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I. Introduction

In 1278 or 1279, some years after the death of Thomas Aquinas, the Franciscan theologian William de la Mare composed a work that was to elicit a vehement reaction from Dominican theology. And not without reason, as Mare sharply opposed the views of Thomas, itemizing no less than 118 points of criticism.¹ The work was soon referred to as the Correctorium Fratris Thomae, under which name it has survived to our days.²

Mare’s book met with considerable success, becoming the official response to the views of Thomas.³ This may be gathered from such documents as the order issued by the Franciscan general chapter of Strasbourg, admonishing its provincials not to copy Thomas’s Summa unless a copy of Mare’s corrections be included.⁴

Again, Dominicans were not indifferent to the attack on Aquinas. A growing number of Dominicans were beginning to look upon Thomas as the Teacher of their order. This may be clear from the notice issued in 1279 by the Dominican general chapter at Paris, sanctioning punishment of friars that spoke irreverently and indecently of Thomas, whose work (as was said) was such a credit to the order.⁵ Furthermore, in 1286 it was decided by the same chapter that every Dominican should, to the best of his knowledge and ability speak up for the views of Thomas, as being at least a defendable position.⁶ From these two facts we may learn that to many Dominican theologians William de la Mare was not merely criticizing Thomas Aquinas, but indeed Dominican theology as such. It is hardly surprising, then, that in the years after the Correctorium’s publication no less than five Dominican responses were written, defending those views of Thomas that were attacked by William, and refuting, where necessary, William’s own views.

The Dominican defenses have come to be known as the Correctoria Corruptorii. The “Corruptorium” in this generic title refers to the work of William of Mare, which—as the author of one of the replies put it—should more properly be called “Corruptorium Fratris Thomae” instead of “Correctorium”.⁷
As a rule, the Dominican Correctoria have been handed down anonymously. Still, the question of their authorship has now largely been cleared up. Thus it is known that it was Richard of Knapwell who wrote what is probably the earliest Correctorium, the *Correctorium Quare* (like the other Correctoria called after its opening word or words). 8 Robert of Orford is held to be the author of the *Correctorium Sciendum*. 9 The *Correctorium Circa* was written by John Quidort. 10 William of Macklesfield may have been the author of the *Correctorium Quaestione*, but this is as yet a matter of dispute. 11 Finally, there is the *Apologeticum Veritatis Contra Corruptorii*, written by Robert of Bologna. 12 Generally speaking, the Correctoria Corruptorii originated between 1279 and ca. 1286.

These five works, together with William de la Mare's *Correctorium Fratris Thomae*, are of great importance to the history of the reception, more specifically the literary reception, of Thomas Aquinas' views. We would like to give four general considerations in support of this thesis. In the first place, being polemical writings, they neatly review those views of Thomas that were a subject of controversy at the end of the thirteenth century. Thus, it is possible to ascertain which of Thomas's views were seen as "new" and "uncommon" in those days. Secondly, as the Correctoria make frequent use of the work of Thomas, we may ascertain through them which of Thomas's writings were used and quoted in those days. Mare's Correctorium tells us something about which works of Thomas were studied by non-Dominicans, and about which writings were taken to be representative of his views outside his own order. Similarly, from the Dominican replies we may learn which writings were held to be of importance within the Dominican order itself, and which writings were preferentially quoted and referred to by Dominicans. In the third place, as the Correctoria make frequent use of Thomas's work, it is possible for us to ascertain through them exactly what was quoted from his writings, and exactly how this was set about. As a final consideration in support of the importance of the Correctoria, we point again to the fact that we are dealing with polemical writings. We may be sure that the authors studied Thomas as carefully and as exhaustingly as they could. A methodological advantage may be gained from this: not only the reference to particular works of Thomas will be telling, but also the absence of such reference. Thus for example as we shall see, nowhere in his Correctorium does Mare make reference to the third part of the Summa Theologicae and the opusculum *De aeternitate Mundi*. In almost every other kind of writing, be it a Quaestio Disputata or a Commentary on the Sentences, such curious omissions might be put down to coincidence or negligence. In the kind of work under consideration, however, this explanation is hardly convincing.

These remarks should suffice to introduce our study. It is now time to look in some detail at the use the *Correctorium* and the *Corruptorium* make of Thomas's works. We may first consider (1) what Thomas's works are quoted; and (2) what Thomas says about the eternity of the world, a question which of Thomas's works his critics quote; and (3) what Mare comments on these works. These sections will serve as background to the same questions will be posed in the next section (section III), we turn to the Correctoria Corruptorii are quoted with which Thomas’s works are quoted within them.

II. William de la Mare

Before going through the aforementioned polemical works, we pause briefly at the general introduction, which consists of 118 articles, each one written by William de la Mare about Thomas's works. The articles are ordered not chronologically but systematically run through one after the other.

Each article opens with a statement of what Thomas under consideration says about a particular subject. Then it expresses the opinion. For example, the sixth article (of the Summa Theologicae) says that it is an article of faith only of faith, that the works are given in support. Sometimes, in the same article, the author, along with Thomas's opinion of Thomas, Marc point out why they think it is incorrect to make these comments.

1. Which works?

Which of Thomas's works are quoted? Notably, De Anima, De Virtutibus, and De Mortuorum Animarum in the Commentary on the Sentences, which have a theological nature. William de la Mare makes reference to Thomas's works, e.g., with his commentaries on them, but he also says that these works are a hint at these works. The correctorium designation as a theologian – which is not to say that Thomas himself point out that Thomas’s reasoning.

A second point of interest is that...
in some detail at the use that was made of Thomas's texts in Mare's Correctorium and the Correctoria Corruptorii. First we shall look into Mare's Correctorium in general (section II, 1–3), ascertaining (1) against which of Thomas's works his criticism is directed; (2) in what way Thomas is quoted; and (3) what Mare's characterization is of Thomas's tenets. These sections will serve as background to the next section (II,4) in which the same questions will be posed specifically with regard to Thomas's view of the eternity of the world, as rendered in Mare's Correctorium. Finally (section III), we turn to the Correctoria Corruptorii, ascertaining which of Thomas's works are quoted with respect to this problem, and again, how they are quoted.

II. William de la Mare's Correctorium

Before going through the aforementioned questions, we would do well to pause briefly at the general construction of Mare's Correctorium. It consists of 118 articles, each dealing with a certain thesis taken from the work of Thomas.

The articles are ordered neither randomly nor thematically; rather, they systematically run through one writing after the other.

Each article opens with a reference to a certain place in the work of Thomas under consideration, and proceeds to quote the contentious opinion. For example, the sixth article begins as follows: "In the 46th quaestio (of the Summa Theologiae), in the body of the second article, Thomas says that it is an article of Faith, a subject not of knowledge but only of faith, that the world has a beginning..." Next, Thomas's arguments are given. Sometimes other contentious theses are added in the same article, along with Thomas's arguments. Having thus presented the opinion of Thomas, Mare points out what he thinks to be wrong with it, and finally shows why it is wrong.

1. Which Works are Criticized?

Which of Thomas's works are affected by Mare's criticism? They are seven, notably, the Summa Theologiae, the disputed questions De Veritate, De Anima, De Virtutibus, and De Potentia, the questions De Quoilibet, and the Commentary on the Sentences. All these tracts, as can be noticed, are of a theological nature. William does not deal with Thomas's philosophical works, e.g., with his commentaries on Aristotle. There is not so much as a hint at these works. The criticism, then, mainly concerns Thomas as a theologian – which is not to say that Mare does not on several occasions point out that Thomas's reasonings are philosophically speaking incorrect.

A second point of interest is the striking absence of theses taken from the...
third part of the Summa Theologiae. William discusses and criticizes theses from the first part, from the first and second parts of the second part, but not from the third part, of which there is not even the faintest trace. Was the work unknown to Mare, then? For surely, had he known it, he might reasonably be expected to have quoted, discussed, or criticized theses from the third part, as well as from the other parts. The Summa's third part deals with, among other things, the relationship between the living and the dead body of Christ, an issue on which Thomas holds to the unity of substantial form, and is criticized by Mare for being unable to maintain that the body of the living and the dead Christ is one and the same, as is stated by Faith.

Thomas holds to the doctrine of the unity of substantial form, and is severely attacked for this by Mare. The doctrine is denounced by the Masters, so the latter says, because its consequences are contrary to Catholic Faith, contrary to philosophy, and contrary to the Holy Scripture. We find this in Mare's discussion of the 76th question of the first part of the Summa. But there is more. The same rejection of Thomas's error recurs in the discussions of the 118th question of the same part of the Summa, of the 9th question of De Anima, of the 22nd question of De Potentia, and of the 6th question of the Quodlibet.

In view of all this, it would hardly be reasonable to suggest that Mare, who seized upon every opportunity, on this as well as on other issues, to point out that Thomas is mistaken, would not have discussed the third part of the Summa, had it been available to him. Now, it is certain that the Correctorium was written after 1277, probably in England, because Mare makes reference to the Paris condemnations of 1277, observing the order of condemned theses that was common in England. These facts seem to suggest that (as Pelster has already hinted) at that time (1278 or 1279) the third part of the Summa had not yet been officially published, or that it had not yet arrived at the place where Mare was writing his Correctorium (England), Knapwell, for that matter, author of the (first) Correctorium Corruptorii, written perhaps shortly after 1280, does make use of the Summa's third part, as do the other Correctoria.

We may notice further that Mare's criticism of the Commentary on the Sentences is limited to theses taken from the first book; on the other three books there is nothing. Now, the Correctorium, as it has come down to us in the version of the Correctorium “Quare”, concludes with nine theses from the first book of Thomas’s Commentary on the Sentences. It is not unthinkable, then, that Mare in point of fact did criticize the remaining three books, but that this part of the Correctorium has been lost. Probable, however, this suggestion is not correct. Even the oldest manuscript of “Quare” reacts only on the nine theses extracted from the first book. This is not to say, however, that the theses on the Sentences were unknown to Mare. Veritate on the issue of what he says quite explicitly, and quotes Commentary. It is rather clear that Mare dealt with in its own right. In part of the Summa Theologiae, alarmingly close to the eighth chapter, he says that the soul, separated from the body, goes to Hell. Why doesn't Mare refer to the soul, not single out for attention? Sentences! Furthermore, how does he single out for attention the Summa ad Marcionem, with regard to the Summa ad Marcionem.

