

## CURRENT THEOLOGY

### NOMINALISM AND LATE MEDIEVAL THOUGHT: A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY

Research trends on the thought of the late Middle Ages have seldom been the subject of a bulletin article. Generally one has had to ferret out the important literature from the *Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale* (which regrettably has run somewhat behind in its review of the secondary literature on medieval thought), the *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* (which briefly reviews the current periodical literature and maintains a sequential bulletin article on medieval doctrine), the bibliographies of individual authors which have appeared from time to time, or the various checklists available for medieval studies.<sup>1</sup> The only recent bibliographical survey that treats late medieval thought is Heiko Oberman, "Theologie des späten Mittelalters: Stand und Aufgaben der Forschung," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 91 (1966) 401-16. Oberman's article concentrates on the themes of Scripture and tradition, ecclesiology and conciliarism, and Gabriel Biel.

The difficulty in getting a synthetic overview of the research in this field has widened the gap, perhaps more than in any other area of medieval thought, between the standard view, as recorded in textbooks, and the discoveries and new interpretations that have marked the research of the last few decades. In a separate article I have compared the traditional interpretation with the newer assessments, and for a fuller treatment of the earlier literature and the revised view of William of

<sup>1</sup> The recent bulletin articles in the *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* (RSPT) that concern late medieval thought are: Louis-Jacques Bataillon, "Bulletin d'histoire des doctrines médiévales: VII: La fin du moyen âge," RSPT 47 (1963) 444-79; J. N. Walty, "Bulletin d'histoire des doctrines, XV<sup>e</sup>-XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles," RSPT 51 (1967) 461-81; Bataillon, "Bulletin d'histoire des doctrines médiévales: La période scholastique (XIII<sup>e</sup>-XV<sup>e</sup> s.)," RSPT 53 (1969) 707-43. Bibliographies of late medieval authors, where these exist, will be treated in the appropriate place in the following bulletin. Other useful bibliographies that are either general or concern pre-fourteenth-century authors are: Ermengildo Frascadore and Herwig Ooms, *Bibliografia delle bibliografie francescane* (Florence, 1964-65); Odulfus Schäfer, *Bibliographia de vita operibus et doctrina Iohannis Duns Scoti* (Rome, 1955). The most important checklists are: *Progress of Medieval and Renaissance Studies in the United States and Canada* (Boulder, Col.); *International Guide to Medieval Studies: A Quarterly Index to Periodical Literature* (Darien, Conn.); *Quarterly Check-List of Mediaevalia: An International Index of Current Books, Monographs, Brochures, and Separates* (Darien, Conn.); *International Medieval Bibliography* (Leeds, Eng.); *Répertoire bibliographique de la philosophie* (Louvain). Future issues of the *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* will, along with other topics, contain a checklist for late medieval thought. Future projects as well as completed ones are listed in *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* (Louvain).

Ockham the reader is directed to that study.<sup>2</sup> The purpose of the present article is to survey in more detail the new approaches taken toward the theology and philosophy of the late medieval period. In order to stay within a manageable length, there are several important areas of late medieval thought that will receive little or no attention. Most of these deserve and have often received separate treatment, e.g., Renaissance thought, fourteenth-century science, conciliarism and late medieval political thought, mysticism, hermeneutics and preaching, Mariology, and heterodox movements. The works that will be discussed are, of course, selected and in no sense represent the total available literature.

#### NEW STIMULI FOR RESEARCH

Although the study of late medieval thought is as old as the field of medieval intellectual history, it has not received as much attention as earlier periods, and interest in it has frequently been distorted by the polemical concerns of both Protestants and Catholics.<sup>3</sup> In the last generation, however, the field has attracted the attention of historians of philosophy and science, and even those whose interests lie in the area of theology have shown more caution and care in analyzing and evaluating the sources.

There are many things that have stimulated this renewed and broadened interest in the late medieval period. The abundance of source materials, vastly greater than in earlier periods, now seems to excite rather than terrify the would-be student. The reading rooms of manuscript libraries have become more popular places, and the availability of microfilming has accelerated research and made it possible to bring to one location the combined resources of multiple European archives. Apart from what the individual scholar can collect for his own immediate needs, there have been large filming projects, such as the Vatican manuscripts at the Vatican Film Library of St. Louis University, the manuscripts of the Ambrosiana in Milan at the Medieval Institute of Notre Dame University, and the manuscripts of the Austrian monastic libraries at St. John's College in Collegeville, Minnesota. Moreover, the photographic reprint process has placed those works that were fortunate enough to be preserved in early printed editions on a library shelf near the working scholar. The Franciscan Institute at St. Bonaventure, N.Y.,

<sup>2</sup> William J. Courtenay, "Nominalism and Late Medieval Religion," to be published among the papers from the Conference on Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion (Ann Arbor, 1972) in *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought* (Tübingen), due to appear in 1973.

<sup>3</sup> This is even true of scholars, such as Francis Ehrle and Constantine Michalski, who had a firsthand knowledge of many of the manuscript sources. For the relevant work of Ehrle and Michalski, see the article referred to in the previous footnote.

took an early lead in this production, but they have subsequently been surpassed by the numerous offerings of Gregg Press in London and Minerva Press in Frankfurt.

Several institutes devoted to the study of particular aspects of late medieval thought have encouraged research and have published the results. Among these are the Franciscan Institute, which has maintained publication series for texts and studies in the philosophy and theology of the period; the Augustinian Historical Institute in New York, which has produced text editions and monographs under the series title *Cassiciacum*; and the Institut für Spätmittelalter und Reformation in Tübingen, which, under the direction of Heiko Oberman, has been publishing the series *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought*. The Société internationale pour l'étude de la philosophie médiévale (Louvain) has, through the international congresses it has convoked and through the publication of the *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale*, provided channels of communication for the scholars working in this field.

