

FRANCISCUS DE MARCHIA

ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL PHILOSOPHY
De Wulf-Mansion Centre

Series 3

FRANCISCI DE MARCHIA

OPERA PHILOSOPHICA ET THEOLOGICA

II,1

Reportatio IIA, qq. 1-12

Editorial Coordinator:
Russell L. Friedman

Editorial Board:
Girard J. Etzkorn, Roberto Lambertini, Fritz S. Pedersen,
Chris Schabel, Tiziana Suarez-Nani

The De Wulf-Mansion Centre is a research centre for ancient, medieval, and Renaissance philosophy at the Institute of Philosophy of the Catholic University of Leuven. It hosts the international project "Aristoteles latinus" and publishes the "Opera omnia" of Henry of Ghent and the "Opera philosophica et theologica" of Francis of Marchia
Kardinaal Mercierplein 2, B-3000 Leuven (Belgium)

FRANCISCI DE MARCHIA

Reportatio IIA
(Quaestiones in secundum librum Sententiarum)
qq. 1-12

Ediderunt

Tiziana Suarez-Nani
William Duba
Emmanuel Babey
Girard J. Etzkorn

LEUVEN UNIVERSITY PRESS
2008

Cette publication est le résultat d'un projet de recherche financé par le
Fonds National Suisse de la Recherche Scientifique
pendant les années 2005-2009.

Published with the support of
Universitaire Stichting van België



© 2008 by De Wulf-Mansioncentrum - De Wulf-Mansion Centre

Leuven University Press / Presses Universitaires de Louvain/
Universitaire Pers Leuven
Minderbroedersstraat 4, B-3000 Leuven (Belgium)

All rights reserved. Except in those cases expressly determined by law, no part of this
publication may be multiplied, saved in an automated datafile or made public in any way
whatsoever without the express prior written consent of the publishers.

ISBN 978 90 5867 700 6
D/2008/1869/45
NUR: 732

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|---------|
| GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE SERIES | VII |
| EDITORS' ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | IX |
| INTRODUCTION | XI |
| I. Francis of Marchia's Life | XIII |
| II. Francis of Marchia's Works | XIX |
| 1. <i>Quaestiones in IV libros Sententiarum</i> | XIX |
| 2. <i>Quodlibet</i> | XIX |
| 3. <i>In libros Physicorum</i> | XX |
| 4. <i>Quaestiones in Metaphysicam</i> (books I-VII) | XXI |
| 5. <i>Quaestiones super primum et secundum librum Metaphysicorum</i> | XXII |
| 6. <i>Improbatio contra libellum Domini Iohannis qui incipit "Quia vir reprobus"</i> | XXII |
| 7. <i>Quaestio utrum nativitas Christi fuerit naturalis</i> | XXII |
| 8. Sermons | XXIII |
| III. The Commentaries on the Four Books of the <i>Sentences</i> | XXIV |
| 1. Composition, dating and manuscript tradition | XXIV |
| A. <i>Principia</i> | XXV |
| B. Book I | XXXII |
| C. Book II | XXVII |
| D. Book III | XXVIII |
| E. Book IV | XXIX |
| 2. The content of the <i>Commentary on the Sentences</i> | XXX |
| A. Book I | XXXI |
| B. Book II | XXXII |
| C. Book III | XXXII |
| D. Book IV | XXXIII |
| IV. The Questions on the Second Book of the <i>Sentences</i> | XXXVI |
| 1. Redactions | XXXVI |
| A. <i>Reportatio IIA</i> and <i>Reportatio IIB</i> | XXXVII |
| B. <i>Reportatio IIA</i> , the <i>Redaction DH</i> , and the <i>Principium secundi</i> | XLVI |
| C. Summary of results | LV |
| 2. The text of <i>Reportatio IIA</i> | LV |
| V. Summary of the Themes Treated in <i>Reportatio IIA</i> , Questions 1-12 | LVI |
| VI. The Sources of <i>Reportatio IIA</i> , Questions 1-12 | LXX |
| 1. Explicit sources | LXX |
| 2. Implicit sources | LXXI |
| VII. Francis' Doctrine of Creation and Historical Impact: A Preliminary Assessment | LXXIV |
| VIII. The Edition | LXXVII |
| 1. Manuscripts | LXXVII |
| 2. Stemma | LXXVIII |

| | |
|--|----------|
| 3. Retention of manuscripts | LXXXII |
| 4. Characteristics of individual retained manuscripts | LXXXIII |
| 5. Editorial method | LXXXV |
| IX. Editorial Conventions | LXXXVIII |
| 1. Symbols used in the text | LXXXVIII |
| 2. Symbols used in the <i>apparatus criticus</i> | LXXXVIII |
| 3. Abbreviations used in the <i>apparatus criticus</i> | LXXXVIII |
| 4. Abbreviations used in the <i>apparatus fontium</i> and the bibliographies | LXXXVIII |
| 5. Sigla of the manuscripts | LXXXIX |
| REPORTATIO A IN II LIBRUM SENTENTIARUM, QQ. 1-12 | |
| Q. 1: Utrum creatio sit demonstrabilis de Deo | 1 |
| Q. 2: Utrum creatio sit possibilis subiective et obiective | 46 |
| Q. 3: Utrum omnia alia a primo ente indigeant actuali conservatione ab ipso | 76 |
| Q. 4: Utrum creatio et conservatio sint idem realiter | 85 |
| Q. 5: Utrum duratio rei differat ab ipsa re durante | 96 |
| Q. 6: Utrum tempus differat a motu secundum rem | 102 |
| Q. 7: Utrum creaturae ad Deum sit aliqua relatio realis | 105 |
| Q. 8: Utrum relatio realis creaturae ad Deum differat realiter a creatura | 115 |
| Q. 9: Utrum relatio creaturae ad Deum ut ad causam efficientem sit eadem cum relatione creaturae ad ipsum Deum ut ad causam finalem | 131 |
| Q. 10: Utrum creatura sit immediate producta a Deo per intellectum et voluntatem et per actum intelligendi et volendi | 132 |
| Q. 11: Utrum creatio-actio sit in Deo vel in creatura vel in utroque | 156 |
| Q. 12: Utrum creatio cuiuscumque rei creabilis fuerit possibilis ab aeterno et utrum fuerit de facto | 195 |
| APPENDIX: REPORTATIO IN II LIBRUM SENTENTIARUM, REDACTIO DH | |
| Q. 1: Utrum creatio sit demonstrabilis de Deo | 226 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | |
| Primary Sources | 243 |
| Secondary Sources | 247 |
| INDICES | |
| I. Index biblicus | 257 |
| II. Index auctoritatum | 258 |
| III. Index codicum manuscriptorum | 261 |
| IV. Index nominum et locorum | 263 |

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE SERIES

Since last century, when Pierre Duhem and Anneliese Maier published their groundbreaking studies of medieval natural philosophy, Francis of Marchia, an Italian Franciscan who read the *Sentences* at Paris in 1319-1320, has been best known for several original and highly interesting scientific views. Recent scholarship has not only confirmed Duhem's and Maier's observations, but has also highlighted other areas of Marchia's thought that show his creativity and deserve more study, such as his philosophical theology, political philosophy, philosophy of mind, and metaphysics. That Marchia's works enjoyed a sizeable medieval readership is witnessed by some twenty-five manuscripts containing his *Sentences* commentary in whole or in part. Moreover, a lively discussion of certain of his views can be traced in the second quarter of the fourteenth century, and his impact can be seen even on such major thinkers as William of Ockham and Gregory of Rimini. Thus, Francis of Marchia's importance as a thinker and as an influence on later discussion cannot be doubted. Nevertheless, because his works are for the most part unprinted, modern scholars have been hampered in their efforts to reconstruct Marchia's thought, let alone its reception.

The goal of the series *Francisci de Marchia Opera philosophica et theologica* is to improve this situation. The series is dedicated to publishing in critical edition most of the currently unprinted works of the Italian Franciscan, and will eventually make available at least the *Scriptum* (or longer) version of Marchia's commentary on I *Sentences*; both versions of Marchia's commentary on II *Sentences*; Marchia's commentaries on III and IV *Sentences*; and a volume of Marchia's Philosophical and Theological *Quaestiones*. Each volume in the series, in addition to the critically edited text and the *apparatus criticus* and *fontium*, will include an introduction discussing the nature and the transmission of the text in question, as well as the major doctrinal points Marchia makes there.

The present volume contains the first twelve of the forty-nine *quaestiones* found in the longer version of Marchia's commentary on II *Sentences*, a version also known as the *Reportatio IIA*. Over the next two years the remaining *quaestiones* of that version of Marchia's II *Sentences* will appear in two volumes, as will the shorter version of Marchia's II *Sentences* (called the *Reportatio IIB*) in one volume. Since the present volume is the first to appear in the series, it opens with a comprehensive introduction written by Tiziana Suarez-Nani and William Duba. Including a summary and reconsideration of the evidence currently at our disposal concerning Marchia's life and known works, the introduction will serve as a point of departure for future studies

on Marchia – studies, which in their turn will allow us to nuance some of the views presented here and answer some of the remaining questions.

Russell L. Friedman
Leuven
August 28, 2008

EDITORS' ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This edition is the product of international teamwork and collaboration. We have benefited from the help and support of numerous scholars, and we would like to thank especially R. Friedman (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven) and C. Schabel (The University of Cyprus), whose initiative brought about the project of editing Francis of Marchia's *Opera Philosophica et Theologica*, and who have generously and continuously provided us with informed advice. We extend our thanks also to the other members of the editorial board, F.S. Pedersen and R. Lambertini, who read, in whole or in part, the text. In addition, we are grateful to S. Ebbesen, F. Amerini, and two anonymous readers for the Universitaire Stichting for their commentary and suggestions.

We would also like to express our gratitude to Leuven University Press and the editors of the Ancient and Medieval Philosophy series, who graciously agreed to publish this work.

Furthermore, we are indebted to the Department of Philosophy of the University of Fribourg (Switzerland), which placed at our disposal the material and computer resources necessary for the project. Our debt extends to the teaching assistants of the Chair of Medieval Philosophy, D. Travelletti and O. Ribordy, who have shared in our labours and have provided us with their unwavering support.

This work could not have been realized without the assistance of the Swiss National Foundation for Scientific Research, which, from October 2005 onward, has provided the financial means necessary to bring it about: to the Humanities and Social Sciences division we convey our heartfelt gratitude for their generous support.

