Educational Background and Theological Foreground: A Study of Correlation between the Medieval System of Higher Education and Medieval Scholastic Theology in the Thirteenth Century

Rostislav TKACHENKO, *OTS, Odessa, Ukraine*

«Богословские размышления» / «Theological Reflections». №16, 2016, p. 88-119.

About the author

Rostislav Tkachenko, Master of Theology and Religious Studies (Th.M.), Ph.D. candidate at *Evangelishe Theologishe Faculteit*, Leuven; Adjunct Professor of Historical Theology at Odessa Theological Seminary and Lviv Theological Seminary. E-mail: RYTkachenko@gmail.com.

Abstract

The article is a piece of interdisciplinary research: it connects historical-theological studies of medieval Christian thinking and studies in the history of Christian education. It is built around the conviction that the socio-cultural and intellectual context on the one side and the form and content of theology on the other side are always correlated to each other. In other words, the system or type of education that a person goes through influences his mode of thinking and, at last, his theology. The weight and value of this contextual-theological stance are checked and examined within a historical-theological analysis of thirteenth-century university education and the formation of the phenomenon of medieval scholasticism. The study detects and shows the connections between the educational model that was prevalent at the time and the theology that was formulated. Such a thesis is confirmed and illustrated by the test case of Thomas Aquinas and his *Summa theologiae*. In the end, the conclusion offers a number of brief notes concerning the educational and intellectual value of study for lay Christians and Christian educators of the present day.

Keywords: Middle Ages, scholasticism, Christian education, medieval university, theological method, Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* Educational Background and Theological Foreground: A Study of Correlation between the Medieval System of Higher Education and Medieval Scholastic Theology in the Thirteenth Century

Introduction

The type of theology you get depends on the type of people who produce it and the type of milieu where it is produced. In other words, human and socio-cultural contexts influence and, to a certain extent, determine the form and content of the theology that emerges and continues to exist in a certain time and place. That is, the psychological, micro-cultural, and spiritual state of a person's heart and mind (internal factors) together with the social, macro-cultural, political, and religious context (external factors) results in some idiosyncratic types of theology.

In particular, (since the thesis just offered in the preceding paragraph is quite obvious, yet vague, and it is possible to turn it in different directions) *the system or type of education that a person goes through influences his mode of thinking and, at last, his theology*. This is the basic statement of the present article, and I would like to demonstrate its weight and value on an example from the Middle Ages.

My purpose is to (1) briefly analyze the later medieval system of education, which was primarily Christian, since at that period theology was considered the "Queen of Sciences" and the whole socio-cultural picture of Europe, from Ireland to the eastern borders of the declining Byzantine Empire could be expressed in the word "Christendom." Parallel to that, I would like to (2) draw connections between the educational model that was prevalent at the time and the theology that was "made" then, thus showing some specific features of that type of theologizing. The latter will be solidified with the help of a test case, (3) which will present and explicate the select ideas of a medieval thinker as an example of the clear correlation of his educational background and his personal theological foreground – that is, his work. Finally, in the conclusion (4) I will make some brief notes concerning these ideas' educational and intellectual value for Christians of the present day and sketch possible directions for further research in the field. But that being said I would first like to make some clarifications.

Firstly, by the later medieval educational model I mean the system of higher or professional education that was being developed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in recently-born and just-being-born universities and, to a lesser degree, in smaller schools. It was there that young Christians could have received professional education in general and high-quality theological education in particular. Secondly, both this educational model and the type of theology implied in this survey are related to the notion and concept of *scholasticism*, which should not be shied away from or dismissed as negative, irrelevant, or alien to Protestant/evangelical theology. The term and its meaning will be explained later in the article, but the need for studies in and analysis of the medieval theological phenomena can and should be justified right away.

In my understanding, evangelicals worldwide, including Russians and Ukrainians, underestimate and frequently overlook the Christian Middle Ages. This is demonstrated, for example, by even a sketchy view on the topics and questions discussed in various evangelical theological journals such as *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society, Westminster Theological Journal, Theological Reflections, Bogomyslie* and oth-

ers: the absolute majority of articles deal with topics of biblical theology, church history (primarily the periods of primitive Christianity and the post-Reformation), and systematic theology; only a few articles normally touch the issues of later Patristic thought and medieval theological developments. Nevertheless, there is a growing awareness among evangelicals that they should—and actually already have started to—"rediscover their history, their *church* history."[1]

This phrase of Gregory Soderberg highlights the connection between a "smaller" local history of the evangelical movement(s) and a "larger" global history of world Christianity and calls for a reappraisal and positive rethinking of this connection. Interestingly, a similar sentiment has been vocalized by a Ukrainian theologian, Mikhail Cherenkov, who said: "Another direction that the development of post-Soviet evangelical churches [should choose] is integration into the European and, later, global evangelicalism. The successful surmounting of the consequences of the seventy-year long [life behind] the "Iron Curtain" is closely connected with *a new reading of church history and assimilation of its heritage* – primarily Reformation principles and ideas."[2]

I would personally agree with both of them and continue their theses with some "Pre-Reformation sentiments": the medieval theological heritage is included in this tapestry of global church history that needs to be rediscovered and appreciated by contemporary evangelicals because it is both *a common theological ground for all Protestants and Roman Catholics* and *a cradle of the Protestant Reformations of the sixteenth century*. Plus, it was the medieval modes of education that heavily influenced the development of the European academy and European theological discourse. As Ulrich Leinsle aptly puts it, "The university's understanding of its nature and mission and theology's claim to be a science were mutually dependent as they evolved."[3] Hence, there exists an undisputable connection between medieval education and medieval—and not only—theology. But it should be established, commented upon, and explicated, which is the goal of the present article.

1. The Thirteenth-Century Theological Education in its Socio-Cultural and Religious Context

It is quite a mistake to see medieval scholastics as "ivory tower theologians" whose main concern was to create as complicated and impractical theology as possible, with dozens of weird terms, hundreds of unnecessary concepts, thousands of subtle distinctions, and millions of pages written to present all this madness to their naive

[1] Gregory Soderberg, "Review of *Church History: The Rise and Growth of the Church in Its Cultural, Intellectual, and Political Context*, Vol. 1: *From Christ to the Pre-Reformation*, by Everett Ferguson, and Vol. 2: *From Pre-Reformation to the Present Day*, by John D. Wodbridge and Frank A. James III," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 57, no. 4 (December 2014): 855.

[2] Mikhail Cherenkov, *Baptizm bez kavychek. Ocherki i materialy k diskussii o buduschem evangel'skih tserkvej* [Baptism without inverted commas: Essays and materials for a discussion of the future of evangelical churches] (Cherkassy: Kollokvium, 2012), 173.

[3] Ulrich G. Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, trans. by Michael J. Miller (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2010), 120.

audience. On the contrary, they lived and worked in "the natural environment where all the social, cultural, and spiritual innovations were being expressed and making their impact."[4] This background of the Latin (that is, Western European) World of the thirteenth century included the development of the "urban mentality" in cities and towns, the growth of medieval universities and mendicant movements, the appearance and increasing influence of new sources of knowledge, and a few shifts of theological paradigms. In brief, the thirteenth century was the century of popes, universities, mendicant orders, and academic methods.

1.1. Remarks on the socio-cultural situation in the thirteenth century

In obvious continuity with the previous centuries[5] the social "portrait" of the thirteenth century was that of "a predominantly rural society, underdeveloped and underequipped, in which technical progress was extremely slow, [and] existence was, for most hard and precarious..."[6] But the label of the "darkly glum" that post-Enlightenment scholars like Burckhardt or Voigt put upon the whole period of Middle Ages is nonetheless inadequate,[7] because to a certain extent both the twelfth[8] and the thirteenth[9] centuries should be justly described as "the renaissances" in cultural and scientific aspects. In socio-cultural perspective the two centuries were characterized by the constant increase of population throughout Europe,[10] the territorial expansion of the Western world into the Mediterranean and North-Eastern regions (that is, the re-conquered Spanish territories, Latin feuds in Greece and on Malta and Crete, a couple of states in the Holy Land as a result of the Crusades, Teutonic lands in Prussia and Baltic countries, the temporary capture of Constantinople itself, etc.),[11] and the growth of towns and cities with their "dialectical dynamics" of life which contained in itself a somewhat "anarchic [character], extremes of wealth and destitution, ...over-employment and unemployment... [and] the element of hysteria."[12] These phenomena illustrated and at the same time constituted the changed face of Western Christendom: not only its external boundaries were expanding, but also its mentality and self-consciousness changed drastically, although gradually.

The urbanization and "enlargement of the physical boundaries" led to the internationalization of the population[13] and the development of trade.[14] The former pro-

[4] Marie-Dominique Chenu, *Aquinas and His Role in Theology* (Collegeville, Minn.: A Michael Glazier Book / The Liturgical Press, 2002), 16.

[5] Richard W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (London: Pimlico, 1993), 73.

[6] Rosalind B. Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars* (New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1975), 112.

[7] Romanus Cessario, *A Short History of Thomism* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2005), 5.

[8] John Marenbon, *Medieval Philosophy: An Historical and Philosophical Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2007), 131.

[9] Cessario, *A Short History of Thomism*, 5.

[10] Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars*, 112.

[11] Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages*, 31-32; David Knowles and Dimitri Obolensky, *The Middle Ages*, vol. 2, 3 vols., The Christian Centuries (London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd., 1978), xviii-xix.

[12] Richard W. Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1970), 274-275.

[13] Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages*, 199 and 211.

[14] Ibid., 42ff; Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars*, 112.

vided for a widening of people's worldview and a change of the social order (less hierarchical and more "democratic," if the term is permissible in the medieval context[15]); the latter gave an impetus for the rise of industries (for example, the cloth industry in Britain and the Low Countries), market prices, and, partly, improvement of the economic situation in some parts of Europe (primarily, the in the south).[16] The traffic of goods to and from Europe was getting more and more intense, but the byproduct of these financial steams was not only people's mobility, but also the "the traffic in ideas,"[17] using Richard Southern's phrase: the number of philosophical texts by ancient Greek and medieval Arabic and Jewish thinkers available for investigation after translation into Latin grew rapidly.[18] This posed both a challenge and an opportunity for the Western mind, but in any case, the economic, political, social, and intellectual changes deconstructed the older medieval world concentrated on localism, thus creating a new social blend based on the principles of internationalism and universality.[19]

This transition from the stability-oriented, closely-related-within and thus well-organized (which often meant "easy-to-control") homogenous rural society to a turbulent and *per definitionem* mixed and disorganized body of city dwellers signified "the disintegration of the traditional order and relationships."[20] Traditional geographical and familial bounds played no role in the centers of social intermingling such as rapidly growing towns; therefore people had to reconsider their own identity and place in these new social structures. This process resulted in (a) the emergence of *communes* with their professional or "free association" principle of formation[21] and (b) a quasi-scientific or semi-religious "psychological interest" in the *individual* as somehow distinct from the *collective*.[22] Both trends found their realization in the ever-growing number and power of various guilds and more personal approaches to the practice of the Christian life in Cistercian and later mendicant spirituality.[23] Yet, the religious spirit of Citeaux and that of the Friars Minor or the Dominicans were very different: Cistercian piety with its simplicity of life, emphasis on interior spirituality, and flight from the world[24] was itself a reaction against the earlier Cluniac (that is, originating at the monastery of Cluny) ideal of "the daily round of religious duties" with routine of regular prayers and physical labor, close association with their

[15] The social self-portrait of medieval society, as well as the set of social bonds and relations themselves, slowly becomes more and more complex, flexible and "professionalized." See a good analysis of this phenomenon in Jacques Le Goff, *La civilisation de l'occident médiéval* (Champs: Flammarion, 1982), 240–241ff.

[16] Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages*, 45-48; Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars*, 112.

