

**Maynooth  
Philosophical  
Papers  
Issue 3  
(2006)**

**An Anthology of Current Research from the  
Faculty of Philosophy, NUI Maynooth**

**Issue Editor: Michael Dunne  
General Editor: Thomas A.F. Kelly**

ISBN 0 901519 61 8

© 2006 The Faculty of Philosophy, National University of Ireland – Maynooth, and the Individual Authors

## **Magister Riccardus de Ybernia: Richard FitzRalph as Lecturer in early 14<sup>th</sup> Century Oxford**

**Michael Dunne**

### **Introduction.**

I wish, in this article to take the opportunity to present some of the preliminary results of my preparatory investigations towards a first edition of Richard FitzRalph's Commentary on the Sentences. FitzRalph later became famous (or infamous) because of his criticism of the incursions of the religious orders into what he regarded as the proper preserve of the secular clergy. Much of the attention of scholars has concentrated upon the figure of *Armachanus contra omnes*, and little has been devoted to his university career. The work of G. Leff was rather negative regarding his originality as a lecturer; he depicted our 'Ybernicus' as a traditionalist, as someone who ignored or was unaware of new ideas. In fact, the truth is rather different: FitzRalph was an extremely successful and influential lecturer. A close reading of his Commentary on the Sentences shows him not only to be one most representative of the Oxford tradition of the late 1320s but also to be one of its foremost protagonists.<sup>1</sup> For this reason, my concern here will be with his earlier 'scholastic' work and, in particular, with the philosophical themes which he developed in the course of the surviving records of his teaching as a lecturer in Oxford.

### **Life and Background.**

Richard Rauf was born at Dundalk in the north-east of Ireland around 1300 to an Anglo-Norman family. It must be surmised that although his family were respectable that they were not initially well off but that they achieved social preferment later, not least through Richard himself. This was perhaps something which was felt by the young Richard as he progressed in life, changing his name by 1325 to the more impressive FitzRalph, perhaps inspired by some real, or wished for connection with one or other branches of the FitzRalph family in England. There were FitzRalphs who held large estates in both Essex and Suffolk in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries as well as those in Exeter. The details of his early life are few and far between. He tells us that some of his relatives were members of the Franciscan order in his hometown of Dundalk. It must be supposed that he received some form of elementary education in Dundalk and since the Franciscan friary was the only religious house in the town, it may have been there. In a sermon of 1349, preached in the Franciscan Church at Avignon on the Feast of St. Francis, 4<sup>th</sup> October, (listed as Sermon 80 by A. Gwynn in *The Sermon Diary ...*, p. 56) FitzRalph refers to his kinsmen who belonged to the Franciscan order: "for this order alone has a house in the town where I was born; and there have been always several of my family in this convent, though we are of lowly birth". A frater J. Radulfi is mentioned as the Franciscan Provincial Minister at the Kilkenny Chapter of May 1332; and it is probable that he was one of the Archbishop's family.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, there is definite evidence, for the later Middle Ages at least, that the principal towns of County Louth such as Ardee, Dundalk and Drogheda, were provided with well-established chantry schools. However, his studies must have been restricted because he did not seek a dispensation in favour of previous studies in philosophy when he came to Oxford.

Despite the fact that he is often called ‘Ybernicus’, there is no doubt that FitzRalph’s family were of English, or Anglo-Norman origin. Although he might have accepted the title ‘de Ybernia’, it is quite unlikely that he would have identified with the ‘Hibernici’, as Brendan Smith puts it: “... the English in Louth considered themselves to be English and were treated as such by the King of England. They did not assimilate with the indigenous population of the area.<sup>3</sup> His English ancestors had settled in County Louth or Oriel possibly not more than one or two generations before the date of his birth. Despite the fact that his family was not of noble rank he was related to the Brisbon and Dowdall families in Dundalk. Whereas the name of Rauf or FizRauf disappears from the records about the time of the Archbishop’s death in 1360, the Dowdall family continued to prosper. Indeed, it was an Archbishop Dowdall who attempted the canonisation of Archbishop FitzRalph as “Saint Richard of Dundalk” during the reign of Henry VIII.<sup>4</sup>

The lack of any institute of higher education in Ireland at the time meant that it was necessary for students such as FitzRalph to travel to other centres in Europe. There is plenty of evidence of Irish students, Gaelic as well as Norman, at both Oxford and Paris as well as in other centres. A century beforehand, Peter of Ireland had studied and travelled as far as Italy where he held a chair in logic and natural philosophy at the University of Naples. (Indeed, it would be a very much desired task for someone to compile a bio-bibliography for such students and teachers – the pioneering work of Richard Sharpe already makes such a work readily achievable). Oxford, however, remained the centre of choice for most Irish students. Firauf, as he is called by his student contemporaries (FizRauf by Bishop Grandisson) came to Oxford as a secular student in arts, (presumably) aged 15 or thereabouts, as was the custom of the time. He was a fellow of Balliol College where by 1322 he would have incepted as master in arts, having completed the seven liberal arts and the three philosophies (natural, moral and metaphysics)<sup>5</sup>. In July 1325, Richard ‘filius Radulfi’ was obliged to resign his fellowship since Balliol was reserved for students in arts and whereas FitzRalph may have been lecturing as regent master in arts to students, he was, it seems, pursuing his studies in theology at the same time.

Indeed, this is our first glimpse of Richard FitzRalph at Oxford and comes from an early deed of Balliol College.<sup>6</sup> On the feast of St. Margaret Virgin, July 20<sup>th</sup>, 1325, a meeting of all of the fellows of “the house of the scholars of Balliol” was held in the presence of the two external masters (or visitors of the foundation), Master Robert of Leicester, a Franciscan professor of theology, and Master Nicholas of Tyngewycke, who is described as a doctor of medicine and bachelor of theology. The meeting had been called to decide a disputed point in the foundation deed of the house, which had been founded by John Balliol, Lord of Galloway, and his wife the Lady Dervorguilla, two generations previously. John Balliol had been ordered to do penance by the Bishop of Durham, and his penance, which included a public scourging, required him also to set aside certain sums of money for the support of poor students at Oxford. This was in 1260. Balliol died in 1268, and his widow, the Lady Dervorguilla, took an interest in those students who were dependent upon her husband’s endowment. Her intention, as expressed in a charter deed of 1282, seems to have been to found a house of studies for poor students in

the faculty of arts. No restriction was placed on the selection of these students, so far as their place of origin was concerned; but they were to live together, elect a principal from among their own number, obey him according to certain approved customs and statutes, and be subject to the authority of two extern masters who had the rights of visitation over this small community. In the deed which was made out at the end of the inquiry held by Robert of Leicester and Nicholas of Tyngewycke, it was ruled definitively that in future no scholar was to reside in the house of Balliol who is hearing lectures in any faculty other than the faculty of arts; in other words, students in the faculty of theology were declared ineligible as members of the community.

After this, as a student in theology he seems to have gone to University Hall which is now University College. Extra financial support was secured in April 1326 when he was collated to the church of Athboy in the diocese of Meath by Edward II<sup>7</sup>.