INTRODUCTION

By Tiziana Suarez-Nani and William Duba

I. Francis of Marchia's Life

As common for many medieval thinkers, few biographical details survive for Francis of Marchia (Franciscus de Marchia, Franciscus de Esculo, Franciscus Rubeus de Pignano, Francesco d'Ascoli) before his lectures on the *Sentences*.¹ Born around 1290, Francis hailed from the Italian village of Appignano del Tronto, now belonging to the province of Ascoli Piceno in the region of the Marches, where most likely he entered the Franciscan Order. University studies probably brought him to Paris around 1310. During the academic year 1319-1320, he most likely lectured on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard.

Support for the 1319-1320 dating of Francis' lectures comes from a piece of evidence internal to his work: the explicit from the *Reportatio* on the first book as contained in a manuscript of the National Library of Naples (BN VII. C. 27, f. 126va) states that Francis of Marchia read the *Sentences* at Paris in 1320.² Further support comes from the works of the Franciscan theologians Francis criticizes and from those who criticize him. One of Francis' most important interlocutors, Peter Auriol, read the *Sentences* at Paris in the period 1316-1318, and was regent master in 1318-1320. Francis often considers Auriol's positions and further uses Auriol's *Sentences* commentary as a source for other opinions.³ Moreover, Francis seems to react to a position on

¹ The following studies have traced Francis' life: A. Teetaert, "Pignano, François de", *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, v. 12, Paris 1935, cols. 2104-2109; N. Schneider, *Die Kosmologie des Franciscus de Marchia*, Leiden 1991, pp. 11-34; N. Mariani (ed.), *Francisci de Esculo OFM Improbatio contra libellum Domini Ioannis qui incipit "Quia vir reprobus"*, Grottaferrata 1993, pp. 3-34; P. Vian, "Francesco della Marca", *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, v. 49, Rome 1997, pp. 793-797; C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2007 edition): <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2007/entries/francis-marchia/>>; R. Friedman and C. Schabel, "Introduction", *Francis of Marchia, Theologian and Philosopher*, *Vivarium* 44 (2006), pp. 3-14; W. Duba, "Francesco d'Appignano tra Parigi e Avignone", in: D. Priori (ed.), *Atti del IV° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco di Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2008 (forthcoming).

² R. Friedman and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on the *Sentences*: Question List and State of Research", *Medieval Studies* 63 (2001), pp. 31-106; the explicit appears in that article on p. 85: "Explicit Lectura Fratris Francisci de Marchia super primum, secundum Reportationem factam sub eo tempore, quo legit Sententias Parisius, anno domini MCCCXX."

³ R. Friedman, "Francesco d'Appignano on the Eternity of the World and the Actual Infinite", in: D. Priori (ed.), *Atti del I° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2002, pp. 83-99; C. Schabel, *Theology at Paris 1316-1345: Peter Auriol and the Problem of Divine Foreknowledge and Future Contingents*, Aldershot 2000; C. Schabel, "Parisian Commentaries from Peter Auriol to Gregory of Rimini and the Problem of Predestination", in: G.R. Evans (ed.), *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, Leiden 2002, pp. 221-265; T. Suarez-Nani, "Linguaggio, conoscenza e libertà. Note in margine alle questioni 26 e 27 del commento di Francesco de Marchia al II° libro delle Sentenze", *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 50 (2003), pp. 354-375; T. Suarez-Nani, "Un modello

the status of the accident of quantity analogous to that held by William of Ockham in his *Sentences* commentary, dating from 1317-1319.⁴ More clearly, Francis criticizes Landulph Caracciolo, who read the *Sentences* at Paris in 1318-1319.⁵ Finally Francis Meyronnes, who read the *Sentences* at Paris in 1320-1321, criticizes the theory of projectile motion formulated by Marchia in his commentary on the fourth book of the *Sentences*.⁶ All these elements taken together allow us to place Francis of Marchia's lectures on the *Sentences* in 1319-1320.

Some time after reading the *Sentences*, Francis probably reworked his lectures for distribution in written form, perhaps finishing in 1323: the explicit of the commentary on the fourth book of the *Sentences* as contained in the Chigi ms. (Vatican City, BAV, Chigi B VII 113) says that it was made in 1323.⁷ For the period from 1321 to 1328, we have very little information on Francis' movements, and what we have is not certain: there is no explicit indication that Francis was at Paris after 1321, nor anything that places him at Avignon before 1328.⁸ N. Schneider cites a note by L. Wadding in the *Annales Minorum* for 1321 referring to Francis' presence at the court of Robert of Anjou, King of Naples (1278-1343).⁹ This could be the case, especially since Francis' fellow

alternativo di conoscenza? Francesco de Marchia e la spazializzazione del rapporto conoscitivo”, *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 53 (2006), pp. 345-366.

⁴ R. Friedman and C. Schabel, “Introduction”, pp. 3-5, citing P. Bakker, *La raison et le miracle. Les doctrines eucharistiques (c. 1250-c. 1400)*, Nijmegen 1999.

⁵ P. Bakker, *La raison et le miracle*, v. 1, p. 403.

⁶ Franciscus de Marchia, *Principium in quartum librum Sententiarum*, redactio B, ed. C. Schabel, “Francis of Marchia's *Virtus derelicta* and the Context of Its Development”, *Vivarium* 44 (2006), (pp. 47-80), pp. 60-80; R. Friedman and C. Schabel, “Introduction”, pp. 5-6.

⁷ R. Friedman and C. Schabel, “Francis of Marchia's Commentary on the *Sentences*”, p. 106: “Explicit Reportatio quarti libri Sententiarum sub magistro Francischo de Marchia Anconita Ordinis minorum facta per fratrem G de <Rubione> anno domini 1323.” Henceforth we will indicate the manuscripts according to the sigla established in the study. See *infra*, p. LXXVII. W. Duba, “Francesco d'Appignano tra Parigi e Avignone” (forthcoming); in this study, Duba assembles evidence suggesting that the 1323 date, if it is correct at all, refers to the completion of the written work, and not the date of the lessons. See also C. Schabel, “The Redactions of Book I of Francesco d'Appignano's Commentary on the *Sentences*”, in D. Priori and M. Balena (eds.), *Atti del II° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2004, (pp. 97-149), p. 104.

⁸ W. Duba, “Francesco d'Appignano tra Parigi e Avignone”.

⁹ N. Schneider, *Die Kosmologie*, p. 15, and L. Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, Quaracchi 1931, v. 6, p. 423 (n. XL): “Floruisse hoc tempore in regio coenobio sancti Laurenti Neapoli litteris et virtute, Regique fuisse a consiliis fratrem Franciscum Asculanum Picenum Minoritam, scripturae inde transmissae testantur”. I.-H. Sbaralea, *Supplementum et Castigatio ad Scriptores trium Ordinum Sancti Francisci a Waddingo aliisque descriptos*, v. 1, Rome 1759, p. 257.

Franciscans at Paris, notably Landulph Caracciolo and Francis Meyronnes, had close ties to the court of Naples, but the written documents to which Wadding refers have not been found, and they likely no longer exist.¹⁰

Many biographies of Francis follow Teetaert in asserting that Francis attended the Franciscan chapter general at Perugia in June 1322.¹¹ In March of the same year, John XXII promulgated *Quia nonnumquam*, lifting the ban on the debate on Apostolic Poverty established by Nicholas III's 1279 constitution *Exiit qui seminat*. In reaction, the chapter general at Perugia issued two public documents which defended the orthodoxy of the position holding the radical poverty of Christ and the Apostles.¹² These documents carry the names of five masters of theology and two bachelors, among whom Francis of Marchia does not figure. Teetaert's precise assertion was that Francis, at the council of Perugia, signed these declarations. His statement does not correspond to the evidence he alludes to, and most likely stems from a confusion on his part.¹³

In the documents pertaining to the 1328 flight of Michael of Cesena and his supporters (including Francis of Marchia) – documents to which we will return below – Francis appears as *lector* of the Franciscan convent at Avignon. At times, the modern literature assigns to Francis this role starting in 1324, based on an indication taken from the *Quodlibet* of the Augustinian Hermit James of Pamiers. In question 16, James raises the argument that a contradiction can be avoided through the formal non-identity of the terms. He then brings up the refutation, noting: “Contra istas rationes arguit magister Franciscus de Ma<rchia> in quadam questione quam determinavit in curia, de qua ibi respondi sibi.”¹⁴ A study of the movements of James of Pamiers suggests that the “curial disputation” took place in 1324,¹⁵ thus leading to the conclusion that Francis of Marchia was in Avignon in 1324. Yet, at least one manuscript witnessing James of Pamier's *Quodlibet* (Avignon, Bibliothèque municipale, 314) cites the name of the ‘Franciscus’ in full, namely “Franciscus de Maronis,” that is, Francis Meyronnes, who very likely was in Avignon in

¹⁰ W. Duba, “Francesco d’Appignano tra Parigi e Avignone”.

¹¹ A. Teetaert, “Pignano, François de”, cols. 2104-2109.

¹² P. Gauchat, *Cardinal Bertrand de Turre ord. min. His Participation in the Theoretical Controversy Concerning the Poverty of Christ and the Apostles under Pope John XXII*, Rome 1930, pp. 54ff. P. Nold, *Pope John XXII and His Franciscan Cardinal: Bertrand de la Tour and the Apostolic Poverty Controversy*, Oxford 2003, pp. 1-24.

¹³ W. Duba, “Francesco d’Appignano tra Parigi e Avignone” (forthcoming).

¹⁴ Text as noted by F. Pelster, “Zur ersten Polemik gegen Aureoli: Raymundus Bequini O.P., seine Questionen und sein Correctorium Petri Aureoli, das Quodlibet des Jacobus de Apamiis O.E.S.A”, *Franciscan Studies* 15 (1955), (pp. 30-47), p. 40.

¹⁵ W.J. Courtenay, “The *Quaestiones in Sententias* of Michael of Massa, OESA. A Redating”, *Augustiniana* 45 (1995), (pp. 191-207), p. 195.

1324.¹⁶ So there is no positive evidence for the beginning of Francis' period at Avignon.

Another source suggests that Francis was Franciscan provincial minister for the Italian region of the Marches between 1327-1332, but this was not the case.¹⁷ Such a claim would be difficult to square with Francis' close association with Michael of Cesena's circle during the flight from Avignon to the court of Louis of Bavaria.