[17] Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages*, 32 and 62.

[18] O.V. Dushin [Душин], "Glava 4. Formirovaniye skholasticheskogo diskursa: Istoricheskaya persptiva" [Chapter 4. The formation of the scholastic discourse: A historical aspect], in *Filosofiya zapadnoyevropeyskogo srednevekov'ya: uchebnoye posobiye* [Philosophy of the West-European Middle Ages: A manual] (Saint-Petersburg: Saint-Petersburg University Press, 2005)ek, 135.

[19] Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages*, 212.

[20] Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars*, 112.

[21] Chenu, *Aquinas*, 6 and 15.

[22] Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages*, 211 and 220ff.

[23] Cf. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages*, 219; Knowles and Obolensky, *The Middle Ages*, 352-353.

[24] Southern, *Western Society*, 250-251.

noble patrons, and an accent on strict observance of rules and timetables;[25] the mendicants' ideas, in their turn, were a reaction against those of Citeaux and, not surprisingly, had an image of a novelty of the time.

1.2. New *modi* of religion: The rise of friars and papal absolutism

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, traditional Benedictine spirituality, represented in several forms and present in many places, found some counterparts or "corporate colleagues." Firstly, there emerged the Cistercians and the Carthusians, led by Bernard of Clairveaux and Bruno of Cologne, and then later came the mendicants. The former signified a return to sound reason, overt simplicity, and regular appeal to ancient authorities as against various more recent customs, thus trying to "introduce a greater degree of solitariness, a greater intensity, and a more acute strife into the religious life" (including an emphasis on introspection and "intelligent" mysticism).[26] But the latter were of a different spirit, though both tended to seek to imitate and incorporate a "really apostolic life" (*vita vere apostolica*).[27]

The two famous orders of mendicants—*Ordo pr?dicatorum* (O.P., the Dominicans) and *Ordo fratrum minorum* (O.F.M., the Franciscans)—were initiated by two famous Catholic saints: St. Dominic and St. Francis of Assisi. The former desired to convert those who were still unbelievers (for example, some communities in Denmark where Dominic had been at least twice) and those who had fallen into heresy (like the Albigensians in the province of Languedoc), while the latter just wanted to faithfully pursue and preach to everyone the life of radical evangelical humility and poverty.[28] Yet, several aspects of the basic intentions of the founders, as well as the developed programs of the two movements, have a lot in common: (a) their common yearning for "revival of the word of God in the Church" with all its maxims and requirements, (b) the admitted great importance of preaching of the gospel to everyone and everywhere, (c) the emphasis on poverty as an—if not the most—important aspect of being a true disciple of Jesus, (d) a somewhat democratic organization—the Franciscans at first did not have any structure and the Dominicans very quickly came to a centralized—yet based on elective principles—model of government, and (e) their attitude to a monastic life that was perceived by them through the lens of a biblical paradox: a Christian should be "set apart from the world, yet still present to it."[29]

Thus, it goes without question that the two new orders were quite alike, although the difference in orientation between them should also be noted. As Rosalind Brooke clearly expressed it, "[t]he aim of the Friars Minor was to follow the Gospel, and this involved living in poverty, wandering and preaching; the aim of the Friars Preachers was to care for souls, and in order to be effective pastors they preached and lived in poverty."[30] Besides, these two different visions implied different monastic regulations

[25] Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages*, 157.
[26] Ibid, 159-160, 215-220.
[27] Goff, *La civilisation de l'occident médiéval*, 65.
[28] Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars*, 91-92 and 20-22.
[29] Chenu, *Aquinas*, 8-9 and 11. Cf. Knowles and Obolensky, *The Middle Ages*, 339-341.
[30] Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars*, 99.

for life (the new and radical Rule of St. Francis vs. the older and more moderate Augustinian Rule)[31] and varying approaches to training (mystical experience and fervent prayer vs. careful theological studies).[32] However, both orders, when it was necessary, were ready to serve the Holy See and the *ecclesia catholica* faithfully and obediently[33] and, quite interestingly, by doing this they partly supported and partly challenged the existent church order.

It is common knowledge that after Gregory VII the popes tended to strengthen their position in Christendom and achieve as absolute authority as possible—"a universal authority" over monarchs, clerics, and ordinary people. The transformation of the traditional title of Roman bishops from "the Vicar of St. Peter" to the much more ambitious "Vicar of Christ" exemplifies the case really well.[34] The "lawyer-popes"[35] of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (especially the brightest example of the "absolutist papal policy," Innocent III[36]) tried to exercise their power over both religious and secular aspects of life. The firmly established feudal-like hierarchical apparatus and Cistercian monasticism became the best tools for supporting the twelfth-century pontiffs' desire for both universality and centralization of power within "his" domain.[37] The friars of the thirteenth century also supported the popes' intentions, but apparently challenged the older monastic system. In their turn, popes (for instance, the same Innocent III) returned favor to the mendicants when they were involved in controversies over their status in the church (1279 AD) or in the university (1255 AD), although the relationships between popes and the new orders were not always easy.[38] It was, by the way, the university that became the new locus of the friars' activity, and it was in this new locus of knowledge that people like the young Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure or later Duns Scotus normally became acquainted with Aristotle's works and started their own careers as church ministers and theologians.[39]

1.3. New *loci* of knowledge and new *scientia*: The rise of universities and their curricula

The universities emerged from great cathedral schools scattered here and there in Europe[40] with support from either the official church[41] or a secular authority,[42] or both. They took the place of the old schools and monasteries and became new centers for professional training, critical thinking, and intellectual innovations.

[31] Knowles and Obolensky, *The Middle Ages*, 339-340.

[32] Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars*, 99.

[33] Knowles and Obolensky, *The Middle Ages*, 342.

[34] Southern, *Western Society*, 104-104; Goff, *La civilisation de l'occident médiéval*, 244.

[35] As Southern notes, "every notable pope from 1159 to 1303 was a lawyer. This fact reflects the papacy's preeminent concern with the formulation and enforcement of law." Southern, *Western Society*, 131-132.

[36] Knowles and Obolensky, *The Middle Ages*, 289-291.

[37] Chenu, *Aquinas*, 4-6.

[38] Knowles and Obolensky, *The Middle Ages*, xix; Goff, *La civilisation de l'occident médiéval*, 66–67.

[39] Aidan Nichols, *Discovering Aquinas: An Introduction to His Life, Work, and Influence* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003), 3–4.

[40] Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages*, 199.

[41] Marenbon, *Medieval Philosophy*, 209.

[42] Dushin [Душин], "Formirovaniye skholasticheskogo diskursa [The formation of scholastic discourse]," 108.

In fact, the university was both a continuation and the *terminus ad quem* of the evolution of cathedral schools (Rheims, Chartres, Orleans, Paris), which were, in their turn, "sisters" of the traditional monastic schools of the earlier Middle Ages (Corbie, Fulda, Le Bec, St. Victor), and a very unique development of the medieval mind and culture.[43] A number of peculiar developments in popular culture and people's worldview have led to the emergence of universities and the "universitarian spirit." R. W. Southern lists three factors that played a major role in this historical development:[44]

i. "the need for some form of instruction in the great collegiate churches," with reading, writing, and administrative skills included,

ii. "the intellectual restlessness, the desire to know more than the needs of daily life required or than local schoolmasters provided, which seems to strike us as a new factor in the general life of Western Europe... [which meant that the] teaching of the Church was beginning to stir a lively response at all levels of society," and

iii. "the rapid growth in the floating population of students of all ages and conditions, prepared to go anywhere for the sake of learning," which also created "a demand for teachers."

But, of course, there were also other factors at play: the emergence and further institutionalization of an urban (sub)culture, the overall growth of the European population with its spiritual and intellectual needs and interests, the development of the scholarly tradition whereby individual *magistri* drew students, collected money for their teaching, and often joined their colleagues in order to form guilds (it was in the *Zeitgeist* of the epoch), and an expression of the new tendency towards "*team formation* and *specialization*" that was arising in society in general and the area of education specifically.[45] After all, it is hard to trace back and encapsulate in a few words the origins of such a massive phenomenon, but, briefly, all or some of these factors did contribute to the organization of the universities of Bologna, Paris, and Oxford—the very first universities in Europe and the world—as well as their younger fellow schools – in Cambridge, Toulouse, Padua, Naples and elsewhere.[46]

A medieval university (for example that of Paris) usually was a guild-like "collective juridical entity with the competence to solve its own problems," with its own rights and freedoms and the "university" of studies offered to its students.[47] Even the word *universitas* ("university") means nothing special but "corporation" or a

[43] Philip Schaff and David S. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church. The Middle Ages: From Gregory VII., 1049, to Boniface VIII., 1294*, vol. 5. Part 1 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907), 534–536ff, 551–552; Antonie Vos, "Scholasticism and Reformation," in *Reformation and Scholasticism. An Ecumenical Enterprise*, ed. Willem van Asselt and Eef Dekker (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2001), 102.

[44] Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages*, 186–187.

[45] Jacques Le Goff, *Les intellectuels au Moyen Âge* (S.l. [Paris]: Editions du Seuil, 1985), 73–74; Goff, *La civilisation de l'occident medieval*, 62–63, 269ff; Southern, *The Making*, 187-188; Schaff and Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 5. Part 1:552–553; Vos, "Scholasticism and Reformation," 102.

[46] Vos, "Scholasticism and Reformation," 102; Schaff and Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 5. Part 1:553–554.

[47] Chenu, *Aquinas*, 16.

certain "totality". This is why a university was primarily a corporation of teachers and students or scholars (*universitas magistrorum et scholarium*). Thus, it was *an organized group of people actively involved in studies*, a corporation of urban intellectuals (Le Goff's *la corporation intellectuele, les intellectuels urbans*). Only secondarily and later the word's meaning was narrowed down to an *institution* of higher professional education in select spheres of knowledge.[48] In the medieval period such a place or center or organization for studies was frequently called *studium*. It could have existed in form of *studium particulare*, "a small (place of) study" – a one-province or regional school, or *studium generale*, also called *commune* or *universale*, which meant "a general (place of) study" – an open interregional or international school. Hence, the universities of Bologna, Paris, and Oxford were referred to as *studium Bononie* or *Bononiense*, *studium Parisiense*, and *studium Oxoniense* respectively.[49]

Usually, there were four faculties in the classical medieval university: the Arts Faculty where the students learnt to know the *artes liberales* of the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric and dialectic) and the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and theory of musical harmony),[50] after which the student was allowed to continue his education in one of the three higher faculties of medicine, law, and theology, [51] although it was not necessary and many graduates left after taking and (obligatorily) teaching courses in the *facultas artium*.

These faculties had quite standardized programs for study (curricula), regulations of the educational process, and a number of customs. It took quite some time for students to master the basics of scholarly knowledge, meet all of the requirements and reach the most profound spheres, which also meant getting to the cutting edge of knowledge and the very top of the medieval academia (after the "final" graduation). The studies at the arts faculty normally took about six years, while further studies at one of the three higher faculties required from six (medicine) or eight (law) to about ten or twelve years (theology) according to some accepted conventional procedures (formulated by Robert de Courçon and/or established by later practices). Sometimes the whole process of university education even took up to fifteen or sixteen years.[52]

Upon the student's successful completion of coursework, internship, and a series of exams (*examen privatum, conventus publicus, determinatio, collatio*) every level of education led to the imposition of a certain degree and the authorization to perform certain actions as a professional. It is here in the medieval university that the now-conventional degrees of bachelor (*baccalaureus*), licentiate (*licentiatus*) and master (*magister*) or doctor (*dominus, doctor*) were initiated. Yet, at that time they conveyed

[48] Schaff and Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 5. Part 1:554–555; Goff, *La civilisation de l'occident medieval*, 63; ibid, *Les intellectuels au Moyen Age*, 39.