When FitzRalph was a student, no school was more famous than that of the Franciscan Convent – the *opus Oxoniense* of John Duns Scotus was already a classic. In fact, FitzRalph quotes Scotus more frequently than any other scholastic work, not excluding the *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas Aquinas. The Franciscan school had always been more prominent at Oxford than the rival Dominican School; and the teaching of St. Thomas in particular had failed to acquire that predominance at Oxford which it had finally won at the University of Paris. Oxford thought lay mainly under the influence of the University's best known chancellor, Robert Grosseteste. Thus, thinkers such as FitzRalph remained loyal to the tradition of Augustinism, while Paris, in common with many European centres, responded quickly to the influence of Peripatetic philosophy.<sup>8</sup> Opposition to Thomas came from a variety of quarters, besides the condemnations of two Archbishops of Canterbury, (the Dominican Kilwardby in 1274 and the Franciscan Pecham in 1284), there was Henry Harclay, an English secular theologian who, when he was *magister regens* in 1311-1312, was noted for his uncompromising hostility to the Dominicans. And yet Oxford produced two notable defenders of St. Thomas in Thomas Sutton O.P. and Nicholas Trivet O.P. The latter was still at the height of his reputation and influence at the time when FitzRalph came to Oxford. Trivet had been brought back to Oxford as *magister regens* in 1314 with a view to restoring the prestige of the order. While opposition to Aquinas in such a writer as Harclay seems nearly to be an anticipation of the nominalism of Ockham, Durandus of Saint-Pourçain was similarly challenging central Thomistic positions at Paris – criticism that was soon to pass on to scepticism. Ockham lectured on the *Sentences* during the years 1322-24, but he probably made his name as a lecturer in the faculty of arts around the time when FitzRalph was a student.

During the winter of 1326-27 all England was thrown into confusion by the intrigue which led first to the fall of Edward II's favorites, the Dispensers, then to the abdication of Edward II, the accession of Edward III, and the murder of the former king. Edward III was crowned at Westminster Abbey on January 29<sup>th</sup>, 1327 and peace was restored. Oxford had also suffered – the book of the chancellor and proctors contains a series of statutes from the year 1327 in which violent gatherings that had disturbed the peace of the university are noted<sup>9</sup>.

Although Irish students were normally classified as Southerners for the purpose of University administration, FitzRalph seems to have developed links with the northern church and the Mertonians from an early stage. Crucial, however, will be his association with Bishop John Grandisson<sup>10</sup>. John de Grandisson was born in Ashperton in Hertfordshire in 1292 of a noble Burgundian family who had settled in England some forty years before. He began studying in Oxford in 1306 and studied theology at Paris under the Cistercian Jacques Fournier (later Pope Benedict XII) between the years 1313 and 1317. A few years later (by 1322) he was in Avignon as chaplain to Pope John XXII. Around 1326-27, he appears to have been studying at Oxford again. Grandisson was consecrated at Avignon on October 8<sup>th</sup>, 1327 and he crossed to England and did fealty to Edward III at Eltham on March 9<sup>th</sup>, 1328. He then attended parliament at Nottingham, and left the town for Exeter on March 16<sup>th</sup> where he was enthroned as Bishop in August 1328. On his way across the midlands he visited Oxford, where, as Bishop of Exeter, he had the right of visitation in Stapleton's Hall, later Exeter College. There he visited his nephew John Northwode<sup>11</sup> and found him a tutor in Richard FitzRalph.

Meeting with Grandisson was a stroke of good fortune for FitzRalph, whose prospects for promotion in the Church were immediately altered. From the point of view of our knowledge of FitzRalph at this stage, it is also fortunate, for Grandisson throughout his life was a methodical administrator, who kept his registers remarkably well,<sup>12</sup> and kept copies of his letters, both official and private.<sup>13</sup> Contained in these registers are a series of letters which throw valuable light on the details of the various steps by which FitzRalph completed his course of studies at Oxford and made his first progress up the ladder of ecclesiastical promotion.

Walsh has established from Grandisson's correspondence that FitzRalph was *bachalarius in sacra pagina* after August 1328 and that he had completed his lectures on the *Sentences* before October 1329. Absent in Paris as tutor to Grandisson's nephew from 1329-30, his inception as doctor seems to have taken place in the summer of 1331. It should also be noted that according to the statutes a *bachalarius* was not allowed to respond in any of the lecture halls of the University for a full year after completing his lectures on the *Sentences* (*Statuta Antiqua*, p. 51). Thus, FitzRalph would have been free to leave Oxford for a year, and so chose this free year for a first visit to the great University of Paris.

Information regarding the stay of FitzRalph and Northwode has recently been uncovered by William J. Courtenay.<sup>14</sup> Courtenay has recently edited a *computus* or financial record of a tax levied on the members of the University of Paris in the academic year 1329-1330. This *computus* contains the names, financial level, and addresses of the majority of masters and most prominent students of the University and thus provides us with a rich source for the social history of the most important *studium generale* in Europe. The document is the earliest surviving record of a *collectio* or *collecta* of money from the masters and students due to the fact that a certain Jean le Fourbeur was accused of raping a certain Symonette of Bar-sur-Aube, a village to the east of Troyes, in the Champagne region. The suspicion was that the parents of Symonette were trying to force a 'shotgun wedding'. Rape was a serious crime in medieval society especially if the person involved

came from a good family. The fine imposed was that of £400 Parisian which le Fourbeur paid and then appealed given that, as a member of the corporation of the University of Paris, he had papal immunity from monetary fines. The University rowed in behind him not to approve his conduct but to defend its privileges. The tax upon the masters and students was to pursue the legal case and in the end the money was returned. In recording the names of the masters and students, we find that lodging in the very up-market rue de Sorbonne, was a certain, 'Richardus filius Rodulfi cum discipulo suo'. FitzRalph, now a *baccalarius formatus* in theology (i.e. one who has now completed his obligations with regard to lecturing) is entitled to be accounted as a *magister* within the university and to have students. He had probably acquired such prestigious lodgings, belonging to the Collège de Sorbonne, thanks to the friendship between Pierre Roger and Grandisson. Roger, Archbishop of Sens, provisor of the Sorbonne, was at that time resident in Paris as adviser to Philip VI and later became Pope Clement VI (1342-1352).<sup>15</sup> FitzRalph and Northwode probably arrived in Paris around the middle of October 1329 and had returned to England by the summer of 1330 when FitzRalph incepted in theology.

In September 1331 FitzRalph was instituted to the prebend of Crediton near Exeter, one of the wealthiest and most important benefices in that diocese, whereas in the previous May, Grandisson had made FitzRalph the grant of a pension.<sup>16</sup> In 1331 Grandisson petitioned Pope John XXII, asking permission to provide Richard FitzRalph, as well as his nephew John Northwode, with canonries in the diocese, as soon as they should fall vacant. Grandisson's attempt to provide FitzRalph with a canonry led to a violent quarrel between the bishop and the Dean of the diocese, Richard Coleton. Coleton appealed to first to Canterbury and then to Avignon. The quarrel ended with Coleton's death on August 4<sup>th</sup>, 1335, on his way home from Avignon to Exeter; but it is doubtful whether FitzRalph ever entered into possession of the canonry. In the meanwhile he had become Chancellor of the University of Oxford in 1332, and later found his own way to the Papal curia at Avignon.

These dates are important, as they enable us to argue backwards to the earlier period of FitzRalph's residence in Oxford. By statute a master of arts was required to study theology for seven years before he was allowed to lecture on the *Sentences* as a *bachalarius*. This gives us 1321 as the probable year in which FitzRalph began his course of theology. Another statute, however, required a master in any faculty to lecture for at least two years in the University and in that faculty. At the time of his inception as a master of arts, the young lecturer (aged around 21) had to take an oath that he would lecture in the faculty for at least two years. He was not considered a member of the university until he had kept his word, otherwise he was regarded as a perjurer.<sup>17</sup> FitzRalph may thus have spent two to three years lecturing in the faculty of arts before he began the higher course in theology; alternatively, he may have begun to study theology while he was still lecturing as a master of arts. Since the course in arts extended over a period of about four years, we must conclude that FitzRalph came to Oxford not later than 1315, and possibly even earlier, but no fixed dates can at present be given for these early years.

