

WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *QUESTIONS ON SCIENCE AND THEOLOGY*,  
INTRODUCTION AND CRITICAL EDITION BY FRANCESCO FIORENTINO,  
ENGLISH TRANSLATION BY JOHN SCOTT, ASCHENDORFF, MUNSTER  
2020 (ARCHA VERBI, SUBSIDIA 18), 784 PP., ISBN: 9783402102404.

VIRGINIA SCRIBANTI  
UNIVERSITY OF PAVIA (FINO CONSORTIUM) – KU LEUVEN



William of Alnwick was a Franciscan theologian whose positions are still largely unexplored and whose works unedited. He is mainly remembered as the secretary of John Duns Scotus and as an opponent of Pope John XXII in the debate on the poverty of Christ.

Francesco Fiorentino, in his volume on the *Questions on Science and Theology* (translated into English by John Scott),<sup>1</sup> besides editing the first six questions of the *Prologue* of the commentary on the *Sentences* and the two *quaestiones de scientia*, gives an overview not only on the edited questions, but also on William of Alnwick's life and works, providing a genealogy of the manuscripts in which they are reported,<sup>2</sup> almost one century after Athanasius Ledoux's monumental study on the *Quaestiones disputatae de esse intelligibile* and the *Quodlibet*.<sup>3</sup>

First of all, William of Alnwick was born in Northumberland (c. 1275), then he went to Paris at the beginning of the fourteenth century, where, as a pupil of Gonsalvus of Spain, he met Scotus and where he read the *Sentences*, between 1313 and 1315. Subsequently, after having been in Oxford (c. 1316) as the forty-second Franciscan regent master, he went to Paris (c. 1317) and to Montpellier (1318–1320). In those years, he wrote both the *Quaestiones disputatae de esse intelligibili* and the *Quodlibet*. Finally, the *Determinationes*, his philosophically most important work, were written in Bologna (1321–1323), while the debate on the poverty of

---

<sup>1</sup> As stated by Fiorentino in the acknowledgments: « This critical edition derives from my project of research 'Le trasformazioni dello statuto scientifico della teologia agli inizi del XIV secolo: il caso di Guglielmo di Alnwick, socius di Giovanni Duns Scoto e vescovo di Giovinazzo', ended in 2012 at the university of Bari 'Aldo Moro', in collaboration with the Town of Giovinazzo ».

<sup>2</sup> WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology*, ed. FRANCESCO FIORENTINO, English translation by JOHN SCOTT, Aschendorff, Munster 2020 (Archa Verbi. Subsidia 18) [henceforth, ed. FIORENTINO], p. 1–3.

<sup>3</sup> GUILLELMUS ALNWICK, *Quaestiones disputatae de esse intelligibili et de quodlibet*, ed. ATHANASII LEDOUX, Quaracchi, Florence 1937 [henceforth, ed. LEDOUX].

Christ, which took place at the General Chapter of the Franciscan Order held in Perugia, is dated 1322. To avoid the measures taken against him, he was forced to go to Naples at the court of Charles of Anjou and a few years later, in 1330, he was consecrated bishop of Giovinazzo. Alnwick died in Avignon in 1333.<sup>4</sup>

This foreword, useful to better frame an author who certainly played a leading role in the early Scotism, terminates with the justification of a new edition of the above-mentioned questions. As Fiorentino points out, the previous editions by Joachim D'Souza (*Prologue*, q. 1) and Stephen Brown (*Prologue*, q. 2) are incomplete because they are not referring to all the manuscripts reporting those questions: the first one does not consider the MS Krakow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 732 and he « deliberately refrained from transcribing from A and P » – MS Assisi, Biblioteca comunale, 172 and MS Padua, Biblioteca Antoniana, 291 – « §§89-108 and 241-321 of the first prologue question » (p. 3), while the second one does not take into account the MS Padua, Biblioteca Antoniana, 291,<sup>5</sup> so « Brown has handed down an imperfect text, in which the second question is also shorter than the one in P » (p. 3).<sup>6</sup>

The introduction is divided into seven sections. The first part is devoted to a framing of Alnwick's works, with a very detailed list of his questions and the references to the manuscripts in which they are reported. This tool can greatly help the scholars. In particular, Fiorentino presents a precise overview of the questions of the commentary on the *Sentences* (p. 4–9), the *Quaestiones disputatae de esse intelligibili*, the *Quodlibet* and the *Determinationes*, to which he adds two *Aliae*

<sup>4</sup> The information about Alnwick's life are taken from WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology*, ed. FIORENTINO, p. 1–2, and from GUIDO ALLINEY, « Quaestiones de tempore o II Sent. D. 2, q. 1–3? Chiarimenti sulla tradizione manoscritta di Guglielmo di Alnwick », *Archivium Franciscanum Historicum* [henceforth, *AH*], 92/1–2 (1999), p. 117–142, here p. 137–140. It is noteworthy that according to Alliney (*ibid.*, p. 138), the *Quaestiones disputatae de esse intelligibili* and the *Quodlibet* are ascribable to 1316, while according to Fiorentino « it is to this period between Oxford and Paris that we date the discussion of *Quaestiones disputatae de esse intelligibili*. Then he moved on to Montpellier where he completed the quodlibetal questions » (WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology*, ed. FIORENTINO, p. 1). On this issue, see WILLIAM DUBA, « Continental Franciscan Quodlibeta After Scotus », in CHRISTOPHER SCHABEL (ed.), *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages: The Fourteenth Century*, Brill, Leiden–Boston 2007 (Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, 7) p. 569–649, here p. 598–600.

