

Radulphus Brito, Master of Arts and Theology

William J. Courtenay

Recent accounts of the life and works of Radulphus Brito, with one exception, have limited the biographical information to a minimum.¹ That basic minimum is that he was a famous master in the arts faculty at Paris in the last decade of the thirteenth century and the opening decade of the fourteenth, that he was probably from Brittany, and that he became a master of theology at Paris. This minimalist biography has been the end result of over a century of conflicting interpretations of evidence: that he was from Brittany or belonged to a Parisian family for which "le Breton" was a surname; that he was or was not identical with the Parisian master of theology referred to as Radulphus de Hotot; that he was or was not identical with the provisor of the Sorbonne known as Radulphus Brito, and that he was or was not identical with the Radulphus Reginaldi Britonis, master of theology, who was awarded an expectation of a canonical prebend in the cathedral chapter at Le Mans in 1316. The purpose of the following article is to reexamine the accumulated information and misinformation in order to arrive at a more accurate and detailed biography.

The earliest extended account of Radulphus Brito was written by Paul Fournier in 1927.² While leaving the matter of his place of origin unresolved, Fournier identified the Parisian arts master with the Radulphus Reginaldi Britonis who, as a doctor of theology, was made a canon at Le Mans in 1316, at which time he held a prebend in the

¹ The exception is the recent contribution of Jean-Luc Deuffic, "Un logicien renommé, proviseur de Sorbonne au XIV^e s. Raoul le Breton de Ploudiry. Notes bibliographiques," *Pecia*, 1 (2002), 45-154, to which Patrick Kernévez called my attention after the completion of the present article. Mine and that of M. Deuffic complement each other. I have given more attention to correcting previous false assumptions and manuscript readings, while M. Deuffic has uncovered important new information regarding the family of Radulphus Brito and has included a catalogue of the contents of Radulphus' works as well as an extensive bibliography. For a recent but, more cautious assessment, see Sten Ebbesen, "Brito, Radulphus (c.1270-c.1320)," in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (London, 1998), vol. 2, pp. 21-23; "Radulphus Brito. The Last of the Great Arts Masters, Or: Philosophy and Freedom," in *Geistesleben im 13. Jahrhundert*, ed. Jan. A. Aertsen and Andreas Speer, *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 27 (Berlin, 2000), pp. 231-251.

² P. Fournier, "Raoul Renaud, dit le Breton, Proviseur de Sorbonne," in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 36 (1927), 169-180.

collegiate church at Saint-Quentin and half of the rectorship of the parish church of Sommery in the diocese of Rouen. To those provisions John XXII added an expectation at Beauvais in 1319, by which time, according to Fournier, Radulphus held a canonical prebend at Laon. The other "facts" that Fournier included were that Radulphus authored a commentary on the *Sentences* found in Pavia, Bibl. Univ. 244, that he was provisor of the Sorbonne between 1315 and 1320, and that he died in 1320, unless he is identical with the "Dominus Radulphus Brito cum sex sociis" listed in the *computus* of the University of Paris that Heinrich Denifle dated between 1329 and 1336, but which now can be dated to the academic year 1329-1330.³

In the entry for Raoul de Hotot in his *Repertoire des Maîtres en théologie de Paris*, Palémon Glorieux maintained that Radulphus Brito and Radulphus de Hotot, both doctors of theology at Paris, were one and the same individual.⁴ He reaffirmed this assertion in a subsequent article, largely on the grounds that if they were not identical, we would be left with the unlikely hypothesis that there were two doctors of theology at Paris by the name of Radulphus Reginaldi at the same time, with parallel careers.⁵ Only Radulphus Brito, however, carried the additional name of 'Renaud', not Radulphus de Hotot. Moreover, their theological careers were not precisely parallel. Radulphus Hotot was cited as a doctor of theology in 1308 while Radulphus Brito is said to have read the *Sentences* in 1308 or 1309 and incepted in 1311-1312.⁶ Glorieux responded to the latter issue by arguing that the date of 1308 (or, more accurately, 1309) was the date for that manuscript copy of Radulphus'

³ The document has been reedited: W. J. Courtenay, *Parisian Scholars in the Early Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 218-246.

⁴ P. Glorieux, *Repertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1933), #225, vol. I, pp. 453-456.

⁵ P. Glorieux, "Raoul Renaud," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 7 (1935), 405-407, 407: "Sinon, il faudra admettre qu'il y eut à Paris, à la même date, deux maîtres en théologie, deux Renaud, dont les deux carrières auront couru parallèlement, tout près l'une de l'autre, et de tout point semblables."

⁶ Radulphus de Hotot is mentioned as a doctor of theology in March 1308 (*Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* [henceforth cited as *CUP*], ed. H. Denifle and É. Châtelain, vol. II (Paris, 1891), #664, pp. 125-128). The date for the *Sentences* commentary of Radulphus Brito is based on the date given in the sole copy of that work, which is found in Pavia, Bibl. Univ. 244, ff. 15r-54v. The date for his magisterial exercises is based on their inclusion among the contemporary texts recorded by Prosper de Reggio Emilia, O.E.S.A., in Vat. lat. 1086, whose contents date to 1311-1316, except for Prosper's quodlibetal questions (1316-1317).

lectures, not the date of the lectures themselves, which could have occurred earlier. Thus, for Glorieux, Radulphus read the *Sentences* early in the first decade of the fourteenth century, was licensed in 1308 (and thus could be referred to as doctor of theology in the proceedings against the Templars), but incepted later because of delays caused by the Council of Vienne.⁷

Victorin Doucet questioned the identification of Hotot and Brito, not on the grounds of any incompatibility in the timing of their theological careers, but because the Radulphus Brito who authored the *Sentences* commentary in Pavia 244 opposed the idea of the Immaculate Conception, while Radulphus de Hotot was described by Jean de Pouilly as publicly supporting that theological position.⁸ Without responding to Doucet's objection, Glorieux continued to maintain the identification of Hotot and Brito in his *La littérature quodlibétique*, in his two-volume work on the Sorbonne, and in his *Repertoire des Maîtres des arts en*

⁷ Glorieux, "Raoul Renaud," 407: "Un recours est possible toutefois qui concilierait toutes ces données: C'est que, pour telle raison qui nous échappe (n'oublions pas par exemple le Concile de Vienne et ce qui le prépara), Raoul Renaud ayant obtenu la licence en théologie en 1308, n'ait tenu ses actes de maîtrise que trois ans plus tard, au moment d'ouvrir école." The argument is without merit. Although 1307-1308 was a year in which the chancellor of Notre-Dame could license candidates in the higher faculties at Paris in the biennial cycle, university statutes required a four-year interval as *baccalarius formatus* between reading the *Sentences* and being licensed in theology, except in cases of papal intervention – a practice that developed later and seems to have been limited to candidates in religious orders. This would push the sentential year of Radulphus Brito back to 1302-1303, which poses difficulties because of Radulphus' familiarity with John Duns Scotus' Paris lectures; see M. Rossini and C. Schabel, "Time and Eternity among the Early Scotists. Texts on Future Contingents by Alexander of Alessandria, Radulphus Brito, and Hugh of Novocastro," forthcoming in *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale*, 16 (2005). Moreover, although masters from the University of Paris participated in the Council of Vienne, that council began in October 1311 and there is no evidence that preparations for it disrupted academic activities at Paris in the 1308-1311 period. Finally, the title of 'doctor of theology' comes with inception as master, not with the license to teach.

⁸ V. Doucet, *Commentaires sur les Sentences. Supplément au Répertoire de M. Frédéric Stegmüller* (Firenze, 1954), p. 73; the question appears in Pavia 244, f.46rb-46va. For Jean de Pouilly's mention of Radulphus de Hotot, see below, note 15. The use Jean de Pouilly makes of Hotot's sermon is discussed in B. Hauréau, "Raoul de Hotot," in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 32 (1898), 575-576, and in Glorieux, *La littérature quodlibétique de 1260 à 1320*, vol. I (Kain, 1325), p. 223.

Paris.⁹ Subsequent scholars have side-stepped this and other unresolved issues regarding the life of Radulphus Brito. In the face of such uncertainty, caution is understandable.

Without wading any further through this historiographical tangle, the following remarks will definitively separate Radulphus de Hotot and Radulphus Brito, and then construct as full a biography of the latter as is presently possible.

Radulphus Brito and Radulphus de Hotot, Doctores in theologia

There is little room for doubt that the prolific master of arts known as Radulphus Brito studied theology while he continued his teaching in the faculty of arts. A Venice manuscript of his questions on the *Prior Analytics* ends with this (autobiographical?) statement: "Expliciunt questiones libri Priorum date a magistro Radulpho Britone qui nunc studet in theologia in qua magnum profectum facit, domino concedente. Amen."¹⁰ Numerous references in documents from 1315 to 1319 to a Radulphus Brito with the title of doctor of theology has led to the generally accepted view that he completed his theological degree, and that the *Sentences* commentary in Pavia 244 attributed to Radulphus Brito as well as the inception and magisterial exercises attributed to him in Vat. lat. 1086 are probably the work of the famous master of arts.¹¹ But which of the references to Radulphus as doctor of theology apply to the famous master of arts?

