

REVIEWS

DECLARATIONES MAGISTRI GUILIELMI DE LA MARE, O.F.M. DE VARIIS SENTENTIIS S. THOMAE AQUINATIS. Primum edidit Franciscus Pelster, S.J. Opuscula et Textus, fasc. xxi. (Aschendorff; DM. 1.40.)

This fascicule is a welcome addition to the scholastic series of *Opuscula et Textus historiam Ecclesiae eiusque vitam atque doctrinam illustrantia*, of which Franz Pelster, S.J., whose death is a serious loss to medieval and scholastic studies, was one of the Editors. It contains the edition of an anonymous criticism of sixty theses drawn up from various works of St Thomas Aquinas: thirty-two from the *Prima Pars* of the *Summa Theologiae*, five from the *Prima Secundae*, six from the *Secunda Secundae*, and seventeen from the *Quaestiones Disputatae*. In the censor's opinion this Thomist teaching was theologically unsound, because it was in opposition to Holy Scripture and to the Fathers of the Church, and was included, or at least implied, in the list of condemned errors.

Dr Pelster called attention to this document, extant in Assisi, Biblioteca Comunale, MS. 174, fol. 55^r—58^v (the only known copy), well over twenty-five years ago, and attributed it to the English Franciscan William de la Mare, the famous author of the *Correctorium Fratris Thomae*. Convinced that the Assisi criticism was written before the *Correctorium*, he styled it *Ur-Correctorium*. Moreover, identifying it with the *Declarationes fratris Wilhelmi de Mara*, mentioned in the decree of the Franciscan General Chapter of Strasbourg in 1282, he termed it *Declarationes*. Hence he unhesitatingly entitled his edition: *Declarationes Magistri Guilelmi de la Mare, O.F.M.*, assuming, it would seem, as an incontrovertible fact what in reality is still an open question. In fact, one may pertinently ask whether the three points under consideration, namely, William's authorship of the Assisi *Articuli*, their identity with the *Declarationes* of the Strasbourg Chapter, and their priority to the *Correctorium Fratris Thomae*, are solidly grounded. In the brief Introduction to the present work, Fr Pelster maintains his former view, without adducing any fresh evidence, with a simple phrase: 'iam alibi probatum est', referring to his previous papers in *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* (1931, p. 397), and *Gregorianum* (1947, pp. 220-226). None the less, the arguments brought forward in support of his contention rest on mere probabilities rather than on ascertained facts.

To begin with, the MS. does not mention the word *Declarationes* or the author's name: the *Articuli* are anonymous. The bare fact that they are included in the same manuscript and follow immediately after the *Correctorium*, duly ascribed to William de la Mare, and after

some of his *Quaestiones*, is not in itself a convincing proof of William's authorship. Furthermore, comparing art. 15 of the Assisi criticism with the corresponding item of the *Correctorium*, Pelster inferred that the former is earlier than the latter. A wider comparison, however, now that the full text is available, and a closer collation of both documents have undoubtedly shown that the Assisi *Articuli* are neither a draft nor prior to, but, on the contrary, excerpts from the *Correctorium*. The anonymous compiler, very likely a Franciscan, selected those tenets which were most generally debated in the schools. Similar compilations were in common usage in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. At the height of the controversies between the two currents of thought, defenders and opponents from either side needed especially, not long and diffuse confutations and corrections, but hand-lists of the main theses of the *magni magistri* with all the necessary qualifications, in order to have them ready at hand in their lectures and disputations. A master or a bachelor, particularly in disputations, had to be always on the alert to select the right argument, to supply the right answer, to give the correct reference by chapter and verse, or to present his opponent's view precisely and to the point. And this is exactly what the *Articuli* purported to be.

That the *Correctorium* is the source and the *Articuli* the derivative, and not the other way round, is shown without any shadow of doubt from the improvements and additions which we meet in the *Articuli*. In the *Correctorium* William generally indicates in a rather vague manner those Thomist theses which in his view fall within the syllabus of condemned errors. The compiler of the *Articuli*, on the other hand, determines painstakingly the exact reference in each case. One instance will suffice to demonstrate how he improved upon his source.

Correctorium, n^o 26 (Glorieux's edition, p. 111): 'Haec positio videtur favere errori alias condemnato Parisius a Domino Stefano, Parisiensi episcopo'. Now the *Articuli* specify thus (Pelster's edit., art. 21, p. 18): 'Hoc videtur erroneum, tum quia videtur dampnatum VIII capitulo errorum XII, "Quod anima separata non est alterabilis secundum philosophiam, licet sit secundum fidem", et VIII capitulo errorum V, "Quod anima separata non patitur ab igne corporeo", tum quia eadem ratione. . . .

Further, whereas in the *Correctorium* there is no express mention of the Oxford prohibition, in the Assisi criticism this is quoted four times, aa. 25 (twice), 33 and 52 (Pelster, pp. 20, 23, 28).

Still, the decisive argument showing unmistakably the priority of the *Correctorium* to the *Articuli* is provided by the addition of the items 46, 47 and 48 (Pelster, pp. 26-27). The compiler did not produce these three *articuli* himself, but found them ready-made in the second

redaction of the *Correctorium*, discovered by Père Creytens in MS. Vat. lat. 4413. (Père L. Bataillon of Le Saulchoir has very kindly checked them for me in the Vatican manuscript.) Père Creytens has convincingly shown (*Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 1942, pp. 322-5) that William de la Mare in the second edition enlarged the documentation, added new arguments and *articuli*, and meticulously revised the whole, without eliminating anything from his previous work. The conclusion is, therefore, forced upon us that the Assisi list, far from being prior to the *Correctorium* and the earliest document in the conflict between the old school and Thomism (Pelster, p. 4), or a theological censure of St Thomas's opinions harsher than the *Correctorium* itself (p. 8), is indeed a later list of sixty propositions or *articuli* extracted not even from the first edition, but from the second of the *Correctorium*. Medievalists will be grateful to Dr Pelster, who, by publishing the full text of the Assisi manuscript, has furnished them with the decisive proof for setting aside once and for all the ghost of the *Ur-Correctorium*, which for so long has haunted not a few of them.

DANIEL A. CALLUS, O.P.

POLITICAL THOUGHT IN MEDIEVAL TIMES. By JOHN B. MORRALL.
(Hutchinson; 18s.)

Not until the thirteenth century, when Aristotle's *Ethics* and *Politics* began to circulate, did political science emerge as a special discipline. Before then, when men reflected and wrote homilies on their social organization, it was to a spiritual fellowship they appealed, not to a sense of political obligation. After the first Dark Ages a Christian commonwealth was slowly formed, but its centralization under the high protection of Charlemagne broke down during the barbarian invasions of the second Dark Ages. The consecration of power and the mystique of the Lord's Anointed survived, and the Holy Reich has been a haunting ideal ever since; nevertheless when Europe recovered, it was the *Sacerdotium* which claimed and for a period successfully maintained supremacy. But for it, the feudal pyramid would have lacked a side, and even an apex, for the mounting relations of service in exchange for protection were contained by religious oath. Later, when this structure was loosened by the economic revolution of the eleventh and twelfth centuries which produced a surplus of produce and labour, the Church's social authority still held the initiative in the growing centres of trade and the colonial expansion covered by the Crusades. The new type of *Regnum*, unlike the *Imperium*, was able to profit by the new forces then released, and eventually to harry the spiritual power into relinquishing its pretensions to direct and universal dominion.

Mr Morrall's outline of the period from the breakdown of the old Roman Empire to the Reformation falls into two parts on either side