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1 Introduction

Henry of Gorkum was born around 1378 in Gorinchem, in the Low Countries. Gorinchem, which is located about 35 miles (56 km) south of Amsterdam, was granted city rights in 1322. Henry began his studies at the University of Paris in 1395 as a member of the English nation and became a master of arts there in 1398. Having attained the degree of *magister*, he served as the regent of the university until 1401. Anton Weiler argues that between 1402 and 1409 Henry probably studied theology at the University of Paris. Following this period of theological studies, Henry served as the procurator of the English nation at Paris between 1410 and 1419, when he left for Cologne.

Henry's commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard is an *abbreviatio* that presents short summaries (ca. 600–900 words) of each distinction of all four books of the *Sentences*. The work became increasingly popular in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, being printed either as an independent commentary consisting of the abbreviations alone (following the traditional incipits of the distinctions in the Lombard's text) or within an edition of the *Sentences*. Because Henry's commentary has been relegated to the category of an *abbreviatio* it has attracted little attention from scholars, particularly regarding its philosophical and theological content. This neglect has been


2 A distinction should be made between the twelfth- and thirteenth-century abbreviations of Peter Lombard's *Sentences* (for example, the abbreviation by Master Bandius or the *Filia Magistri*) and those of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries (for example, John Eck's
addressed, albeit indirectly, in the recent work of Maarten Hoenen, whose studies of the *abbreviatio* literature is giving these commentaries the proper attention that they deserve within the development of medieval thought.3

The best guide to interpreting Henry’s *abbreviatio* is to place it within the historical and textual tradition within which it was produced. Thus, the present paper will first consider Henry within the context of the University of Cologne, summarizing both the institutional context within which Henry worked and the other works he wrote while at Cologne. Secondly, it will briefly examine the textual tradition of Henry’s *Conclusiones* as found in the manuscript and incunabula tradition. Thirdly, it will consider the methodology of the *Conclusiones*, looking at what Henry chose to treat in his summaries of the Lombard and what information this gives the historian regarding both the intent of the work and its theological content. The argument of this chapter is that Gorkum’s *Conclusiones* belong to the *modus expositionis* tradition of textual analysis, which was common to the realist masters (*antiqui*) working in Cologne at the beginning of the fifteenth century, and as such was developed as a pedagogical tool for students studying the Lombard’s *Sentences*.

2 Henry of Gorkum and Cologne

2.1 Cologne and the Bursae

Henry of Gorkum was a Thomist who has the distinction of being one of the first theologians to write a commentary (or summary) of Thomas Aquinas’s *Summa theologiae*. He was influential in the fifteenth-century Thomistic renaissance that had its beginnings in the late fourteenth century and exerted such a significant influence on the German universities. The origins of this

---

3 For the relevant studies by Maarten J.F.M. Hoenen, see footnotes 8, 44, 50, and 51 below.
movement are perhaps traced back to Paris, as many of the *antiqui* at Cologne and other European universities were originally trained there.⁴ For example, Henry of Gorkum (Thomist) and Heymericus de Campo (Albertist) both studied at Paris around the turn of the century. Another example is the Thomist John Capreolus († 1444), who began his studies as a *baccalarius Sententiarum* at Paris in 1407, becoming a master in theology there in 1411 and subsequently teaching in Dominican houses in Toulouse and Rodez. Astrik Gabriel argues that several students of Johannes Wenck († 1460)—including Conradus from Franken, Johannes Leivolfingher from Schaffhausen, Nicholaus from Rospacha, and Ludovicos Rorich from Hesse—were responsible for spreading “realist” philosophical positions throughout Germany.⁵ Wenck, an Albertist, remained in Paris until around 1418, when he left for Heidelberg. He also wrote a Thomistic commentary on the *Sentences* and was influential in spreading “realist” philosophy to Heidelberg.⁶ It is within this broader interest in the writings of Thomas Aquinas and Albert the Great that Gorkum composed his theological works. Gorkum left Paris and arrived in Cologne in 1419. The University of Cologne, founded in 1388, was influenced by the *via moderna* in the late fourteenth century, but with Gorkum’s arrival it began to be influenced by the *via antiqua*, and particularly Gorkum’s brand of Thomism.⁷

The debates between the various *viae* or philosophical schools in the fifteenth century—debates that are generally referred to as the *Wegestreit*—had

---


a significant influence on the development of the University of Cologne.\textsuperscript{8} Anton Weiler, critiquing both Ritter and Keussen, argues that the 1398 statutes of the faculty of arts demonstrate that the masters were free to use either Peter of Spain's *Summulae de dialectica* or John Buridan's *Summulae logicales* for instruction in logic.\textsuperscript{9} The logical works of Peter of Spain were generally understood to be more open to a realist reading, whereas Buridan's logic was employed by the terminists or conceptualists. As Weiler emphasizes, the result was an openness to the various *viae* and their respective approaches to the study of logic.\textsuperscript{10}

In the fifteenth-century debates between the *reales/antiqui* and the *nominales/moderni* the former defended a realist understanding of universals


\textsuperscript{9} See Weiler, *Heinrich von Gorkum*, 57. Hermann Keussen and Gerhard Ritter interpreted the statute in question to be prohibiting a nominalist view of logic, and in his critique of this position Weiler indicates the following texts and pages: Hermann Keussen, *Die alte Universität Köln. Grundzüge ihrer Verfassung und Geschichte* (Cologne, 1934), 296; Gerhard Ritter, *Via antiqua und Via moderna auf den deutschen Universitäten des xv. Jahrhunderts* (Heidelberg, 1963), 42. The statutes state three separate times when the logic of Peter of Spain or Buridan could be studied within the arts faculty. See Bianco, *Die alte Universität Köln*, vol. 1.2, 71: “Item de quantitate collectarum, statuimus et ordinamus circa libros ordinarios in Facultate nostra legendaros, quod Summule Petri Hispani et similiter Byridani legantur per tres menses, et pro quinque albis; Vetus ars per quatuor meses et pro sex albis; Topicorum per decem septimanas et pro quinque albis; Elenchorum per decem septimanas et pro quatuor; de anima per quatuordecim septimanas et pro sex; Physicorum per tria quartalia anni et pro duodecim albis. . . .”

while the latter defended a conceptualist or terminist view. Beyond the theory of universals, the debates which characterized the Wogestreit extended into areas of formal logic and supposition theory. The supposition of terms, therefore, was a central point of disagreement between the antiqui and moderni.11 However, within the realist camp, there was also a heated debate between the Thomists and Albertists at Cologne. Since this latter debate is the context in which Henry wrote his commentary on the Lombard, a brief description of the two schools of thought and their institutional organization is in order.