<sup>5</sup> Brown states: « Our edition of Alnwick's questions is taken from *cod. Assisi, Biblioteca comunale, 172* (fol. 11v–20v). V. Doucet has described this manuscript in great detail and has argued most convincingly against M. Schmaus that it is authentic work of William of Alnwick. The first two books of Alnwick's *Sentences* are also found in *cod. Padova, Biblioteca Antoniana, 291*. We have used only the Assisi manuscript for this edition and employ the letter A to indicate it » (STEPHEN F. BROWN, « Sources for Ockham's Prologue to the Sentences – II », *Franciscan Studies*, 27 (1967), p. 39–107, here p. 63).

<sup>6</sup> These elements are pointed out by Fiorentino not only in the introduction (WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology*, ed. FIORENTINO, p. 3) but also in the critical apparatus (*ibid.*, p. 82, 92, 154, 206, 210, 252, 254, 276, 292, 314).

*Determinationes*<sup>7</sup> and five *Quaestiones variae*, so called and numbered by the editor in an « arbitrary » way because they are not found in the main manuscripts containing Alnwick's works (p. 12–14).<sup>8</sup>

This scheme, along with Ledoux's study, is the most comprehensive attempt to catalogue William of Alnwick's works, but, for the sake of completeness, we have to carry out two remarks: firstly, the editor correctly cites the manuscripts which witness Alnwick's questions, but in a few cases he does not indicate all the questions reported in them; secondly, especially with regard to the *Determinationes*, there are a few further manuscripts that are not quoted in the introduction, probably because the main focus of the volume is the commentary on the *Sentences*.

Regarding the first point, we will consider the following manuscripts: MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 318, MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 6768 and MS Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laureanziana, Plutei 31, dext. 8. Firstly, Fiorentino refers to the MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 318 with regards to *Determinationes* 10, 16, 25 and the first *Quaestio varia*, but he does not mention *determinatio* 6, present, albeit incompletely, on fol. 227ra–237va.<sup>9</sup> Secondly, in Fiorentino's scheme the MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 6768 reports only the second *determinatio* and the second *quaestio varia*, but Annaliese Maier, in her description of this manuscript, listed also other Alnwick's questions, namely the first two questions of the *Quodlibet* (fol. 78r–80r, 80r–83v)<sup>10</sup> and the following determinations: « Det. 2 (fol. 89v–95r neu),<sup>11</sup> 8 (fol. 65r–69r), 9 (fol. 69r–74r), 10 (fol. 51v–55r), 11 (fol. 55r–59v), 17 (fol. 83v–89v), 18 (fol. 59v–65r), 23 (fol. 11r–12v), 24 (fol. 12v–15v), 25 (fol. 75v–78r), 26 (fol. 95r–97r), 27 (fol. 97v–98r) », <sup>12</sup> to which are

---

<sup>7</sup> These two questions, entitled *Utrum intellectus agens sit substantia separata* and *Utrum consilia evangelica includant perfectionem* are called *Quaestiones aliae* by Ledoux (GUILLELMUS ALNWICK, *Quaestiones disputatae de esse intelligibili et de quodlibet*, ed. LEDOUX, p. xviii).

<sup>8</sup> As stressed by Fiorentino, the expression *Quaestiones variae* and *Aliae Determinationes* is not found in Alnwick's works, but we will refer to those questions with the denomination proposed by Fiorentino (see p. 14, here Fiorentino defines his numbering as *arbitrary*).

<sup>9</sup> We did not have access to Maier's analysis of MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 318 (ANNALIESE MAIER, « Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des italienischen Averroismus im 14. Jahrhundert », *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, 33 (1944), p. 136–157). This information is found in DOMINIC VELIATH, « Three Determinationes of William of Alnwick on the intellectual soul (Text and Study) », Ph.D. Diss., Salesian University, Rome, December 1967, p. lxxi.

<sup>10</sup> The reference is taken from ANNALIESE MAIER, « Die italienischen Averroisten des Codex Vaticanus Latinus 6768 », *Manuscripta*, 8/2 (1964), p. 68–82, here p. 70, fn. 9.

<sup>11</sup> The term *new* indicates the new numbering of the *folii* proposed by Maier (see MAIER, « Die italienischen Averroisten des Codex Vaticanus Latinus 6768 », p. 68–69).

<sup>12</sup> MAIER, « Die italienischen Averroisten des Codex Vaticanus Latinus 6768 », p. 70, fn. 9.

added *determinatio* 5 – numbered by Maier as 44a (fol. 242r–246v)<sup>13</sup> – and a further disputed question on the plurality of forms (fol. 172r–173v).<sup>14</sup> Finally, the manuscript Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laureanziana, Plutei 31, dext. 8, indicated by Fiorentino as F and cited as witness of the two *aliae Determinationes*, reports also a few further *Determinationes*:<sup>15</sup> 9 (fol. 83ra–89va), 8 (fol. 89va–95rb), 11 (fol. 95rb–100va), 10 (fol. 100va–104vb), 5 (fol. 106ra–110va), 6 (fol. 110va–115ra), 7 (fol. 115ra–118rb), 18 (fol. 119ra–126rb).<sup>16</sup>

As for second point, we will take into account the following manuscripts: Paris, Bibliothèque National de France, lat. 15805, Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, B.VII.9, Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 533 and Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 609. Specifically, as noted by Girard Etzkorn, the Parisian manuscript, on fol. 20r–26v, contains two of Alnwick’s determinations, i.e. 2 and 18.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, the Basel

<sup>13</sup> MAIER, « Die italienischen Averroisten des Codex Vaticanus Latinus 6768 », p. 79.

