

Marsilius of Inghen: Quaestiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum, Volume 3: Super primum, quaestiones 22–37, First Critical Edition.

Maarten J. F. M. Hoenen and Markus Erne, eds.

Studies in the History of Christian Traditions 173. Leiden: Brill, 2014. xii + 454 pp. \$219.

Marsilius of Inghen is one of those thinkers who has not enjoyed much sustained scholarly interest in the modern world, though he was of some importance in his own day. Marsilius was prominent enough as a master at Paris, where he served as rector in 1367 and 1371, that he was asked to serve as founding master at the University of Heidelberg in 1386. Most of Marsilius's writings are philosophically oriented: either works on logic, epistemology, or commentaries on various Aristotelian writings. Though he began his theological studies in Paris, it is not until he arrived in Heidelberg that he penned his only theological writing, his commentary on the *Sentences*. Completed shortly before his death in 1396, he was the first theologian to earn his doctorate at Heidelberg. Thus his commentary provides a window into the nature of the theological enterprise at this formative phase of the university. The publication of Marsilius's commentary is a welcome event for this reason alone.

This volume is the third of a proposed seven-volume critical edition of Marsilius's commentary. It is based upon five textual witnesses, four of which are manuscripts with the final witness being the 1501 printed Strasbourg edition. Unfortunately, but understandably, the editorial principles and descriptions of the sources are outlined in the earlier volumes of the series, but are not reiterated here. A manuscript from Isny serves as the main witness. The reader is treated to a description of the provenance and the general construction of each witness. This is followed by an account of the composition of the critical text, including a description of the textual apparatus and even

orthographical and grammatical concerns. The editors appear to have taken into consideration criticisms of the apparatus in earlier volumes and improved it. The volume covers fifteen questions from the *Sentences*, all of which address questions of intra-Trinitarian relations.

The editors helpfully point out two doctrinal points of interest related to the questions presented in this edition. First, though “Marsilius has an independent view on most issues, he models his treatment often in discussion with a number of authors who are labelled ‘antiqui’” (12). These *antiqui* include Bonaventure, Thomas Aquinas, Giles of Rome, and others. This is an interesting point because Marsilius declares himself to be a part of the nominalist *moderni* and it is widely acknowledged that he was influenced by John Buridan. This really only seems to serve to underscore both the idiosyncratic nature of Marsilius’s thought as well as the complexities of late medieval thought, which tend to defy simple categorization. The editors draw the reader’s attention to one other aspect of Marsilius’s commentary — his concern to limit the possibility that something might be concluded to be true logically that is heretical when considered theologically. The editors connect this to their first point by informing the reader that at points that logic would seem to carry one away from the shores of orthodoxy, Marsilius advised one to follow trusted *antiqui*. This is an important point in light of revisionist accounts of Scholasticism that attempt to clear away older notions of the movement as almost necessarily inimical to piety and a warm religious faith.

If I may be so bold, there is at least one other area in which this volume stands to make a significant scholarly contribution — the history of Trinitarian doctrine. Christians have traditionally had difficulty articulating the relationship between the persons of the Trinity while maintaining monotheism. The last few decades have seen a resurgence of interest in patristic and medieval, particularly Thomist, Trinitarian doctrine, but the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries have seen less interest. Some work has been done already on Marsilius’s Trinitarian theology, including an essay by one of the editors of this volume; but increased access to Marsilius’s commentary should help to place him in this field of research. The critical edition of Marsilius’s *Sentences* commentary will be a valuable contribution, especially to scholars of late medieval philosophy and theology.

DAVID M. BARBEE, *Winebrenner Theological Seminary*