[49] Étienne Gilson, *La philosophie au Moyen Age*, (Paris: Payot et Cte, 1922), 1:126–127; Schaff and Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 5. Part 1:552–553.

[50] Fernand Van Steenberghen, *La philosophie au XIIIe siècle*, 2ème edition, mise à jour, Philosophes Médiévaux, Tome XXVIII (Louvain-la-Neuve / Louvain: Éditions de l'Institut superieur de philosophie / Éditions Peeters, 1991), 55.

[51] Dushin [Душин], "Formirovaniye skholasticheskogo diskursa [The formation of the scholastic discourse]," 102.

[52] Goff, *Les intellectuels au Moyen Âge*, 84–85; Schaff and Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 5. Part 1:559.

slightly different meanings: a bachelor was identical to a young apprentice and, at the same time, assistant, as he was allowed to do some subordinate lecturing under the guidance of professor; a licentiate was but the owner of a diploma with permission to teach or work as a young professional; and a doctor or master were synonyms signifying the man who has become an independent scholar and a real expert in his field.[53] Within the educational background a diploma was identical to a license to teach and instruct (*jus docendi, jus* or *licentia legendi*) and it was not reserved to the highest level of the licensée (that is, doctors and magisters) only. In fact, as J. Marenbon rightly notes, "there was no rigid distinction between students and teachers. As a student went through the course, he gave first introductory, and then more advanced lectures, and his role in disputations became more serious". Hence, it is obvious that the medieval university was indeed a body of colleagues, all involved in one collective business, yet one with the certain set of rules, regulations, and hierarchically organized structures.

The approximate plan of one's hypothetic studies in the university from the very first stages in the Arts Faculty to one of the most respected positions in the Faculty of Theology can be schematized in a table. This one is offered and clearly explained by John Marenbon.[54]

The university of the thirteenth century as the *locus scientiæ* was in fact an outcome and simultaneously a "promoter" of two developments in the European thinking of that period: (1) "the standardization of the academic practices" and (2) "the encounter with the whole range of new sources translated from the Greek and the Arabic".[55] The first consisted in the structuration of educational practices (which were discussed above), systematization of "study programs" or curricula (clearly and concisely presented in the works of J. LeGoff, J. Marenbon, and others[56]), and the elaboration of scholastic method (which will be discussed in the next section), whose origin could be traced back to the *magistri* of the twelfth century—Peter Abelard, William of Champeaux, Anselm of Laon, Peter Lombard and others—with their adherence to a "*questio*-technique",[57] appeals to ancient authorities (*auctores*), and the systematic arrangement of material (Lombard's *Sententiæ* are a good exemplar of this developing style of writing and thinking).[58] The second trend was the result of the laborious effort of Spanish and Italian translators who made available in Latin many forgotten or unknown texts of Aristotle, other Greek thinkers, and a number of Jewish and Arabic philosophers.[59] This "translation phenomenon" indicates and firmly establishes the thesis concerning the further expansion of the borders of knowledge as they were seen and encountered by medieval people.[60] The *scholastici*

[53] Goff, *Les intellectuels au Moyen Âge*, 85–88; Schaff and Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 5. Part 1:558–559.

[54] Marenbon, *Medieval Philosophy*, 207–208.

[55] Marenbon, *Medieval Philosophy*, 205.

[56] Ibid., 212–214; Goff, *Les intellectuels au Moyen Âge*, 85f.

[57] This is a philosophical, logical, or theological discussion started with the question, which usually had hypothetically different—even conflicting—ways of answering it.

[58] Marenbon, *Medieval Philosophy*, 160-161.

[59] Ibid., 169–170, 210–212.

[60] Dushin [Душин], "Formirovaniye skholasticheskogo diskursa [The formation of the scholastic discourse]," 133–136; Steenberghen, *La philosophie au XIIIe siècle*, 33.

Table 1.

Duratiott (approximate age at beginning)	*Description*	*Main activities*
Arts Faculty		
2 (15)	Undergraduate	Attends introductory and discursive lectures on grammatical, logical and some other Aristotelian works; and attends disputatious.
2 (17)	Undergraduate	As above, but also responds in disputations.
After which he is 'admitted to determine' 3 at Oxford; more variable at Paris (19)	Bachelor	As above, but the lectures also cover Aristotle's natural philosophy and *Metaphysics* and the qiuadrivium. Responding at disputations; giving introductory lectures.
After which he receives his 'licence' and 'incepts' as a Master of Arts 2 hut can be extended (c. 22)	Master of Arts – necessary regency	Participation in special disputations etc. Gives discursive lectures and determines at disputations.
Theology Faculty		
7, later reduced to 6 (24)		Attends introductory and discursive lectures on the Bible and (discursive) lectures on the *Sentences*, and disputations.
2 (30-31)	Cursus/ Baccalareus biblicus	As before, but gives introductory lectures on the Bible and responds in disputations.
2, reduced to 1 by the 14th century (32-33)	Baccalarius sententiarius	Gives discursive lectures on the *Sentences,*
4 (33-35)	Baccalarius formatus	Takes part in disputations and attends university functions.
After which he	incepts as a Master of Theology	Participation in special disputations etc.
Usually limited (37-39)	Regent Master of Theology	Gives discursive lectures on Bible and determines at disputations.

of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries were greatly interested in reading more, knowing more, and thinking more about what they had just seen, read or heard. It is not only the information at their disposal that expanded their modes and "schemes" of thinking expanded and changed as well. The new times brought forward and called on scholars to use some new (intellectual) tools:[61] scholastic methodology was recognized by default as a good tool for the creative and critical absorption of these new materials. It must be explained and commented upon in the next section.

1.4. New *viae* to knowledge: The rise of scholastic tools and methods

It was established in the previous section that any professional and academic education (as we would call it nowadays) started with the study of the basics – the so-called *trivium*, which included (a) grammar as a general theory of language; (b) rhetoric as the art and science of eloquence; and, finally, (c) dialectic as both the art of sound or critical thinking and the theory of argumentation. Thus, the study of words, concepts, and language in general was indeed the "foundation of medieval pedagogy" (*le fondement de la pédagogie médiévale*) and the "basis for all instruction" (*la base de tout l'enseignement*), which led to the formation of a specifically technical vocabulary among the scholars of the epoch.[62] But, in fact, these "basic subjects" and a developing academic jargon were but the building blocks of a structure that had constituted the scientific approach for and in humanities for centuries: the *scholasticism* or *scholastics*.[63]

When it comes to the term "scholasticism", one can interpret it in several ways. It can either have a social and historical connotation as a reference to people and ideas that flourished in medieval *scholae* (i.e. cathedral schools and universities),[64] or a methodological and somewhat philosophical connotation as a denomination of a specific scientific method utilized by and characteristic for a number of medieval thinkers related to various schools.[65] Here I speak of scholasticism as *scholastic meth-*

[61] As J. Le Goff aptly and concisely says, "temps nouveaux, instruments nouveaux." Goff, *La civilisation de l'occident médieéval*, 315.

[62] Ibid., 305. Goff, *Les intellectuels au Moyen Âge*, 98.

[63] Vos, "Scholasticism and Reformation", 108–110.

[64] "Au moyen âge, on nommait scolastique tout professeur enseignant dans une école, ou tout homme qui possédait les connaissances enseignées dans les écoles. Appliquée à la philosophie elle-même cette épithète désignerait donc simplement la philosophie enseignée au moyen âge dans les écoles. Le défaut de cette définition est évidemment de ne pas nous faire connaître ce qui caractérise la philosophie qu'on y enseignait. Le terme de scolastique éveille plutôt dans la pensée l'idée d'un certain genre de philosophie que celle du lieu et même du simple local dans lequel on la transmettait. C'est pourquoi cette définition est généralement considérée comme vraie mais insuffisante." Gilson, *La philosophie au Moyen Âge*, (Paris: Payot et Cte, 1922), 1:7.

[65] "Dans le premier chapitre nous avons vu que la caractérisation de la philosophie médiévale comme 'scolastique' ou 'philosophie scolastique' n'a pas de sens parce qu'elle renvoie seulement à la méthode appliquée, qui en tant que méthode ne donne aucun renseignement sur l'élémént décisif, à savoir la doctrine. La caractérisation est doctrinairement dépourvue de sens, parce qu'à l'intérieur de la méthode commune une série variée de doctrines contraires pouvaient naitre. Mais cela n'empêche pas que la méthode scolastique a marqué de son

odology, that is, the method used—by default and on the basis of joint consensus—by members of medieval schools. It was a rather "complex methodological paradigm with shifting techniques, presuppositions, manners of representation and standards of rationality."[66] This method can be clearly defined and well described in Lambertus-Marie DeRijk's words:

> By *scholastic method* I mean: a method applied in philosophy (and in theology) which is characterized, both on the level of research and on the level of teaching, by the use of an ever and ever recurring system of concepts, distinctions, definitions, propositional analyses, argumentational techniques and disputational methods, which had originally been derived from the Aristotelian and Boethian logic, but later on, on a much larger scale, from the indigenous terminist logic.[67]

This helps to clarify (together with L. M. De Rijk, U.G. Leinsle, A. Vos and others) that the medieval—as well as the early modern—scholasticism *per se* was primarily a *method*, and not a content as some researchers used to claim (early M. De Wulf, Cl. Baeumker, F. Van Steenberghen and others).[68] This method was forged

---

empreinte l'activité philosophique au Moyen Âge et, par le biais de la philosophie, la théologie médiévale. Lambert Marie de Rijk, *La philosophie au moyen âge* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985), 82.

[66] Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, 9.

[67] The English version of the definition (with slight modifications) is offered in Vos, "Scholasticism and Reformation," 106–107 and Antonie Vos, *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 223. Original French text found in De Rijk, *La philosophie*, 85, reads like this:

> Par "méthode scolastique" j'entends une méthode, appliquée en philosophie (et en théologie), qui se caractérise par l'emploi, tant pour la recherche que pour l'enseignement, d'un système constant de notions, distinctions, définitions, analyses propositionnelles, techniques de raisonnement et méthodes de dispute, qui au début étaient empruntées à la logique aristotélicienne et boécienne, et plus tard, de façon plus ample, à la propre logique terministe.

[68] Steenberghen, *La philosophie au XIIIe siècle*, 22–24. For example, the initiator of this tendency, often connected with the Louvain School, Maurice De Wulf expressed his early conviction in this way:

> Dès le début du moyen âge, on donna le nom de *scolasticus* à quiconque était titulaire d'un enseignement. On peut donc entendre par scolastique, la philosophie telle qu'elle était professée dans les écoles médiévales. ... Le moment est venu, ce nous semble, de se faire de la scolastique une notion plus adéquate, et pour y réussir, *aux définitions extrinsèques il faut substituer les definitions intrinsèques et doctrinales*. Car la langue des scolastiques exprime des pensées, leurs formules syllogistiques recouvrent des théories; — comment en serait-il autrement? La philosophie scolastique nous apparaît comme une vaste synthèse, dont l'évolution harmonieuse constitue un cycle fermé et caractéristique dans l'histoire de la pensée humaine. Suivant une progression lente et paisible, à travers bien des tâtonnements, cette doctrine s'élbore du IX^{e} à la fin du XII^{e} s., atteint la plénitude de son épanouissement au XIII^{e}, s'altère à partir du XIV^{e} s. D'ailleurs, cette *unité du système scolastique* ne stérilise pas chez ses représentants l'originalité de la pensée; les dissidences personnelles laissent intactes une foule de thèses organiques universellement respectées. ...[C']est la *doctrine scolastique*...
>
> Maurice De Wulf, *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale précédée d'un Aperçu sur la philosophie ancienne* (Louvain / Paris / Bruxelles: Institut superier de philosophie / Félix Alcan / Oscar Schepens, 1900), 146–147, italics in the original. For an overview of his views see Fernand Van Steenberghen, "Maurice De Wulf (1867–1947)," in *Medieval Scholarship: Biographical Studies on the Formation of a Discipline: Volume 3: Philosophy and the Arts*, ed. Helen Damico (New York, NY: Garland Publishing, 2000), 47–51.

in the specific context of medieval Christendom with its all -encompassing Christian spirit, born in monastic and cathedral schools, and sharpened in the indigenous atmosphere of young universities. Consequently, it possessed a Christian worldview as its background, and it led to the formation of a primarily Christian—though not exclusively orthodox—theology and philosophy, which were also later called "scholastic", as its façade.[69] It is not identical with scholastic metaphysics in the strict sense of the both terms, nor is it *the* expression of the medieval religious spirit. But the scholastic itself is a method and, in a cultural or philosophical sense, a "bridge" between certain tendencies inherent in Western medieval civilization[70] and its final intellectual product—theological and philosophical systems and theories. It is, so to speak, *a technical expression of the medieval interest in research and new knowledge and a technical prerequisite for scholastic metaphysics*. But how did this method operate, and what were its steps or characteristics?

