The scholars of the generations of secular masters of theology that succeeded Henry of Ghent and Godfrey of Fontaines at the University of Paris were not of the same stature. Nevertheless, several left written *quodlibeta*, including those recorded in the compilations of Nicholas of Bar and Prosper of Reggio Emilia, other fragmentary collections of *quodlibeta* or those contained in single witnesses—notably by John Lesage and Francis Caracciolo—and, most significantly, the back-to-back *quodlibeta* of a succession of important secular masters dating sequentially from 1296 to 1316: Peter of Auvergne (1296–1301), Thomas of Bailly (1301–06), John of Pouilly (1307–12), and Thomas Wylton (master from ca. 1312, *Quodlibet* from 1315 or 1316). Thomas of Bailly’s six efforts from the academic years 1301–02 to 1306–07 have been critically edited by Glorieux himself. Since they are readily available, they will not be treated here. In contrast, the *quodlibeta* of the more influential scholars Peter of Auvergne, John of Pouilly, and Thomas Wylton circulated more widely and had a greater impact on contemporary Parisian theology, yet they are for the most part unedited, except for the piecemeal publication of Wylton’s questions. Thus they each receive separate attention in this volume.¹ This chapter concerns Peter of Auvergne’s six *Quodlibeta* and

¹ Besides the edition of Bailly’s *Quodlibeta* in *Thomas de Bailly. Quodlibets*, ed. P. Glorieux (Textes philosophiques du Moyen Age, 9) (Paris 1960), Glorieux also edited Lesage’s in *Jacques de Thérines Quodlibets I et II. Jean Lesage Quodlibet I*, ed. P. Glorieux (Textes philosophiques du Moyen Age, 7) (Paris 1958), pp. 327–50. For Pouilly and Wylton, see the chapters by L. Hödl and C. Trifogli, respectively, below. On Nicholas’ collection, see S. Piron’s chapter in this volume. Prosper’s collection in BA, Vat. lat. 1086, which W.J. Courtenay discusses in a chapter in this volume, includes summaries of quodlibetal questions by the secular masters Alain Gontier, Henry Amandi, and Radulphus Brito. Glorieux’s Anonymous XIX, XXI, and XXII (Glorieux II, pp. 299–301), from BA, Vat. lat. 932, have been dated ca. 1310 and assigned to Francis Caracciolo, the latter
will focus on basic issues, rather than doctrine. Its aim is to facilitate and encourage further editing work.

*The Dating, Composition, and Contents of Peter of Auvergne’s* Quodlibeta

Peter of Auvergne had been a rather prolific and influential Parisian arts master for a quarter of a century before he took over one of the chairs in theology reserved for canons of Notre-Dame as a secular master in 1296. His numerous Aristotelian commentaries have long drawn the attention of historians of virtually every aspect of medieval philosophy. Perhaps the sheer number of his surviving works has obscured the importance of what is—besides a small fragment of his *Sentences* commentary[^2]—his only surviving theological work, his *Quodlibeta*, although attention to these last has not been completely lacking[^3]. Nevertheless, they deserve more, since the *Quodlibeta* circulated widely and are among the last things he wrote in his long career. Indeed, since *Quodlibeta* by nature can touch on just about any subject, Peter of Auvergne’s forays into the genre offer historians of medieval thought not only his theological opinions on a wide spectrum of issues, but also his final say on a great variety of topics that he had already treated in his Aristotelian commentaries. Anyone interested in his earlier opinions should there-

[^2]: Nine somewhat brief questions from the early sections of book I, preserved among questions from other theologians in the first few folios of Bologna, Archiginnasio A. 913; see V. Doucet, *Commentaires sur les Sentences. Supplément au répertoire de M. Frédéric Stegmüller* (Florence 1954), pp. 65 and 90–9. The questions are as follows: 1: *Quid est <theologiae> subiectum, utrum videlicet Deus aut non* (f. 1ra–v); 2: *Utrum theologìa sit practica vel speculativa* (3va–b); 3: *Utrum theologìa subalternet sibi alias scientias et subalternetur scientiae beatorum* (4va–b); 4: *Utrum Deus sit unus* (5rb–va); 5: *Utrum in divinis sit pluralitas personarum* (6vb); 6: *Utrum ex creaturis possit haberi cognitio de Deo* (7rb); 7: *Utrum Deum esse sit per se notum* (8ra–b); 8: *Utrum potentiae animae sint idem quod animae essentia* (8va–b); 9: *Utrum essentialia generet* (12ra–b).

[^3]: For the works of and about Peter of Auvergne, see G. Galle, “A Comprehensive Bibliography on Peter of Auvergne,” *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 42 (2000), pp. 53–79 (pp. 64–5 on the *Quodlibeta*), and the “Supplement” in vol. 47 (2005), pp. 87–96 (p. 89 on the *Quodlibeta*).