Soon after his arrival in Cologne Gorkum founded a bursa, which was later called the bursa montana.12 The bursae of the German universities in the early fifteenth century are therefore important to understanding the academic context within which Henry's Conclusiones were composed. The bursae were founded by an individual person and remained independent administratively from the university and city. But the bursae were the places where the students lived; eating and lodging together, they developed over time a sense of a familia magistri.13 Consequently, the individual bursae began to exert considerable influence on the structure of the university and were increasingly the places not only where students lived and ate but also took their courses.14 While the bursa montana was the oldest bursa in Cologne, by the mid-fifteenth century there were four central bursae (two Thomist and two Albertist ones).15

The two Thomist bursae were the bursa montana (named after Gerhard de Monte, a student of Gorkum’s) and the bursa corneliana (named after Cornelius Baldwini de Dordraco/of Dordrecht). The two Albertist bursae were the bursa laurentiana, which was begun by Heymericus de Campo in 1440 (named after Laurentius Berungen of Groningen) and the bursa kuckana (named after John of Kuck, who died in 1470). As is argued by Harm Goris and others, the Cologne bursae established a theological tradition within which students and masters conducted their work. Thus, it was common in the latter fifteenth century for commentaries to be written secundum processum bursae Montis or secundum

---

12 I will refer to the bursa founded by Henry Gorkum as the bursa montana, although it received this title at a somewhat later date.
14 For a discussion of student life and the students’ relationship with the bursae, see Tewes, Die Bursen, and Meuthen, Kölnische Universitätsgeschichte.
15 For information on these bursae—and the smaller bursa Raemsdonck and bursa Ottonis—see Tewes, Die Bursen, 27–110 and 250–61.
The two realist *viae*—despite their general objection to the *nominales*—also had significant points of disagreement with each other. Thus, the controversy between the Thomists and Albertists “would be even fiercer and longer lasting” than the debates of either with the *nominales*. The philosophical and theological disputes between the *viae antiqui*—both in Cologne and in the fifteenth-century universities broadly speaking—are studied in great detail by Maarten Hoenen, who defends the thesis that many of the heated debates in the fifteenth century were between the Thomists and the Albertists.

The Cologne *bursae* were influential in spreading Thomism and Albertism into the German universities. The two *viae antiqui*—as developed within their respective *bursae* in Cologne—spread throughout the German universities. However, what is important for the present paper is not the development of the *bursae* per se, or the spread of the *viae antiqui* throughout Germany, but the institutional context in which Henry of Gorkum carried out his work. Within the Thomistic and Albertist *bursae* at Cologne, the masters developed significant pedagogical tools for instructing the members of their respective colleges. In the following section, I will briefly consider two other works by Henry of Gorkum which indicate that the texts in question were developed as teaching tools within the *bursae*.

### 2.2 Thomism and the *Modus Expositionis*

Before analyzing Henry of Gorkum’s *Conclusiones* in detail, it is necessary to consider not only the institutional context of his works but also similar treatises that can provide a hermeneutical key for understanding his abbreviation of the Lombard. Thus, the present section will consider briefly two of Henry’s works—the *Supplementum iiiae partis Summae theologiae S. Thomae Aquinatis* and the *Quaestiones in Summam Sancti Thomae*—by analyzing their basic methodological structure as well as the question of what this structure indicates about Henry’s approach to Thomas Aquinas. The point of departure for interpreting the method of Henry and the *viae antiquae* is still the work of Gerhard Ritter. Ritter, in his study of late fifteenth-century sources, argues that the *via antiqua* and the *via moderna* developed two distinct commentary traditions: the *modus expositionis* followed by the *reales*, and the *modus quaestionum*.

---

17 For a discussion of the terminists and a “terminist school” within the Cologne arts faculty at the beginning of the fifteenth century, see Tewes, *Die Bursen*, 279–332.
followed by the *nominales*. Weiler adopts this methodological division in his analysis of Henry of Gorkum. Henry composed the *Supplementum IIIae partis Summae theologiae S. Thomae Aquinatis* to expand on Thomas's *Summa*. Because Thomas died before completing his *Summa theologiae*, the work of supplementing the *tertia pars* fell to his confessor, the Dominican Reginald of Piperno († c. 1290), who composed his *supplementum* from the relevant sections of Thomas's *Scriptum super Sententiis*. Following Reginald's lead, Henry of Gorkum compiled a second supplement to the *tertia pars*. Henry's was a more substantive *supplementum* than the one complied by Reginald, expanding as it did the text through a more generous use of Thomas's *Sentences* commentary.

Henry's *Supplementum* is significant in the present context because it indicates his general approach to theology. As a follower of Thomas Aquinas—and as the founder and master of a newly instituted *bursa*—it was important for him to present the Dominican's theology in its fullest and most developed form. That being said, because the *Supplementum* does not contain original commentary or argumentation by Henry, it is difficult to compare it with his other, more expository works. In this sense the *Supplementum* is best understood as a pedagogical work developed for the use of students. But, beyond the pedagogical interest that this text demonstrates it would perhaps be more productive to consider Henry's commentary on the *Summa theologiae*.

Alongside the *Supplementum* Henry also wrote the *Quaestiones in Summam Sancti Thomae*. The *Quaestiones*, which were probably conceived as a pedagogical tool to summarize Thomas's massive *Summa* within a lecture setting, treat all four parts of the *Summa*: the *prima pars*, the *prima secundae*, *secunda secundae*, and the *tertia pars*. The work systematically divides the four parts into *quaestiones*, each of which contains three *propositiones* and one or more corresponding *corollaria*. The *prima pars* has 38 *quaestiones* (table: 1r) and occupies about 48 folios (2r–49v); the *prima secundae* has 19 *quaestiones* (table: 50v) and occupies about 34 folios (51r–85v); the *secunda secundae* has

---
19 See Ritter, *Via antiqua und Via moderna*, 104ff.
20 For a discussion of the *Supplementum*, see Weiler, *Heinrich von Gorkum*, 122–30. Weiler notes that the *Supplementum* was not edited or printed in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth centuries. For a list of the manuscripts, see ibid., 92.
21 See ibid., 89–90, 130–7.
22 I am using the following edition: Heinricus de Goricem, *Quaestiones in Summam S. Thomae* (Esslingen: Konrad Fyner, 1473), which is kept in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Stamp. Ross. 2142.
23 The practice of dividing the individual *quaestiones* into three *propositiones* is significant. Gorkum follows this pattern in the *Conclusiones*, see the discussion in sections 4.1 and 4.2 below.
22 quaestiones (table: 86r) and occupies about 43 folios (87r–130r); and the tertia pars has 25 quaestiones (table: 130r) which occupy about 44 folios.24 The Quaestiones, unlike the Supplementum, were edited and published in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.25 Both the Supplementum and the Quaestiones demonstrate Henry’s interest in disseminating the original works of Thomas Aquinas, as well as making the works of the Angelic Doctor more accessible to students within the classrooms of the bursa. That said, the argument described above—developed by Ritter and defended by Weiler, among others—suggested a distinction between the nominales and reales regarding their use of the modus quaestionis and the modus expositionis, respectively.26 So, how should Henry’s Quaestiones be interpreted in this regard? Is the methodology of the work expository, that is to say, based on philosophical and theological questions that remain unreconciled? Weiler addresses this question in his analysis of the title of the work. He argues that, although the incunabula tradition often refers to the work using the term Quaestiones, it was previously referred to as a Summa nova, Compendium, or Abbreviatum.27 These designations, Weiler notes, describe the methodology of the Quaestiones more adequately. In fact, what Henry of Gorkum presents in his Quaestiones is a summary or abbreviation of Thomas Aquinas’s Summa theologiae. Thus, both the Supplementum and Quaestiones can be adequately described, following Ritter, as following a modus expositionis approach.28

3 The Textual Tradition of the Conclusiones

The extant manuscripts, incunabula, and early modern printings of Henry of Gorkum’s Conclusiones were originally cataloged by Friedrich Stegmüller,

24 Weiler composed a table in which he correlates Henry’s quaestiones with the Summa theologiae (for the prima pars and prima secundae only). See Weiler, Heinrich von Gorkum, 135–7.
25 See ibid., 89–90.
26 See ibid., 132. “Wenn die Titel mit Quaestiones . . . oder Positiones . . . sich auf die äußere Gestalt des Werkes beziehen, so geben die Bezeichnungen Summa, Compendium oder Abbreviatum den Zweck an, den es verfolgt: eine kurze Zusammenfassung von Thomas’ Hauptwerk zu geben.”
27 See ibid., 132.
28 Weiler’s distinction between the modus expositionis and the modus quaestionum has been the subject of critique and should be used with caution. But given this caveat, his description of Gorkum’s works as encapsulating a modus expositionis remains convincing (if understood as not necessarily excluding the modus quaestionum).
whose findings were subsequently completed by Anton Weiler.\[^{29}\] Thus, for information regarding the manuscripts and early printings, the reader is directed to Weiler’s work. The present section, therefore, will not present a full analysis of the manuscripts or printings, but instead will treat the content of the manuscripts and printings. That is, because Gorkum’s work is often printed alongside the Lombard’s *Sentences* (particularly in the early modern printings) the discussion here will consider how the *Conclusiones* circulated both in manuscript and in early printed form.

