

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE 2015

HISTORIA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE PRAGENSIS

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE 2015

HISTORIA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE PRAGENSIS

Tomus LV. Fasc. 1

The First Decades of Prague University: Transforming Intellectual Space in 14th Century Central Europe

Edited by

Jan Odstrčilík, Francesca Battista, Riccardo Burgazzi

CHARLES UNIVERSITY
KAROLINUM PRESS
2016

Executive editors:

Jan Odstrčilík (Austrian Academy of Sciences)

Kateřina Schwabiková (Charles University in Prague)

Blanka Zilynská (Charles University in Prague)

Assistant editors:

Francesca Battista (Charles University in Prague)

Riccardo Burgazzi (Prospero Editore, Milano)

This issue is produced within the framework of Programme for the Development of Scientific Disciplines at the Charles University (PRVOUK), P21: *History of Academic Science and Education*. The editorial work of Jan Odstrčilík on this issue has also received funding from the European Research Council under the European Community's Seventh Framework programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement No. 263672.

This issue of AUC-HUCP is the result of the grant provided by the Charles University Grant Agency (GA UK), No. 1124413, entitled *Prague Teacher Henricus Totting de Oyta in the Medieval Bohemical Manuscripts from Corpus Christi Library in Cambridge: An Analysis and an Edition of Selected Parts of his Works*, carried out at the Faculty of Arts at the Charles University in Prague.

Cover photo: Detail from *Conradi de Soltau Quaestiones in quattuor libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi*, National library in Prague, Ms. I. D. 23., fol. 1r, 2nd half of the 14th c.

<http://www.karolinum.cz/journals/hucp>

© Charles University, 2016

ISSN 0323-0562 (Print)

ISSN 2336-5730 (Online)

CONTENTS

Introduction

- 11 The First Decades of Prague University: Transforming Intellectual Space in 14th Century Central Europe
Programme of the conference

Articles

Section I: Masters and Students of Prague University

- 19 Chris Schabel – Monica Brinzei – Mihai Maga, A Golden Age of Theology at Prague: Prague *Sentences*
Commentaries from 1375 to 1385, the *terminus post quem* for Evidence of Wycliffism in Bohemia
41 Dušan Coufal, Jan of Mýto's Bachelor Lecture on the Psalms and its Sources in Thomas Waleys's Work.
A New Light on English-Czech Connections in the Late Middle Ages
53 Martin Dekarli, Henry Totting of Oyta and the Prague Nominalist *Schola Communis* between 1366 and 1409:
A Preliminary Draft
71 Jan Odstrčilík – Francesca Battista – Riccardo Burgazzi, The Preaching of Henry Totting of Oyta

Section II: Prague University in the Intellectual Space of Medieval Europe

- 95 Fulvio Delle Donne, The Charters of Foundation of Prague and Naples: The Models and their Reuse
107 Péter Haraszti Szabó, The Effects on the University of Prague to the Hungarian Royal Court in the Fourteenth
Century
123 Daniela Pagliara, Uberto Decembrio: A Humanist in Prague at the End of the Fourteenth Century
131 Irene Malfatto, John of Marignolli and the Historiographical Project of Charles IV
141 Lena Oetjens, Charles IV and Learned Order: The Discourse on Knowledge in 'Der meide kranz'

Czech or German summaries

- 40 Chris Schabel – Monica Brinzei – Mihai Maga, Zlatý věk teologie v Praze: pražské komentáře *Sentenci*
z let 1375–1385, termín *post quem* pro doložení viklefismu v Čechách
52 Dušan Coufal, Bakalářská lektura Žalmů Jana z Mýta a dílo Thomase Waleyse jako její pramen. Anglicko-
české vazby v pozdním středověku v novém světle
70 Martin Dekarli, Jindřich Totting z Oyty a pražská nominalistická *schola communis* mezi lety 1366–1409.
Předběžný náčrt
91 Jan Odstrčilík – Francesca Battista – Riccardo Burgazzi, Kazatelství Jindřicha Tottinga z Oyty
101 Fulvio Delle Donne, Zakládací listiny univerzit v Praze a Neapoli: modely a jejich využití
122 Péter Haraszti Szabó, Význam pražské univerzity pro uherský královský dvůr ve 14. století
130 Daniela Pagliara, Uberto Decembrio: humanista v Praze na konci čtrnáctého století
139 Irene Malfatto, Jan Marignola a historiografický projekt Karla IV.
151 Lena Oetjens, Karl IV. als Ordnungsstifter: Der Wissensdiskurs in 'Der meide kranz'