#### THE CHANGING MEANING OF NOMINALISM

Until the last generation the term "nominalism," when applied to late medieval thought, had a commonly accepted meaning. In the narrow sense it referred to the philosophical position that denied to universals any extramental existence and substituted for the idea of a common nature an atomistic world of particulars, or individuals. In the broader sense it referred to a system of thought, derived from this epistemological and ontological rejection of universals, that destroyed metaphysics and made the doctrines and moral principles of theology dependent solely on the omnipotent and arbitrary will of God. The leading nominalist of the period was William of Ockham, and since his followers dominated the universities of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the scholastic thought of this period has often been termed nominalist.

The meaning and application of the term "nominalism" has today become a subject of debate that is far from being resolved. Part of the problem arises from the fact that "nominalist" has been a pejorative as well as a descriptive term, and the intensive research on late medieval thinkers conducted across the past few decades has found the value judgment unacceptable and the traditional description questionable for one reason or another.

Some historians have continued to believe that nominalists in the traditional sense did exist despite the fact that those whom they have studied do not conform to the older definition. Albert Lang, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta* (Münster, 1937), maintained that Oyta was only half a nominalist, because he followed Ockham in philosophy and Thomas in

theology. Philotheus Boehner, who piloted a re-evaluation of Ockham, argued that Ockham was not a nominalist in either philosophy or theology. In a series of studies, posthumously republished as *Collected Articles on Ockham* (St. Bonaventure, 1958), he suggested that Ockham might better be considered a realistic conceptualist, since he believed that universal terms refer to concepts that exist apart from the language through which they are expressed, and that these concepts, in turn, refer to similarities among existing individuals that are real and experienced. In like manner, Boehner attempted to show the conservative and constructive nature of Ockham's ideas in theology and political thought. For Boehner, the radical nominalists were to be found among some of Ockham's disciples (for whom he was not responsible), such as Robert Holcot. More recently, Damasus Trapp has argued that another famous nominalist, Gregory of Rimini, was rather the standard-bearer against the nominalists.<sup>4</sup>

With the declining enrollment within the nominalist school, some historians have begun to question the appropriateness of the label "nominalist" when applied to Ockham or other fourteenth-century thinkers. Erich Hochstetter, "Nominalismus?" *Franciscan Studies* 9 (1949) 370-403, suggested that the term should be discarded, especially for Ockham. Both he and Trapp noted that the label was introduced later by the opponents of the followers of Ockham and may therefore be suspect. Trapp has preferred to use the terms *moderni* and "modernists" to distinguish the constructive and destructive elements within late medieval thought.<sup>5</sup>

A different approach to nominalism has been taken by other scholars. While still insisting that nominalism is an entire system, a particular approach to reality, they have taken it to be principally a name that identifies the thought of William of Ockham and his most prominent followers, Pierre d'Ailly and Gabriel Biel. When faced with the conflict between the traditional meaning of nominalism and the newer assessment of Ockham and others, these scholars have chosen to alter the definition of nominalism rather than suggest that the term is inappropri-

<sup>4</sup> Among Damasus Trapp's numerous articles, those that sketch out this thesis are: "Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century: Notes on Editions, Marginalia, Opinions and Book-Lore," *Augustiniana* 6 (1956) 146-274; "Peter Ceffons of Clairvaux," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 24 (1957) 101-54; "Gregory of Rimini Manuscripts: Editions and Additions," *Augustiniana* 8 (1958) 425-43; "Gregory de Rimini y el nominalismo," *Augustinianum* 4 (1964) 5-20.

<sup>5</sup> In particular see: "Augustinian Theology"; "Peter Ceffons"; "Clm 27034: Unchristened Nominalism and Wycliffite Realism at Prague in 1381," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 24 (1957) 320-60; "'Modern' and 'Modernists' in MS Fribourg Cordeliers 26," *Augustinianum* 5 (1965) 241-70.

ate to these figures. This approach now has a long and respectable history. One finds it in Paul Vignaux, "Nominalisme," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, 11/1 (Paris, 1930) cols. 717-84; "Occam," *ibid.*, cols. 876-89; and *Nominalisme au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Montreal, 1948). It is also found in Heiko Oberman, "Some Notes on the Theology of Nominalism with Attention to its Relation to the Renaissance," *Harvard Theological Review* 53 (1960) 47-76, and *The Harvest of Medieval Theology* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963).

Among those responsible for the revision in the understanding of late medieval thought there are two scholars who, for different reasons, have retained the label "nominalist" in describing the thought of Ockham and others. For E. A. Moody, nominalism is essentially the application of logical analysis to philosophical and theological problems in such a way that they become problems about "the meaning and reference of terms and the truth conditions of sentences."<sup>6</sup> In metaphysics this resulted in the elimination of intensional entities that exist apart from concrete particulars. Ockham's repudiation of the idea of a "common nature" which inheres in things of the same species was a major result of this linguistic analysis. Thus nominalism was a philosophy of language, and as a method it came to be known as the *via moderna*. As used by Moody in this strict philosophical sense, nominalism was one of the more important aspects of Ockham's thought, but it does not explain or dictate Ockham's positions in theology and political thought. Nominalism was and is a philosophical position (in epistemology and metaphysics) and a method; it was not a "school." Moreover, one could be more or less nominalistic depending on how far one carried the rejection of common natures. Moody has suggested that Ockham's nominalism may have been "restricted to the first-order language of physical objects."<sup>7</sup>

Heiko Oberman has defended the position that nominalism was as much a theology as a philosophy, if not more so. Indeed, it was not so much the method of linguistic analysis that characterized nominalism as it was the dialectic of the two powers of God applied to a series of philosophical and theological problems, especially the atonement, justification and sanctification, natural law and ethics. One can therefore identify the nominalist as the one who applies this dialectic, with its twofold stress on the omnipotence of God and the stability and dependability of

<sup>6</sup>E. A. Moody, "Buridan and a Dilemma of Nominalism," in *H. A. Wolfson Jubilee Volume 2* (Jerusalem, 1965) 577. See also "A Quodlibetal Question of Robert Holkot, O.P., on the Problem of the Objects of Knowledge and of Belief," *Speculum* 39 (1964) 53-74; "Ockhamism," *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* 5 (New York, 1968) 533-34; "William of Ockham," *ibid.* 8 (New York, 1968) 306-17.

