



The Philosophical Renaissance of the 13th Century Maurice de Wulf

The sudden and widespread outburst of philosophical speculation which lights up the opening years of the thirteenth century, is traceable to three main causes: (1) the introduction of the Western intellectual world to a rich and hitherto unknown philosophical literature; (2) the creation of the Universities, especially of Paris and Oxford; (3) the rise of the mendicant orders in the church. To those extrinsic causes we may add an internal factor: the vital force developed in philosophical speculation by the preparatory labours of the preceding period (195).

§ 1. THE NEW PHILOSOPHICAL REVIVAL IN THE WEST.

History and Chronology of the New Latin Translations. — For the second, or even the third time, the West discovered a portion of the philosophical treasures of ancient Greece. At the same time it came into contact with the genius and the works of a strange race. All these treasures reached the Western philosophers in Latin translations. These we may divide into three groups: —

1. Translations of Greek Works. — Here we must carefully distinguish those made directly from the Greek, from those that came through the Arabic.

(1) The *Greek-Latin* versions are the best. During the twelfth century, French scholars visited Greece, Sicily and the East. Then the capture of Constantinople in 1204 brought East and West into relations of closer intercourse. Yet the translations made directly from the Greek were less numerous and less known than those made through the Arabic. Prominent among the translators from the Greek is Robert Grossetête (1175-1253), professor at Paris and Oxford, and afterwards Bishop of Lincoln. He is the author of a *Breve Compendium in VIII Libros Physicorum*, a commentary on the *Analytica Posteriora* and an original treatise, *Summa Philosophiae*, often confounded with the *De Divisione Philosophiae* of Gundissalinus. According to Herman the German, he wrote a commentary on the *Nichomachean Ethics*, with possibly a translation, which, however, if it existed, has never been discovered. JOHN BASINGSTOCK and THOMAS OF CANTIMPRÉ have left fragmentary translations from the Greek. Albert the Great used Latin versions of the *Phaedo* and the *Meno*. An unknown writer of the second half of the thirteenth century made a little-used version of the *Hypotyposes Pyrrhonienses* of Sextus Empiricus: of whom we notice a like ephemeral appearance in the philosophy of the Byzantine, Cabasilas, early in the fourteenth century (see Third Period).

Special mention must be given to the Dominican, WILLIAM OF MOERBEKE, who undertook, at the request of St. Thomas, the task of translating all Aristotle, or revising existing translations of certain portions. The great doctor — to the credit of his critical exactness be it said — would have nothing to do with translations made from the Arabic: in his eyes they had no sufficient warrant of fidelity. William of Moerbeke, born about 1215, orientalist and philosopher, Archbishop of Corinth from 1278 to his death in 1286, was one of the most

distinguished literary men of the second half of the thirteenth century. He translated all the works of Aristotle, notably the *Politics*, of which he was the first translator. His versions of the *Liber de Causis* and of the *Elementa Theologica* of Proclus became the main sources from which the thirteenth-century Neo-Platonists drew their inspiration. William's versions are literal; though wanting in elegance, they are careful and accurate and may still be consulted with profit.

BARTHOLOMEW OF MESSINA, who lived at the court of Manfred, king of Sicily, has left a version of the *Magnorum Moralium*; also of the *Problemata*, the *Liber de Principiis*, the *De Mirabilibus Auditionibus*, the *Physionomia*, the *De Signis*, informing us that these translations were made at the king's order. NICHOLAS OF SICILY, who translated the *Liber de Mundo*, and DURANDUS OF AUVERGNE are of less importance. Certain Italian manuscripts contain, besides, anonymous versions of the *Physics*, the *De Anima* and the *De Coelo et Mundo*.

The scholastics of the thirteenth century were also acquainted with certain Byzantine works. For instance, Albert the Great and St. Bonaventure had the treatise of EUSTRATIUS (211) on the Ethics of Aristotle, in the version of some unknown translator. Conversely, the Byzantines, on coming into contact with the West, translated some Latin works into Greek. The first of these Byzantine translators was MAXIMUS PLANUDES (1260-1310) whom Andronicus II. sent on a scientific mission to Venice, 1296. He translated the works of Cicero, Macrobius and Boëthius. His version of the *De Consolatione Philosophiae* is still used in teaching the elementary humanities.