Authors

Francesca Battista, Charles University, Prague

Monica Brinzei, L'Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes in Paris

Riccardo Burgazzi, Prospero Editore, Milano

Dušan Coufal, Centre for Medieval Studies, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague

Martin Dekarli, Institut für Mittelalterforschung, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien

Fulvio Delle Donne, Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy

Mihai Maga, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj, Romania

Irene Malfatto, International Society for the Study of Medieval Latin Culture, Firenze, Italy

Jan Odstrčilík, Institut für Mittelalterforschung, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien

Lena Oetjens, University of Zurich, Deutsches Seminar

Daniela Pagliara, Università degli Studi 'Gabriele. d'Annunzio', Chieti-Pescara, Italy

Chris Schabel, University of Cyprus

Péter Haraszti Szabó, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest

Introduction

THE FIRST DECADES OF PRAGUE UNIVERSITY: TRANSFORMING INTELLECTUAL SPACE IN 14th CENTURY CENTRAL EUROPE

ACADEMIC CONFERENCE CENTER, JILSKÁ 1, PRAGUE, NOVEMBER 6–7, 2014

Since the 19th century, the main tendencies in historiography of the University of Prague were focused on the first two decades of the 15th century. This era was usually viewed within the perspective of the rise of pre-national consciousness and the development of the prereformation Hussite movement. And although the early history of Prague University was far from ignored, it has been often viewed as a prelude to these upcoming events. Almost two years ago, we tried to shift the focus on to the period of the first fifty years of Prague's *alma mater*. Our main aim was to raise the questions concerning the changes within the cultural and intellectual space in Central Europe which followed the founding of Prague's University in 1348.

The two-day international conference, devoted to the early history of Prague University, was held in the Academic Conference Center, Jilská 1, Prague on November 6–7, 2014. Sixteen papers were divided into six sessions. The first day's papers were focused on intellectuals of Prague University, i.e. Henry Totting of Oyta, Conrad of Ebrach and Jan of Mýto. The majority of presentations addressed Totting's philosophical and theological works, his preachings, as well his attitudes towards the Jewish people.

The second day offered various historical aspects. The opening session paid close attention to international contexts of Prague University, e.g. the founding Charter of the Prague *alma mater* and University of Naples, and connecting lines of the emperor Charles IV with intellectuals from Italy. The second session dealt generally with various aspects of transmission of knowledge, such as instructions for lay women by Henry of Bitterfeld, vernacular poetry from the court of Charles IV and the relation between learned magic, alchemy and some university members. The last session of the second day concluded with prosopographical aspects (exchanges between Prague university and the university of Vienna, as well as Hungarian students in Prague).

The conference was organized by Jan Odstrčilík (Charles University in Prague and the Austrian Academy of Sciences), Francesca Battista (Charles University in Prague) and Riccardo Burgazzi (Charles University in Prague) and was sponsored by Institute for Medieval Research of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, the Charles University Grant Agency¹ and the Centre for Medieval Studies of the Czech Academy of Sciences, to all of whom we are immensely grateful.

¹ The conference *The First Decades of Prague University: Transforming Intellectual Space in 14th Century Central Europe*, Prague, November 6–7, 2014, was founded by the Charles University Grant Agency (GA UK), No. 1124413, and the European Research Council under the European Community's Seventh Framework programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement No. 263672.

The journal *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis* kindly provided this issue covering the papers from our conference. More than half of them are presented here, all of which were peer-reviewed. The issue was edited by cooperation between the internal redactors of the journal and the organizers of the conference.

Jan Odstrčilík, Francesca Battista, Riccardo Burgazzi

Programme of the Conference

Thursday, 6th November 2014

Session I: Henry Totting of Oyta as a philosopher and a theologian

William Duba (University of Nijmegen): *Henry Totting of Oyta's Prague Lectures on the Sentences*
Martin Dekarli (Prague): *Henry Totting of Oyta and the Emergence of the Nominalistic Tradition in Central Europe between ca. 1370 and 1409*

Iris Palenik (Universität Wien): *Henry Totting of Oyta and his Disputatio catholica contra Iudaeos – Scholars and the Fight against Jews, Heretics and Disbelievers*

