

**RAYMOND MACKEN**

## **HENRY OF GHENT AS DEFENDER OF HUMAN HEROISM \***

To scholars having some knowledge of the history of philosophy, it is not necessary to introduce the celebrated medieval thinker Henry of Ghent. His Complete Works are being edited by the Catholic University of Leuven in ca. 46 volumes, (13 of them have already appeared). Scholars in other disciplines than philosophy, are also philosophers in the sense of searchers of truth: the message of a renowned thinker of the Western Middle Ages will without doubt interest them. Henry of Ghent was an illustrious professor in the University of Paris in the last quarter of the 13th century, who legated us a highly respected and very extensive whole of works, solidly rooted in the Platonic-Augustinian current, in which have stood a secular chain of many brilliant minds.

I let now directly speak Henry of Ghent to this sympathetic public. In the last question of his 15th quodlibetic dispute he had to answer a question about human magnanimity, or in more modern terms, human heroism. In order to highlight the importance of this extensive and rich exposition by Henry we must add that it was not only the last question of his *Quodlibet XV*, but that this *Quodlibet XV* was also the last quodlibetic dispute Henry held as master of theology in the University of Paris in the Christmas time of 1291 or in the Easter time of 1292<sup>1</sup>. In 1293 Henry died<sup>2</sup>. To those being familiar

---

\* This study has been presented at the Sixth Biennial Meeting of the International Society for the Study of Ultimate Reality and Meaning, August 21-24, 1991, Scarborough Campus, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. HENRICI DE GANDAVO *Quodlibet I*. Ed. R. MACKEN (HENR. DE GAND. *Opera Omnia*, V), Leuven University Press-E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1979, p. XVII.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *op. cit.*, p. XII.

with Henry's works this last quodlibetic exposition of an unbroken mind, after a public service on a high position during so many years, with his vigorous defence of human magnanimity, expressed some of the convictions which were very dear to him, and remembers us of the adage which Mgr Baunard, after a whole life of public service, put in evidence in such a moving way in his book *Le vieillard* ("The old Man"): "The last words are the true words" <sup>3</sup>. It remembers us also the title of the last choral of Johann Sebastian Bach composed after a long and successful career: "Vor deinem Thron tret' ich hiermit" ("Before Thy Throne I advance me with this Choral").

### **This exposition of Henry as a medieval university quodlibetic question**

Indeed the medieval thinker treated here, Henry of Ghent, as Martin Grabmann has well put in evidence, was a master of the medieval university writings called "Quodlibets" <sup>4</sup>. They were the redaction resulting from a university practice, whereby each member of the audience could directly ask questions to a master of theology, actually in function, but normally he had to add to his question arguments in the two senses of a possible answer. Two consecutive days were foreseen for a quodlibetic dispute, and the organisation of this oral quodlibetic dispute by the master of theology with his helpers was far more complicated than the redaction of the final text edited afterwards. In this study we will limit ourselves to this quodlibetic question in the ultimate redaction of the master. There these pro's and con's<sup>5</sup> appear at the beginning of the question, introducing for the reader the proposed question with its actuality and its backgrounds. They were immediately followed by the 'body of the question', also called 'the solution'<sup>6</sup>, where the master of theology gave his personal answer to the question. Then the master of theology proceeded to judge the arguments in either

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Mgr. BAUNARD, *Le vieillard (La vie montante. Pensées du soir)*, p. 42-43.

<sup>4</sup> M. GRABMANN, *Bernhard von Auvergne, O.P. (nach 1304), ein Interpret und Verteidiger der Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquino aus alter Zeit*, in *Divus Thomas*, Freiburg/Schweiz, 10 (1932), p. 34. GRABMANN expressed it in this way: "Die *Quodlibeta* des Doctor Sollemnis" (Henry's well-known title of honour since the Middle Ages), "wohl das wertvollste Quodlibetalienwerk der Scholastik, ist für ein tieferes geschichtliches Verständnis der innern Lehrgegensätze zwischen dem Augustinismus und dem thomistischen Aristotelismus des XIII. Jahrhunderts eine überaus wichtige, bisher nicht genügend ausgeschöpfte Quelle".

<sup>5</sup> "Argumenta pro et contra".

<sup>6</sup> "Corpus quaestionis", also called "Solutio".

direction. This judgment on the arguments could sometimes be very extensive, and enrich substantially our knowledge of the question<sup>7</sup>. We will follow these three parts, so that the contemporary searcher of truth reads not only Henry's answer, but also feels something of the richness of the oral dispute as it has been really held, of the conflicting opinions of several scholars. "Du choc des idées jaillit la lumière" ("From the shock of the ideas the light springs up"), wrote the French thinker Victor de la Montaigne.

### The concrete question, and the arguments in the two senses

First, the argument against the thesis of Henry of Ghent is given. "That a soldier who precipitates himself alone into the army of the enemies, does not a work of magnanimity, is proved in the following way. When he had fled from the enemy, he would have done a good work by saving his own life, but he has behaved badly by precipitating himself into the enemies, with the unique effect that he is killed. But recently, while the Saracen enemies destroyed the city of Acres, those who fled from them, did well by saving their life, and therefore this soldier, who, while the others fled, precipitated himself alone into the Saracens and was killed, acted badly. Indeed such a deed is not a work of magnanimity: magnanimity is a virtue, and according to Augustine, "we cannot apply a virtue to a bad use, nor to execute a bad work". Therefore, etc"<sup>8</sup>.

Then follows the argument in favour of the position Henry will defend: "In the contrary, it is written in the last chapter of the Canticle of Canticles: "Love is strong as death". This is quoted here because the person who loves profoundly, exposes him — or herself to the danger of death for the beloved person. That is a work of magnanimity. In this way this soldier who has precipitated himself into the enemies, by sacrificing his life for his friends in faith and charity, executed a work of the highest charity, and therefore of the

---

<sup>7</sup> "Ad argumenta".

<sup>8</sup> "*Circa quartum et ultimum arguitur quod miles praevolans in exercitum hostium, non facit opus magnanimitatis, sic. Ubi fugiens bene facit, vitam suam salvans, male facit in hostes irruens, ut occidatur. Sed nuper, Sarracenis, hostibus Christianorum, devastantibus civitatem Acconensem, bene fecerunt qui fugerunt, vitam suam salvantes. Ergo miles ille qui, aliis fugientibus, in exercitum Sarracenorum irruit praevolans et occisus est, male fecit. Sed factum malum non est opus magnanimitatis: cum magnanimitas virtus sit, et, secundum Augustinum, "virtutibus non contingit male uti, neque ad agendum malum opus". Ergo etc.*" (HENRICI DE GANDAVO *Quodlibet* XV, q. 16, (ed. 1518,) f. 594rP-vP. Because the critical edition of this *Quodlibet* has not yet appeared, we quote for this study the edition of the humanistic printer Badius, Paris, 1518.

highest virtue in human deeds, which is the magnanimity”, also called the heroism <sup>9</sup>.