As for the third book, it may be that Thomas's Christology does make use of both the Summa ad Marcionem Commentary on the Sentences, reference to or make use of the Summa ad Marcionem. It is perhaps of interest to note that Thomas's choice of words in the Summa ad Marcionem for example, he clearly prefers the Commentary on the Sentences, to the other Dominicans. That Thomas's views in the Summa ad Marcionem, is stated in the Summa ad Marcionem, “Quare, in Summa quam in Scripturis.”

Two last points should be made in this discussion. First, de la Mare submit to criticism on the basis of the fact that in these views to disagree with. Mare makes the point in particular, but refers to it. Mare is prompted by Thomas’s reasoning. But if this is so, Mare is not correct. Even the oldest manuscript of “Quare” reacts only on the nine theses extracted from the first book.
discusses and criticizes theses and parts of the second part, but not even the faintest trace. Was surely, had he known it, he might have paused, or criticized theses from parts. The Summa’s third part 44 shows the unity of the living and the first part, yet Thomas holds to the unity of Christ one is and the same, as is clearly of substantial form, and is doctrine is denounced by the consequences are contrary to reason and contrary to the Holy of the 76th question of the same rejection of Thomas’s question of the same part of the Summa, of the 22nd question of De Quodlibet. 18

Reasonable to suggest that Mare, as well as on other issues, did not have discussed the third person. Now, it is certain that the largely in England, because Mare of 1277, observing the order of England. 20 These facts seem to that at time (1278 or 1279) the official published, 21 or that it was writing his Correctorium of the (first) Correctorium after 1280, does make use of the Correctorium 22,23 Correctorium of the Commentary on the first book; on the other three books, as it has come down to us in concludes with nine theses from on the Sentences. It is not fact did criticize the remaining Correctorium has been lost. Probable, even the oldest manuscript of that is removed from the first book. 24 This is not to say, however, that the last three books of Thomas’s Commentary on the Sentences were unknown to Mare. Criticizing a thesis taken from De Veritate on the issue of what befalls the soul in Hell, Mare makes reference — quite explicitly, and quoting literally — to the fourth book of the Commentary. 25 It is rather curious, though, that this place has not been dealt with in its own right. In his criticism of the 64th question of the first part of the Summa Theologiae, Mare shows Thomas’s view to be alarmingly close to the eighth thesis condemned by Tempier in 1270, viz., that the soul, separated from the body after death, is not affected by the fire of Hell. 26 Why doesn’t Mare repeat his criticism, we may ask, and why does he not single out for attention Thomas’s remark in the Commentary on the Sentences? Furthermore, how is it that Mare does not mention theses taken from the second and the third book? As for the second book, he might readily have criticized Thomas’s view on the eternity of the world, as he did with regard to the Summa and the questions De Quodlibet. 27

As for the third book, it may have given him yet another opportunity to criticize Thomas’s Christology. 28 The Correctorium “Quare”, to be sure, does make use of both the second and the fourth book of Thomas’s Commentary on the Sentences. 29 Also the other Correctorium either make reference to or make use of these books. 30

It is perhaps of interest to note here, that Knapwell, the author of the Correctorium “Quare”, does not always seem to be entirely happy with Thomas’s choice of words in the Commentary. As for the doctrine of angels, for example, he clearly prefers Thomas’s wording in the Summa to that of the Commentary on the Sentences. 31 Incidentally, it may be pointed out that several other Dominican theologians also preferred the statement of Thomas’s views in the Summa to those in his Commentary on the Sentences. A point in case is the author of the Articuli in quibus frater Thomas melius in Summa quam in Scriptis, a work from around 1280. 32

Two last points should be made. In the first place, nowhere does William de la Mare submit to criticism theses from the Summa contra Gentiles, in spite of the fact that in this important work he would surely have found views to disagree with. Mare mentions it only once, not having in mind any place in particular, but referring rather to the overall design of the work. Mare is prompted by Thomas’s opinion that one should not seek proof of what is solely a matter of Faith, in this case: that the world has been created in time.

According to Thomas, this would only expose us to the ridicule of the unbelievers, who might think that our Faith were grounded in deficient reasoning. 33 But if this is so, replies Mare, then why did Thomas bother to write the Summa contra Gentiles? Again, the Summa contra Gentiles is used by Knapwell, who mentions each of its four books. The other
Correctoria Corruptorii, too, either mention or make use of each of the four books.  

In the second place, in his criticism of the Quaestiones Disputatae Mare used a differently ordered collection than the one known to us today, and than the one used by Knapwell in his response. For example Mare speaks of question 220, where Knapwell, having the same article in mind, refers to it as Quaestio De Veritate 25 (=26) art.1.  

Apparently, Mare had a manuscript that numbered Thomas’s articles consecutively. In his version, the articles are called “questions”. Knapwell, on the other hand, used a text in which different articles of Thomas are grouped together, these groups being called “questiones”. In each of these groups the consecutive numbering of the articles starts anew, as is also customary in modern editions.  

2. How Does Mare Quote Thomas?  

We have seen just now which of Thomas’s works are quoted by Mare; now we shall turn to how and what is quoted from them. We shall start with the latter. From a quick survey we learn that the various articles of Mare’s Correctorium quote either (1) from an article’s body; or (2) from the responses to the arguments to the contrary; or (3) from both.  

Incidentally, however, (and this is interesting) Mare also gives (4) arguments from the “sed contra”, presenting them as arguments of Thomas himself.  

How does Mare set about his quotations? As a rule, (1) he proceeds verbatim. Again, sometimes (2) he gives only a summary of Thomas’s arguments. Sometimes, also, (3) he omits crucial qualifications, and sometimes the reader may even get the impression that (4) Thomas’s views are misrepresented. It is beyond the scope of the present paper, however, to verify the exact extent to which this impression is correct, which would take a meticulous and comprehensive study, for Mare will most certainly have read some parts of Thomas in the light of other parts, as is the right and plight of every reader, Mare’s as well as ours. Now, notwithstanding the fact that Mare wrote a Correctorium, and even though he may really have been trying intentionally to misrepresent Thomas, we must still assume that he was sincerely seeking to peruse the content and significance of Thomas’s teachings, even if some of his conclusions would strike us as somewhat curious (to say the least). Thus, from the thesis that individual and species coincide, in incorruptible beings, Mare concludes that Thomas advocated Averroes’s theory of intellect. The author of the Correctorium “Quare”, however, does indeed seem to be under the impression that Mare misrepresents Thomas’s view.  

He has not been able to find the alleged passage.  

I could not find any supporting evidence for this.  

Similarly, with regard to a certain passage from Anima, where Thomas dealt with the question of whether, or not, the celestial beings are ensouled.  

Mare is mistaken in making it a question of whether celestial bodies are ensouled.  

He expressly says that they are; nowhere does he say that they are not.  

But, of course, this is what his position begins.  

3. Mare’s General Considerations  

Mare’s writing is polemical; it is intended to make Thomas’s writings seem more susceptible to criticism in many cases.  

Mare characterizes Thomas’s opinions as being “false”, for example, and even admits some aspect of an opinion that is in conflict with the view that angels are from the theses dubbed “false”, or as “giving rise to errors”.  

For Mare, errors are those opinions or positions specifically opposed to Faith, or the opinions of the Saints.  

Those that are merely false, but also in agreement with Scripture, to the Gospel, to Scripture, to the Gospel, to Scripture, to the Gospel, to Scripture, to the Gospel, to Scripture, to the Gospel, to Scripture, to the Gospel, to Scripture, to the Gospel, to Scripture.  

Furthermore, his work is said to be “sed contra” to the work of the Fathers in support of his position.  

Again, sometimes Thomas seems to contradict himself, sometimes he contradicts himself, and sometimes his reasoning does not.  

Sometimes his position is at odds with the teachings of Aristotle, or with those of the past.  

It is not clear whether there could be another topic, or if this is a subject on which the
3. Mare’s General Characterization of Thomas’s Position

Mare’s writing is polemical; its intention is to show that Thomas’s views are susceptible to criticism in many points. Of course, this also affects the way Mare characterizes Thomas’s position. Most often he speaks of his opinions being “false”, for example with regard to the view that beatitude is essentially an act of intellect, not of will. It is only very rarely that he admits some aspect of an opinion expressed by Thomas to be correct, as with the view that angels are by their nature incorruptible. But apart from the theses dubbed “false”, many are described as being “erroneous”, or “giving rise to errors”. What is meant by “errors”? According to Mare, errors are theses or positions that are not just false, but that are more specifically opposed to Faith, to Holy scripture, or to Tradition (i.e., to the opinions of the Saints). Thomas’s work is said to contain not only views that are merely false, but also views that are contrary to Faith, such as the thesis that the angelic or human soul is not composed of matter and form. Furthermore, his work is said to contain theses that are contrary to Holy Scripture, to the Gospel, to Saint Paul, and to Augustine. Sometimes even, Mare says, Thomas allegedly cites a sentence of Augustine, but the quotation cannot be found there, or he falsely cites the authority of one of the Fathers in support of his own position.

Again, sometimes Thomas runs counter to common opinion, sometimes he contradicts himself, sometimes he starts from incorrect assumptions, sometimes his reasonings do not hold, or his conclusions do not follow. Sometimes his position is at variance with experience, with the views of Aristotle, or with those of the philosophers. Again, sometimes Aristotle is quoted on issues he should not have been quoted on, as on the question of whether there could be another Earth apart from ours. According to Mare, this is not a subject on which to appeal to Aristotle, who held the matter to
be impossible.\textsuperscript{55} The appeal to Aristotle, therefore, is tantamount to denying God’s omnipotence, hence to denying an article of Faith. Finally, Mare points out time and again that a number of Thomas’s views (e.g., those concerning angels) come under theses condemned in 1241, in 1270, or in 1277.\textsuperscript{56} In fine, Thomas’s views are not only called suspect from a theological point of view, but also suspect from a philosophical perspective.

In the next section, a closer look at Mare’s criticism of Thomas’s view on the provability of the eternity of the world will illustrate both kinds of criticism, thereby giving some insight into the general attitude towards Thomas in the Franciscan camp.