<sup>7</sup>"A Quodlibetal Question," p. 74.

the created order, to various problems in theology and (to a lesser degree) philosophy.

Although not all scholars are willing to define nominalism in terms of the dialectic of the two powers, an increasing number share with Oberman his belief that the dialectic of the two powers and, behind it, a particular understanding of covenant and contingency is an important key to the thought of Ockham and many of his followers—perhaps ultimately more significant than the approach to language, although both aspects can certainly be found in Ockham, d'Ailly, and Biel. Recent discussions of the "covenantal" theme of late medieval thought include: Heiko Oberman, "Wir sein pettler. Hoc est verum: Bund und Gnade in der Theologie des Mittelalters und der Reformation," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 78 (1967) 232-52; Martin Greschat, "Der Bundesgedanke in der Theologie des späten Mittelalters," *ibid.* 81 (1970) 44-63; William J. Courtenay, "Covenant and Causality in Pierre d'Ailly," *Speculum* 46 (1971) 94-119; "The King and the Leadin Coin: The Economic Background of *Sine qua non* Causality," *Traditio* 28 (1972) 185-209; Steven Ozment, "Mysticism, Nominalism and Dissent," to be published among the papers from the Conference on Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion (Ann Arbor, 1972) in *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought* (Tübingen), due to appear in 1973.

Not all works that have recently appeared show the signs of the revision in late medieval studies. The traditional assessment can still be found, relatively undisturbed, in Ramón M. Torelló, "El Ockhamismo y la decadencia escolástica en el siglo XIV," *Pensamiento* 9 (1953) 199-228; 11 (1955) 171-88, 259-83; Juan Roig Gironella, "Para la historia del nominalismo y de la reacción antinominalista de Suárez," *ibid.* 17 (1961) 279-310; Karl Anton Sprengard, *Systematische-historische Untersuchungen zur philosophie des XIV. Jahrhunderts* (2 vols.; Bonn, 1967-68).

#### WILLIAM OF OCKHAM

In the history of philosophy Ockham is generally approached by way of his two most prominent "forerunners," Durand of St. Pourçain and Peter Aureol. Little that has altered our understanding of Durand and Aureol has appeared in recent years. The major interpretive studies still remain Johannes Koch, *Durandus de S. Porciano O.P.: Forschungen zum Streit um Thomas von Aquin zu Beginn des 14. Jahrhunderts 1: Literargeschichtliche Grundlegung* (Münster, 1927); R. Dreiling, *Der Konzeptualismus in der Universalienlehre des Franziskanerbischofs Petrus Aureoli* (Münster, 1913); Paul Vignaux, *Justification et prédestination au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle: Duns Scot, Pierre d'Auriol et Grégoire de*

*Rimini* (Paris, 1934); and R. Schmücker, *Propositio per se nota, Gottesbeweis und ihr Verhältnis nach Petrus Aureoli* (Werl, 1941).

The picture of the relationship between these thinkers and Ockham has, however, undergone some revision. Philotheus Boehner has pointed to areas in which Ockham and Aureol were not in agreement: "The Text Tradition of Ockham's *Ordinatio*," *New Scholasticism* 16 (1942) 203-41. Recently Kenneth Plotnick, *Hervaeus Natalis OP and the Controversies over the Real Presence and Transubstantiation* (Munich, 1970), has suggested some areas of Eucharistic thought in which Ockham and Durand were in opposition. For further discussion see my review of Plotnik's work in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 40 (1972) 256-58. More changes may be forthcoming now that the texts of these two authors have become more accessible. The Franciscan Institute has published a critical edition of the first part of Aureol's Commentary on the *Sentences: Scriptum super primum Sententiarum* 1 & 2 (St. Bonaventure, 1953-56). The Vatican Film Library in St. Louis has made available, through its "Manuscripta" series, a microfilm copy of the entire *Sentences* Commentary of Aureol. In 1964 Gregg Press reprinted in photocopy the *Sentences* Commentary of Durand from the edition of Venice, 1571.

In contrast to Durand and Aureol, Ockham seems to be of perennial interest to a wide group of scholars, and the recent literature on him is abundant. The groundwork for the revision in Ockham studies, and thus the foundation for the more recent literature, can be found in the works of Erich Hochstetter, especially his *Studien zur Metaphysik und Erkenntnislehre Wilhelms von Ockham* (Berlin, 1927), and the articles of Paul Vignaux, Philotheus Boehner, and E. A. Moody referred to earlier. Occasionally, whole issues of journals have been given over to studies on Ockham, such as the 1950 issue of *Franziskanische Studien*. Similarly, Ockham was one of the main themes of the III Convegno dei lettori di filosofia italiani, meeting at the Apostolic Institute in Castel Fogliani in 1954, and those papers were published in *Studi francescani* 52 (1955) 169-215.

Several helpful bibliographies have made this literature more accessible: Valens Heynck, "Ockham-Literatur 1919-1949," *Franziskanische Studien* 32 (1950) 164-83; J. P. Reilly, "Ockham Bibliography: 1950-1967," *Franciscan Studies* 28 (1968) 197-214; and the annotated bibliography of Alessandro Ghisalberti, "Bibliografia su Guglielmo di Occam dal 1950-1968," *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* 61 (1969) 273-84, 545-71.

The early stages of this literature and the revised picture of Ockham have been surveyed several times: Erich Hochstetter, "Ockham-

Forschung in Italien," *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 1 (1947) 559–78; Philotheus Boehner, "Ockham's Philosophy in the Light of Recent Research," *Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of Philosophy* (Amsterdam, 1949) pp. 1113–16, and "Der Stand der Ockham-Forschung," *Franziskanische Studien* 34 (1952) 12–31, both reprinted in *Collected Articles*; Timotheus Barth, "Wilhelm Ockham im Lichte der neuesten Forschung," *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 60 (1950) 464–67, and "Nuove interpretazioni della filosofia di Occam," *Studi francescani* 52 (1955) 187–204. Most of these studies have been surpassed by the thorough work of Helmar Junghans, *Ockham im Lichte der neueren Forschung* ("Arbeiten zur Geschichte und Theologie des Luthertums," no. 21; Berlin, 1968).