So far as we can calculate the years of his youth, FitzRalph must have been a young boy of fifteen or sixteen when Edward Bruce landed in Ireland. He may have already been in Oxford before the sack of Dundalk and the massacre of June 29<sup>th</sup>, 1315 which seemed to threaten the very survival of the English colony in Ireland. The tide began to turn, however, when another decisive battle was fought near Dundalk on October 14<sup>th</sup>, 1318. In the end Edward Bruce was killed by a citizen of Drogheda and the dream for a joint Gaelic kingdom of Scotland and Ireland was at an end. Thus, the date of Richard Rauf's birth can be fixed at ca. 1299-1300.

### **The *Lectures on the Sentences*.**

Although FitzRalph later belittled his time as a lecturer<sup>18</sup>, his lectures on the *Sentences* have turned out to be of greater importance than might have at first been realised by authors such as G. Leff.<sup>19</sup> According to the regulations at the time, the bachelor began by commenting on the *Sentences*, whereas at Paris this was the task of a doctor in theology. The requirement to lecture on the four books of Lombard had by this stage been relaxed and so commentators were free to specialise during the one year that was allotted to them. The recent edition of the *quaestio biblica* by J.-F. Genest<sup>20</sup> serves to place FitzRalph's contribution in a proper context and bears witness to his capability of adaptation to new literary forms, that of the *conclusiones*. Indeed, the importance of FitzRalph's Commentary cannot be underestimated, since it is the point of reference for the discussion of a number of major thinkers when Oxford became the centre of theological speculation.

### **The *Introitus Sententiarum*.**

The Oxford MS Oriel College 15. uniquely contains FitzRalph's inaugural speech on the *Sentences*. Oriel College Ms 15 describes this work as a '*sermo in opus*' and the tendency would be to translate this as a 'sermon'. This translation would also be suggested by the fact that, as Walsh points out,<sup>21</sup> this *sermo* was, in all likelihood given in the University Church of St. Mary the Virgin.<sup>22</sup> FitzRalph at this stage was probably a priest. In his earliest letter to FitzRalph, Bishop Grandisson refers to his invitation to Exeter, apparently with a view to his coming ordination.<sup>23</sup>

Now as tutor (*curator*) to the bishop's nephew John Northwood, FitzRalph went with him to Paris in 1329 where both of them perhaps attended some lectures.<sup>24</sup> While they were away, Grandisson writes a letter from his residence at Chudleigh on December 5<sup>th</sup>, 1329<sup>25</sup> to Richard Retford – the same who had to leave Balliol in 1325 and go with FitzRalph to University Hall. In the letter the bishop thanks Retford for having notified him of a volume of St. Augustine's sermons which was for sale in Oxford. Richard FitzRalph, as we learn from the letter, had told Retford that the Bishop was looking out for books that would be useful in his library at Cudleigh. Grandisson ends his letter by asking Retford to search for any rare old theological works that were for sale, including volumes of old sermons, even if they were not divided into *themata*.



It is this latter point which interests us here, the literary form of a public address in the Middle Ages. As is now well documented there were two principal forms of public address normally given by preacher in a liturgical context. Firstly, there was the older form, the homily, in which the preacher would explain the significance of the Gospel reading for that day, drawing out whatever doctrinal or moral lessons he deemed appropriate. In other words, the homily bases itself upon a work of exegesis of the sacred text. It seems that this homily form was still used in Italy well into the thirteenth century but by the early fourteenth century, it was clearly an anachronism as Grandisson's letter implies. The Wycliffite sermons of the late fourteenth century returned to the ancient homily form.

From about 1200 on, a new style of public address developed which is normally called the sermon form. It was distinguished from the older homily form, as Grandisson's letter suggests, by the style of taking a theme (*thema*) and developing it in the course of the speech.<sup>26</sup> It is difficult to find an appropriate name for this new, 'modern' sermon form. Sometimes it is called the 'university sermon' since this new style originated at the major universities. It is also known as the 'thematic sermon' since it develops out of a phrase, normally of scripture,<sup>27</sup> the *thema*. S. Wenzel prefers the term 'scholastic sermon' since, as he says,<sup>28</sup> this both suggests the period (post 1200) and the milieu – the university, as well as certain formal structures – “a constant urge ‘to prove’ everything either through reference to scripture or to the fathers”.

As with the *disputatio*, the scholastic sermon form was a challenge. It relied upon the rhetorical skill of the speaker to develop a speech from a single phrase.<sup>29</sup> It was also an assessment of the speaker's education and training. It required quite strict adherence to certain rhetorical conventions which were laid down in a host of popular treatises, known as the *artes praedicandi*. It was, as Wenzel points out,<sup>30</sup> an art form which its audience found both entertaining and aesthetically pleasing because of, and not in spite of, its formal structure. It took skill to develop a speech out of a single phrase, to put forward a structure to be followed (the *divisio thematis*), to 'inflate' the text (the *modus amplificandi*), and finally to tie everything together at the end (the *unitio*)<sup>31</sup> and to finish up with a *commendatio* or prayer.

Present in the *sermo* are the *rimes léonines* which is a rhyming stylistic feature also known as the *collatio*.<sup>32</sup> Cousins points out that this poetic device is already present in the *sermo* of Peter Aureoli (1318) to his *Commentary on the First Book of the Sentences*<sup>33</sup> as well as in John of Ripa's *Lectura* on Book I in 1357, as well of course in that of Peter of Candia of 1358.

Although the sermon form originally began out of a liturgical setting, by the thirteenth century at least, it was no longer confined to such a setting. The classical ideal of education included a training in rhetoric and this continued as a normal part of the medieval curriculum. Thus, whenever one spoke formally in public certain conventions were followed, whether this was in Church or in the setting of a formal inaugural speech as is the case here. As K. H. Tachau points out, the root meaning of *sermo* is simply a speech,<sup>34</sup> and that of *praedico* is to speak in public. Thus, *sermones* or speeches were not

confined to liturgy, nor even to the theology faculty.<sup>35</sup> Wenzel has edited a ‘sermon’ in praise of philosophy, and the same style is used for inaugural speeches in the faculties of law and of medicine, for concluding speeches (the *sermo finalis*)<sup>36</sup> and for graduation speeches.<sup>37</sup>

In the context of FitzRalph’s inaugural speech, a certain confusion is to be avoided with regard to the difference in practice between the Universities of Paris and Oxford.<sup>38</sup> FitzRalph’s speech is not an inception speech, a *principium*, such as might be given by a new master in the University of Paris. In Oxford, the student beginning his lectures on the *Sentences* was still a bachelor in theology and so perhaps the more accurate term would be that of an *introitus Sententiarum*<sup>39</sup>. Indeed, very few examples of this kind of speech, the *introitus Sententiarum* at Oxford have survived. Apart from a few in the thirteenth century, there are (as far as I am aware) apart from that of FitzRalph, those of Holcot, Hopeman and Wyclif in the fourteenth century, and the five edited by Wenzel from the fifteenth century.<sup>40</sup>

The Oxford course in theology at this time was long and difficult. Students were admitted to the degree of *bachalarius* after seven years of theological studies. They were then expected to lecture on the *Sentences* for a year and after this to lecture on some book of the Bible, as well as attending a certain number of public disputations in which the young *bachalarius* was expected to appear as a *repondens* in the schools of the various regent masters of the year. Two full years had to go by after the completion of the lectures on the *Sentences* before the candidate could be admitted to the doctorate.<sup>41</sup>

This was, in fact, one of the points in which the course followed at Oxford differed from the Continental tradition as exemplified in that of the University of Paris. At Paris the young *bachalarius* was expected to lecture on the Bible before attempting his course of lectures on the *Sentences*. In Oxford, on the other hand, Biblical studies were held in special reverence.<sup>42</sup> This may be due, in some respect, to Grosseteste and the polemic over the introduction to Oxford of the custom from Paris of lecturing on the *Sentences* towards the end of the first half of the thirteenth century which my colleague J. McEvoy has discussed in his recent book on Grosseteste. Moreover, the University of Oxford had always insisted, sometimes in the face of considerable opposition from the mendicants who were more attuned to the custom of the University of Paris, that the lectures on the *Sentences* must come before those on the Bible since the former were regarded as being of less importance.

