

In summary, based on the aforementioned topics, I heartily recommend Király's profound new book *Death and History*, which sheds light on the basic problems of current philosophical thinking of history, for both the research professionals and the wider reading public interested in history and philosophy.

ZSUZSANNA MARIANN LENGYEL  
[lengyelzsm@gmail.com](mailto:lengyelzsm@gmail.com)

PHILIPP W. ROSEMAN, ed., *Medieval Commentaries on the 'Sentences' of Peter Lombard*, volume 3 (Leiden- Boston: Brill, 2015).

---

**Keywords** commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, theological education, Latin scholasticism, 15<sup>th</sup> century.

In 2015 Brill has published the third volume of studies dedicated to Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. The editor is Philipp W. Rosemann who had also edited a previous volume in 2010 in the continuation of Gillian Evan's work, *Medieval Commentaries on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard*. The volume published in 2010, although comprehensive, left a wide area of the subject uncharted. This is why this third volume is more than a desirable addition.

In his opening considerations, "Introduction: Three Avenues for Studying the Tradition of the *Sentences*", Rosemann states that there are three major themes that hold the volume together: (1) the problem of authorship, (2) that which he and one of the collaborators call theological education "on the ground" – that is to say, the way in which theology was taught with the help of Lombard's work or its abbreviations in the *studia* of different religious orders – and, finally, (3) the discussion concerning the dynamic role of the *Sentences* in later medieval theology.

From these three 'avenues' I choose to expand on the second one, treating all of the articles from the perspective of how they give an insight into the way in which Lombard's text influenced theological education throughout the Middle Ages. I say 'expand' because I am not only going to focus on the manner in which they shed new light on theological education within the different *studia*, but also on how some of them enrich our knowledge of how theology was taught at the university. It is worth saying, from the very beginning, that each of them makes a decisive contribution to the history of this subject. Focusing on just this aspect will enable us to better illustrate how this book paints a picture of the history of Peter Lombard's *Sentences* and its popularity in different educational circles.

The first chapter, written by Franklin T. Harkins and entitled "*Filliae Magistri*: Peter Lombard's *Sentences* and Medieval Theological Education 'On the Ground'" expressly treats the theme that I am following. By studying the different manuscripts of "a family of abbreviations of the Lombard's abbreviation of his contemporary's abbreviations of

Augustine”,<sup>1</sup> the author shows that the *Filia* was not used in the universities but rather in the *studia*, that is “for the more basic education and pastoral formation of friars, canons and monks *on the ground* in various religious houses and schools across Europe”.<sup>2</sup> There are three main contributions that Harkins makes to the history of this somehow misunderstood text that he calls an “updated abridgement”. The first contribution is that of noting the fluidity of these texts. Since in each manuscript the readers had added their own notes, it is more precise to speak of the tradition of the *Filiae Magistri* rather than of that of the *Filia Magistri*. The second remarkable contribution is his statement that “the *Filia* may have found a home, a pedagogical purpose, and a utility outside the University”.<sup>3</sup> This possibility had not yet been taken into consideration by the scholars studying the text. The third contribution is his comparative analysis which “suggests that *Filiae* and formal commentaries or other synthetic works are separated by a much smaller theological distance than scholars have previously imagined”.<sup>4</sup>

The chapter written by Claire Angotti, “Les listes des *opiniones Magistri ‘Sententiarum’ quae communiter non tenentur*: forme et usage dans la *lectio* des *Sentences*”, focuses on the analysis of the lists of sentences of Peter Lombard which were no longer held. Her study is based on the lists of such sentences from the surviving copies of the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, which can be found in the fund of the College of Sorbonne. Nine surviving manuscripts of Peter Lombard’s *Sentences* from this fund have lists of opinions which are no longer held. These lists give us very precise information about theology in the classroom, since Claire Angotti studies the actual material copies which were used for didactical purposes. For instance, she shows that a note such as *non tenetur* would many times lead to a more in depth analysis of the sentence to which the note referred. This article is accompanied by very rich annexes, among which I would like to point out the particular importance of the 4<sup>th</sup> one, “Les listes de propositions non tenues dans les exemplaires des *Sentences* du collège de la Sorbonne”, in which Claire Angotti edits the lists of such opinions which were no longer held, found in the 9 surviving manuscripts of the College of Sorbonne. Claire Angotti’s subtle and very detailed analyses as well as her rich annexes give us a real insight into how these lists actually functioned.