4. Thomas’s View on the Provability of the Eternity of the World, as Rendered in the Correctorium Fratris Thomae

4.1. Which works are cited by Mare?

Thomas’s position on this issue is discussed twice by Mare, first in articles 6 and 7, discussing theses from the Summa Theologiae (here the 46th question, art.2, of the first part is quoted), next in article 109, discussing theses from the questions De Quodlibet (quoting the 3rd Quodlibet, q14 art.2).\textsuperscript{57} Thomas’s position in these two works can briefly be sketched as follows. Reason cannot demonstrate the necessity of a beginning of the world, any more than it can demonstrate the articles of Faith (e.g., that God is one and three), because Creation depends only on God’s free will. God’s free will, however, can be manifested through revelation. Therefore, the fact that the world had a beginning is credible, but not demonstrable. Furthermore, Creation is not successive change from not-being to being. Hence, the idea of Creation does not logically imply a beginning in time or a maker who antecedes the thing made. Special attention should be given to one of the objections in the Summa Theologiae, trying to prove that the world has a beginning in time.\textsuperscript{58} The argument runs as follows. If the world (and consequently the huma race) did not have a beginning in time, there would be an infinite number of immortal souls actually existing. However, there cannot be an actually infinite number of things. Therefore we know, not only by revelation, but also by reason that the world had a beginning in time. To this objection, Thomas responds by listing the solutions that have been given by those who hold the world to be eternal. Next, he remarks that the objection could be answered by claiming that the world is eternal, at least with respect to some creatures, such as angels, though not man. It is clear from Thomas’s Commentary on the Sentences and his small tract De Aeternitate Mundi\textsuperscript{59} that Thomas considers this objection difficult to cope with. As we see, it was used by Mare against Thom.

4.2. Which of Thomas’s views are almost verbatim. Thomas summarized in a single sentence where Thomas (1) has quoted Faith cannot be proved. Curiously are introduced by Mare with primo...’\textsuperscript{60} Next, almost the same argument is indicated (2) why the world (3) that the non-eternity of the world (4) Again, form the body of the article be sought for matters that are infidels occasion for ridicule. In the Correctorium, Mare quotes discussion (5) of the view that the world had a beginning from time.

As far as this last quotation, it occurring in the various known briefly summarizes the matter of arguments, Thomas seems to say. \textsuperscript{61} This sheds significantly on Thomas’s thought of. A similar argument, where Thomas wrote that was necessary (\ldots) that God in the manuscripts either omit the “(Thomas) holds that” in its printed meaning of Thomas’s words. To explicate the opinion of certain, we might turn to Augustine. The Correctorium states that Thomas was giving his own view.

Finally, in his seventh article, Thomas’s exposition of (6) holds that the world implies the existence of current.

In the 109th article, a large Quodlibet is quoted verbatim. (7) that the non-eternity of the world is dependent only on God’s will.
therefore, is tantamount to writing an article of Faith. Finally, a number of Thomas's views (e.g., Ficino's) have been condemned in 1241, in 1270, and not only called suspect from a philosophical perspective but from a philosophical and theological one as well. This criticism of Thomas's view on the eternity of the world will illustrate both kinds of attacks on Thomas's view on the general attitude towards the Eternity of the World, Fratriss Tomhie. 

The Eternity of the World, Fratriss Tomhie

Held by Mare?

It is held by Mare, first in articles 91 and 108 of the Summa Theologiae (here the 46th and 50th articles), then in article 109, discussing the 3rd Quodlibet, q14 116. The arguments can briefly be sketched as follows. Mare presents a necessity of a beginning of the world by making an appeal to the articles of Faith (e.g., that the world depends only on God's free will. The argument is then stated through revelation. Therefore, Mare's view is not only credible, but not demonstrable. The argument is not clear from his being to being. It only implies a beginning in time or space. Special attention should be given to Thomas's treatment of these two articles, trying to prove that the eternity of the world runs as follows. If the world has a beginning in time, there can be no omniscience. If the world has a beginning in space, there can be no omnipotence. Therefore we know, from the idea of a world beginning in space, that the world had a beginning in time and that the world must be eternal. Next, he argues that by claiming that the world has a beginning in time, the solution that the world is eternal is not possible, because angels, such as angels, though not dependent on the Sentences and his small Thomas considers this objection difficult to cope with. As we shall see in section 4.3., this very argument is used by Mare against Thomas.

4.2. Which of Thomas's views are called false and dangerous by Mare, and how are they presented?

In the sixth article of Mare's Correctorium, the quotations from Thomas are almost verbatim. Thomas's article from the Summa Theologiae is summarized in a single sentence. Next, Mare quotes from the "sed contra", where Thomas (1) has quoted some authorities, arguing that articles of Faith cannot be proved. Curiously, the argument from the "sed contra" are introduced by Mare with the words "quod probat (scl. Thomas) primo ... " Next, almost the entire body is quoted, where Thomas has indicated (2) why the world cannot be proved not to be eternal, and (3) that the non-eternity of the world is a matter only of Faith, not of proof. Again, form the body of the article Mare quotes (4) that proofs should not be sought for matters that are entirely of Faith, lest one should give the infidels occasion for ridicule and mockery. In the seventh article of his Correctorium, Mare quotes from the Summa Theologiae Thomas's discussion (5) of the view that a cause need not always precede its effect in time.

As for this last quotation, it is interesting to pause briefly at the variants occurring in the various known manuscripts of the Correctorium. One Ms briefly summarizes the matter as follows: "In his response to the first arguments, Thomas seems to be saying that Creation is co-eternal with God." This sheds significant light on the way Thomas's teaching was then thought of. A similar attitude may be found in other manuscripts. Where Thomas wrote that "(Some philosophers) hold it to be not necessary ...) that God should exist before the world does", the manuscripts either omit the "(Some philosophers) hold that", or put "(Thomas) holds that" in its place. As goes without saying, this upsets the meaning of Thomas's words. In point of fact, Thomas did no more than explicate the opinion of certain philosophers with regard to a quotation from Augustine. The Correctorium's wording, however, makes it look as if Thomas was giving his own opinion.

Finally, in his seventh article Mare gives from the Summa Theologiae Thomas's exposition of (6) how to vitiate the argument that the eternity of the world implies the existence of infinitely many souls.

In the 109th article, a large part of the body from the question from the Quodlibet is quoted verbatim. Mare cites the place where Thomas has said (7) that the non-eternity of the world cannot be proved (because it is dependent only on God's will), and (8) that no proof should be sought for
4.3. Mare’s characterization of Thomas’s views . . .

It would be beyond the scope of this paper to enter deeply into the substance of Mare’s criticism. However, to give the reader an impression of the truly vigorous opposition Thomas’s teaching met with, let us briefly gather here the various verdicts Mare passed on the theses mentioned above. There will be instances of almost every kind of judgement used in Mare’s work to characterize Thomas’s views.

Thus, the first thesis (1), that articles of Faith cannot be proved, is called false, contrary to Scripture, contrary to the Saints, and contrary to the doctors; it is also said to nourish doubt and infirmity of Faith. The second and the third thesis, (2) that the non-eternity of the world cannot be proved, and (3) that the non-eternity of the world is solely a matter of Faith, are also called false. For as a matter of fact, according to Mare, the world can be proved to be not eternal, not by a demonstration propter quid, but by a deductio ad impossibile. If the world were eternal, Mare says, then two impossible consequences would follow, viz., (a) that an infinite number of immortal souls would actually exist, which is impossible as there cannot simultaneously be infinitely many things, and (b) infinitely many days would have passed, which is impossible as what is infinite cannot be traversed. Since the consequences are impossible, the premise (that the world is eternal) must be false. To be sure, Thomas tried to vitiate these two problems. But Mare swears to God that Thomas did not give a viable solution, neither real nor apparent, neither philosophically nor theologically. Furthermore, Thomas is accused of inconsistency in trying to defend those who take the world to be eternal (vide (6) above). The problem of the infinite number of souls (a) he tries to solve by assuming that man could have been created at a later time. Here, Mare says, Thomas seeks to defend the view of Aristotle. At the same time, however, Mare adds, he contradicts the view of Aristotle, because Aristotle took all species, including the human species, to be eternal. The fourth thesis, (4) that no proof should be sought of matters of Faith, is called false, contrary to Scripture, and contrary to the Saints. Mare also points out that Thomas is contradicting himself; did he not himself undertake to defend Faith by means of reason against the infidels in his Summa contra Gentiles? Again, Thomas’s opinion is called unreasonable: Whenever a demonstrative proof is possible (and Mare thinks this is possible here), one should not rest at giving merely probable or so itself.

In the discussion of the question (7), that the world cannot have opportunity for the error of being eternal. And of maxim (8), 'the world of Faith, it is said that it is hard.

Finally, with regard to the always precede its effect in time that the world could have existed even in the suggestion could have existed from the end the those who hold it to be really.

From Mare’s judgements the doctrine of the unity of substance may well have been Thomas’s world that was most objection theologically.

III. The

As this paper cannot be more than an attempt at the literary reception of Thomas, the attempt will be made here to give quotations from Thomas in this issue. All we want to say here is that the quotations may be found in the thought of Thomas. Our procedure will be as follows: the starting-point will be the text of the passage responding to its criticism of one of Thomas’s theses (1)–(8) above may serve as a summary. For convenience sake, we shall designate (A)–(D). Thus we shall go through Thomas in the Correctoria with his arguments about matters of Faith can be proved that the world can be proved not to exist (cf. thesis (4) and (8) above).
giving merely probable or sophistic arguments, but rather give the proof itself. 68

In the discussion of the question from the De Quolibet, Thomas’s thesis (7), that the world cannot be proved to be eternal, is said to afford opportunity for the error of believing that the world is, or could have been, eternal. 69 And of maxim (8), that no proof should be sought for matters of Faith, it is said that it is harmful rather than conducive to Faith. 70

Finally, with regard to Thomas’s statement (5), that a cause need not always precede its effect in time, Mare reproaches Thomas for implying that the world could have existed from eternity. Quite strikingly, Mare sees danger even in the suggestion of a mere possibility: the idea that the world could have existed from eternity is just false, and very close to the error of those who hold it to be really eternal. 71

From Mare’s judgements we may conclude that in addition to the doctrine of the unity of substantial form, and to the doctrine of angels, it may well have been Thomas’s view on the provability of the eternity of the world that was most objectionable to Mare, philosophically, but especially theologically.

III. The Correctoria Corruptorii

As this paper cannot be more than a first step towards an investigation into the literary reception of Thomas’s view of the eternity of the world, no attempt will be made here to compile and order the mass of implicit quotations from Thomas in the Correctoria. Nor shall we try to ascertain how the various authors have interpreted and assimilated his opinions on this issue. 72 All we want to do here is to sketch some broad outlines. However, as may presently become clear, this will suffice to give us a fair enough impression of how the various authors have variously handled Thomas’s thought.