<sup>14</sup> MAIER, « Die italienischen Averroisten des Codex Vaticanus Latinus 6768 », p. 75. This question was transcribed by Veliath in the appendix to his doctoral thesis (VELIATH, « Three Determinationes of William of Alnwick on the intellectual soul (Text and Study) », appendix, p. I–XV). It is remarkable that in addition to these questions Maier seems inclined to attribute to Alnwick all the questions reported on fol. 1–20, 51–100 (new numbering) and the question 22 of the last *quatenus* (fol. 201r–202r), entitled *Utrum intentiones secundae sint subiective in intellectu vel in rebus* (See MAIER, « Die italienischen Averroisten des Codex Vaticanus Latinus 6768 », p. 70–71, in particular fn. 11, and p. 76). Lambertini criticizes this latter attribution (ROBERTO LAMBERTINI, « Intentions in Fourteenth-Century Bologna: Jandun, Alnwick and the Mysterious ‘G’ », in STEN EBBERSEN, RUSSELL FRIEDMAN (eds.), *Medieval Analyses in Language and Cognition. Acts of the symposium The Copenhagen school of Medieval philosophy, January 10–13 1996, organized by The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters and The Institute for Greek and Latin, University of Copenhagen*, The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Copenhagen 1999, p. 431–451).

<sup>15</sup> The element is noted by Veliath who points out that in the second part of Florence manuscript (fol. 79v) there is written « Quaestiones magistri Guillelmi Amoyc anglici lectoris Bononiae », confirming that the determinations were drawn up in Bologna (VELIATH, « Three Determinationes of William of Alnwick on the intellectual soul (Text and Study) », p. XX). This attribution is also stressed by: VICTORIN DOUCET, « Descriptio codicis 172 bibliothecae communalis assisiensis », *AFH*, 25 (1932), p. 257–274, 378–389, 502–524, here p. 386–387, fn. 3: « Cod. *Plut.* 31, *dext.* 8 *Bibl.* Laurentianae Florentiae continet (f. 79v–126r) determinationes 5–11 inclusive necnon 18<sup>am</sup>, et insuper duas alias quaestiones quae inter Determinationes *Vat. Lat.* 1805 non inveniuntur », CELESTINO PIANA, « Una ‘determinatio’ inedita di Guglielmo Alnwick O.F.M. (1333), come saggio di alcune fonti tacitamente usate dall’autore », *Studi francescani*, 79/1–2 (1982), p. 191–231, here p. 192, and LAMBERTINI, « Intentions in Fourteenth-Century Bologna », p. 435).

<sup>16</sup> We did not have access to the volume *I manoscritti datati della Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana di Firenze. Plutei 12–34*, TERESA DE ROBERTIS, CINZIA DI DEO, MICHAELANGIOLA MARCHIARO (eds.), SISMEL-Edizioni del Galluzzo, Florence 2008, and currently not even to Veliath’s doctoral thesis in which he reports the list of disputed questions by Alnwick in the Florence manuscript (« Three Determinationes of William of Alnwick on the intellectual soul (Text and Study) », p. XXXIX–XLI), so the indication of the folii is based on our own independent analysis.

<sup>17</sup> Girard Etzkorn states: « The first part of this section contains the second (according to the numbering of MS *Vat. Palat. lat.* 1805) of Alnwick’s *Determinationes* as described by A. Ledoux in his edition of Alnwick’s *Quaestiones*. The question is entitled: ‘Utrum in maiori quantitate

manuscript reports the three determinations on the soul: 5 (fol. 33ra–39vb), 6 (fol. 39vb–46ra) and 7 (fol. 46ra–50rb).<sup>18</sup> Thirdly, as for MS Leipzig Universitätsbibliothek, 533, Peter Burkhart points out that it witnesses the following determinations: 11 (fol. 68ra–72vb), 2 (fol. 72 vb–78ra), 8 (fol. 78ra–82va), 9 (fol. 82va–87ra), 10 (fol. 87ra–90vb), 5 (fol. 90vb–95va), 6 (fol. 95va–99vb), 7 (fol. 99vb–102vb), 17 (fol. 104ra–107ra) and the first question of the *Quodlibet* (fol. 107ra–107vb).<sup>19</sup> Finally, with respect to the MS Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 609, Burkhart stresses that it reports the first *quaestio de scientia* entitled *Utrum scientia possit advenire intellectui absque omni mutacione interius noviter intellectus* (fol. 26ra–26vb).<sup>20</sup> After a comparison between Fiorentino’s edition and the text of MS Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 609, we can assume that Burkhart’s attribution of this question to Alnwick is plausible, albeit the author of the question in Leipzig manuscript is not explicitly mentioned. Although this contribution does not aim at analyzing the Leipzig manuscript in detail, we can advance the hypothesis that the question reported there represents an abbreviated version of the first question on science that ends at §95.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, at a first comparison between Leipzig manuscript and Fiorentino’s edition, we can see an overlapping in structure, in their arguments (albeit they are not identical in both sources) and in their conclusions.<sup>22</sup> Whether this question is really