### 3.1 The Manuscript Tradition

In recording the manuscripts of Gorkum’s *Conclusiones*, Weiler notes that the work is extant in four complete and two incomplete versions.\[^{30}\] The present discussion will consider the work housed at Erlangen, *Universitätsbibliothek*, 508/1. The purpose is to analyze briefly the structure of Gorkum’s *Conclusiones* as found within the manuscript tradition.

**Ms. Erlangen 508/1** contains two commentaries on the *Sentences*. The first is a commentary by Johannes Tinctoris on the first and second book; the second is the commentary by Henry of Gorkum on all four books. Johannes Tinctoris from Tournai was a student of Henry of Gorkum at Cologne, and was one of the first to lecture on Thomas’s *Summa theologiae* (ca. 1443).\[^{31}\] Tinctoris’s commentary on Thomas’s *Summa*, which was not published in incunabula or early printed form, is a much more expansive work than Gorkum’s own modest *Quaestiones in Summam Sancti Thomae*.\[^{32}\] Like Gorkum, Tinctoris wrote commentaries and notes on both Peter Lombard’s *Sentences* and Thomas Aquinas’s
Summa theologiae. It is instructive, therefore, that the commentaries of Gorkum and Tinctoris were bound in a single volume, as there are numerous parallels between the two authors and their corresponding works.

The version of Gorkum’s Conclusiones found in Erlangen 508/1 presents only the commentary, without the Lombard’s text itself. The text preserves all four books of the Conclusiones, each occupying between 20 and 25 folios as follows:

Book I (184r–206r);
Book II (206r–226v);
Book III (226v–248r);
Book IV (248v–274v);
Table of questions (275r–279v).

The work is preserved in a format that contains about 40–44 lines of text per page, written in a single column.

Throughout, Erlangen 508/1 assumes an explicit familiarity with the Lombard’s Sentences, in that it divides the individual conclusions up based on the incipit of the Lombard’s original distinction. Thus, the work does not present numbered distinctions but only a large capital occupying two lines of text followed by the standard underlined incipit. For example, for the prologue and first three distinctions of Book I the work is presented as follows:

33 The commentary on the Sentences by Johannes Tinctoris has received little attention from modern scholars. The work is interesting for considering the content and structure of Sentences commentaries belonging to the early to mid-fifteenth century. The first book is treated in about 82 folios (fols. 1ra–82va) and Book II in almost 100 folios (fols. 84ra–183vb). The cover of the work, the initial page of Book I (1r), and the initial page of Book II (84r) state that the work is by Tinctoris (Tinctoris in primum Sententiarum; Tinctoris in secundum). The text is presented in two columns and is almost completely devoid of corrections or marginalia. The third and fourth books of Tinctoris’s commentary (the companion volume) is found in MS. Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek, 508/2. I have not seen MS. 508/2, but Grabmann lists the foliation as follows: Book III contains about 120 folios (fols. 1–119r) and Book IV, about 110 (fols. 121r–232v). See Grabmann, “Der belgische Thomist,” 420. Grabmann’s discussion of the Sentences commentary is very brief (pp. 419–29) and simply provides foliation information, etc. The catalog of manuscripts contains useful information: Hans Fischer, Die lateinischen Papierhandschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen (Erlangen, 1936), 112–14. See also Stegmüller, Repertorium, 1: 246, and Jörgen Vijgen, “Johannes Tinctoris,” in Thomisten-Lexikon, ed. David Berger and J. Vijgen (Bonn, 2006), 316–18.
Followed by Gorkum’s text: *Iste est liber dictus Sententiarum…*

*Vetere ac nove legis* (184v)

Followed by Gorkum’s text: *Ista est secunda pars principalis…*

*Hoc itaque vera et pia fide* (185v)

Followed by Gorkum’s text: *Ista est secunda distinctio huius…*

*Apostolus namquam ait* (186v)

Followed by Gorkum’s text: *Est distinctio tertia huius primi libri…*

Thus, we can conclude that the late medieval theologians were familiar with the Lombard’s *Sentences*—and in particular the incipit of each distinction—as they appear to have been able to navigate the text easily; or, alternatively, they had the Lombard’s *Sentences* open on the desk beside them. For this particular manuscript the basic visual markers that assist the reader are the large initial capitals and the underlining of the original text.

Henry of Gorkum’s *Conclusiones* are most familiar to modern readers as part of an edition of Peter Lombard’s *Sentences*. In that context—discussed in the following section—Gorkum’s commentary functions as a tool for studying the Lombard himself. It is clear, however, that in the earliest manuscript tradition, and, as we will see, in the first incunabula, the *Conclusiones* were preserved independently of the Lombard’s text itself.

### 3.2 The Incunabula and Early Printed Tradition

The incunabula and early printed editions of the *Conclusiones* can be divided into two distinct groups: editions that publish the *Conclusiones* separately as an independent treatise, and those that publish them along with a copy of the Lombard’s *Sentences*. Here I will briefly discuss these two types of printings and present a description of these works along with a few tentative conclusions regarding the possible intent of the editors and publishers.

One of the earliest editions of Henry’s *Conclusiones* is that edited and printed by the *Fratres vitae communi* in Brussels in 1480. The edition published by the Brothers presents only Henry of Gorkum’s abbreviations without the
text of the Lombard. In this sense the edition closely follows the manuscript tradition in simply publishing Gorkum’s *abbreviationes*.

The 1480 edition—with no introduction announcing the publishers, etc.—opens with the traditional incipit: *Incipiunt conclusiones pulcerrime super quattuor libros sententiarum compilata*. Immediately after the incipit is a large capital C and the work begins by citing the first six words of the *Sentences*, Book 1, prol.: *Cupientes aliquid de penuria ac tenuitate*, etc. Gorkum’s text follows, offering a brief summary of the Lombard’s work that extends over one and a half folios (single column, c. 30 lines per page). Following the summary of the prologue, there is a heading indicating the first distinction (*sequitur secunda pars principalis*, etc.), followed by a large capital V and the incipit of the *Sentences*, Book 1, dist. 1: *Veteris ac novae legis*. Gorkum’s commentary follows, occupying one and a half folios.

Structurally, the edition presents a heading indicating the distinction (for instance, *sequitur tercia distinctio*), the incipit of the distinction of the Lombard (such as *Apostolus namque ait* from Book 1, dist. 3), and Henry’s commentary. This early printing, then, follows closely the structure of the work found in the manuscript tradition described above (that is, ms. Erlangen 508/1). The only editorial addition is the numbering of the distinctions to make it easier to locate one’s place in the work. This minimalist edition of the *Conclusiones* which followed closely the manuscript tradition would however soon be replaced by a very different type of work.