Our procedure will be as follows. As each of the Correctoria takes as its starting-point the text of the Correctorium of William de la Mare, responding to its criticism of one thesis after the other, the theses numbered (1)–(8) above may serve as a suitable key to our reading of the Correctoria. For convenience sake, we shall divide these theses into four groups, (A)–(D). Thus we shall go through the what and how of quotations from Thomas in the Correctoria with regard to the following issues: (A) whether matters of Faith can be proved (cf. thesis (1) above); 73 (B) whether the world can be proved not to exist from eternity (cf. (2), (3), (6) and (7) above); and (C) whether or not one should seek to prove matters of Faith (cf. thesis (4) and (8) above). Finally, (D) we shall consider at how the
authors dealt with Thomas’s saying that a cause need not always precede its effect in time (cf. (5) above).

(A) Can Matters of Faith be Proved?

A marked difference among the Correctoria is the fact that some of them mention the name of Thomas only occasionally, no more than sporadically making reference to his works, whereas others do so much more frequently, most notably the Correctorium “Quaere”, and to a lesser degree the “Sciendum”. Thus with regard to the provability of matters of Faith, the Correctorium “Quaestione” and the “Apologeticum” do not refer to any particular work of Thomas, nor do they explicitly attribute any particular opinion to him. To be sure, it is unquestionable that they did make use of Thomas’s works. Thus, the wording of the Correctorium “Quaestione” betrays the fact that its author has consulted the Summa contra Gentiles, the Summa Theologiae, and De Veritate. Quotations from these works, however, have been assimilated into the text in such a way that the reader is never under the impression of being given a quotation, not even in the case of longer passages.74 The “Apologeticum”, on the other hand, is somewhat more explicit in giving Thomas’s opinions. Thomas’s view is presented here as the opinion of “quorundam qui dicunt”.75 In this tract, the opinion of Thomas is contrasted not only with that of Mare, but also with the views of two other “aliqui”, one being Henry of Ghent, the other being Richard of Middletown.76 In the other Correctoria William de la Mare figures as the sole opponent.

In the Correctorium “Quaere” the Summa contra Gentiles is mentioned; from its wording it is clear that the third and fourth chapter of the first book are being referred to.77 In these chapters Thomas had argued that there are things about God that can be proved (e.g. that he is one), but also things that cannot be proved (the articles of Faith). These chapters are among the loci classici with regard to Thomas’s view of the relationship between Faith and Reason. Again, the Correctorium “Sciendum” refers to the Summa Theologiae, giving the well-known fragment from the second article of the second question of the first book, where it is said that whatever can be known by reason does not belong to Faith, but rather precedes Faith. Let us pause briefly at the exact way in which the author of the Correctorium “Sciendum” has rendered the passage. Did he treat Thomas fairly, or did he perhaps overstep his mark? Among the things that we can know about God, but that are not articles of Faith because they can be proved by natural reason, the author includes not only the fact that there is but one God, but also the fact that He is omnipotent.78 Yet, the latter point does not reflect Thomas’s view. Elsewhere, Thomas unambiguously states God’s omnipotence to be an artifex omnipotentia. He is not just the creator of the world, but He is omnipotent. The “Quaere” also makes us aware of the second part of the Summa contra Gentiles, the object of Faith.81 In this passage, the correctorium’s “dictum” and the author’s “dictum” are cited almost verbatim.82

A final point of interest here is the fact that quotations from passages in the Summa contra Gentiles lack of necessary arguments. The “Sciendum” refers to the Summa contra Gentiles, and the “Quaestione”; reference is here to the Summa contra Gentiles, and in the former reference is here to the Summa contra Gentiles, and in the latter reference is quite a bit more extensive. This last reference is quite a bit more extensive than the Correctorium that makes reference to the Summa contra Gentiles. Moreover, it is pointed out that the argument of the infinite God can be proved by the author’s argument.89 A further point of interest is that the author responds to the two arguments by pointing out that the world can be proved not to exist. He does so by citing the work or the name of Thomas Aquinas in the means of literal quotations from the Summa contra Gentiles.89

(B) Is it Impossible to Prove it?

On the issue of the provability of the “Quaere” refers to the Summa contra Gentiles, as elsewhere, so the author tells us. He goes on to criticize Mare for his position on the view of those who hold that “Thomas never held this position, but his arguments to be defective”.86 A further point of interest is that the author points out that the argument of the infinite God is not. It is pointed out that the argument of the infinite God can be proved by the author’s argument.89 A further point of interest is that the author responds to the two arguments by pointing out that the world can be proved not to exist. He does so by citing the work or the name of Thomas Aquinas in the means of literal quotations from the Summa contra Gentiles.89
omnipotence to be an article of Faith, as it cannot be proved. The Correctorium's "slip of the pen" is rather common though; other Thomists (e.g., Thomas of Sutton) also thought that Thomas taught that God's omnipotence can be proved.

The "Quare" also makes use (without mentioning it) of the beginning of the second part of the Summa, where Thomas dealt with issues concerning the object of Faith. In the Correctorium "Quaestione", the entire passage is cited almost verbatim, again without mentioning either source or author.

A final point of interest here concerns the explicit references to or literal quotations from passages in the work of Thomas, prompted by Mare's quoting Richard of St. Victor's well-known saying, "that there is no lack of necessary arguments in explaining Faith." The Correctorium "Sciendum" refers to the Summa (I q 32 a 1 ad 1) and to the Commentary on the Sentences (I d 3 q 4 ad 3), where Thomas has given his interpretation of Richard's dictum. The author of the Correctorium "Quaestione" seizes the opportunity to give Thomas's interpretation almost verbatim, again, however, without mentioning his source.

(B) Is it Impossible to Prove that the World does Not Exist from Eternity?

On the issue of the provability of the eternity of the world, the Correctorium "Quaere" refers to the Summa contra Gentiles. Here as well as elsewhere, so the author tells us, we learn that the arguments of those who believe that the world can be proved to be not eternal, do not hold. He goes on to criticize Mare for wrongly insinuating that Thomas shared the view of those who hold the world to be eternal (cf. thesis (6) above). "Thomas never held this position. On the contrary, he showed their arguments to be defective." Such is also the response of the Correctorium "Quaestione"; reference is here to the Commentary on the Sentences, to the Summa contra Gentiles, and to Thomas's Commentary on the Physics. This last reference is quite interesting, as "Quaestione" is the only Correctorium that makes reference here to Thomas's Commentary on the Physics. Moreover, it is pointed out in both tracts that Thomas's refutation of the argument of the infinite number of souls does not involve anything suspect, as Mare had suggested. The authors draw attention to the fact that Thomas merely wanted to show how the argument might be countered.

A further point of interest is the way the Correctorium "Quaestione" responds to the two arguments of Mare that were supposed to show that the world can be proved not to exist from eternity. Without mentioning either the work or the name of Thomas, the author presents these arguments by means of literal quotations from the objections in the work of Thomas. Both
the first argument (the eternity of the world allegedly implies the existence of infinitely many souls), and the second argument (it would similarly imply that an infinite number of days would have passed), are given in the wording of the Summa Theologiae (I q 46 a 2 obj 6, obj 8) and the Commentary on the Sentences (II 1 q 1 a 5 obj 3). (Note that the phrasing of the second argument is identical in the Summa and in the Commentary). Special attention should be given to the author’s response to the second argument, which consists of two literal quotations. The response starts out with the first part of Thomas’s answer to the objection in his Commentary on the Sentences, then goes on with a quotation from Thomas’s answer to the objection in the Summa, and concludes with the last part of the response in the Commentary on the Sentences. Could this be an indication, perhaps, that the author of the Correctorium “Quaestiones” used some special compilation of quotations from Thomas? In the “Apologeticum” the solution of the first argument is quoted from the same place in the Commentary on the Sentences. Here, however, the source is mentioned, and Thomas’s response is quoted in one piece, without the admixture of other quotations. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that on the issue of the provability of the eternity of the world there is only one Correctorium, viz., the “Circa”, which makes reference to Thomas’s small tract De Aeternitate Mundi. Neither Mare nor his other respondents mention it. It seems, then, that this tract did not figure in the discussion between the Dominican and the Franciscan way, notwithstanding the fact that it was probably designed and written against the Franciscan persuasion.

Finally, we want to draw attention to two curiosities. In the first place, as we have seen above, Mare had sworn to God that Thomas did not solve the problem of the infinite number of souls and of the infinite number of days. The Correctorium “Quare” dismisses the oath as a straight-out testimonium paupertatis, not worthy of any further discussion. The author of the Correctorium “Quaestione”, however, sets out to expose in more detail the utter ridiculousness of Mare’s oath. Though it may be proper to swear an oath in criminal court or in the cause of engaging in matrimonial bonds, it has no place in an enquiry into the truth that proceeds by way of a disputation.

It is quite conceivable that, once more, the author was anxious to give the opinion of Thomas, expressed elsewhere and in a different context. For as Thomas had said, “it is ridiculous to resort to an oath when trying to confirm one’s case in a scientific disputation.”

In the second place, Mare reproached Thomas for being inconsistent in his alleged defence of Aristotle (vide thesis (6) above), referring to the tract De Vegetabilitibus (which he attributed to Aristotle). The author of the Correctorium “Quaestiones” translated from the Arabic, as is the case for the original Greek, as is the case for occasions, too, he expresses Arabus translations from the Arabic, which then, displays a distinct sense.

(C) Should One

Thomas’s statement that proof is explained in the Correctoria s in “Quare” and “Sciensum” refers to the first book, where Thomas set out his arguments. Their object is to refute Mare’s statement that “Quare” gives an extensive list of some well-chosen characteristic divine truths, viz. the articles of faith, e.g., the fact that God exists and various other cardinal truths. The author quotes verbatim from chapters of the Summa Theologica, to make matters of Faith reason in the Summa Theologica (I q 1 of theology is discussed.

(D) Does a Cause

In response to the accusation that the world comes very close to the eternity, the Correctorium “Quaestiones” states that Mare’s criticism is based on a misunderstanding of what Mare wants to mean by the wording of Thomas’s fragment of the text. “Thomas does not mean to argue that the philosophers, whose opinion of the world was erroneous, should be accused of claiming that the world was not eternal.” The Correctorium “Quaestiones” provides its choice of examples, “for no example is to the point.”