### **An explanation of the case which has provoked this question**

Indeed, as Henry explains, on May 10, 1291, the sultan of Egypt, Kalaoun, had taken and destroyed the principal bastion of the Frankish domination in the Near East: Saint-John of Acre. Pope Nicholas IV exhorted to the Crusade. The causes of the disaster were heavily disputed. Had the population shown enough of the self-denial and the spirit of sacrifice which could have forced the victory? Had it not too rapidly followed the counsels of prudence, by abandoning this Christian territory to the enemy? One cited, it is true, the example of a knight who had precipitated himself into the ranks of the hostile Saracen army, with the effect to find there a certain death, while all the other Franks tried to fly from the catastrophe, but was it really a deed of heroism? Was it not more to blame as an imprudent foolishness or a reprehensible suicide? That is the question which was put to Henry of Ghent <sup>10</sup>.

### **Henry places the question in a larger framework: the question of the just war <sup>11</sup>**

For Henry this is an occasion to expose his doctrine on the just war. “A war is just”, he claims, “when it is the unique means which is left to us in order

<sup>9</sup> *“Contra est quod scribitur Cantici ultimo, “Fortis est ut mors dilectio”. Et hoc ideo, quia zelanter diligens pro dilecto in necessitatis articulo mortem contemnit et illi se exponit, quod est opus magnanimitatis. Talis est ille miles praevolans, ponendo animam suam pro amicis suis in fide et caritate, quod est opus maximae caritatis, et ideo maximae virtutis in agibilibus, quae consistit in magnanimitate. Ergo etc.” (ibid., f. 594v).*

<sup>10</sup> *“...ista quaestio tangit, et in exemplum proponit, captionem, subversionem atque destructionem civitatis Acconensis atque Christianorum et incolarum eiusdem. De quibus mentionem facit dominus papa in littera exhortatoria, ... sic inquit: “Civitas Acconensis quadraginta quattuor diebus arctissima Babylonicae potentiae obsidione circumdata, terribilibus machinis die noctuque vexata, impetita crebris et durissimis insultibus, moenibus perviis et per cuniculos occultos excisis, quadragesima quarta die obsidentium viribus, Dei permissione mirabili et stupenda, succubuit, capta per eos et igni exposita, Christicolis inibi existentibus caesis innumeris, et ceteris, qui habere nequiverunt ad maritima vasa succursum, in captivitate abductis. Quae quidem facta narrantur anno Domini 1291<sup>o</sup>, 10<sup>a</sup> die mensis Maii.” (ibid., f. 594vP). Cf. also G. DE LAGARDE, *La philosophie sociale ...*, p. 85-86.*

<sup>11</sup> Cf. for the history of the doctrine on the just war: R.H.W. REGOUT, *La doctrine de la guerre juste de Saint Augustin à nos jours d’après les théologiens et les canonistes*

to retake things from which we have been unjustly robbed, or to repel enemies who unjustly attack our life, our country, our freedom, our laws". As Augustine claims in his book of the Questions", Henry says, "just wars can be defined as those wars which avenge injustice. In this way we ought to attack by a just war a nation or a city, which has neglected to avenge what its subjects have done unjustly against us, or to retribute what has been robbed from us by injuries. But", as says Augustine in his work against the Manichees, "the cupidity of damaging, the crudelity of avenging, the implacable mind, the ferocity of fighting, the lust for domination, and things of the same kind, these are the practices which in the wars are justly accused" <sup>12</sup>.

---

*catholiques* (réimpression de l'édition de Paris 1934), Scientia Verlag Aalen 1974. A brief resumen of the thesis of Henry in this question is given on the pp. 77-79.

- <sup>12</sup> "... in qua civitate, ut aestimo, congregati erant non tantum populares, sed etiam praelati et principes. Idcirco quaestionem paulo altius sublevando, bellorum celebritatem paulo altius quam quaestio proponat, exsequamur, dicendo imprimis cum Tullio, in libro P. De officiis sic dicente: "In re publica maxime conservanda sunt iura belli. Nam cum sint duo genera decertandi, unum per disceptationem, alterum per vim, cumque illud proprium sit hominum, hoc beluarum, confugiendum ad posterius, si uti non licet superiori. Et sic illi qui potest ius suum iam habitum retinere, aut amissum sive nondum habitum recuperare, non licet pro illo bellum constituere. Quare", ut idem prosequitur continuo, "suscipienda quidem sunt bella ob eam causam, ut sine iniuria in pace vivatur." Et ut dicit Augustinus in epistola ad Bonifatium comitem, "Bellum debet esse necessitatis, ut liberet Deus de necessitate et conservet in pace. Non enim quaeritur pax ut bellum exerceatur, sed bellum geritur ut pax acquiratur. Esto ergo bellando pacificus, ut eos quos expugnas, ad pacis utilitatem vincendo perducas, ita ut hostem pugnans necessitas deprimat, non voluntas. Sicut bellanti et resistenti violentia redditur, ita capto misericordia iam debetur, maxime in quo pacis perturbatio non timetur." Quod Tullius per alia verba continuo dicit, ubi supra: "Parta autem victoria, conservandi sunt ii qui non crudeles nec immanes fuerunt. Mea quidem sententia, paci quae nihil habet insidiarum, semper consulendum est. Tum ii qui, armis positus, ad imperatorum fidem confugient, quamvis murum aries percusserit, recipiendi sunt. Ex quo", ut dicit Tullius, paucis interpositis, "intelligi potest nullum bellum esse iustum, nisi quod aut, rebus repetitis, geratur, aut denuntiatur ante sit et indictum." De quo dicit Isidorus in Etymologia: "Iustum est bellum, quod ex edicto de rebus repetendis geritur, aut propulsandorum hostium causa." Et Augustinus in libro Quaestionum: "Iusta bella solent definiri, quae ulciscuntur iniurias. Sic gens vel civitas petenda est, quae vel vindicare neglexerit quod a suis improbe factum est, vel reddere quod per iniurias ablatum est." "Sed", ut dicit Augustinus contra Manichaeos, "nocendi cupiditas, ulciscendi crudelitas, implacatus atque implacabilis animus, feritas debellandi, libido dominandi, et si qua similia, haec sunt quae in bellis iure culpantur." Et ut sequitur ibidem post pauca, "ordo ille naturaliter mortalium paci accommodatus, hoc postulat, ut suscipiendi belli auctoritas atque consilium apud principes sit." Sed, ut ait Tullius, ubi supra, in capitulo de fortitudine, "ea animi elatio quae cernitur in periculis et laboribus, si

"Therefore we must take care", says Henry, "that the war is really just. Indeed", and here he quotes Cicero in his 1st book on the Duties, "there are two kinds of fighting: one by discussion, the other by violence. The first way is proper to the humans, the second to the beasts. We may only take our refuge to the second, when we are impeached to obtain our right by the first. In other terms, wars may only be made with the aim that there can be lived in peace." And, says Henry, "as Augustine says in a letter to the count Bonifatius, "a war must be provoked by necessity, with the aim that the Lord liberates us of that necessity and maintains us in peace. Indeed we must not search peace in order to have chance to make war, but we may only make war in order to acquire the peace. Therefore, o count, be pacific in your way of fighting, with the aim to bring the persons against whom you make war, by defeating them, to the useful habit of maintaining the peace, so that only the necessity brings down this fiend against whom you have undertaken a war, not your wish of fighting. As long as this enemy continues fighting and resisting, the struggle must go on, but to the captured enemy mercy must be given, and surely, when from his part a new perturbation of the peace must not be expected".