Given the abundance of recent literature on Ockham, one can mention only the most important trends and contributions. The first area that has attracted attention is the establishing of an accurate chronology of the life and writings of Ockham. Much of the early work on this was done by Boehner and can be found in his *Collected Articles*. Equally important in this regard is Léon Baudry, *Guillaume d'Occam, Sa vie, ses oeuvres, ses idées sociales et politiques 1: L'homme et les oeuvres* (Paris, 1950). This task now seems to be complete, thanks to the painstaking research of Charles K. Brampton.<sup>8</sup>

There have been several general works since 1949 that have further documented various aspects of the revised picture of Ockham: Gottfried Martin, *Wilhelm von Ockham: Untersuchungen zur Ontologie der Ordnungen* (Berlin, 1949); Damascene Webering, *Theory of Demonstration according to William Ockham* (St. Bonaventure, 1953), which covers much more than the title would suggest; Oswald Fuchs, *The Psychology of Habit according to William Ockham* (St. Bonaventure, 1952); and Jürgen Miethke, *Ockham Weg zur Sozialphilosophie* (Berlin, 1969).

Ockham's theory of knowledge and its relation to our knowledge of God has long been an important topic in Ockham studies. Two early but still important works on this subject were products of the Franciscan Institute: Sebastian J. Day, *Intuitive Cognition: A Key to the Significance of the Later Scholastics* (St. Bonaventure, 1947), and Matthew C. Menges, *The Concept of Univocity regarding the Predication of God and Creature according to William of Ockham* (St. Bonaventure, 1952). In recent years these topics have been reopened. The relation of the teaching on intuitive cognition in Duns Scotus and Ockham has been re-examined by Charles K. Brampton, "Scotus, Ockham and the Theory of Intuitive Cognition," *Antonianum* 40 (1965) 449–66. A further exami-

<sup>8</sup> The full list of Brampton's articles is given in the bibliographies of Reilly and Ghisalberti cited above.



nation of the sources and limitations on our knowledge of God according to Ockham has been provided by Léon Baudry, "Guillaume d'Occam: Critique des preuves scotistes de l'unicité de Dieu," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 20 (1953) 99-112; "Les rapports de la raison et de la foi selon Guillaume d'Occam," *ibid.* 29 (1962) 33-92; Alessandro Ghisalberti, "Il Dio dei filosofi secondo Guglielmo di Occam; fede e ragione," *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* 62 (1970) 272-90. Gordon Leff, a prolific writer on fourteenth-century topics, has given a foretaste of his forthcoming book on Ockham by treating this topic in his "Ockham, Knowledge and Its Relation to the Status of Theology," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 20 (1969) 7-17. On Ockham's ontology, Gustav Bergmann briefly engaged E. A. Moody over the proper interpretation; see Bergmann, "Some Remarks on the Ontology of Ockham," *Philosophical Review* 63 (1954) 560-71, and Moody's reply, "Comment: Some Remarks on the Ontology of Ockham," *ibid.*, pp. 572-76.

The controversy between Boehner and Anton Pegis over Ockham's theory of intuitive cognition of nonexistents, which seemingly had been resolved in Boehner's favor, has flared up again.<sup>9</sup> The problem has been independently pursued by R. C. Richards, "Ockham and Skepticism," *New Scholasticism* 42 (1968) 345-63; T. K. Scott, "Ockham on Evidence, Necessity, and Intuition," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 7 (1969) 27-49; Marilyn M. Adams, "Intuitive Cognition, Certainty, and Skepticism in William Ockham," *Traditio* 26 (1970) 389-98. While all three scholars accept the general conclusions of Boehner, they also feel that Ockham's solution is not satisfactory from a philosophical point of view.

In a similar way the question of Ockham's theory of relation has been revived. Initially the problem was treated by P. Doncoeur, "Le nominalisme de Guillaume d'Occam: La théorie de la relation," *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie* 23 (1921) 5-25, and Léon Baudry, "A propos de la théorie occamiste de la relation," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 9 (1934) 199-203. In contrast to Doncoeur, who argued that relation for Ockham was only a *res rationis*, an intellectual relation, Gottfried Martin, "Ist Ockhams Relationstheorie Nominalismus?" *Franziskanische Studien* 32 (1950) 31-49, maintained that Ockham made a distinction between two types of relation, one real and one intellectual, and that both were valid. Recently Hermann Greive, "Zur Relationslehre Wilhelms von Ockham," *Franziskanische Studien* 49 (1967) 248-58, has tried to show that these two theses are not incompatible.

<sup>9</sup> Philotheus Boehner, "The Notitia Intuitiva of Non-Existents according to William Ockham," *Traditio* 1 (1943) 223-75; Anton Pegis, "Concerning William of Ockham," *ibid.* 2 (1944) 465-80; Ph. Boehner, "In propria causa," *Franciscan Studies* 5 (1945) 37-54.

Ockham's view of nature and natural causality, touched on earlier in the works of Hochstetter and Webering, has received further discussion lately. Francesco Corvino, who has rendered noble service to the field by editing so many of Ockham's unpublished texts, has examined Ockham's use of the term *natura*, "Il significato del termine natura nelle opere filosofiche di Occam," in *La filosofia della natura nel medioevo* (Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di filosofia medioevale; Milan, 1966) pp. 605-15. Ockham's view of nature in relation to divine causality has been examined by William J. Courtenay, "The Critique on Natural Causality in the Mutakallimun and Nominalism," *Harvard Theological Review* 66 (1973).