The publication of the Lombard’s *Sentences* in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries often included various tools that could assist in the study of theology. In the numerous printings of the *Sentences*, the editors and printers often included Henry’s *Conclusiones*. The present discussion will briefly consider the 1498 edition of the *Sentences* published in Basel by Nicholas Keßler. The purpose here is to consider in some detail the content and structure of this work, so as to ascertain the use of Henry’s *Conclusiones* in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century.

Keßler’s 1498 edition includes the full text of Peter Lombard’s *Sentences*, Henry of Gorkum’s *Conclusiones*, marginal notations identifying biblical

---


35 I have selected this edition for consideration because it was reprinted in 1967 by Minerva, Frankfurt am Main. This edition should be compared with the 1516 edition that was published by Hornken in Cologne. The Hornken edition is the final one listed by Weiler, *Heinrich von Gorkum*, 92. Structurally, the Hornken edition closely follows the Keßler text described below.
and patristic references, a complete table of questions for each book of the *Sentences*, a list of the English and Parisian condemnations, a list of articles in which common opinion disagrees with the Lombard, and finally an alphabetical index of theological topics. Thus, in the Keßler edition Henry’s commentary is only one tool among many that were included to facilitate the study of the *Sentences*.

The Keßler edition begins with Peter Lombard’s prologue and Henry of Gorkum’s summary of the prologue (a i–v), which are followed by a comprehensive table (*rubrica*) listing the distinctions of the Lombard and briefly summarizing them (a i–v–a iii). Following the table is the text of the Lombard, beginning with distinction 1 of book 1 of the *Sentences*. Before considering the place of Gorkum within this work, it is necessary briefly to discuss the relationship between the manuscript tradition of the Lombard’s *Sentences* themselves and the text as presented by Keßler.

Following Alexander of Hales the Lombard’s *Sentences* were generally divided into distinctions. The majority of medieval theologians in the thirteenth through the sixteenth centuries knew the distinctions based on the incipits—such as, for the first four distinctions of Book 1: *Veteris ac novae legis, Hoc itaque vera, Apostolus namque ait*, and *Hic oritur quaestio satis*. While some manuscripts included information regarding the individual distinctions (either above the columns or within the columns themselves), many did not. Thus medieval theologians could use the incipits to mark the distinctions themselves in the manuscripts. For example, ms. British Library, Royal 10.A.1—the sole surviving copy of Peter Gracilis’s commentary on the *Sentences*—indicates the distinctions through a large capital and, in larger font, the incipit of each distinction. This method was followed in the manuscript of Gorkum’s

---


38 The edition by Lodovicus Hornken provides numerous other tools, including the *elucubrationes* by Giles of Rome and the *additiones* by Henricus de Urimaria. Beyond these two tools, the other aspects of the editions by Hornken and Keßler are remarkably similar, in that both include marginal notes to the Bible and the tradition, the condemnations, the alphabetical tables, etc.

Conclusiones discussed above, Erlangen 508/1. Through this method the reader can immediately identify the distinction he is looking for. This is all well and good, but when a reader opens up Keßler’s edition—or the modern critical edition by Ignatius Brady—there are other headings that are employed to demarcate the texts at the beginning of individual distinctions and throughout the distinctions. These other textual divisions are important both in the manuscript tradition and in Keßler’s edition. The present discussion will focus on the Keßler edition because it is readily available through a reprint.

Keßler’s edition includes four distinct font sizes as well as marginal notes to indicate different types of divisions in the text. The four font sizes (which I will refer to as 1–4, with 1 being the smallest) are as follows: font 1 records Henry’s Conclusiones; font 2 records the text of Peter Lombard’s Sentences; font 3 records textual divisions (not distinctions) marked between paragraphs, etc.; and font 4 records paragraph breaks within the Lombard’s Sentences by presenting the incipit of the paragraph. Further, there are also thematic divisions indicated in the margins. Setting aside for a moment fonts 1, 2, and 4 as self-explanatory, the status of font 3 and of the marginal notes is perhaps unclear to the reader. Interestingly, the modern reader can turn to Ignatius Brady’s edition of the Sentences for some clarification regarding these textual divisions and marginalia.

Turning to distinction 1 of the first book, one can note the first sentence of Brady’s edition is in bold type: Omnis doctrina de rebus vel de signis.40 However, when one consults the corresponding footnote Brady writes that this particular rubric is inauthentic to the manuscript tradition, being absent from all of the codices.41 Interestingly, this particular rubric is also omitted in the Keßler edition. That said, the subsequent rubrics of distinction 1 that Brady presents in a bold font are authentic to the manuscript tradition—and Keßler presents them in the third size of font described above. Thus, in distinction 1 of book 1 one finds the following bold rubrics in Brady’s modern edition:

1. Omnis doctrina de rebus vel de signis;
2. De rebus communiter agit;
3. De rebus quae fruuntur et utuntur*;
4. Quid sit frui et uti*;
5. De rebus quibus fruendum est*;
6. De rebus quibus utendum est*;
7. Item quid intersit inter frui et uti, aliter quam supra;
8. Determinatio eorum quae videntur contraria;
9. Alia determinatio*;
10. Utrum hominibus sit utendum vel fruendum;
11. Hic quaeritur utrum Deus fruatur an utatur nobis;
12. Utrum fruendum an utendum sit virtutibus; and
13. Epilogus.42

40 Peter Lombard, Sentences, Book 1, dist. 1 (Brady 1: 55).
41 See ibid., apparatus criticus to line 5.
42 Peter Lombard, Sentences, Book 1, dist. 1 (Brady 1: 55–61).
closer inspection, one also notices that certain rubrics are followed by an asterisk (*): those without an asterisk are found in the body of the text in the manuscripts, whereas those with an asterisk appear in the margins.43 In the Keßler edition, the rubrics that Brady prints without an asterisk are found in the body of the text, but are distinguished from the main text by being presented in a slightly larger font (namely, our font 3). Further, the Keßler edition also sets them off by sequentially lettering these rubrics (a, b, c, d, etc., in font 3). Finally, in accordance with the manuscript tradition, Keßler presents the marginal rubrics (those with an asterisk in Brady’s text) in the margins of the text.

Both the 1480 edition published by the Brothers of the Common Life and that of Nicholas Keßler from 1498 present an edition of the Conclusiones that is consistent with the manuscript tradition. The 1480 edition, like ms. Erlangen 508/1, preserves only Gorkum’s Conclusiones without a corresponding edition of the Lombard’s Sentences. However, it seems that the edition completed by the Brothers is the only one to do so, as the subsequent editions preserve the Conclusiones alongside the Lombard’s Sentences, together with other resources for studying the Lombard. This fact presents an initial argument for the interpretation that the Conclusiones were used in the late fifteenth century as a study aid to supplement the analysis of the Sentences. The following section on the content of the work will further support the claim that the work is fundamentally pedagogical in nature, not only with respect to its use in the late fifteenth century but even initially within the Cologne bursae.