---

continua sunt plures partes in potentia quam in minori’. (fol. 20ra–22va) However, it begins in the middle of the question. The beginning has been supplied on fol. 31ra–va by the same (?) scribe who transcribed fol. 40–60. As far as I have been able to determine, Ledoux was unaware that this question was found in MS Par. Nat. lat. 15.805. The next question proves to be question 18 (again according to the numbering of MS Vat. Palat. lat. 1805) of Alnwick’s *Determinationes*. It is entitled: ‘Utrum voluntas humana possit movere se ad actum volendi’ (fol. 22va–26vb). Its contents were summarized by Ledoux » (GIRARD J. ETZKORN, « The Codex Paris Nat. Lat. 15805 », *AHF*, 80 (1987), p. 321–333, here p. 322–323).

<sup>18</sup> This information is taken from: GUSTAV MEYER, MAX BURCKHARDT, *Die mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Basel. Beschreibendes Verzeichnis. Abteilung B: Theologische Pergamenthandschriften*, vol. I: *Signaturen B I 1 – B VIII 10*, Verlag der Universitätsbibliothek, Basel 1960, p. 687–688. This manuscript was analyzed also by Prospero Stella who noted the presence of these three determinations (PROSPERO T. STELLA, « The Basel Codex, Universitätsbibliothek, B VII 9 e Pietro Di Baume », *Salesianum*, 42 (1980), p. 73–113, here p. 73).

<sup>19</sup> PETER BURKHART, *Die lateinischen und deutschen Handschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek Leipzig*, vol. II: *Die theologischen Handschriften (Ms 501 – 625)*, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1999, p. 70–71.

<sup>20</sup> BURKHART, *Die lateinischen und deutschen Handschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek Leipzig*, p. 270. In describing this question, Burkhart refers to MSS Padua, Biblioteca Antoniana, 291 and 295 and to Doucet’s study on the MS Assisi, Comunal Library, 172 (p. 259–262), in which the scholar mentions, with reference to the first question on the science, the MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1012, which Fiorentino rightly takes into account in his edition together with the two Padua manuscripts.

<sup>21</sup> The numbering of the paragraph refers to Fiorentino’s edition.

<sup>22</sup> We would like to emphasize that the synoptic work carried out is not intended to be conclusive. Furthermore, a similar issue has been stressed by Victorin Doucet as regards the MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1012: according to him, this manuscript on fol. 110r–112r

attributable to Alwnick, and how it relates to the version given in the manuscripts taken into account by Fiorentino in his edition, remains an open question.

In spite of these small additions, which, certainly, will not definitively complete the entire catalogue of Alwnick's works that Fiorentino provides in his introduction, it is noteworthy that such a systematic effort, as pointed out by the editor, allows to observe which distinctions are added or missing in each manuscript and to assess which philosophical cores are explored in depth in different works. In particular, the editor underlines the following topics (p. 10–11): the proper location of a scientific habit, the formal distinction *ex parte rei*, God's knowledge of things different from Himself, the eternity of the world, the human knowledge in relation to God, the definition of time, the principle of individuation, the status of the soul, the human beatitude.

The second section of the introduction is dedicated to the description of the « witnesses » of the questions edited (paragraph 2), followed by sections devoted respectively to « the commentary on the *Sentences* » (paragraph 3), to the « *Quaestiones de scientia* » (paragraph 4), to « the variants » of the manuscripts (paragraph 5) and to « the editing criteria » (paragraph 6).

It could be interesting, for the present purposes, to reconstruct the debate on the relationship between the manuscripts reporting the questions that Fiorentino and Scott deal with in their volume, since it represents an issue that has been addressed several times in the introduction and that has to be unraveled in order to understand the complexity of the edition analyzed here.

As highlighted in the second section (p. 15–17), Fiorentino analyzes the following manuscripts:

1. Assisi, Biblioteca comunale, 172 [henceforth, A]
2. Krakow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 732 [henceforth, C]
3. Padua, Biblioteca Antoniana, 291 [henceforth, P]
4. Padua, Biblioteca Antoniana, 295 [henceforth, P1]
5. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1012 [henceforth, V]

It is noteworthy that none of these manuscripts contains all the questions edited and that, as Fiorentino points out, their order in the manuscripts is also different, indeed the ninth question of the *Prologue* is the first one in P (p. 19). So, for the sake of clarity, we report in full Fiorentino's list of the questions with the reference provided by him of the *folii* in which they are copied (p. 4):

---

reports a question similar in structure and conclusion to Alwnick's first question of the *Prologue*, but then he does not draw conclusions about its authorship (DOUCET, « Descriptio codicis 172 bibliothecae communalis assisiensis », p. 259, fn.1).