"For such aim, imposed by a strict necessity", says Henry, "we have the duty to constitute and to maintain in the republic an army". Here again he quotes Cicero, who says in the first book on the Duties: "The right and the readiness of the republic for instituting wars must be preserved with the greatest care." Further on in this same question, Henry will propose to us a complete theory of the legitimacy and usefulness of a regular and well-trained army <sup>13</sup>.

### **After having placed the proposed question in a larger framework, Henry gives now his judgment on it**

#### *Two kinds of just war*

As usual, before answering the question, Henry places it in a larger framework. This he had already done here by placing the proposed question

---

iustitia vacat pugnatque non pro salute communi, sed propriis commodis, in vitio est. Non enim modo id virtutis non est, sed potius immanitatis omnem humanitatem repellentis." (HENR. DE GAND. *Quodl.* XV, q. 16, (ed. 1518,) f. 594vP-Q).

<sup>13</sup> "Ut autem descendamus ad propositum, de bello justo est distinguendum, quia aut est ad recuperandum bona iniuste ablata, de quo nihil ad praesens; aut est ad repellendum iniuriam qua nituntur hostes bello bona auferre, puta vitam, patriam, libertatem, leges, et cetera bona, sive spiritualia, quale bellum instruxerunt Sarraceni contra Acconenses. In

in the larger context of the doctrine of the just war. But before pronouncing his judgment, he esteems necessary to localize it also in one of the two kinds of just war, briefly mentioned above. "In order to return now to the exact question as it was proposed", he says, "we must still distinguish the just war in two kinds. In the first kind the just war is undertaken against the enemy in order to regain goods of which have been unjustly deprived; but of this kind of just war we will not speak here. The second kind is the just war, undertaken in order to repel the unjust war by which the enemies try to take away from us such goods as the life, the country, the freedom, the laws, and still other goods, namely in this case spiritual goods. The latter was inflicted by the Saracens on the inhabitants of Acre, in which the knight on whom our question is proposed, has lost his life. By precipitating himself alone on the Saracens, he has performed a deed of magnanimity."

It is interesting to observe that the context in which Henry deals with the question exceeds the one of a strict religious war. Indeed he also mentions as motive for a just war the defense of other goods, such as: the life of the inhabitants of a territory; the country, in other terms a patriotic aim, often recurring in medieval wars; freedom, against despotism; the laws of the country. He bases himself for this large treatment of just wars on the ancient thinkers, the Holy Writ, the Fathers of the Church, and without doubt also on the authors of his time, whom he did not ignore, although, according to the use of the scholastic writers of that period, he does not quote them by their name.

*How can we define the virtue of magnanimity, so that we can judge if the deed of our knight is really characterized by it?*

After having introduced these preliminary distinctions, Henry still esteems necessary to give a more precise definition of the "magnanimity", also called "heroism", seen as a subdivision of the virtue of fortitude.

"Let us first", he claims, "consider the magnanimity in itself, and say that it is a subdivision of the virtue of fortitude, namely the special virtue which concerns great and difficult works. Aristotle says of it in the IVth book of his Ethics: "The magnanimity, as is indicated by its name, concerns great things. But not each great work which belongs by its kind to the virtue of fortitude, is a work of fortitude, but only when this great work is performed by the habit of virtue, not by a certain presumption or a cupidity. Indeed the

---

*quo mortuus est miles de quo quaestio nostra proposita est, utrum irruendo praevolanter in Sarracenos, fecit opus magnanimitatis." (ibid., f. 594vR).*

magnanimity is a subdivision of the virtue of fortitude, and only on this condition, the fortitude is a virtue.”<sup>14</sup>.

Henry characterizes it in the following way: “In this sense Cicero gives the following definition of the fortitude: “The Stoics define rightly the fortitude, when they say that it is a virtue which struggles for equity. In this respect, one having acquired the reputation of fortitude never obtained it by false tricks and badness. Whatever is deprived of justice, cannot be honest. In this respect there is a celebrated expression of Plato: “Not only”, he says, “the science which is separated from the justice, must be called more ‘williness’ than wisdom, but also the mind ready to the danger, if it is more impelled by cupidity than by a real usefulness, is more considered as audacity than as true fortitude. The humans consider as marked by fortitude and magnanimity those, who are good men and friends of simple virtue, and not at all those who work with false tricks, but only persons with a solid reputation of honesty and justice.”<sup>15</sup>.

*Henry examines meticulously the motives and circumstances  
of the deed of the knight of St John of Acre*

Henry now proceeds to minutiously examining the motives and circumstances of the deed of the knight of St John of Acre. We will not follow him here in the last details of this nuanced exposition, but only note that he adds here some circumstances which may have some importance; e.g. the Saracens entered the city before the rising of the sun, and the Christians did

---

<sup>14</sup> “Et dico quod magnanimitas est pars fortitudinis, et virtus quae versatur circa opera magna et ardua, dicente Philosopho in IV<sup>o</sup> Ethicorum: “Magnanimitas circa magna ex nomine videtur esse, sed tamen non omne opus magnum pertinens de genere suo ad fortitudinem, est opus magnanimitatis, nisi sit ex habitu virtutis, non ex praesumptione aliqua, aut cupiditate, ut, cum magnanimitas fortitudo quaedam sit, et alias fortitudo non sit virtus, ut patet ex iam dictis.” (*ibid.*, f. 594vR).