The question of Ockham's understanding of divine omnipotence in relation to possibility and causality has been and will increasingly be an important area of Ockham's thought. Allan Wolter, "Ockham and the Textbooks: On the Origin of Possibility," *Franziskanische Studien* 32 (1950) 70-96, has argued that Ockham's teaching was sound and basically in conformity with the thought of Aquinas. Not surprisingly, Franz Pelster, "Die Lehre Ockhams von Grund der Möglichkeit der Possibilitäten," *Scholastik* 28 (1953) 405-7, remained unconvinced. An interesting contribution to the discussion has been given by Marie Anne Pernoud, "Innovation in William of Ockham's References to the 'Potentia Dei,'" *Antonianum* 45 (1970) 65-97.

The theology of Ockham has by no means been ignored. In addition to the works cited above that have theological implication, the most rewarding perspectives have been opened up by Erich Hochstetter, "Viator Mundi: Einige Bemerkungen zur Situation des Menschen bei Wilhelm von Ockham," *Franziskanische Studien* 32 (1950) 1-20, and Wilhelm Kölmel, "Die Freiheit des Menschen bei Wilhelm Ockham," *Beilage zur Festschrift der Lessingschule* (Mannheim, 1952); "Wilhelm Ockham: Der Mensch zwischen Ordnung und Freiheit," *Beiträge zum Berufsbewusstsein des mittelalterlichen Menschen* (Miscellanea mediævalia, no. 3; Berlin, 1964) pp. 204-24.

In the continuation to his study of Duns Scotus' doctrine of *acceptatio divina*, Werner Dettloff, *Die Entwicklung der Akzeptations- und Verdienstlehre von Duns Scotus bis Luther mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Franziskanertheologen* (Münster, 1963), has treated Ockham's doctrine of justification. A related theme has been examined by Giuseppe Barbaglio, *Fede acquisita e fede infusa secondo Duns Scoto, Occam et Biel* (Brescia, 1968). Ockham's views on justification were also the subject of Erwin Iserloh's *Gnade und Eucharistie in der philosophischen Theologie des Wilhelm von Ockham: Ihre Bedeutung für die Ursachen der Reformation* (Wiesbaden, 1956), which, unlike Dettloff's later work, finds Ockham's doctrine subversive. Earlier, the Eucharistic

thought of Ockham had been defended by Gabriel N. Buescher, *The Eucharistic Teaching of William of Ockham* (St. Bonaventure, 1950).

As with so many other areas of late medieval thought, the research on Ockham has been facilitated and improved by the greater accessibility of the sources. Most of the works of Ockham are now available either in photographic reprint or in modern critical edition. Particularly noteworthy in this regard is the appearance of the critical edition of Ockham's Commentary on the *Sentences*, *Opera philosophica et theologica. Opera theologica: Scriptum in librum primum Sententiarum ordinatio* (St. Bonaventure, 1967 ff.)

#### OCKHAMISM

One of the most heated areas of scholarly debate in the late medieval field is in the description of the development of post-Ockhamist thought—in particular, Ockham's relation to the so-called radical nominalists, Nicholas of Autrecourt and John of Mirecourt. The debate on this issue begins with the immediate disciples and critics of Ockham.

We know considerably more today about some of the earliest critics of Ockham: John Lutterell, John of Reading, Walter Chatton, and Walter Burley. The important texts along with an interpretive study of Lutterell have been published by Fritz Hoffmann, *Die Schriften des Oxforder Kanzlers Johannes Lutterell: Texte zur Theologie des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1959). The only study of John of Reading remains that of E. Longpré, "Jean de Reading et le Bx Jean Duns Scot: L'école franciscaine d'Oxford au début du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle," *La France franciscaine* 7 (1924) 99–109. Recently, however, a number of important texts have been published that cast considerable light on the relationship of Reading and Ockham: Stephen Brown, "Sources for Ockham's Prologue to the *Sentences*," *Franciscan Studies* 26 (1966) 36–51; Gideon Gál, "Quaestio Ioannis de Reading De necessitate specierum intelligibilium: Defensio doctrinae Scoti," *Franciscan Studies* 29 (1969) 66–156; and Stephen Brown and Gideon Gál, in the introduction to William of Ockham, *Opera philosophica et theologica: Opera theologica* 2 (St. Bonaventure, 1970).

Of these two critiques on Ockham, that of Lutterell seems to be highly conservative and possibly motivated by personal hostility; that of Reading is a more reasoned defense of Scotistic thought, which had come under attack by Ockham. Walter Chatton, the third critic, seems to have been more gifted than the first two, and his arguments are rapidly becoming available to us through the publication of his texts. The first two questions of the prologue of his *Sentences Commentary* have

now been published: Maria Elena Reina, "La prima questione del prologo del 'Commento alle Sentenze' di Walter Catton," *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 25 (1970), 48-74, 290-314; Jeremiah O'Callaghan, "The Second Question of the Prologue to Walter Catton's Commentary on the Sentences: On Intuitive and Abstractive Knowledge," in J. R. O'Donnell, ed., *Nine Mediaeval Thinkers* (Toronto, 1955). In addition, Gideon Gál has published the second question of the third distinction of Chatton's *Reportatio I*, "Gualteri de Chatton et Guillelmi de Ockham Controversia de natura conceptus universalis," *Franciscan Studies* 27 (1967) 191-212.<sup>10</sup> The important studies on Chatton are: E. Longpré, "Gualterio di Chatton: Un maestro francescano d'Oxford," *Studi francescani* 9 (1923) 101-14; Léon Baudry, "Gauthier de Chatton et son Commentaire des Sentences," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 14 (1943-45) 337-69; Johann Auer, "Die 'skotistische' Lehre von der Heilsgewissheit: Walter von Chatton, der erste 'Skotist,'" *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 15 (1952) 1-19; Charles K. Brampton, "Gauthier de Chatton et la provenance des mss. lat. Paris Bibl. Nat. 15886 et 15887," *Etudes franciscaines* 13 (1963) 200-205; E. A. Moody, "A Quodlibetal Question of Robert Holkot, O.P., on the Problem of the Objects of Knowledge and of Belief," *Speculum* 39 (1964) 53-74. The only work on Burley's critique of Ockham remains Léon Baudry, "Les rapports de Guillaume d'Occam et de Walter Burleigh," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 9 (1934) 155-73.