#### **A list of the known works from FitzRalph’s time as lecturer in Oxford:**

1. The Logical Treatises:
  - a) *De distinctionibus et formalitatibus* (contained in Pisa Bibl. Caterina 159 ff. 11r-55v, Roma, Biblioteca Angelica 563 (F.3. 15) 49-81) and
  - b) *Tractatus de propositione per se nota* (contained in Pisa Bibl. Caterina 159, ff. 121r-128r and Roma, Bibl. Angelica 563 (F.3. 49-15), 49-81).
2. A Commentary on the Physics (now lost but referred to by FitzRalph himself – something of it may be possible to reconstruct from references by contemporary

authors such as Kilvington, or a flavour gained from his own later comments on infinity, motion, etc.)

3. The Commentary on the Sentences (give a list of the *questiones* as we now have them; give a list of the MSS; mention something about the ‘long’ and the ‘short version’; mention that all of what survives is from the *opus correctum* and not the original *lectura*, nor was an *ordinatio* ever completed; that none of the manuscripts is a copy from an exemplar but probably all are extracts made from individual quires since no one manuscript contains all of the text; how is the order of the questions to be determined.)
4. A tractatus *De ymagine Trinitate* referred to by Wodeham is in reality part of the Sentences commentary circulating as a separate work.
5. The *Questio Biblica* which was given immediately after the *lectura* before FitzRalph left for Paris and later incorporated (by him, or others) as part of the *opus correctum*.
6. *Quaestiones disputatae* contained in Vienna, Osterreichische Nationalbibliothek, CVP 5076, ff. 65r – 69r, as noted by Walsh and repeated by R. Sharpe. The questions are as follows:
  - Queritur utrum creatura rationalis clare videns Deum necessario diligit ipsum.
  - - Queritur utrum dampnati in inferno ante iudicium videntes gloriam beatorum post iudicium omni luce privati penitus excecuntur.
  - Queritur utrum essenciam proportionatam caritatis (vie) succedit pro premio proportionaliter magnitudo gloriae.
  - Queritur utrum persone divine in mentes proprias ad sanctificandum eas invisibilis missio sit operacio propria emitatur.

The problem here, however, is that whereas these quaestiones follow on from some sermons of FitzRalph, the first seems to be attributable to Adam Wodeham and the second is identical to material contained in the Augustinian Library of Klosterneuburg and attributed to Petrus de Pirichenwart and dating from 1424.

7. The *determinationes Ybernici* (given after he returned from Paris when he was regent master in theology) and are referred to by Adam Wodeham. A number of *determinationes* are contained in a manuscript in Florence. There are seven *determinationes* which follow FitzRalph’s *lectura* in Firenze, Conv. soppr. A.III.508. At the bottom of f.109vb: *Hic incipiunt determinationes ybernici*. They followed by a table of contents of the *lectura* on f. 138vb which finish: *Expliciunt tituli questionum ybernici siue phyraph*. They are:
  1. f. 109vb *Utrum cuiuscumque actionis meritorie sit caritas principium effectivum.*
  2. f. 113va *Utrum per omnem actum meritorium augmentatae caritate minuatur caritas.*
  - 3 f. 120ra *Utrum ammitata caritate necessario minuatur cupiditas.*
  4. f. 120vb *Utrum cupiditas possit augeri.*
  5. f. 121ra *Utrum per omnem actum augmentandem caritatem minuatur cupiditas.*
  6. f. 121vb *Utrum caritas et cupiditas in eadem anima possint simul augeri.*
  7. f. 129ra *Utrum sit possibile antichristum fore bonum pro omni tempore quo conversabitur in terra.*

List of MSS of Commentary on the Sentences:

‘Full text’:

F<sup>1</sup> = Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Conventi soppr. A.III.508, saec. XIV, ff. 1r-109v..

F<sup>2</sup> = Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Conventi soppr. A.VI.611 (S. Croce 611), saec. XIV, ff. 1r-109v..

P<sup>1</sup> = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 15853, saec. XIV, ff. 1ra-191va.

V<sup>1</sup> = Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, lat. 11517, saec. XIV, ff. 1ra-175va.

‘Shorter text’:

O<sup>1</sup> = Oxford, Oriel College MS 15, saec. XIV (1389), ff. 1-114.

T = Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 505, saec. XIV, ff. 1r-70v.

W<sup>1</sup> = Worcester, Cathedral Library MS Q.71, saec. XIV, ff. 1r-168r..

Extracts:

M = Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 8943, ff. ff. 81va-83rb, 87rb-89va (32v-34r?).

O<sup>2</sup> = Oxford, Magdalen College MS 16, ff. 109r-113r.

P<sup>2</sup> = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 6441.

V<sup>2</sup> = Vatican City, Ottoboni 179, saec. XIV/XV, ff. 59ra-67rb, 69vb-87vb.

V<sup>3</sup> = Vatican City, Ottoboni 869, saec. XV, ff. 60r-130r.

W<sup>2</sup> = Worcester, Cathedral Library MS F.65, ff. 63-92.

Attested copies:

- a text of xiv s. at O.F.M. in Todi
- a text of xiv s. at O.S.A. in Oxford.
- a text seen by Bale at Ramsey (See, Bale, *Scriptorum Illustrum maioris Brytannie Catalogus*, Basle 1557, p. 443 -similar to O)
- a text “Questiones amachani super sentencias”, among the books listed in an “Inventory of Books at Canterbury College, Oxford in 1524”. See, M.R. Jones, *Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (1903), p. 167.
- Cambridge, Gonville Hall, seen by Leland (*Collectanea*, 4. 20)
- Syon (MSS D. 31, D. 42)
- York, Austin Friars (219)

### **Table of Quaestiones.**

Order of questions and articles in FitzRalph's Commentary on the *Sentences* (based primarily upon MS. Latin 15853, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris and as suggested by Leff (1963, pp. 194-197) with some corrections and additions). As will be noted, however, P

is not a perfect text as evidenced by the fact that it omits material which is definitely authentic such as the question *Utrum unicus actus intellectus vel voluntatis sit respectu diversorum distinctus*, which is only found in W.

Principium or Introitus Sententiarum: *Fluminis impetus letificat ciuitatem dei* [f. 1a]<sup>43</sup>.

Prologus.

[1] Q. 1 *Vtrum possibile sit viatori scire demonstratiue deum esse.*

Art. 1 Vtrum deum esse sit per se notum.

Art. 2 Vtrum fides et sciencia eiusdem rei possint simul esse in eodem.

Art. 3 Ad questionem.

[2] Q. 2 *Vtrum theologia sit sciencia speculatiua vel practica.*

Art. 1 Numquid theologia sit sciencia.

Art. 2 Vtrum vita contemplatiua sit melior quam actiua.

Art. 3 Vtrum aliqua sciencia dicitur speculatiua vel practica.

Art. 4 Ad questionem.<sup>44</sup>

### **Book I**

[3] Questio 1 *Utrum sola trinitate incommutabili sit fruendum.*

Art. 1 Utrum fruitio dei sit homini possibilis.

Art. 2 Utrum sit possibile aliquem frui una persona non fruendo alia vel essentia dei absque persona.

Art. 3 Utrum voluntas libere libertate contradictionis fruatur ultimo fine.

Art. 4 Ad questionem.

[4] Questio 2 *Utrum beatitudo sit actus intellectus vel voluntatis.*

Art. 1 Utrum voluntas sit potentia nobilior quam intellectus.

Art. 2 Utrum passiones intellectus et voluntatis distinguantur.<sup>45</sup>

Art. 3 Utrum delectatio sit beatitudo.

Art. 4 Ad questionem principalem.