4 The Conclusiones: Summarizing the Lombard’s Sentences

When understood within the broader historical context, Henry of Gorkum’s Conclusiones are best understood as a pedagogical tool for studying the original text of the Lombard. The general trend of early fifteenth-century theology is helpfully summarized by Hoenen, who writes:

Questions about the nature of theology and of theological truths played a central role in fifteenth-century intellectual life and debates. In the years after the Great Schism (1378) the essence of academic theology changed significantly. Generally, theologians were no longer inclined to penetrate

43 For a discussion of the rubrics used in the manuscript tradition of the Sentences and in Ignatius Brady’s edition, see Peter Lombard, Sentences, ed. Brady, i: 138*–141*; Brady, “The Rubrics of Peter Lombard’s Sentences,” Pier Lombardo 6 (1962): 5–25. For a brief and helpful overview, see Rosemann, Peter Lombard, 228–9 n. 13 and 40.
the mysteries of faith with metaphysical and logico-semantic tools; rather, their intention was only to make the items of belief somehow comprehensible and to protect them against heretical understandings.44

If the intention of the majority of fifteenth-century authors was to articulate the comprehensibility of the Christian faith and to guard against heretical interpretations, Gorkum’s writings are best understood within this broader development. Gorkum’s abbreviations of Peter Lombard’s Sentences and Thomas Aquinas’s Summa theologiae are summaries that guard against heresy and guide the student towards a better understanding of the faith.

Henry of Gorkum’s Conclusiones provide succinct summaries of the various distinctions. It will be helpful to analyze the internal structure and content of Gorkum’s work. The present discussion will first note a structural characteristic of many late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century Sentences commentaries, and how Gorkum’s work is consistent with this general trend. Secondly, I will focus briefly on the theological summaries of Peter Lombard’s Sentences in the Conclusiones, considering whether or not Gorkum interprets the Lombard through an identifiable Thomistic lens.

4.1 *The Tripartite Structure of Late Medieval Sentences Commentaries*

In keeping with the practice of Sentences commentaries in the final quarter of the fourteenth century, Henry of Gorkum organizes his Conclusiones according to a tripartite structure. Numerous examples of the threefold structure of late medieval Sentences commentaries can be found, and it is perhaps instructive to consider the commentaries of Pierre d’Ailly, Peter Gracilis, and Heymericus de Campo.45 This background will provide a context within which one can understand the structure of the Conclusiones.

---


45 I am limiting the discussion to Peter d’Ailly, Peter Gracilis, and Heymericus de Campo to keep it manageable. One could also consider the Sentences commentaries of James of Eltville, Peter of Candia, Henry of Oyta (Paris Quaestiones, not the later Prague Lectura), Marsilius of Inghen, Michael Aiguani of Bologna, etc. The masters of the numerous commentaries on the Sentences belonging to the period 1360–1400 systematically divide the individual distinctions or questions into three articles, conclusions, or propositions. For example, the Carmelite Michael Aiguani of Bologna—who lectured on the Sentences at Paris in 1362–63 (in the generation prior to d’Ailly)—divides his commentary on all four books into distinctions. Each distinction consists of a single question (except Book I, dist.
Pierre d’Ailly’s commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard—which was delivered in Paris in 1377–78—is divided into questions, not distinctions, with each of the questions containing three articles (articuli). This tripartite structure is maintained consistently throughout his commentary on Books I, II, and IV. Pierre d’Ailly’s socius at Paris, the Augustinian Peter Gracilis, developed a similar tripartite structure in his commentary on the Sentences. The structure of Gracilis’s commentary is however distinct from that of d’Ailly, in that Gracilis more closely follows the formal structure of the Lombard’s Sentences. Thus, he begins each question with the incipit (in bold script) of the corresponding distinction of the Lombard, followed by a brief summary of the content of the distinction. Following the incipit and the introduction, Gracilis lists his question (Utrum in bold script), which, as in d’Ailly’s commentary, is divided into three conclusions (conclusiones), responses to the conclusions (contra conclusionem), and finally arguments against the responses (ad argumenta contra conclusionem). The common feature characteristic of the

---

1, 2 questions; Book II, dist. 2, 2 questions; Book IV, dist. 3, 2 questions; Book IV, dist. 25, 5 questions, and Book IV, dist. 29, 2 questions), which is divided into three conclusiones or articuli. See Michael Aiguani, Super quattuor libris Sententiarum, ed. Ioannes Guerilium (Venice, 1662), table of questions, fols. 1r–2v.


47 The complete table of questions can be found in Monica B. Calma, “Pierre d’Ailly: le commentaire sur les Sentences de Pierre Lombard,” Bulletin de philosophie médiévale 47 (2007): 139–94. The one exception to the tripartite structure of d’Ailly’s commentary is, as Calma notes (p. 163 n. 43), question 4 of Book I. I have edited this question (based on mss. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 934 and 935) in John T. Slotemaker, Pierre d’Ailly and the Development of Late Medieval Trinitarian Theology (with an Edition of Quaestiones super primum Sententiarum, qq. 4–8, 10) (Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston College, 2012, 516–46). The remaining questions (namely, qu. 5–8 and 10) exhibit the tripartite structure.


49 The London manuscript of Gracilis’s commentary contains all four books of the Sentences, and according to the scribe was written during the year 1415 (see fol. 234v). See also Slotemaker, Pierre d’Ailly and the Development of Late Medieval Trinitarian Theology, Appendix C, 507–12.
commentaries of d’Ailly and Gracilis is the tripartite structure that informs the individual questions.

The tripartite structure of the commentaries of Pierre d’Ailly and Peter Gracilis can be found in numerous *Sentences* commentaries of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Significantly, it is also found in some of the abbreviated commentaries on the *Sentences*. In particular, one can note Heymericus de Campo’s *Quadripartitus questionum sillogistice supra quartor libros Sententiarum* recently edited by Maarten Hoenen. Heymericus (Heymerich van den Velde, † 1460), who was a student of the Parisian Albertist Jean de Maisonneuve, arrived in Cologne by invitation of Henry of Gorkum.51 The *Quadripartitus* is of particular interest to the present discussion, as it contains a tripartite structure that is reminiscent of a structure found in Gorkum’s *Conclusiones*.

Since Maarten Hoenen discusses the structure and content of the *Quadripartitus*, it is only necessary to summarize his findings briefly here. Heymericus’s *Quadripartitus* is a “fourfold” commentary on the *Sentences* in the sense that it treats all four books;52 the work divides each book into four questions (except the fourth book, which contains three),53 with each question being further divided into three syllogisms. Hence, at the level of the individual questions, the work takes on a tripartite structure. This tripartite structure and corresponding Trinitarian vocabulary, as Hoenen notes, is typical of Heymericus, who “used threefold formulas to express the fundamental trinitarian nature of reality.”54 Interestingly, the *Sentences* commentary

---


53 On the “breakdown” of the structure of the text itself—and the possibility of scribal errors—see Hoenen, “Academic Theology in the Fifteenth Century,” 533.

54 Hoenen, “Academic Theology in the Fifteenth Century,” 521. Hoenen also notes that this threefold structure is similar to other works written at Cologne. He writes: “Further infor-
by John Hulshout of Mechelen—a lectura secundum alium, following the Quadripartitus—retains the formal structure of Heymericus's commentary.\(^{55}\)

The commentary of Heymericus, and John of Hulshout following him, develops a structure that is consistent with the commentaries of Pierre d’Ailly and Peter Gracilis. It appears, then, that beginning in the mid- to late fourteenth century numerous commentators on the Sentences organized their commentaries (particularly the individual distinctions or questions) according to a tripartite structure. This is true for both larger traditional commentaries (such as the ones by Peter Gracilis and Pierre d’Ailly) and abbreviated commentaries (for example, the work by Heymericus of Campo). Further, while the present discussion is limited to Gracilis, d’Ailly, and Heymericus, there are numerous other examples that could be given. In the second half of the fourteenth century, the majority of authors organized the material of their commentaries in a threefold structure.

