

## Contents

Preface . . . . .	V
The editions	
1. The <i>Commentary</i> of James of Metz . . . . .	1
1.1. Manuscripts of the <i>Commentary</i> . . . . .	1
1.2. Versions of the <i>Commentary</i> . . . . .	2
1.3. The quality and affinities of the manuscripts . . . . .	6
2. The <i>Commentary</i> of Hervaeus Natalis . . . . .	9
2.1. List of manuscripts . . . . .	9
2.2. Versions of the <i>Commentary</i> . . . . .	10
2.3. The quality and affinities of the manuscripts . . . . .	12
3. The relation between James of Metz's Prologue and that of Hervaeus . . . . .	16
4. The editing rules . . . . .	17
4.1. James of Metz . . . . .	17
4.2. Hervaeus Natalis . . . . .	18
Iacobus Metensis	
Commentarius in Sententias. Prologus (redactio prima) . . . . .	21
Quaestio 5: Utrum theologia sit practica vel speculativa . . . . .	22
Additiones ad Commentarium in primum librum Sententiarum. Prologus . . . . .	33
Quaestio 1: Utrum theologia sit scientia . . . . .	34
Quaestio 2: Utrum Deus sit subiectum in theologia . . . . .	36
Quaestio 4: Utrum subalternet sibi alias scientias . . . . .	42
Commentarius in Sententias. Prologus (redactio secunda) . . . . .	49
Quaestio 1: Utrum theologia sit scientia . . . . .	50
Quaestio 2: Utrum Deus sit subiectum in theologia sub aliqua ratione speciali . . . . .	58
Quaestio 3: Utrum subalternetur alicui scientiae . . . . .	67
Quaestio 4: Utrum subalternetur alicui scientiae humanae . . . . .	70
Quaestio 5: Utrum theologia subalternet sibi alias . . . . .	72
Quaestio 6: Utrum theologia sit practica vel speculativa . . . . .	74
Hervaeus Natalis	
Commentarius in Sententias. Prologus (redactio prima) . . . . .	83
Quaestio 1: Utrum theologia sit scientia . . . . .	84
Quaestio 5: Utrum theologia sit practica vel speculativa . . . . .	96

Commentarius in Sententias. Prologus (redactio secunda)	113
Quaestio 1: Utrum theologia sit scientia	114
Quaestio 2: Utrum Deus sit subiectum theologiae sub ratione speciali et non absolute secundum quod Deus	126
Quaestio 3: Utrum theologia subalternetur alicui scientiae	137
Quaestio 4: Utrum speculativum et practicum distinguantur penes objecta	147
Quaestio 5: Utrum ista scientia debeat denominari a fine habendo in via vel in patria	153
Quaestio 6: Utrum sit speculativa vel practica	156
Quaestio 7: Utrum theologia sit scientia una	165

The Dominican reflection on the nature of theology at the crossroads.  
 A commentary to the Prologues to the *Commentary on the Sentences* by  
 James of Metz and Hervaeus Natalis

1. Thomas Aquinas	169
1.1. Theology as a science	169
1.2. The subject of theology	172
1.3. Theology: practical or theoretical?	173
1.4. The unity of theology	174
2. Giles of Rome	178
2.1. Theology as a science	179
2.2. The subject of theology	183
2.3. Subalternation of theology	188
2.4. Theology: practical or theoretical?	192
2.5. The unity of theology	195
3. Henry of Ghent	200
3.1. Theology as a science	200
3.2. The subject of theology	209
3.3. Subalternation of theology	214
3.4. Theology: practical or theoretical?	220
3.5. The unity of theology	224
4. Godfrey of Fontaines	227
4.1. Theology as a science	227
4.2. The subject of theology	241
4.3. Theology: practical or theoretical?	246
5. The Dominican predecessors of James and Hervaeus	255
5.1. John Quidort	256
5.2. William Peter of Godino	265
6. James of Metz and Hervaeus Natalis	273
6.1. Theology as a science	275
6.1.1. James of Metz	275
6.1.2. Hervaeus Natalis	279

6.2. The subject of theology . . . . .	291
6.3. Subalternation of theology . . . . .	302
6.4. Theology: practical or theoretical? . . . . .	310
6.4.1. James of Metz . . . . .	310
6.4.2. Hervaeus Natalis . . . . .	320
6.5. The unity of theology . . . . .	330
7. Concluding remarks . . . . .	332
7.1. The Dominicans as critics and polemicists . . . . .	333
7.2. The Dominicans as positive thinkers . . . . .	336
 Bibliography . . . . .	 340
Index biblicus . . . . .	353
Index codicum manu scriptorum . . . . .	354
Index auctorum et operum anonymorum . . . . .	355