The response to Mare’s criti
allegedly implies the existence of an argument (it would similarly have passed), are given in the Commentaries 2 (obj 6, obj 8) and the Com- mentary 3. (Note that the phrasing of the sentence in the Commentary is different from that in the author's response to the second objection. The response starts out with a different formulation of the objection in his Commentary and continues in the same fashion as the author's answer to the first objection. The last part of the sentence is not a direct quote.)

Could this be an example of a case where the author's answer to the first objection does not directly address the objection? In this case, the response to the second objection is not directly related to the first objection. The author's response to the second objection begins with a different formulation of the objection in his Commentary and continues in the same fashion as the author's answer to the first objection. The last part of the sentence is not a direct quote.

The author's response to the second objection begins with a different formulation of the objection in his Commentary and continues in the same fashion as the author's answer to the first objection. The last part of the sentence is not a direct quote.

(C) Should One Seek Proof of Matters of Faith?

Thomas's statement that proof should not be sought for articles of faith is explained in the Correctorium with reference to the Summa contra Gentiles. "Quare" and "Sciendum" refer to and quote from the ninth chapter of the first book, where Thomas set forth the general procedure of the Summa. Their object is to refute Mare's accusation of self-contradiction in Thomas. "Quare" gives an extensive literal quotation; "Sciendum" confines itself to some well-chosen characteristic phrases. Furthermore, "Sciendum" refers to the fourth chapter of the first book, where Thomas says that some divine truths, viz. the articles of Faith, cannot be proved, whereas others can (e.g., the fact that God exists). Again, "Sciendum" confines itself to some characteristic wording. The Correctorium "Quaestione" refers to and quotes verbatim from chapters 5 and 6 of the first book in order to show that Thomas was not of the opinion that an attempt should never be made to make matters of Faith reasonable. On this point, "Sciendum" refers to the Summa Theologicae (I q 1 a 8), where the manner of demonstration in theology is discussed.

(D) Does a Cause Always Precede its Effect in Time?

In response to the accusation that Thomas's view of the eternity of the world comes very close to the error of those who hold the world to exist from eternity, the Correctorium "Quaestione" gives the entire passage on which Mare's criticism is based (STheol I q 46 a 2 ad 1), "so as better to understand what Mare wants to refute". The Correctorium gives the exact wording of Thomas's fragment, without the curious omission we find in Mare's text. "Thomas does not go beyond Augustine here". The author of the Correctorium writes. He tells us that Thomas is merely explaining what the philosophers, whose opinions were rendered by Augustine, meant by claiming that the world was eternal. Neither Augustine nor Thomas can justify be accused of sharing the views of these philosophers. As the Correctorium "Quaestione" puts it, it is pointless to attack Thomas for his choice of examples, "for no example goes on all fours".

The response to Mare's criticism of the quaestio De Quilibet occurs only
in "Quare"109 and "Sciendum".110 It is absent in the other Correctoria. On the issues (7) and (8), "Quare" refers the reader "to what has been said above", as does the Correctorium "Sciendum". The latter, however, also briefly discusses Mare’s comment on (7) and (8), though without referring to Thomas.

We shall end this chapter with a brief survey of the works referred to or used in the Correctoria to refute Mare’s arguments in support of the view that the world can in point of fact be proved to be created in time. The core of Mare’s arguments can be summarized as follows. In the first place, all that has been made has originated in time because the process of being made and the outcome of the process cannot exist at the same time. Hence, the world (which has also been made) must have originated in time and cannot exist from eternity. Secondly, originating "ex nihilo" implies "esse post non esse". Therefore, there is always a moment of non-being that precedes the being of the world. Hence, the world does not exist from eternity.113 In its response the Correctorium "Quare" draws upon the first part of the Summa Theologica (I q 45 a 2 ad 2), in which Thomas explains the difference between "creatio" and "mutatio". Creation, so it is said, is not a change, except merely according to our way of understanding. The same text is quoted in the Correctorium "Quaestione", but more extensively and truer to the original wording, although some sentences are left out and replaced with others. Again, "Quaestione" cites the discussion in the Summa Theologicae of whether "creation" means "to make something out of nothing" (I q 45 a 1 ad 3), and also quotes a large passage from De Potentia (q 3 a 1 ad 7). However, neither these sources nor the name of Thomas are mentioned.114 "Sciendum" refers to the questions De Quodlibet and to De Potentia (q 3 a 1 ad 11), from which it quotes literally.115 The purpose of these quotations is to elucidate the meaning of "creation" and especially of "creatio ex nihilo". Following Thomas, the authors hold that for something to be created ex nihilo does not mean that it has been created in time, contrary to what Mare held.

We shall conclude our investigation here in posing a final question. Of what concern is all this to the history of the literary reception of Thomas’s thought? What methodological conclusion is to be gained from the above? Our study has been focused on the Correctoria, because – as has been argued above – they admit of the assumption that not only the presence of a reference or quotation is telling, but also its absence. Hardly any other kind of work has this methodological advantage with respect to the history of the literary reception of Thomas’s thought. Thus for example the fact that only one Correctorium makes reference to the De Aeternitate Mundi (and then only in passing), is highly significant for our subject. The Correctoria’s design excludes the possibility of a mere coincidence; we may be almost certain that De Aeternitate Mundi had no prominent part to
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Methodologically speaking, certain works are highly significant for a list of the works and elucidating Thomas’s views. In the heuristic principle. For consider from the standard list; the fact works, now gains significance because course cover only a limited number remained obscure and insignificant an Appendix.

Moreover, a note should be made that Thomas by Dominicae writes Correctoria give verbatim quotations to the reader of this fact. In itself sometimes the case is such that ( ...) to know better) that the author is remarkable, because on other particular places in the work of at least not without saying this.

Equally worthy of attention are quotations from various works: a quotation from work A being in work B. We have already seen an example that quotations were sometimes in Thomas’s works.2106

Or did the authors rather ameliorate or elucidate their remarks?

Finally, which kind(s) of comment on? The question is in the input forward as being his own, of Aristotle, presented by Thomas, that we have seen, Mare’s censorship work but also included those views dangerous by Mare, that Thomas’s opinion of those who hold the view of which Thomas merely says Faith (e.g., as to the question of... From this we may learn that a view to the opinions an author presents in other opinions were to be found.
play in the period 1279-1286. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same goes for the other opuscula. At the focus of attention were the *Summa Theologiae* and the *Summa contra Gentiles*.

Methodologically speaking, these observations on the use or absence of certain works are highly significant. They (help to) make it possible to draw up a list of the works and loci that were more or less commonly used in elucidating Thomas’s views. In its turn, such a list may serve as a valuable heuristic principle. For consider a third author, whose references depart from the standard list; the fact that he quotes different loci, or different works, now gains significance. Without the list, however, (which can of course cover only a limited number of problem areas) this fact would have remained obscure and insignificant. A tentative first list is given below as an Appendix.

Moreover, a note should be made on the manner of quotation from Thomas by Dominican writers. Time and again, the authors of the *Correctoria* give *verbatim* quotations from Thomas’s work without informing the reader of this fact. In itself, there is nothing very peculiar to this. But sometimes the case is such that the reader would almost think (were he not to know better) that the author is speaking for himself. And this latter case is remarkable, because on other occasions these same authors do refer to particular places in the work of Thomas, sometimes even most explicitly, or at least not without saying that they are giving Thomas’s view.

Equally worthy of attention in this connection is the fact that sometimes quotations from various works of Thomas are interlaced, a literal quotation from work A being inserted into a literal quotation from work B. We have already seen an example of this. Should we conclude, perhaps, that quotations were sometimes taken from earlier compilations of Thomas’s works?2106

Or did the authors rather make their own compilations in order to ameliorate or elucidate their response to Mare?

Finally, which kind(s) of remarks from Thomas’s work did Mare comment on? The question is important: was it only the views that Thomas put forward as being his own, or also the opinions of others for example of Aristotle, presented by Thomas without explicitly refuting them? As we have seen, Mare’s censorship was not confined to Thomas’s own opinions, but also included those views, rendered by Thomas and considered dangerous by Mare, that Thomas had not explicitly refuted (e.g., the opinion of those who hold the world to exist from eternity), as well as those of which Thomas merely says that they do not pertain to the doctrine of Faith (e.g., as to the question whether the celestial bodies are ensouled). From this we may learn that a thirteenth century censor not only attended to the opinions an author presented as being his own, but also to whatever other opinions were to be found in a work that were dangerous, but left
unrefuted. A case in point are the condemnations of 1277. Among the condemned theses there are various reactions against certain views that are mentioned, but neither endorsed nor refuted, in the work of Siger of Brabant. Although Siger had explicitly stated that these views are contrary to Faith, the censors of 1277 were apparently not satisfied with this comment. On the methodological plane, we may learn from this not to condemn a critic of Thomas too easily for having misread or misunderstood him, when calls dangerous a view that is described by Thomas, but never explicitly defended by him. Was the critic perhaps less concerned with Thomas than with Truth?

**APPENDIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUARE</th>
<th>De Aeternitate Mundi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCIENTIAM</td>
<td>ST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCA</td>
<td>ScG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAESTIONE</td>
<td>I.q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOLOGETICUM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations used:

- De Aet Mundi = De Aeternitate Mundi
- De Pot = Quaestiones Disputatae de Potentia
- De Ver = Quaestiones Disputatae De Veritate
- Phys = Expositio in Octo Libros Physicorum Aristotelis
- Ques Disp = Quaestiones Disputatae
- ScG = Summa contra Gentiles
- Sent = Commentarium in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum
- STheol = Summa Theologiae
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(A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUARE</th>
<th>De Ver q 14 a 9 c; ScG I c 3; STheol I q 1 a 2 c; ScG I c 4; De Ver q 14 a 9 ad 3um.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCIENDUM</td>
<td>STheol II, II q 2 a 4 c; STheol II, II q 2 a 9 ad 2um; STheol I q 2 a 2 ad 1um; STheol II, II q 1 a 5 c; STheol I q 32 a 1 ad 2um; I Sent d 3 q 4 ad 3um.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCA</td>
<td>ScG I c 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAESTIONE</td>
<td>ScG I c 3; ScG I c 4; STheol I q 1 a 8 c; STheol I q 2 a 2 ad 1um; ScG I c 4; De Ver q 14 a 9 ad 8um; STheol I q 32 a 1 ad 2um.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOLOGETICUM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUARE</th>
<th>ScG II c 31 (=38); ScG II cc 34–36 (=35–37).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCIENDUM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCA</td>
<td>II Sent d 1 q 1 a 5; STheol q 46 a 2; Quaest Disp; De Aeter Mundi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAESTIONE</td>
<td>STheol II, II q 1 a 4 c; STheol II, II q 89 a 1 c; II Sent d 1 q 1 a 5 obi 3 – STheol I q 46 a 2 obi 6; STheol I q 46 a 2 obi 8; II Sent d 1 q 1 a 5 ad 3um; STheol I q 46 a 2 ad 6um; II Sent d 1 q 1 a 5 ad 3um; STheol I q 61 a 3 c; ScG; Sent; Phys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOLOGETICUM</td>
<td>II Sent d 1 q 1 a 5 ad 3um.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. One should not seek to prove matters of Faith.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUARE</th>
<th>SeO I c 9.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCIENDUM</td>
<td>SThel I q 1 a 8; SeO I c 9; SeO I c 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCA</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAESTIONE</td>
<td>SeO I c 8; SeO I c 5; SeO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOLOGETICUM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Causes do not always precede their effects in time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUARE</th>
<th>SThel I q 45 a 2 ad 2um.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCIENDUM</td>
<td>De Pot q 3 a 1 ad 1um; De Quodlibet q 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCA</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAESTIONE</td>
<td>SThel I q 45 a 2 ad 2um; SThel I q 45 a 3 c; SThel I q 45 a 1 ad 3um; De Pot q 3 a 1 ad 7um.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOLOGETICUM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

1. We have two works of William de la Mare in which he opposes the views of Thomas. The first is the well-known Correctorium that prompted the Dominicans' vehement reaction. The work dates from between March 1277 and August 1279 (see Glorieux 1928 p. 72, Ceyrens 1942 p. 325, and Callist 1954 (1)), and is composed of 118 articles. It has been edited in the edition of the Correctorium Corruptorii “Quare” (Quare 1927). Mare's second work was written some time after, between 1279 and 1284 (see Ceyrens 1942 p. 327). It is a new, enlarged edition of the first work, composed of 138 articles. Unlike the first work, the latter did not figure in the discussion between Dominic and his unknown to him), nor do (Cayepts 1942 p. 328). The Hissette 1984. The small work (see Pelster 1931 and Pelister not a first draft of the (first) same unknown later author (bibliographical data on Wil 2. Cf. the remark of Henry of Con tractatu quodam quae sc he Mare's work was also known P.I. Olivi o.f.m. calls it the “Franciscan general chapter, in tiles that were used included Mara” (see Ehrle 1913 p. 27. 3. See Roensch 1964 p. 15. 4. See Archivum Franciscanum p. 25: “Item minister general multipli cari Summam fratris hocc non nisi cum declaration.” 5. See Acta capit ultrorum genera 1896, p. 204, quoted in Roens fr. Thomas de Aquino, sum honoravest ordinem, nec sit aliqui irreverentet et indec prioribus provincialibus et universis, quod si quos inv postponat.” 6. See Acta capitulorum genera 1896, p. 204, quoted in Roens: fratres omnes et singuli, praes venerabilis magistri Fratrius T saltem ut est opinio defendent. 7. Apologeticum 1943 p. 9. 8. See Glorieux in Quare 1927 p. 93. Both Glorieux and Hödl 1286. Hödl even considers the 1947 (1) p. 458.461, however 1292 by Thomas of Sut 9. Pelster 1952 p. 424sqq, Hödl authorship was much disputed attributed to William of Ma a view that was challenged by written shortly after 1288, w. 1288. Hödl gives 1286 as its 10. The authorship is unanimous Moller in Circa 1941 p. x, question of its date, however 1282 and 1284 in Circa 1941 p. after 1286, possibly shortly be 11. In the preface to his edis conclusion that the author may be the author's name, however, may have been William of L. 11. Hödl op. cit. p. 109 gives
which he opposes the views of Thomas. The discussion between Dominicans and Franciscans. Mare's second edition does not respond to the Dominican responses to his first work (which were perhaps as yet unknown to him), nor do the Dominicans respond to this second edition (see Creytens 1942 p. 328). Three articles of this second edition have been edited in Hissette 1984. The small work that was long taken to be Mare’s Ur-Rectorem (see Pelster 1931 and Pelster 1947 (2)), edited by Pelster in 1956 (see Pelster 1956), is not a first draft of the (first) Correctorium, but really a summary of the second by some unknown later author (see Callius 1954 (2) and Hissette 1984). Biographical and bibliographical data on William de la Mare can be found in Pelster 1955.

2. Cf. the remark of Henry of Ghent in his Quodlibet 13 q 14 (written in 1289): “... in tractatu quodam quem scholarum appellant Correctorium ...” (ed. cit., fo 543v). Mare’s work was also known by other names. In a quaestio disputata of 1280–1281, P.I. Olivi a.f.m. calls it the “Correctiones Thomae” (see Heynek 1967 p. 14). The Franciscan general chapter, in 1292, speaks of “Declarationes” (see nt 4). Other titles that were used included “Articuli repromati” and “Articuli fratri Guillemi de Mara” (see Ehrle 1913 p. 272).


4. See Archivum Franciscanum Historicum, 26 (1933), p. 139, quoted in Roensh 1964 p. 25: “Item minister generalis imponent ministris provincialibus, quod non permissim multiplicari Summam fratri Thome nisi apud lectores rationalitier intelligentes, et hoc nonnisi cum declarationibus fratri Wilhelmi de Mara...”


8. See Glorieux in Quare 1927 p. xliv–lv, Bataillon 1953 p. 1257–1258, and Hödl 1956 p. 93. Both Glorieux and Hödl are of the opinion that the work was written before 1286; Hödl even considers the possibility of a terminus ad quem close to 1280. Pelster 1947 (1) p. 458.461, however, has argued that the work was written between 1286 and 1292 by Thomas of Sutton, a view that is refuted by Hödl 1966 p. 88sq.

9. Pelster 1952 p. 424sqq., Hödl 1966 p. 98. In the earliest part of our century the authorship was much disputed. See the references in Scendium 1956 p. 12sqq. It was attributed to William of Macksfield by Glorieux (see Scendium 1956 p. 12sqq.), a view that was challenged by Hödl op. cit. p. 97sq. Pelster op. cit. holds the work to be written shortly after 1288, whereas Bataillon (1953) dates it to between 1279 and 1288. Hödl gives 1286 as its terminus ad quem (op. cit.).


11. In the preface to his edition (Quaestiones 1954 p. xxiiis), Muller comes to the conclusion that the author must have been an English Dominican theologian; as to the author’s name, however, there can be no certainty, though Muller argues that, it may have been William of Macksfield. See also Calius 1954 (1), and Hödl 1966 p. 111. Hödl op. cit. p. 109 gives 1286 as the terminus ad quem of this Correctorium.
12. Muller, Apologeticum 1943 p. xxiv. Muller (op. cit. p. xxvii) conjectures that the work originated between the last part of 1286 and 1296.

13. Though the Correctoria Corruptior, unlike Mare's Correctorium, do refer to Thomas's philosophical works, these references are very rare. Especially his shorter works, such as De Ente et Essentia and De Unitate Intelectus, are hardly ever mentioned at all in the Correctoria, and are completely absent in Mare's Correctorium. De Aeternitate Mundi is mentioned in only one of the five Correctoria Corpusxii with regard to the problem of the eternity of the world, viz. in "Circa" (Circa 1941 p. 44), and does not occur in Mare's Correctorium. This is all the more remarkable if Van Steenberghen is correct in holding the work to be written against Bonaventure, or against other Franciscan theologians (Van Steenberghen 1966 p. 463), or if it was directed against Pecham, as Brady argues (Brady 1974). According to Van Steenberghen, Mare's Correctorium should be seen as the "codification" of the neo-Augustinism that was "inspired" (as Van Steenberghen puts it) by Bonaventura, and "founded" by Pecham. See Van Steenberghen 1966 p. 470. The view that De Aeternitate Mundi was written against Bonaventure or Pecham, however, is challenged by Weissheil. According to him, Thomas's De Aeternitate is not against any one person or determination, but against the common position of Parisian masters, see Weissheil 1983 p. 230–1.

14. See for example op. cit. p. 85, 103, 119, 129, 192 and 382, where certain views of Thomas are said to be "contra philosophiam" or "contra philosophos". In spite of the fact that Mare's criticism is largely directed against Thomas as a theologian, and although the Correctoria hardly use any but Thomas's theological works, Pelzer regrets that "as he sees it" the Correctoria's discussion has almost exclusively been confined to philosophical issues, or to issues that concern the use of certain philosophies in theology. See Pelzer 1947 (3) p. 415. He probably has in mind the extensive discussions of questions like that of the unity of substantial form, or of the doctrine of angels. There can be no doubt, however, that Mare's concern is with the theological implications of Thomas's views, as is also noticed by Pelzer 1947(2) p. 295.

15. STheol III, q. 50.

16. Op. cit. p. 129: "Fides posita quod unum illud corpus numero quod Filius Dei de Virgine sumpsit, quod Virgo peperit et quod peperidit in eruce, unum et idem fuit numero... Si autem illius corporis Christi non fuisse alia forma substantialis quam intellectiva, postquam praeter separata, remanit praeta materia sola vei alia forma substantialis fuit introdueta. Ex quibus sequitur quod non fuit idem corpus..."

17. Ib. "Haec positio de unitate formae substantialis reprobatur a magistro, primo, quia ex ipso ipse sequuntur contraria fidei catholicae; secundo, quia contradicit philosophiae, tertio, quia repugnat Sacrae Scripturae." To get an impression of the philosophical and theological problems that, according to some thirteenth century theologians, are involved in this position, we refer to a letter of Robert Kilwardby to Peter of Conflans OP, bishop of Corinth. Peter has asked Kilwardby, archbishop of Canterbury, for some explanation with regard to the condemnations of 1277. In his answer to Peter, Kilwardby sets out what he takes to be the problems that beset the theory in question. See Ehrle 1889 p. 624sq; also Birkenmayer 1922 p. 60sqq, who also gives the letter's final part, which is lacking in Ehrle's edition. The letter is discussed in Sharp 1934, especially pp. 315sqq. Callus 155 p. 199sq gives a discussion and an evaluation of some letters of Pecham on the subject. Like Kilwardby and Mare, Pecham is radically opposed to the doctrine of the unity of substantial form. See also Zavalloni 1951 pp. 213–221, Roensch 1964 pp. 170sqq and Jordan 1982 for a discussion of the views of these theologians.