Still in the spirit of showing how the *Sentences* commentaries (by commentaries I also understand abbreviations and compilations) influenced theological education, John T. Slotemaker’s chapter, “Henry of Gorkum’s *Conclusiones Super IV Libros ‘Sententiarum’*: Studying the Lombard in the First Decades of the Fifteenth Century”, proves that Gorkum’s *Conclusiones* belongs to typical exposition of the realist masters working in Cologne at the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century and was used as a pedagogical tool for students studying the *Sentences*. In order to do so, he makes an extensive presentation of the University of Cologne

<sup>1</sup> Franklin T. Harkins “*Filiae Magistri*: Peter Lombard’s *Sentences* and Medieval Theological Education ‘on the Ground’”, *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. 3, ed. Philipp W. Rosemann (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 28.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 34–35.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 78.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 78.

and its *bursae*, of how Thomism and the *modus expositionis* are connected and a detailed analysis of the textual tradition of the *Conclusiones* (both manuscripts and incunabula), finally analysing the *Conclusiones* from both a structural and a doctrinal point of view. Slotemaker concludes by pointing out the subtle influence of Henry of Gorkum's *Conclusiones* and showing how they influenced Martin Luther's reading of the *Sentences*, in spite of the fact that Luther never mentions Gorkum by name: "(...) Luther did not merely divide the individual distinctions into three propositions, but often adopted Gorkum's textual divisions of the individual distinctions as developed in the *propositiones generales*. Thus, while Luther did not explicitly engage with the theological statements in the *Conclusiones*, the work exerted a strong influence on how Luther understood the *Sentences* themselves. In this sense, the *Conclusiones* functioned in the pedagogical role that Gorkum intended."<sup>5</sup>

Monica Brînzei and Chris Schabel shed some light on the very complex tradition of Dinkelsbühl's commentary on the *Sentences*, as well as on this work's importance for understanding the evolution of theology in Central Europe. Thus the fourth chapter of the book, "The Past, Present and Future of Late Medieval Theology: The Commentary on the *Sentences* by Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl, Vienna, ca. 1400", contains precious information about how theology was taught in the universities of Central Europe. The first step that they undertook in order to put some order into the history of the complex manuscript tradition was to establish the 'history' of the theologian who wrote them. By doing so and also by thoroughly investigating the manuscript tradition, the two authors prove that what had previously been considered one of the redactions of Dinkelsbühl's text, called the *Quaestiones communes*, actually "grew out of the need to have a kind of updated Lombard for teaching purposes at the new University of Vienna. They are called *communes* because they were used by many bachelors of the *Sentences* and indeed served as the basis for written commentaries attributed to various individuals, including Dinkelsbühl. Accordingly, all redactions sharing the core of a common base commentary might have been referred to collectively and individually in the faculty of theology at the University of Vienna as the *Quaestiones communes*".<sup>6</sup> The manuscript Schotten 269 is, however, Dinkelsbühl's compilation, but a compilation that does not stem from his lectures, being most probably his working draft. The fact that Dinkelsbühl is a compiler does not make his work any less valuable: "As is the case with many, if not most, commentators on the *Sentences* after the Black Death, and several of them in earlier periods, Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl could be termed a compiler or abbreviator. Nevertheless, this does not entail that he did not create thereby an original commentary. Nor does it seem, at this stage of

---

<sup>5</sup> John Slotemaker, "Henry of Gorkum's *Conclusiones Super IV Libros Sententiarum*: Studying the Lombard in the First Decades of the Fifteenth Century", *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. 3, ed. Philipp W. Rosemann (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 172–173.