(2) *Arabic-Latin* versions of Greek works. — Ancient Greek philosophy found its way to the West mainly through Arabian channels: translations through the Arabic to Latin were earlier known and used than translations directly from the original Greek. When we remember that the thought of Aristotle had to pass from its original embodiment in Greek, through Syriac, Arabic, Hebrew — and sometimes a vernacular in addition — before it came to be expressed in Latin, we need not be surprised at the preference shown by the scholastics for versions directly from the Greek, in comparison with the older versions through the Arabic. For these latter all conformed strictly to this stereotyped canon of translation: "The Latin word to cover the Arabic word as the piece covers its place on the chessboard".

(a) *Works translated.* — These were, above all, the works of Aristotle, more especially the *Physics*, the *Metaphysics* and the *De Anima*. Next come a number of scientific treatises, notably on mathematics, with the works of Ptolemy and Galen. These, lending themselves readily to practical uses, were translated into Latin before the works on philosophy proper. It was at second hand and mainly through the Arabians that the scholastics knew the Greek *commentators* on Aristotle; but St. Thomas had access to a version of the commentary of Themistius on the *De Anima*.

It is certain that Aristotle's treatises did not all become known at the same time in the West: they found their way gradually, one after another, into circulation, during the closing years of the twelfth, and the opening years of the thirteenth century. University records attest that the *Physics* and *Metaphysics* were known from 1213. Radulfus de Longo Campo, in his commentary on Alan of Lille, dating from about 1216, does not mention those treatises, for the reading of them had just been forbidden, but he does mention the *De Anima*, the *De Somno* and *De Vigilia*, along with various writings of Averroës and Avicenna. William of Auvergne, who taught in 1228, was more familiar with the philosophy of Aristotle in its fulness, and Albert the Great wrote commentaries on the whole collection of the works of Aristotle.

(b) *Principal workers and centres of translation.* — The Arabic-Latin translations of the twelfth century (by Constantine the African, Adelard of Bath, Herman the Dalmatian) were, and remained, isolated phenomena. It needed an organized, collective enterprise in translation

to familiarize the West with the works of Aristotle: of this enterprise Toledo was the centre.

The archbishop of that city, RAYMOND (1126-1151), established a college of translators which became famous on account of the inestimable services it rendered to Western culture and learning. Best known among its members are the names of DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS or GUNDISALVI; JOHANNES DAVID, a Jew (otherwise known as JOHANNES HISPANUS and JOHN AVENDEATH); DAVID and JEHUDA BEN TIBBON, also Jews; the Englishman, ALFRED OF MORLAY (translated the first three books of the *Meteors* and the *De Vegetalibus*) and GERARD OF CREMONA. Somewhat later the same school produced two other well-known translators, MICHAEL SCOT and HERMAN THE GERMAN.

2. Translations of Jewish and Arabian Works. — Here we have (1) Arabic-Latin, and (2) Arabic-Hebrew versions.

(1) *Arabic-Latin Versions.* It was through the Toledo translators, especially JOHANNES HISPANUS, D. GUNDISSALINUS and GERARD OF CREMONA, that the Western scholastics, about the end of the twelfth century, came to know the works of Alkindi, Alfarabi, Gazali, Avicenna and Averroës. The commentaries of the great Arabian philosophers on the work of Aristotle were translated simultaneously with the text of Aristotle himself. For instance, Gundissalinus added the commentaries of Averroës to the translations of the *De Anima*, the four books of the *Physics* and the ten books of the *Metaphysics*. Herman the German — not to be confounded with Herman the Dalmatian — “translated, in 1240, the middle commentary of Averroës on the *Nichomachean Ethics*; in 1244, an Alexandrian compendium of the *Ethics*; about 1250, a work of Averroës on *Rhetoric*, after having translated the opening glosses of Alfarabi on that work, to which translations he subsequently added an original treatise on *Rhetoric*; and, finally, in 1256, the commentary on the *Poetics*.” There is no ground for the supposition that he lived in Sicily. He spent his life in Spain, probably as Bishop of Astorga, from 1266 to his death in 1271. Michael Scot translated Averroës’ commentaries on the *De Coelo et Mundo* and the *De Anima*: and these commentaries were known in the West at the commencement of the thirteenth century.