[5] Questio 3 *Utrum unicus actus intellectus vel voluntatis sit respectu diversorum distinctus*

[6] Questio 4 *Utrum in divina essentia sit trinitas personarum.*

Art. 1 Utrum cum simplicitate divine essentie stet pluralitas personarum.

Art. 2 Utrum omne quod dicitur de deo ad se sive absolute dicatur singulariter de tribus personis.

Art. 3 Utrum divina essentia sit gignens vel genita.

[Art. 4 An sit aliqua distinctio a parte rei formalis vel aliqua inter attributa.]<sup>46</sup>

Art. 5 Responso ad questionem principalem.

[7] *Questio 5 Utrum spiritus sanctus procedat a patre et a filio.*

Art. 1 Utrum posito quod spiritus sanctus non procederet a filio distingueretur ab eo.

Art. 2 Utrum spiritus sanctus mittatur sive detur a patre et filio.

Art. 3 Ad questionem.

[8] *Questio 6 Utrum mens humana sit ymago trinitatis increate.*

Art. 1 Utrum memoria, intelligentia et voluntas distinguantur ab invicem realiter.

Art. 2 Utrum in spiritu rationali sit aliquis habitus cognitivus.

Art. 3 Utrum actualis cogitatio distinguatur realiter a specie in memoria.

Art. 4 Utrum cognitio et volitio sint idem realiter.

Art. 5 Utrum partes ymagine create sint equales.

Art. 6 Ad questionem principalem.

[9] *Questio 7 Utrum mens ipsa et ceteri habitus sibi presentes sint principia in memoria respectu sui.* No articles, but the reply to the question given as 'Ad articulum.'

[10] *Questio 8 Utrum ex presentia speciei in memoria sequatur necessario cogitatio actualis per illam.*

[11] *Questio 9 Utrum intellectus agens sit aliqua pars ymagine.*<sup>47</sup>

[12] *Questio 10 Utrum amor procedat ab aliqua notitia.*

Art. 1 Utrum voluntas sit activa respectu sue actionis vel passiva.

Art. 2 Utrum actus voluntatis fiat subito vel in tempore.

Art. 3 Utrum ex actuali notitia alicuius obiecti sequatur necessario amor sive volutio.

Art. (4) Ad questionem principalem.

[13] *Questio 11 Utrum appetitus contrarii vel passiones contrarii possint<sup>48</sup> esse in voluntate.* [Not determined].

[14] *Questio 12 Utrum caritas possit augeri.*

Art. 1 Utrum intensio forme accidentalis fiat per additionem alicuius.

Art. 2 Utrum caritas potest minui per actum demeritorium.

[15] *Questio 13 Utrum sit ponenda alia caritas in anima quam spiritus sanctus.*

[16] *Questio 14 Utrum deus sit prescius omnium futurorum.*

[17] *Questio 15 Utrum deus possit revelare creature rationali futura contingentia.*

[18] *Questio 16 Utrum creatura rationalis possit prescire in verbo aliquod futurum contingens.*<sup>49</sup>

[19] *Questio 17 Utrum deus sit immutabilis et incircumscriptus.*

Art. 1 Utrum quilibet spiritus sit circumscriptus in loco.

Art. 2 Utrum angelus vel anima humana possit moveri subito et per se.

Art. 3 Utrum aliquis spiritus creatus possit per se moveri localiter successive.

Art. 4 Ad questionem.

[20] *Questio 18 Utrum Deus sit omnipotens.*

Art. 1 Numquid potest probari ex puris naturalibus deum esse infinite potentie in vigore.<sup>50</sup>

Art. 2 Numquid Aristoteles et commentator Averrois hoc senserunt.<sup>51</sup>

Art. 3 Ponendo quod ex puris naturalibus possit convinci deum esse potentie infinite numquid convinci possit quod sit omnipotens et agens infinitum.<sup>52</sup>

Art. 4 Numquid voluntas Dei sit prima causa rerum.

Art. 5 Ad questionem principalem.

### *Book II*

[21] *Questio 1 Utrum deus in principio temporis creavit mundum de nihilo.*

Art. 1 Utrum includit contradictionem deum produxisse mundum ex nihilo.

Art. 2 Utrum motus et tempus distinguantur realiter.

Art. 3 Utrum creatio vel aliqua relatio sit aliud a suo fundamento.

Art. 4 Utrum creatio soli deo conveniat.

Art. 5 Ad questionem principalem.

[22] *Questio 2 Utrum angeli peccaverunt per libertatem arbitrii.*

[23] *Questio 3 Utrum omnes angeli confirmati sint in statu merendi.*

[24] *Questio 4 Utrum angeli habeant cognitionem distinctam omnium creaturarum.*

Not determined.

[25] *Questio 5 Utrum angeli cognoscant per species.*

[26] *Questio 6 Utrum angeli fuerunt creati in caritate.*<sup>53</sup>

[27] *Questio 7 Utrum quilibet homo concupiscentialiter propagatus concipiatur in peccato originali.*

Art. 1 Utrum quilibet homo habeat aliquid de corpore Ade.

Art. 2 Ad questionem principalem.<sup>54</sup>

### *Book III*

[28] *Questio 1 (unicus) Utrum in voluntate sit aliquis habitus allectivus vel inclinativus ad actionem.*

## Book IV

[29] *Questio 1 Utrum in sacramento altaris sit corpus Christi sub speciebus vini et panis.*

Art. 1 *Utrum accidentia in sacramento altaris sint ibi sine subiecto.*

Art. 2 *Recitabo opiniones doctorum.*<sup>55</sup>

Art. 3 *Ad questionem.*<sup>56</sup>

[W in its *tabula* (made from the loose quaterni of the present text when in a different order from the present) includes a *quaestio* which is not found elsewhere, nor is it now included in the present codex, namely “*Utrum suffragia Ecclesie prosint defunctis in purgatorio*”.]

The Order of Quaestiones in some of the principal manuscripts:<sup>57</sup>

Full text:

P<sup>1</sup>: 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, (missing: 1, 2, 5).

F<sup>1</sup>: 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 (missing: 1, 2, 5, 18).

V: 3, 4, 6, 7, 14, 16, 19, 20, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 (missing: 1, 2, 5, 15, 17, 18).

Shorter Text:

T: 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 8, 11, 28, 12, 19, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 26, 22 (missing: 1, 2, 5, 13, 18, 23, 29).

O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8\*, 12, 9, 10, 8\*, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 20, 19, 22, 26, 24, 25, 23, 27 (missing: 5, 13, 18, 28, 29).

W: 14, 15, 6, 7, 19\*, 21\*, 3, 26, 17, 27, 12, 23, 4, 5, 21\*, 22, 20\*, 10, 11, 8, 28, 29, 25, 24, 18, 20\*, 16, 19\* (missing 12, 9, 13).

Extract:

P<sup>2</sup>: 17, 12, 4, 14\*, 15, 14\*, 3, 21, 19, 20\*.<sup>58</sup>

## Conclusions

What can one conclude from this analysis? Both Gwynn and Leff identified P<sup>1</sup> as being the best and most reliable copy of the text. P<sup>1</sup>, however, cannot be a copy from an exemplar or finalised text since it omits at least one certainly authentic question which is only contained in W. W is one of the most chaotically ordered copies and yet it is the only MS. to contain Q. 5 and a full copy of Q. 18 (the *Quaestio biblica*). Again, P<sup>1</sup> and W differ inasmuch as P<sup>1</sup> contains the ‘full text’ and W the ‘shorter text’. P<sup>1</sup>, T, V, O, W, are all independent witnesses, not depending on each other, whereas F<sup>1</sup> seems to depend upon a source common to itself and P<sup>1</sup>, but not upon P<sup>1</sup> itself since it omits Q. 18. P<sup>1</sup> was left to the Sorbonne by Jean Gorre in 1360, and F<sup>1</sup> is a later copy; again, F<sup>1</sup> is the only



one to contain the “determinationes Ybernici sive phyrph”. O, which was copied by a monk of Glastonbury in 1389, also contains material which is not to be found elsewhere, while omitting other material. In fact, no one manuscript can be said to contain the ‘full text’.