The tripartite structure of Henry of Gorkum’s Conclusiones is perhaps best understood within the context of Heymericus of Campo’s Quadripartitus. Hoenen is correct to direct our attention to the pedagogical function of this structure within the classroom. In particular, as he surmises, the syllogistic structure of Heymericus’s work may well have served a pedagogical function within the classroom.\(^{56}\) This reading is consistent with that of Weiler, who emphasizes the pedagogical role of Gorkum’s various abbreviated works within the classrooms of the bursa.

### 4.2 The Tripartite Structure of the Conclusiones

Peter Lombard’s Sentences present a particular problem for the scholar seeking to summarize the work: it is somewhat unclear what it would mean, strictly speaking, to summarize a list of authoritative statements or quotations organized into a specific theological order. In short, the Lombard’s work constitutes a genre that is difficult to summarize because it consists of a large number of

---


\(^{56}\) See Hoenen, “Academic Theology in the Fifteenth Century,” 531.
citations from previous authors and precious little direct theological argumentation on behalf of the Lombard himself. To address this problem, Henry of Gorkum developed a systematic approach to the material, imposing a standard structure and method on each of the Lombard’s distinctions, organizing the material as systematically as the content allows.

The Conclusiones present one summary for each distinction of all four books (that is, 48 distinctions in Book I; 44 distinctions in Book II; 40 distinctions in Book III; 50 distinctions in Book IV). Gorkum’s summaries are about 600 to 900 words in length and follow a strict structure, employing the same phrases in almost every summary. The summaries begin with an introductory statement that provides the distinction number and a one- or two-sentence summary. Thus, the introduction states which distinction is being summarized (for example, for dist. 10: *ista est distinctio decima*) and the topic under consideration (dist. 7: *in qua magister ostens osteneri qualiter . . . or dist. 10: in qua magister postquam eit . . .*). The phrases used in the first sentence are consistent throughout the work (*ostens/postquam eit*) so that the reader immediately begins to recognize the patterns established. Following the introductory sentences, Gorkum always repeats the same phrase with different levels of abbreviation—for instance, *et circa hoc tria facit*, or, in a more abbreviated form, *et tria facit*. Following this phrase, Gorkum presents three propositions—although he does not use that term—which summarize the distinction of the Lombard. Here, for the purpose of explication, it is helpful to consider a particular distinction. In distinction 10 of Book I, Gorkum writes: *circa hoc tria facit.*

1. *Primo enim ostendit Spiritum Sanctum amorem esse Patris et Filii, et per consequens procedere per modum voluntatis.*

2. *Secundo subiungit quod amor convenienter appropriatur personae Spiritus Sancti.*

3. *Tertio concludit quod etiam Spiritus Sanctus convenieter nominatur nomine communi, scilicet conveniuti tam Patri quam Filio, quorum quodlibet est et potest dici Spiritus Sanctus.*

The three propositions are then linked to clearly identified sections of the Lombard’s text. Thus, following the three propositions Gorkum states the first proposition is explicated by the Lombard from the beginning of the distinction.

---

For a discussion of the type of work that the Sentences are, see Colish, Peter Lombard; Rosemann, Great Medieval Book, 23–7; Richard W. Southern, Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1995 and 2001), 2: 49–65 and 135–47.
until the phrase, *Hic manifestavit se dixisse*;\(^{58}\) the second proposition from the phrase, *Hic manifestavit se dixisse* until the phrase, *Hic notandum est*;\(^{59}\) and the third proposition from the phrase, *Hic notandum est* until the end of the distinction. Thus, Gorkum identifies each of the three propositions with a specific section of the Lombard’s work. Following this textual division, Gorkum concludes the section with a summary phrase: *Et haec est sententia magistri in hac distinctione in generali.* This phrase—stating explicitly that the three previous propositions capture the thought of the Lombard in this distinction generally speaking—concludes the first section of Gorkum’s abbreviation.

At this first level of abbreviation Gorkum summarizes each distinction by identifying three propositions that correspond with sections of the Lombard’s text; in the second and longer section, Gorkum more fully articulates three specific propositions and elucidates them theologically. He creates a distinction, that is, between a general (*generalis*) and a specific (*specialis*) analysis. Accordingly, the second section begins with the following phrase: *In speciali sententia magistri stat in tribus propositionibus: quarum prima est haec.*\(^{60}\) If we take Book I, dist. 10 as an example, the three propositions are as follows:

[1.] *Caritas seu amor essentialis Spiritui Sancto appropriatus, est communi- nis toti Trinitati.*

[2.] *Caritas scilicet amor personalis nulli alteri proprie convenit quam solius Spiritus Sancti personalitati.*

[3.] *Spiritus Sanctus communis originalis principii est nomine Spiritus Sanctus nominatus non obstante quod illud nomen sit commune omnibus tribus personis.*

\(^{58}\) This phrase is found in Peter Lombard, *Sentences*, Book 1, dist. 10, chap. 2 (Brady 1: 112).

\(^{59}\) Ibid., chap. 3 (1: 113).

\(^{60}\) Gorkum is remarkably consistent in his language and the structural divisions, although it is important to not overstate his consistency. The first book contains the following exceptions: dist. 2 (b i\(^{-}v\)) uses conclusiones, not propositiones; dist. 3 (b iii\(^{vi}\)) 4 propositiones; dist. 20 (f iii\(^{vi}\)) 3 rationes, not propositiones; dist. 22 (f iii\(^{vi}\)) 1 propositio, 2 regulae. The second book has only one exception: dist. 2 (m vi\(^{i}\)) states … *in tribus propositionibus* …, but contains only 2 propositiones. The third book contains two departures from the standard: dist. 7 (B 3\(^{vi}\)) contains 1 propositio; dist. 33 (F 4\(^{i}\)) contains one propositio. The fourth book contains the most exceptions: dist. 9 (I i\(^{i}\)) contains 1 propositio; dist. 10 (I i\(^{i}\)) contains 1 propositio; dist. 29 (N iii\(^{v}\)) contains 1 propositio; dist. 35 (O iii\(^{i}\)) contains 2 propositiones; dist. 37 (O v\(^{i}\)) contains 2 propositiones; dist. 42 (P v\(^{i}\)) contains 4 propositiones; dist. 44 (Q i\(^{i}\)) contains 2 propositiones; dist. 46 (Q iii\(^{v}\)) contains 1 propositio. The four books of the *Sentences* contain 48, 44, 40, and 50 distinctions respectively, which means that with the 15 exceptions, 92% of Gorkum’s *conclusiones* follow his established structure.
Since the *propositiones speciales*\(^{61}\) are the heart of Gorkum’s analysis, it is worth considering how he approaches each of these propositions. First I will consider in general how Gorkum analyzes the individual propositions, and secondly I will consider a specific case (namely, the first of the *propositiones speciales* listed above).