1. Prologus, q. 1, *Utrum ab eodem intellectu eadem obiecta possunt esse credita per fidei adhaerentia est scita per rei evidentiam*: A, fol. 1r–11v; C, fol. 1ra–6rb; P, fol. 13ra–20vb.
2. Prologus, q. 2, *Utrum theologia sit scientia speculativa vel practica*: A, fol. 11v–20v; P, fol. 20vb–27vb.
3. Prologus, q. 3, *Utrum habitus practicus et speculativus distinguantur principaliter per obiecta vel per eorum fines*: A, fol. 20v–25r, C, fol. 10rb–12va, P, fol. 27vb–31va.
4. Prologus, q. 4, *Utrum finis sit propria operatio intellectiva an alterius potentiae operatio bona*: A, fol. 25r–29v, C, fol. 12vb–14vb, P, fol. 31va–35ra.
5. Prologus, q. 5, *Utrum theologia in Scriptura canonica explicata sit proprie scientia*: A, fol. 29v–34r, P, fol. 35ra–38va.
6. Prologus, q. 6, *Utrum notitia intellectiva fruitioni ultimi finis conformiter elicitur sit simpliciter practica*: A, fol. 34r, P, fol. 38va–39va.
7. Prologus, q. 9 or Quaestio de scientia 1, *Utrum scientia potest advenire intellectui scientis absque omni mutatione a parte sui intellectus noviter intelligentis*: P, fol. 6vb–12vb, P1, fol. 44ra–49vb, V, fol. 41v–45r.
8. Quaestio de scientia 2, *Utrum scientia possit causari in intellectu nostro a Deo immediate sine obiecto praeostenso*: P1, fol. 49vb–51rb, V, fol. 39r–41v.<sup>23</sup>

The main problematic point concerns, primarily, but not exclusively, the complex relationship between A and P. In order to frame the debate on this issue and to show how Fiorentino copes with it, we will briefly go over the most remarkable positions according to a chronological order.

The first to address the issue was Victorin Doucet who, in 1932, described the manuscript here indicated as A. According to Doucet, A and P are two different versions of the first and second book of the commentary on the *Sentences*.<sup>24</sup> Secondly, almost forty years later, Prospero Stella states that P and A are not the result of different teachings, but P gives an *Ordinatio* and A a *Reportatio*.<sup>25</sup> Thirdly, Joachim D'Souza, stressing several transcription mistakes in A and P and their different argumentative structure, deduces that they are copies, however « thought independent, the two codices appear to have a common source, and a rather proximate one », <sup>26</sup> called *Scriptum*, « of which Cod. P, containing the longer text, is a fairly integral transcription, while Cod. A, preserving the shorter text, is

---

<sup>23</sup> As mentioned, this list is found in WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology*, ed. FIORENTINO, p. 4. However, we must stress that, although the titles and the indications of the folii in which they are found in the manuscripts are taken verbatim from p. 4, the list given does not include all the questions of the prologue, which are instead catalogued in Fiorentino's list.

<sup>24</sup> DOUCET, « Descriptio codicis 172 bibliothecae communalis assisiensis », p. 272, fn .1 and p. 518.

<sup>25</sup> PROSPERO T. STELLA, « *Illi qui student in Scoto*. Guglielmo di Alnwick e la haecceitas scotista », *Salesianum*, 76 (1968), p. 1–87 (331–387, 614–641), here p. 66 (620)–67 (621). In Stella's edition, the Padua manuscript constitutes the reference codex, indicated as D.

<sup>26</sup> JOACHIM D'SOUZA, « William of Alnwick and the Problem of Faith and Reason », *Salesianum*, 35 (1973), p. 425–488, here p. 428 (the quotation is taken from p. 428, while the arguments from p. 426–436).

a deliberate abbreviation ».<sup>27</sup> Subsequently, Stephen Dumont, in the introduction of his edition of the eighth question of the *Prologue*, states that both C (which he refers to as K) and P « are independent copies of a common source and represent a revision of A », thus disagreeing either with Doucet's view that P and A report different teachings, and with Stella's view that they contain an *Ordinatio* and a *Reportatio*.<sup>28</sup> Bassi, who edited the seventh question of the Prologue, agrees with Dumont's opinion and, in addition, she observes that although P is longer not only because of the number of questions copied, but also because of the length of each argument, while « A turns out to be generally more precise both in the indication of the place of the passage and in the quotation itself »<sup>29</sup>.

Moreover, at the end of last century, Guido Alliney refers to these studies to show his own conclusion. Firstly, we should note that he divides the manuscripts reporting the *quaestiones de tempore* into three groups: the MS Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, Conv. Soppr. VII C 6;<sup>30</sup> the MSS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 869, P and A;<sup>31</sup> V (to which he refers to as V2) and C (indicated by Alliney as K).<sup>32</sup> According to his analysis, the MS Vatican Library, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 869 « would be earlier than P and A; then because the proximity between V1 » – MS Vatican Library, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 869 – « and P is remarkable, it follows that A must be an abbreviated version of P »<sup>33</sup>. This argument allows him to propose the following stemma: one manuscript – called X – is the source, from which the MS Vatican Library, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 869, P and a third copy (of which A would

<sup>27</sup> D'SOUZA, « William of Alnwick and the Problem of Faith and Reason », p. 435. The *Scriptum* is dated 1313–1315 (*Ibid.*, p. 436).

<sup>28</sup> STEPHEN D. DUMONT, « The Univocity of the Concept of Being in the Fourteenth Century: John Duns Scotus and William of Alnwick », *Medieval Studies*, 49 (1987), p. 1–75, here p. 32. The quotation is taken from the same page.

<sup>29</sup> MARIAELISABETTA BASSI (ed.), « La settima questione del Prologo del 'Commento alle Sentenze' di Guglielmo di Alnwick », in GUIDO ALLINEY, LUCIAVO COVA (eds.), *Parva mediaevalia. Studi per Maria Elena Reina*, Università degli Studi di Trieste, Trieste 1993, p. 133–156, here p. 130–131, the quotation is taken from p. 131 (translation by the author from Italian to English).

