filii Dei et illius hominis, oportet quod sit unum esse Dei Patris et illius hominis. Ergo eadem ratione humana natura est unita Patri sicut et Filio. Ergo ita Pater est incarnatus sicut et Filius, quod est falsum. 15

Preterea. Per mortem destruitur esse hominis. Christus autem vere fuit mortuus, ergo vere esse humane nature fuit destructum in Christo per mortem. Sed constat quod esse divinum non fuit destructum, ergo aliud esse erat in Christo preter esse divinum. Ergo oportet ponere in Christo duplex esse.

Contra: Secundum Boetium, in libro de unitate et uno, unumquodque ideo est quia unum est. Ubi etiam dicit quod ubi "desinit esse unum, desinit esse id quod est". Et paulo ante concludit: «Quapropter sicut res unitate ad esse ducitur, sic ex unitate [in] illo esse custoditur. Unde unum et esse inseparabiliter se concomitantur et videntur simul esse natura». Ergo ex istis verbis Boetii concluditur quod si Christus non est unus, quod Christus non est. Ergo cum unius rei unicum est esse, oportet quod in Christo sit unum esse; quod si non est unum esse in Christo, quod Christus non est unus, quod 20 25

1 Firenze, Bibl. Naz., cod. J. VIII. 47, f. 28<sup>va</sup>-30<sup>ra</sup> (F); cod. Vat. lat. 14013 f. 42<sup>vb</sup>-43<sup>vb</sup> (V). 1 titulum *om. F.* 2 Queritur *om. V* et *om. F.* 3 enim *om. F.* 3 pro informatione *V* 4 divina natura *F* 5 humana *add. natura F* 5-7 utraque... esse] etc. *V* 8 Preterea] item *V* 8 ens *om. V* 10 ex] cum *V* naturis *om. V* 11 in Christo est *om. V* 12 Preterea] item *V* 13 illius hominis.. Patris et *om. V* 14 hum. nat. est] est humanitas *V* et *om. F.* 15 falsum est *V* 16 Preterea] item *V* hominis *add. mortui F* autem *om. F.* 17 mortuus fuit *F* destructum] destitutum *F* 18 sed... destructum *om. V* destitutum *F* 19 in Christo ponere *F* 24 se concomitantur] commitantur *F* 25 Boetii *om. V* 25-27 quod si... unum esse *om. F.* 27-29 quod si... Christus *om. V*

20 P. Correns, Die dem Boethius fälschlich zugeschriebene Abhandlung des Dominicus Gundisalvi De Unitate (Beitr. z. Gesch. d. Philos. d. Mittelalt. I, 1), Münster 1891,3.

22 Ibid., p. 4.

est contra articulum fidei, quoniam in symbolo dicitur: « Deus et homo unus est Christus ».

30 Sed dicebat quod, licet Christus sit unus in persona, tamen in eo due sunt nature. Unde anima que est forma constituens alteram naturam, adveniens corpori constituit aliquod esse. Constat autem quod non constituit esse divinum, et ita oportet quod constituat aliquod esse aliud.

Contra: omne illud quod habet esse per se in genere substantie est sup-  
35 positum. Si ergo anima Christi adveniens corpori Christi dat ei esse per se aliud ab esse divino, constituit suppositum per se, ergo humana natura in Christo est suppositum per se, et ita cum in Christo sit suppositum Filii Dei, duo supposita erunt in Christo quod est heresis dampnata in Concilio V apud Constantinopolim celebrato.

40 Sed dicebat quod anima dans esse illi corpori non constituit suppositum, quia ordinatur ad aliud esse completius, respectu cuius primum esse est imperfectum, sicut quelibet forma precedens ultimam formam dat esse incompletum respectu ultimi esse, quod datur ab ultima forma.

Contra: omnis forma substantialis adveniens materie constituit speciem  
45 que predicatur de individuo constituto per adventum illius forme, ergo si omnes forme precedentes manent, quelibet dat esse determinate speciei, et tunc omnes species poterunt predicari de isto individuo constituto per ultimam formam. Ergo potest dici quod iste homo est semen, et quod iste homo est lac, et quod est sanguis, et sic de omnibus aliis formis precedentibus ani-  
50 mam rationalem que est ultima forma, quod est nimis absurdum; ergo impossibile est quod alie forme precedentes remaneant cum ultima forma, vel quod aliquod aliud esse remaneat cum ultimo esse.