<sup>15</sup> “Unde et Tullius post dicta proxime praecedentia continuo addit dicens: “Itaque probe definitur a Stoicis fortitudo, cum eam virtutem esse dicunt, pugnantem pro aequitate. Quocirca nemo qui fortitudinis gloriam consecutus est, insidiis et malitia laudem est adeptus. Nihil enim honestum potest esse, quod iustitia vacat. Praeclare igitur Platonis illud: “Non solum”, inquit, “scientia quae est remota a iustitia, calliditas potius quam sapientia est appellanda, verum etiam animus paratus ad periculum, si sua cupiditate, non utilitate communi, impellitur, audaciae potius quam fortitudinis nomen habet. Itaque viros fortes et magnanimos, eosdem bonos, et simplicis virtutis amicos, minimeque fallaces, esse volumus, qui sunt ex media laude iustitiae.” Et infra: “Omnino fortis animus et magnus duabus rebus maxime cernitur, quarum una in rerum externarum despicientia ponitur, altera, ut res geras magnas, et maxime utiles, arduas, plenasque laborum, et periculorum,” etc.” (*ibid.*, f. 594vR-596rR).

not have any time for a longer deliberation, but only for acting immediately. The knight was in command of others in the war; like his companions he was sleeping in full armour, and immediately launched himself towards the enemy, présuming that his companions would follow, and in order to set them an example, in a moment in which no other solution was possible than immediately acting <sup>16</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> "Quamquam ergo factum militis nostri arduum fuit et magnum, quia circa mortis periculum, atque terribile, circa quod maxime consistit fortitudo, dicente Philosopho in III<sup>o</sup> Ethicorum: "Circa qualia igitur terribilia fortis, vel circa maxima; terribilissimum autem mors est: terminus enim est", non tamen ex hoc sequitur quod est opus fortitudinis seu magnanimitatis, aut alicuius virtutis, si forte illud agressus est ex praesumptione, aut ambitione gloriae, aut cupiditate alia, aut forte temere et inconsulte. Quod videtur innuere ipsa quaestio, in eo quod dicit militem praevolasse. Si enim ita fuisset, non opus virtutis, et ita nec fortitudinis nec magnanimitatis, fuit. Unde de modo aggrediendi facta magnanimitatis, dicit Tullius post praedicta: "Ad rem autem gerendam qui accedit, caveat ne id modo consideret, quam illa res honesta sit, sed etiam ut habeat efficiendi facultatem. In quo ipso considerandum ne aut temere desperet propter ignaviam, aut nimis confidat propter cupiditatem." Et infra: "Omnino enim illud honestum, quod ex animo excelso magnificoque quaerimus, animi efficitur, non corporis, viribus. Exercendum tamen corpus, et ita afficiendum est, ut oboedire consilio rationique possit in exsequendis negotiis et in laboribus tolerandis." Et infra: "Quare expetenda quidem magis est discernendi ratio quam decertandi fortitudo. Fortis autem et constantis animi est non perturbari in rebus asperis, nec tumultuantem (ut dicitur) de gradu eici, sed praesentis animi consilio, nec a ratione discedere, nec committere ut aliquando sit: "Non putaram". Haec sunt opera magni et excelsi animi, et prudentia consilioque fidentis. Temere autem in acie versari, et manu cum hoste configere, immane quiddam et beluarum simile est, sed cum tempus necessitasque postulat, decertandum est et mors servituti turpitudinique anteponenda. Sed fugiendum est illud, ne offeramus nos periculis sine causa, quo nihil potest esse stultius." Haec ille. Hinc dicit Vegetius libro III<sup>o</sup>, cap.º ultimo, De arte militari: "Boni duces publico certamine numquam nisi occasione aut nimia necessitate, configunt." Si ergo miles noster, non confidens de commilitonum adiutorio, nec putans eos paratos ut simul ad bellum procedant, solus in hostes praevolando insiliit, ipse absque omni rationabili causa morti se obtulit, debens scire quod nihil per se solum proficere potuit, et sic opus non magnanimi, sed stulti egit. Sed nec ex hoc quod iste praevolans solus in hostes irruit, et periculo mortis se exposuit, iudicari potest certitudinaliter quod opus magnanimi non egit, quia, *ut dicitur, Sarraceni ante auroram subito civitatem Acconensem intraverunt, nec fuit tunc Christicolis in illa contentis, tempus deliberationis maioris, sed solummodo statim exercendae virtutis, quae secundum Philosophum, I<sup>o</sup> Ethicorum, maxime in repentinis probatur. Miles igitur noster, qui, ut audivi dici, dux aliorum in bello esse debuit, quam citius occurrisset, forte iacens in excubiis armatus cum aliis, et paratus ad bellum, statim, audito tumultu et discurrentibus Sarracenis per vicos, exsiliit, et putans commilitones suos se consecuturos, in hostes solus irrupit, attendens illud Vegetii De arte militari, libro III<sup>o</sup>, cap.º 8<sup>o</sup>: "Ne vero repentinus tumultus amplius noceat, commonendi sunt milites, ut parati sint omnino, ut arma in manibus habeant. In necessitate enim*

## Henry gives then his concrete judgment on the question.

What comes next is a central piece in each redacted quodlibetical question. At the end of the body of the question (also called "the solution"), the master of theology proceeds to pass judgment on the question. He had to do that: it belonged to his deontology, to 'determine' the question, which means: to pronounce himself on it, without any pretention to a lasting solution. On the next occasion he might 'determine' otherwise, because he had changed his mind in the meantime. That he condensed here his answer to the question, does not imply that a redacted quodlibetic question cannot be much richer than this strict answer of the author to the proposed question; it often exposes more general considerations, treats lateral questions, etc. Sometimes the more general considerations can be very important for another aim; when various general considerations, found in various questions, are combined and put together by us as a zigzag-puzzle, they can help us to reconstitute, at least in part, the more general doctrinal synthesis of this author. But that is another consideration.

"If these were indeed the concrete circumstances," Henry of Ghent says, "then the available time and the need urged to fight immediately in a hand to hand battle. Death had to be preferred to the servitude and the shame, and to the evil which had to be avoided. I therefore say and believe firmly, that the deed of our knight was a work of magnanimity, and that from his habitude of this virtue, he chose immediately the most difficult work, namely to die honestly for the faith and for the city, rather than continuing to live by flying dishonestly, and perhaps, in an attempt to fly with an uncertain result, coming under the yoke of the Saracens."

Here Henry of Ghent passes to an important consideration. "If like him the other citizens and soldiers had acted and had been at his level, I believe that without doubt with the help of God they would have obtained the victory, and the city had been maintained. Indeed, as is said in the 1st book of the Macchabees, 3rd chapter, "it has often been the case that a few persons held in their hand the sort of a great multitude. And it is not different for the God of heaven, to liberate by means of many persons, than by means of a

---

subita, quae terrent, ante praevisa, non solent esse formidini." Et cap.º 6º: "Multa quidem sunt dicenda atque observanda pugnantibus, si quidem nulla sit negligentiae venia ubi de salute certetur." Et libro Iº, cap.º 14º: "In aliis rebus, sicut ait Cato, si quid erratum fuit, postmodum corrigi potest; praeliorum delicta emendationem non recipiunt, cum poena statim sequatur errorem." Et libro IVº, cap.º 39º: "Sicut enim providos cautela tutatur, sic negligentes exstinguit ignavia." (*ibid.*, f. 595rR).

few persons, because not a great crowd of soldiers effectuates the victory, but the assistance from the heaven.”