Session II: Henry Totting of Oyta's preaching

Jan Odstrčilík (Charles University in Prague and Austrian Academy of Sciences): *Sermo de Nativitate Iohannis Baptistae: Quis putas puer iste erit? (Luc 1,66)*

Francesca Battista (Charles University in Prague): *Sermo de Assumpcione Virginis Marie: In Ierusalem potestas mea (Eccli 24,15)*

Riccardo Burgazzi (Charles University in Prague): *Sermo de Passione Domini: Erit vita tua quasi pendens ante te (Deut 28,66)*

Session III: Masters of Prague University

Chris Schabel (University of Cyprus): *The Cistercian Conrad of Ebrach's Prague Lectures on the Sentences*

Dušan Coufal (Centre for Medieval Studies in Prague): *Master Jan of Mýto and His Commentary on the Psalms (ca. 1400)*

Friday, 7th November 2014

Session IV: Prague University viewed by foreigners

Fulvio Delle Donne (Università della Basilicata): *The Charters of Foundation of Prague and Naples: The Models and their Reuse*

Daniela Pagliara (Università degli studi 'G. d'Annunzio'): *Uberto Decembrio: A Humanist in Prague at the End of the Fourteenth Century*

Irene Malfatto (International Society for the Study of Medieval Latin Culture /SISMEL/ in Florence): *John of Marignolli and the Historiographical Project of Charles IV*

Session V: Transmission of Knowledge

Jakub Šimek (Universität Heidelberg): *Instructing Lay Women: The German 'Regimen vitae cum confessionali' by Heinrich von Bitterfeld*

Lena Oetjens (Universität Zürich): *Charles IV and learned order: the discourse of knowledge in Heinrich of Mügeln as a mirror of Prague's new University*

Zdenko Vozár (Charles University in Prague – Université Paris-Est): *Learned Magic and Alchemy between and betwixt the University and the Courts: Interaction of Seats of Power, Wisdom and the Seats of Knowledge*

Session VI: Historical aspects

Andrea Bottanová (Universität Wien): *Places of Learning, Places of Exchange. Universities of Vienna and Prague in their Early Years*

Péter Haraszti Szabó (Hungarian Academy of Sciences): *The Effect of the University of Prague to the Hungarian Society in the 14th century*

Concluding remarks (Jan Odstrčilík), **discussion**

Articles

Section I:

Masters and Students of Prague University

A GOLDEN AGE OF THEOLOGY AT PRAGUE: PRAGUE *SENTENCES* COMMENTARIES FROM 1375 TO 1385, THE *TERMINUS POST QUEM* FOR EVIDENCE OF WYCLIFFISM IN BOHEMIA

CHRIS SCHABEL – MONICA BRINZEI – MIHAI MAGA

ABSTRACT

This article is a survey of the first *Sentences* commentaries at the University of Prague, from lectures delivered between ca. 1376 and ca. 1381, those of Conrad of Ebrach O.Cist, the seculars Conrad of Soltau and Menso of Beckhusen, and Nicholas Biceps O. P. Biceps' commentary contains the first evidence for Wyclif's works in Bohemia, but a careful examination of the sources reveals that we have no evidence for Wycliffism in Prague before 1385, not 1381 or 1378 as previously thought. If Biceps was remembered primarily in Prague, Ebrach's commentary exerted an influence in Paris and Vienna, Soltau's was read all over Central Europe, and the works of Ebrach, Soltau, and Beckhusen provided the models for several *Sentences* commentaries at Kraków. They may not have aroused the excitement that Jan Hus and Jerome of Prague would, but they make the years surrounding the onset of the Great Schism a Golden Age of Theology.

Keywords: Sentences commentaries – Conrad of Ebrach – Conrad of Soltau – Menso of Beckhusen – Nicholas Biceps – Wycliffism

By the 1370s commentaries on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard had become by far the most important philosophical genre in the queen of the sciences, theology.¹ The University of Paris had always dominated the field, except for a period of Oxonian rivalry in the 1320s and 1330s, and in the 1370s Paris could still boast great theologians the likes of Henry of Langenstein, Peter of Candia, Pierre d'Ailly, and Henry Totting of Oyta.² By the end of the

¹ For the popularity of various genres of philosophical theology in the fourteenth century, see Chris SCHABEL, *Reshaping the Genre: Literary Trends in Philosophical Theology in the Fourteenth Century*, in: Spencer E. Young (ed.), *Crossing Boundaries at Medieval Universities*, Leiden 2011, pp. 51–84. For *Sentences* commentaries in general, see the three-volume *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, Gillian R. EVANS (ed.), vol. 1, Leiden 2002, and Philipp W. ROSEMAN (ed.), vols. 2–3, Leiden 2010–2015. This paper forms part of Monica Brinzei's ERC project THESIS on late-medieval *Sentences* commentaries, in which Brinzei and Schabel are concerned with Conrad of Ebrach's commentary and Mihai Maga is dealing with that of Conrad of Soltau. We thank Ota Pavlíček, Elżbieta Jung, and Martin Dekarli for their assistance.