The master of theology cited in documents as Radulphus de Hotot came from Normandy, as Barthélemy Hauréau noted more than a century ago.¹² Hotot, or Hautot, is a common place name in Normandy. There

⁹ Glorieux, *La littérature quodlibétique*, vol. II (Paris, 1935), pp. 236-237; *Aux origines de la Sorbonne* (subsequently cited as *Sorb.*), vol. I: *Robert de Sorbon* (Paris, 1966), pp. 133-136; *La faculté des arts et ses maîtres au XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1971), #375, pp. 297-299.

¹⁰ Venice, Bibl. San Marco, cl. X cod. 39, fol. 52, cited from Glorieux, "Raoul Renaud," 406.

¹¹ Pavia, Bibl. Univ. 244, f. 15r-54v (*Sent.* I-III); his vesperal questions, given at the time of his inception as master of theology, probably in 1314, are contained in Vatican, Vat. lat. 1086, f. 156r-158r, as well as his participation in the disputation "in aula" at the time of Thomas Wilton's inception between 1312 and 1314 (Worcester F 69, f. 165r). There are also other magisterial questions, some belonging to a quodlibetic disputation, in Vat. lat. 1086, f. 195r-208r; see Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie* I, p. 455; *La littérature quodlibétique*, pp. 236-237.

¹² Hauréau, "Raoul de Hotot," pp. 575-576.

are at least five in the diocese of Rouen, one in the diocese of Lisieux, and one in the diocese of Bayeux.¹³ Radulphus de Hotot was already doctor of theology in March 1308 when he was among the theologians consulted by Philip the Fair in the proceedings against the Templars, and he was also among the twenty-one masters of theology who censured Marguerite Porete on 11 April 1310.¹⁴ In neither case were these the actions of theological masters acting in their official capacity as active regents in the faculty of theology. The names of several regents are missing in both documents, and among those who did sign the actions, there are a number of non-regent masters of theology.

Radulphus de Hotot was a doctor of theology and probably a regent master at the time of both deliberations (March 1308 and April-May 1310), which would make him active in the faculty of theology in the three academic years from 1307 to 1310. He was also the doctor of theology who publicly preached at Paris in favor of the Immaculate Conception, for which he was attacked by a fellow regent master, Jean de Pouilly.¹⁵ The date of that sermon is usually given as 1309 because it

¹³ The suffix '-tot' is common to many place names in Normandy, especially in upper Normandy. The Latin 'Hotot' can designate Hautot-l'Auvray, Hautot-sur-Mer, Hautot-sur-Seine, Hautot-Saint-Sulpice, and Hautot-le-Vatois, all in the diocese of Rouen. The 'Hotot' in the diocese of Lisieux is Hotot-en-Auge, and for the diocese of Bayeux, Hottot-les-Bagues. Similarly, the name of the notary Johannes de Plumecoc in document #16 in Glorieux, *Sorb.* I, p. 211, and document #418 in *Sorb.* II, p. 538, should probably be transcribed as Plumetot, a town north of Caen in lower Normandy, despite his self-identification as a clerk from the diocese of Rouen; see *Recueil des historiens de la France. Pouillés*, vol. 2: *Pouillés de la Province de Rouen*, ed. A. Longnon (Paris, 1903), p. 110. This last example shows that a place name, by itself, does not necessarily identify the immediate topographical background of an individual, whose family may have migrated elsewhere.

¹⁴ For the response of the masters to Philip the Fair, see *CUP* II, #664, pp. 125-128, edited from Paris, Archives Nationales J 413, n.1. The documents for the proceedings against Marguerite Porete are found in Paris, Arch. Nat., J 428. The latter collection of documents are all from April and May of the fifth year of Clement V's pontificate (5 June 1309 to 4 June 1310), which places them in 1310 although many of them are dated 1309, possibly because the proceedings in Paris began before the change of the year on 25 March.

¹⁵ Jean de Pouilly, *Quodlibeta* III, q. 4 (Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 14565, f. 145ra): "Utrum potest teneri pro opinione probabili quod ipsa [Beata Virgo] non contraxit originale peccatum. Et arguitur quod sic, quia nullus doctor sacre scripture videtur aliquid in pleno et generali sermone predicare Parisius nisi quod potest teneri Parisius pro opinione probabili, aliter enim esset eius doctrina periculosa et contraria fidei aut bonis moribus vel omnia improbabilis. Sed Beatam Virginem non contraxisse originale peccatum est pre-

was mentioned in the fourth question of the third *Quodlibeta* of Jean de Pouilly, whose quodlibet is in turn dated by this reference to Radulphus de Hotot – a classic circular argument. Whatever the date, Hotot's sermon obviously had occurred by the time Jean de Pouilly composed his quodlibetal question, but it need not have occurred in the same year as Pouilly's question. Jean de Pouilly states only that Hotot preached the view that Mary was conceived without the stain of original sin, and does not mention any date. One can assume, however, that the sermon was a relatively recent event and that it belonged to the same period as the declarations against the Templars and Marguerite Porete, that is, in 1308-1310.

It has always been assumed that Radulphus de Hotot was a secular theologian, which is likely but not certain. On his parchment strip with seal attached to the bottom of the Templar document, he is listed as magister Radulphus de Hotot, but several of those in religious orders were also accorded the title of 'magister' rather than 'frater' on their sealed strips.¹⁶ His name appears twice in the documents preserved from the action against Marguerite Porete. He is first listed among the twenty-one masters of theology who pronounced against Marguerite on 11 April 1310.¹⁷ Because no affiliation with a religious order follows his name in either document, it has been assumed he was a secular theologian. But Petrus de Sancto Dionysio is also listed without further identification, although he is identified in another document as a Benedictine.¹⁸ Apart from Johannes de Poilliaco, whose name was listed in between Gerardus

dicatum Parisius a doctore sacre scripture in pleno et in generali sermone universitatis, ut dicebat" The marginal note reads "a .R. de Hotot," not "Ra. de Hotot," as cited by Hauréau and repeated by Glorieux. The same text, without the marginal note, occurs in Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 15372, f. 76rb.

¹⁶ CUP II, p. 127, edited from Paris, Arch. Nat., J. 413, n. 1.

¹⁷ Paris, Arch. Nat., J 428, #15: "venerabili et discretis viris Symone decano, Thoma de Balliaco, Guillelmo Alexandri, ac Johanne de Gandavo canonicis Parisien., Petro de Sancto Dyonisio, Gerardo de Sancto Victore, Jacobo Caroliloci, Gerardo Carmelita, Johanne de Poilliaco, Laurencio priore Vallis Scolari, Alexandro, Henrico Teutonico, ac Gregorio de Luca ordinis Heremitarum sancti Augustini, Johanne de Monte Sancti Eligii, Radulpho de Hoitot, Berengario ordinis Predicatorum, Johanne de Claromarisco, Nicolao de Lira, ac Jacobo de Esquillo ordinis Minorum, Jacobo Cistercien., et Rogero de Roseto, magistris in theologia"

¹⁸ Paris, Arch. Nat., J 428, #16: "Petro de Sancto Dyonisio ordinis sancti Benedicti". The monastery of St-Denis maintained a house of studies in Paris, near the convent of the Augustinian Hermits. This theologian is listed as a secular master by Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie*, I, #221, p. 248.

Carmelita [of Bologna] and Laurentius, prior Vallis Sclarium, many of the names in the Porete document are grouped by order: Alexander [de Sancto Elpidio], Henricus [de Vrimaria] Teutonicus, and Gregorius de Lucca, all Augustinian Hermits; Johannes de Claromarisco, Nicolaus de Lyra, and Jacobus de Esquillo, all Franciscans. That opens the possibility of reading the sequence "Radulpho de Hoitot, Berengario ordinis Predicatorum" as identifying both as belonging to the Dominicans. Yet in the action taken at the Dominican convent in Paris on 3 April 1310 against Guiard de Cressonessart, named as a supporter of Marguerite Porete, only eleven masters of theology are mentioned as passing judgment at this earlier meeting, and Hotot is not listed among them.¹⁹ In that document Hotot's name appears later as one of those witnessing and consenting to those actions: "Presentibus religiosis viris fratribus Alexandro de Marcia [de Sancto Elpidio, O.E.S.A.], Radulpho de Hotot, Jacobo de Dyvione Cistercien. ordinis, et Gregorio de Luca ordinis sancti Augustini, magistris in theologia, qui etiam consilio doctorum magistrorum consenserunt"²⁰ The simplest reading of that passage is that Radulphus de Hotot, like the other *viri fratres*, was a friar.