Sed dicebat: constat quod istud individuum est substantia et est corpus, et est animal. Iterum constat quod alia forma est substantie, alia corporeitatis,  
55 alia animalitatis, et ita sunt diverse forme.

Contra: cum dico substantiam, corpus, animal, hominem et quecumque sunt in recta linea predicabili, aut dico unum aut dico diversa. Si unum, habeo propositum: quia cum omne quod predicatur sit formale respectu eius de quo predicatur, cum etiam omnia ista de ultimo individuo in eadem linea predi-  
60 centur, ergo omnia dicentur unum formaliter. Si sunt diversa, ergo unum non predicatur de alio.

Sed dicebat, quod licet sint unum re, sunt tamen diversa ratione.

Contra: Diversitas rationis non ponit diversitatem rei, alioquin in Deo esset maxima diversitas realis, cum in eo sit maxima pluralitas rationum.

---

33 aliud] creatum *F* 34 per se *om. V* 35 ergo] igitur *F* Christi *om. F*  
36 aliud... per se *om. F* 40 anima d. esse] illud esse quod anima dat *F*  
41 completum *F* 42 formam *add. que F* 46 omnes] ille *V* 47 isto *om. F*  
48-49 et quod... sanguis] et quod est sanguis et quod est lac *F* 49 aliis *om. F*  
50 nimis est *F* 56 homo *V* 59 etiam *om. V* 60 formaliter] formale *F*  
61 alio] altero *F*

Ergo habemus propositum, quod secundum rem in nulla re est nisi una forma, 65  
et per consequens nisi unum esse.

Responsio. Dicendum quod pretermisso esse rationis, quod significat  
compositionem enuntiationis vel propositionis, quod consistit tantum in actu  
anime componentis vel dividendis, ad presens loquimur in proposita questione  
de esse reali, quod attribuitur illis rebus que continentur in decem predica- 70  
mentis.

Esse igitur sic acceptum respicit (fol. 43<sup>rb</sup>) duo, scilicet, illud quod est,  
et illud quo est. Illud autem quod est, proprie loquendo, est ypostasis vel sup-  
positum, quod per se subsistit, et per se habet esse. Illud autem quo est non  
subsistit in se, nec per se, sed in alio, in illo scilicet, quod per se subsistit, ita 75  
quod illi supposito subsistenti dat aliquod esse, sive sit forma accidentalis  
sive substantialis sive natura communis. Sortes enim albedine est albus, ita  
quod albedo in eo subsistit et dat ei esse album. Item Sortes humanitate est  
homo, ita quod humanitas subsistit in Sorte et dat ei esse humanum.

Ex quibus apparet quod solum suppositum sive ypostasis, que per se 80  
subsistit, habet esse proprie per se; quilibet autem forma sive natura com-  
munis non habet esse per se, sed tantum in alio, sic nec per se subsistit. In  
istis autem que subsistunt in alio, qui dant aliquod esse, est advertenda que-  
dam differentia. Sunt enim quedam forme que non pertinent ad esse substan-  
tiale sive ypostaticum ipsius ypostasis subsistentis, et ideo illud esse quod 85  
dant tales forme non est esse ypostasis simpliciter vel persone, sed tantum  
secundum quid, sicut esse album est quoddam esse Sortis non inquantum  
est Sortes, sed inquantum est albus, et illud esse in uno supposito potest mul-  
tiplicari. Aliud enim est esse quo Sortes est albus, et aliud quo Sortes est  
musicus. Et loquendo de tali esse accidentali non est inconueniens multiplex 90  
esse tale esse in Christo, sicut esse album vel esse crispum et sic de aliis.