Unlike the *propositiones generales*, which are listed without comment, the *propositiones speciales* are explicated and defended (following the Lombard) in a short discussion of about 150 to 250 words. Generally speaking, Gorkum begins with a theological explication of the proposition. Following this, he presents a counterargument (usually a counterargument raised by Peter Lombard himself) before considering the Lombard’s response to the objection in question. In general, Gorkum will follow the Lombard’s argumentation quite closely as he elaborates on the central theological claim with a series of arguments and counterarguments. Further, it is in response to the *propositiones speciales* that Gorkum often refers to specific authoritative passages that support the Lombard’s argument. The authoritative passages, which are almost always taken from the *Sentences* themselves, are generally paraphrases or short quotations from Augustine, other Church Fathers, or Scripture. Following the Lombard, Gorkum commonly refers to Augustine of Hippo, Gregory the Great, or John Damascene to support a proposition or a theological conclusion defended by the Lombard. The authoritative passages rarely stand alone, but are part of a complex syllogistic argument that supports the general position. Finally, speaking generally about Gorkum’s explication of the *propositiones speciales*, it is important to note that, while he often devotes equal space to the three *propositiones* in question, it is not uncommon for him to focus narrowly on the first and/or second proposition, defending the third only briefly.\(^{62}\) Given this general overview, I will now consider by way of illustration Gorkum’s exposition of the first *propositio specialis* noted above.

The first aspect of Gorkum’s analysis that requires unpacking is his distinction between the *propositiones generales* and the *propositiones speciales*. In

---

61 I am applying the terms *propositiones generales* and *propositiones speciales* to the basic distinction employed by Gorkum. This language is my own. Henry Gorkum lists two sets of propositions, giving the first three propositions and then referring to them as the Lombard’s three points in general. Subsequently, he lists the second list of propositions and refers to them as the Lombard’s particular or special sense. For sake of simplicity, I will refer to the two lists of propositions as *propositiones generales* and *propositiones speciales*. While this language is mine, the structure is clearly found in each of Gorkum’s *conclusiones*.

62 For a few examples from Book i, see dist. 11 (d i\(^{iv}\)–d ii\(^{v}\)), dist. 16 (e i\(^{v}\)), dist. 19 (f ii\(^{v}\)), and dist. 40 (k v\(^{v}\)).
short, the two are similar with respect to their theological import, with the special proposition engaging more deeply the theological implications of the general proposition. Thus, for Book I, dist. 10, Gorkum summarizes the first section of the distinction *generaliter* as: *Primo enim ostendit Spiritum Sanctum amorem esse Patris et Filii, et per consequens procedere per modum voluntatis.*63 This general proposition captures Peter Lombard’s claim in a broad way but, as Gorkum recognizes, there is more at stake in the text. Thus, when he offers his special proposition for this same section of text, Gorkum restates it as follows: *Caritas seu amor essentialis Spiritui Sancto appropriatus, est communis toti Trinitati.* This rephrasing is significant, because Gorkum is not simply stating that the Holy Spirit is love (*caritas seu amor*), but that love is appropriated to the Holy Spirit and is also common to (or shared by) all three persons of the Trinity. In this sense, the special proposition takes on the more technical question presented in the Lombard’s text:64 in what sense is the Holy Spirit love strictly speaking, if it is true that all three persons of the Trinity are love? Thus, the focus of the special proposition as defined by Gorkum is the complicated issue of the relationship between the common attributes of the persons, and the person’s individual personal properties.

The *Conclusiones* are therefore a highly structured abbreviation of the *Sentences*. The structure, I think, is imposed on the work so that the student of the Lombard can easily navigate the work and master the material of each distinction. Weiler and Hoenen, as noted above, have correctly emphasized the pedagogical value of these types of commentaries. For the student, it is incredibly convenient to have both a structural (in the *propositiones generales*) and a theological (in the *propositiones speciales*) breakdown of each one of the Lombard’s distinctions. In short, the student could rely on the fact that each distinction has a threefold structure that corresponds to three distinct theological claims.

---


64 See Peter Lombard, *Sentences*, Book I, dist. 10, chap. 1 (1:110): “Quod Spiritus Sanctus dilectio proprie dicatur et tamen Trinitatis sit dilectio. Ioannes autem in Epistola canonica ait: *Deus caritas est.* ‘Non dixit: *Spiritus Sanctus caritas est,* quod si dixisset, absolutior esset sermo et non parva pars quaestionis decisa; sed quia dixit: *Deus caritas est,* incertum est, et ideo quaerendum, utrum Deus Pater sit caritas, an Filius, an Spiritus Sanctus, an Deus ipsa Trinitas, quia et ipsa non tres dixi, sed Deus est unus.’” The quotation is from Augustine, and the italics are the editor’s.
4.3 **The Theology of the Conclusiones**

Henry of Gorkum’s *Conclusiones* were written as a pedagogical tool for students studying the *Sentences*. Because Gorkum was a Thomist—and a founding member of a Thomist *bursa montana*—one of the central questions that must be asked is whether or not the work betrays a distinctively Thomist approach to Christian theology. The *Sentences*, one must recall, were instituted in the thirteenth century as a pedagogical tool for studying theology at both Oxford and Paris. The *Sentences*, therefore, predate the great theological systems of Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, John Duns Scotus, William of Ockham, or Gregory of Rimini, and consequently do not support one of the theological positions vying for supremacy in the fifteenth-century *Wegestreit*. The focus of the present discussion is to understand whether or not Henry of Gorkum’s *Conclusiones* are explicitly Thomistic in a theological sense, or simply a summary of the Lombard that avoids specific commitments to the competing fifteenth-century *viae*.

Thomas Aquinas held several distinctive theological positions that were supported by his followers throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. One of those distinctive theological opinions is Thomas’s argument in his *Scriptum super Sententiius* and *Summa theologiae* that the three persons of the Trinity are distinct by means of opposed relations of origin. This theological position, which has been the focus of much study in recent decades, is distinctively Thomistic and therefore makes it a useful test case. The present section will briefly describe Thomas’s position before considering whether or not the doctrine is supported in John Capreolus’s *Defensiones theologiae divi*.

---


Thomae Aquinatis or Gorkum’s Conclusiones. John Capreolus is introduced to the present discussion at this point because he exemplifies a specifically Thomistic approach to the question at hand in the first four decades of the fifteenth century.

John Capreolus studied theology at Paris in the early fifteenth century and became a master in theology in 1411. After completing his studies in Paris, he taught theology at the Dominican house in Toulouse and finally Rodez. Capreolus’s massive Defensiones were completed in 1442 and present a defense of the theology of Thomas Aquinas following the order of doctrine established in Peter Lombard’s Sentences. In a certain respect, one can note, the Defensiones are a commentary on the Lombard secundum Thomam that defends Aquinas against his fourteenth-century critics.

In distinction 11 on the procession of the Holy Spirit a Filio, Capreolus explicates and defends Thomas’s argument that the Holy Spirit is distinct from the Son because there is an opposed relation of origin between the two persons: the Son’s relation to the Holy Spirit is active spiration, whereas the Holy Spirit’s relation to the Son is passive spiration. Following his articulation of Thomas’s conclusiones, Capreolus presents several objectiones by Peter Aureoli and Gregory of Rimini before offering his solutiones by means of a rebuttal of the arguments of Peter Aureoli, John Duns Scotus (who was not discussed in the objections), and Gregory of Rimini. In distinction 26 Capreolus returns to the discussion of opposed relations, again defending at length Thomas’s understanding of the distinction of persons. The point, for the present argument, is that in the third and fourth decades of the fifteenth century Capreolus vigorously defended Thomas’s account of opposed relations against the critiques of the fourteenth-century theologians such as John Duns Scotus, Peter Aureoli, and Gregory of Rimini. Thus, despite the fact that the discussion of opposed and disparate relations was not hotly debated in the second half

---

68 See Capreolus, Defensiones theologiae divi Thomase Aquinatis, ed. C. Paban and T. Pégues, 7 vols. (Tours, 1900–1908), Book 1, dist. 11, qu. 1, art. 2 (vol. 2, p. 26): “Ex quo enim prima distinctionis ratio inter Filium et Spiritum Sanctum est per oppositionem duarum affirmationum, in Filio autem non est aliqua affirmatio opposita affirmationi quae sit in Spiritu Sancto nisi spiratio activa, quae opponitur relative spirationi passivae, oportet quod primo distinguatur Filius a Spiritu Sancto per spirationem activa, non autem per filtrationem primo; quia illa non opponitur affirmativa alicui affirmationi quae sit in Spiritu Sancto.”
69 See ibid. (vol. 2, pp. 26–9).
70 See ibid., dist. 26, qu. 1 (vol. 2, pp. 214–35).
of the fourteenth century or the beginning of the fifteenth century, Capreolus still defended Thomas's account against the critiques of the early fourteenth-century theologians.