On December 8, 1322, John XXII issued the bull *Ad conditorem canonum*, in which he assigned to the Franciscan order the ownership in common of the goods that the order used. In reaction, Bonagrazia of Bergamo protested the papal decision, and the pope, in turn, had him arrested and imprisoned for a year.¹⁸

In late 1327, as the controversy simmered, John XXII summoned Michael of Cesena to Avignon. Arriving in December, Michael quickly became aware of the pope's hostility, and by mid-January the pope forbade Michael to leave the city. On April 9, 1328, the pope summoned Michael and accused him of inciting heresy. Michael protested these accusations in a document dated April 13 and known as the *Appellatio Michaelis in Avenione*, accusing the pope of heresy. The first of the witnesses to this document is Francis of Marchia: "Acta, gesta et facta fuerunt praedicta coram religiosis et honestis viris, fratribus Ordinis Minorum, Francisco de Esculo, in sacra theologia doctore et lectore tunc in conventu Fratrum Minorum de Avenione." Francis' name is followed by those of William of Ockham and Bonagrazia of Bergamo.¹⁹ This document establishes the current *terminus ante quem* for Francis' presence as *lector* of the Franciscan convent of Avignon.

The final break between the Minister General and the pope came the night of May 26, 1328, when Michael of Cesena, Bonagrazia of Bergamo, William of Ockham and Francis of Marchia fled Avignon for Italy and the court of Louis of Bavaria (who in January had received the imperial crown from the Roman people), and the pope excommunicated them. Having arrived at Pisa by June 9, the fugitives issued further protests, capped by the public "Pisan

¹⁶ B. Roth, *Franz von Mayronis O.F.M. Sein Leben, seine Werke, seine Lehre vom Formalunterschied in Gott*, Werl-in-Westf. 1936, pp. 44-45; H. Roßmann, "Die Quodlibeta und verschiedene sonstige Schriften des Franz von Meyronnes", *Franziskanische Studien* 54 (1972), (pp. 1-76), p. 59. C. Schabel and W.J. Courtenay, "Augustinian *Quodlibeta* after Giles of Rome", in C. Schabel (ed.), *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages: The Fourteenth Century*, Leiden 2007, (pp. 545-568), pp. 562-568.

¹⁷ J. Weisheipl, "Francis of Marchia", *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, v. 6, New York 1963, p. 32. In the introduction to the *Improbatio* (cited in n. 1 above), pp. 5-6, Mariani casts doubt on whether Francis ever exercised this function. In a forthcoming article, R. Lambertini will conclusively show that Francis never held such a post.

¹⁸ Bonagrazia's protest is closely linked to Louis of Bavaria's "Sachsenhausen Appeal". See on the incident, P. Vian, "Francesco della Marca", p. 794; R. Lambertini and A. Tabarroni, *Dopo Francesco: l'eredità difficile*, Turin 1989, p. 116.

¹⁹ G. Gál and D. Flood (eds.), *Nicolaus Minorita: Chronica*, St. Bonaventure, NY 1996, p. 189; S. Baluze and J.D. Mansi (eds.), *Miscellanea*, vol. II, Lucca 1761, p. 140.

Appeals", which sought to prove that John XXII was a heretic.²⁰ Francis of Marchia signed these documents as well: "Cui appellationi et provocationi incontinenti adhaeserunt et eam approbaverunt religiosi viri frater Franciscus de Esculo, doctor in sacra pagina...."²¹

From that point on, Francis actively participated in the polemics and re-cremations exchanged between the circle of fugitive Franciscans and the Avignon papacy. The Franciscan order, at the Paris Chapter General held in June 1329, elected a new Minister General, Geraldus Odonis (Guiral Ot), and reiterated the excommunication of the four fugitives. Pope John XXII replied to Michael of Cesena in the bull *Quia vir reprobus*, issued on 16 November 1329, affirming that Adam was the first to hold property, and that property has a divine origin. In taking such a position, the pope elicited numerous reactions,²² including that of Francis of Marchia, who in 1330 wrote the *Improbatio*.²³ In this text, Francis refutes point-by-point the position taken by the pope in the bull, and calls John XXII "insanus," "insulsus," "hereticus," "perversor," "fremens contra Apostolos," "delusor," "abusor" and "pervertens iura humana et divina."²⁴ Francis and his companions followed Louis of Bavaria from Pisa to Munich, taking up residence in the Franciscan convent there in 1330. Also in Munich was Marsilius of Padua, author of the 1324 *Defensor pacis*, which John XXII had condemned in 1327. Francis participated in the intense polemical activity going on in Munich, and is credited with writing a second *Improbatio*, now lost, in 1332.²⁵

When Benedict XII succeeded John XXII as pope (December 20, 1334), Louis of Bavaria sought to mend his relations with the papal court, an act which meant distancing himself from the rebel Franciscans. In 1340 and 1342, respectively, Bonagrazia of Bergamo and Michael of Cesena died impenitent,

²⁰ R. Lambertini, *La povertà pensata: evoluzione storica della definizione dell'identità minoritica da Bonaventura ad Ockham*, Modena 2000, p. 210 and N. Schneider, *Die Kosmologie*, p. 20; the texts of the Pisan Appeals, known as the *Appellatio Maior* and the *Appellatio Minor*, are edited in Gál and Flood (eds.), *Nicolaus Minorita*, pp. 213-456.

²¹ Gál and Flood (eds.), *Nicolaus Minorita*, p. 423; for the *Appellatio Minor*, see p. 455 (evidently in a different hand from the rest of the *Appellatio Minor*, and being word-for-word identical with the witness list of the *Appellatio Maior*). This identification appears in the "Collectoriae" MS, Vatican City, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, 276/A, f. 31v, which carries the "Appellatio maior" of September 18, 1328; R. Lambertini, *La povertà pensata*, p. 210, n. 89.

²² R. Lambertini, *La povertà pensata*, pp. 233ff.

²³ Edited by N. Mariani, *Francisci de Esculo, OFM, Improbatio (supra, n. 1)*.

²⁴ N. Schneider, *Die Kosmologie*, pp. 21-22, n. 58, citing A. Heysse, "Descriptio codicis bibliothecae Laurentianae Florentiae S. Crucis, Plut. 31, sin., cod. 3", *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 11 (1918), pp. 251-259. For a description of the chief positions Francis takes in his *Improbatio*, see R. Lambertini, *La povertà pensata*, pp. 214-226. For the influence of this text on William of Ockham's political philosophy, see esp. the studies of R. Lambertini mentioned in n. 93 *infra*.

²⁵ This text is alluded to in the catalogue of the Avignon pope, Benedict XIII. See P. Vian, "Francesco della Marca", p. 794.

as did William of Ockham in 1347. At some point, Francis of Marchia fell into the hands of the Inquisition. He was tried and, having retracted everything he had defended in the previous years, acquitted.²⁶ He was then sent to Avignon, where the new pope, Clement VI, sought to use Francis' abjuration as a model to bring back to the fold the remaining partisans. These events took place between 1341 and 1344;²⁷ in particular, Francis abjured his views and professed his faith in the presence of Clement VI on December 1, 1343.²⁸

The recent discovery of a manuscript (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 4246, ff. 37r-39r and 40r-41v) containing the record of the case brought against Francis provides an insight into Francis' position and his strategy for defending it.²⁹ In effect, he firmly defended his position on poverty while dissociating himself from the ecclesiological and political positions that he had shared with his fellow exiled Franciscans during the conflict with John XXII. Nevertheless, such a defense did not convince Clement VI, and included in Francis' 1343 abjuration were those theoretical points concerning poverty that he had sought to defend to the end.³⁰

Francis disappears from the historical record after 1344. Perhaps he succumbed to the plague that, a few years later (1347-1351), laid waste to the population of Europe.³¹

²⁶ Fragments of this case have been collected by S. Baluze and J.D. Mansi (eds.), *Miscellanea*, vol. II, Lucca 1761, pp. 281a-284a and reproduced by N. Mariani, *Francisci de Marchia sive de Esculo Sententia et compilatio super libros Physicorum Aristotelis*, Grottaferrata 1998, pp. 85-95.

²⁷ N. Schneider, *Die Kosmologie*, pp. 24-25; Schneider's hypotheses on Francis' movements at this time are adopted by P. Vian, "Francesco della Marca", p. 795.

²⁸ This date appears in Vatican City, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, A.A. Arm I-XVIII, 5014, ff. 109v-110r, containing the text of the "Absolutio et confessio fratris Francisci de Esculo de ordine Minorum." For more details, see E.L. Wittneben and R. Lambertini, "Un teologo francescano alle strette. Osservazioni sul testimone manoscritto del processo a Francesco d'Ascoli", *Picenum Seraphicum* 18 (1999), (pp. 97-122), pp. 97-98.

²⁹ E.L. Wittneben and R. Lambertini, "Un teologo francescano alle strette", pp. 98ff.

³⁰ E.L. Wittneben and R. Lambertini, "Un teologo francescano alle strette", p. 122.

³¹ N. Schneider, *Die Kosmologie*, pp. 25-26.

II. Francis of Marchia's Works

Known since the fifteenth century as the *Doctor succinctus*, Francis of Marchia authored several works, of which only a part have been edited. Since this is the first volume to appear in a series dedicated to making Marchia's works generally available, we supply below a list of Francis' writings (authentic and doubtful), along with an indication of what has already been edited, in order to provide an overview of the state of research on Francis' texts. As further volumes in this series appear, the hypotheses and evidence offered below concerning individual works will be nuanced and augmented.

1. *Quaestiones in IV libros Sententiarum*

Francis' commentary on Peter Lombard's four books of the *Sentences* derives from Francis' teaching at the Franciscan *studium* at Paris, most likely in the academic year 1319-1320. The extant written commentaries, however, may have been revised later. Numerous versions and redactions of this work survive.³²

Major Editions:

N. Mariani, *Francisci de Marchia sive de Esculo Commentarius in IV libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi. Quaestiones praeambulae et Prologus* (=the four *principia* and the prologue to the *Reportatio*), Spicilegium Bonaventurianum 31, Grottaferrata 2003.

N. Mariani, *Francisci de Marchia sive de Esculo Commentarius* (=Reportatio I) *in IV libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi. Distinctiones primi libri a prima ad decimam*, Spicilegium Bonaventurianum 32, Grottaferrata 2006.