The court of Sicily, under Frederick II. and his son Manfred, was another centre of Arabian culture: and of Grecian culture as well, for it produced some Greek-Latin versions in addition to Arabic-Latin ones. We meet here Michael Scot and Bartholomew of Messina. Frederick II. set great store on the commentaries of Averroës and did much to popularize them: by the middle of the thirteenth century Paris was in possession of all the writings of Averroës except his commentaries on the *Organon* and his *Destructio Destructionis*.

These scholars were moreover no mere interpreters of Arabian scientific thought: their knowledge embraced the works of the Patristic and early medieval Christian periods. Many of them also found, in the rich material they were dealing with, ample inspiration for quite original philosophical treatises. Michael Scot, for instance, composed a *Divisio Philosophiae*; but it was inspired by the similar treatise of Gundissalinus. The latter indeed merits a special place as a philosophical writer. He will be dealt with later on.

(2) *Arabic-Hebrew Versions.* — In the thirteenth century many works were translated from Arabic into Hebrew. “When the Jewish civilization was driven northward from Mussulman Spain into Provence and the regions around the Pyrenees, Arabic, which had been the vernacular of the Jews, was gradually abandoned by them in their new surroundings, and they began to feel the need of translating all their important works on science and philosophy from Arabic into their own Hebrew.” This task was carried on mainly by the members of one family, the Tibbonides, established at Lunel. It was confined almost exclusively to the works of Averroës, especially his commentaries on Aristotle, and to the text of Aristotle itself. Some of these commentaries are extant in a number of distinct Hebrew versions.

3. Some Apocryphal Works, translated from the Arabic and mostly attributed to Aristotle, all tinged with Neo-Platonism. Among these the principal are: —

(1) The *Secretum Secretorum*, a compendium of scientific lore, translated by a cleric of Tripoli.

(2) The *Theology of Aristotle*, also known as the *De Secretion Aegyptiorum Philosophia* (215).

(3) A pseudo-Aristotelian treatise, *De Anima*.

(4) The *Liber de Causis*, quoted under various titles by the scholastics, translated by Johannes Hispanus or Gerard of Cremona between 1167 and 1187; annotated by Albert the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas, who refer it to Proclus; attributed subsequently to Aristotle and included in his works. The maxims gathered from this small treatise attest to its widespread popularity in the thirteenth century and afterwards. It is in reality an extract from the **Stoicheiôsis Theologikê** of Proclus. Guttman attributes it to Johannes Hispanus. It has been edited by Bardenhewer after an Arabian manuscript of the year 1197. Like the works of Pseudo-Denis and the hermetic writings, the *Liber de Causis* lends itself to different interpretations and was quoted in support of conflicting theses. Indeed it seems to have been utilized not so much for any new doctrines it might yield as for the purpose of defending old ones.

(5) In addition to these Pseudo-Aristotelian works, we find also an *Elementa Theologiae*, wrongly attributed to Proclus, and other treatises wrongly attributed to Empedocles (on the five elements) and Pythagoras, going the rounds of the medieval schools.

General Influence of those Translations on the Philosophy of the Thirteenth Century.

We must distinguish between the influence of the works of Aristotle and that of the Arabian and Jewish writings.

(1) *Influence of the Aristotelian treatises.* — The greater works of Aristotle directed the attention of the scholastics to new problems; and they also suggested solutions which were destined to be sifted, corrected and completed before being finally incorporated in the scholastic synthesis. In another direction Aristotle helped to build up and establish the didactic methods of the thirteenth century (see below).