“Therefore”, Henry says, “the inhabitants of St-John of Acre, as I believe, would have obtained the victory, if they had the best fought they could, and trusting on the Lord, had unanimously repeated to one another the words of Judas the Macchabee, 1st book of the Macchabees, 3rd chapter: “They come to us with a great crowd and in arrogance, in order to annihilate us, and our women, and our children, and in order to spoil us. But we will fight for our lives and for our laws, and our Lord himself will crush them before our face. But you, do not fear them.” And this they could say in good trust”, says Henry. “With the same trust I esteem that our knight has done a work of magnanimity and virtue, and that with his good work he shows that he has understood this expression of the Psalm: “Precious is in the face of the Lord the dead of his saints”. And that he has said for himself, what Cicero said in his allocution to the knights of Rome: “Nothing what can protect the republic, is hard or repelling for me. No compassion is needed for the miserable kind of subsistence, nor for the dead, which would be suffered for the republic, nor the exile for it is shameful. Not the least, because these pains have in themselves a great consolation. Indeed, although they take our life, they do not abolish our glory; although they punish our mortal body by the banishment, they will not remove our soul from the republic.” And the same Cicero says in the 1st book on the Duties: “All the loves of all its inhabitants the one country has united in itself. Which good person between its inhabitants would doubt to look death in the face, if he could by this way be useful to his country?” As if he understood: “None”<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>17</sup> *“Quod si ita fuit, quia tunc tempus necessitasque postulabant decertandum esse manu et mortem servituti turpitudinique esse anteponendam et malum fugiendum, quod re vera ita puto contigisse, idcirco dico credens firmiter, quod opus militis nostri erat opus magnanimitatis, ex cuius habitu repente elegit opus summe arduum, honeste scilicet mori pro fide et civitate, quam fugiendo inhoneste vivere, et forte, fuga incerta non subveniente, iugum Sarracenorum subire. Quod si ceteri cives et commilitones sic fecissent, et tales fuissent ut ille, credo quod procul dubio in adiutorio Dei victoriam obtinuissent, et civitas staret. Ut enim dicitur P Macchabaeorum, 3<sup>o</sup>, “Facile est concludi multos in manu paucorum, et non est differentia in conspectu Dei caeli, liberare in multis et in paucis, quia non ex multitudine exercitus victoria belli, sed de caelo fortitudo.” Et ut dicit Vegetius, ubi supra, libro III<sup>o</sup>, cap.º 22º, “Victoria semper per paucos fieri consuevit, et maxime per homines virtutis.” Ut enim ibidem dicit libro I<sup>o</sup>, cap.º 10º, “in omni conflictu non tam prodest multitudo quam virtus”. Et libro V<sup>o</sup>, cap.º 32º, “In rebus bellicis celeritas amplius solet prodesse, quam virtus”. Et libro III<sup>o</sup>, cap.º 39º: “Necessario amplior securitas solet gravius habere discrimen, quod imparatis ac nihil suspicantibus superveniens assolet fieri, hoc casu oppressis, nec virtus potest, nec multitudo prodesse.”*

## Henry gives his judgment on the proposed argument in favour of his thesis

With this answer the redaction of this question is still far from completed. Henry has now to give his judgment on the argument(s) in favour of his own thesis, and then on the argument(s) against his own thesis. At this occasion new considerations enrich still the redaction.

First Henry gives here his judgment on the argument in favour of his own thesis. This judgment is short: "From what is said", he claims, "it is clear that this argument must be conceded" <sup>18</sup>.

It is important to take into account the background against.

## Henry gives now his judgment, as last part of this question, on the argument, proposed at the beginning of the question against his own thesis.

*The case of the knight concerns the more general question, if it is allowed to fly before the enemies of the Christian faith, who search to conquer the Christian territories*

The argument against his own thesis leads Henry to a question connected with his answer: "The first argument directed against my own thesis," he says, "pretended that the work of this knight was not a work of magnanimity, because those who have fled from the war in which he has found the death, have well acted". I answer, "that the question which has

---

*Unde Acconenses, ut credo, victoriam obtinuissent, si belligerassent pro posse suo, et confisi Domino dixissent unanimiter, unusquisque illorum ad ceteros, illud quod dixit ludas continuo post praedicta, P Macchabaeorum, 3<sup>o</sup>: "Ipsi veniunt ad nos in multitudine et superbia, ut disperdant nos, et uxores nostras, et filios nostros, et ut spolient nos. Nos vero pugnabimus pro animabus nostris et pro legibus nostris, et ipse Dominus conteret eos ante faciem nostram. Vos autem ne timueritis eos." Sic ergo confidenter dicere possunt, ut existimo quod ille miles noster opus magnanimitatis et virtutis egit, et bene facto suo intellexit illud Psalmi: "Pretiosa in conspectu Domini mors sanctorum eius", et dixit illud Tullii in oratione populari ad equites Romanos: "Nihil duri, nihil acerbi mihi erit, quod rem publicam tutabitur. Non enim illis victus, credo, neque mors miseranda est, quae ob rem publicam capitur, neque exsilium turpe est, quod virtute suscipitur, praesertim cum non nullam hae poenae habeant in se consolationem. Nam vitam si eripiunt, non adimunt gloriam; mortale si exsilio mulctabunt corpus, non animum a re publica removebunt." Idem libro P De officiis: "Omnes omnium caritates patria una complexa est, per quam quis bonus dubitet mortem oppetere, si ei sit profuturus?" Quasi dicat: "Nullus" (ibid., f. 595rS-595vS).*

<sup>18</sup> "Ex dictis patet, quod concedenda est secunda ratio" (ibid., f. 596rS).

been here proposed, indeed concerns a more complicated case than this argument expresses, namely if it is allowed to fly from a war directed against the country or its laws, by the enemies of the Christian law and faith.”<sup>19</sup>.

It is important to take into account the background against which Henry examines this question of the right to fly before the invasion of the Saracens, who in his time were menacing the Christian territories. It is not only an isolated case of a knight, he claims, but the more general question, whether the Christians have the right to let their territories be conquered by the enemies of the Christian law and faith. Indeed, the inhabitants of a country have not only rights, but also duties towards it. The right and the duty to legitimate defence do not only belong to each human person, but also to their countries. As we have already said above, the attack of the enemies of the religion of their country is one of these cases in which the duties of the inhabitants can go so far, that they eventually have to expose themselves to the danger of death in order to protect and help their country. As a medieval master of theology, Henry of Ghent viewed himself occupying a public function, in which he was consulted, and had the duty to advice the Christian society of his time, where the medieval master of theology had to function “as a major light in the Church”<sup>20</sup>.

The conquest of St-John of Acre provoked a shock among the Christian nations, an alarm-signal, still increased by the fact that the pope soon afterwards exhorted to crusade<sup>21</sup>. Is it allowed, by flying before the enemies of the Christian faith, to let them take possession of our Christian territories?

*The duty of resistance against the enemies of the Christian faith extends to the whole population of a Christian territory*

Henry treats this duty of resistance first concerning all the various categories of Christian inhabitants of a territory, without making any difference. “Concerning this duty of resistance,” he says, “my judgment is the

<sup>19</sup> “Ad primam, quae est in oppositum, quod dictum opus militis nostri non erat magnanimitatis, quia fugiens bellum in quo ille mortuus est, bene fecit”, dico quod hic incidit difficilius assumptio, an scilicet licitum sit fugere bellum, quod contra patriam aut patrias leges attentatum est ab hostibus legis et fidei christianae.” (*ibid.*, f. 595vS).

