

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 ob- iecta	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