19. E.g., Thomas's view that angels are only specifically distinct not numerically, is discussed three times by Mare, op. cit. pp. 50, 122 and 365. Thomas's view of the eternity of the world is discussed twice (see below, part II, section 4.1).

20. E.g., op. cit. pp. 95 and 96. Paris thesis nr.71 is called 6 (=7.7 in the Collectio Errorum of Du Plessis d'Argentre.) This is also done by cit. pp. 99 and 100. Nr.71 is that is observed by both M. Anglia et Parisii Condennu (Pelser 1955 p. 79) and M. d'Argentre's Collectio Judaic.

21. See, Pelzer 1947 (2) p. 228. A tax list of books (CUP I p. 1) which the work (written at

22. E.g., op. cit. p. 135sqq and p.


24. See the description of Ms "A", also the Ms that contain response (e.g., Vat. Lat. 8 Creytem 1942 p. 49, which is p. 757 on this point. In "De Correctorium", Pelzer 193 Commentary on the Sentences of Thomas Creytem calls the Correctorium "in IV seu princípali ultimáe questioni divínae iustitiae habit ut in veracrer ille ignis spiritus es o igne turbatur" (cf. Thomas


20. Especially 11 Sent 1.22, where

27. As we shall see, Mare's criticism

28. Especially III Sent 1.22, we above problem. Whether Mare have viewed the problem of the unity of substantial form on the Sentences (which is claim that the theory can also 1555 p. 27). Others, however, yet explicit in the Commentaries with references to the literature have been able to find (obv form in the Commentary on

29. Op. cit. pp. 186 (bk 2 d 11 q 3 om on marriage), 262 (bk 4 c 4 d 44 q 3 a 2, on the way the
Errorum of Du Plessis d’Argentière; nr. 76 is called 11 (= 7.12), and nr. 78 is called 13 (= 7.14). This is also done by the writer of the Correctorium “Quare.” See op. cit. pp. 99 and 100. Nr. 71 is called 6 (= 7.7), nr. 78 is called 13 (= 7.14). The order that is observed by both Mare and Knappwell is that of the Collectio Errorum in Anglia et Parisiis Condemnatorum, which originated in England (see CUP p. 556, Pelser 1955 p. 79), and was published (with a difference of 1 nr) in Du Plessis d’Argentière’s Collectio Judiciorum de Novis Erroribus (Du Plessis 1724 p. 188sq).

21. See, Pelser 1947 (2) p. 220. In support of this thesis, he refers to the Paris University tax list of books (CUP I p. 646), dated to between 1275 and 1286 by Denifle, on which the work (written at Naples, 1272–3) does not occur.

22. E.g., op. cit. p. 135sq and p. 148sq.


24. See the description of Ms “O” (Vat. Ottob. Lat. 184) in Quare 1927 p. xxviii sq. Also the Ms that contain only Mare’s Correctorium, without the Dominican response (e.g., Vat. Lat. 813), give only these taken from the first book. See Greysens 1942 p. 9, which corrects the manuscript’s description by Ehrle 1913 p. 275 on this point. In the short work Pelser mistook for Mare’s “UR-Correctorium” (Pelser 1931 p. 398–402, and 1947 (2) p. 222), no theses on the Commentary on the Sentences are discussed, as is also the case with the tract Greysens calls the Correctorium’s second edition (Greysens 1942 p. 319sq).

25. Op. cit. p. 336. “In IV suo super Sententias, distinctione 21 (= 44) in solutio principali ultimae quaestionis ita dicit: Ille ignis inquantum est instrumentum divinæ iustitiae habet ut spiritum quodam modo retinet alligatum et in hoc veraciter ille ignis spiritui est nocivus; et sic anima ignem sibi noxiam videns ab igne turbatur.” (Cf., Thomas, IV Sent. d. 44 q. 3 a 3 solutio iii c.).

26. Op. cit. p. 110sq, where Mare quotes (and contends) the opinion of Thomas, viz., that (Cf. STholol 1 q. 64 ad 1) “Locus non est poenalis angelo aut animae, quasi affectionem alteron naturam sed quasi afficiens voluntatem contristando, dum angello vel anima apprehendit se esse in loco non conuenienti sue voluntati.” According to Mare, this view implies that the soul is not really punished in Hell. Thus, the position of Thomas in point of fact comes under a thesis condemned by the bishop of Paris. Ib.: “Prædicta posito plane inuit quod daemones et animae non punitur in inferno nisi intellectualiter, vel imaginari vel phantastic, non vere... Unde hæc posito videtur favere erroris alias condemnatis Parisio a Domino Stephano, Parissini episcopo, qui est quod anima separata post mortem non affligtur nec patitur ab igne corporeo”. Mare seems to refer here to the eighth thesis of Tempier’s condemnations of 1270, “Quod anima post mortem separata non patitur ab igne corporeo” (see CUP I p. 487 nr. 8), and not (as Glorieux claims, l.c.) to the 19th thesis of 1277, “Quod anima separata nullo modo patitur ab igne” (see CUP I p. 544 nr. 19). Mare’s criticism on Thomas’s view in the Commentary on the Sentences is the same as that on his view in the Summa (see op. cit. p. 338sq).

27. As we shall see, Mare’s criticism on this point is quite strong.

28. Especially III Sent. d. 22, where Thomas deals with questions that touch on the above problem. Whether Mare would really have had the opportunity to return to the problem of the unity of substantial form with respect to Thomas’s Commentary on the Sentences (which is an early work), is hard to tell. Some modern writers claim that the theory can already be found in Thomas’s earliest works (e.g., Callis 1955 p. 27). Others, however, are more reluctant, holding that the theory is not yet explicit in the Commentary on the Sentences (e.g., Kozlowski 1961 p. 136, with references to the literature on this subject). The question whether Mare would have been able to find (objection to) Thomas’s theory of the unity of substantial form in the Commentary on the Sentences, has therefore no straightforward answer.

29. Op. cit. pp. 186 (bk 2 d 11 q 2 a 3, on the doctrine of angels), 244 (bk 4 d 26 q 2 a 2, on matrimony), 262 (bk 4 d 19 q 2 a 3, on the “rectifico fratern”), and 345 (bk 4 d 44 q 3 a 2, on the way the soul can be affected by the fire of Hell).
30. Scindum, op. cit. p. 101: bk 2 and bk 4; Quaestione, op. cit. p. 38 sq bk 2 (see below), and Corridore, op. cit. p. 44 bk 2 (see below) and p. 135 bk 4.
32. See Gauthier 1952.
34. E.g., Quare, op. cit. p. 33 sq bk 1 (see below, section III); p. 38 bk 2; p. 334 bk 3; p. 364 bk 4; Scindum, op. cit. p. 52 bk 1 (see below, section III); p. 346 bk 2; p. 214 bk 3; p. 141 bk 4; Quaestione, op. cit. p. 40 bk 1 (see below, section III); p. 38 bk 2 (see below, section III); p. 5 bk 3; p. 9 bk 4.
36. This can easily be checked by means of the consecutive numbering in the Marietti edition of the Quaestiones Disputatae. It holds for each but the last of the nine theses quoted De Veritate by Marc. De Veritate q 28 a 3 is referred to as quaeestio 234 (other MSS read 24 and 224), which should be quaeestio 239. At the questions from De Anima, Marc’s numbering starts anew, and from then on runs parallel to the modern numbering. Furthermore, the consecutive numbering of the questions from De Virtutibus is continued in that of the questions from De Veritate. Also, the questions from De Potentia are numbered consecutively. Incidentally, we remark that one should give due consideration to adjustments made by copyists, in the course of checking references.
37. According to some authors, this would be evidence of the English origin of the Corredor. See Pelletier 1955 p. 79.
38. E.g., (1) op. cit. p. 1 (ad STheol I q 12 a 2): “in responsionis principali dicit...”; (2) op. cit. p. 12 (ad STheol I q 14 a 11): “in responsionem et argumendum dicit...”, and (3) op. cit. p. 87 (ad STheol I q 55 a 3): “in responsione principalis dicit... et infra in solutione tertii argumendum dicit...”.
39. E.g., op. cit. p. 118; see also, below notes 51 and 60.
40. Examples of (1) and (2) can be found at the very beginning of the Corredorium, in the first article, op. cit. p. 1 sq (ad STheol I q 12 a 2). Marc opens with a summary of Thomas’s article by means of literal quotations (=1). He continues, “Et hoc videtur insinuare quattuor rationibus. Prima quae summar, licet non expresse, est talis...”, whereupon a summary (=2) is given of one of the points made by Thomas. The text proceeds, “Secunda ratio est...”, followed by a literal quotation (=1). Next, there is “Tertio ratio...”, followed again by a literal quotation. Marc even copies Thomas’s remark “ut supra ostensum est”, which is of course quite meaningless in his own text. He concludes with a “Quarta ratio...”, followed again by a literal quotation. See also op. cit. p. 209. An example of (3) will be given below. See part II, section 4.2. Case nr. (4) occurs now and then in Marc’s interpretation of the positions of Thomas, which is given after the theses have been formulated. See, e.g., note 63 and 67. In these interpretations, too, we can find summaries of the positions of Thomas, occasionally quoting literally from his works.
41. Op. cit. p. 45 (ad STheol I q 47 a 2): “Quod in rebus incertabilibus non est nisi unum individuum unus speciei...”. “Hoc reputamus erorumque quia cum anima intellectiva sit incertibile, tunc non esset plurae animae intellectiva numerum differentes sed tantum una, qui fuit error Averrois super iiii. De Anima, qui error est multipliciter contra fidem”. Marc draws this same conclusion from STheol I q 76 a 2 ad 1, (op. cit. p. 125).
42. The question at issue is whether Thomas said in STheol I.11 q 88 a 2 that (1) “ratio proprie principium mali actu”, and in Marc’s reading, that (2) “birem loquitur (Thomas) de ratioce divisa contra voluntatem”, op. cit. p. 241. Knapwell responds, “Non potui invenire illud sub his verbis”.
43. Op. cit. p. 371, “Posito illa quod coeli sunt animi a Thoma nec tue nec alibi affirmatur; ipse enim sub dubio sine assertione eam derelinquit”. The reference is to De Anima q un a 8 ad 3.
44. Notice, however, Thomas’s autem quod dictum est de anima fidei doctrinam, ad quam ni.
45. See, e.g., op. cit. pp. 54, 237, 246, 252, 260, 268, 275, 283. Marc says that “quod dicis hic positio videtur essa falsa”. This can be found in op. cit. p. 20.
48. According to Marc, then, no such remarks as, “Non dicius STheol I q 108 a 3 ad 3, op. cit. sed erronea” (ad STheol I q 108 a 3 ad 3), are contrary to Faist, see op. cit. praetria fidei, contrary to the ("Haec sunt... dicta quae videamus doctrina Sanctorum")
49. Op. cit. p. 45 (ad STheol I q 56 a 3) are held to be contrary to I op. cit. 376.
51. Op. cit. p. 120, “Quoddam adducit Augustine;”  “Si tamen hoc dicit (Augustine) in the "sed contra" of STheol I q 108 a 3 ad 3, quod anima non est facit nec non 358 no”. Marc first gives the quotation (from the “sed contra" of Augustine). We see again taken from the “sed contra" back, op. cit. p. 368: "Quotidie in adducit Augustine...”
53. Respectively, op. cit. pp. 348; 569.
56. E.g., op. cit. pp. 60 (CUP p. 127, 121, (CUP nr. 71) and 395 (CUP p. 127, 121, see op. cit. p. 394 (CUP p. 160) of 1270 (see note 26 above).
57. These articles bear the titles “6, op. cit. p. 30,” “Quoddam non cum mundum duratione” (art. 7, op. cit. p. 30) and “Quoddam non esse aeternum et divinum et immortale” (art. 8, op. cit. p. 30). The numbering of the articles is Quoddibet III. At op. cit. p. 31, 54 (?), by means of a literal question, Marc had in mind the question fo... Moreover, one Ms adds a remark (like Marc, see below)
44. Notice, however, Thomas's remark in the Summa contra Gentiles II c 70: "Hoc autem quod dictum est de animatione caeli, non dictum quasius asserendum secundum fidei doctrinam, ad quam nihil pertinet sive sic sive altius dicatur".