Quedam autem forme vel nature sunt que pertinent ad esse substantiale  
vel ypostaticum ipsius ypostasis subsistentis; esse autem huius ypostasis sub-  
stantiale vel ypostaticum resultat ex omnibus illis ex quibus unitas suppositi  
integratur. Ita quod dicit actum ipsius suppositi vel ypostasis subsistentis et 95  
est simpliciter esse ipsius suppositi, et istud esse impossibile est in eodem  
supposito vel ypostasi multiplicari, quia si essent duo esse necessario essent  
duo supposita. Impossibile est enim intelligere et esse idem suppositum esse  
hominem et esse asinum vel lapidem simul. In Christo autem ponimus unam  
tantum rem subsistentem, sicut patet in Ephesina Synodo ex verbis Cyrilli 100

66 nisi<sup>2</sup> om. F 69 vel] et F 74 et... esse om. V 74-75 illud... subsistit om. V  
marg. illud quo est est essentia V 78 item] iterum F 79 Sorte] eo F 82 tan-  
tum om. F 84 enim] autem F 85 sive] vel F 86 non est] non dicitur F  
88 illud] istud F 90 esse] inveniri F 94 ex] de F 98 et esse om. F  
99 esse<sup>2</sup> om. F 100 tantum om. V

contra Nestorium, qui ponebat duas personas in Christo, ubi sic dicitur: Si quis non confitetur carnem secundum subsistentiam unicum ex Deo Patre Verbum unumque esse Christum cum sua carne, eundem videlicet, Deum simul et hominem, anathema sit ».

105 Unitas autem istius rei subsistentis consistit ex divina et humana natura, sicut patet in Symbolo Athanasii ubi dicitur: « Sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo, ita Deus et homo unus est Christus ».

Ubi premititur unus omnino etc. Et ita [cum] secundum Boethium in libro de Duabus Naturis contra Nestorium, unum et esse convertantur, oportet quod si in Christo est unitas suppositi, sit etiam unitas esse. Ita quod illa  
110 res subsistens est suppositum utriusque nature, scilicet, divine et humane secundum veritatem fidei catholice quam tenemus. Et ideo oportet necessario dicere quod sicut unum suppositum est in Christo, ita etiam est unum esse substantiale vel ypostaticum, ita quod illud esse habet unitatem ex ipso sup-  
115 posito quod subsistit, non ex ipsis naturis quarum est suppositum.

Unde si unio duarum naturarum non esset facta in una ypostasi subsistente, sicut posuit prima opinio, necessario oporteret ponere quod duo esse ypostatica essent in Christo; sed sicut autem pars alicuius totius non habet esse proprium dum est unita toti, quia esse totius est esse partium, et com-  
120 municatur ipsis partibus, sicut esse humanum communicatur manui et pedi et sic de aliis, ut sic dicantur esse aliquid ipsius hominis sive partes. Sed si separaretur pars a toto, pars habet suum proprium esse, aliud ab esse totius. Ita humanitas Christi quia est unita divino supposito non habet esse proprium, esse aliud ab esse illius suppositi eterni; et tamen natura humana in  
125 aliis hominibus, in quibus non est unita divino supposito habet suum proprium esse per se.

Item si contingeret quod aliqua pars adveniret alicui creato supposito quam prius non haberet, ut pes vel oculus vel manus, sicut partes corporibus aliquando non habentibus miraculose restituuntur ex tali parte adveniente ipsi  
130 toti non accresceret sibi aliud esse substantiale, sed tantum quedam relatio ad huius partem, quia non solum diceretur esse secundum (fol. 43<sup>va</sup>) partes quas prius habebat sed etiam secundum partem que sibi postea advenit; sicut homo cui visus esset restitutus dicitur modo videns, non tamen propter hoc diceretur alius homo in substantia vel in supposito. Sic ex hoc quod humana natura  
135 advenit supposito divino non advenit illi supposito aliquid novum esse, sed

104 simul *om. V* 105 consistit] integratur *F* 108-110 ubi... unitas esse *om. F* 112 et ideo] ita *V* 113 ita etiam] et ita *V* 115 non *om. F* 118 sed *om. F* 121 esse *om. F* 122 pars<sup>2</sup> *om. F* 124 esse<sup>2</sup> *om. F* 127 Item] Iterum *F* 127 alicui creato *om. F* 128 corporis *F* 130 quedam no<sup>v</sup> 133 videns *add. cum prius non diceretur F* 134 alius *add. aliquid F* 134 ex hoc *om. V*

solum nova habitudo illius esse preexistentis ad humanam naturam, ut scilicet, illud idem suppositum divinum quod ante assumptionem humane nature erat tantum suppositum divine nature, post assumptionem dicatur etiam suppositum humane nature. Ita dicatur subsistere non solum secundum divinam naturam, sed etiam secundum humanam, ex hoc quod illud esse preexistens suppositi eterni communicatur ipsi nature humane assumpte. 140