(2) *Influence of the Jewish, Arabian and apocryphal treatises.* — To the writings of the Arabians and Jews the scholastics are indebted for a number of Neo-Platonic notions and a large contribution of scientific data, especially of a psycho-physiological character; also for a number of interpretations of Aristotle's doctrine, which are seen to be identical in Arabian and in scholastic philosophy. It was Avicenna especially who contributed very largely in this way to the development of many scholastic theories.

It must not, however, be inferred that the scholastics either adopted or even countenanced the philosophical systems of the Arabians. To see that they did not, we have but to observe their attitude towards those of the latter who influenced them most: towards Avicenna and Averroës among the Arabians, and towards Moses Maimonides, Avicbron and Isaac Israeli among the Jews. Averroës, in fact, they regarded as the initiator of a sort of pseudo-peripateticism to which they offered a determined and unrelenting opposition. He was for the anti-scholastics of the thirteenth century what Scotus Eriugena had been for those of the preceding period. Avicenna likewise had his own special theories and his misleading interpretations of Aristotle, opposed by the thirteenth century scholastics. Anyhow, his influence in the schools was never so great as that of Averroës: there was a Latin Averroism in existence for centuries, there was never a Latin "Avicennism". Avicbron, whom none of the scholastics thought to be a Jewish philosopher, transmitted theories of considerable importance to some of their schools: Duns Scotus was glad to follow his guidance. But the doctrine thus transmitted were freed from their monistic

tendencies and transformed by the infusion of a totally new spirit. Moreover, Avicbron's pantheism and emanation were expressly and specifically combated. *Maimonides* arrested the attention of the scholastics mainly by his attempt to harmonize Aristotelianism with the Bible: they were reminded to address themselves to the similar task of harmonizing their philosophy with Catholic dogma. Apart from this happy suggestion, the philosophy of Maimonides met with no better reception from the scholastics than that of Averroës.

Prohibitions of Aristotle's Works at Paris.

Early in the thirteenth century the works of Aristotle were repeatedly condemned by the ecclesiastical authorities. A council convoked at Paris in 1210 by Peter of Corbeil forbade the teaching, whether public or private, of the Natural Philosophy and the commentaries of Averroës (*nec libri Aristotelis de naturali philosophia nec commenta legantur Parisius publice vel secreto*), at the same time as it condemned the teachings of Amalric of Bène and ordered the *Quaternuli* of David of Dinant to be publicly burned. It is likely that the *libri de naturaliphilosophia* included not only the *Physics* of Aristotle, but also his *Metaphysics*. Five years later, the Papal legate, Robert de Courçon, renewed these censures at the seat of the youthful university: while allowing the *Ethics*, he expressly prohibited the *Physics*, the *Metaphysics* and the *Summae de eisdem*. And this time again Aristotle was reckoned with the heretics: the followers of David, of Amalric and of Maurice of Spain.

There were various reasons for those ecclesiastical censures. The immense volume of new philosophical material, brought to light by the introduction of the greater works of Aristotle, could not fail to produce confusion in the schools. The theologians became alarmed at certain teachings which ran counter to Catholic dogma: the theory of the eternity of the world, for instance. The Arabian commentaries aggravated the heterodoxy of those theories and introduced others that were no less objectionable, and always under cover of Aristotle. And then, too, the badly translated texts of Aristotle lent themselves to divergent interpretations, thus favouring the designs of all who wanted to propound novel or dangerous teachings.