Already as early as the twelfth century the key elements of the scholarly (or "scholastic") study of any topic were more or less defined. They implied (a) *an appeal to authority* (primarily ancient) or authorities, since there were quite a number of them (Aristotle and Boethius in logic; the Bible, Augustine and other Church Fathers in theology; Plato and Aristotle in philosophy; etc.), and (b) *a strictly ordered critical evaluation of its judgment(s)*. Thus, on the one side, scholarly knowledge is identical to acquaintance with the most crucial authoritative texts. It is a tapestry of opinions or, in the fine wording of Jacque Le Goff, "a mosaic of citations or 'flowers', which in the thirteenth century were named 'sentences'."[71] But, on the other side, since Peter Abelard's *Sic et non* and Peter Lombard's *Libri quattuor sentientiarum* any "scientific" discourse should have proceeded along the specific way or order of "discovery" (*ordo inventionis*): it implied such steps as careful reading of an authoritative text (*lectio*), whether basic (*cursorie*) or more detailed (*ordinarie*), and subsequent consideration of all the pros and cons of a possible interpretation.[72]

The authoritative text and its content should not be simply taken for granted as unquestionable truth: they have to be pondered upon, thought through, analyzed and weighed with consideration of the possible shortcomings or problematic statements included. Of course, this approach was not as critical as modern science – after all, the authority of the Scripture or reverend Fathers and Doctors of the church could not be doubted. Yet, such an analytical approach to their legacy was actually a step forward to the development of "real" critical science (as *Wissenschaft* or, more broadly, *scientia*), because it allowed for and promulgated a "new modality of

[69] This notion is well expressed by Étienne Gilson, who writes: "L'esprit de la philosophie médiévale, tel qu'on l'entend ici, c'est l'esprit chretien, pénétrant la tradition grecque, la travaillant du dedans et lui faisant produire une vue du monde, une *Weltanschauung* spécifiquement chrétienne." *L'esprit de la philosophie médiévale*, Études de Philosophie Médiévale (Paris: Vrin, 1989), vii.

[70] See sections 1.1-1.3 above.

[71] "Le savoir est un mosaique de citations ou 'fleurs' qu'on nomme au XIII^{e} *siècle* 'sentences'." Goff, *La civilisation de l'occident Médiéval*, 299.

[72] {Citation} J.A. Weisheipl, "Scholastic Method", in vol. 12 of *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed., ed. by Thomas Carson and Joanne Cerrito (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 2002), 747; Marenbon, *Medieval Philosophy*, 215.

thought" (Vos's term[73]), which implied a thoughtful use of ancient texts and their careful as well as creative interpretation. Hence, the double orientation and fervor of the medieval mind (Gilson's *l'esprit de la philosophie médiévale* and Le Goff's *l'esprit scientifique médiévale*): both a traditionalist tendency to safeguard the past, present since the early Middle Ages (fifth-sixth centuries), and a new yearning of the *moderni* of the twelfth-fourteenth centuries for fresh expressions of tradition, new ways of thinking, and more balanced approaches to the old authorities.[74]

Such an analytical approach to the sacred or authoritative texts had changed and was further changing the technical and mental equipment (*un outillage mental*) of the medieval scholar, as well as his internal mechanisms of thinking (*des méthodes intellectuels et des méchanisms mentaux*).[75] These notions deserve brief explications and comments, since it is important to understand them if one wants to see the pedagogical and conceptual sides of medieval scholasticism.

A medieval intellectual's toolkit included the "desacralized" book, accompanied by a range of supplies such as a desk, pulpit, candles, rule, ink, and quills, etc., and a set of techniques to work with it – not to simply read, but really work. The book had ceased to be a treasure and a thing to be carefully held and carefully read, which was the case in the earlier Middle Ages. Rather it had become the necessary means for a professional or a thinker: the number of books grew (to meet the needs of academia and society) while their size and format decreased (to increase their availability and comfortable use), and their value was now seen in their content and not in their decoration or connection with religion.[76] The book was partly trivialized and partly transformed into quite an ordinary—yet, still relatively expensive—resource; European culture was gradually becoming less oral and illiterate and more written and literate. This also had some bearing upon the way teachers and students learnt from the book and from each other.

Firstly, there emerged "a culture of handbooks and textbooks", as one might call it: those texts considered authoritative were regarded as textbooks and recognized as indispensable things for every course. Plus, the teacher's lectures were frequently written down and copied either by the university (*exemplar, pecia*) or by students (*reportatio*). Due to the changes in mechanisms of production these booklets were often hand-books indeed, *manuales*, that is, books that one could hold in one's hands without need of a desk or table.[77] This tradition of producing and sharing (or selling) manuals has come down to us and remained a customary practice in the global system of education.

Secondly, there arose a habit of making accurate references to the text used or quoted. The medieval scholar, when citing Augustine or Lombard, often preferred

[73] Vos, "Scholasticism and Reformation," 103. Later he concludes: "Modern science is a harvest of Christian thought. The critical attitude of the exact sciences could not have been the fruit of ancient Greek or Hellenistic philosophy" (p. 104).

[74] Gilson, *L'esprit de la philosophie médiévale*, vii; Goff, *La civilisation de l'occident médiéval*, 310 (Here Le Goff speaks of "les tendances traditionelles et les orientations nouvelles de l'esprit scientifique médiéval.")

[75] Goff, *La civilisation de l'occident médiéval*, 315, 317.

[76] Goff, *Les intellectuels au Moyen Âge*, 93-97.

[77] Ibid., 85f, 95–96.

to quote the direct words of the author in question (to avoid ambiguities and solidify his own appeal to ancient or recent authorities). He might even have named the work and its section (book, chapter, or page), where the citation is to be found, and almost always gave the name of the author cited.[78] Now this is called the "exact quotation," as opposed to a simple paraphrase or allusion. It has become a requirement in the scholarly world of today, but the practice of making references was born in the scholastic mold.

Thirdly, the courses taught and books written by the scholastics acquired a peculiar feature that was not found in that form in ancient sources: medieval academic literature had *structure*. Every discourse tended to follow a certain procedure, and the strict order (*ordo*) was a *sine qua non* of university life. The books and discussions were always divided into "first," "second," "third," and other parts – topics, questions, chapters, which were further subdivided into "first," "second," and others smaller parts. It created a very systematized and methodologically rigorous, though somewhat fragmented, type of literature, whose key characteristic was orderliness. The medieval *summae*, *summulae* and various treatises are good examples of this approach.[79] And again, this early academic pursuit of order is well known to every modern student or professor who is expected to write papers with outlines, chapters, sections, and summaries included on a regular basis.

Fourthly, the whole scholastic discourse was built upon the principles of dialectic, that is, logic.[80] Medieval thinking always started with and worked on the sacred or "pagan" authoritative texts, but it did so with the help of logical techniques. As Richard Southern puts it, for medieval men logic "was an instrument of order in a chaotic world ...[which] opened a window on to an orderly and systematic view of the world and of man's mind."[81] A combination of the theory of language (*grammatica*), the theory of argumentative and logical fallacies (*fallaciae*), and the principles of correct analytical thinking (*logica*) enabled the scholar of the epoch to analyze any text semantically and philosophically (or theologically). It gave them tools to delve into the meanings and significations of every term and every clause (terminist logic), as well as weigh the truth-value and argumentative validity of every proposition (traditional, primarily Aristotelian, logic).[82] Thus, logic taught its students how to correctly describe and categorize things and words, how to make affirmations or negations, how to build arguments, and how to evaluate others people's arguments.[83]

As a result, it provided a tool for mental dissection (analysis proper) and mental systematization (synthesis proper) of concepts and ideas; and even if scholastic oeuvres might seem rigid and somewhat dry, they are never illogical and unreasonable. Moreover, logic has for centuries been the foundation of any science and the whole scientific method even of today. Hence, here is another example of the similarity and

[78] Dushin [Душин], "Formirovaniye skholasticheskogo diskursa [The formation of the scholastic discourse]", 103.
[79] Ibid., 103-104.
[80] Goff, *Les Intellectuels Au Moyen Age*, 98.
[81] Southern, *The Making*, 172.
[82] Vos, "Scholasticism and Reformation," 107.
[83] Southern, *The Making*, 172–174.

even continuity between medieval scholasticism and some later developments in academia.

Finally, one of the most prominent and idiosyncratic elements of the scholastic method is *discussion* (*quaestio, disputatio*). Usually, careful reading of the text (*lectio*) led to the formulation of certain questions (*quaestio*), which were either immediately answered by the reader himself or by the lecturer present (*responsio*). But in the university culture of the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries, particular questions and themes were regularly raised and discussed during organized colloquiums (*disputatio*) where the objector (*opponens*) posed questions and criticisms, the replier (*respondens*) provided answers and defended his theses, and finally, the master presiding over the dispute pronounced his conclusion (*determinatio, conclusio*). The themes for such disputes were frequently set beforehand, but from time to time there happened discussion without an umbrella topic: if such was the case, then the questions could have been "about anything" (*de quodlibet*) and asked by anybody (*a quolibet*).[84] But it should be remembered that this flexibility and variety of forms was counterbalanced by strict regulations and the required intellectual rigor and accuracy. Every opinion had to be made with an appeal to authorities and logical rules, every step had to be taken at its proper time, and no one was allowed to interrupt the dispute or break the rules. It was a serious intellectual game characterized by both extreme formality and overt passion.

This peculiar practice can be said to have some heirs in the modern university with its diploma defenses or open discussions, but the specifically medieval procedure and form of disputations reveals something of the medieval mind. First of all, it demonstrates the *passion for truth and knowledge for its own sake*, which leads to (partial) *desacralization of knowledge* and (partial) *rationalization of the academic*—whether philosophical, juridical, or theological—*discourse*.[85] The Anselmian dictum "fides quaerens intellectum" (faith seeking understanding) is realized by the scholastics when the desire for truth and understanding finds a suitable combination of resources to reach its goal. Trust in divine revelation or faith in the authoritative writers (*auctores*) uses reason as a powerful tool, and it builds up theology as science and, by extension, philosophy as science. (Here science means *an established discipline [in the university] and a critical and/analytical study of something*).[86] This is a significant outcome of medieval scholasticism's "operation". Yet it is not the only one.

The *disputatio* and its procedure indicate that the medieval scholar is a person who has the right and the ability to question something and to ask questions about

[84] Dushin [Душин], "Formirovaniye skholasticheskogo diskursa [The formation of the scholastic discourse]," 102; Goff, *Les intellectuels au Moyen Âge*, 100ff; Marenbon, *Medieval Philosophy*, 215; Weisheipl, "Scholastic Method", 747.

