

THE STATUS OF EUCHARISTIC ACCIDENTS ‘SINE SUBIECTO’: A HISTORICAL TRAJECTORY UP TO THOMAS AQUINAS AND SELECTED REACTIONS

In this dissertation, we have attempted to present a historical trajectory of the philosophical elements present in the discussions on the status of the Eucharistic accidents ‘sine subiecto’ from Berengar of Tours to Thomas Aquinas and selected reactions. We have attempted to identify the fundamental philosophical concerns of these authors, their principle insights and conclusions.

This dissertation comprises an introduction, five parts and four annexes. In part one (pp. 9-35) we have presented, through a reading of selected passages from Aristotle’s *Categories*, *Posterior Analytics*, *Physics* and *Metaphysics* the Aristotelian background with regard to the status of accidents.

In part two (pp. 36-92) we reviewed, starting with Berengar of Tours, the different 12th century ‘schools’, the genres of the *Summae confessorum* and *Expositiones Missae* – and in particular the work of Lothar of Segni (Innocentius III), ending with the first *Summae* written towards the end of the 12th and the beginning of the 13th century (Praepositinus of Cremona, Petrus Cantor, Robert Courson, Stephan Langton, Guido of Orchelles).

In part three (pp. 93-203) we have examined the secular masters William of Auxerre and William of Auvergne, early Franciscan (Alexander of Hales, Ps.-Odo Rigaldi (Codex Troyes 1862, William of Melitona) and Dominican (Roland of Cremona, Richard Fishacre) authors and texts, emphasizing their use of the Basilian dictum (‘ea quae sunt ratione separabilia, Deo actu sunt separabilia’). It is in Alexander of Hales that we find for the first time that idea that an accident has a distinctive ‘esse’, apart from the ‘esse’ it receives from the subject. Together with the Basilian dictum, this forms the heart of the argumentation: while the ‘esse materiale’ (Alexander of Hales) or the ‘esse naturale’ (William of Melitona) of an accident is dependent upon its subject, the ‘esse formale’ is not. With regard to the position of Albertus Magnus we have shown, by way of our close reading, the important differences between Albertus’ *Sentences*-commentary, his later philosophical commentaries and commentaries on the Bible on the one hand and *De corpore Domini* on the other hand. These differences question the authenticity of *De corpore Domini*. Bonaventure introduces the concept of aptitudinal inherence although Richard Rufus in his unedited *Lectura Parisiensis* does not seem willing to accept this argument or any of the other arguments proposed (‘Sed haec omnia ficta videntur esse’).

In our analysis of the position of Thomas Aquinas in part four (pp. 204-318), we have located the central texts (In IV Sent. d. 12, Quodl. IX, q. 3, a. un., ScG IV, c. 62-63, 65-67 and STh. III, q. 75, 77) within the larger contexts of these works. We have emphasized the importance of Proposition 1 of the *Liber de Causis* (“Omnis causa primaria plus est influens super suum causatum quam causa secunda universalis”) and his definition of an accident and the unique role of quantity. Distinguishing between the ‘esse’ of an accident in an absolute sense and the mode of being (‘modus essendi’) which pertains to an accident as ordered to the proximate cause of its ‘esse’, i.e. the substance, Thomas Aquinas argues that, in the case of a removal of such an ordering of an accident to its proximate cause, it is possible that the ordering to its first cause remains. In such a case of an ordering of accident to its first cause, the mode of being of an accident is not ‘in esse’, but ‘ab alio esse’. Aquinas concludes therefore that God can cause an accident to exist in such a way that it does not exist in a subject and is not contradictory to the definition of an accident. For what is removed from the accident is not its ‘esse’, but its mode of being, i.e. ‘in esse’. Contrary to Bonaventure, Thomas Aquinas refrains from using the concept of aptitudinal inherence. With regard to the first text, we have analyzed the way in which Petrus de Tarentasia and Hannibaldus de Hannibaldis use

and excerpt this text. We have also shown the influence of the second text on Adenulfus de Anania's *Quodlibetum*, q. 7 of which we offer a transcription.

In our analysis of selected reactions by contemporaries and authors and works of the first generation after Thomas Aquinas in part five (pp. 319-434), we have highlighted the criticism of Parisian members of the Artes-faculty to justify philosophically the possibility of accidents 'sine subiecto' and in particular the criticism of Siger of Brabant. The most severe criticism in this respect is however uttered by the German Dominican Dietrich of Freiberg. We have also analyzed the nuanced positions of Godfrey of Fontaines, Aegidius Romanus and John of Paris. Our study also has shown the strong resemblance between the arguments put forward by Thomas Aquinas and those in the Brugge Ms. 491 abbreviation. In our analysis of John of Sterngassen, we have shown that he has an awareness of the principal arguments of the discussion, although he lacks the power to integrate them.

The dissertation ends with providing transcriptions of the following manuscripts: Cod. Troyes, Bibl. Municipale 1862 (=T), Fol. 158vb-159vb, 161va ; Anonymus (Ps.-Odo Rigaldi), IV Sent. d. 11 (Excerptum); Assisi. Bibl. Sacro convento 176, Fol. 109va-110vb: Richardus Rufus, Sententia Parisiensis; Paris, BNF Lat. 14899, Fol. 145rb-145va: Adenulfus de Anania: *Quodlibetum*, quaestio 7 : *Utrum Deus possit facere, quod accidens sit sine subiecto*; Codex Brugge, Stadsbibliotheek 491, Fol. 313rb-313va : Anonymus, IV Sent. d. 12.

Explicit