N. Mariani, *Francisci de Marchia sive de Esculo Commentarius* (=Reportatio I) *in IV libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi. Distinctiones primi libri ab undecima ad vigesimam octavam*, Spicilegium Bonaventurianum 33, Grottaferrata 2007.³³

2. *Quodlibet*

This written work, if the name is correct, would derive from a university exercise. With the exception of one question that also appears at the end of a copy of William of Alnwick's *determinaciones* (Vatican City, BAV, vat. lat.

³² For further discussion and a list of the editions of individual questions, see our discussion on Francis' *Sentences* commentaries, *infra*, pp. xxiv-xxx. For the full contents and the state of the question concerning the manuscript tradition, see R. Friedman and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on the *Sentences*".

³³ Father Mariani's edition of the remaining distinctions of Book I is currently in press and should appear shortly in the same series.

6768, ff. 98rb-100vb),³⁴ and a separate redaction of two others (neither of which was likely written by Marchia), only one manuscript witnesses this text: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 16110, and even then in an extremely fragmentary and faulty manner. A medieval librarian erred in placing the title of this work on folio 125r instead of 126r, and this mistake went unnoticed until very recently. As a result, the Mariani edition publishes nine fragmentary and complete questions, but the first two, questions 1 and 2, in fact come from Scotus' *Reportata Parisiensia*. On the other hand, Francis certainly appears to be the author of questions 3-9 (as they are numbered in Mariani's edition). The place and the date of the disputation cannot yet be determined.³⁵

Edition:

N. Mariani, *Francisci de Marchia sive de Esculo OFM Quodlibet cum quaestionibus selectis ex commentario in librum Sententiarum*, Spicilegium Bonaventurianum 29, Grottaferrata 1997.

3. *In libros Physicorum*

Two manuscripts³⁶ carry this work, a literal commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*. Francis stays faithful to the genre of the literal commentary, expounding the Philosopher's views even on the topics where Francis elsewhere disagrees with Aristotle.³⁷ This text could be the product of a course taught at

³⁴ See G. Etzkorn, *Iter Vaticanum Franciscanum: A Description of Some One Hundred Manuscripts of the Vaticanus Latinus collection*, Leiden 1996, pp. 199-209.

³⁵ W. Duba, "Continental Franciscan *Quodlibeta* after Scotus", in: C. Schabel (ed.), *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages. The Fourteenth Century*, Leiden 2007, (pp. 569-649), pp. 600-609; "Francesco d'Appignano tra Parigi e Avignone"; "The Authenticity of Francis of Marchia's *Quodlibet*: the Testimony of Paris, BNF Ms. Lat. 16110", *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale* 49 (2007), pp. 91-102. The relevant questions from Scotus' *Reportata Parisiensia* (d. 3, qq. 6 and 7) have recently been edited and translated in A. Wolter and O. Bychkov (eds.), *John Duns Scotus. The Examined Report of the Paris Lecture: Reportatio I-A*, St. Bonaventure, NY 2004.

³⁶ Naples, BN, XI. E. 47; Vatican City, BAV, Vat. Ottob. lat. 1816.

³⁷ A. Maier, *Zwei Grundprobleme der scholastischen Naturphilosophie*, 3rd ed., Rome 1968, p. 161. The question concerning projectile motion confirms this: in his commentary on book IV of the *Sentences*, Francis criticizes Aristotle's theory, and replaces it with his own concerning the *virtus derelicta*. See book IV, q. 1: "Utrum in sacramentis sit aliqua virtus supernaturalis insistens sive eis formaliter inhaerens." All redactions of this question have now been edited; see C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's *Virtus derelicta*", pp. 60-80 (edition of "Francisci de Marchia. Principium *In quartum librum Sententiarum*, redactio B"); "La *virtus derelicta* di Francesco d'Appignano e il contesto del suo sviluppo", in: D. Priori (ed.), *Atti del III° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2006, (pp. 125-154), pp. 140-154 (From MS E). E. Katsoura, C. Papamarkou and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on Book IV of the *Sentences*. Traditions and Redactions, with Questions on Projectile Motion, Polygamy and the Immortality of the Soul", *Picenum Seraphicum* 25-27 (2006-2008) (forthcoming).

a Franciscan *studium*. At the moment, we have no information that could help determine the date of this work.

Edition:

N. Mariani, *Francisci de Marchia sive de Esculo OFM Sententia et compilatio super libros Physicorum Aristotelis*, Spicilegium Bonaventurianum 30, Grottaferrata 1998.

4. *Quaestiones in Metaphysicam (books I-VII)*

Francis' question-commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* survives in several manuscripts. Two contain books I-VII: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, Cod. 3490, ff. 1-57r and Bologna, Collegio di Spagna 104, ff. 48r-102v.³⁸ No doubt remains concerning its authenticity,³⁹ and the work may have been completed before 1323.⁴⁰

Editions of questions:

I. I, q. 1 and I. VI, q. 16: ed. A. Zimmermann, *Ontologie oder Metaphysik?*, Leiden 1965, 1998 (second edition), pp. 56-71.

I. II, q. 5, ed. N. Schneider, "Eine ungedruckte Quästio zur Erkennbarkeit des Unendlichen in einem Metaphysik-Kommentar des 14. Jahrhunderts", *Miscellanea mediaevalia* 18 (1986), (pp. 96-118), pp. 104-107.

I. VII, q. 5, ed. N. Schneider, "Franciscus de Marchia über die Wirklichkeit der Materie (Metaph. VII q. 5)", *Franziskanische Studien* 71 (1989), pp. 138-158, pp. 144-149.

Proemium, ed. R. Friedman, in: S. Folger-Fonfara, "Franziskus von Marchia: Die erste Unterscheidung einer allgemeinen und einer besonderen Metaphysik", *Documenti e Studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 16 (2005), (pp. 461-513), pp. 504-513.

I. VII, q. 1, ed. F. Amerini, "Utrum inhaerentia sit de essentia accidentis. Francis of Marchia and the Debate on the Nature of Accidents", *Vivarium* 44 (2006), (pp. 96-150), pp. 144-150.

³⁸ A question list for this commentary appears in A. Zimmermann, *Verzeichnis ungedruckter Kommentare zur Metaphysik und Physik des Aristoteles aus der Zeit von etwa 1250-1350*, Leiden 1971, p. 37 and pp. 140-145, and P. Künzle, "Mitteilungen aus Codex Mazarine 3490 zum Schrifttum des Franziskaners Petrus Thomae, vorab zu seinen 'Quaestiones in Metaphysicam'", *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 59 (1966), (pp. 3-37), pp. 17-23. For a full bibliography on this text, see R. Friedman and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on the *Sentences*", p. 33, n. 12.

³⁹ N. Schneider, *Die Kosmologie*, pp. 27-29.

⁴⁰ R. Friedman and C. Schabel, "Introduction", p. 15; S. Folger-Fonfara, "Franziskus von Marchia: Die erste Unterscheidung einer Allgemeinen und einer Besonderen Metaphysik", *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 16 (2005), (pp. 461-513), pp. 495-501.

5. *Quaestiones super primum et secundum librum Metaphysicorum*

This short work probably abbreviates only book I of the larger *Metaphysics* commentary.⁴¹ It survives in two manuscripts: Florence, Biblioteca Mediceo-Laurenziana, Fesul. 161, ff. 67ra-73ra, and Vatican City, BAV, vat. lat. 3130, ff. 29ra-36vb.

This work has not been edited.

6. *Improbatio contra libellum Domini Iohannis qui incipit “Quia vir reprobus”*

This polemic work is a refutation of John XXII's bull *Quia vir reprobus*. It was composed in the year 1330, and has three manuscript witnesses: Florence, Biblioteca Mediceo-Laurenziana, S. Croce plut. 31 sin. cod. 3, ff. 23r-85v; Vatican City, BAV, vat. lat. 4857; Vatican City, BAV, vat. lat. 14812, ff. 36r-47v (fragmentary).

Edition:

N. Mariani, *Francisci de Esculo OFM Improbatio contra libellum Domini Iohannis qui incipit “Quia vir reprobus”*, Spicilegium Bonaventurianum 28, Grottaferrata 1993.

7. *Quaestio utrum nativitas Christi fuerit naturalis*

Nazareno Mariani has published this *quaestio* as a ‘sermone inedito di Francesco della Marca,’ from Munich, Staatsbibliothek, CLM 8991, ff. 159-171.⁴² Although the treatise appears in this fifteenth-century manuscript amid a series of sermons attributed to Francis Meyronnes, the explicit reads, “Explicit questio bona et sermo bonus et subtilis de nativitate Domini... Francisci de Marcia.” Mariani rightly observes that Bartholomäus Roth had doubts about the attribution to Marchia. Roth cites the explicit as a case where a scribe mistook Meyronnes for Marchia and does not question that Meyronnes is the text's actual author. Mariani, on the other hand, holds that the evidence of the explicit should not be so casually discarded, and publishes a transcription of the text from CLM 8991 as being by Francis of Marchia.

Mariani's case for an attribution to Marchia is weakened by the fact that CLM 8991 is not the only manuscript witness. Roth explicitly names as witnesses to the treatise the Venice 1493 edition of Meyronnes' *Sermones de sanc-*

⁴¹ R. Lambertini, “Predicare Aristotele. A proposito di alcuni sermoni recentemente attribuiti a Francesco d'Appignano” (forthcoming). Lambertini publishes a question list, showing that the Vatican manuscript containing this work only treats questions parallel to those on book I in Francis' major *Quaestiones in Metaphysicam*; therefore it is likely that this text only treats book I, and not book II.

⁴² N. Mariani, “Sermone inedito di Francesco della Marca”, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 99 (2006), pp. 213-250; on this *quaestio*, its authenticity and status as a sermon, see also R. Lambertini, “Predicare Aristotele” (forthcoming).

tis (ff. 15va-22rb); Munich, CLM 18606 (f. 192r-204v); St. Florian, XI, 138 (ff. 78ra-89rb); and Oxford, Balliol College, cod. lat. 67A (f. 106ff.).⁴³ To this list, Heribert Roßmann adds Frankfurt, Stadt- und Univ.-Bibl., Ms. Leonh. 12, ff. 2r-19v.⁴⁴

Mariani's attribution needs to be weighed against the full evidence that Roth provides. While the St. Florian codex presents the *quaestio* as anonymous, and Balliol has it following, but not contained in, a series of sermons attributed to Meyronnes, the Venice edition identifies it as composed by Meyronnes. More significantly, Roth also transcribes the incipit to the fifteenth-century copy contained in CLM 18606 (f. 192r): "Questio bona seu sermo bonus de nativitate Domini Franciscus de Maronis aut sic titulis formetur: Utrum nativitas Christi fuerit naturalis."⁴⁵ Therefore, against the *explicit* naming Marchia, there is an *incipit* identifying Meyronnes as the author. Moreover, other works contextually identify the treatise with Meyronnes, not Marchia. A critical study, most desirably an edition from all witnesses, is needed to clarify the issue of the authorship.