As soon as the first panic subsided and the scholastics got time to make a closer acquaintance with the new peripatetic theories and see what in them was compatible with Catholic dogma and what not, the Church quietly relaxed the rigour of its early prohibitions. If these were not expressly withdrawn they were allowed to fall into disuse; the authorities took no notice of things, and so usage abrogated the law. In 1231 Pope Gregory IX., a sincere patron of learning, entrusted to three theologians (William of Auxerre, Simon of Authie and Stephen of Provins) the task of correcting the condemned books, evidently with the intention of putting the amended editions on the programme of the Paris Faculty of Arts, *ne utile per inutile vitietur*; and he delegated to the abbot of St. Victor and the prior of the Dominican convent the power of absolving those who had incurred the ecclesiastical censures. These first steps seem to have been ineffectual; but from 1255 onward the *Physics* and *Metaphysics* were regularly prescribed by the Faculty of Arts for the University courses. The fact that the ecclesiastical authorities did not then interfere is a sufficient proof that the prohibitive measures were allowed to become and remain a dead letter; henceforward the authorities dealt only *post factum* with those who sheltered themselves behind the name of Aristotle for the purpose of teaching error. We may add that the censures of 1210 and 1215 had no binding force outside Paris, and that the honour Aristotle received at Paris afterwards amply condoned for the suspicion with which he was treated there in the beginning.

§ 2. THE RISE OF THE UNIVERSITIES.

Foundation and Organization of the University of Paris.

The circulation of the new Aristotelian literature synchronized with the erection of the University of Paris. This originated in the closing years of the twelfth and the opening years of the thirteenth century, from the combination of all the masters and scholars attached to the schools of Notre Dame Cathedral and subject to the jurisdiction of its chancellor (*universitas magistrorum et scholarium*). Little by little identity of interests drew the masters into four groups or *Faculties*: the theologians; the artists or philosophers; the canonists; the physicians. In the course of the thirteenth century, scholars' unions made their appearance under the name of *nations*: Picards, Gauls, Normans, English. Strictly speaking, these unions comprised only the masters and pupils of the Faculty of Arts, but as these were the most numerous, and as, moreover, after having completed the study of arts, both masters and pupils remained incorporated in their respective nations, these latter really represented the entire university. Very soon a struggle commenced between the *rector*, or head of the nations, and the *chancellor* of the cathedral. It lasted for a century and a half, during which time the authority of the chancellor was slowly but steadily supplanted by that of the rector, who was thenceforth recognized as the chief of the university.

The growth of the Paris University was remarkably rapid on account of the numerous privileges with which it was favoured by popes and kings. All the great theologians and philosophers passed through its schools. Its elaborate disciplinary organization was the work of its own time; it was taken as a model by all the other universities of the Middle Ages. We shall confine our attention to a few noteworthy points in connection with the teaching of philosophy and theology.

The Study of Philosophy and Theology.

Just as philosophy was subordinate to theology, so was mastership in the arts a necessary preparation for degrees in theology. *Non est consensendum in artibus, sed a liminibus sunt salutandae*. The teaching organization of the University is a faithful reflex of the general social condition of the Middle Ages: its underlying idea is the view of secular knowledge as leading up to the sacred science. But the master of arts (*magister artium*), when he became a theologian, was not likely to lay aside the habits of mind engendered by his philosophical training. And moreover, the growth of the dialectic method in theology encouraged the professors to make long and frequent incursions into the domain of philosophy. Add to this the absence of a sufficient philosophical grounding in many of their auditors, thereby necessitating a recapitulation, in theology, of arguments and matters that should have been assumed as already known. All this explains the fact that the philosophical teaching of the Paris masters must be sought in their theological, as well as in their philosophical, lectures.

Two features characterize the university teaching at Paris: *internationalism* of students and masters, and *freedom* of instruction. Students flocked to Paris from *every country* of the West. There was no matriculation: the student selected a master; and he was known to his university only through his master. "Nullus sit scholaris Parisius qui certum magistrum non habeat." It was in the master's school and under his direction that the student should accomplish all his scholastic acts and exercises. The *freedom* of teaching enjoyed is manifest from the phenomenal extension of the mastership or professorial office. By fulfilling a few easy formalities, whoever had talent enough could become a professor. The university studies were in fact a long apprenticeship to the professoriate, and the student might be described as a candidate for the latter. He became

professor by professing. Another index to this freedom of teaching is the language used by some of the masters — as testified by the questions sometimes discussed at the quodlibetic disputations.