<sup>20</sup> “luminare maius in Ecclesia” (HENR. DE GAND. *Quodl. I*, q. 34, (ed. 1518,) p. 200, lin. 21; Cf. R. MACKEN, *La personnalité, le caractère et les méthodes de travail d’Henri de Gand*, in *Festschrift für Martin Anton Schmidt zum 70. Geburtstag am 20. Juli 1989*, (in *Theologische Zeitschrift*, hrsg. von der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Basel, Jahrgang 45, 1989, Heft 2/3), p. 198-201.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *supra*, p. 3.

same for spiritual and temporal rulers, and the same for simple clerics and simple laymen. Spiritual rulers are obliged to be at the service of the inhabitants in the spiritual matters, as well as temporal rulers are obliged to be at the service of the same inhabitants in the temporal matters for the free development and the conservation of their temporal life. That temporal rulers receive from the inhabitants of the territory the necessary temporal things for their use, is founded on the fact that they must have the possibility to implement their function, and they have not the right, when a war supervenes, to abandon their subalterns by flying before the enemy. Of course, there are always some exceptions to this rule. Flying from the enemy can be justified in some circumstances. Although, Henry adds, "in this special case of a direct menace for the Christian faith, we have also to bring in another nuance, in the sense that the spiritual rulers are still held under the pain of a greater sin, not to abandon their faithful. For in such a danger, directly menacing the faithful for their eternal salvation, the ministry of the spiritual rulers is for the remaining population of this Christian territory absolutely required, because of the absolute priority of keeping the Christian faith alive among them, even in very hard and difficult circumstances."<sup>22</sup>

*In this resistance to the enemies of the Christian faith,  
the temporal rulers have a special duty*

For this special case of a frontal attack of the enemies of the Christian faith in order to conquer Christian territories, Henry devotes here a special consideration to the strict duty, also of the temporal rulers, to join and support completely the spiritual rulers in their resistance against these enemies of the faith. Of course, we have not to remember that all the great ancient thinkers, novelists, poets, painters, composers of music, etc. have to be read, seen, heard for the eternal truths, the generally human sentiments, the remaining beauty, which they contain. Each human being with

---

<sup>22</sup> "Et censeo in hac materia idem de fuga praelatorum maiorum et minorum, et principum superiorum et inferiorum, et quod de fuga simplicium clericorum, hoc etiam de fuga simplicium laicorum, quia, sicut praelati ministrare populo in spiritualibus ad fomentum et conservationem vitae eorum spiritualis, sic principes ministrare tenentur eidem in temporalibus ad fomentum et conservationem vitae eorum temporalis. Propterea enim de publico eis provisum est in temporalibus ad usum necessariis, et non debent eos in periculo belli deserere fugiendo, nisi secundum modum sequentem, exponendum de fuga praelatorum principaliter, quamvis praelati ad non relinquendum populum poena maioris criminis adstringantur, quanto magis necessarium est populo in bellorum periculis ministerium praelatorum in spiritualibus, quam principum in temporalibus." (ibid., f. 595vS).

culture has the possibility of making some minor historical transpositions, taking his or her distance towards some typical conceptions of the time of these authors. "On the general duty of the temporal rulers, to assist the Church in its defence against its enemies, Augustine, in a comment on the Gospel of St-John, expresses himself in the following way: "Temporal rulers engage themselves in proceeding publicly against the dissipators and depreciators of the Church. If they neglected doing that, how would they afterwards justify their publications before the Lord? Indeed, taking care that during their reign their mother, the Church, from which they are all spiritually born, is by all means maintained in peace is also part of the duties of christian kings." Some other considerations from Augustine and Isidore are added <sup>23</sup>.

*Is it in general allowed to fly in the war, especially if it is a war,  
attempted by the unfaithful against the Church,  
as it is proposed in our theme?*

The rest of Henry's answer to the argument is now devoted to this right of flying before the enemies of the Christian faith, when they strive to occupy Christian territories and impose there with violence another faith.

Henry considers this question first for the totality of the Christians living in a territory, and distinguishes three cases. "If we have to answer whether it is allowed to fly from a war, specially from one attempted against the Church, as it is proposed in this question," he says, "I think that we must

<sup>23</sup> "De debito enim principum in impugnatione adversariorum Ecclesiae dicit Augustinus super Ioannem sic: "Commoventur potestates christianae contra dissipatores et detestatores Ecclesiae. Si non moverentur, quomodo redderent rationem de imperio suo Domino? Quia hoc etiam pertinet ad reges saeculi Christianos, ut suis temporibus pacatam velint matrem suam Ecclesiam habere, unde spiritualiter nati sunt?" Item ad Bonifatium comitem: "Quomodo Domino reges serviunt in timore, nisi ea quae contra iussa Domini sunt, religiosa severitate prohibendo atque plectendo? Aliter enim servit rex quia homo est, aliter quia rex est. Quia homo est, servit vivendo fideliter. Quia rex est, servit, convenienti rigore sanciendo." Item Isidorus, XXIII<sup>a</sup> quaestione, 5<sup>o</sup> cap.<sup>o</sup> "Principes", dicit sic: "Intra Ecclesiam potestates saeculi non essent, nisi quod non praevalent sacerdotes efficere per doctrinae sermonem, potestas impetret per disciplinae terrorem. Cognoscant principes saeculi Deo se debiti rationem esse reddituros propter Ecclesiam, quam pro Christo tuendam suscipiunt. Nam, sive augeatur pax et disciplina Ecclesiae per fideles principes, sive solvatur, ille ab eis rationem exigit, qui eorum potestati suam Ecclesiam tradit Unde et ad Ecclesiam tuendam possunt per praelatos compelli, ut ibidem, "Praeterea", ubi dicitur sic: "saecularium dignitatum administrationibus defendendarum ecclesiarum necessitas incumbit. Quod si facere contempserint, a communi-  
one sunt repellendi." (*ibid.*, f. 595vS).

still distinguish chronologically three possibilities. Either the war is only imminent, and a great fear exists that it will come. Or it is already there, and the faithful population is actually being attacked by the enemies. Or it is deficient, because the enemies already obtain the victory.”<sup>24</sup>

For each of these three cases Henry introduces further subdivisions, but we will not longer follow here this examination in detail. We will only put in evidence here Henry’s great preoccupations. The first point which he *time* and again stresses, is the duty of the whole Christian nation, to sacrifice itself for the country, its faith and its laws. The second point which he emphasizes, is the duty of the whole Christian nation, to prepare for such dangers by having always in advance a regular, sufficient and well-dressed army ready in order to affront them with confidence and trust. The position of Henry of Ghent with his strong and realistic mind remembers us here strikingly of the ancient proverb: “*Si vis pacem, para bellum*” (“If you wish the peace, prepare the war”), and of the well-known counsel of Charles de Gaulle to the French nation, to have always ready at hand “*une force de dissuasion*” (“a force of dissuasion”), persuading the enemies not to risk an attack.