Editions:

Franciscus de Maronis, *Sermones de sanctis*, Venice 1493, ff. 15va-22rb.

N. Mariani, "Sermone inedito di Francesco della Marca", *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 99 (2006), 213-250 (from Munich, CLM 8991).

8. Sermons

Vatican City, BAV, vat. lat. 3130, contains a series of philosophical and theological works associated with the study of Aristotle, including Francis' questions on book I of the *Metaphysics* (see above). Among these questions are two anonymous sermons: *Amice, ascende superius* (f. 31ra-va) and *Doctrinam sapientiae et disciplinae scripsit in codice isto* (f. 32ra-va). Mariani has proposed that Francis of Marchia is the author of these sermons. They appear to be similar to sermons in praise of Aristotle that university arts masters would give at the beginning of a course. The identification of these sermons with Francis of Marchia is hence uncertain.

Edition:

N. Mariani, "Due sermoni attribuiti a Francesco della Marca", *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 98 (2005), pp. 571-595.

⁴³ B. Roth, *Franz von Mayronis O.F.M.*, pp. 247-278, where Roth also makes a vague reference to "other" manuscripts.

⁴⁴ H. Roßmann, "Die Quodlibeta und verschiedene sonstige Schriften des Franz von Meyronnes", p. 60, n. 183.

⁴⁵ B. Roth, *Franz von Mayronis O.F.M.*, p. 274.

III. The Commentaries on the Four Books of the *Sentences*

1. *Composition, dating and manuscript tradition*

As a bachelor of theology, Francis of Marchia lectured on the *Sentences* at Paris, most likely for one academic year, presumably 1319-1320.⁴⁶ Like his contemporaries at Paris, he would have read the four books of the *Sentences* in the order I-IV-II-III,⁴⁷ and commented on the Lombard's text in question form, using the topics discussed by Peter Lombard as points of departure for his own investigations.⁴⁸

Four times during this course of lectures, Francis would have held a *principium*, a ceremonial disputation marking the beginning of his lectures on each

⁴⁶ For general information on *Sentences* lectures and their regulation in this period, see, e.g.: P. Glorieux, "L'enseignement au Moyen Age: Techniques et méthodes en usage à la Faculté de Théologie de Paris au XIII^e siècle", *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 35 (1968), (pp. 65-186), esp. pp. 111-18 (*Sentences*). 138-141 (*principia*); "Sentences (commentaires sur les)", *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, v. XIV, Paris 1939, (cols. 1860-1884), col. 1862; Z. Kaluza, "La nature des écrits de Jean de Ripa", *Traditio* 43 (1987), (pp. 257-298), pp. 260-261; C. Schabel, "The Redactions of Book I", p. 102, n. 1. More generally, and for further information concerning individual lectures on the *Sentences*, see W.J. Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England*, Princeton 1987, pp. 7-9; O. Weijers, *Le maniement du savoir. Pratiques intellectuelles à l'époque des premières universités (XIII^e-XIV^e siècles)*, Turnhout 1996, p. 52; F. Del Punta and C. Luna, "La teologia scolastica", in: E. Menestò, G. Cavallo and C. Leonardi (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario nel Medioevo. 1. Medioevo Latino*, Rome 1993, v. 2, p. 340; R. Friedman, "The *Sentences* Commentary, 1250-1320: General Trends, the Impact of the Religious Orders, and the Test Case of Predestination," in: G.R. Evans (ed.), *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, Leiden 2002, pp. 41-128; A. Oliva, *Les débuts de l'enseignement de Thomas d'Aquin et sa conception de la Sacra doctrina*, Paris 2006, pp. 238-241.

⁴⁷ An important early witness to this usage is Remigio de' Girolami, *Prologus super IV Sententiarum*: "Quartus angelus tuba cecinit, Apoc. 8 [12]. Liber iste 'Sententiarum' qui secundum consuetudinem antiquam debet a nobis exponi post primum librum.... Et propter hoc lectura quarti libri 'Sententiarum' premicti videtur lecturae secundi et tertii...." text cited by E. Panella, *Il De subiecto theologiae di Remigio dei Girolami O.P.*, Milan 1982, p. 10, n. 7. There are exceptions to this usage, e.g., Thomas Aquinas; cf. A. Oliva, *Les débuts de l'enseignement*, p. 252. On Marchia, see A. Maier, "Zu einigen Problemen der Ockhamsforschung", *Ausgehendes Mittelalter: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geistesgeschichte des 14. Jahrhunderts*, Rome 1964-1977, vol. 1, Rome 1964, (pp. 161-200), p. 180; *Metaphysische Hintergründe der spätscholastischen Naturphilosophie*, Rome 1955, p. 200.

⁴⁸ For the structure of Francis' commentary and its relation to Lombard's text, see *infra*, pp. xxxvii-xl. With regard to the changes in structure that mark the evolution of commentaries on the *Sentences* in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, see the studies in G.R. Evans, *Mediaeval Commentaries on the 'Sentences' of Peter Lombard*, Leiden 2002, as well as W.J. Courtenay, "Philosophy in the Context of *Sentences* Commentaries", in: G. Fioravanti, C. Leonardi and S. Perfetti (eds.), *Il commento filosofico nell'Occidente medievale (secoli XIII-XIV)*, Turnhout 2002, pp. 445-467.

of the books of the *Sentences*. The bachelor would give a sermon to the assembled faculty of theology before considering a question related in some way to the book of the *Sentences* he was starting to lecture on.⁴⁹ We have written texts of Marchia's principal lectures.

The written versions of Francis' *Sentences* commentaries proper bear a relation to Francis' teaching, but in diverse ways. Some texts appear to be pure *reportationes*: copies made by a student (a *reportator*) of what the speaker said in the classroom. Others seem to have undergone authorial revision so that we might speak of a revised *reportatio* (or *ordinatio* or *reportatio examinata*), or a *scriptum*, a separate written work.

Francis' commentary on the *Sentences* survives for each book in more than one version, and the traditions, witnesses and circumstances are different for each book of the *Sentences*. The current state of research has not removed all doubts concerning the relationships between all these texts. Nevertheless, using the study of R. Friedman and C. Schabel as a guide, and bringing it up to date with later studies,⁵⁰ we can depict the current state of research and establish the known facts.⁵¹

A. *Principia*

A written version of the ceremonial lectures Francis held at the start of lessons on each book of the *Sentences* survives. Ms. M contains all four *principia*, while JKVa have the one for book III (*Principium tertii*), and a second copy of book II (*Principium secundi*) exists in D.

For the relationship between the *principia* and the commentaries on the *Sentences* see the studies of R. Friedman (for book I, "*Principia* and Prologue in Francesco d'Appignano's *Sentences* Commentary") and A. Poppi ("*Quaestiones praeambulae et Prologus* del commento alle *Sentenze* di Francesco della Marca", *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 97 (2004), pp. 469-480).

⁴⁹ On the genre of the *Principia* in general, see especially, W.J. Courtenay, "Theological Bachelors at Paris on the Eve of the Papal Schism. The Academic Environment of Peter of Candia", in K. Emery, R.L. Friedman, and A. Speer (eds.), *Philosophy and Theology in the Long Middle Ages: A Tribute to Stephen F. Brown*, Leiden (forthcoming). On especially Marchia's *Principia*, see R. Friedman, "*Principia* and Prologue in Francesco d'Appignano's *Sentences* Commentary: The Question '*Quaeritur utrum ens simpliciter simplex possit esse subiectum alicuius scientiae*,'" in: D. Priori and M. Balena (eds.), *Atti del II° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, (pp. 123-149), pp. 124-127. A written redaction of all four of Francis' *principia* can be found in Madrid, Biblioteca nacional 504, in the order I-IV-II-III.

⁵⁰ C. Schabel, "The Redactions of Book I"; R. Friedman, "*Principia* and Prologue". These studies challenge the hypotheses set forth by N. Mariani, "Certezze e ipotesi sul Commento alle *Sentenze* di Francesco della Marca OMin.", *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 95 (2002), pp. 93-183.

⁵¹ In what follows, we refer to the manuscripts by the sigla assigned in R. Friedman and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on the *Sentences*" (for the sigla of manuscripts used in the present edition, see the list of sigla *infra*, p. LXXVII).

Edition:

(as ‘*Quaestiones praeambulae in IV libros Sententiarum*’) ed. N. Mariani, *Francisci de Marchia sive de Esculo Commentarius in IV libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi. Quaestiones praeambulae et Prologus*, pp. 147-343.

B. Book I

Francis’ commentary on book I of the *Sentences* exists in two versions, referred to as the *Reportatio* and the *Scriptum*. Four manuscripts (EHQX) witness the shorter *Reportatio*, although H seems to have a different redaction starting with q. 19. Moreover, E contains several fragmentary questions possessing enough significant variants that one suspects a distinct redaction.⁵² The longer *Scriptum*, witnessed by thirteen manuscripts (ACFLMNORSU VYZ) shows signs of having been reworked by the author⁵³ after 1322.⁵⁴ Four of the thirteen manuscripts carry part (ACL, the first part of q. 1) or all (R) of the prologue to the *Reportatio*.⁵⁵

Distinctions from book I currently edited:

Reportatio

Prologus (as ‘*Quaestiones praeambulae*’ and ‘*Prologus*’), *Quaestiones praeambulae et Prologus*, ed. N. Mariani, Grottaferrata 2003, pp. 345ff.

dd. 1-10, Distinctiones primi libri a prima ad decimam, ed. N. Mariani, Grottaferrata 2006.

dd. 11-28, Distinctiones primi libri ab undecima ad vigesimam octavam, ed. N. Mariani, Grottaferrata 2007.

d. 39, dd. 42-44, and dd. 45-48, ed. C. Schabel, in: E.N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (2008)* (URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2008/entries/francis-marchia/>).