Et hanc veritatem ponunt isti doctores: Innocentius V, frater Thomas, dominus Annibaldus, dominus Bonaventura, frater Albertus. Iterum Boetius sic loquitur super hoc in libro de Duabus Naturis et una persona Christi contra Nestorium: « quod enim non est unum, inquit, nec esse omnino potest, esse enim atque unum convertuntur, et quodcumque est unum est etiam ». 145

Ad primum ergo dicendum quod quando duo sic se habent quod unum non se habet ad aliud per informationem, et utrumque subsistit per se, tunc oporteret quod quodlibet illorum haberet suum esse; sed si alterum illorum non subsistat in se nec per se, sed tantum in altero, sicut dictum est, non oportet quod habeat tunc proprium esse per se, sed quod communicetur sibi esse illius preexistentis in quo subsistit, sicut patet de parte restituta prout subsistit in toto. Humanitas autem in Christo non subsistit in se sed tantum in supposito eterno, et ideo non oportet quod habeat esse per se, sed communicetur sibi esse illius suppositi eterni. 150 155 165

Ad secundum dicendum quod licet humana natura non sit conversa in aliam, nec ex illis duabus naturis sit tertia constituta, non tamen humana natura subsistit per se, sed in illo supposito preexistenti, sicut dictum est.

Ad tertium dicendum quod in Deo solo essentia est ipsum esse subsistens, et ideo quia una est essentia Patris et Filii, oportet etiam ponere quod sit unum esse essenziale Patris et Filii. 160

Iterum essentia et persona sunt idem in re, et ideo esse essentie est esse persone; licet autem essentia et persona sint idem in re, tamen differunt ratione, et secundum istum modum esse divinum consideratur prout est esse essentie et prout est esse persone; et licet sit idem esse in re, tamen differunt ratione, prout dicitur esse essentie et esse persone, sicut essentia et persona, quia alia est persona Patris et alia persona Filii, licet sit unum esse Patris et Filii, prout dicitur esse essentie, non tamen est idem esse prout dicitur esse persone. Humana igitur natura unitur Filio in uno esse divino, non prout consideratur ut esse essentie, sed prout consideratur ut esse persone; iuxta 165 170

---

136 precedentis V 138 dicitur V 139 Ita add. quod F 142-146 Et hanc...  
 est etiam om. V 148 per informationem ad aliud F 149 oportet F habeat F  
 150 subsistit V 151 tunc proprium om. F 156-158 Hic deficit responsio 2<sup>a</sup>  
 argumenti marg. V 159 solum F 160 unum om. F essenziale om. V et  
 Filii om. V 162 esse om. V 165-169 et licet... persone om. V 169 unitur  
 Filio] unita est divine nature V uno om. F 170 consideratur ut] est V

quem modum Pater et Filius non conveniunt in uno esse, quia sic esset una persona Patris et Filii, quod esset hereticum. Unde cum alia sit persona Filii et alia sit persona Patris, ideo non oportet quod si humana natura est unita Filio in esse divino, quod propter hoc sit unita Patri in esse divino, et quod  
175 Pater sit incarnatus.