[85] N.B. *Desacralization* here does not mean secularization in the modern sense, and *rationalization* is far from being identical with the reason of the Enlightenment. Both terms mean simply what they mean lexically: (i) a process of removing or reducing the aura of sacredness from something; and (ii) a belief in the power of human reason and a more and more regular use of reason in solving theoretical or practical questions, respectively.

[86] See Vos, "Scholasticism and Reformation," 102–103, 107; Goff, *Les intellectuels au Moyen Âge*, 100 (the section referred to is entitled "Raison: la theologie comme science").

someone or something. Science is not only about texts and truths, as the former are not always clear and the latter are not always easily accessible; it is about the *constructive exchange of opinions*. Thus, the process of discussion must consist of several elements: (a) a doubt or a question; (b) a presentation of opinions, which means hearing the others and expressing one's own position; (c) internal intellectual deliberation; and (d) an answer or conclusion. A question without an answer is not a discussion and does not lead to truth. A discussion without conclusion is idle talk. An answer without careful thinking and taking other's opinions into account is a hasty conclusion. Hence, the scholastic "strategy of reconciliation" (Dushin's term), which tries to overcome contradictions, revels in the discussion, and attempts to give maximally comprehensive answers and harmonize the data (a search for a *concordia discordantium*).[87]

All these features and methods were part of the scholastic approach to knowledge in general and theological knowledge in particular. The educational tradition(s) and propagated technique(s) heavily influenced the religious thought of that period, which is why (although, as I defined it, scholasticism *per se* is method) there exist *scholastic (Christian) philosophy* and *scholastic (Christian) theology*. They are properly called so, because they were associated with specific *scholae* of the Middle Ages, formed with the use of scholastic methods, and born in a very religious and primarily Christian context to (most often) Christian "parents" – that is, thinkers and scholars. But when it comes to scholastic theology, one should not generalize and make overall observations, for it is much better to provide basic definitions and have a look at specific examples of such theology. This is what I will do in the next section.

2. Thirteenth-century scholastic theology: A definition and a test case

As it was shown above, the twelfth- and thirteenth-century system of education, prevalent in Western Europe, employed a number of techniques to teach students how to work with texts, concepts, questions, and opinions. As a result, it influenced and, to certain extent, determined the *form* and *type*—but for the most part not the content[88]—of the theological product of the High Middle Ages. The scholastic approaches and methods created the purely scholastic medieval theology. But this statement requires a definition (What is *medieval scholastic theology*?) and some clarifications (*How exactly was it built up? With the use of which scholastic features?*). They will be provided in the next sections.

[87] Dushin [Душин], "Formirovaniye skholasticheskogo diskursa [The formation of the scholastic discourse]," 102, 126–127; O.V. Dushin [Душин], Glava 5. "Osnovopolozheniya skholasticheskogo diskursa: Problemy i ponyatiya srednevekovoy mysli 13-14 vekov" [Chapter 5. The foundations of scholastic discourse: Problems and concepts of the medieval thought of the 13th–14th centuries], in *Filosofiya zapadnoyevropeyskogo srednevekov'ya: uchebnoye posobiye* [Philosophy of the West-European Middle Ages: A manual] (St. Petersburg: Saint-Petersburg University Press, 2005), 158.

[88] The content of a "scholarly" or "written" theology—in the sense of particular topics and big questions discussed—was more or less set and established during the Patristic Age and the Earlier Middle Ages in the works of Augustine, Anselm of Canterbury, Hugh of St. Victor, Peter Lombard, and other authors.

2.1. Medieval scholastic theology: A definition

First of all, the whole concept of medieval scholastic theology should be unpacked and explicated. We can ask together with Leinsle and Schönberger: "What (sorts of things) do we signify with the term "Scholastic theology?" Their joint answer is that "[t]hese may be quite dissimilar phenomena which admit of no univocal concept», but the concept itself is empty and devoid of meaning. I interpret it in the following way: by, firstly, dismantling and defining the terms and notions that are used (section 2.1) and, secondly, elaborating on the meaning of the concept that is signified and described by a combination of those terms.

The term "medieval" should be recognized to have a purely *chronological connotation and historiographical value without any ideological burden*. It refers to a historical period between 500 AD and 1500 AD, although I here concentrate on the individual thinkers who lived in the thirteenth century. Still, the adjective "medieval" stands for the "body" of people (specifically, thinkers or intellectuals) and the "corpus» of facts, events, and literature dating from the just-introduced period of one thousand years.[89] Plus, I have to admit that in my essay this term and its cognates are employed in a "geographically qualified" sense: here we speak of the *western*, i.e. strictly European and even Latin (i.e. France, Italy, Germany, England, Low Countries, Spain, and other countries located to the northwest of the Danube and to the west of the Dnypro) *Medium Aevum*.

The term "scholastic",[90] as was already established in section 1.4, means relating to a specific *research and teaching method* that regularly employs a recognized "system of concepts, distinctions, definitions, propositional analyses, argumentational techniques and disputational methods".[91] When applied to a certain type of literature, it signifies a theological or philosophical product shaped by this technique.

The third term in the proposed concept is "theology". Yet, it can be paired with another term – "philosophy." When one speaks of medieval scholasticism, sometimes these terms are used as if they mean one and the same thing: a scholastic metaphysics or scientifically—in the historically qualified sense of the word[92]—constructed and presented worldview. But sometimes they are supposed to mean two distinct or even opposite things. Although the terminological and conceptual problem touched upon here is very complex,[93] I will try to briefly explain it.

[89] "...[L]'emploi strictement chronologique d'un terme tel que '*Moyen Age*' s'avère inéluctable. ... Une conséquence pratique de l'emploi terminologique que je propose est que l'adjectif 'médiéval' a une signification exclusivement chronologique. L'épithète 'médiéval' ne s'applique donc qu'aux personnes, événements et phénomènes vivant et se situant entre 500-1500. De même les termes 'haut-médiéval' et 'bas-médiéval' ont un sens strictement chronologique, dont toute connotation de primitivité, de dépérissement ou de décadence est exclue". De Rijk, *La philosophie*, 5, 23.

[90] See a very good overview of the historical evolution of meaning and the specifically medieval connotation(s) of the term "scholastic" (Greek noun *schole*—Latin noun *schola,* adjective *scholasticus*, etc) in Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, 1–9.

[91] De Rijk, *La philosophie*, 85, and Vos, "Scholasticism and Reformation", 106.

[92] See, for example, Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, 13.

[93] For example, the issue was hotly debated in the famous discussion between E. Gilson and F. Van Steenberghen and their distinguished colleagues. For an overview see Marcia L. Colish,

For medieval scholars themselves, as Vos aptly notes, *philosophia* meant primarily non-Christian (i.e. ancient Greek, Roman and partly contemporaneous Arabic) thought and *theologia* – specifically Christian thinking whether in forms of systematically philosophical or contemplative-mystical writings.[94] Additionally, the former implied, as De Rijk puts it, "the rational investigation of the ultimate reality and the most fundamental principles and causes of the existing things" ("*la recherche rationnelle de lá réalité ultime et des causes et principes les plus fondamentaux des choses*").[95]

It was pursued by means of the creative interpretation (in accord with the principles of logic) of the then-available philosophical writings (mostly Greek in letter and spirit) and experiential data.[96] Meanwhile, the latter stood for a primarily rational (i.e. logically coherent) and thus philosophical—yet, not exclusively so—interpretation of the Christian Scriptures as special revelation and, to certain extent, nature as the general revelation of God.[97] But then, the philosophy and theology of medieval times have much in common: although their sources and orientations were different, they both were interested in "ultimate questions" (about God and reality) and both used rational means (*grammatica*, *dialectica*, *metaphysica*) to achieve their proper goals.

Thus, it becomes obvious that although philosophy and theology were—and are—*distinct* from each other, they cannot be *separate*, if one thinks of the medieval period and the medieval academic world. This is why I would speak of medieval philosophy *and* theology as either descriptions of two complementary and closely interwoven activities, or synonyms meaning quite the same thing (in a qualified sense). Additionally, following the example of J. Weinberg and L. M. De Rijk, I would prefer to periodically employ the concept of *philosophical theology*[98] meaning what I have defined above as "medieval theology", that is, *a systematic rational inquiry into, or interpretation of, Christian doctrine*.[99]

In the last analysis, then, the medieval scholasticism I deal with is a type of philosophy and/or theology built with the help of and by means of the scholastic method. Consequently, it can be regarded as *a specific type of philosophical theology (or partly theological philosophy), shaped by the scholastic technique and formed by the scholars of medieval times (500–1500 AD) and associated with such medieval educational institutes as cathedral schools and universities*. But what were the fundamental characteristics of this medieval metaphysics?

Remapping Scholasticism, The Etienne Gilson Series, 21 (3 March 200) (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2000), 7–8. Cf. Steenberghen, "Maurice De Wulf", 49–50; Edward A. Synan, "Etienne Gilson (1884–1978)", in *Medieval Scholarship: Biographical Studies on the Formation of a Discipline: Volume 3: Philosophy and the Arts*, ed. Helen Damico (New York: Garland Publishing, 2000), 82–85.

[94] Vos, *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus*, 3.

[95] De Rijk, *La philosophie*, 66.

[96] Julius R. Weinberg, *A Short History of Medieval Philosophy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991), 4.

[97] Ibid, 3-5; Vos, *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus*, 3.

[98] Weinberg literally speaks of a "philosophical theology" or even a "Christian philosophical theology" in *A Short History*, 182, 213, while De Rijk calls the same phenomenon "la pensée philosophico-théologique" in *La philosophie*, 68.

[99] In Gilson's words, it can be appellated "un travail d'interprétation philosophique du dogme". Gilson, *La philosophie au Moyen Âge*, 1:4.

2.2. Medieval scholastic theology: A description

Now that the key terms have been clarified, it is time to briefly introduce the notion of medieval philosophy and theology or, rather, identify its *ethos*. The task would be tremendous and extremely difficult for such a short essay, therefore I will offer some basic conceptual considerations and mention only its key aspects or traits.

From the historical-philosophical point of view, medieval Christian thought was a creative and diverse-in-itself progressive absorption and original (re)interpretation of ancient Greek philosophy which resulted in the essential renewal and *Umwertung aller Werte* ("the reevaluation of all values") of Western philosophy.[100] More specifically, it was a diversification of Neo-platonic philosophy (with its numerous Aristotelian elements) and its integration with Platonic, Epicurean, Skeptical and Stoic ideas, as Marenbon summarizes.[101] But more than this, in the process of the formation of scholastic theology, as De Rijk notes, "it is possible at the same time to discern a great number of discontinuities, wherein the medieval thinkers have freed themselves from the ancient paradigms."[102] This happened because, "the influence of Christianity... manifested itself in the radical change of the philosophic horizon."[103] Christianity "christened" and remade the whole system of philosophy, having transformed it from the inside. Before *medii aevi* it was a pagan philosophy alone; after that period there appeared a *philosophia christiana*.[104]

At the same time, from the historical-theological point of view, medieval thought signified the emergence of a so-to-speak "philosophy of doctrine" or, better, a philosophical theology (a la Gilsonian "*une interpretation philosophique du dogme*"[105]). It was a development of long-established orthodox thinking (sometimes with individual deviations) and a reworking of traditional Augustinianism into progressive forms of Augustinianism:[106] Platonized (John Scott Erigena, Anselm of Canterbury), Aristotelianized (Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas), and mixed or extremely modi-

[100] Antonie Vos, *Scotus' Significance for Western Philosophy and Theology*, Textes et Etudes du Moyen Age 52 (Porto: Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Etudes Médiévales, 2010), 211, 213. Gilson wrote on this: "La philosophie médiévale suppose donc d'abord l'assimilation préalable de la philosophie grecque, mais elle a été autre chose et beaucoup plus que cela. ... les philosophes du [moyen age] vont apporter, avec un sens remarquable de la continuité doctrinale, de nouvelles solutions aux anciens problèmes." Gilson, *La philosophie au Moyen Âge*, 2:146, 153.