But if Hotot belonged to a religious order, which is admittedly not certain, what order might it have been? His support of the Immaculate Conception makes it unlikely that he was a Dominican, although there may have been Dominicans who disagreed with Thomas Aquinas on this theological issue. It was a position closely identified with John Duns Scotus and favored by Franciscans. That suggests that Hotot may have been a Franciscan, although Scotus also had followers among secular theologians, such as Henry of Harclay. Pending further evidence, the

¹⁹ On the actions against Guiard, see R. E. Lerner, "An 'Angel of Philadelphia' in the Reign of Philip the Fair: The Case of Guiard of Cressonessart," in *Order and Innovation in the Middle Ages. Essays in Honor of Joseph R. Strayer*, ed. W. C. Jordan, B. McNab, and T. F. Ruiz (Princeton 1976), pp. 343-64, 529-40. Lerner described this event as "a judgment by canon lawyers," but in the document it is a joint action of masters of theology and canon law, with the theologians listed first.

²⁰ Robert Lerner used the "Jacobus de Divione" in this document to identify the "Jacobus Cist." in the declaration against Marguerite Porete a week later on 11 April 1310. Denifle had incorrectly identified the Cistercian Jacobus to be Jacobus de Furno (Jacques Fournier, later pope Benedict XII). Jacobus de Divione (Jacques de Dijon) became abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Preuilly near Sens in 1312; see R. Lerner, "A Note on the University Career of Jacques Fournier, O. Cist., Later Pope Benedict XII," *Analecta Cisterciensia*, 30 (1971), 66-69.

question of whether Hotot was a secular or mendicant theologian remains open.

Radulphus de Hotot is not known to have left any surviving scholastic work. Nor is there any mention of him before the Spring of 1308 or after the Summer of 1310, unless the arguments of Radulphus Normannus cited by Prosper de Reggio Emilia in Vat. lat. 1086 are those of Radulphus de Hotot.²¹ He is not known to have held any benefice. His name does not appear as the recipient of any papal grace during the pontificates of Boniface VIII, Clement V, or John XXII. Nor is it certain that the sermon in Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 14 859, f.173ra-173vb, attributed in the manuscript to R. de Ratot and often said to be by Radulphus de Hotot, is actually his.²² In fact, if the connection with Radulphus Brito is severed, there is nothing associated with Hotot's tenure as a doctor of theology at Paris beyond his participation in the actions against the Templars and Marguerite Porete, appearing as a witness at the condemnation of Guiard de Cressonessart, his stand on the issue of the Immaculate Conception, and possibly his participation in the disputations connected with the inception of Prosper de Reggio Emilia, O.E.S.A.

On the basis of the foregoing analysis of the evidence, it is apparent that Radulphus de Hotot and Radulphus Brito were, in fact, two different persons. First, Radulphus de Hotot was from Normandy, not from Brittany. There are no towns or villages in Brittany called Hotot or Hautot, while there are many in Normandy, and a master from Normandy would not be referred to as a Breton. Second, Radulphus de Hotot is never cited as "dictus Brito" or "le Breton," and Radulphus Brito is never given the additional name of "de Hotot". Third, Radulphus de Hotot is known to have supported the Immaculate Conception, while Radulphus Brito opposed it. Finally, and most compelling, Radulphus de Hotot was already a doctor of theology four or five years before Radulphus Brito incepted as a master of theology and could legitimately be referred to as 'doctor'. Despite the fact that both were doctors of theology at Paris in

²¹ Vat. lat. 1086, f. 26v: "Rationes magistri Radulphi normanni," "opinio magistri Radulphi normanni," "ad argumenta Radulphi normanni." In Prosper's work, this individual is clearly distinguished from Radulphus Brito, whom he cites frequently.

²² Although the sermon itself is undated, Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie*, I, p. 455, gives the date of the sermon as 10 May 1310, presumably on the grounds that the scriptural text is appropriate for the third Sunday after Easter and that Hotot was still active at Paris in 1310. The other sermons in the manuscript, however, date before 1300.

the first two decades of the fourteenth century, their theological careers were sequential, not simultaneous.

It should be noted that there is another Radulphus de Hotot, namely Radulphus Sellonis de Hotot, also called Ranulphus, who was master of arts at Paris in the second decade of the fourteenth century, and who became a doctor of medicine at Paris in the 1330s.²³ This Radulphus de Hotot was a regent master in the arts faculty and a representative of the Norman nation along with Guillelmus de Hotot, also a regent in arts from Normandy, when they witnessed and approved a university action in favor of the Sorbonne in 1317.²⁴ Guillelmus de Hotot, who came from the diocese of Rouen, would later become a doctor of theology and canon at Notre-Dame in Paris.²⁵ Despite their close association at Paris, Radulphus/Ranulphus de Hotot came from the diocese of Bayeux, probably from Hottot-les-Bagues.²⁶

Radulphus Brito, Radulphus de Plebe diriaci, and Radulphus Reginaldi

Having distinguished Radulphus de Hotot from Radulphus Brito, another assumption of Glorieux needs to be examined, namely that the Radulphus, doctor of theology, who rented a house from the College de Sorbonne in June 1315 is identical with the Radulphus Brito who, according to Glorieux, became provisor of the Sorbonne later that year. The document of June 1315, edited by Glorieux, deserves close examination because of errors in transcription and in the arguments based on it and the following document in Glorieux's edition.²⁷ The full name of the doctor of theology in the rental document was transcribed by Glorieux as "Radulphus de Plebe diriaci." The connection with Brittany is provided by the "de Plebe," or "Plebs," which is a common first part of many place names in Brittany, especially in the northwestern region, and

²³ *Rotuli Parisienses. Supplications to the Pope from the University of Paris* (subsequently cited as *Rot. Par.*), vol. I: 1316-1349, ed. W. J. Courtenay, p. 82; E. Wickersheimer, *Dictionnaire biographique des médecins en France au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1936), pp. 683-84.

²⁴ Glorieux, *Sorb.* I, p. 210: "magistris ... Radulpho Britone, Thoma de Wiltone, ... Guillelmo et Radulpho de Hotot"

²⁵ *Rot. Par.* I, pp. 81, 82, 203n, 248n.

²⁶ In addition to their names being linked in the Sorbonne document of 1317, Guillelmus de Hotot was executor on a papal provision for Radulphus/Ranulphus in 1337; *Rot. Par.* I, p. 82.

²⁷ The rental agreement of 1315 is edited in Glorieux, *Sorb.* II, #415, pp. 529-531.

rendered in modern forms as Pleu-, Ploe-, Plou-, Plo-, or Plu-. References to two doctors of theology from Brittany by the name of Radulphus in documents from 1315, one a renter of property belonging to the Sorbonne and the other provisor of the Sorbonne, led Glorieux to argue that they were one and the same person. The fact that the Radulphus who rented a house was not acknowledged as the provisor of the Sorbonne became the basis for Glorieux's assertion that Radulphus Brito became provisor between late June 1315 (the date of the rental document) and the end of that year.²⁸

There is one major problem with Glorieux's reasoning. The document immediately following the rental agreement is dated three weeks earlier than the rental agreement, and in it Radulphus Brito is referred to as provisor of the college.²⁹ If Radulphus the renter is identical with the Radulphus who became (and in fact already was) the provisor of the Sorbonne, why was not the renter referred to by the name "Radulphus Brito" and acknowledged as the provisor of the college?

Before answering that question, a problem with "de Plebe diriaci" needs to be resolved. While "Plebe" suggests a parish in the western part of Brittany, there is no known town or village in the fourteenth century called "Plebs diriacum" nor any today that could be derived from that name. The problem is solved, as is often the case, by a fresh look at the original document.³⁰ What appears in Glorieux's edition as "magister Radulphus de Plebe **dyriaco** regens Parisius in theologia" is actually "magister Radulphus de Plebe **Dyri actu** regens Parisius in theologia." The second place in the document where Glorieux's edition gives

²⁸ Glorieux, *Sorb.* I, p. 134: "Si, comme on semble fondé à la croire, l'accensement d'une maison de la rue Coupe Gueule faite en juin 1315 à «Radulphus de plebe dyriaco regens Parisius in theologia» (C. 415) concernait Raoul Breton, on aurait là et une précision sur son origine et sur la date de son élection (entre le 29 juin et la fin de l'année). Son nom paraît pour la première fois avec son titre de proviseur dans un acte de 1315 (Doc. 16)" The house that was rented was not in the rue Coupe Gueule but in the Cloître de S. Benoît, with a rear entrance on the rue de Sorbonne, as the property description makes clear. Document 16, pp. 210-211, to which Glorieux referred his readers, actually dates to November 1317, and although Radulphus Brito is mentioned in the document, it is not in his capacity as provisor of the Sorbonne. The first document in which Brito is accorded that title, as we shall see, is in June 1315.

²⁹ Glorieux, *Sorb.* II, #416, pp. 531-535, at 531: "magister Radulphus Brito doctor in theologia, magister et provisor domus magistrorum et scholarium de Serbona"

³⁰ Paris, Archives Nationales, S 6219, dossier 4 (côte 199), n. 10. The document location cited as doss. 2 in Glorieux, *Sorb.* I, p. 530, is incorrect.