<sup>30</sup> According to Alliney (ALLINEY, « Quaestiones de tempore o II Sent. d. 2, qq. 1–3? », p. 129) the MS Naples, National Library, Conv. Suppr., VII C 6 constitutes « a first redaction of Alnwick's commentary » (*Ibid.*, p. 129, translation by the author from Italian to English). This manuscript is quoted several times by Fiorentino (WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology*, ed. FIORENTINO, p. 2–3, 6, 10, 18), who adds to the fundamental conclusions advanced by Alliney, the hypothesis that « N or a part of it may have been brought by Alnwick to Naples, where he could revise some questions on the second book, for example those on creation and time, and take part in the debates at the Studium sancti Lorentii » (*Ibid.*, p. 2, see also p. 18).

<sup>31</sup> The questions reported in these manuscripts are dated in the Oxonian period (ALLINEY, « Quaestiones de tempore o II Sent. d. 2, qq. 1–3? », p. 140).

<sup>32</sup> ALLINEY, « Quaestiones de tempore o II Sent. d. 2, qq. 1–3? », p. 137.

<sup>33</sup> ALLINEY, « Quaestiones de tempore o II Sent. d. 2, qq. 1–3? », p. 130 (translation by the author from Italian to English).



be a revision) would depend.<sup>34</sup> Instead, in contrast with Dumont's position, V and C « report the text of a different teaching »<sup>35</sup> and they share a common position on the problem of time, but they are different, because « V2 » – here V – « is always shorter, less precise in argumentative passages, but essentially faithful to K », here C.<sup>36</sup> So, the overall conclusion Alliney reaches is that all the questions considered do not change in the position they report, but in the targets on which they focus, an element that would confirm the idea that V and C represent later versions of the same questions, perhaps to be ascribed to Alnwick's period in Montpellier (1318–1320).<sup>37</sup>

Finally, Fiorentino, recalling Bassi's and Alliney's conclusions, firstly notes that A and P differ not only in their respective lengths or because one may represent a *Reportatio* and the other an *Ordinatio*<sup>38</sup>, but also in the degree of depth with which the topics are addressed and because P witness only the first two books of the commentary on the *Sentences*, while the A reports four books (p. 18). For « we are faced with two distinct commentaries which could reasonably correspond to two different readings » (p. 18). Secondly, with regard to the questions on science, Fiorentino, taking up the index of V, states that « the two questions on science and the quodlibetal questions appear to be contemporary » (p. 19), confirming what has been hypothesized also by Alliney.

The study on the variants proposed in the fifth section (p. 20–25) turns out to be detailed and allows us to observe in a more in-depth way the relationship between the manuscripts. Fiorentino, with reference to the questions of the *Prologue*, observes that P, A and C are independent copies, and that « P generally adds the text of A in the margin, sometimes also adopted in C, in the revision phase » (p. 20). According to Fiorentino, P is the last version of the commentary on the *Sentences* that we possess – although probably not the last in an absolute sense, given the peculiar collocation of the first *quaestio de scientia* at the beginning

---

<sup>34</sup> ALLINEY, « Quaestiones de tempore o II Sent. d. 2, qq. 1–3? », p. 130–131. The hypothesis of a copy prior to P is also confirmed by Fiorentino who reports that the scribe copying the sixth question of the *Prologue* states that it was transcribed « from a notebook which included this question first and had a *deletio* which is not found either in A or in P » (WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology*, p. 22–23).

<sup>35</sup> ALLINEY, « Quaestiones de tempore o II Sent. d. 2, qq. 1–3? », p. 131 (Translation by the author from Italian to English); as for his comparison with Dumont's thesis, see *Ibid.*, p. 130.

<sup>36</sup> ALLINEY, « Quaestiones de tempore o II Sent. d. 2, qq. 1–3? », p. 132 (translation by the author from Italian to English). On the relationship between these two manuscript see *Ibid.*, p. 131–134.

<sup>37</sup> ALLINEY, « Quaestiones de tempore o II Sent. d. 2, qq. 1–3? », p. 136–137. The hypothesis that V and C reports question discussed in Montpellier is advanced at p. 141–142.

<sup>38</sup> According to Fiorentino « if an *ordinatio* may be considered more extensive than a *reportatio*, perhaps because the reportator was in a hurry, then P becomes the *ordinatio* and A the *Reportatio*. Instead, if it is thought that a *reportatio* may be longer than an *ordinatio* thanks to the master's greater concision, then P becomes the *Reportatio* and A the *Ordinatio* » (WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology*, p. 18).

of the *Prologue* and not at the end of it – and it is a revision not only of A,<sup>39</sup> but also, as regards the questions on science, of P1 and V (p. 25).

In conclusion, although the question of the relationship between P and A is still unresolved, these authoritative theses share a preference for the use of P as the reference manuscript of their edition, probably because it is considered a more complete text from the argumentative point of view.<sup>40</sup> This choice is also taken by Fiorentino, who in his edition uses P as the main reference, indicating in the apparatus the omissions and *addenda* of other manuscripts (p. 26).

Finally, following Fiorentino's arguments, we come to the last section of the introduction, titled « fundamental contents » (paragraph 7, p. 26–37) and devoted to two main topics that run through the questions at stake: the status of theology and its definition as a speculative science.