There were several issues on which Chatton placed himself at odds with Ockham and his followers, and these issues have been examined in part in the literature cited: the object of knowledge and belief (Moody); the problem of quantity and continuum (Murdoch and Synan); the nature of universals (Gál); and the Eucharist (Brampton). In most of these cases, the defenders of the Ockhamist position against Chatton were Adam Wodham and Robert Holcot. Much of the literature on Chatton, therefore, concerns Wodham and Holcot as well.

Only three issues in Wodham have received study recently. Dettloff, in his work on the development of the *acceptatio divina*, examined Wodham and found that his view of justification closely paralleled Ockham's. Murdoch has shown, in the work cited above, that Wodham was attacking the atomism of Chatton. Thomas Mitchell, *Medieval Discussions of Quantity and the Development of Eucharistic Thought with Special Concentration on the Ockhamist Tradition* (unpublished mas-

<sup>10</sup> See also the texts published by John Murdoch and Edward Synan, "Two Questions on the Continuum: Walter Chatton (?), O.F.M., and Adam Wodeham, O.F.M.," *Franciscan Studies* 26 (1966) 212-88.

ter's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1971), has pointed to the more conservative tone of Wodham's defense of Ockham's Eucharistic thought.

Robert Holcot, the second of the two "disciples" of Ockham, has been seen as a critic of the Scotist Chatton and of the nominalist Crathorn. Once considered a close disciple of Ockham, Holcot was cast as an extreme nominalist in the scholarly literature of the period from 1944 to 1964. As Ockham came to be considered more traditional, Holcot was thought to be more radical and was credited with the authorship of the infamous *Centiloquium* by Philotheus Boehner, "The Medieval Crisis of Logic and the Author of the Centiloquium Attributed to Ockham," *Franciscan Studies* 4 (1944) 151-70. This view was shared by Erich Hochstetter, "Nominalismus?" *Franciscan Studies* 9 (1949) 370-403, and Beryl Smalley, "Robert Holcot, OP," *Archivum Fratrum praedicatorum* 26 (1956) 5-97. E. A. Moody, "A Quodlibetal Question of Robert Holcot, O.P., on the Problem of the Objects of Knowledge and of Belief," *Speculum* 39 (1964) 53-74, not only contrasted the positions of Holcot and Chatton, but also suggested that Holcot was a more thoroughgoing nominalist than was Ockham.

In the more recent literature Holcot seems less extreme. The charges of skepticism and fideism made in the earlier literature have been considerably dispelled by Oberman, "Facientibus quod in se est Deus non denegat gratiam: Robert Holcot, O.P., and the Beginnings of Luther's Theology," *Harvard Theological Review* 55 (1962) 317-42. Paolo Molteni, *Roberto Holcot O.P. dottrina della grazia e della giustificazione con due questioni quodlibetali inedite* (Pinerolo, 1968), supports Oberman's findings, although Molteni's interpretation of Holcot's views outside the area of justification and grace are still wedded to the older viewpoint.

Most of the attention in Holcot research today, however, is given over to the problems of logic, epistemology, and metaphysics, as the article by Moody already suggests. Within this context, Holcot is seen in battle against both Chatton and Crathorn. The important contributions to this discussion are: Mario Dal Pra, "Linguaggio e conoscenza assertiva nel pensiero di Robert Holcot," *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 9 (1956) 15-40; Fritz Hoffmann, "Robert Holcot: Die Logik in der Theologie," in *Die Metaphysik im Mittelalter* (Acts of the 2nd International Congress of Medieval Philosophy; Berlin, 1963) pp. 624-39; "Der Satz als Zeichen der theologischen Aussage bei Holcot, Crathorn und Gregor von Rimini," in *Der Begriff der Repraesentatio im Mittelalter: Stellvertretung, Symbol, Zeichen, Bild* (Miscellanea mediaevalia 8; Berlin, 1971) pp. 296-313; Henrich Schepers, "Holcot contra dicta Crathorn,"

*Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1970) 320–54; 79 (1972) 106–36. For an evaluation of another recent contribution to the Holcot-Crathorn debate, Karl Anton Sprengard, *Systematische-historische Untersuchungen zur Philosophie des XIV. Jahrhunderts* (2 vols.; Bonn, 1967–68), see H. Schepers's review, *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 76 (1969) 395–400.

If the extremist appellations that were once applied to Wodham and Holcot are now being modified, their Parisian counterparts, Nicholas of Autrecourt and John of Mirecourt, have only in the last two years begun to be re-examined in light of our newer knowledge. From 1947 until 1970 the best evidence seemed to suggest that there was little relation between the moderate and orthodox theologian Ockham and the radical Autrecourt. E. A. Moody, "Ockham, Buridan, and Nicholas of Autrecourt," *Franciscan Studies* 7 (1947) 113–46, argued that the positions of Ockham and Autrecourt were opposed. The Parisian decree of 1339 did not condemn Ockham but only prevented his being taught to the exclusion of other writers. The decree of 1340, by contrast, was directed against Autrecourt. Moody supported this thesis by contrasting in detail the thought of the two men and by pointing out that Bernard of Arezzo and John Buridan, the two leading opponents of Autrecourt, were faithful disciples of Ockham. Erich Hochstetter, "Nominalismus," accepted that thesis, and from 1950 on it seemed to meet with general approval.