<sup>6</sup> Monica Brînzei, Chris Schabel, "The Past, Present, and Future of Late-Medieval Theology: The Commentary on the *Sentences* of Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl, Vienna, ca. 1400", *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. 3, ed. Philipp W. Rosemann (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 181.

our research into his ideas, that he chose his components willy-nilly without regard to doctrine. Indeed, his choices, so decisive for the future of Viennese theology, were conscious.”<sup>7</sup>

In what follows, the two authors show how Dinkelsbühl made use of his sources: they make a detailed demonstration of how he employed Rimini’s texts and suggest a connection between the Viennese master’s return to the *Sentences* commentaries of the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries and Jean Gerson’s views on the subject.

Monica Brînzei and Chris Schabel then proceed to describe the “Vienna Group commentary” which is actually a group of commentaries that share a common core, namely that of Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl’s autograph from Schotten 269. To quote the authors: “One thing is certain: Schotten 269 is the basis for the remaining commentaries of the Vienna Group, whether or not they are attributed to Dinkelsbühl”.<sup>8</sup> Brînzei and Schabel manage to prove their point extensively by presenting a series of both published and unpublished commentaries of the Vienna Group.

Ueli Zahnd’s chapter, “Easy- Going Scholars Lecturing *Secundum Alium*? Notes on Some French Franciscan *Sentences* Commentaries of the Fifteenth Century”, takes us to another geographical area, namely the University of Paris, during the same century as the previous chapter. In the article he analyses three Franciscan commentaries which were “in one way or another linked to the University of Paris,”<sup>9</sup> more precisely, while still giving some importance to context, he discusses the style and sources of William of Vaurouillon’s, Nicholas of Orbellis and Stephen Brulefer’s *Sentences* commentaries.

Actually, in Vaurouillon’s case, Ueli Zahnd analyses both his *Sentences* commentary and his *Vademecum non opinionis Scoti* which is a kind of *apparatus fontium* of Scotus’s *Ordinatio* and thus belongs to the wider tradition of the *Sentences* inspired literature. The text is in fact more than what we would call an *apparatus fontium*. It also acts as a tabula of the Subtle Doctor’s *Ordinatio* and it gives some elements of a *divisio textus* for the more complicated questions.

Vaurouillon’s Commentary on the *Sentences* is, however, a more important source than his *Vademecum*. It has survived in one manuscript and has 4 editions. Looking at its entire structure, Ueli Zahnd shows that the Commentary is organized following a Fibonacci sequence based on the number 3: “This use of a mathematical sequence is more than simple fooling about. Fibonacci sequences are directly linked with the golden ratio: the higher one gets in a sequence, the more the result of the division of two subsequent members approximates the golden section. It appears, then, that Vaurouillon tried to build his commentary in accordance with the predominant proportion used in Renaissance architecture”.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 186.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 198.

<sup>9</sup> Ueli Zahnd, “Easy- Going Scholars Lecturing *secundum alium*? Notes on some Franciscan *Sentences* Commentaries in the 15<sup>th</sup> Century”, *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. 3, ed. Philipp W. Rosemann (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 273.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 284.

The commentary seems to be more like a schoolbook than anything else. Vaurouillon does not get into lengthy debates, but rather makes a summary of what he considers to be the best theological position. In most cases this is the position of Duns Scotus: “If it is true, in addition, that William conceived of his commentary with a predominantly didactical purpose, he is to be blamed for a lack of speculative outpourings as much as any modern author of a philosophical or theological compendium. William wanted to present a schoolbook thus, if we miss in his commentary any original thoughts, then this corresponds exactly to William’s own intention.”<sup>11</sup> Ueli Zahnd also shows that, given the structure of Vaurouillon’s commentary as well as his surpassing of the traditional scholastic sources, he was “not ignorant of early French humanism.”<sup>12</sup>