In the first paragraph of section (p. 26–30), starting from the first question of the *Prologue*, Fiorentino shows that « Alnwick defines the epistemological status of faith, opinion and science on the basis of two criteria, namely evidence and the assent of free will » (p. 26). As pointed out by Fiorentino, knowledge and faith require the assent of free will and so do both their operation, i.e. reflecting and believing, but the second one is more meritorious because it is ordered to a more important end, namely the salvation (*Prologue*, q. 1, §197, p. 134–135). Nevertheless, knowledge and faith are distinct on the basis of the grade of evidence of their object: the latter is based on authorities, while the former is based on an object that it intends to know; in this sense Fiorentino consistently emphasizes that the science Alnwick refers to is a syllogistic demonstration (p. 26–27). However, faith and knowledge should not be understood as opposed or impossible, indeed Alnwick defends the idea « that faith and knowledge in the same intellect and with respect to the same object are not formally inconsistent » (*Prologue*, q. 1, §161, p. 116–117)<sup>41</sup> because the same person could « assent to some truth because of a demonstrative proof and [to assent to it] at the same time because of the authority of the speaker » (*Prologue*, q. 1, §232, p. 150–151).<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Instead, C « is influenced by a series of contaminations handed down by both A and P or by a lost witness very similar to both of these » (*Ibid.*, p. 25).

<sup>40</sup> Except for Brown, who uses only A in his edition (see fn. 5) and to some extent also Alliney because he edited separately the three versions of the questions on time: the first edition regards N, the second one P, A and Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 869 – in this case P is the reference manuscript for the edition –, and the third one regards C (GUIDO ALLINEY, *Time and Soul in Fourteenth Century Theology. Three Questions of William of Alnwick on the Existence, the Ontological Status and the Unity of Time*, Leo S. Olschki, Florence 2002 (Biblioteca di Nuncius, 45), p. LXIII).

<sup>41</sup> See also Augustine's authority on this issue, WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology*, *Prologue*, q. 1, §221–222, p. 146–149.

<sup>42</sup> See also WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology*, §299, p. 184–185.

Fiorentino links this topic to *Prologue*, question 5, in which Alnwick asks if theology as derived from Scriptural texts is a science. Here, after having criticized Thomas Aquinas, Henry of Ghent, Godfrey of Fontaines and William of Ware, Alnwick shows his position, built on a real distinction between the *habitus fidei* and the *habitus theologiae* (*Prologue*, q. 5 §98–101, p. 506–509): the former implies the assent « at the command of the will to some truth concerning things that are to be believed on account of divine authority » (*Prologue*, q. 5 §100, p. 508–509), whereas the latter is a science « with which the awareness of faith begins and which is completed by necessary reasons » (*Prologue*, q. 5 §101, p. 508–509). So, theology needs faith but it is strengthened by study, although we have to be aware of the weakness of the human intellect (*Prologue*, q. 5, §103, p. 508–511). These *rationes necessariae* represent the focal point of Fiorentino's interpretation: if this element is connected with the Augustinian position, it is possible to note a shared solution between Alnwick and Peter of Tarantaise (p. 28), otherwise, if it is considered together with the « defence of the Catholic faith by apology and Isaiah's sentence » (p. 29) it shows a certain similarity with Raymond Lull's thesis.<sup>43</sup>

In the second paragraph of the section (p. 31–37), which terminates the introduction, Fiorentino copes with the subject of the second question, namely, the status of theology. After having contrasted John Duns Scotus's, Giles of Rome's and Godfrey of Fontaines's opinions, according to which theology is respectively a practical science, it is neither speculative nor practical, but affective, and it is both speculative and practical, Alnwick affirms that theology is a speculative science (*Prologue*, q. 2, §130–131, p. 258–259) because theoretical contemplation, which is also posited by Aristotle as the highest happiness, is what makes it possible to love God, hence « the love of God is not action » (*Prologue*, q. 2, §148, p. 264–265). So, Alnwick, after criticizing Robert Cowton's arguments and recalling Alexander of Hales and Henry of Ghent, defines theology as « wisdom (from flavor) which moves towards the good » (*Prologue*, q. 2, §190, p. 284–287). Fiorentino, after having showed how Alnwick criticizes the theses of Giles of Rome and Godfrey of Fontaines, focuses on his relationship with John Duns Scotus (p. 31–33). The editor demonstrates how often « Scotus's opinion is not copied verbatim but it is summarized by Alnwick, albeit with a high degree of precision » (p. 33),<sup>44</sup> then he proceeds in explaining how Alnwick interprets and rejects Duns Scotus's concept of *praxis* (p. 33–35) and his definition of theology as a practical science (p. 35).

Certainly, the overview proposed by Fiorentino allows not only a clear explanation about Alnwick's position, but also a better understanding of his relationship with his own sources and with some of his contemporaries, but an in-

---

<sup>43</sup> On these topics see also FRANCESCO FIORENTINO, *Conoscenza scientifica e teologia fra XIII e XIV secolo*, Edizioni di Pagina, Bari 2014 (Biblioteca filosofica di Quaestio, 19), p. 207–218.