*The duty of the whole Christian population, to sacrifice itself  
for its country, its faith and its laws*

Although Henry distinguishes a whole series of cases and subcases, and concedes that some persons can be allowed to fly under special or completely untenable circumstances, in general, as soon as there is a minimal chance for resisting, he insists on the most complete generosity of the whole population in opposing the invasors in a massive way; even women can participate in the struggle<sup>25</sup>. In order to express the spirit of this

<sup>24</sup> “*Si ergo quaeratur de illo quod ponitur in argumento, an scilicet liceat fugere de bello, praecipue quod ab infidelibus attentatur contra Ecclesiam, ut in nostro themate proposito, puto fore distinguendum divisione trimembri, quia aut tale bellum est imminens tantum, et timetur venturum; aut est iam instans et comprehensus est populus fidelis ab adversariis; aut est deficiens, adversariis obtinentibus iam victoriam.*” (*ibid.*, f. 595vT).

<sup>25</sup> Although Henry of Ghent says of a case where the whole population has to resist by fighting, that the women eventually can be excepted: “*In tali ergo casu nulli licitum est fugere, nisi forte mulieribus, pueris, et viris invalidis, dicente Vegetio, ubi supra, libro IX<sup>o</sup>, cap. 9<sup>o</sup>: “Imbellis aetas, et sexus, propter necessitatem frequenter exclusa est, aut suasus ab aliis, qui eum maiori utilitati civitatis reservare intendunt”* (*ibid.*, f. 595vT), on the other hand he cites also Vegetius for an eventual help of the women in the war: “*Unde, si sic sese mutuo adiuvasent Acconenses, non solum viri, sed et mulieres viros, puto (ut praedixi), quod victoriam obtinuissent Acconenses, qualiter iuverunt matronae Romanae in obsidione civitatis, quae per auxilium earum liberata est, dicente Vegetio, ubi supra, libro IV<sup>o</sup>, cap. 10<sup>o</sup>: “Ballistae, ceteraque tormenta, nisi funibus et nervis*

complete generosity, required from the whole population, he quotes here Cicero, who in his allocution before the senate, declared: "I was so animated from the beginning, that I considered myself not so much as born for my own sake, rather than as procreated for the sake of the republic." At the end of the 1st book of the *Invectives against Catilina* he said: "The country is dearer to me than my own life." "In the proposed case" Henry claims, "everybody of the Christian population in a supreme degree has to expose his own life for the defence of his country, as says the same Cicero in the 4th book of his *Invectives against Catilina*: "If something would happen to me, I will die with a ready and prepared mind. There can be no shameful death for a courageous man, nor a too early death for an ancient consul, nor a miserable death for a wise man." And further in the same allocution he says: "The wise humans never underwent death against their will; the courageous humans underwent it even with joy."<sup>26</sup> "In this case", says Henry, "we must do what is said in the first Canonical letter of St. John: "If Christ has sacrificed his life for us, also we must sacrifice our lives for our friars." This is already prescribed by the perennial law of nature, as Cicero says in his 1st book on the *Duties*: "Plato has written in a celebrated expression: "We are not only born for ourselves: in our birth our country claims the part of a friend." And, as it is an idea cherished by the Stoics, "All the things which are generated, are procreated to the use of the humans, but the humans are generated not only for their own sake, but also for the other humans, so that between them the one can be useful for the other." Here we have to follow the nature as guide."<sup>27</sup>

---

*intenta, nihil prosunt; equorum tamen setae de caudis ac iubis ad ballistas utiles asseruntur. Indubitanter vero et crines foeminarum in eiusmodi tormentis non minorem habere virtutem ratione necessitatis expertum est, nam in obsidione Capitolii, corruptis iugi et longa fatigatione tormentis, cum nervorum copia defecisset, matronae obsessos crines viris suis obtulere pugnantibus, reparatisque machinis, adversariorum impetum repulerunt. Maluerunt enim pudicissimae foeminae, deformato ad tempus capite, libere vivere cum maritis, quam hostibus integro decore servire." (ibid., f. 596vT).*

<sup>26</sup> "... dicente Tullio in oratione populari ad senatum: "Sic ab initio fui animatus, ut me non tam mea causa putarem esse natum, quam rei publicae procreatum." Et ut idem dicit in fine libri *Invectivarum*: "Patria mihi vita mea carior est." Propter quod quilibet in isto casu maxime pro patriae defensione debet etiam vitam suam mortis periculo exponere, dicente eodem in IV<sup>o</sup> libro *Invectivarum*, hoc est, *In Catilinam*, oratione 4<sup>a</sup>: "Si quid obtigerit, aequo animo paratoque moriar. Neque enim turpis mors viro forti potest accidere, neque immatura consulari, neque misera sapienti." Et infra in eo: "Itaque sapientes numquam eam in vii sustinuerunt; fortes etiam saepe libenter oppetierunt." (ibid., f. 595vT).

<sup>27</sup> "... in hoc casu locum habet illud in *Canonica Ioannis P., cap. 3<sup>o</sup>*: "Si pro nobis Christus animam suam posuit, et nos debemus animas nostras pro fratribus ponere. Hoc enim

*The duty in general, in order to defend the country against such dangers, to have a regular, sufficient and well-dressed army, which allows to expect them with confidence and trust*

Henry now passes to a new consideration: the necessity or duty in general, to have a regular and well-dressed army, in order to prepare for such dangers. "As Vegetius says in his book on The art of war, 1st book, chapter 3," Henry claims, "By no other practice, as we can see, the Roman nation has subjugated the earth, than by the exercise of the arms, the discipline of the encampings, and the well-trained soldier. The art of war requires the audacity of the battle. Indeed, nobody fears to execute, what he trusts to have well learned. A limited number of soldiers, but well-trained by the practice of the wars, is more ready to the victory than a rural and uninstructed multitude, which is exposed to be crushed. And as Vegetius says in the 2nd book of his same work, chapter 2, "In the republic of Rome a non-exercised soldier or recruit was continuously trained, in order to facilitate continuing the practice of his daily exercise in the war. Indeed, so much the well-trained soldier wishes the war, so much the uninstructed soldier fears it. We must always be conscious that in a battle practice is more useful than physical force, because, if exercise ceased to be practised by the soldier, the simple peasant would in nothing be inferior to the soldier." And in the 3rd book, chapter 1, Vegetius says: "Who is in command and wishes the victory, must occupy himself with carefully instructing his soldiers; who wishes a good result in the war, must fight with competence, leaving nothing to chance."<sup>28</sup>

---

*primo dictat ius naturae, dicente Tullio libro P De officiis: "Ut praeclare scriptum est a Platone, non nobis solum nati sumus, ortusque nostri partem patria vindicat, partem amici", atque, ut placet Stoicis, quae in terris gignuntur, ad usum hominum omnia creari, homines autem hominum causa esse generatos, ut ipsi inter se alius alii prodesse possint, in hoc naturam debemus sequi ducem."* (ibid., f. 596rT).