The series of academic acts varied with the epoch. In 1215, Robert de Courçon laid down as the minimum age for teaching: twenty-one for the arts, thirty-five for theology; and as the minimum term of preparatory studies: six years' study for the arts, eight years' study for theology. The bachelorship or *baccalaureate* (*baccalareatus*, *determinantia*) was the lowest degree in the arts faculty. In the beginning of the thirteenth century the candidate was examined by a board of three masters of the arts faculty: later on there were four. If considered sufficiently qualified, he was admitted to the *determinatio*, a solemn academic test which took place about the next pasch following the examination; under the direction of his own master, the *bachalariandus* undertook a public defence of a number of theses proposed for discussion. The ordeal was a long one: it was supposed to commence *infra octavas cinerum* and to last *per totam quadragesimam*. In a concluding session the candidate summed up his conclusions, he “determined” the solutions to be given to the various questions raised, and answered difficulties (*quaestionem determinare*); thereupon he received the title of *determinator*, *determinans*. Between the baccalaureate and the second degree, the *licence*, there usually elapsed an interval of two or three years: although often, especially in the earlier days, we find instances of candidates who obtained all three degrees of the faculty within the space of a single year. The recipients of the second degree, the *licentiati*, were qualified by its reception to give their first or inaugural lecture as masters (*incipere in artibus*). On delivering this lecture they became entitled to be called *incipientes*, and the procurator of the nation admitted them to the rank of *mastership* (*magister*). Most of the “incipient” masters of arts never delivered a second lecture in Paris: they either went elsewhere to teach, or else betook themselves to other studies at the University: these were called the *magistri non regentes*. The *magistri actu regentes* were the masters actually appointed by the nations for the regular work of teaching: they gave the ordinary university courses in the public class-halls of the various nations or in their own private halls.

The degrees in the Faculty of Theology were conferred in much the same way. To the baccalaureate there were three stages: the student became successively *biblicus ordinarius*, *sententiarius* and *bacchaliarius formatus*. In the fourteenth century “each ‘formed’ bachelor undertook four defences of theses against his colleagues: one ‘aulica’ (in aula episcopi), a second ‘vesperalis,’ a third ‘sorbonica,’ during the holidays at the Sorbonne, and a fourth in Advent ‘de quolibet’” Not till then was he entitled to be presented to the chancellor for his *licence*: then, after a mere formal examination, the chancellor conferred upon the aspirant, with much pomp and ceremony, the *licentia* to undertake the office of teaching and preaching. Having gone through all those stages the *licentiatus* was admitted to the full and official exercise of the duties he had been hitherto discharging as an apprentice. As for *mastership*, or incorporation in the group of masters, the academic acts which qualified for it (*vesperiae*, *aulica* and *resumptum*) were rather of an honorary character. As Thurot well remarks, “the mastership was to the licence what the nuptial festivities are to the marriage blessing”. The masters *actu regentes*, or those who, after obtaining their mastership, continued to teach and were not content with the mere honorary title of masters (*actu non regentes*), went on giving their public lectures and conducting disputations like the bachelors.

Lectures and *disputations* may be distinguished as two *forms* of teaching. The professor *read* (*legere*, we have still the German *Vorlesungen*), that is, he took up as the basis of his instruction some text which he explained and developed. In theology the first text was the Bible, which was studied from the literal standpoint (*lectores biblici*). Then came the *Sentences* of the Lombard (*bachalarei*). Finally the masters (*magistri*) undertook the real or scientific exposition of the Bible.