The other commentator that Zahnd studies is Nicholas of Orbellis, who, in the author’s own words, wrote “a detailed commentary of Lombard’s *Sentences*”. He shows the internal coherence of the entire set of works of Nicholas, which seem to be intended as a whole. Nicholas too, like Vaurillon, writes with a didactic purpose and is influenced especially by the works of Duns Scotus, although his *Sentences* commentary does introduce some other authors. Stephen Bruelefer is the third commentator of whom Zahnd speaks. His commentary is quite different from that of the other two authors: although he was known in the 15<sup>th</sup> century as a Scotist, his *Sentences* commentary is primarily influenced by Bonaventure. Unlike the other two, not only did he intend to provide a compendium of an author’s thoughts, but also to defend his opinions. Bruelefer’s commentary does not stem from his Parisian lectures, because “Bruelefer’s surviving commentary is centered on the *Sentences* commentary of the Seraphic Doctor, whereas he is known to have read, whilst in Paris, according to Scotus.”<sup>13</sup>

The conclusion that is in concordance with the theme mainly followed in this book review is that all three Franciscan commentaries analyzed by Ueli Zahnd are “designed for pedagogical purposes, and they promote in a more or less forthright manner the doctrines of Duns Scotus without, however, exclusively focusing on him”<sup>14</sup>. In the end, Zahnd proves that the structure and sources of these late commentaries was not determined by intellectual phlegm, as Damasius Trapp had suggested, but by the didactical needs and the precise intentions of the authors.

The sixth chapter, written by Severin V. Kitanov, “The Concept of Beatific Enjoyment (*Fruitio Beatifica*) in the *Sentences* Commentaries of Some Pre-Reformation Erfurt Theologians”, follows the use of the two Augustinian concepts, *frui* and *uti*, in some *Sentences* commentaries from Erfurt, belonging to Augustinians, Franciscans and secular priests. This manner of treating the subject gives us great insight into the way in which a certain theme was being discussed at the young University of Erfurt, as well as in the *studia* of certain orders of the same town. All of the observations of the article are interesting and subtle, but I will focus mostly on those which allude to the way in which theological education functioned.

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 288.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 289.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 302.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 311.

First of all, it is probably important to point out that the surviving commentaries belong to the Augustinians, Franciscans, as well as to some secular priests. There are no Dominican or Carmelite ones conserved. Secondly, from my point of view, Kitanov's mention of the long tradition of Franciscan Commentaries is very important. Actually, most of the Erfurt commentaries are Franciscan ones and they go as far back as John of Erfurt, one of the first lecturers in the Franciscan study house at Erfurt (active before 1275). Thirdly, another aspect which I find very interesting is the didactic character of John Wensel's commentary, especially given the fact that Wensel was a secular priest.

Kitanov's conclusions, which show how such commentaries were used in theological education at Erfurt, are: (1) the tradition of Erfurt commentaries is rooted in the tradition of the Parisian ones; (2) these commentaries are characterized by "selectivity and consolidation in the treatment of theological doctrine"<sup>15</sup> – this would be the case of the Franciscan and secular commentaries; (3) they are also characterized by "didactic concerns" and "emphasis on the letter of Peter Lombard's work and the preference for views and positions that have survived theological controversy, or that epitomize the distinctive flavor and best insights of one's own theological tradition".<sup>16</sup>