Scriptum

Prologue, q. 1, ed. N. Mariani, *Francisci de Marchia sive de Esculo OFM, Quodlibet cum quaestionibus selectis ex commentario in libros Sententiarum*, pp. 377-88 (from MS C).

⁵² While Mariani maintains that H abbreviates QX, C. Schabel, “The Redactions of Book I”, pp. 117-121 argues that H appears to be a separate redaction. See also our remarks on DH’s redaction of book II, *infra*, pp. XLVI-LV.

⁵³ The term *scriptum* appears in one manuscript: Z, f. 93vb; C. Schabel, “The Redactions of Book I”, pp. 102-103; R. Friedman and C. Schabel, “Introduction”, p. 1, *in nota*.

⁵⁴ C. Schabel, “The Redactions of Book I”, p. 105; W. Duba, “Francesco d’Appignano tra Parigi e Avignone”. In the forthcoming edition of the *Scriptum*, G. Etkorn notes that in d. 20 Francis cites the arguments of Peter Auriol as being of a *Doctor bonae memoriae*; Peter Auriol died in early 1322.

⁵⁵ R. Friedman and C. Schabel, “Francis of Marchia’s Commentary on the *Sentences*”, pp. 49-50.

- Prologue, q. 2*, ed. N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 361-76 (from MS C).
- d. 1, q. 13*, ed. N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 525-42 (from MS C).
- d. 1, q. 14*, ed. N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 304-16 (from MS C).
- d. 2, q. 16*, ed. N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 414-27 (from MS C).
- d. 2, q. 18*, ed. N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 543-60 (from MS C).
- d. 3, q. 20*, ed. N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 507-15 (from MS C).
- d. 3, q. 22a*, ed. N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 516-24 (from MS C).
- d. 3, q. 23*, ed. N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 351-59 (from MS C).
- d. 4, q. 24*, ed. N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 324-45 (from MS C).
- d. 8, q. 27*, ed. N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 429-43 (from MS C).
- d. 8, q. 28, a. 1*, ed. N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 477-505 (from MS C).
- d. 11* (partial), ed. R. Friedman, "Francis of Marchia and John Duns Scotus on the Psychological Model of the Trinity", *Picenum Seraphicum* 18 (1999), pp. 46-56;
- d. 22*, ed. N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 389-413 (from MS C).
- d. 24*, ed. N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 414-75 (from MS C).
- d. 27*, ed. R. Friedman, in: '*In principio erat verbum*'. *The Incorporation of Philosophical Psychology into Trinitarian Theology, 1250-1325*, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1997, pp. 555-572. Transcription of *d. 27, q. 1, a. 1-2* in N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 295-303 (from MS C).
- dd. 35-38*, ed. C. Schabel, "Il determinismo di Francesco de Marchia", *Picenum Seraphicum* 18 (1999), pp. 69-95 and 19 (2000), pp. 18-55.
- dd. 39-40*, ed. C. Schabel, "La dottrina di Francesco de Marchia sulla predestinazione", *Picenum Seraphicum* 20 (2001), pp. 9-45.

C. Book II

Book II survives in three redactions. The most significant is that dubbed "Reportatio IIA" by Friedman and Schabel, and is witnessed in whole or in part by 14 manuscripts (ABCFGKLNPTVWYZ). While the explicit to V calls the text a *scriptum*, the explicit to K names William of Rubio as the *reportator*.⁵⁶ In addition to IIA, Friedman and Schabel named the version found in a sole manuscript witness (E) "Reportatio IIB". IIB presents a considerably shorter and different text than *Reportatio IIA*.⁵⁷ A third redaction (DH) bears strong ties to IIA, although it contains a shorter text. The relations between

⁵⁶ R. Friedman and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on the *Sentences*", p. 54.

⁵⁷ See the discussion in N. Schneider, *Die Kosmologie*, pp. 37-39.

the redactions, and between the witnesses to IIA, will receive further consideration in the discussion below.⁵⁸

All questions from book II currently edited come from IIA:

- q. 3*, ed. N. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 346-350 (from MS C);
- q. 12, a. 1* (partial), ed. R. Friedman, in: D. Priori, ed., *Atti del I° convegno internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2002, pp. 100-101 (from MSS BCYZ).
- q. 16, a. 5*, ed. C. Schabel, in: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Supplement to Francis of Marchia* (<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2007/entries/francis-marchia/>).
- q. 25*, ed. Mariani, *Quodlibet*, pp. 317-23 (from MS C).
- qq. 29-32, ed. N. Schneider, *Die Kosmologie des Franziskus de Marchia*, pp. 41-75 (using BCGLNW).

D. Book III

There are three versions of the commentary on book III. Thirteen manuscripts (ABCEFHJMNPTYZ) witness in whole or in part the major version (redaction IIIA).⁵⁹ At the end of P's copy of the main redaction, questions 1-8 are repeated in a second redaction (P', redaction IIIB). Finally, W contains a different version of the text (IIIC). The explicits of BCHY call IIIA a *reportatio*, while T qualifies it as *editus*, suggesting that Francis revised the text.⁶⁰ The commentary on book III is the shortest of the four, covering only a small portion of the Lombard's text and comprising only fifteen questions, sixteen if one includes the question *Utrum Christus fuerit vere frater noster*, witnessed only by JK.

Currently edited questions from book III:

- q. 1, a. 1; q. 7, a. 1 (IIIA, IIIB and IIIC)*: W. Duba and C. Schabel, "The Redactions of Francis of Marchia's Commentary on Book III of the *Sentences*", *Picenum Seraphicum* 26 (2007) (forthcoming).
- q. 13 (IIIA)*: W. Duba, "Francesco di Marchia sulla conoscenza intuitiva mediata e immediata", *Picenum Seraphicum* 22/23 (2002/2003), pp. 131-157.

⁵⁸ *infra*, pp. xxxvi-lv.

⁵⁹ W. Duba and C. Schabel "The Redactions of Francis of Marchia's Commentary on Book III of the *Sentences*", *Picenum Seraphicum* 25-27 (2006-2008) (forthcoming). For the manuscript tradition of book III, see W. Duba, "Francesco d'Appignano sull'immacolata concezione", in: D. Priori and M. Balena (eds.), *Atti del II° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2004, pp. 59-75; "Francesco di Marchia sulla conoscenza intuitiva mediata e immediata", *Picenum Seraphicum* 22/23 (2003/2004), pp. 127-130.

⁶⁰ R. Friedman and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on the *Sentences*", p. 57, for the stemma.

E. Book IV

Ten manuscripts (ABCDHKPYWZ) witness the commentary on this book in its entirety, and two (EVb) in a fragmentary manner.⁶¹ There exist three versions. Two are closely related, namely BDHKY (Redaction IVA) and CPWZ (Redaction IVB), with MS A shifting from IVB to IVA after the first few questions. E witnesses a few questions from a third redaction (IVC). The relationship between these versions is problematic, and many hypotheses have been formulated, such that we cannot as yet take a definitive position on the history of the text's transmission, outside of stating that none of the versions are abbreviations.⁶² The most recent studies have revealed that the versions relate to each other in different ways at various points in the commentary.⁶³ In any case, the explicits to BCHP identify the text as a *reportatio*, and P further qualifies it as *editus* by Francis. Moreover, C and P identify William of Rubio as the book's *reportator*, and C provides the date 1323, which may refer to the date the specific written redaction was completed.

Currently edited questions from book IV:

Redactio IVA

q. 1, ed. E. Katsoura, C. Papamarkou and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on Book IV of the *Sentences*, with Questions on Projectile Motion, Polygamy and the Immortality of the Soul", *Picenum Seraphicum* 25-27 (2006-2008) (forthcoming): from all MSS.

qq. 46 et 47, ed. E. Katsoura, C. Papamarkou and C. Schabel, *ibid.*

qq. 61a-b, ed. E. Katsoura, C. Papamarkou and C. Schabel, *ibid.*

Redactio IVB

q. 1, ed. C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's *Virtus Derelicta* and the Context of Its Development", *Vivarium* XLIV (2006), (pp. 41-80), pp. 60-80.

⁶¹ R. Friedman and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on the *Sentences*", p. 40.

⁶² R. Friedman and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on the *Sentences*", pp. 57-59; N. Mariani, "Certezze e ipotesi", p. 114; R. Lambertini, "A proposito del IV° libro del commento alle *Sentenze* di Francesco d'Appignano: la *quaestio* 37", *Atti del II° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, D. Priori and M. Balena (eds.), Appignano del Tronto 2004, pp. 9-26; R. Lambertini, "Francesco d'Appignano e Guglielmo di Ockham: alcuni aspetti di un rapporto non facile", in: D. Priori (ed.), *Atti del III° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2006, pp. 89-124; E. Katsoura, C. Papamarkou and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on Book IV".

⁶³ R. Lambertini, "A proposito del IV° libro", p. 17; E. Katsoura, C. Papamarkou and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on Book IV".

Redactio IVC

q. 1, ed. C. Schabel, "La virtus derelicta di Francesco d'Appignano e il contesto del suo sviluppo", in D. Priori, ed., *Atti del III^o Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2006, (pp. 125-154) pp. 140-154.

In addition, numerous passages have been published from Francis' commentary on book IV in studies on his philosophy of nature and on his doctrine of accidents.⁶⁴

2. *The content of the Commentary on the Sentences*

Peter Lombard's four books of *Sentences* were organized by its author into books and chapters; in the early thirteenth century, Alexander of Hales imposed upon Lombard's text the organization into 'distinctions' that is associated with the text today. Francis of Marchia's commentary on the *Sentences* was composed at a moment in the evolution of the genre when considerable distance had been established between the written commentary and Lombard's text as it was reorganized by Alexander of Hales. By the third decade of the fourteenth century, this evolution would lead in some cases to the abandonment of the structuring of the commentary according to distinction in favor of an organization based exclusively on questions (*quaestiones*).⁶⁵ In contrast to this later development, Francis' commentary follows the structure of the Lombard's text, but without completely adhering to it, and without reproducing all the articulations. Francis' commentaries on books I and IV present the questions with the divisions into distinctions still evident. Book III (all redactions) follows the structure of the Lombard's text, but makes only one mention of a distinction (q. 2, mentioning that it is dealing with material from d. 2). Book II, *Reportatio A* has no divisions into distinctions, but rather contains references to the "three parts" of the book.⁶⁶ *Reportatio B* has very few references to the Lombard's text. Moreover, while, with the exception of book III, the size of Francis' commentary does not vary much between the books,⁶⁷ the topics treated have been carefully selected and reflect the author's interests, reducing the scope of the commentary with respect to the Lombard's text, and giving it a more personal character.