"magistro Radulpho de Plebe diriaco sacre pagine doctori actu regenti Parisius in theologia," the manuscript reads "magistro Radulpho de Plebe diri sacre pagine doctori actu regenti Parisius in theologia." While there is no such place in Brittany (or anywhere else in France) that corresponds to the Latin "Plebs diriacum," there is a "Plebs diri," rendered in the Pouillés as "Ploediri," referring to the modern Ploudiry in Finistère, arrondissement of Brest.³¹

If Raoul de Ploudiry was the Radulphus Brito who was the provisor of the Sorbonne at the time of the rental agreement, why was that not stated? The answer lies in the legal language of such documents. Property documents, whether of sale or lease, require that the identity of the parties be specified in a way that is later not open to question or legal challenge. There could be, and in fact probably were, several persons from Brittany at Paris in this period by the name of Radulphus or Raoul.³² However famous Radulphus Brito might be in the university community, that form of the name was not precise enough for legal purposes. But why not identify him as the provisor of the Sorbonne? That position, like ecclesiastical benefices or offices in the university – and unlike a status, once gained, that remained with one for life, such as "doctor of theology" – was held for a period of time and might not apply at some point in the future. The fact that he was provisor of the Sorbonne at the time was irrelevant to the rental agreement. The most accurate legal description of Radulphus was by his place of origin, Ploudiry, a wealthy village in the southern part of the diocese of St-Pol-de-Léon, between Landerneau and Landivisiau.³³ In some cases a sur-

³¹ *Recueil des historiens de la France. Pouillés*, vol. 3 : *Pouillés de la Province de Tours*, ed. A. Longnon (Paris, 1903), p. 334. Deuffic arrived at the same conclusion regarding Radulphus' place of birth through the reference to Radulphus' uncle, "Herveus Eveni Danielis dictus de Plebedyri, oriundus de dioceso Leonensi, clericus civis parisiensis," who in his will of 20 July 1317 left the usufruct of his properties to "magistro Radulpho de Plebedyri, ejus nepoti, nunc doctori in theologia." The document is edited in Deuffic, "Un logicien renommé," 146-149.

³² See Courtenay, *Parisian Scholars*, for a "dominus Rodulphus Brito cum 6 sociis" living in rue du Four, pp. 209-210, 227, and a "Raulfus Brito" living in rue S.Hilaire, p. 228.

³³ The actual size of Ploudiry in the early fourteenth century is not known. The population in 1800 was 1,061, which had grown to 1,369 by 1911, before declining to 770 in 1968; see *Guide des archives du Finistère*, ed. J. Charpy (Quimper, 1973), p. 342. The parish church of Ploudiry had a value of 60 solidi around 1330, one of the highest in the region; see *Pouillés de la Province de Tours*, p. 334.

name or father's name might be added, but that was usually for persons from towns or cities for whom a place name would be insufficient identification. No matter what offices Radulphus held in the present or future, in and after 1315 he would always be Radulphus de Plebe diri, magister in theologia.

But how can one be certain that Radulphus Brito, provisor of the Sorbonne, and Radulphus Brito de Plebe diri, and, for that matter, Radulphus Reginaldi Britonis were one and the same? First, all three were described in documents from 1315 and 1316 as regent master in the faculty of theology at Paris. Given the fact that at any one time there were no more than five or ten secular regent masters in theology at Paris in this period, it is implausible that there could be two of them, let alone three, from Brittany by the name of Radulphus. The theological studies of the arts master Radulphus Brito at the opening of the fourteenth century corresponds perfectly with a Radulphus who incepted as master in theology around 1313 and was provisor of the Sorbonne by 1315.

This connection is further supported by two other pieces of evidence that have not until now been part of the dossier. First, the only cathedral chapter in which Radulphus Brito, doctor of theology, ever held a canonical prebend was St-Pol-de-Léon in Brittany. The oft-cited provision of a canonical prebend at Laon is the result of a mistake by Fournier, who mistranslated the diocese mentioned in the 1319 provision for Radulphus Brito (Leonensis in Latin, or St-Pol-de-Léon in French) as Laon, the Latin for which is Laudunensis.³⁴ Glorieux and all subsequent scholars simply repeated Fournier's error.

Second, how was it that Radulphus Brito became rector of the parish church of Sommery in the diocese of Rouen rather than of a church in Brittany, or in the area of Paris? The answer lies in the identity of the person who held the advowson, or right of collation, for that church. In the Pouillé of 1337, the patron of Sommery was Hervé de Léon (Herveus de Leone), knight and lord of Noyon-sur-Andelle (today Charleval) in Normandy, east of Rouen, near Fleury-sur-Andelle.³⁵ He is mentioned as

³⁴ *Jean XXII (1316-1334), Lettres communes analysées d'après les registres dits d'Avignon et du Vatican* (henceforth cited as *LC Jean XXII*), ed. G. Mollat et al., 16 vols. (Paris, 1904-1947), #10344, dated 12 September 1319: "non obst. in Leonen. et s. Quintini in Viromandia eccl. canon. cum preb."

³⁵ *Pouillés de la Province de Rouen*, p. 39. The index to *LC Jean XXII*, vol. 15, col. 768, mistakenly placed the first mention of Sommery (Radulphus Brito's 1316 provision) in the diocese of Noyon, assuming it to be in the same diocese as St-Quentin,

lord of Noyon in 1306, having inherited that seigneurie and other lands in the Bray region of Normandy at the death of his father, Hervé V, in 1304.³⁶ Hervé VI de Léon died in 1337, leaving to his heirs the patronage of a church (Bellefosse) for which he shared rights of appointment, as the Pouillé of 1337 mentions.³⁷ Hervé VI held the advowson of eight other churches in the Bray region of Normandy, one of them, Radepont, close to his principal seigneurie. The other seven were clustered near Forges-les-Eaux, including Sommery.³⁸ The road east of Sommery to what was once the monastery of Beaubec still today crosses through Bois de Léon. Sommery was the wealthiest of the parish churches in the gift of Hervé, having a tithe value of 200 pounds in 1337.³⁹ Even split between two rectors at the time Radulphus Brito was rector, it provided substantial income. But awarding any church to a petitioning cleric depended on its being vacant, so the fact that Radulphus Brito obtained the richest church in Hervé's gift was probably a fortunate coincidence of timing.

Hervé VI de Léon bore two territorial identities in the opening decades of the fourteenth century. The revolt of Hervé III against Jean le Roux, duke of Brittany, in the late 1230s had cost the family some of its lands and titles in Brittany, and the marriage of Hervé IV to Mahaut de Poissy, dame de Noyon-sur-Andelle and heir to other lands in the Bray region and the Norman Vexin gave the family a strong territorial position in that region of France. Although all the activities of Hervé VI recorded in the documents for the reign of Philip the Fair were centered in eastern

since no other diocese was mentioned in the document. The same index, col. 738, correctly identifies the 'Sommeriaci' mentioned in Radulphus Brito's 1319 provision as located in the diocese of Rouen. Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie* I, p. 453, "Raoul Renaud," p. 406, and *Sorb.* I, p. 324, mistakenly renders the name of the church and village as Sillery.

³⁶ *Registres du trésor des chartes*, vol. I: *Règne de Philippe le Bel*, ed. R. Fawtier (Paris, 1958), no. 246. On the family of Hervé VI, see Patrick Kernévez and Frédéric Morvan, "Généalogie des Hervé de Léon (vers 1180-1363)," *Bulletin de la Société archéologique du Finistère*, 131 (2002), 279-312.

³⁷ *Pouillés de la Province de Rouen*, p. 26. The patronage of the church of Bellefosse (today Allouville-Bellefosse near Yvetot) was shared with Robert d'Estouteville, who also died in 1337.

³⁸ Hervé's rights over Sommery and the immediate region are attested to by 1310; see *Registres du trésor des chartes*, I, no. 1178. The other six churches, from west to east, were Vieux-Manior, St-Martin-du-Plessis, Buchy, Bosc-Bordel, Bois-Hérault a little to the south, and Nesle-Hodeng to the north.

³⁹ *Pouillés de la Province de Rouen*, p. 39.

Normandy,⁴⁰ Hervé nevertheless maintained his ties with the region of Léon, whose name he bore. When, in 1336, perhaps fearing death, he petitioned Benedict XII for absolution of sins, *in articulo mortis*, he identified himself simultaneously as lord of Noyon and from the diocese of St-Pol-de-Léon.⁴¹ His wife Jeanne, daughter of Érard de Montmorency, lord of Conflans and maître échanson de France, whom Hervé VI married in 1307, also petitioned for an indulgence *in articulo mortis* at the same time.⁴² Hervé held several fiefs in Brittany, including Roche-Maurice near Ploudiry. It is possible, therefore, that Radulphus' appointment to a canonical prebend at St-Pol-de-Léon resulted from the influence of Hervé VI.

When Radulphus Brito was appointed rector of Sommery is not known. It could have occurred while he was simply a master of arts, but it more likely was granted to him after he became a bachelor or master in theology. Either through personal contact with Radulphus or on the advice of others, Hervé VI de Léon appointed Radulphus rector of the church at Sommery, temporarily splitting the income of the church into a

⁴⁰ *Registres du trésor des chartes*, I, nos. 246, 1178, 1582.