Indeed, it would seem that the distinction between complete texts and ‘extracts’ may be an artificial one since all of the MSS. may contain extracts to a greater or larger extent. The situation is complicated by the fact that we have a ‘full’ text and a ‘shorter’ text – and yet an early ‘shorter’ text such as that of Troyes (copied 1335-50) and originally belonging to the Abbey of Clairvaux, contains ‘shortened’ paragraphs which are not to be found in a so-called ‘full’ text such as that of P<sup>1</sup>. Troyes called the text a *reportatio* but as W.J. Courtenay has shown from an analysis of Adam Wodeham’s quotations from FitzRalph, none of the texts which survive are from the original lectures given in 1328-29, rather all would seem to be from FitzRalph’s *opus correctum*, an incomplete revision of his lectures, made by the author in 1330 and never turned into an *ordinatio*. This is clear from the fact that sometimes articles promised in the introduction to the question are not given; single *quaestiones*, or rather *articuli*, float without being incorporated into their relevant *quaestio*; a *Quaestio biblica* is included which goes against the author’s opinion as put forward in his *lectura*.

What can one say regarding the order of the *quaestiones* – the situation seems to be fairly chaotic. I propose a possible explanation and a solution. The explanation was suggested to me by a remark of the scribe in the MS. Oriel 15. A colophon which was erased but rediscovered with the use of UV reads:

This book was written through the diligence of Brother Nicholas Fawkes, monk of Glastonbury, in the year of the Lord 1389, at which time it was hard to find many questions of Holcot’s work.

Holcot was a slightly younger contemporary of FitzRalph; a Dominican, he lectured on the *Sentences* during the years 1331-32 during FitzRalph’s regency. And yet, over fifty years later his work was still circulating in unbound quires – the same may well have been true of FitzRalph’s work. It would seem that scribes made copies from what was available, or made selections from what was available, or (more likely again) made selections depending upon their own interests (the marginal notes in O made by Fawkes seem to have been made by way of preparation for his own Commentary on the *Sentences* – he had incepted in theology by 1395), and presumably the order in which the material became available as it was returned by borrowers, etc. Apart from W, the various gatherings would seem to be in the original order because of the extensive use of catchwords and alphabetical numbering of quires. How then are we to solve the problem of the *quaestiones*? It may be that some help may be given by the text itself where it refers to the text of Lombard. There is no problem with the *principium* and the first two *quaestiones* since they deal with introductory material. As regards the first book: [3] and [4] (and perhaps [5] as well) refer to the first distinction of the first book. [6] refers to the third distinction. But [7] could refer to either the 7<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, or 33<sup>rd</sup> distinction. [8], [9], [10], [11], [12] refer to dist. 3. [13] and [14] refer to dist. 17.

[16] and [17] to dist. 35.

[18] was associated by Wodeham with III, dist. 14.

[19] refers to dist. 18.

Obviously, here again there are problems – only when the transcription of the text is at an advanced stage will we (perhaps) be in a position to establish the order of the *quaestiones* regarding Lombard's text – presuming that FitzRalph followed that order!

---

<sup>1</sup> See, Jean François Genest, "Contingence et révélation des futurs: La *questio biblica* de Richard FitzRalph" in *Lectio Varietates: Hommage à Paul Vignaux (1904-1987)*, ed. J. Jolivet, Z. Kałuża, A. de Libera, pp. 199-246. Paris: J. Vrin, 1991, p. 199.

<sup>2</sup> See FitzMaurice-Little, *Materials for the History of the Franciscan Province of Ireland* (Manchester, 1920), p. 135.

<sup>3</sup> See, B. Smith, *Colonisation and Conquest in Medieval Ireland. The English in Louth 1170-1330*. Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 8.

<sup>4</sup> George Dowdall was Archbishop of Armagh during the critical years of Henry VIII's reign and during the reigns of Edward VI and Mary I. It was he who as Archbishop of Armagh instituted an annual ecclesiastical feast in honour of his famous kinsman, St. Richard of Dundalk.

<sup>5</sup> Works attributed to FitzRalph may have survived from this time, the *De distinctionibus et formalitatibus* (contained in Pisa Bibl. Caterina 159 ff. 11r-55v, Roma, Biblioteca Angelica 563 (F.3. 15) 49-81) and *Tractatus de propositione per se nota* (contained in Pisa Bibl. Caterina 159, ff. 121r-128r and Roma, Bibl. Angelica 563 (F.3. 49-15), 49-81).

<sup>6</sup> See, *Oxford Deeds of Balliol College*, ed. Salter (Oxford Historical Society, 1913), p. 285.

<sup>7</sup> See, Walsh, p. 4.

<sup>8</sup> This is not to underplay the continuing influence of Augustinism at Paris, particularly in the combined form of Augustinism and Aristotelianism in such a figure as St. Bonaventure. Indeed, Grandisson's Augustinian tendency may relate to his time at Paris.

<sup>9</sup> See, *Munimenta Academica*, ed. Anstey, vol. I, pp. 119-125.

<sup>10</sup> Many writers have explored the relationship between Grandisson and FitzRalph, especially in the recent excellent study by M. Haren. It is not my intention here to comment upon this influence in FitzRalph's latter career and the background to the anti-mendicant controversy as this has already been dealt with by Haren. I would in the context of the present work point out the very Augustinian nature of the sources which FitzRalph uses in his *inriotus Sententiarum* and also throughout the *Sentences Commentary* – an Augustinianism which he shared with Grandisson. Another influence of Grandisson upon FitzRalph may perhaps be traced to one of the introductory articles, found only in the Oriel manuscript, which deals with the nature of the active life over the contemplative, and especially with the role of a good pastors and bishops. This second question is entitled *Vtrum theologia sit scientia speculativa vel practica* and the second article *Vtrum vita contemplativa sit nobilior quam activa*. The conclusion is that the mixed life of action and contemplation which is that of good pastors and prelates in the most meritorious kind of life *in statu viatoris* and is superior to the religious life. Another influence of Grandisson's? An anticipation of a future stance on the part of FitzRalph?

<sup>11</sup> Northwode acquired an MA by 1334, probably from Oxford and was a DTh by May 1345, when he was elected chancellor of the University of Oxford.

<sup>12</sup> Grandisson's Register is better kept than most but there are still some gaps and discrepancies (particularly in the latter part of the pontificate).

<sup>13</sup> *Exeter Diocesan Registers: The Register of Bishop John de Grandisson (1327-1369)*, 3 Vols., ed. F.C. Hingeston-Randolph (London 1894-99) which also contains sources for the life of Grandisson in the preface to Vol. III, pp. v-lxxviii, referred to hereafter as *Reg.* .

<sup>14</sup> See, W.J. Courtenay, *Parisian Scholars in the Early Fourteenth Century – A Social Portrait*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

<sup>15</sup> It is interesting to note FitzRalph's ease of access to the Papal Court from the time of John XXII who was interested in his Commentary on the Sentences regarding what he had written on the Beatific Vision; to both Jacques Fournier (Benedict XII, 1334-1342) and Peter Roger, the first being the teacher and the latter

---

the friend of Grandisson. Perhaps the change in FitzRalph's influence came with the accession of Innocent VI?

<sup>16</sup> In a letter dated May 24<sup>th</sup>, 1331, Grandisson addresses FitzRalph as *magistro Ricardo nato Radulphi, sacre theologie bachalario, clerico nostro familiari* and tells him that he has decided to make him an annual pension of five pounds sterling '*donec de competenciori providerimus*' (*Reg.*, II, p. 616). Clearly, FitzRalph has not yet incepted but in bishop's register of the following September which instituted him to the prebend of Crediton he is described as a doctor of theology (*Reg.*, III, p. 1286).