In the Faculty of Arts the programme of lectures or *lectiones* was roughly outlined in Robert de Courçon's constitution of 1215. We know it in detail from two sources dating from the middle of the thirteenth century: the statutes of the English nation (1252) regulating the conditions for the admission of bachelors to the Lenten *determinatio* and especially a statute of the Faculty of Arts (1255) "de modo docendi et regendi in artibus deque libris quae legendi essent". We learn from this latter document that the following books were read: the *Vetus logica* (*videlicet liber Porfirii, praedicamentorum, periarmerias divisionum et thopicorum* Boëcii), Priscian (*major* and *minor*), the *Logica nova* (the *topica, elenchi, priora* and *posteriora*); the *Nichomachaeae Ethics* (only the first four books are mentioned); the *Liber Sex Principiorum* of Gilbert de la Porrée; the treatise of Donatus on *Barbarisms* (the third book of his *Ars Major*), that of Priscian on *Accentuation*; Aristotle's *Physics, Metaphysics, De Animalibus, Liber coeli et mundi*, First Book on *Meteors, De A nima, De Generatione, De Causis*, Books on *Senses and Sensations, on Sleep and Vigil, on Plants, De Memoria et Remiscentia*, Costa Ben Luca's *De Differentia Spiritus et Animae*, and the Book *De Morte et Vita*. On comparing the branches enumerated in this programme with the classification of the philosophical sciences (given below), we can see the parallelism there is between them.

In the *disputations*, questions were treated by way of objection and answer: this was more animated, for all were invited to shed what light they could upon the matter under discussion. These dialectic exercises and *disputationes magistrorum in studio solempni* formed part of the ordinary curriculum in the arts schools. Similar in character were the *disputationes generales de quolibet* in the schools of theology.

Rise of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

Oxford dates from the middle of the thirteenth century. It acknowledged the supremacy of Paris, to which it was indebted for its organization and its best professors. The University of Cambridge came later, not taking definite shape until the fourteenth century. The "scientific pilgrimage" of the English to Paris commenced about the middle of the twelfth century. ROBERT GROSSETÊTE and the chancellor WILLIAM OF SHYRESWOOD attended Paris; the Franciscans, ADAM OF MARISCO and RICHARD CORNUBIENSIS, and many others, taught at Paris before teaching at Oxford.

§ 3. THE MENDICANT ORDERS.

Conflicts between Regulars and Seculars.

Immediately on establishing themselves at Paris (1217 and 1219-20), the Dominicans and Franciscans sought to occupy chairs of theology in the University: they succeeded too, but not without some difficulty. After a general strike of the masters, resulting from a disagreement between the Bishop of Paris and the chancellor of Notre Dame, the Dominicans obtained a chair of theology (1229). They secured a second chair in 1231, and about this date also the Franciscans were offered a chair in the faculty. The first Dominican master was Roland of Cremona, the first Franciscan master, Alexander of Hales. Between 1233 and 1238 the Franciscans appear to have filled a second chair: the one given to John de la Rochelle, who was proclaimed *magister regens* simultaneously with Alexander of Hales. The rights of the mendicant orders were based on sound titles. But the seculars, who were unsuccessful in opposing their incorporation in the first instance, were consistently hostile to them and showed their animosity in various ways. From

1252 to 1259 there were entanglements arising from the presence of regulars in the Faculty of Theology. The seculars, led by NICHOLAS OF LISIEUX, GERARD OF ABBEVILLE, and especially by the turbulent WILLIAM OF ST. AMOUR (fl. 1272), wanted to carry a rule to the effect that each religious order should be limited to one chair in the University. The quarrel was settled by the intervention of Alexander IV.: the Dominicans held their two chairs, the Franciscans one; and the pope condemned William of St. Amour and the other ringleaders and ordered them to leave France.

The hostilities also assumed the form of interminable controversies on the nature and excellence of the religious state: these commenced in 1255 with the publication of William of St. Amour's *De Periculis Novissimorum Temporum*, and they ramified into almost all the theological controversies of the thirteenth century. Still more embittered opposition was aroused by the Bull of Martin V., *Ad Uberes Fructus*, wherein the pope granted important privileges to the regulars in regard to faculties for hearing the confessions of the faithful. Whatever side the regulars might take in the philosophical questions that usually divided them among themselves, they always stood shoulder to shoulder against the seculars in defence of their common canonical privileges.

Influence of the Mendicant Orders on Scholastic Philosophy.