⁴¹ *Benoît XII (1334-1342), Lettres communes analysées d'après les registres dits d'Avignon et du Vatican* (henceforth cited as *LC Benoît*), ed. J.-M. Vidal, vol. 1 (Paris, 1902), #3397, from Reg. Vat. 121, f. 29r: "Nob. Herveo de Leonia, dom. de Noyone, mil. Leonen. dioc." Hervé VII de Léon and his wife Marguerite [d'Avangour] also petitioned the pope for plenary indulgences, *in articulo mortis*, at the same time (*LC Benoît XII*, #3390, 3391). The younger Hervé, was also listed as a noble from the diocese of Léon; *LC Benoît*, # 3390, from Reg. Vat. 122, f. 148v: "Nob. Herveo de Leonia, juniore, mil., dom. de Treizfaveim [or better Treizfaveny, as in the indulgence for his wife, f. 148v], Leonen. dioc." Treizfaveny is most likely Tréfaven in Morbihan, a stronghold between Lorient and Hennebont, not Tréflaouénan, southwest of St-Pol-de-Léon, as suggested in the index of *LC Benoît*; see *Guide des archives du Finistère*, pp. 205, 493. I am grateful to Patrick Kernévez for informing me on the location of Tréfaven. On the later history of the family, see Kernévez and Morvan, "Généalogie des Hervé de Léon," 308-311, and Pol Potier de Courey, *Nobiliare et armorial de Bretagne* (Mayenne, 1970), vol. II, p. 173.

⁴² The dowry for the marriage of Hervé and Jeanne is recorded in a 'vidimus' document of January 1311, which is summarized in *Registres du trésor des chartes* I, no. 1582. The indulgence of absolution *in articulo mortis* for Jeanne was granted on 29 January 1336 and is found in *LC Benoît*, # 3398, from Reg. Vat. 121, f. 39v: "Nob. mulieri Joanne de Montemoranciaco, uxori nobilis viri Hervei de Leona militis Leonen. dioc."

double rectorship, presumably so that Radulphus could be supported at Paris while the care of souls was handled by the other rector or a vicar.⁴³

The Theological Career of Radulphus Brito

As the *explicit* in the Venice manuscript of Radulphus Brito's commentary on Aristotle's *Prior Analytics* makes clear, he continued to teach in the faculty of arts while he pursued his studies in theology. That document, however, does not provide a date or inform us how far in Radulphus Brito's theological career he had progressed by that time. The claims that he incepted as a master of theology in 1311-1312, or that his quodlibetal questions were composed in 1312-1314, are based on nothing more than the inclusion of his vesperal and quodlibetal questions in Prosper de Reggio Emilia's manuscript (Vat. lat. 1086), the contents of which – apart from Prosper's own quodlibetal questions – presumably took place before Prosper himself incepted in 1316. It is possible, however, to date Radulphus' theological career more precisely, starting with his lectures on the *Sentences*.

The only known copy of Radulphus Brito's questions on the *Sentences* is found in Pavia, Bibl. Univ. 244, with the *explicit* (f. 54v): "Expliciunt questiones supra tercium sentenciarum disputate a magistro Radulfo Britone, deo gratias, anno domini M.CCC.VIII, die sabbati post festum beati benedicti." Despite the present location of the manuscript, the handwriting of this section (15r-56v), which originated separately and was later bound with the other parts, is a small, cursive version of *littera parisiensis*, such as would be used for notes or draft copies. That suggests, at the very least, that it was either written in the Paris region or by someone trained in that Parisian hand. Further, the quality of the hand suggests that it might either be Radulphus Brito's personal copy or a *reportatio* copy of Brito's *lectura*.⁴⁴

⁴³ By 1337 the church at Sommersy was no longer split between two rectors; see *Pouillés de la Province de Rouen*, p. 39.

⁴⁴ The manuscript, in its present arrangement, also contains Walter Burley's *De comparatione specierum* (ff. 1r-2v, 57r-64v, 3r-4v), *Utrum contradictio sit maxima oppositio* (ff. 4v-6v), and *De intensione et remissione formarum* (ff. 6v-9v, 65r-66v, 10r-14r), as well as the first quodlibet of James of Viterbo (ff. 67r-78r). For a description of the manuscript (Aldini 244), see L. De Marchi and G. Bertolani, *Inventario dei manoscritti della R. Biblioteca universitaria di Pavia*, vol. I (Milan, 1894), 17-138; and *Catalogo di manoscritti filosofici nelle biblioteche italiane* (Firenze,

Because the date mentioned in the *explicit* (the Saturday after the feast of St. Benedict [21 March]) falls before the feast of the Annunciation as well as before Easter in 1308 and 1309 – the two ways of calculating the beginning of the year in France at that time – the actual date of the *explicit* is 22 March 1309, which can be read either as the completion date for Brito's lectures on the third book of the *Sentences* or, as Glorieux argued, the completion date for this copy of the work.⁴⁵ The manuscript does not contain questions on a fourth book.

But was 22 March 1309 the date for the completion of the lectures on the third book of the *Sentences* or the completion of this particular manuscript or section of the manuscript? At the end of Book II of Brito's questions on the *Sentences* (Pavia 244, f. 45v) he refers his audience or readers to the first quodlibet of Jean de Pouilly, which was a product of disputations held during Advent in 1306 or Lent in 1307.⁴⁶ But for Radulphus to call it Pouilly's first quodlibet implies that Radulphus already knew there was a second quodlibet, which can be dated precisely. In his last question in Quodlibet II Pouilly discusses the proceedings against the Templars and of disclosing the secrets of the Templars to the pope.⁴⁷ Pouilly noted that the king had already investigated and uncovered these secrets, presumably referring to the confessions of the Grand Master Jacques de Molay on 24 and 25 October and of Hugues de Pairaud on 9 November.⁴⁸ The issues under debate suggest that the

1980-), vol. VII, ed. G. M. Cao. I am grateful to Hester Gelber and Stefano Caroti for providing access to this information.

⁴⁵ The date given by Fournier and repeated by Glorieux (15 March 1309) is an error. The manuscript reads '*post*', not '*ante*'.

⁴⁶ The reference is part of the question and is in the same hand as the rest of the text. This dating of Pouilly's first quodlibet departs from that suggested by Glorieux, *La littérature quodlibétique*, I, pp. 223-24. Jean de Pouilly was already regent master in theology (i.e., had incepted) when he petitioned Pope Clement V in the summer of 1307 for a dispensation to receive the income from his prebend and benefices while continuing to teach at Paris. His petition was granted on 7 September 1307 (*CUP* II, p. 123-24, at 123: "in theologia facultate, in qua magister existis, Parisius regere dinoscaris ..."). Glorieux assumed that Pouilly began his regency in the fall of 1307 and that the first quodlibet was given during Advent 1307. While Glorieux's dating of the first quodlibet to 1307 is probably true, Pouilly was already an active regent master in 1306-1307.

⁴⁷ In Paris, Bibl. Nat. 14565, f. 124rb-125vb, this question is n. 13, although in Glorieux's list it is n. 19.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 124rb: "Utrum expediat simpliciter quod secreta cuiuslibet religionis revelentur papae." *Ibid.*, f. 125rb: "non potest scire papa regulas quas confirmare habet

events of October-November 1307 were recent and still worthy of debate, which places Pouilly's second series of quodlibetal questions in December 1307.⁴⁹ Whether Radulphus Brito lectured on the *Sentences* in the order of the books (I, II, III, and IV, in contrast to the sequence I, IV, II, and III favored by some mendicant theologians, especially Franciscans), Brito's lectures on book two would have been delivered between January and February of the year in which he was *sententiarius*.⁵⁰ The reference to Pouilly's first quodlibet, implying as it does the existence of a second series of quodlibetal questions, narrows the dating range of Brito's lectures on books II and III of the *Sentences* at Paris between January 1308 and March 1309, thus during the academic year 1307-1308, or more likely, 1308-1309. Glorieux's desire to view the date of 1309 as the date of the manuscript of a work composed much earlier was motivated by his belief that Radulphus Brito was identical with Radulphus de Hotot, and if the later was regent master in March 1308, the *Sentences* commentary had to have been written several years earlier. Yet with the separation of Brito and Hotot, that "requirement" is not relevant.

Before turning to Brito's inception as master of theology, it should be noted that Pavia, Bibl. Univ. 244, f. 55v-56v, contains a brief anonymous commentary on Psalms 1-4, immediately following Brito's questions on the *Sentences*. In Friedrich Stegmüller's survey of biblical commentaries,

nisi sibi revelentur, ideo etc. Et forte, potest esse quod multa fiunt in collegiis, et plus in uno quam in alio, que si scirentur nullatenus permittenda essent. ... Sed etiam communitatem que papa cum omni diligentia deberet inquirere et corrigere, sicut rex diligenter inquisivit facta istorum pessiorum<?> apostatarum et sodomitarum inquisitione et reduxit ad lucem de quibus non puto processu temporas<?> cervit, quia parvus error in principiis magnus est in fine" On the Templar affaire, see Malcolm Barber, *The Trial of the Templars* (Cambridge, 1978).