<sup>28</sup> "... dicente Vegetio, ubi supra, libro P, cap.º 2º: "Nulla alia re videmus populum Romanum orbem subiugasse terrarum, nisi armorum exercitio, disciplina castrorum, atque milite. Scientia enim rei bellicae dimicandi vult audaciam. Nemo enim facere metuit, quod se bene didicisse confidit. Etenim certamine bellorum exercitata paucitas ad victoriam promptior est, ruralis et indocta multitudo exposita est ad caedem." Et ut dicit, libro XXº ibidem, cap.º 21º: "Inexercitatus miles seu tiro, ut quotidiani laboris usus difficilis non videretur in bello, exercebatur assidue. Nam quemadmodum bene exercitatus miles proelium cupit, ita formidat indoctus. Postremo sciendum est in pugna usum amplius prodesse quam vires, nam si doctrina cesset armorum, nil villanus distat a milite." Et libro IIP, cap.º 1º: "Igitur qui victoriam cupit, milites imbuat diligenter; qui secundos optat eventus, dimicet arte, non casu." (ibid., f. 596vV-X). Cf. also G. DE LAGARDE, *La philosophie sociale* ..., p. 86, note 2.

*Are the spiritual rulers allowed to fly from the same kind of war?*

The last subdivision is devoted to spiritual rulers only.

"In order to judge if in the proposed case", he says, "it can be allowed to some spiritual rulers ('the prelates', as he calls them, without distinguishing here between bishops and simple priests), to fly, two different possibilities can occur: or the whole community is menaced with death, or only the spiritual ruler. In the first case we must further distinguish, because if the spiritual ruler flies, the spiritual ministry necessary for his remaining subalterns, is either completely subtracted, or it is not subtracted but further exercised by other spiritual rulers, who procure him in this way a possibility to fly. But if that possibility does not exist, then "what Augustine says rightly in his above mentioned letter to Honoratus, applies to the spiritual ruler," Henry claims: "When our ministry, of whatever greater or smaller dignity it may be, is of vital necessity for the population which remains, so that it may not be deprived of it, we have to say to the Lord: "Be for us a protecting God, and a fortified place". And we should not search another fortified place by flying, and leaving the population to its fate." <sup>29</sup>.

Other exceptional cases are examined. The enemies of the Christians triumph, and the victors unfurl on the country; a spiritual ruler may accept to fly, but then it can only be allowed on the condition of beforehand providing the spiritual ministry of the population by other spiritual rulers. Henry here refers these spiritual rulers to the counsel of Augustine in the same letter to Honoratus: "Let us more fear that the sheep of Christ would be struck in their heart by the sword of the spiritual death, than that their life is token off their body by the iron." <sup>30</sup> We will not pursue in detail all the sinuosities of this

---

<sup>29</sup> "Sed in casu posito distinguendum est de fuga praelatorum, quia aut communitas quaeritur ad mortem, aut solus praelatus. Si primo modo, subdistinguo, quia aut per fugam praelati omnino a subditis subtrahitur ministerium illi incumbens, aut non subtrahitur, sed per alios manentes potest suppleri. Si primo modo, dico quod non licet praelatum fugere, dicente Augustino in epistola praedicta ad Honoratum, post verba eius recitata in illa de epistola ad Quodvultdeum praedicta: "Restat ergo ut nos, quorum ministerium, quantumcumque est, plebi Dei ubi sumus, manenti ita necessarium est, ut sine hoc eam non oporteat remanere, dicamus Domino: "Esto nobis in Deum protectorem et in locum munitum." (ibid., f. 596vX-Y).

<sup>30</sup> "Et infra: "Magisque timeamus ne oves Christi spiritualis nequitiae gladio in corde, quam ferro in corpore, trucidentur. Magis timeamus ne, sensu interiori corrupto, pereat castitas fidei, quam ne feminae violenter constuprentur in carne, quia violentia non violatur pudicitia, si mente servatur. Magis timeamus ne lapides vivi exstinguantur, deserentibus nobis, quam ne lapides et ligna terrenorum aedificiorum incendantur, praesentibus

last part of a lateral question <sup>31</sup>. With a last quotation of Augustine from the same letter, Henry concludes this long exposition, in which he has touched with his ordinary generosity and exhaustivity at some themes which were very dear to his heart, and at the same time concludes devoutly this *Quodlibet XV*: "The best that we can do in these dangers, is to offer prayers to the Lord our God, that he may be merciful to us." <sup>32</sup>

If the adage quoted by Mgr. Baunard in "Le vieillard" ('The old Man'), that "the last words are the true words", corresponds to the truth, we can say that this last quodlibetic question of Henry of Ghent, on the duty of the spiritual rulers who ought to prefer dying themselves to abandoning their faithful to the invading enemies of the Christian faith, can be applied in the same time to his own faithfulness, during his long exercise of his public function as master of theology, to his high conception of the duty resulting of it, which he expressed already in the first quodlibetical dispute, held in this function: that the master of theology had to be a "major light in the Church" .

We hope that our sympathetic public has understood that the aim of our brief communication was not to extract from Henry of Ghent's very extensive works his complete philosophical doctrine on human heroism, and on the just war, and to situate both in the general history of these philosophical doctrines. This short communication has only the aim to be a small preparatory contribution to such larger studies, which without doubt would enrich our knowledge on the medieval philosophical conceptions in moral and political matters. We have therefore limited in the "mare magnum" ("the ocean") of Henry's works to one question, letting him expose himself his thought to the modern reader, with a large choice of authentic Latin texts, which allow the reader to compare our exposition with the authentic Latin texts. In the same time we have tried to show for some contemporaneous thinkers less familiarized with this medieval quodlibetic literature, at hand of a concrete question of a medieval Quodlibet, how to read and interpret it rightly in order to extract from it its philosophical message. We are indeed convinced that the contemporaneous searchers of truth are able enough in

---

nobis. Magis timeamus ne membra corporis Christi, destituta spiritali victu, necentur, quam membra corporis nostri, oppressa hostili impetu, torqueantur." (*ibid.*, f. 597vY).

<sup>31</sup> "Si secundo modo, tunc distinguo ... ad Dominum Deum nostrum ut misereatur nostri." (*ibid.*, f. 596vY-597vY). Cf. also G. DE LAGARDE, *La philosophie sociale ...*, p. 87.

<sup>32</sup> "Et infra: "Melius autem quod in his periculis faciamus, invenire non possumus, quam orationes ad Dominum Deum nostrum, ut misereatur nostri." (*ibid.*, f. 97vY).

order to discover in such direct conversation with a great thinker of the past, in spite of some minor historical transpositions which are always necessary, the great and remaining truths and the deep and noble sentiments which he has to pass to them. And so we finish this study of Henry's defence of human heroism in the last question of his last Quodlibet <sup>33</sup>.

---

<sup>33</sup> Cf. above, note 20.