Recently, however, Moody's argument has been attacked with the intent of showing a closer tie between the thought of Ockham and Autrecourt. T. K. Scott, "Nicholas of Autrecourt, Buridan, and Ockhamism," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 9 (1971) 15–41, has attempted to show that the seeds of Autrecourt's position were already in Ockham. Similarly, the Ockhamism of Buridan has been questioned by Scott.<sup>11</sup> An exhaustive analysis of the 1340 document by Ruprecht Paqué, *Das Pariser Nominalistenstatut zur Entstehung des Realitätsbegriffs der neuzeitlichen Naturwissenschaft (Occam, Buridan und Petrus Hispanus, Nikolaus von Autrecourt und Gregor von Rimini)* (Berlin, 1970), purports to show that Ockham, not Autrecourt, was the object of the condemnation of 1340.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> For a discussion of Buridan's nominalism, see: T. K. Scott, "John Buridan on the Objects of Demonstrative Science," *Speculum* 40 (1965) 654–73; J. J. Walsh, "Nominalism and the Ethics: Some Remarks about Buridan's Commentary," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 4 (1966) 1–13; T. K. Scott, "Nicholas of Autrecourt, Buridan and Ockhamism," *ibid.* 9 (1971) 15–41. Also significant are: M. E. Reina, "Il problema del linguaggio in Buridano," *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 14 (1959) 367–417; 15 (1960) 141–65, 238–64; L. Kuksewicz, "Deux 'Quaestiones de universali' de Jean Buridan," *Bulletin société internationale pour l'étude de la philosophie médiévale* 4 (1962) 126–29.

<sup>12</sup> Important additions to the understanding of Autrecourt's thought by Mario Dal Pra, "La fondazione dell'empirismo e le sue apone nel pensiero di Nicola di Autrecourt,"

Our view of the other Parisian nominalist, John of Mirecourt, may soon be modified to a considerable extent. Dettloff, *Die Entwicklung* . . . , in examining the views of Mirecourt on grace and justification, found nothing out of keeping with Ockham's thought, and he therefore concluded that Mirecourt's radicalism must lie in some other area. Roy Van Neste, *The Epistemology of John of Mirecourt in Relation to Fourteenth Century Thought* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1972), discovered that Mirecourt's epistemology had little in common with Autrecourt and instead followed the outline of Ockham's theory of knowledge. Moreover, Mirecourt rejected intuitive cognition of a nonexistent, thus increasing empirical certitude at the expense of possibly incurring the anger of the Ockhamists. In my "John of Mirecourt and Gregory of Rimini on Whether God Can Undo the Past," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 39 (1972), I argue that Mirecourt was far more conservative on the issue of divine omnipotence than the condemnation of 1347 would lead us to believe.

#### AUGUSTINIANS AND CISTERCIANS

One of the most expanding research areas on late medieval thought concerns the theologians of the Augustinian order and the Cistercians who seem to have been intellectually related to them. Much work has been done on the educational background of these theologians. Of special note are the works of Eelcko Ypma, *La formation des professeurs chez les Ermites de saint-Augustin de 1256 à 1354* (Paris, 1956); "Notice sur le 'Studium' de Paris au cours de la deuxième moitié du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Augustiniana* 17 (1967) 14-36; "Notice sur le 'Studium' de Paris au début du schisme d'Occident," *Augustiniana* 18 (1968) 82-99; Adolar Zumkeller, "Die Augustinerschule des Mittelalters: Vertreter und philosophisch-theologische Lehre," *Analecta Augustiniana* 27 (1964) 167-262; *Manuskripte von Werken der Autoren des Augustiner-Eremitenordens in mitteleuropäischen Bibliotheken* (Würzburg, 1966).

Among those who have contributed to our better understanding of fourteenth-century Augustinianism, the most important contributions have been those of Damasus Trapp and Adolar Zumkeller. Trapp's extensive study of the theologians in the Augustinian order, "Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century: Notes on Editions, Marginalia, Opinions and Book-Lore," *Augustiniana* 6 (1956) 146-274, has surveyed the field

---

*Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 7 (1952) 389-402, and Piotr Chojnacki, "Les facteurs et les limites de la connaissance humaine d'après la critique d'Occam et de Nicolas d'Autrecourt," in *L'homme et son destin d'après les penseurs du moyen âge* (Actes du premier Congrès international de philosophie médiévale; Louvain, 1960) pp. 680-87.

and marked out the nature of the work to be done. In a series of additional articles Trapp has concentrated on individual authors: "Hiltalinger's Augustinian Quotations," *Augustiniana* 4 (1954) 412-49; "Gregory of Rimini Manuscripts: Editions and Additions," *Augustiniana* 8 (1958) 425-43; "New Approaches to Gregory of Rimini," *Augustinianum* 2 (1962) 115-30; "Gregorio de Rimini y el nominalismo," *ibid.* 4 (1964) 5-20; "Notes on John Klenkok, OSA (d. 1374)," *ibid.*, pp. 358-404. Trapp's position on nominalism, already referred to earlier and contained in the above articles, has recently been expanded in "Modern' and 'Modernists' in MS Fribourg Cordeliers 26," *Augustinianum* 5 (1965) 241-70.

A thesis that runs through many of Trapp's articles is that Gregory of Rimini, far from being a nominalist, was the standard-bearer against the nominalists because he played an important role in the condemnation of John of Mirecourt. I have recently questioned the validity of that thesis in the article on John of Mirecourt and Gregory of Rimini referred to above.

The second historian who has made a major contribution to our knowledge of fourteenth-century Augustinian theologians is Adolar Zumkeller. In particular, Zumkeller has provided a series of studies on Hugolino Malbrache of Orvieto, one of the most conservative Augustinians of the period: *Hugolin von Orvieto und seine theologische Erkenntnislehre* (Würzburg, 1941); "Hugolin von Orvieto (d. 1373) über Urstand und Erbsunde," *Augustiniana* 3 (1953) 35-62, 165-93; 4 (1954) 25-46; "Hugolin von Orvieto über Prädestination, Rechtfertigung und Verdienst," *ibid.* 4 (1954) 109-56; 5 (1955) 5-51.

Both Trapp and Zumkeller have pointed to contacts and similarities between Augustinian and Cistercian theologians in the fourteenth century. One of the more striking proofs of this affinity lies in the number of times theologians of these two religious orders based their Commentaries on the *Sentences* on the structure and content of a Commentary from the other order. Gottschalk of Nepomuk, a Cistercian, read according to Gregory of Rimini. The Commentary of Hugolino Malbrache of Orvieto formed the basis for the Commentary of Conrad of Ebrach, a Cistercian, who was in turn read by Dionysius of Montina, an Augustinian. James of Eltville, a Cistercian, read according to John Hiltalinger of Basel, an Augustinian, and James was later read to his own monks by Henry of Langenstein.