As the edition of entire books of Francis' commentaries is just beginning, we shall describe the major themes that occur in the various redactions, and point to the scholarly studies so far done on individual topics.

⁶⁴ R. Friedman and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on the *Sentences*", p. 98.

⁶⁵ R. Friedman, "Conclusion", in: G.R. Evans (ed.), *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, Leiden 2002, (pp. 509-527), pp. 524-525.

⁶⁶ For the structure of book II, see *infra*, xxxvii-xl.

⁶⁷ Comparing just the various *Reportatio* versions, book I contains 71 questions, book II 49, book III 16 and book IV has 66.

A. *Book I*

Francis' commentary on book I begins with the questions on the prologue concerning theology as a science and its subject (God), what can be known of God through science, and the nature of this science (speculative *in patria*, and practical, after a fashion, *in via*).⁶⁸ Passing to the first distinction, Francis discusses questions concerning the will, the act of the will, freedom and its relation to the ultimate goal (i.e. eternal life).⁶⁹ He then considers final causality and the cognizability of the infinite in detail before arriving at the Trinity.⁷⁰ Distinctions 5 through 30 focus in detail on issues involving the Trinity.⁷¹ Francis raises in distinction 30 the issue of the relationship between God and creature, specifically from the perspective of God, and he will return to this theme in the present volume, qq. 7-9, from the complementary perspective of creatures. The following distinctions, 31-34, continue to treat relations, but within divinity. Distinctions 35 and 36 consider created reality, contingency and the knowledge of future contingent propositions,⁷² while distinction 37 addresses God's omnipresence in things, and His cognition of particulars. Predestination takes up distinctions 38, 40 and 41,⁷³ while 39 considers divine ideas.⁷⁴ In distinctions 42-44, Francis asks what makes creation possible, and he returns to the theme of the will in distinctions 45-48.

⁶⁸ On these topics, see A. Poppi, "Ontologia e scienza divina nel Commentario alle Sentenze di Francesco della Marca (1319)", *Miscellanea francescana* 104 (2004), pp. 100-120 and F. Zanin, "Gregorio da Rimini contro Francesco d'Appignano sulla conoscenza scientifica dell'oggetto della teologia", in: D. Priori and M. Balena (eds.), *Atti del II° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2004, pp. 27-58.

⁶⁹ On these issues, see generally G. Alliney, "La ricezione della teoria scotiana della volontà nell'ambiente teologico parigino (1307-1316)", *Documenti e Studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 16 (2005), pp. 339-391; specifically on Francis, idem, "La libertà dell'atto beatifico nel pensiero di Francesco d'Appignano", in: D. Priori (ed.), *Atti del III° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2006, pp. 9-34.

⁷⁰ For Francis' treatment of the cognizability of the infinite, see N. Schneider, "Eine ungedruckte Quästio zur Erkennbarkeit des Unendlichen in einem Metaphysikkommentar des 14. Jahrhunderts", *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 18 (1986), pp. 96-118.

⁷¹ For some of these themes, see R. Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions at the Medieval University: The Use of Philosophical Psychology in Trinitarian Theology among the Franciscans and Dominicans, 1250-1350*, Leiden (forthcoming), cap. 12, part 2.

⁷² C. Schabel, *Theology at Paris*, pp. 189-220 and pp. 324-336; F. Fiorentino, *Gregorio da Rimini. Contingenza, futuro e scienza nel pensiero tardo-medievale*, Rome 2004, pp. 75-76, 83-84, 188-189.

⁷³ C. Schabel, "Il determinismo di Francesco di Marchia"; "La dottrina di Francesco di Marchia sulla predestinazione".

⁷⁴ C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia on Divine Ideas", in: M.C. Pacheco and J.F. Meirinhos (eds.), *Intellect et imagination dans la philosophie médiévale*, Turnhout 2006, pp. 1589-1599.

B. *Book II*

See the detailed treatment, *infra*, pp. xxxvi-lv.

C. *Book III*

Francis' commentaries on book III are the shortest of the four books. The most complete version has fifteen questions, plus an additional question found in two closely related manuscripts.⁷⁵ As noted, only q. 2 mentions the Lombard's distinctions ("Circa distinctionem secundam"), although the other questions address material associated with several different distinctions in Peter Lombard's text. Francis' rough contemporary and fellow Franciscan Peter Auriol (reading the *Sentences* two years before Francis), similarly has a disproportionately short commentary on book III, suggesting that the reason might be institutional, perhaps related to the fact that book III was the last one treated by a bachelor in the course of lectures.⁷⁶

Francis' commentary on book III starts with a series of questions on the hypostatic union (qq. 1-6, related to distinction 1). After addressing the possibility of the Incarnation, he considers its vessel, the Virgin, with two questions relating to Peter Lombard's distinction 8: whether the Virgin was a mother in the same sense as other women (q. 7)⁷⁷ and a defense of the Immaculate Conception (q. 8).⁷⁸ Questions 9 and 10 relate to distinction 18, and treat the redemption: namely in what way the redemption can be considered the cause of the Incarnation,⁷⁹ and whether the redemption could be brought about by a mere creature. The next three questions (qq. 11-13) relate to distinction 14 and consider the human soul and the intellect of Christ.⁸⁰ The following question

⁷⁵ On the various redactions of this book, see W. Duba and C. Schabel, "The Redactions of Francis of Marchia's Commentary on Book III".

⁷⁶ For an examination of Auriol's commentaries on book III of the *Sentences*, see W. Duba, "The Immaculate Conception in the Works of Peter Auriol", *Vivarium* 38 (2000), pp. 5-34. Examples of disproportionately short contemporary commentaries on book III abound. For instance, Francis Meyronnes' commentary on book III in the 1520 Venice edition is very short, both in absolute length and in the number of questions, in comparison to his commentaries on the other books.

⁷⁷ See on this question, C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia and the Women", in: D. Priori (ed.), *Atti del IV° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2008 (forthcoming).

⁷⁸ Consult on this topic, W. Duba, "Francesco d'Appignano sull'immacolata concezione".

⁷⁹ See W. Duba, "Se non ci fosse la redenzione, ci sarebbe l'incarnazione? Il rapporto fra la *reparatio humani generis* e la causa dell'incarnazione del Verbo secondo Francesco d'Appignano", in: D. Priori (ed.), *Atti del III° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2006, pp. 35-46.

⁸⁰ See W. Duba, "Francis of Marchia on Christ's Cognition of the Word", in: M.C. Pacheco and J. Meirinhos (eds.), *Intellect et imagination dans la philosophie médiévale*, Turnhout 2006, pp. 1613-1624.

(q. 14), pertaining to distinction 36, considers the connection of the virtues,⁸¹ while the last two return to Christ: His relationship to grace and glory (q. 15), and (in mss. JK) in what sense Christ can be considered “our brother” (q. 16).⁸²

For book III, Francis appears to have carefully selected a limited number of themes to discuss. In these themes, Francis complements his highly personal theological perspective with precise philosophical analysis and defends unique positions not only in Christology and Mariology, but also in psychology and anthropology.

D. *Book IV*

Among Francis’ works, the commentary on book IV has to this point attracted the most scholarly attention, in large part due to Francis’ discussion of projectile motion in the initial question. As with book II, the first question begins with a reference to a *principium*: “*Circa principium quarti libri...*”⁸³ This reference suggests that the question was part of the *quaestio collativa* that a bachelor of the *Sentences* held before beginning the lectures on the particular book.⁸⁴ Further supporting this hypothesis is this question’s lack of strong relationship with the first distinction of book IV of the Lombard. Finally, Schabel has recently argued that the whole of the first question constitutes the “‘missing’ fourth article” of Marchia’s *principium*.⁸⁵ In terms of content, the question considers the power (*virtus*) that works in the sacraments. In the three articles of this eminently theological question (“*Utrum in sacramentis sit aliqua virtus supernaturalis insistens sive eis formaliter inhaerens*”),⁸⁶ Francis inserts a small treatise on natural philosophy: the first two articles are dedicated to motion, in particular the force that serves as cause of motion in violent motion (first article)⁸⁷ and in natural motion (second article).⁸⁸ In the third article, Francis

⁸¹ See E. Babeay, “En vertu du lien. François d’Appignano et la ‘connexio virtutum’ (III Sent. q. 14, a. 3)”, in: D. Priori (ed.), *Atti del IV° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d’Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2008 (forthcoming).

⁸² This last question appears in only two manuscripts: J, ff. 103vb-106rb and K, ff. 221v-229v (R. Friedman and C. Schabel, “Francis of Marchia’s Commentary on the *Sentences*”, p. 98).

⁸³ The phrase *circa principium* appears in three manuscripts that carry the long version; see C. Schabel, “Francis of Marchia’s *Virtus derelicta*”, p. 57.

⁸⁴ R. Friedman, “*Principia* and Prologue”, pp. 123-125.

⁸⁵ C. Schabel, “Francis of Marchia’s *Virtus derelicta*”, p. 57.

⁸⁶ Edited in C. Schabel, “Francis of Marchia’s *Virtus derelicta*”, pp. 60-80; C. Schabel, “La *virtus derelicta* di Francesco d’Appignano”, pp. 140-154; E. Katsoura, C. Papamarkou and C. Schabel, “Francis of Marchia’s Commentary on Book IV”.

⁸⁷ “Primo videbitur utrum in instrumento artificiali sit sive recipiatur aliqua virtus a principali sive artificiali agente ipsi instrumento inhaerens sive formaliter inexistens”, in Schabel, “Francis of Marchia’s *Virtus derelicta*”, p. 61, ll. 40-43.

⁸⁸ “Secundo, videbitur idem de instrumento naturali, utrum videlicet in manu vel in lingua, et sic de aliis naturalibus instrumentis, sit aliqua virtus influxa a potentia principaliter talia instrumenta naturalia movente, alia a forma ipsorum cuiuslibet propria et a motu”, *ibid.*, p. 61, ll. 43-46.

applies the results of the first two to the sacraments, considered as spiritual or supernatural instruments.⁸⁹ It is in this question that Francis formulates his famous theory of *virtus derelicta*, later known as *impetus*, and this is the reason why this question is the most studied text of Francis' thought.⁹⁰ Indeed, the doctrinal and historical significance of Francis' thought in this question is unanimously acknowledged. Moreover, it supplies an eloquent witness to the philosophical value of the medieval debates on theological themes.