[101] Marenbon, *Medieval Philosophy*, 2-3, 350.

[102] Original: "*On peut discerner cependant un très grand nombre dè discontinuités, là où les penseurs médiévaux se sont dégagés des cadres antiques*," translation mine. De Rijk, *La philosophie*, 69.

[103] Original: "*l'influence du christianisme... se manifestait dans la modification radicale de l'horizon philosophique*," translation mine. Ibid, 71.

[104] Weinberg rightly summarizes and highlights: "The three great religious systems of the West-ern world—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam— have employed philosophy as a handmaid of theology. The degree of servitude has varied with time and differences in these religious traditions, but there is no doubt in principle that philosophical investigations were confined within a set of more or less deter-minate theological commitments. ... [But nevertheless] philosophy did exist in the period from the first to the fifteenth century, not merely in spite of, but also because of the religious traditions in which it developed." Weinberg, *A Short History*, 3.

[105] Gilson, *La philosophie àu Moyen Âge*, 1:4.

[106] Vos, *Scotus' Significance*, 213-216. Cf. Vos, *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus*, 121, 322, 349, 365.

fied (John Duns Scotus, William Ockham) versions. This type of theology was built upon the foundation of the Divine Revelation (*sacra pagina*), which gave rise to "the cathedrals of ideas" (Gilson's "*les cathédrales d'idées*"),[107] i.e. a body of purely philosophical speculations within a primarily religious framework.[108] Thus, the Christian thought of the Middle Ages was notable for its "leaning towards *a* (or *the*) harmonization of faith and reason."[109]

Finally, from a purely analytical—i.e. philosophical and theological—perspective, the philosophical-theological thought of the Middle Ages (DeRijk's "*la pensée philosophico-théologique* du *Moyen Âge*) signified the birth of both a new kind of philosophy—one that was enriched and qualitatively changed by Christianity and its unique worldview and metaphysical ideas (e.g. the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Triunity of God and many others)[110]—and the new kind of theology—one that was formed and informed by the systematized, "critical and precise thinking developing in the schools."[111] Thus, it has become precisely "a legitimate continuation of ancient philosophy [and patristic theology]" and, at the same time, a "renewal" (*renouvellement*) of Western thinking.[112] Not only a specifically Christian and undeniably philosophical "emancipation from the ancient way of ideas" has taken place, but some alternative approaches, theories, and hypotheses have been thought out, formulated, written down and given to the world.[113]

Therefore, in the last analysis, medieval scholastic theology was *an idiosyncratic product of the maturating Christian mentality, living by its faith in the Divine Revelation and nourished by many ideas, which it inherited from the ancient Jews, Greeks, and Romans*. It was primarily Christian, though some scholars have shown the existence of semior quasi-scholastic phenomena in the Arabic or Byzantine worlds of the Middle Ages (Grabmann, Madiski).[114] But the most crucial thing is that it was *Christianizing, critical, and creative*: the *scholastici* of the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries had been creatively rethinking, redescribing, and reformulating their Christian heritage with the help of Greek logical, philosophical, and analytical tools. It was a very interesting development, deserving closer attention. This is why it is now time to turn to a test case that can demonstrate (a) the structure and method of this type of theology; and (b) the connection between the medieval educational background and the medieval theological foreground.

---

[107] Gilson, *La philosophie au Moyen Âge*, 2:154.

[108] Ibid., 2:151; De Rijk, *La philosophie*, 65-68, 71; Weinberg, *A Short History*, 4-5.

[109] Original: "*la tendance à* une *(à* l'*) harmonisation de la foi et de la raison*," translation mine. De Rijk, *La philosophie*, 16. Cf. Weinberg, *A Short History*, 5.

[110] For instance, De Rijk names the following in *La philosophie*, 71:

> "Des exemples de ces données de la révélation sont: la création à partir de rien (*creatio ex nihilo*), qui entrainait une vue nouvelle sur la matière: l'unicité de Dieu (opposée à toutes formes de polythéisme); la Providence (opposée à l'idée du destin); le Principe suprême (Dieu) comme l'Etre absolu; l'histoire comme projet de Salut renvoyant à la consommation des temps (en opposition avec les théories cycliques de l'histoire)."

[111] Vos, *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus*, 3.

[112] Original: "*une continuation légitime de la philosophie antique* [*et la théologie patristique*]," translation mine. De Rijk, *La philosophie*, 68-69.

[113] Vos, *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus*, 35, 215, 292; Vos, *Scotus' Significance*, 211.

[114] Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, 11.

2.3. Scholastic theology: The test case of Thomas Aquinas

There could be several candidates for the "position" of a test case in the given study. But I have deliberately chosen the one who exemplifies medieval theological scholasticism with its features very well and is also well known to both an English- and Russian-speaking audience through a number of translations of his works. This test case is Thomas Aquinas and his famous *Summa theologiæ*.

The *Summa theologiæ* is not *the* summary of the whole Thomistic vision of the world, nor is it *the* outcome of his life-long professorship, because it remained unfinished. Plus, there are at least two more grand works of Aquinas—more Augustinian in their outlook—that might equally be considered "theological syntheses" of different kinds: written lectures on Lombard's *Libri sententiarum quattuor* (the *Scriptum*) and *Summa contra gentiles*.[115] As for the *Summa theologiae* itself (ST from now on), this volume had a specific purpose and story, and I would like to tell it briefly: firstly, I will introduce this oeuvre, secondly, analyze its genre, structure, and methodology, and, lastly, present an overview of its one "article" or section. Along the way I will also make comments about how exactly some of the ST features and theological aspects correlate to and reflect the features of the scholastic educational approach.

General information. First of all, the whole enterprise of the summa-writing appeared to be a response to a certain need on the part of Thomas's fellow friars and pupils. According to the beginning of the ST (I, *prologus*), novice theologians (*novitii*) sensed their need for a concise and comprehensive theological textbook that would serve as "a sound educational method" (*ordo disciplin?*)[116] But on the other hand, it was the result of Thomas's elaboration of his own theological conceptions and a summary of his studies in *scientia sacra*. Thus, this book was intended to become a handbook for students who were on the beginner's level in their theological education, "an ordered exposition of the problems of theology, independent of Peter the Lombard and the university course".[117] Thus, it had to both help students *hic et nunc,* and, at the same time, in wider perspective provide an alternative approach to looking at theology, different from the traditional lens of Lombard's method and aimed at solving "the great problem of organizing a sacred history into an organized science."[118] But this whole problematic field is the field of (medieval theological) education: a scholar writes a book for students, and this activity is *education-driven* and informed by the scholar's *theological research*.

The parts of this book were written over a long course of time: Aquinas moved slowly from one section to another, considering different nuances and problems, and

[115] W. A. Wallace, J. A. Weisheipl, and M. F. Johnson, "Thomas Aquinas, St.," ed. Thomas Carson and Joanne Cerrito, *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2002), 24.

[116] Thomas Aquinas, *Christian Theology (1a. 1)*, ed. and trans. by Thomas Gilbey, vol. 1, *Summa Theologiæ: Latin Text and English Translation, Introduction, Notes, Appendices and Glossaries* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1964), 2–3.

[117] Marenbon, *Medieval Philosophy*, 218.

[118] Thomas F. O'Meara, *Thomas Aquinas, Theologian* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), 22. Cf. Fergus Kerr, "Thomas Aquinas," in *The Medieval Thinkers: An Introduction to Theology in the Medieval Period*, ed. G. R. Evans (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 210; Chenu, *Aquinas and His Role*, 135, 137; Marenbon, *Medieval Philosophy*, 218.

this movement of thought was parallel to the Angelic Doctor's bodily movements from one place to another. Traditionally, it is stated that the writing of the "theological summary" was begun c. 1265 AD in Rome (the first part), continued from 1269–1272 AD in Paris (the second part), and partly finished in 1273 AD in Naples (what we have of the third part), when it was intentionally left incomplete by its author.[119]

Structure and methodology. Although unique in its purpose and general idea (to make on orderly theological exposition of Christian doctrines in a new and user-friendly order), the *Summa* in its form is a reproduction and outcome of the standard disputations on various topics held in medieval universities: it is a clear example of the use of the famous *quæstio*-technique and scholastic toolkit. This approach consisted of several aspects or steps taken in order:[120]

1) the *quæstio* itself, that is, a problem or a question (starting with the standard formula: *whether...?*);
2) the false arguments or objections to the main thesis (the formula: *it seems (not) that...*);
3) the clear statement expressing the position of the one speaking (the formula: *but on the contrary* or *on the other hand...*);
4) the *corpus* of the question, a detailed argumentation—with logical explanations and/or quotations from authorities—in favor of the stated position (the formula: *the reply is...*);
5) and the responses to the objections (the formula: *concerning the first/second/third objection it should be said that...*).

Thomas Aquinas almost fully adopts this scheme in his book, with only slight changes: the book is divided into parts by major themes (on God and creation, on vices and virtues, and on Christ and salvation), which are subdivided into sections organized by more specific topics ("Existence and Nature of God" or "The Eucharistic Presence"). These sections usually contain a number of questions and *articuli* that are to be discussed ("Is the Eucharist a Sacrament at all?" or "Can the bread be changed into the body of Christ?"). These "articles" are treated in exactly the manner prescribed by the *quæstio*-technique. Their normal plan is this:[121]

1) Title of the *Quæstio* in the form of a real question: *utrum...?* (*whether...?*);
2) Objections: *sic proceditur...* (*this is what follows* or *it goes like this...*):
   - *Objectio* 1: *videtur quod* [*non*]... (*it seems (not) that...*),
   - *Objectio* 2: *præterea...* (*moreover...*),
   - *Objectio* 3: *præterea...* (*furthermore...*);
3) the *Sed contra* (an authoritative text or short key statement, starting with "On the other hand...");

[119] Wallace, Weisheipl, and Johnson, "Thomas Aquinas," 19–20, 24; Nichols, *Discovering Aquinas*, 9.

[120] Marenbon, *Medieval Philosophy*, 216.

[121] Cf. ST I, q.1, art.1-3. See also introductions to the form of the theological *Summa* in Frederick C. Bauerschmidt, *Holy Teaching: Introducing the Summa Theologiae of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brazos Press, 2005), 22–24; or by Thomas Gilbey in Thomas

4) the *Responsio* (Aquinas's answer in the form of well-grounded statement(s): *Reply*);

5) Solutions to the (false) arguments:
   - *ad primum ergo dicendum...* (*concerning the first objection it should be said that...*),
   - *ad secundum dicendum...* (*concerning the second objection it should be said that...*),
   - *ad tertium....* (*concerning the third objection...*).

Thus, the form and method of the ST is a "child" of its age, because it uses the scholarly approach of that period based on a process of questions-posed and answers-given put into the framework of strict logical distinctions and well-defined statements. The methodological rigor, rationalizing tendencies, and inclusion of (at least virtual or theoretical) discussion pursued in and encouraged by the university education of the thirteenth century are clearly echoed in such an approach. The strict internal order of the articles reflects the love for structure and clear logical reasoning; the interplay of objections and responses imitates a living discussion in the classroom; the *sed contra*'s and *responsio*'s reverberate like the master's voice. This is why the ST had to be anything but boring and dry – it was a continuation of or preparation to intensive and dynamic studies: with disputes, bright ideas, and real controversies.