The Dominicans and Franciscans exercised a very marked influence on the destinies of scholastic philosophy. These great religious corporations insisted on the education of their members in order to foster in the latter a taste for learning: they thus gave the philosophy of the thirteenth century some of its most illustrious exponents. The regulations of the Dominican order, though minute and ample from the beginning of the thirteenth century, afford but little information on the earlier organization of its studies. Distrust and opposition had to be overcome before the cultivation of philosophical studies was recognized along with the study of theology. But this early hostility gave way to an enthusiastic attachment, once Albert the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas vindicated for the secular branches of study their rightful place in the temple of knowledge. Soon, in addition to the *studia solemnia*, proper to each province, there were established *studia generalia*, common to the whole order, for the more advanced study of philosophy and theology. "Paris, to which each province had the right to send three students, became at once, and always remained, the most important centre of these *studia generalia*." The Franciscans likewise had their *studia particularia* in each province and their *studia generalia* for higher theological studies at the great university centres. These *studia generalia* of the mendicant orders were not autonomous or independent teaching centres, but formed part of the university organism in proportion as the theological faculty of the university recognized chairs of theology held by the regulars. In the same manner, the *magistri regentes* who happened to wear the religious habit, shared in the jealously guarded privileges of the faculties. The rivalry between the Franciscans and Dominicans stimulated the zeal of all. Other religious orders also fell in with the intellectual movement and obtained theological chairs: so much so indeed that in 1271 Roger Bacon could say — with a small stretch of imagination, no doubt — that for forty years the seculars had not composed a single treatise on theology or philosophy.

To the Dominicans chiefly, on account of the gigantic labours of St. Thomas and Albert the Great, — but to the Franciscans also in a lesser degree, — belongs the honour of carrying into execution the ambitious project of Gregory IX.: the correction of the works of Aristotle. In this way did the two great orders of St. Dominic and St. Francis contribute its peripatetic elements to scholasticism. Neither the Dominicans nor the Franciscans, however, followed out uniform, unchanging philosophical traditions. Apart altogether from the testimony of St. Bonaventure,

that the Friars Minors aimed at unctio rather than speculation — differing in this from the Friars Preachers, — the Franciscan school developed two decidedly different tendencies: (1) the *early philosophical line* marked out by Alexander of Hales, pursued by St. Bonaventure, and ending in a compromise between Aristotelian theories and theories inspired from other sources; (2) the *later direction*, towards purer peripateticism, initiated by Duns Scotus. This latter was the more influential current. Of secondary importance are the *naturalist* impulse due to Roger Bacon, and the *theosophic* tendency of Raymond Lully. What is known as the “terminist” movement appeared at a later period with William of Ockam and extended rapidly outside the Franciscan order. The earlier Dominicans first rallied to the body of doctrines then current, constituting the older scholasticism; but from the time of St. Thomas, they all, with a few exceptions, espoused one single philosophical tradition: that of scholastic peripateticism, as propounded by Albert the Great and St. Thomas.

Secular Colleges. The Sorbonne.

It was probably the recognized necessity of counterbalancing the influence of the regulars that first led to the erection of great colleges open to secular students only, and organized after the model of the convent schools. The most famous of those thirteenth-century colleges was the Sorbonne, founded in 1253 by ROBERT OF SORBON (1201-1274), chaplain to Louis IX. It admitted a certain number of theological students for the purpose of training them for preaching and scholastic controversy. They were bound to live in common, under the direction of a provisor. The masters called themselves — after the fashion of the mendicants — *pauperes magistri de Sorbona*. Among the writings left by Robert of Sorbon, the most remarkable are the *De Conscientia* and the *De Tribus Dietis*. The former deals with the last judgment, which the author compares with the licentiate examination: preserving from oblivion in this way many curious and interesting facts and theories on matters pedagogical. The latter treatise has for subject the roads that lead to Paradise.

The courses at the Sorbonne were closely connected with the teaching in the Faculty of Theology, for the Sorbonne disputations were not private exercises confined to the intern students, but were public and open to all.

Maurice de Wulf. *History of Medieval Philosophy*. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907.

© SophiaOmni, 2013. The specific electronic form of this text is copyright. Permission is granted to print out copies for educational purposes and for personal use only. No permission is granted for commercial use.