Moving on to the rest of the text, Francis privileges certain themes, in particular the Eucharist, which receives fifteen questions,⁹¹ and marriage, which gets nineteen.⁹² Additionally, distinction 21 addresses a hot topic of Francis' time: property, and Francis makes it a matter of positive law as opposed to

⁸⁹ "Tertio, ex hoc videbitur principale propositum, videlicet utrum in sacramentis, quae sunt instrumenta spiritualia sive supernaturalia, sit aliqua supernaturalis virtus eis inhaerens formaliter", *ibid.*, p. 61, ll. 46-49.

⁹⁰ Among the numerous studies dedicated to Francis' position on this theme, see: A. Maier, *Zwei Grundprobleme*, pp. 61-200; *Zwischen Philosophie und Mechanik*, Rome 1958, pp. 350-354; "Zu einigen Problemen der Ockhamsforschung"; "Die naturphilosophische Bedeutung der scholastischen Impetustheorie", *Ausgehendes Mittelalter*, v. 1, pp. 353-379; *Die Vorläufer Galileis im 14. Jahrhundert*, Rome 1949, pp. 133-136 and pp. 241-247; N. Schneider, *Die Kosmologie*, pp. 225-237; "Kontexte des Naturbegriffs", in: D. Priori (ed.), *Atti del I° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2002, pp. 161-173; M. Wolff, *Geschichte der Impetustheorie. Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der klassischen Mechanik*, Frankfurt 1978, pp. 191-198; G. Federici Vescovini, *La teoria dell'impeto*, Turin 1969, pp. 1-21; K. Michalski, *La physique nouvelle et les différents courants philosophiques au XIVe siècle*, Krakow 1928, pp. 1-2, 47-49, 56; D. Priori, "Francesco d'Appignano: *Frustra fit per plura quod fieri potest per pauciora*", in: idem (ed.), *Atti del I° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d'Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2002, pp. 103-115; F. Zanin, "La rielaborazione del concetto di *vis derelicta* in Nicole Oresme", *ibid.*, pp. 117-158; "Francis of Marchia, *Virtus derelicta*, and Modifications of the Basic Principles of Aristotelian Physics", *Vivarium* 44 (2006), pp. 81-95; C. Schabel, "La *virtus derelicta* di Francesco d'Appignano"; "Francis of Marchia's *Virtus derelicta*"; S. Livesey, "Accessus ad Lombardum: The Secular and the Sacred in Medieval Commentaries on the *Sentences*", *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévale* 72.1 (2005), (pp. 153-174), pp. 165-167.

⁹¹ See on some aspects of Francis' theory of the eucharist, P.J.J.M. Bakker, *La raison et le miracle*, vol. 1, pp. 86-94 and 399-408 (with passages of Francis' texts). Francis' theory of accidents has also been studied by F. Amerini, "Utrum inhaerentia sit de essentia accidentis. Francis of Marchia and the Debate on the Nature of Accidents", *Vivarium* 44 (2006), pp. 96-150 (with an edition of *Quaestiones in Metaphysicam*, VII, q. 1); "Francesco d'Appignano come fonte di Paolo Veneto. Il caso degli accidenti eucaristici", *Picenum Seraphicum* 25-27 (2006-2008) (forthcoming). Moreover, a comparison between Francis' doctrine of quantity and that of Ockham has been proposed by R. Lambertini, "Francesco d'Appignano e Guglielmo di Ockham".

⁹² See C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia and the Women"; E. Katsoura, C. Papamarkou and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on Book IV" (with an edition of q. 46 ("Utrum sit contra ius naturae quod una mulier habeat plures viros") and 47 ("Utrum sit contra ius naturae quod unus habeat plures uxores").

natural law.⁹³ Towards the end, distinctions 43 to 47 treat the Resurrection, separate souls and their immortality.⁹⁴

⁹³ R. Lambertini has extensively studied this theme in numerous works, chief among which are: *La povertà pensata*, pp. 196-204; “Oltre la proprietà, alle origini del potere: Francesco d’Appignano nel pensiero ecclesiologico-politico del Trecento”, in: D. Priori (ed.), *Atti del I° Convegno Internazionale su Francesco d’Appignano*, Appignano del Tronto 2002, pp. 51-66; “Francesco d’Ascoli e la polemica francescana contro Giovanni XXII: a proposito del rapporto tra *l’Improbatio* e *l’Appellatio magna monacensis*”, in: A. Degrandi, O. Gori, G. Pesiri, A. Piazza and R. Rinaldi (eds.), *Studi in onore di Girolamo Arnaldi offerti dagli allievi della Scuola nazionale di Studi Storici*, Rome 2001, pp. 277-308; “A proposito del IV° libro del Commento alle Sentenze di Francesco d’Appignano”; “Francesco d’Appignano e Guglielmo di Ockham”; “Francis of Marchia and William of Ockham: Fragments from a Dialogue”, *Vivarium* 44 (2006), pp. 184-204.

⁹⁴ The immortality of the soul will be treated again in book II, qq. 18-19. On this topic, see T. Suarez-Nani, “Peut-on prouver l’immortalité de l’âme? Démonstration et certitude selon François de Marchia”, *Picenum Seraphicum* 25-27 (2006-2008) (forthcoming); E. Katsoura, C. Papamarkou and C. Schabel, “Francis of Marchia’s Commentary on Book IV” (with an edition of book IV, q. 61a-b, substantially the same as *Reportatio IIA*, q. 19).

IV. The Questions on the Second Book of the *Sentences*

1. Redactions

Three redactions of Francis' commentary on book II of the *Sentences* survive, and an awareness of the relationship between these redactions is necessary to evaluate Francis' thought as contained in these texts. The present volume presents the first part of the major redaction, *Reportatio IIA*. This text exists in 14 manuscripts, namely ABCFGKLNPTVWYZ. E, that is, Vatican City, BAV, vat. lat. 943, reports a different text (and will appear in an edition directed by Girard Etzkorn). To distinguish these two redactions, Friedman and Schabel have proposed the titles *Reportatio IIA* and *Reportatio IIB*, which we have adopted, abbreviating them as IIA and IIB for the discussion that follows.

In addition, Friedman and Schabel noted that manuscripts DH "share a rather different text."⁹⁵ While the text in DH has strong textual similarities with IIA, at times it deviates greatly. From soundings in the manuscript tradition, it became evident that DH reports a different redaction, although closely related to IIA. As an appendix to this introduction, we have edited q. 1 as it appears in DH in order to illustrate the range of differences from IIA.

Friedman and Schabel also suggested that V contains an abbreviation of IIA, and yet they observe that a note in the manuscript calls the text a *Scriptum*.⁹⁶ Our soundings suggest that V could just as easily contain an extremely faulty copy. For all of V's faults, however, our reconstruction of the *stemma codicum* places V in a privileged position with respect to the original, and so we cannot discard V's observations as entirely inauthentic.

So at least three redactions exist, and, while no unambiguous, explicit indications permit us to state the relationship between the texts with certitude, we can advance hypotheses with respect to the three texts. First, IIB is an early *reportatio*, perhaps reflecting Francis' Parisian lectures. Second, DH reflects the text in an intermediate state, possibly a revised *reportatio*. Third, IIA revises and completes the text as found in DH. In order to support these statements, then, we need to consider the relation between two groups of texts: IIA-IIB, and IIA-DH.

The following examination considers examples from throughout Francis' commentary on book II, and not just those related to the first twelve questions of IIA. Particular questions in these works are indicated in the format redaction:question, where redaction can be IIA, IIB or DH, and question re-

⁹⁵ R. Friedman and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on the *Sentences*", p. 55.

⁹⁶ R. Friedman and C. Schabel, "Francis of Marchia's Commentary on the *Sentences*", p. 56.

fers to the number, for example, IIA:4. Paragraphs are indicated using the abbreviation *n*.

A. *Reportatio IIA and Reportatio IIB*

The content of IIA and IIB is largely the same, at the level both of the questions considered and of the argumentation within those questions. In the actual structure of the commentary as well as its explicit and implicit articulation, IIA reflects a text composed in written form, while IIB presents strong evidence of orality. Since both commentaries treat the arguments of Peter Auriol, we suspect that both IIA and IIB relate to Francis' Paris lectures.

Structure

According to Friedman and Schabel's numeration, IIA has 49 questions, and IIB 65. A comparison of the questions reveals that, with the exception of IIA, q. 1 (derived from the *Principium secundi*), IIB has one or more questions parallel to each of IIA's discussions, and, for the most part, there are strong correspondences between the internal structures of the questions.

We have prepared a table of corresponding questions (or discrete groups of questions) between IIA and IIB, along with distinctions from Lombard's *Sentences* to which these questions would presumably belong, the latter determined from a comparison of question titles with those in the *Sentences* commentaries of Peter Auriol, Landulph Caracciolo and John Duns Scotus, which are divided according to distinction. An asterisk (*) marks the cases where, in IIB, Francis specifies the distinction, along with, in cases of divergence, the "traditional" distinction such questions marked in parenthesis:

Table 1: Question Order in Reportationes IIA and IIB

| <i>Reportatio IIA</i> | <i>Reportatio IIB</i> | <i>II Sent. distinction</i> |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| q. 1 | - | d. I |
| q. 2, a. 1 | q. 1 | d. I |
| q. 2, a. 2 | q. 2 | d. I |
| q. 2, a. 3 | q. 3 | d. I |
| q. 3 | q. 4 | d. I |
| q. 4 | q. 5 | d. II* (I) |
| q. 5 | q. 6 | d. II* |
| q. 6 | q. 7 | d. II* |
| q. 7 (conclusio 1) | q. 8 | d. IV* (I) |
| q. 7 (conclusio 2) | q. 9 | d. IV* (I) |
| q. 8 | q. 10 | d. IV* (I) |
| q. 9 | q. 11 | d. IV* (I) |
| q. 10 | qq. 12-15 | d. I |
| q. 11 | qq. 16-18 | d. I |
| q. 12 | q. 19 | d. I |