<sup>17</sup> See J.A. Weisheipl, "The Curriculum of the Faculty of Arts at Oxford in the early Fourteenth Century", *Mediaeval Studies* 26 (1964), pp. 143-185; p. 147.

<sup>18</sup> See, the autobiographical prayer edited by L. L. Hammerich, *The Beginnings of the Strife between FitzRalph and the Mendicants*...p. 20.

<sup>19</sup> See G. Leff, "Richard FitzRalph's Commentary on the Sentences", *Bulletin of the John Ryland's Library* 45 (1963), pp. 390-422; *Richard FitzRalph Commentator of the 'Sentences': A Study on Theological Orthodoxy*, Manchester, 1963.

<sup>20</sup> Jean François Genest, "Contingence et révélation des futurs: La *questio biblica* de Richard FitzRalph" in *Lectionum Varietates: Hommage à Paul Vignaux (1904-1987)*, ed. J. Jolivet, Z. Kałuża, A. de Libera, pp. 199-246. Paris: J. Vrin, 1991.

<sup>21</sup> Walsh, p. 56.

<sup>22</sup> The religious setting was, however, also used for 'secular' activities as well. Lectures were given quite normally in the Church and it was used for court cases and so on.

<sup>23</sup> *Reg.*, i, 173. Haren in *Sin and Society* ..., p. 61 points out that Grandisson following an investigation conducted by him on the point, dismisses a reservation that he had held regarding FitzRalph's suitability for orders. Nothing further is known as to the date and place of FitzRalph's ordination to the priesthood; but the fact that some twenty years later he chose Exeter as the place of his episcopal ordination, and Grandisson as the ordaining prelate, suggests that it was Exeter, most probably in the summer or autumn of 1328, that he had been ordained to the priesthood in the partially built Exeter Cathedral of the time.

<sup>24</sup> Grandisson's nephew seems to have given his uncle some cause to worry about him. In a number of letters Grandisson seems to have been concerned as to whether his nephew will succeed in keeping within what seems to have been a very generous allowance from a prebend at Stoke (see, *Reg.*, I, 192-193).

In a letter in Grandisson's register, dated from his manor at Chudleigh on October 4<sup>th</sup>, 1329 (*Reg.*, I, p. 233), in which he introduces his nephew and his nephew's tutor to an unnamed prelate or doctor of the University of Paris. According to Courtenay (*Parisian Scholars* ..., p. 15), this was probably Pierre Roger, the future Pope Clement VI, whom Grandisson had known since their days as theology students in Paris. The Bishop speaks first of his nephew, whom he commends to his friend:

He is going to the *studium* of Paris for the first time and we beg you most earnestly, knowing well your great kindness, to look after him, for he has neither friends nor experience. Receive him as a father would receive an adopted son; guard him with the strong arm of your protection during the time of his stay with you; and I beg you also to find friends among the masters and scholars of the University whom you are able to recommend, and especially among the members of your household.

On his nephew's tutor, the Bishop writes as follows:

We ask you also to show the same fatherly kindness to his tutor (*curator*), Master Richard FitzRalph, the bearer of these letters. He is a man of distinguished scholarship and honest conversation; and we commend him all the more willingly since he is a master of arts and bachelor of divinity, and is recognised among all the scholars and lecturers of the University of Oxford as exceptionally able and sharp of intellect. Experience will no doubt teach you and your students the truth of my words.

We have no means of knowing how long FitzRalph and Northwode spent at Paris, nor what lectures they heard there. Many years later, when he was preaching to his people as Archbishop of Armagh (April 10<sup>th</sup>, 1356), FitzRalph was able to recall an episode which is most probably to be connected with this first visit to Paris. While expounding the law of charity to the people of his Episcopal residence at Termonfechin near Dundalk, he insists (following the Catholic doctrine) that in moments of extreme necessity where there is a question of life or death, that private property loses its claim as against the common good of humanity: *in tali tempore sunt cuncta communia*. And the Archbishop then goes on to tell his hearers what he had himself been told in Paris: that a beggar if caught in the act of stealing, had his pockets searched. If he was

---

found with money sufficient to buy the bread he had stolen, he was promptly hanged; but if he was found to be penniless, he was allowed to go free. The text is to be found in Bod. MS 144, f. 76v in Sermon 55 as listed by Gwynn, "The Sermon Diary ...", p. 53 and described as '*Sermo eiusdem in vulgari in ecclesia de Tarmfechym dominica in passione*'.

<sup>25</sup> Reg., I, p. 240.

<sup>26</sup> It seems that this practice of taking a theme and developing it began in Northern Europe in the twelfth century. See L.-J. Bataillon, "Approaches to the Study of Medieval Sermons ...," pp. 28-29.

<sup>27</sup> Though not exclusively so, the style was not restricted to scripture but was also used in philosophy, law, graduation ceremonies, etc.

<sup>28</sup> S. Wenzel, *Preachers, Poets and the Early English Lyric*, (Princeton University Press, 1986), p.62. For a description of the scholastic sermon, see J.J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* (L.A. and London 1974), pp. 269-355; J. Longère, *La prédication médiévale* (Paris, 1983); S. Wenzel, *Macaronic Sermons: Bilingualism and Preaching in Late Medieval England* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1994), pp. 74-75, and B. Mayne Kienzle et al., *The Sermon*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental (Turnhout, 1988).

<sup>29</sup> It should be noted that the sermons which survive are mainly *reportationes*, only the essential has been retained by the reporter – and sometimes not even that! What we have is certainly not the text of the sermon as given. For example, the *commendatio* would have usually been said at the end of the protheme, where a prayer was recommended or required to be said in order for the audience to settle down but this has not been preserved in our case.

<sup>30</sup> S. Wenzel, *Preachers, Poets and the Early English Lyric*, (Princeton University Press, 1986), p.62.

<sup>31</sup> As Wenzel points out, pp. 73-74, English preachers quite charmingly called this the 'knot' of the sermon.

<sup>32</sup> E. H. Cousins, "Peter of Candia's Sermons in Praise of Peter Lombard", in *Studies Honoring Ignatius Charles Brady, Friar Minor*, (Franciscan Institute Publications, Theology Series No. 6), edited by R..S. Almagno and C.L. Harkins, The Franciscan Institute, St. Bonaventure, N.Y., pp. 141-197; pp. 142-145.

<sup>33</sup> Petri Aureoli, *Scriptum super Primum Sententiarum* (Franciscan Institute Publications, Text Series, 5: St. Bonaventure, N.Y., 1953, pp. 127-131.

<sup>34</sup> K. H. Tachau, "Looking Gravely at Dominican Puns: the 'sermons' of Robert Holcot and Ralph Friseby", *Traditio* 46 (1991), pp. 337-345; p. 339: ... there can be no philological objection to reading the fourteenth century Latin term *sermo* as 'speech' rather than sermon.

<sup>35</sup> See S. Wenzel, "A Sermon in Praise of Philosophy", *Traditio* 50 (1995), pp. 249-259; p. 254: ... by the fourteenth century the scholastic sermon form had acquired the status of a rhetorical genre that could be used for occasions beyond the normal environment for preaching.

<sup>36</sup> The concluding speech of Robert Holcot's lectures on the *Sentences* has been edited by J. Wey, "The *Sermo Finalis* of Robert Holcot", *Medieval Studies* 11 (1949), pp. 219-223.