Yet, there is another side of it: St. Thomas of Aquino follows not only the order of scholastic disputations but also the Christian tradition of *doing theology per se*:

- he begins with the *præambulum fidei*, presupposing that the light of Divine Revelation is the necessary prerequisite to the usage of the light of reason in questions related to the sacred teaching;
- he builds his positions on the basis of biblical verses and authoritative statements of the ancient *auctores* (primarily the Church Fathers and especially St. Augustine);
- and also more or less frequently refers to the authority of philosophers (primarily *the Philosopher*, Aristotle).[122]

Thus, it is obvious that ST is an embodiment of Aquinas's desire to integrate and synthesize (where it was possible) the controversial Aristotelian metaphysics and the traditional Augustinian theology: he tries to keep the balance between the two poles by using them together, one after another, taking and incorporating the best of them into his system. Hence, this mixture of the old and the new in the overall method of the book: it is both a "[m]editation on the Scriptures and the Fathers"[123] and an effort to have a dialogue with the Philosopher or philosophers along the lines of the medieval academic game. This "Aquinatic aspiration" reflects the openness to the new that existed in the twelfth- and thirteenth-century schools and at the same time (in this case quite controversial) awe before the authoritative authors. It is exactly the tension between these two aspects *and* the desire to reconcile them that was the great

Aquinas, *Christian Theology (1a. 1), Summa Theologiœ*, 1:43–46.

[122] Thomas Aquinas, *Christian Theology (1a. 1), Summa Theologiœ*, 1:47–49.

[123] Ibid., Vol. 1 (1a. 1):49.

double driving force of St. Thomas's thinking and an important factor in the development of Latin medieval theologies.

Structure and vision behind it. Thomas Aquinas was always driven by his conviction that "all theological writing ought to reflect the unity of divine truth", as Romanus Cassario's formulation reads.[124] As God is one, simple and perfectly harmonized in himself, so also his world reflects this unity to a certain degree, and, as a logical consequence, even "theology is about ordering truths to the one Truth".[125] The world of the *Doctor Angelicus* was absolutely theo-centric,[126] and in his theology he tried to express this reality by speaking about God and creatures not "as though they were counterbalancing, but on God as principal and on creatures in relation to him, who is their origin and end" (ST I, q.1, art.1, ad 1).[127] This general vision was objectified in the (Neo-)Platonic framework of the emanation-return pattern, which was to become a red line for "orderly [theological] reflection... carried out in the light of God's knowledge of himself and his saving plan".[128] On the basis of this perception, St. Thomas decided to start his theological handbook with a story about reality's "coming out" of God (*exitus* or *egressus*), continue with some rules, goals and pitfalls of humans' "pathway to God" (*progressus* or *iter ad Deum*), and finish with the whole creation's "return" to God through Christ (*reditus*), which would culminate in final eschatological glorification in perfect communion with God (*exaltatio*).[129] This scheme is very orderly and shines brightly through the structure of ST, although one does not have the right to overemphasize the significance of this simple pattern: the ideas as well as the structural nuances of this opus are much more complex than this "blueprint" of the universal emerging-from and returning-to God. But, again, the theological vision itself corresponds to the more or less widespread aspirations of the medieval scholastics as they tended to discover the world and, if possible, comprehend it in all its uniqueness and totality.

Furthermore, although the *exitus-reditus* scheme is a "skeleton" of ST, its division into parts and sections reveals many more details and nuances.[130] First of all, the three-partite structure starts with a prolegomenon (ST I, q. 1) on *Sacra doctrina* ("The Sacred Teaching", Christian theology), which explains what this teaching is, how it works, and what it serves. After the preliminary definitions and clarifications, St. Thomas turns his attention to the "fontal being" which is the *Causa Prima* of everything – the Godhead, the One and Three-in-One (ST I, qq. 2–43). This God 'expresses' himself in his act of creation, giving existence and life to the universe as we

[124] Cessario, *A Short History of Thomism*, 9.

[125] Ibid.

[126] Dushin [Душин], "Osnovopolozheniya skholasticheskogo diskursa [The foundations of the scholastic discourse]", 182–183.

[127] *... sacra doctrina non determinat de Deo et de creaturis ex aequo, sed de Deo principaliter, et de creaturis secundum quod referuntur ad Deum, ut ad principium vel finem*. Thomas Aquinas, *Christian Theology (1a. 1), Summa Theologiæ*, 1:14, 15.

[128] Nichols, *Discovering Aquinas*, 9.

[129] Chenu, *Aquinas*, 137; Nichols, *Discovering Aquinas*, 10-11.

[130] The overviews of the *Summa*'s structure which I use for this paragraph are to be found in Thomas Aquinas, *Christian Theology (1a. 1), Summa Theologiæ*, 1:43–46.; Nichols, *Discovering Aquinas*, 9-12; Bauerschmidt, *Holy Teaching*, 22ff. Also the structure and content of the Summa may be easily browsed on the Internet, for example, at: *Summa Theologica*. http://www.newadvent.org/summa/ (accessed June 11, 2011).

know it (ST I, qq. 44–49). Then Aquinas "introduces" the creatures of different levels and ranks—firstly, angels as pure forms/minds (ST I, qq. 50–64), secondly, celestial bodies and the cosmos (ST I, qq. 65–74), and, thirdly, human beings as "intellectualized bodies" made according to the *imago Dei* (ST I, qq. 75–102)—enjoying their God-given existence in the harmonious world order (ST I, qq. 103–119).

In the first half of the second part (the *prima secundæ*) the author establishes the answers to people's ultimate questions: he explains *that* they really have a purpose of their lives, *what* it is—true happiness is in the vision of and love for God (ST I–II, qq. 1–5)—and *how* it could be reached (ST I–II, qq. 6–70). But then he immediately tells about the great impediment to human happiness which makes its achievement impossible—sin (ST I–II, qq. 71–89), and shows some necessary, yet very limited in their profit, principles (the Law) for mankind's life under the power of sin (ST I–II, qq. 90–105). However, the conclusion of the *prima secundæ* gives hope to everyone, because by God's mercy there exists a new principle of life – the Gospel of Grace (ST I–II, qq. 106–114). But before making a deeper inquiry into the nature of this Good News, the Dominican professor offers a detailed analysis of various human vices and virtues that are present in the lives of those who follow the gospel in the second half of the second part (the *secunda secundæ*), where such phenomena as faith, hope, charity, (in)justice, activity and contemplation, etc., are discussed (ST II–II, qq. 1–189).

Then, finally, there comes the "explicit treatment of the difference Christ makes" (Aiden Nichols' expression),[131] as the theologian from Aquino speaks about Christ "who as man is the way of our striving for God" (ST I, q. 2, pr.):[132]

i. firstly, the key ideas about Christ's nature and personality (he is the Incarnate Logos of God, who is also a real human with his intellect, will, and other qualities) are brought forth (ST III, qq. 1–26);

ii. then his life, work and achievements are looked at, inclusive of some sections on Mary (ST III, qq. 27–59);

iii. and, finally, the doctrine of the continuation of Jesus' ministry and salvific activity in his church through the sacraments comes to the fore (ST III, qq. 60–90).

Unfortunately, Aquinas did not complete this part, so one cannot find here his detailed deliberations on questions about the sacraments of matrimony, ordination, and extreme unction as well as his developed eschatological thinking. Nevertheless, this overview of his well-structured handbook of theology gives a glimpse of how the scholastic method and a medieval theologian's vision form a masterpiece of theological literature. Its organized arrangement is a very good expression of the educational approaches of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. I would like to conclude this sub-

[131] Nichols, *Discovering Aquinas*, 10.

[132] *...de Christo, qui, secundum quod homo, via est nobis tendendi in Deum*. Text is taken from *Corpus Thomisticum: Sancti Thomae de Aquino Summa Theologiae prima pars quaestio II*, http://www.corpusthomisticum.org/sth1002.html (accessed June 11, 2011). Translation is taken from Thomas Aquinas, *Christian Theology (1a. 1), Summa Theologiæ*, 1:44.

[133] In this subsection I will primarily refer to

section on Thomas Aquinas's methodology as an example and variation of general scholastic procedures; it is time to have a look at one particular article to enhance and confirm the test case.

Overview of an article of ST. Here I would offer a brief exposition of the first article in question 75, wherein the notion of Eucharistic change is introduced and explicated (ST III, q. 75, art.1).[133] The *articulus* is dedicated to the following theological question: "is the Body of Christ really and truly in this sacrament or only in a figurative way or as in sign?"[134]

Aquinas starts by asking a question about the reality of Jesus Christ's presence in the Eucharist, because there are several ways of thinking about this issue: he might be present "only in a figurative way or as in a sign" (*solum secundum figuram, vel sicut in signo*), which could mean either his spiritual presence (presence by his Spirit), or the mystical symbolism of the Eucharist whereby Christ is just signified (*solum secundum mysticam significationem*), which implies both his spiritual and physical absence. Thomas does not elucidate these theories in detail, but at least offers several possible arguments *pro* a theory of Jesus' bodily/physical absence:

i. his words about his body in the bread and wine should be understood spiritually, as recommended by St. Augustine;

ii. it seems quite improper for the Christian faith, oriented on spiritual things, to adhere to the *corporalem Christi præsentiam*;

iii. since Christ ascended to heaven, his body is "located" there, while his *veritas* is indeed on earth;

iv. moreover, since Christ's body is a normal, yet transfigured human body, after the resurrection, it simply cannot be present in several places (specifically, the altars of local churches) at once.

But all these objections do not prevent the "theologian of transubstantiation" from stating that the Savior's body is present in the Eucharist "not merely as by a sign or figure, but in actual reality as well" (*non solum in significatione vel figura, sed etiam in rei veritate*). By this crucial phrase Aquinas apparently demonstrates that he does not deny that the mass has some symbolism imbedded: it is indeed the sign. But, at the same time, it is more than just a sign[135] it is a combination of both the symbolic function (the Eucharist signifies Christ and reminds people of his sacrificial death) and the "transmitting" realistic function (the Eucharist "transmits" or, in Aquinas's language, "contains"[136] the real Christ). Thus, St. Thomas seeks to stay in accord with

---

the Latin text and English translation of the *Quœstio* 75 as given in Thomas Aquinas, *The Eucharistic Presence (3a. 73-78)*, ed. and trans. by William Barden, vol. Vol. 58, *Summa Theologiœ: Latin Text and English Translation, Introduction, Notes, Appendices and Glossaries* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1965), 52-91.

[134] *1. utrum in hoc sacramento sit corpus Christi secundum veritatem, vel solum secundum figuram vel sicut in signo*. Ibid., Vol. 58:52.

[135] Cf. Bauerschmidt, *Holy Teaching*, 285n1, 287n7.