The seventh chapter, "John Major's (Mair's) Commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard: Scholastic Philosophy and Theology in the Early Sixteenth Century" written by Severin V. Kitanov, John T. Slotemaker and Jeffrey C. Witt, represents an extensive presentation of John Mair's (one of Erasmus's contemporaries) *Sentences* commentary. The authors thoroughly follow the structure of the different redactions of Mair's commentary on the four books of the *Sentences* and analyze his sources. They also show how Mair's approach to theology is close to that of 14<sup>th</sup> century authors. A very important point is that although Mair was a scholastic traditionalist, he was, nevertheless, aware of the humanist changes that were imposing themselves in the 16<sup>th</sup> century: "Mair's commentary, in effect, stands witness to the disorienting context of the times, amply illustrating Mair's status as a transitional figure in the history of Western philosophical theology: Mair is a theologian who identified very strongly with the great tradition of Latin scholasticism, realized that times were changing, but did not fully embrace or share the spirit of novelty".<sup>17</sup>

The eighth chapter, written by Lidia Lanza and Marco Toste, "The *Sentences* in Sixteenth- Century Iberian Scholasticism", opens up a whole new area of research given that literature dedicated to the 16<sup>th</sup> century Iberian Scholasticism focuses mainly on the manner in which *Sentences* commentaries are replaced by the *Summa* and not on the commentaries

---

<sup>15</sup> Severin V. Kitanov, "The Concept of Beatific Enjoyment (*Fruitio Beatifica*) in the *Sentences* Commentaries of Some Pre-Reformation Erfurt Theologians", *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. 3, ed. Philipp W. Rosemann (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 367.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 368.

<sup>17</sup> Severin V. Kitanov, John T. Slotemaker, Jeffrey C. Witt, "John Major's (Mair's) Commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard: Scholastic Philosophy and Theology in the Early Sixteenth Century", *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. 3, ed. Philipp W. Rosemann (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 415.

themselves. This chapter thus offers a very rich presentation of the commentaries of the *Sentences* which can be connected to the largest universities operating in the Iberian Peninsula in the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

In the final chapter, “Text, Media and Re-Mediation: The Digital Future of the *Sentences* Commentary Tradition”, the *Sentences* are studied as a living tradition by Jeffrey C. Witt. He points out the importance of digital editions of the *Sentences commentaries* as we are now undergoing a change not less important than that undergone by the contemporaries of the transition from manuscripts to printed editions. I would like to point out two aspects mentioned in this article which might be of some importance to today’s scholars of the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard. The first one would be that digital editions seem to be a very good solution to the problems raised by the present print editions, namely that they have to be published in an almost perfect version- which takes a very long time- and that the publishers are often reluctant to publish an author who is not well known. These problems are all solved by a digital edition, published on the internet, from the very beginning of the editorial work and changed often. The second very interesting aspect mentioned in the chapter is the necessity for editors to be able to semantically encode the texts that they are now editing just as they have been able to visually encode them so far.

This volume dedicated to Peter Lombard’s work opens up new research fields and addresses the practical concerns of contemporary ‘*Sentences* commentators’, while giving precious information on how the *Book of ‘Sentences’*, through its abbreviations and commentaries, influenced the study of theology throughout the *Middle Ages* and is presently influencing researches in different areas, ranging from theology to history and philosophy.

ALEXANDRA BANEU

[alexandra.baneu@yahoo.com](mailto:alexandra.baneu@yahoo.com)

JOHANNES HONTERUS, *Rudimenta Cosmographica. Grundzüge der Weltbeschreibung*, Corona/Kronstadt, 1542. Edited by Robert OFFNER, Harald ROTH, Thomas ŞINDILARIU and Ulrich A. WIEN. (Hermannstadt–Bonn, Schiller Verlag, 2015).

---

**Keywords** Johannes Honterus, cosmography, history of geography, 16<sup>th</sup> century education

The figure of Johannes Honterus, the polyhistor of Braşov, is still very much alive in the cultural memory of the Saxon population of Transylvania, especially in the communities of Braşov and Sibiu. Honterus’s statue in Braşov, and the streets, squares and schools named after him are gestures of reverence and instruments of maintaining his memory.

At home, he is mainly known as a publisher, editor of textbooks, typographer, pedagogue, the founder of humanist education in Transylvania, and a reformer of Braşov and