<sup>44</sup> Alnwick's relationship with Duns Scotus is also stressed by CLAUS ANDERSEN in his review of the volume analyzed here, in *AFH*, 114/3–4 (2021), p. 669–672.

depth analysis of all the edited questions would help more the reader.<sup>45</sup> Since Andersen, in his review of Fiorentino's edition, already summarizes the questions precisely,<sup>46</sup> we will just frame the themes that Alnwick treated in the questions not analyzed by Fiorentino in the introduction.

Firstly, the sixth question deals with the enjoyment of the final end and the possibility for this *notitia intellectiva* to be practical or speculative (*Prologue*, q. 6, p. 526-527). Alnwick, explicitly recalling the second question of the *Prologue*, states that it is speculative (*Prologue*, q. 6, §18, p. 534-535).<sup>47</sup>

Secondly, another philosophical core is constituted by the third and the fourth questions of the *Prologue* that cope with the distinction between practical and speculative habit. The speculative habit is distinguished from the practical one *principalius* for its object, while the practical habit is distinguished from the speculative one *principalius* for its end (*Prologue*, q. 3, §84, p. 362-363).<sup>48</sup> On this end Alnwick focuses in the fourth question.

Thirdly, the two questions the science deal with gnoseological issues. The first *quaestio de scientia* copes with the possibility for the intellect to know something without entailing a change in itself. Alnwick endorses this view if the knowledge is regarded as relation, but there is an intrinsic change if it considered as the foundation of this relation and this intrinsic change also causes an accidental change in the knowledge considered as a relation (*Prologue*, q. 9 sive *Quaestio de scientia* 1, §103-104, p. 604-605).<sup>49</sup>

The last question has already been analyzed in-depth by Fiorentino in the section devoted to William of Alnwick of his *Conoscenza scientifica e teologia fra XIII e XIV secolo*.<sup>50</sup> Here Alnwick deals with the possibility that « that knowledge strictly speaking of God and of matters that must necessarily be believed can be brought about by God directly in the intellect of a pilgrim without there being a concurrent object in its motive nature or in its nature as being evidently shown beforehand » (*Quaestio de scientia* 2, §15, p. 664-665). Alnwick criticizing John of Reading and sharing John Duns Scotus's conclusion, states that God's will can cause any effect

---

<sup>45</sup> Fiorentino probably avoids to provide such an analysis because he already dealt with Alnwick's philosophical position about the status of theology in his volume *Conoscenza scientifica e teologia fra XIII e XIV secolo*, p. 206-223.

<sup>46</sup> See *AFH*, 114/3-4 (2021), p. 669-672.

<sup>47</sup> See also WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology, Prologue*, q. 6, §32, p. 542-543.

<sup>48</sup> On the effects of this position on moral acts see WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology, Prologue*, q. 3, §85-89, p. 364-367, §134, p. 390-391.

<sup>49</sup> See also WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology, Prologue*, q. 9 sive *Quaestio de scientia* 1, §11, p. 550-551, §132, p. 618). Alnwick states that knowledge is considered *ad se* it is the first species of quality, while if it considered *ad aliud* it is a relation (*Ibid.*, §51, p. 572-575). We note that Scott translated the term « aequivoce » with « ambiguously », but this term in the Scholastics was connotated with a strongest meaning.

<sup>50</sup> FIORENTINO, *Conoscenza scientifica e teologia fra XIII e XIV secolo*, p. 219-223.

and the intellect is « an appropriate receptacle for the acceptance of any habit involving knowledge and its acts » (*Quaestio de scientia* 2, §59, p. 686–689), so there is no medium required.<sup>51</sup>

In conclusion, Alnwick's questions turn out to be very tangled, not only in terms of the complex manuscript tradition, but also in their internal structure, consisting of manifold references to the positions of his contemporaries that he criticizes, so that it is often difficult to reconstruct and analyze the structure of his arguments. For although John Duns Scotus's thought plays an important role in the development of Alnwick's views, he is not the only philosopher with whom Alnwick is in constant dialogue – this is the reason why Ledoux and Stella defined him respectively a « scotista independens »<sup>52</sup> and an « antiscotista a racion veduta ».<sup>53</sup> Indeed, among the most authoritative sources, in addition to John Duns Scotus, we find Avicenna, Averroes, Augustine, Aristotle (along with his commentators, quoted in the critical apparatus, such as Eustratius of Nicea and Michael of Ephesus) and Boethius as well as Anselm of Canterbury, Richard of St. Victor, Thomas Aquinas, Aegidius Romanus, Godfrey of Fontaines, William of Ware, Robert Cowton, John of Reading, Alexander of Hales, Henry of Ghent. Their positions are highlighted by Fiorentino in the titles he gives to the paragraphs of the Latin text and in the critical apparatus (some of them are also analyzed in the introduction), with the result of making the dense web of references to these positions immediately recognizable by the reader, facilitated also by a clearly edited Latin text, an extensive introduction and a valuable English translation.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> All the argument provided to defend this opinion are based on God's omnipotence and his being a first cause: see WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology*, ed. FIORENTINO, *Quaestio de scientia* 2, §58–82, p. 686–697.

<sup>52</sup> GUILLELMUS ALNWICK, *Quaestiones disputatae de esse intelligibili et de quodlibet*, ed. LEDOUX, p. IX.

<sup>53</sup> STELLA, « *Illi qui student in Scoto*. Guglielmo di Alnwick e la haecceitas scotista », p. 641 (87).

<sup>54</sup> WILLIAM OF ALNWICK, *Questions on Science and Theology*, p. 26.