Ad quartum dicendum quod in aliis hominibus quando homo moritur, esse humane nature in ipso destruitur, non quod ipsum esse in se destruat, sed quia desinit esse humane nature, de cuius ratione est quod sit composita ex anima et corpore, que compositio in morte destruitur, non quod  
180 anima corrumpatur vel amittat esse, sed quia corpus corrumpitur et admittit illi esse prout erat esse illius nature. Unde cum unum esse sit anime et corporis, et anima non amittat suum esse, sed tantum corpus, et per consequens compositum, oportet quod ipsum esse non destruat in se; sed iam  
185 illud esse non est esse humane nature, que non subsistit in isto mortuo homine, sed est esse rationalis anime que subsistit post mortem, et ideo illud idem esse numero communicatur corpori post resurrectionem resumpto, et per hoc restituetur idem esse humane nature, quod in morte fuerat destructum, predicto modo, et sic resurget idem homo numero. Sic dico in proposito, quod in morte Christi esse humane nature fuit destructum, non quod  
190 ipsum in se destrueretur, sed quia humana natura per separationem anime a corpore ammisit illud esse, ut iam mortuo Christo non diceretur homo, cuius quidem hominis ratio consistit in compositione corporis et anime, que compositio fuit dissoluta in morte. Suppositum tamen non ammisit esse illud quod fuerat esse humane nature ante mortem; unde idem esse communicatum est humane nature post resurrectionem. Unde sicut per coniunctionem  
195

---

170-172 iuxta... hereticum *om. V* 173 ideo *om. V* 174 in esse divino *om. F* propter hoc *om. V* 174-175 et quod... incarnatus *om. F* 176 ad tertium *V* 178 desinit esse] non est *F* est scilicet *V* 181 prout... nature *om. F* 183-184 iam illud] in aliud *F* 184-185 est *om. F* 185 anime rationalis *F* 185-186 illud id *F* 188 et sic... numero *om. F* in proposito] per omnia *F* 191 mortuus Christus *F* 191-193 cuius... in morte *om. F* 194 fuerat] erat *F* ante mortem *om. F* 195-205 Unde... quarti. *om. F* 195 resurrectionem. *add.* Explicit. possumus etiam investigare quadruplici via quod in Christo non fuerit nisi unum esse, et quod humana natura non dedit supposito aliud esse.

Prima via talis est: Nulla natura que recipitur in unitate persone et pertinet ad unitatem personalem potest dare supposito aliud esse, nisi det ei aliud esse personale. Sed humana natura in Christo assumpta est ab eo in unitate persone, ergo non potest ei dare aliud esse, nisi det ei aliud esse personale; sed hoc est impossibile, cum Christus non est alia et alia persona; humana ergo natura in Christo non dedit ei aliud esse, et per consequens in eo non sunt multa esse.

Secunda via talis est: Nulla natura humana et nulla natura creata est aliquid per se subsistens, sed omnis talis natura intantum est inquantum in supposito habet esse, ergo quelibet talis natura sicut comparatur ad suppositum, sic comparatur ad esse.

corporis et anime constituebatur natura humana in Christo, et per consequen-  
omnia que (fol. 43<sup>vb</sup>) sunt de ratione humane nature, sicut esse vivum et huius  
modi, non tamen constituebatur suppositum, ita in morte per separationem  
corporis et anime fuit destructum in Christo illud esse quod erat de ratione 200  
humane nature, ut non posset dici homo vel vivus vel aliquid huiusmodi in  
illo triduo mortis; non tamen suppositum Christi fuit destructum, et ita nec  
esse suppositi ipsius Christi, quod est esse suppositi eterni, sed tantum in illo  
triduo mortis desiit esse humane nature.

(Rubr.) Explicit questio de uno esse tantum in Christo, quam disputavit  
quidam frater predicator Perusii tempore domini Martini pape quarti. 205

---

Sed humana natura in Christo non fecit aliud suppositum, ergo non dedit ei aliud  
esse, et per consequens in Christo non sunt multa esse.

Tertia via talis est: Secundum fidem catholicam in Christo est una persona et  
due nature, cum vero natura sit quo est, persona vero sit quod est, in Christo sunt  
plura quo est, sed unum quod est, et unum subsistens; et quia esse est ipsius quod  
est sive ipsius subsistentis, sicut in Christo est unum quod est, et unum subsistens  
ita in eo est unum esse.

Quarta via talis est: Actus est qui distinguit; omnis ergo distinctio et omnis plu-  
ralitas sumitur ex actu, et quia omnis actualitas sumitur ex esse, quidquid habet duo  
esse oportet quod sit duo, quod in Christo negamus dicente Symbolo: non duo ta-  
men, sed unus est Christus. *F.* 205 quarti] tercii *V.*