⁴⁹ This means, in turn, that 1307-1308 was Jean de Pouilly's second year as regent master. Although Pouilly was a firm opponent of the Templars, he was not among those masters of theology whose names and seals were on the parchment strips attached to the response of the masters of theology on 25 March, possibly because their statement did not give the king the right to proceed immediately against the Templars as lapsed heretics. For Pouilly's stand against the Templars, see Noel Valois, "Jean de Pouilli, Théologien," *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 34 (1914), 220-81, at 224-31; Barber, *The Trial of the Templars*, pp. 152-53.

⁵⁰ The length of Radulphus' commentary on book I of the *Sentences* is twice as long as either books II or III. Assuming he began his lectures at the beginning of the fall term in October and completed book III by late March, he would have begun his lectures on book II in January.

this work is attributed to Radulphus Brito, O.F.M., presumably on the grounds that the previous work was attributed to Radulphus Brito.⁵¹ Yet, there does not seem to be anything in the brief commentary that would suggest a Franciscan author.⁵² If this is a work by Radulphus Brito, for which the only evidence is proximity in the Pavia manuscript, this would date back to Brito's biblical lectures as cursor, which in the theological program at Paris preceded the lectures on the *Sentences*, or might be a product of his years as regent master in theology, also known as master of the sacred page. The form of this biblical commentary, however, is basic, which suggests that if it is the work of Brito, it belongs to an academic exercise before he was *sententiarus*.

Assuming that Radulphus Brito followed the statutory requirements of the faculty of theology, he stayed at Paris as a *baccalarius formatus* for four years (1308-1312 or 1309-1313), would have been licensed around late November or December 1313, and afterwards incepted as a master of theology in the winter or spring of 1314.⁵³ This dating accords

⁵¹ F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium biblicum medii aevi*, vol. 5 (Madrid, 1955), p. 37, # 7090.

⁵² There was a Radulphus de Cornaco, OFM, who was promoted to the magisterium in 1346 (*CUP* II, #1132, pp. 597-98), but he was not from Brittany. Stegmüller's supposition was probably based on the heading, written in a hand different from that of the text, at the beginning of Radulphus' commentary on f. 15r. The upper right-hand side of the page (f. 15rb) is missing, and with it, the portion of the heading between "Istud est opus super quatuor libros sententiarum R. brixton." and "de Fiore? ordinis minorum . . .," the latter part perhaps identifying the scribe or a possessor.

⁵³ The early fourteenth century statutes for the faculty of theology at Paris spell out the customary procedures of the faculty at that time (*CUP* II, #1188, p. 692): "Item, nota quod bachalarii qui legerunt Sententias, debent postea prosecui facta facultatis per quatuor annos antequam licentientur, scilicet predicando, argumentando, respondendo; quod verum est, nisi papa per bullas, vel facultas super hoc faceret eis gratiam, immo et per quinque annos aliquando expectat, scilicet quando annus jubileus non cadit in quarto anno post lecturam dictarum Sententiarum." Licenses in the higher faculties at Paris were granted by the chancellor of Notre-Dame every other year (*annus jubileus*). Whether Radulphus completed his four years in 1312 or 1313, the next *annus jubileus* in which one could be licensed and incept would be the academic year, 1313-1314. Papal requests that the chancellor license a bachelor before the four-year period seem to have applied almost entirely to those in religious orders. The faculty of theology granted a dispensation only when the fifth year was not an *annus jubileus* and the candidate would have to wait until his sixth year, and even those exceptions appear rare. For a discussion of the timing of licensing in the faculty of theology, see Z. Kaluza, "Nicolas d'Autrécourt. Ami de la vérité," *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 42.1 (Paris, 1995), p. 68.

with the contents of Vat. lat. 1086, compiled by Prosper de Reggio Emilia, which contains works from or citations to many masters of theology active at Paris between 1311 and 1316, including Radulphus Brito.⁵⁴ In his commentary on Book I of the *Sentences* Prosper mentions an opinion of Radulphus Brito that can be found in the first question of Radulphus' vespereal disputation at the time of his inception, questions of Radulphus that Prosper included in the second section of his manuscript.⁵⁵ We know that Prosper incepted in March 1316 and that 1315-1316 was an *annus jubileus* in which licensing normally took place.⁵⁶ That need not mean that Prosper read the *Sentences* four years earlier, and that Radulphus Brito incepted even earlier. As a mendicant, Prosper would probably have read the *Sentences* at a *studium* of his order and engaged in disputations for one or more years before being sent to Paris to read, and those additional years at the advanced level of theological study were often used as grounds for early licensing. John Duns Scotus, who read the *Sentences* at Oxford before going to Paris to read the *Sentences* a second time, was licensed and incepted as doctor of theology in the year after he completed his lectures at Paris. Peter Aureol, having lectured on the *Sentences* at Toulouse, proceeded to the doctorate

⁵⁴ A. Pelzer, "Prosper de Reggio Emilia, des Ermites de Saint-Augustin, et le manuscrit latin 1086 de la Bibliothèque Vaticane," *Revue Neo-Scholastique de Philosophie*, 30 (1928), 316-351; Pelzer, ed., *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae Codices manu scripti recensiti. Codices Vaticani Latini*, vol. II, pars prior: *Codices 679-1134* (Vatican, 1931), pp. 654-83; P. Glorieux, "A propos de Vatic. lat. 1086. Le personnel enseignant de Paris vers 1311-14," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 3 (1933), 23-39; Glorieux, "Duns Scot et les Notabilia Cancellarii," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 24 (1931), 3-14.

⁵⁵ Vat. lat. 1086, f. 80ra: "Ideo alii aliter respondent, quod actus rectus est obiectum actus reflexi, ideo non oportet quod sit simul cum actu reflexu ..." In the margin: "m. Radulphus brito." In the first question of his vespers (Vat. lat. 1086, f. 156rb), Radulphus Brito makes the following remark: "dilectio et delectatio habent idem obiectum, sed rectus et reflexus habent diversa obiecta, nam obiectum reflexi est actus rectus, obiectum autem recti est res ipsa." This discussion was probably stimulated by Durand of St. Pourçain's argument that the enjoyment of God in the Beatific Vision is a reflexive act of knowing that one is enjoying God rather than the direct act of knowing God. Durand proposed this view in debate with Thomas Wilton at Paris in 1312-1313; see R. L. Friedman, "On the Trail of a Philosophical Debate: Durand of St. Pourçain vs. Thomas Wylton on Simultaneous Acts in the Intellect," forthcoming in *Philosophical Debates at the University of Paris in the Early Fourteenth Century*, ed. S. F. Brown, T. Dewender, and T. Kobusch, Studien und Texte (Leiden, 2006).

⁵⁶ Prosper gave his inception responses "in aula" on 1 March 1316 (Vat. lat. 1086, f. 294r).

in the year after he completed his reading at Paris, albeit with the help of a letter from John XXII to the chancellor.⁵⁷ It appears that Prosper was able to bypass the four-year waiting period and obtain the license in the year following his lectures on the *Sentences*.⁵⁸ He could not, however, have obtained a papal bull requesting the chancellor to grant him the license, since there was no one on the papal throne during the academic year 1315-1316. While it is possible that the view Prosper attributes to Radulphus Brito occurred in an earlier work, for example in his questions on the *Sentences*, the chronology of Radulphus Brito incepting early in 1314, Prosper reading the *Sentences* in 1314-1315 and incepting in March 1316, better accords with the biographical information we have for Prosper's contemporaries mentioned in his questions on the *Sentences*.⁵⁹

Under whom had Radulphus studied theology and been promoted? His work shows a favorable attitude toward Jean de Pouilly, to whose quodlibetal questions he directed his readers and with whom he shared the same position on the Immaculate Conception. The most likely promoter, however, is Alain Gontier, a prominent master of arts and theology at Paris, who was appointed bishop of St-Malo in 1317.⁶⁰ Gontier appears as one of the executors on the papal provisions to Radulphus in 1316 and 1319. Since neither his appointment to half the rectorship of Sommerey nor his canonical prebend at St-Pol-de-Léon came by way of papal provision, Gontier may have played a role in bringing Radulphus to the attention of the de Léon family, if he had not already

⁵⁷ CUP II, #772, p. 225. There is no known papal request in the case of Scotus.

⁵⁸ Many examples of papal intervention on behalf of Augustinian Hermits (Prosper's order), Franciscans, Dominicans, and Benedictines date to the pontificate of John XXII. In the absence of a pope, Prosper (or some influential person on his behalf) would have had to have petitioned the faculty of theology. Yet something like this must have occurred. To argue that Prosper read the *Sentences* at Paris in 1310-1311 and yet in that work cited doctors of theology who incepted after 1311 (e.g. Alain Gontier, Durand of St. Pourçain OP, Hugh de Novo Castro OFM, Thomas Wilton) makes no sense.