Of these Cistercian theologians, few have yet been studied. The groundwork, however, has been established by Zumkeller, *Dionysius de Montina* (Würzburg, 1948), and Kassian Lauterer, *Konrad von Ebrach S.O.Cist. (d. 1399): Lebenslauf und Schrifttum* (Rome, 1962).



## LATE FOURTEENTH-CENTURY THINKERS

Because of interest in the questions of nominalism, conciliarism, and political thought, Pierre d'Ailly is one of the most studied writers in this period. Pursuing the important issue of epistemology, Bernhard Meller has contributed *Studien zur Erkenntnislehre des Peter von Ailly* (Freiburg, 1954), several aspects of which have been criticized by other scholars. The problem of divine omnipotence in relation to human volition has received the most concentration. Various aspects of this issue have been considered by George Lindbeck, "Nominalism and the Problem of Meaning as Illustrated by Pierre d'Ailly on Predestination and Justification," *Harvard Theological Review* 52 (1959) 43-60; Francis Oakley, "Pierre d'Ailly and the Absolute Power of God: Another Note on the Theology of Nominalism," *ibid.* 56 (1963) 59-73; and William J. Courtenay, "Covenant and Causality in Pierre d'Ailly," *Speculum* 46 (1971) 94-119.

D'Ailly's disciple and successor, Jean Gerson, has received equal attention, but more from the standpoint of his mysticism and conciliar theory. A new edition of his work is now available through the editing work of Palémon Glorieux, *Jean Gerson: Oeuvres complètes* (Paris, 1960 ff.). The most significant recent work to appear on Gerson is Steven Ozment, *Homo spiritualis: A Comparative Study of the Anthropology of Johannes Tauler, Jean Gerson and Martin Luther (1509-1516) in the Context of Their Theological Thought* (Leiden, 1969).

On the side of German theology, Henry of Langenstein has commanded the interest of scholars from several countries. Divine causality in relation to the concept of nature has been discussed by Franco Alessio, "Causalità naturale e causalità divina nel 'De habitudine causarum' di Enrico di Langenstein," in *La filosofia della natura nel medioevo* (Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di filosofia medioevale; Milan, 1966). Henry's Christology has been a subject of study for the Franciscan J. Lang, *Die Christologie bei Heinrich von Langenstein* (Freiburg, 1966). Nicholas Steneck is presently engaged on a study of Langenstein on sense knowledge and the internal senses. A contemporary of Langenstein, Henry Totting of Oyta, has recently attracted the attention of one of the major scholars in fourteenth-century studies, A. Lang, "Das Verhältnis von Schrift, Tradition und kirchlichem Lehramt nach Heinrich Totting von Oyta," *Scholastik* 40 (1965) 214-34. Finally, the beginnings for a study of the fifteenth-century theologian Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl have been charted by Alois Madre, *Nikolaus von Dinkelsbühl. Leben und Schriften. Ein Beitrag zur theologischen Literaturgeschichte* (Münster, 1965).

The late fourteenth century is no less an area for the publication of

important texts. The two prize additions to the working medieval library in this area are Pierre d'Ailly, *Quaestiones super libros sententiarum cum quibusdam in fine adjunctis* (Strassburg, 1490; reprinted Frankfurt, 1968), and Marsilius von Inghen, *Questiones super quattuor libros sententiarum* (Strassburg, 1501; reprinted Frankfurt, 1966).

#### NOMINALISM AND THE REFORMATION

One of the most important areas of Reformation studies today is the relation of Reformation thought to the intellectual movements of the late Middle Ages. Because of that tie, the recent literature in this last area of late medieval thought has been more frequently surveyed. It is necessary therefore to indicate only the most important studies and to direct the reader to these other bibliographical essays.

The single most important contribution to this topic is Heiko Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), which emphasizes the Catholicity of Biel. The series edited by Oberman, *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought*, has been especially dedicated to examining connections between the late Middle Ages and Reformation. In addition to those works already mentioned, such as Ozment, are: Jane Dempsey Douglass, *Justification in Late Medieval Preaching: A Study of John Geiler of Keisersberg* (Leiden, 1966), and David C. Steinmetz, *Misericordia Dei: The Theology of Johannes von Staupitz in Its Late Medieval Setting* (Leiden, 1968).

There have been many articles surveying past scholarship and assessing present trends in the understanding of medieval thought on the eve of the Reformation. Ludger Meier, who has devoted much effort to an examination of Scotism and Ockhamism at Erfurt, has covered one aspect of this question in his "Research That Has Been Made and Is Yet to Be Made on the Ockhamism of Martin Luther at Erfurt," *Archivum Franciscanum historicum* 43 (1950) 56-67. In THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 29 (1968) 549-73, Lewis Spitz included a section on Luther's relation to scholasticism and humanism in which he examined the literature on Luther's relation to nominalism. A thorough examination of this topic now appears in Bengt Hägglund, *The Background of Luther's Doctrine of Justification in Late Medieval Theology* (Philadelphia, 1971).<sup>13</sup>

In light of the breadth of research presently being done in the area of

<sup>13</sup> It is interesting to compare this study with Hägglund's earlier work: *Theologie und Philosophie bei Luther und in der occamistischen Tradition: Luthers Stellung zur Theologie von der doppelten Wahrheit* (Lund); "Luther et l'occamisme," *Positions luthériennes* 3 (1955) 213-23.

late medieval studies, it would be presumptuous to select out, for purposes of summary, one or two major themes, or to predict the course of future research. The more extensive availability of the sources, however, allows one to believe that we have been looking at only the first essays in what will soon become an even more rapidly changing field.

*University of Wisconsin, Madison*

WILLIAM J. COURTENAY