In considering Gorkum's discussion of the divine relations in his Conclusiones, our question now is whether or not Gorkum's Thomistic approach to Christian theology influenced his summary of Peter Lombard in an identifiable way, or whether he attempted to present a theologically neutral interpretation of the Lombard for use by students who possibly supported a variety of theological positions.

In Conclusiones, Book I, dist. 11, Henry summarizes the Lombard's analysis of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son. Following his established pattern, he presents three general and three special propositions. The general propositions are as follows:

1. *Nam primo ostendit quid circa huiusmodi principium Latini sentiant.*
2. *Secundo subdit in quo Graeci ab ipsis discrepant.*

Thus, in his general propositions Gorkum notes that the Lombard (1) explicates the Latin understanding of the procession of the Holy Spirit, (2) discusses the way in which the Greeks differ from the Latins, and (3) explains the similarities between the Greeks and the Latins. These three propositions summarize the basic structure of distinction 11 as found in the Lombard; the focus is on the similarities that the Lombard discusses at the end of distinction 11. This basic approach is maintained in the special propositions:

1. *Veritas approbat evengelii Patrem et Filium simul produxisse Spiritum Sanctum.*
2. *Graeci falsa motivo inducti Spiritum Sanctum a Filio procedere negaverunt.*
3. *Ex quo Graeci concedunt Spiritum Sanctum esse Spiritum Filii; non sensu sed verbis a nobis differunt.*

The special propositions expand somewhat on the theological aspects of the distinction. Gorkum begins with the claim that according to Scripture, the Father and Son simultaneously produce the Holy Spirit. The second

---

71 Henry of Gorkum, Conclusiones I, dist. 11 (Basel, 1498, d i⁴; MS. Erlangen, 508/1, fol. 191v).
72 Ibid.
proposition considers the Greek argumentation and motive for denying that the Holy Spirit proceeds a Filio. Finally, the third proposition returns to the similarities between the Greeks and Latins, maintaining that the Greeks concede that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, such that the Greeks disagree with the Latins only verbally. For the present argument, it is simply necessary to note that throughout distinctions 11, 12, and 26 of the first Book of the Conclusiones Gorkum does not engage in the heated debate regarding disparate or opposed relations.73

This is one example—of the many that could be given—where Henry of Gorkum chooses to ignore or sideline a theological issue that was central to fifteenth-century Thomistic theology. As a reading of John Capreolus demonstrates, the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit was still being debated by theologians around the time when Henry composed his Conclusiones. My tentative thesis, therefore, is that Gorkum’s Conclusiones do not engage in the numerous philosophical and theological debates that divided the competing schools or viae of the Wegestreit. Gorkum’s abbreviation of the Lombard’s Sentences is a more general work, and one that attempted to summarize the Lombard’s work itself.

5 Conclusion: The Conclusiones as a Pedagogical Tool

Henry of Gorkum’s Conclusiones did not leave an indelible imprint on the development of late medieval and early modern thought. The influence of the Conclusiones is much more subtle.

When Martin Luther lectured on the Sentences at the University of Erfurt between 1509 and 1511, the textbook for the class was the Basel edition of the Sentences published by Nicholas Keßler in 1489. This edition, discussed above, included the Conclusiones by Henry of Gorkum. Yet when one studies Luther’s marginal notations, there is no explicit discussion of Henry of Gorkum’s abbreviations.74 Thus, Luther does not mention Gorkum by name and does not seem

---


74 Luther’s marginal notes from 1509–11—covering, among other works, various theological writings of Anselm, Bonaventure, Augustine, Peter Lombard, William of Ockham,
to engage with the *Conclusiones* directly. Nevertheless, it does not follow that Gorkum's work did not have an influence on how Luther understood Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, or how he lectured on them to the students in his class as a *baccalaureus sententiarus*.

In fact, there is evidence that the *Conclusiones* did influence how Luther understood the structure of individual distinctions. As argued above, Gorkum divided each distinction both structurally (*propoitiones generales*) and thematically (*propoitiones speciales*) into sets of three propositions. This threefold structure—so common, it was argued above, to the commentaries of the late fourteenth century—was implemented by Gorkum and borrowed by Martin Luther. In one of the latest contributions to Luther's marginalia, Philipp Rosemann comments on this threefold structure of Luther's marginal notations. What is interesting for the present argument is that 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 *propoitiones generales*. Thus, while Luther did not explicitly engage

---


75 See Rosemann, *Great Medieval Book*, 177. He notes in particular: "Many marginal notes draw attention to the structure of Peter Lombard's text. Interestingly, Luther consistently divides each distinction into three parts, independently of the number of chapters. This tripartite division is indicated in the margins: 2a pars, 3a pars (the first part naturally coincides with the beginning of each distinction)."

76 The new edition of Martin Luther's marginalia by Jan Matsuura makes it much easier to track the subtle influence of Henry Gorkum's *Conclusiones*. Thus, when Luther divides the text (usually marked with 2a pars, 3a pars), Matsuura provides a footnote noting any correspondence between Luther's textual division and Gorkum's. Further, he provides a brief transcription of the relevant section of Gorkum's *Conclusiones* as presented in the Keßler edition. See, for example, Martin Luther, *Erfurter Annotationen 1509–1510/n*, Book 1, dist. 2 (268 n. 10); dist. 4 (281 n. 1); dist. 5 (287 n. 7); dist. 6 (293 n. 6); dist. 7 (294 n. 4). While Luther is generally consistent in maintaining this threefold structure, like Gorkum he does not do so in every single case. This, one can only assume, was a natural development as Luther
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. As Luther taught the Lombard to students of theology between 1509 and 1511, he found it instructive to follow Gorkum’s threefold divisions of the individual distinctions. Why?

Asking why Luther followed the textual divisions found in Gorkum’s *Conclusiones* is a purely speculative exercise; that said, it is helpful to recall that Luther’s marginalia originated within the classroom setting, and as such they provide concrete evidence of the arguments developed by Anton Weiler and Maarten Hoenen that such abbreviations served a pedagogical role within the late medieval university. In the case of Gorkum’s *Conclusiones*, it is clear that Luther used Gorkum’s textual analysis of the *Sentences* to help his students understand the structure and content of the *Sentences* themselves—and this despite the fact that Gorkum was a representative of the *via antiqua* whereas Luther, and the University of Erfurt more broadly, followed the *via moderna*.77

Looking at Luther, therefore, one can reasonably conclude that Gorkum’s abbreviation of the Lombard achieved its pedagogical goal by (1) providing a textual and thematic breakdown of the *Sentences* on which future lecturers could rely on to analyze the text, and (2) avoiding, as argued above, specific philosophical or theological arguments that would have limited the use of the *Conclusiones* to a particular *via* within the *Wegestreit*.

---