⁵⁹ The most likely place in Radulphus Brito's questions on the *Sentences* for the *rectus/reflexus* discussion to occur is in dist. 1, q. 2: "Utrum solo Deo sit fruendum" (Pavia 244, f. 18rb-18vb), but no such discussion appears there. If the issue was introduced in the debate between Durandus and Thomas Wilton in 1312-1313, and Prosper was aware in 1314-1315 of Radulphus' contribution to this debate, that again places Radulphus' licensing and inceptation in 1313-1314. I am grateful to Russell Friedman for helping contextualize and date this debate.

⁶⁰ It is possible that Alanus Gontier belonged to the same family as the Franciscan theologian, Aufredus Gontier.

made that contact in his home diocese. Pouilly and/or Radulphus' *Landsmann* Gontier, both of whom held burses at the Sorbonne, may have facilitated Radulphus' appointment as provisor of the Sorbonne. In turn, Radulphus may have been in a position, along with Gontier, to facilitate the academic career of another, younger, arts master from the diocese of St-Pol-de-Léon, Oliverius Salhadini, who went on to become a doctor of theology and later bishop of Nantes.⁶¹

The Ecclesiastical Benefices of Radulphus Brito

During Radulphus' years as a master of arts and theology, he was able to assemble an enviable income from ecclesiastical sources. The earliest of these may have been the half-rectorship of the parish church at Sommery, which as we have seen provided an income well above that of a normal parish church. By 1316, when he was regent master of theology at Paris, he also held a canonical prebend at one of the wealthier collegiate churches in northern France, St-Quentin in the diocese of Noyon.⁶² At that time he was seeking to add a cathedral prebend at Le Mans. By September 1319 he had obtained a canonical prebend in the cathedral chapter at St-Pol-de-Léon, was allowed to retain his expectation at Le Mans, and in addition received an expectation of a prebend at the cathedral of Beauvais.⁶³ While his actual ecclesiastical income in 1319 came only from Sommery and St-Pol-de-Léon, the additional expectations reveal a person high in papal favor, probably through the patronage of others.⁶⁴ The most likely patrons were Hervé de Léon and Alain Gontier.

To gain a sense of the significance of such a beneficial career for a Parisian master, we might compare it to that of the most prominent master of arts at Paris in the second quarter of the fourteenth century, albeit one who did not pursue studies in theology, Jean Buridan. Across a thirty-year career Buridan was never able to obtain ecclesiastical

⁶¹ On Oliverius Salhadini see Courtenay, *Parisian Scholars*, pp. 194-95.

⁶² *Rot. Par.* I, p. 32. In 1362 there were 71 prebends at St-Quentin, each with a value of 40 pounds, in addition to three dignities and 42 chaplains; see *Recueil des historiens de la France. Pouillés*, vol. 6: *Pouillés de la Province de Reims*, ed. A. Longnon (Paris, 1908), pp. 195-96.

⁶³ *LC Jean XXII*, #10344.

⁶⁴ It was rare for a university master to be allowed to retain two expectations. Moreover, the usual pattern was for any new appointment to result in the resignation of a position presently held.

income beyond the rectorship of a parish church in the diocese of Arras, the custodianship in the collegiate church of St-Sauveur at St-Pol-sur-Ternoise, and a chaplaincy at St-André-des-ars in Paris, which he obtained through the university toward the end of his career.⁶⁵ By contrast, of the twenty-one masters with less seniority listed after Buridan in the supplication of the Picard nation in 1349, eight already held canonical prebends or dignities in collegiate churches.⁶⁶ Several of them, like Buridan, had served one or more terms as rector of the university, but none indicate study in any higher faculty. If intellectual achievement and prominence within the university community were the means for obtaining outside ecclesiastical income, Buridan should have matched or exceeded his peers in the Picard nation. The fact that he did not reveals that other factors, such as family background or personal connections, were more significant. Radulphus Brito's career follows this second pattern, where prominence in the university was matched by personal associations that provided him access to ecclesiastical positions. The fact that Radulphus studied theology and became a regent master in that faculty simply improved his access to those sources. Whatever the route, Radulphus was clearly successful inside and outside the university context.

Radulphus Brito and the Collège de Sorbonne

The property Radulphus rented in 1315 was located on one of the wealthier streets in the Latin Quarter, rue du Cloître-de-St-Benoît, in which the Collège de Sorbonne owned several houses. This was a closed or gated street that ran from the church of St-Benoît-le-Bestourné north to the rue des Thermes, between the Grande rue St-Jacques and rue de Sorbonne. At one time or another between 1315 and 1330 that street and the adjacent rue de Sorbonne were home to some of the leading masters and churchmen in Paris, including Amanevus de Ramaforti, cantor of Langres, Johannes de Maiori Monasterio, doctor of theology, Johannes de Villa Rosa, doctor of canon law, Nicolaus de Vienna (Vienne, on the

⁶⁵ W. J. Courtenay, "Philosophy's Reward: The Ecclesiastical Income of Jean Buridan," *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales*, 68 (2001), 163-169. Buridan obtained an expectation of a canonical prebend at the cathedral of Arras in 1341, which apparently was never realized, and unlike the way Radulphus' expectations were treated, Buridan was required to resign his sinecure at St-Sauveur if and when he obtained a prebend at Arras.

⁶⁶ *Rot. Par.* I, pp. 424-31.

Rhône), Marsilius de Padua and Johannes de Genduno (Jandun), masters of arts, Robertus de Bardis, theologian and later chancellor of Notre-Dame, and for a year in 1329-1330 Richard Fitzralph and John Northwode, nephew of John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter. Like several of the houses on the western side of the cloister, the one Radulphus rented for 14 pounds per year was large, multi-storied, and ran through to the rue de Sorbonne on the back side. As far as we know he retained his residence there throughout his years as provisor.

The dates for Radulphus Brito's time in office as provisor of the Sorbonne are invariably given as 1315-1320. But these dates are based on Alfred Franklin's edition of the *Catalogus Provisorum* contained in an eighteenth-century manuscript that purports to be based on an earlier record from the Sorbonne.⁶⁷ That manuscript is inaccurate in numerous respects, not the least of which is its listing a Hannibaldus and Annibaldus de Ceccano as separate individuals, and placing the provisorate of Petrus de Croso ("1327-1361") before that of "Clemens papa, cum praecedente eligitur") and "Annibaldus de Ceccano, cum praecedentibus provisor, moritur 1350." All that is certain is that Radulphus became provisor of the Sorbonne at some point between June 1312 (the date of the last document in which the previous provisor, Johannes de Vallibus, is mentioned) and June 1315 (the date of the first document mentioning Radulphus as provisor).⁶⁸ Similarly, the date for the end of Radulphus' provisorate falls between 1319 (the date of the last document in which he is mentioned as provisor) and 1321 (the date of the first document in which Annibaldus is mentioned as provisor).⁶⁹

The provisor was the administrative head of the college, whose major responsibilities were to represent the college in official matters and to oversee the acquisition and leasing of properties belonging to the college. He was appointed to that position by an electoral committee composed initially of the archdeacon and chancellor of Notre-Dame, regent masters

⁶⁷ A. Franklin, *La Sorbonne* (Paris, 1875), 221-231, transcribed from Paris, Bibl. Arsenal, ms 1228, f. 336r, sqq. The dates for the provisorate of Radulphus Brito is on f. 338, and in Franklin on p. 224: "nominatus 1315, moritur 1320."

⁶⁸ Both documents have been edited in P. Glorieux, *Les origines de la Sorbonne*, vol. II: *Le cartulaire* (Paris, 1965), #414, pp. 525-529, and #416, pp. 531-535. Glorieux, *Les origines*, I, p. 129, claims that Jean de Vallibus is last attested as provisor of the Sorbonne in a document of December 1312, but the only documents of 1312 edited by Glorieux that mention Jean de Vallibus date to April and June; see Glorieux, *Les origines*, II, #413 and #414, pp. 522-529.

⁶⁹ Glorieux, *Les origines* I, #19, p. 213, and #22, p. 214.

in theology, the deans of the faculties of canon law and medicine, the rector of the university, and the procurators of the four nations in the faculty of arts.⁷⁰ The day-to-day running of the college was handled by the prior, who was elected annually, and two procurators, who assisted the prior and the provisor in their official tasks. After the death of the founder and first provisor, Robert de Sorbon, in 1274, the provisor was selected not from among the fellows of the college but from among masters of arts with no known previous connection to the college, yet who held an important ecclesiastical position in Paris and who was well-enough connected in the university and Parisian communities to be of use in defending and advancing the interests of the college. The first successor as provisor was Guillaume de Montmorency, who was a master, presumably of arts, and archpriest of the church of St-Séverin on the left bank in Paris.⁷¹ His successor, Pierre de Villepreux, was dean of the chapter of the collegiate church of St-Marcel in Paris and had been chaplain to the bishop of Paris, Étienne Tempier.⁷² The same pattern can be seen in the third successor to Robert de Sorbon, Jean de Vallibus, who as provisor continued to hold the position of rector of the church of St-Eustache on the right bank in Paris.⁷³

The appointment of Radulphus Brito as provisor of the Sorbonne followed much the same pattern: a master of arts with no known previous connection to the college, who held a canonical prebend in an important collegiate church in northern France, albeit not in the Paris region, and who was respected in the university community. Brito had the additional qualification that he was a regent master of theology and may have studied theology under Alain Gontier, a master from Brittany, who was a fellow of the Sorbonne at the time Radulphus Brito was appointed.⁷⁴ As was suggested earlier, Brito may also have received support from another

⁷⁰ Glorieux, *Sorb.* I, pp. 118-119, II, pp. 314-315.