[136] Latin *contineo* is used here to denote an idea of "being present inside," but without notions of "being confined," "limited" or "restricted" to a containing place. Thomas Aquinas, *The Eucharistic Presence (3a. 73–78), Summa Theologiœ*, xxiin1. Cf. *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), s.v. "contineo", and *Collins Latin Dictionary and*

the Augustinian understanding of Holy Communion with its distinction between *signum* and *res sacramenti*, although such a strong idea of Christ's real presence within the host belongs to the earlier medieval theologians but not to Augustine himself.[137]

Aquinas, continuing his logical chain, even comes to the conclusion that Christ *should* be present in the Eucharist due to the following reasons:

1) because Holy Communion is the sacrament of "the New Law" (that is, the gospel) and, as a consequence, must be different from the sacraments and sacrifices (*sacrificia*) of "the Old Law" which were signs only. Since Christ fulfills and realizes the Old Testament law, he adds reality to all those signs, as stated in Hebrews 10:1, and therefore the new sacraments are more than just symbols;

2) because of his love to his followers and according to the principles of friendship presented by Aristotle—that "friends should live together" (*maxime proprium amicitiae est convivere amicis*)—which requires the never-ceasing presence of both parties (*conjunctio Christi ad nos*). This rule, as Frederick Bauerschmidt notes, has to express the idea that a normal (human) friendship usually implies close and regular interaction between those involved; and this fellowship always occurs in the physical dimension, employing "the medium of our bodies."[138] This fits perfectly into the lifestyle of ordinary humans and, in Aquinas's opinion, must work equally well when the relationship between the God-human Jesus and merely-human Christians is concerned;

3) due to the usefulness of such a miraculous presence in the sacrament for people's faith (*hoc competit perfectioni fidei*) for Christ is in the bread and wine *bodily* but *invisibly* (*invisibiliter*): only faith is able to accept this doctrine. Thus, this Eucharistic presence encourages people to exercise their faith and, as a result, grow spiritually (speaking in contemporary Christian terminology);

4) and, additionally, because this belief finds support from such authoritative exponents of the Truth (primarily the Church Fathers) as Cyril of Alexandria, Augustine, Jerome, Hilary, Ambrose, and some others whom Aquinas regularly quotes and whose *auctoritas* was of great value for the theological reasoning of those times.[139]

Hence, it is right to believe that Jesus is truly (*secundum veritatem*) present in the Eucharist and assert the "reality of Christ's body" (*veritatem corporis Christi*). Even the objections cannot stand against it:

i. neither the notion of "spiritual understanding" nor that of "spiritual presence" found in Augustine's text are able to negate the "real presence" idea, since (a) "spiritually" can mean simply "invisibly" (*invisibiliter*) and "by the power of the spirit" (*per virtutem spiritus*), and (b) a notion of the "spiritual" does not

Grammar (Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers, 1997), s.v. "contineo".

[137] Cf. Peter Lombard, *Sent.* IV, d.8, c.7, sec.2. Referred to in Marilyn McCord Adams, *Some Later Medieval Theories of the Eucharist: Thomas Aquinas, Giles of Rome, Duns Scotus, and William Ockham* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 49.

[138] Bauerschmidt, *Holy Teaching*, 287-288n8.

[139] Cf. Vos, *The Philosophy*, 531-532.

necessarily exclude any material participation, as was confirmed by the Incarnation, but, on the contrary, "the spirit united to the flesh" brings great benefit;

ii. the Christian faith does not become "materialistic" for it still *has to believe* in Christ's presence, which cannot be regarded as normal in the ordinary sense, because Christ is not there in the physical sense (*per modum corporis*);

iii. the same argument pertains to the third objection mentioned: the "location" language might be used with regards to Christ's "natural appearance" (*quod videtur in propria specie*), but must be avoided in the context of sacramental realities;

iv. also, Christ's physical body is in heaven indeed, but the Eucharist does not contain it "locally," that is "in the way a body is in place," which must imply certain correspondence between the body's constitution and the limits of physically determined space (*sicut corpus in loco, quod suis dimensionibus loco commensuratur*). On the contrary, the Savior appears in the sacrament in a special, supernatural way (*speciali modo, sicut in sacramento*) guaranteed by God's power.

Summing it up, one should see that in his very first article Thomas Aquinas not only establishes the possibility, let alone necessity and benefits, of Christ's real presence in the Eucharist, but also rules out some misconceptions that easily occur (about Christ's physical and locally-measured mode of presence and an extremely symbolist understanding of the mass). But what is important for us in the discussion of medieval education practices and their connection to the theological products of the educators of those times is that this article shows very well such features of scholastic methodology as the regular use of a great number of then-established concepts (*veritas, figura, signum, modus, locus*, etc.), clear-cut distinctions (*spiritual* vs. *Spirit-driven* vs. *invisible*; *signs only* vs. *signs-and-realities*), precise definitions (the meaning of *Christ's presence*, the concepts of the *Old Testament and New Testament sacraments*, etc.), analyses of the authoritative texts (appeals and references to the Bible, Augustine, and other Church Fathers), and well-constructed arguments with pros and cons considered and a certain judgment provided. Thus, the test case of Thomas Aquinas has been presented and established, and it definitely confirms—or, at least, supports—the thesis of a correlation between the educational/academic traditions (scholasticism) of the thirteenth century and its theology (medieval scholastic theology).

Conclusion

The theses, arguments and examples presented above demonstrate that there exists a strong connection between the type of theology and the type of setting where it was made. At least, this article demonstrates that this thesis is well grounded when medieval education and theology are discussed. It is hard to make a one-sided conclusion about either the exclusive influence of scholastic methods and instructional tools upon theology or, vice versa, of theology upon education. Yet, it has been

established and confirmed by the test case that *the university practices of the thirteenth century and scholastic methodology had its bearing upon the way theology was made and presented in written (and oral) form*. It follows, then, that indeed medieval scholastic theology and the system of education—at least in the thirteenth century—stood in strong correlation with each other, and it might be that this correlation holds true when other time periods are in question as well. In fact, it can be a good research goal for interdisciplinary studies in the history of Christian (theological) education and historical theology, but the scope of the given article does not allow for such a step.

Suffice it to say that the scholastic theology of the thirteenth century was indeed an idiosyncratic product of the maturing Christian mentality, which tended to engage critically with the sources available at that time and creatively to rethink traditional Christian teaching *in the university classroom*. Theologizing took place in various *studia* scattered all over Europe and was done by means of specific "schools' tools" – the scholastic methods and techniques. These methods led to the emergence of a certain type of theology, loaded with philosophical notions, technical terms, logical steps, and argumentative practices, which was the very peculiar fruit of the medieval Christian mind. Hence, medieval scholastic metaphysics was a child of its age and a product of the medieval university. Perhaps some types of contemporary theology enjoy the same type of relationship with contemporary systems and methods of education. Yet, this question needs to be raised and studied elsewhere.

Bibliography

Bauerschmidt, Frederick C. *Holy Teaching: Introducing the Summa Theologiae of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brazos Press, 2005.

Brooke, Rosalind B. *The Coming of the Friars*. New York, NY: Barnes and Noble Books, 1975.

Cessario, Romanus. *A Short History of Thomism*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2005.

Chenu, Marie-Dominique. *Aquinas and His Role in Theology*. Collegeville, MN: A Michael Glazier Book / The Liturgical Press, 2002.

Mikhail Cherenkov, *Baptizm bez kavychek. Ocherki i materialy k diskussii o buduschem evangel'skih tserkvej* [Baptism without inverted commas: Essays and materials for a discussion of the future of evangelical churches]. Cherkassy: Kollokvium, 2012.

Colish, Marcia L. *Remapping Scholasticism*. The Etienne Gilson Series, 21 (3 March 200). Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2000.

Collins Latin Dictionary and Grammar. Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers, 1997.

De Rijk, Lambert Marie. *La philosophie au moyen âge*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985.

Dushin [Душин], O.V. ""Glava 4. Formirovaniye skholasticheskogo diskursa: istoricheskaya persptiva" [Chapter 4. The formation of the scholastic discourse: a historical aspect]." In *Filosofiya zapadnoyevropeyskogo srednevekov'ya: uchebnoye posobiye* [Philosophy of the West-European Middle Ages: a manual], 100–153. St. Petersburg: Saint Petersburg University Press, 2005.

_____. "Glava 5. Osnovopolozheniya skholasticheskogo diskursa: problemy i ponyatiya srednevekovoy mysli 13-14 vekov" [Chapter 5. The foundations of the scholastic discourse: problems and concepts of the medieval thought of 13th-14th centuries]." In *Filosofiya zapadnoyevropeyskogo srednevekov'ya: uchebnoye posobiye* [Philosophy of the West-European Middle Ages: a manual], 154–210. St. Petersburg: Saint Petersburg University Press, 2005.

Gilson, Etienne. *La philosophie au Moyen Âge*. Vol. I and II. Paris: Payot et Cte, 1922.

_____. *L'esprit de la philosophie médiévale*. Etudes de Philosophie Médiévale. Paris: Vrin, 1989.

Goff, Jacques Le. *La civilisation de l'occident médiéval*. Champs: Flammarion, 1982.

_____. *Les intellectuels au Moyen Âge*. S.l. [Paris]: Editions du Seuil, 1985.

Kerr, Fergus. "Thomas Aquinas." In *The Medieval Thinkers: An Introduction to Theology in the Medieval Period*, edited by G. R. Evans, 201–20. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Knowles, David, and Dimitri Obolensky. *The Middle Ages*. Vol. 2. 3 vols. The Christian Centuries. London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd., 1978.

Leinsle, Ulrich G. *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*. Translated by Michael J. Miller. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2010.

Marenbon, John. *Medieval Philosophy: An Historical and Philosophical Introduction*. London: Routledge, 2007.

McCord Adams, Marilyn. *Some Later Medieval Theories of the Eucharist: Thomas Aquinas, Giles of Rome, Duns Scotus, and William Ockham*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Nichols, Aidan. *Discovering Aquinas: An Introduction to His Life, Work, and Influence*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003.

O'Meara, Thomas F. *Thomas Aquinas, Theologian*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997.

Oxford Latin Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Schaff, Philip, and David S. Schaff. *History of the Christian Church. The Middle Ages: From Gregory VII., 1049, to Boniface VIII., 1294*. Vol. 5. Part 1. 8 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

Soderberg, Gregory. "Review of Church History: The Rise and Growth of the Church in Its Cultural, Intellectual, and Political Context, Vol. 1: From Christ to the Pre-Reformation, by Everett Ferguson, and Vol. 2: From Pre-Reformation to the Present Day, by John D. Wodbridge and Frank A. James III." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 57, no. 4 (December 2014): 855–60.

Southern, Richard W. *The Making of the Middle Ages*. London: Pimlico, 1993.

_____. *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1970.

Steenberghen, Fernand Van. *La philosophie au XIIIe siècle*. 2ème edition, mise à jour. Philosophes Médiévaux, Tome XXVIII. Louvain-la-Neuve / Louvain: Éditions de l'Institut Superieur de Philosophie / Éditions Peeters, 1991.

_____. "Maurice De Wulf (1867–1947)." In *Medieval Scholarship: Biographical Studies on the Formation of a Discipline: Volume 3: Philosophy and the Arts*, edited by Helen Damico, 43–53. New York: Garland Publishing, 2000.

Synan, Edward A. "Etienne Gilson (1884–1978)." In *Medieval Scholarship: Biographical Studies on the Formation of a Discipline: Volume 3: Philosophy and the Arts*, edited by Helen Damico, 75–87. New York: Garland Publishing, 2000.

Thomas Aquinas. *Christian Theology (1a. 1)*. Edited and translated by Thomas Gilbey. Vol. 1. 60 vols. Summa Theologiæ: Latin Text and English Translation, Introduction, Notes, Appendices and Glossaries. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1964.

_____. *The Eucharistic Presence (3a. 73-78)*. Edited and translated by William Barden. Vol. 58. 60 vols. Summa Theologi?: Latin Text and English Translation, Introduction, Notes, Appendices and Glossaries. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1965.

Vos, Antonie. "Scholasticism and Reformation." In *Reformation and Scholasticism. An Ecumenical Enterprise*, edited by Willem van Asselt and Eef Dekker, 99–119. Grand Rapids, Mich., 2001.

_____. *Scotus' Significance for Western Philosophy and Theology*. Textes et Etudes Du Moyen Âge 52. Porto: Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Etudes Médiévales, 2010.

_____. *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.

Wallace, W.A., J.A. Weisheipl, and M.F. Johnson. "Thomas Aquinas, St." Edited by Thomas Carson and Joanne Cerrito. *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2002.

Weinberg, Julius R. *A Short History of Medieval Philosophy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Weisheipl, J.A. "Scholastic Method." Edited by Thomas Carson and Joanne Cerrito. *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2002.

Wulf, Maurice De. *Histoire de La Philosophie Médiévale Précédée D'un Apercu Sur La Philosophie Ancienne*. Louvain: Institut superier de philosophie / Felix Alcan / Oscar Schepens, 1900.