45. See, e.g., op. cit. pp. 1, 64, 85, 87, 103, 122, 161, 170, 174, 183, 190, 199, 210, 230, 237, 246, 252, 260, 268, 275, 298, 303, 362, 379, 390, 393 and 398. In all these cases, Mare says that "quod dictum hic patet esse falsum", or "hoc videtur falsum", or "haec positione videtur essa falsa". The example mentioned above (ad STheol I.II q 3 a 4) can be found in op. cit. p. 209.


47. E.g., op. cit. pp. 45, 69, 71, 110, 125, 223, 336, 380, 381 and 394, where it is said that "hoc videtur erroneum", and pp. 170, 324, 348, 426sq, where it is said that "hoc praebet occasioern erreundi". An instance of the latter case is Thomas's view that the human intellect is unable to have knowledge of singularia (STheol I q 14 a 11 ad 1), op. cit. p. 13.

48. According to Mare, then, not all that is false is also an error, which is evident from such remarks as, "Non dicimus quod sit error, sed putamus quod sit falsum" (ad STheol I q 108 a 3 ad 3), op. cit. p. 190, or "Haec positione non solum videtur ficta, sed erronea" (ad STheol I.II q 17 a 1), op. cit. p. 233 "Erronea" are views that are contrary to Faith, see op. cit. pp. 18 and 223 ("Erronea propter multa contraria fidelis"), contrary to the Scripture and to the tradition, op. cit. pp. 170, 336sq ("Haec sunt... dicta quae videntur erronea, quia sunt contra Evangelium et contra doctrinam Sancrorum").

49. Op. cit. p. 49 (ad STheol I q 50 a 2) and p. 376 (ad De Anima q 14). Other theses are held to be contrary to Faith can be found at op. cit. pp. 129, 192, 363 and 376.

50. Respectively, op. cit. pp. 129 (that there is only one substantial form in man); 356; 243, 110, 119, 227, 253, 266, 278, 329, 382 and 419.

51. Op. cit. p. 120, "Quod adducit de Augustino non inveni, licet diligenter quasierim. Si tamen hoc dictum (Augustine), dicere intendit quod... At issue is a quotation from the "sed contra" of STheol I q 75 a 5, "Augustinus probat in 7. super Gen. ad Litt. quod anima non est facta nec ex materia corporali, nec ex materia spirituali (PL 34, 358sq)." Mare first gives the brief content of this article, then introduces the quotation (from the "sed contra") with the words "quod probat (Thomas) primo per...". We see again that the theses criticized by Mare are sometimes taken from the "sed contra" (see above). However, Knappell elegantly pays Mare back, see op. cit. p. 368: "Quod dictum de puncto centrali, nec ubi dicunt nec alibi, ad istam materiam ab Augustino inveni applicatum".


53. Respectively, op. cit. pp. 348; 3; 19; 46, 248, 26, 325, 380; 192.


56. E.g., op. cit. pp. 60 (CUP nr.81), 72 (CUP nr.218), 95 (CUP nr.71 and 76), 107 (CUP nr.71) and 395 (CUP nr.204). Sometimes he refers to the condemnation of 1241, see op. cit. p. 394 (CUP p. 170 nr.4), and p. 92 (CUP I.c. nr.9), sometimes to that of 1270 (see note 26 above).

57. These articles bear the titles "Quod mundum incepisse non posset demonstrari" (art. 6, op. cit. p. 30), "Quod non sequitur si Deus est causa activa mundi quod sit prior mundi duratio" (art. 7, op. cit. p. 40) and "Quod demonstravit non potest probari mundum non esse aeternum" (art 109, op. cit. p. 410). In his discussion of the questions from the De Quodlibet Mare used a manuscript with a consecutive numbering of the articles in Quodlibet I and II, but with a new numbering of those in Quodlibet III. At op. cit. p. 31, Mare refers to the Quaestiones Disputatae, quaesto 54 (?), by means of a literal quotation. From the quotation it is clear, however, that he had in mind the question from the Quaestiones De Quodlibet mentioned above. Furthermore, one Ms adds a reference to De Potentia a 17, betraying the fact that the copist (like Mare, see above, part II section 1) used a manuscript of Thomas's
Quaestiones Disputatae that had a consecutive numbering: De Potentia a 17 = De Potentiae erga 3 a 4.


59. See, *Sent* d 1 q 1 a 5 ad 6 num (ed. cit. p. 395) and *De Aeternitate Mundi* (ed. cit. p. 89).

60. The same procedure, arguments from the "sed contra" being presented by Mare as if they were Thomas's own, is followed at oc. p. 118 (see note 39 above), and at *op. cit.* p. 91.

61. *Op. cit.* p. 40 Ms "V" (= Vat. Lat. 825); "... in responsum primum argumentum videtur dicere quod creavit sibi coeternam Deo.

62. Thomas *Theol. I* q. 2 a 2 d 1 reads: "unde dicunt [philosopho quidam] quod non sequitur ex necessitate, si Deus est causa activa mundi, quod sit prior mundo duratione..." Some Ms collated by Grelot (Quaere 1927) read: "unde non sequitur ex necessitate..." Ms Merton 267, transcribed by Muller (Quaestiones 1554), reads (p. 42) "unde dicit quod non sequitur ex necessitate..."

63. (6) is not included under the "verba Thomae", but is cited in Mare's judgment of Thomas's position.

64. *Op. cit.* p. 31, "Dicitus quod falsum est, et contra Sacram Scripturam, et contra sanctos, et contra doctores; insuper est occasus haestitans et non firmiter crededens".

65. These two arguments can also be found in Bonaventure, *Sent* I d 1 p 1 a 1 q 2 c and c (ed. cit. p. 14) and in Matthew of Aquasparta, *Quaestiones Disputatae de Productione Reorum*, q. 9 (ed. cit. p. 210).

66. *Op. cit.* p. 32, "Ambas istor rationes, scel de transitu infinitorum et infinitae animarum, ipse ponit in obiciendo pro novitate mundi, et conatur cas dissolvere; et veritatem infinitam quaest Deus est, invoco, teste conscientia mea, quod nec vere nec apparenter, nec philosophice nec theologice cas dissolvi".

67. *Op. cit.* p. 33, "Et sic conatur defendere opinionem ponentium aeternitatem mundi et non negare. Dicit enim Philosophus cujus opinione ipse defendit, libro De Vegetabilibus..." Mare, then, takes Thomas to be defending the view of Aristotle. The argument that man could have been created here is associated with *Mare* (op. cit. p. 33) as an argument of Thomas himself: "Post istas falsitates absqudasimaeae (viz., the arguments some philosophers, according to Thomas, might have put forward) "ipse ponit suam dicere quod posset aedquis dicere quod mundus fuit aeternus... non autem homo". It is rather questionable, though, whether Thomas would have endorsed this view himself. His precise words are "unde posset dicere aedquis...", using a carefully chosen irrealis.
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**RICHARD OF MIDDLETON ON THE QUESTION WHETHER CREATION COULD HAVE BEEN IN AVOIDANCE**

**P. W. TAYLOR**

In book III of his *Commentaries* and in the question of the creation of the world, Richard of Middleton has problems to discuss. That is peculiarly so considering the question of an origin of the world. On the precise meaning of creation, he notes that it is not out of nothing and since the primordial substance creatio ab aeterno is impossible. His aim is concerned to achieve a good understanding. He searches for the intelligibility of creation, a concept diametrically opposed to each other. He exposes the possibility of an eternally creative God as the most likely. In exposing this controversy on the substantial existence, Richard of Middleton, who while strictly explaining it, nevertheless developed original arguments, he exposes the possibility of an eternally creative God. Therefore, it is evident that the concept is of methodological and philosophical interest. In this paper, we shall see, Richard turns his attention to another topic. He gives an interpretation of The One and the Many. In this way, we shall see that is essential for a clear understanding of the concept of creation.

Richardus de Mediavilla was known by the honorary-titles of *magister regens* and *magister theologus* of the Franciscanate of York in England or, according to some sources, from March 1302. Richard probably knew William de la Mare and Matthew of Paris. In Richard’s main work is his *Magister regens* of the Franciscanate of York in line with Augustine, but in particular why he was a student of the second generation of French Franciscans. Richard’s main work is his *De nature et causis*, in which he exposes the work and writings of the Franciscanate of York. Richard of Middleton's work and writings I refer to...