⁷¹ Glorieux, *Sorb.* I, pp. 118-124. Glorieux, p. 119, speculated on whether this Guillaume de Montmorency might have been connected to the Montmorency family prominent in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

⁷² Glorieux, *Sorb.* I, pp. 124-129.

⁷³ Glorieux, *Sorb.* I, pp. 129-133.

⁷⁴ Alanus Gontier came from the diocese of Quimper in the western part of Brittany and incepted as master of theology, probably in the middle of the 1309-1310 academic year. He was among the regent masters of theology in April 1310 who signed the declaration against Marguerite Porete. He was not only a regent master in theology from Radulphus' region, but he was one of the productive and prominent masters at Paris at this time.

fellow of the Sorbonne and regent master in theology, Jean de Pouilly, with whom Brito shared an opposition to belief in the Immaculate Conception and whose Quodlibetal questions Brito recommended in his own lectures on the *Sentences*.⁷⁵ By 1315 Alain Gontier, Jean de Pouilly, and Radulphus Brito all held canonical prebends in the collegiate church at St-Quentin in the diocese of Noyon.⁷⁶ A further influential connection with the Sorbonne may have come through the wife of Hervé VI de Léon, Jeanne de Montmorency, whose family may have included the earlier provisor of the Sorbonne, Guillaume de Montmorency. If previous provisors, with the exception of Robert de Sorbon himself, are not known to have studied or become masters in theology, Radulphus Brito may have been the first provisor after the founder with this particular qualification to head a college composed of theologians.⁷⁷

It has been presumed, on the basis of the *Catalogus Provisorum* referred to above, that this first generation of provisors died in office, including Radulphus Brito. That may well have been the case, but it is not certain. The statutes provide for a change of provisor, apart from death, and the two provisors after Radulphus Brito, Annibaldus de Ceccano and Petrus Rogerii (later pope Clement VI), resigned that office: Ceccano when he became a cardinal, and Pierre Roger while archbishop of Rouen and two years before being appointed cardinal. The following provisor, Petrus de Croso, apparently continued as provisor after being appointed cardinal. Since death was not necessarily the reason for the election of a new provisor, what might have ended Radulphus' term as provisor other than death?

The reason was not, as it was for Ceccano and Roger, the entry into high ecclesiastical office with increased responsibilities and residence away from Paris. There is no evidence that Radulphus Brito obtained any office beyond those he already held in 1319. On the other hand, the end of his term as provisor coincides with a major shift in the type of person chosen to lead the Sorbonne. Ceccano, Roger, and Croso were all noble and came from powerful families. Annibaldus de Ceccano was not only a doctor of theology but also the nephew of cardinal Jacobus

⁷⁵ Pavia, Bibl. Univ. 244, f. 45v: "Istam questionem require in Quolibet I mag. Johannis de Poliacio."

⁷⁶ For Radulphus' prebend, see *Rot. Par.* I, p. 32. Alain Gontier held a prebend at St-Quentin by 1308; see *CUP* II, #671, p. 135. According to Denifle, *CUP* II, p. 124n, Jean de Pouilly also held a prebend at St-Quentin-en-Yvernois by 1307.

⁷⁷ This is a point made earlier by Glorieux, *Sorb.* I, p. 133.

Caietanus Stephanescis and related to the family of Boniface VIII. Pierre Roger came from an important noble family in the Limousin, and at the time of his appointment as provisor he was already abbot of Fécamp, an advisor to the king of France, and soon to be bishop of Arras (1328). He continued to hold the office of provisor while serving as archbishop of Sens (1329) and archbishop of Rouen (1330). Petrus de Croso was a nephew of Roger, who made him a fellow of the Sorbonne, vice-provisor, then provisor. Thus the end of Radulphus Brito's time as provisor of the Sorbonne marked a shift to an entirely different type of provisor. With a change in papal policy under John XXII that allowed the University of Paris and its colleges to supplicate the pope directly for benefice support, the advantages of having a provisor closely involved with papal administration was of considerable advantage to the college.⁷⁸

It is possible, therefore, that Radulphus Brito was eased out of the office of provisor in order to appoint someone who could better serve the larger needs of the college and its members. But if that is the case, where did he go? The only mention of a Radulphus Brito after 1320 is in the accounts of the financial collection of the university in 1329-1330. As mentioned earlier, that record lists a Rodulphus Brito and six *socii*, presumably students, living as a group in the rue du Four, and also a Raulfus Brito in the rue St-Hilaire, both locations near the schools of canon law.⁷⁹ The first of these bears the title "dominus," which could imply noble status but in university records is usually the designation of someone who holds an ecclesiastical position, which Radulphus Brito certainly did. It is more likely, however, that the "dominus Rodulphus Brito" of 1329-1330 is Radulphus de Insula, master of arts by 1328 and canon with expectation of prebend at St-Pol-de-Léon in 1328.⁸⁰ It is possible that Radulphus Brito resigned as provisor and moved his place of residence, but what would explain such a move? Although he received considerable additional income from the estate of his uncle in 1317, he is not known to have received any further ecclesiastical positions, and the records of the University of Paris are silent on him

⁷⁸ On the origins of university *rotuli* of supplication, see the introduction to *Rot. Par.* I, pp. 17-19.

⁷⁹ Courtenay, *Parisian Scholars*, pp. 209-10, 227, 228.

⁸⁰ His appointment to the chapter of St-Pol-de-Léon in October 1328 was in response to a university supplication (*Rot. Par.* I, p. 47), to which was added an expectation of a benefice from the archbishop, dean, or chapter of Sens in February 1331, again in response to a university supplication (*Rot. Par.* I, pp. 58, 60).

after 1320, apart from these two persons of similar name who appear in the *computus* of 1329-1330.⁸¹

On balance, then, it is likely that Radulphus Brito died in or around 1320. Several houses owned by the Sorbonne in the Cloître de St-Benoît that were near to or identical with the one occupied by Brito received new tenants between 1320 and 1324, suggesting that 1320 or 1321 may well be the date for Brito's death.⁸²

The known facts for Radulphus Brito, then, fit together into a consistent picture. He came from the village of Ploudiry in the arrondissement of Brest, in the northwest corner of Brittany. He is also called Radulphus Reginaldi in the 1316 provision, which means Reginaldus was his father's name. There is no indication that he was of noble birth, but the fact that he was able to secure one of the fifteen canonical prebends in the cathedral chapter at St-Pol-de-Léon suggests that his family background and/or his association with persons of influence was not insignificant. Thanks to the new evidence uncovered by M. Deuffic, we know that his uncle, Hervé Even Daniel, was a prominent citizen and property owner in Paris, and it is likely that Hervé's household was the first place of residence for his young nephew upon coming to Paris for his studies in the faculty of arts. If Radulphus' career followed a normal pattern without undue interruption, the date of his *Sentences* commentary (probably 1308-1309) and datable references to him would mean that he began the study of theology by 1299 and incepted as master in 1313-1314. The date on the Erfurt manuscript of Radulphus' *Quaestiones super libros Topicorum* confirms that he became a master of arts at Paris before 1295. That places his date of birth around 1270, certainly no later than 1273.

Not long after obtaining the doctorate in theology, Radulphus Brito was appointed provisor of the Sorbonne and continued teaching as a

⁸¹ Positions for which Radulphus Brito was qualified by reason of academic achievement, membership in the cathedral chapter, and having the support of the most important noble family in the region, were cathedral dignities in the chapter, or even bishop of St-Pol-de-Léon. Although the few records that survive for the cathedral of St-Pol-de-Léon for this period are silent on the officers of the chapter immediately after 1319, the office of bishop was occupied, first by Guillelmus [de Kersaeson?] (1317-1327) and then by Petrus Bernardi (1328-1332); see *LC Jean XXII*, #2915, 17841; P. Gams, *Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae* (Regensburg, 1873), p. 622; Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevi*, vol. I (Münster, 1898), p. 315.

⁸² Glorieux, *Sorb.* II, #421, pp. 541-43; #423, pp. 544-47.

regent master in theology. He was among the seven doctors of theology, presumably all regents at the time, who received provisions as a result of the first rotulus of the University of Paris in November 1316.⁸³ Five of the seven, Galterus de Auxiac, Raynerius Alemanni, Thomas Wilton, Johannes de Blangiac, and Radulphus Brito were also connected with the Sorbonne. Beyond 1319 we have no firm evidence concerning Radulphus, possibly because he may have died soon thereafter. He would have been only around 50 at that time, not unusual in that age but young for a university master, many of whom lived into their 50s and 60s. In any event, in theology and more especially in philosophy, he had achieved a large body of philosophical work that was preserved and studied by later generations.

⁸³ *Rot. Par.* I, pp. 31-33.