<sup>37</sup> On Wenzel, see note above and see also "Academic Sermons at Oxford in the early Fifteenth Century", *Speculum* 70 (1985), pp. 303-329. N. K. Spatz is editing a inaugural speech in law contained in Naples MS VII B 31. See also, C.C. Schlam, "Graduation Speeches of Gentile da Foligno", *Medieval Studies* 40 (1978), pp. 96-119; P. Osmund Lewry, "Four Graduation Speeches from Oxford Manuscripts (c. 1270-1310)", *Medieval Studies* 44 (1982), pp. 138-80; B. Mayne Kienzle, et al., *The Sermon*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental (Turnhout, 1998).

<sup>38</sup> The statutes of the University of Oxford at this time required a *bachalarius* to begin his course by lecturing for a year on the *Sentences*. See, *Statuta Antiqua Universitatis Oxoniensis*, ed. Strickland Gibson (Oxford, 1931), p. cx; and pp. 48-50. See also, A.G. Little and F. Pelster, *Oxford Theology and Theologians* (Oxford Hist. Soc., 1934), pp. 25-29.

<sup>39</sup> The contemporary use of the term *introitus* is attested in a number of manuscripts. It is the term favored by S. Wenzel in "A Sermon in Praise of Philosophy", p. 249 and in "Academic Sermons at Oxford in the Early Fifteenth Century", p. 307.

Such inaugural speeches could also be given on each book as was the custom elsewhere, although given the brief treatment of FitzRalph to the books of the *Sentences* other than the first, it is unlikely that he gave further inaugural speeches. Final speeches were also given, the *sermo finalis* of Holcot edited by Wey is evidence of the fact. These may, however, have been restricted to the religious orders – if FitzRalph ever gave one it has not, it seems, survived.

By the middle of the fourteenth century the statutes at the University of Paris required every graduate student in the faculty of theology to give a solemn introduction to their commentaries on each book of the *Sentences* (see, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, nos 1188-1189, pp. 691-704).

Requirements seemed to be less stringent at Oxford – perhaps only on the first book. At Bologna the statutes held that the introductory speech to each book of the *Sentences* should be in praise of theology or of Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. See F. Ehrle, *I più antichi statuti della facoltà teologica di Bologna* (Bologna 1932) and also S.F. Brown, "Peter of Candia's Sermons in Praise of Peter Lombard", in *Studies Honoring Ignatius Charles Brady Friar Minor* (St. Bonaventure, N.Y. 1976), pp. 142-197; p. 141. The stylistic device of rhyming various phrases in the text as given, for example, on p. 169, is also to be found in FitzRalph's speech.

On the requirement to give a speech in praise of Peter Lombard, see G. Leff, *Paris and Oxford. Universities in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries: An Institutional and Intellectual History* (N.Y. 1968), pp. 160-177. See also, P. Glorieux, "L'Enseignement au Moyen-Âge. Techniques et méthodes en usage à la faculté de théologie de Paris au XIIIe siècle", *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, 35 (1968), pp. 65-186.

<sup>40</sup> See, S. Wenzel, "Academic Sermons at Oxford in the early Fifteenth Century", pp. 308-309. It is interesting to note that a century after FitzRalph gave his inaugural lecture similar stylistic conventions were being observed in those speeches edited by Wenzel.

<sup>41</sup> See K. H. Tachau, Introduction to *Seeing the Future Clearly. Questions on Future Contingents by Robert Holcot*. Edited by Paul E. Streveler and Katherine H. Tachau, p. 3. Some texts have survived from FitzRalph's time as regent master. The first of these, a *questio biblica* has been edited by Jean François Genest, "Contingence et révélation des futurs: La *questio biblica* de Richard FitzRalph" in *Lectionum Varietates: Hommage à Paul Vignaux (1904-1987)*, ed. J. Jolivet, Z. Kałuza, A. de Libera, pp. 199-246. Paris: J. Vrin, 1991. A number of *determinationes* are contained in a manuscript in Florence. There are seven *determinationes* which follow FitzRalph's *lectura* in Firenze, Conv. soppr. A.III.508.

At the bottom of f.109vb: *Hic incipiunt determinationes ybernici*. They followed by a table of contents of the *lectura* on f. 138vb which finish: *Expliciunt tituli questionum ybernici siue phyraph*. They are:

1. f. 109vb *Utrum cuiuscumque actionis meritorie sit caritas principium effectivum.*
2. f. 113va *Utrum per omnem actum meritorium augmentatae caritatae minuat caritas.*
3. f. 120ra *Utrum ammittata caritate necessario minuat cupiditas.*
4. f. 120vb *Utrum cupiditas possit augeri.*
5. f. 121ra *Utrum per omnem actum augmentandem caritatem minuat cupiditas.*
6. f. 121vb *Utrum caritas et cupiditas in eadem anima possint simul augeri.*
7. f. 129ra *Utrum sit possibile antichristum fore bonum pro omni tempore quo conversabitur in terra.*

Much of the content would seem to be a reply to the Ockhamist theory regarding the intensification and remission of forms. See, M. McCord Adams, *William Ockham*, Vol. II, (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1987), ch. 17 "Intensification and Reduction of Forms", pp. 697-740.

<sup>42</sup> The first *Sentences* commentary at Oxford which we have is that of Fishacre (d. 1248) from the 1240s. See, R. James Long, "The Science of Theology According to Richard Fishacre: Edition of the Prologue to the *Commentary on the Sentences*", *Medieval Studies* 34 (1972), pp. 71-98; pp. 72-73: In 1246 the Bishop of Lincoln had written to the regent masters at Oxford that the Old and New Testaments should be their only textbooks in theology and that courses on the latter be held in the morning hours, the time appointed for the 'ordinary' lectures. However, between the years 1245 and 1247 an "*epistola secreta*" was issued from the court of Innocent IV, addressed to the Bishop of Lincoln in which the Pope commands that "Frater R. de ordine Praedicatorum" presently teaching in the theology faculty at Oxford, be not prevented from lecturing *ordinarie* on the *Sentences* but rather that he be encouraged in every way.

<sup>43</sup> On the right hand margin is the heading in the copyist's hand: *Sermo in opus armachani*.

<sup>44</sup> The *introitus sententiarum* and the two introductory *questiones* are only given in O they end on f. 4c and are then immediately followed by the third *questio*, which is I, q. 1 in the Paris MS.

<sup>45</sup> This is the article treated in the text although in the *divisio textus* it is given as: *Utrum gaudium vel delectatio sit ipsa voluntas* (f. 12vb).

<sup>46</sup> This article is not given in the text.

<sup>47</sup> Note, however, that O treats qq. 7-9 as articles of Q. 6 which, perhaps, is more correct.

<sup>48</sup> *recte sint?*

<sup>49</sup> This question: was omitted as spurious by Leff but has been recently been established as authentic and edited by J.-F. Genest as FitzRalph's *Quaestio biblica*, given in 1329 before he left for Paris. In style, it is different from the rest of the text, adopting the more 'modern' method of *conclusiones*. The full text is

---

only found in W and part of it in P. It is uncertain as to whether it was included by FitzRalph in his *opus correctum* or by the anonymous compilers of W and P.

<sup>50</sup> Not treated in P, V, F<sup>1</sup>, F<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>51</sup> Only in O.

<sup>52</sup> Not treated in any manuscript.

<sup>53</sup> Qq. 2-6 seem as if they could have been arranged into articles of a single *quaestio* on angels but that they remained unedited by the author.

<sup>54</sup> This includes the dubitatio, 'quomodo originalis iniustitia sive peccatum originale dicatur pccatum', treated in MS. 0 as a separate article (No.2).

<sup>55</sup> Not treated as distinct from Art 1.

<sup>56</sup> Not reached in text, which breaks off at reply ad 8m argumentum of Art. 1.

<sup>57</sup> An asterisk indicates the material normally found together in a single *quaestio* is to be found divided up in one or more parts in this codex.

<sup>58</sup> But this codex also contains two further *quaestiones* which may or may not be authentic: *Utrum Deus possit facere infinitum in actum; Utrum voluntas creata teneatur se conforme ultimo fine.*