² Marco Toste and Chris Schabel are preparing the critical edition of book I of Langenstein's *Sentences* commentary, as part of Schabel's University of Cyprus research program DINKY and the THESIS project. The University of Cyprus also sponsors the online edition of PETRI DE CANDIA *Lectura in quatuor libros Sententiarum*, ed. Paul J. J. M. BAKKER, Stephen F. BROWN, William O. DUBA (also webmaster), Girard J. ETZKORN, Rondo KEELE, Severin KITANOV, Andreas KRINGOS, and Chris SCHABEL (2004–). The critical edition of d'Ailly's commentary, PETRI DE ALLIACO *Questiones super primum, tertium et quartum librum Sententiarum*, vol. I, *Principia et questio circa Prologum*, ed. Monica BRINZEI, Turnhout 2013 (CCCM 258), will be completed under the aegis of THESIS. Finally, Marco Toste is transcribing Oyta's commentary for online publication in conjunction with DINKY and THESIS.

century, however, and partly as a result of the Great Schism, the new Central European universities had collectively ended Parisian hegemony, and arguably the University of Vienna could claim to be the new leader.³ Yet for a brief period around the outbreak of the schism it seemed as if Prague would be the one to rival Paris, until a series of setbacks began with the departure of many German masters in the mid-1380s.⁴ The arrival of Wyclif's ideas in Bohemia set the stage for a different sort of theological Golden Age in Prague, but a careful examination of the sources reveals that we have no evidence for Wycliffism in Prague before 1385, not 1381 or even 1378 as previously thought.

Although Henry Totting of Oyta's *Lectura textualis* from around 1370 is probably the first *Sentences* commentary from the University of Prague to survive in written form in a significant way, his coverage was cursory compared to his main contribution to philosophical theology, his *Quaestiones*, which lay in the future and elsewhere, at Paris. Moreover, contrary to the claim that the elderly Augustinian Oxford theologian John Klenkok lectured on the *Sentences* again at Prague between 1370 and his death in 1374, there is no evidence that Klenkok even lived in Prague, let alone taught there.⁵ No less than four extant *Sentences* commentaries derive from lectures delivered at Prague between ca. 1376 and ca. 1381, however, those of the Cistercian Conrad of Ebrach († 1399), the seculars Conrad of Soltau († 1407) and Menso of Beckhusen (or Beckhausen, † post 1397),⁶ and the Dominican Nicholas Biceps († 1390/91). Their number, and the popularity of three of these works, make the years surrounding the onset of the Schism a Golden Age of theology at Prague. This paper surveys and corrects what we know about manuscripts and chronology for these four *opera*, each of which would probably require 1000 pages in a critical edition. Since Nicholas Biceps' *Sentences* commentary contains the first evidence for the circulation of Wyclif's works in Bohemia, redating Biceps' text in particular has significant repercussions.

³ See now the papers in Monica BRINZEI (ed.), *Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the Sentences at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth Century*, Turnhout 2015, which builds on Monica BRINZEI – Chris SCHABEL, *The Past, Present, and Future of Late-Medieval Theology: The Commentary on the Sentences of Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl, Vienna, ca. 1400*, in: Rosemann, Mediaeval, 3, pp. 174–266, and Ueli ZAHND, *Wirksame Zeichen? Sakramentenlehre und Semiotik in der Scholastik des ausgehenden Mittelalters*, Tübingen 2014.

⁴ See Andrea Bottanová's paper in this volume and the literature cited there.

⁵ Christopher OCKER, *Johannes Klenkok: A Friar's Life, c. 1310–1374*, Philadelphia 1993 (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 83.5), pp. 70–72. This corrects the list in Josef TŘIŠKA, *Sententiarii Pragenses*, *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 13, 1968, pp. 100–110, at 102. Likewise, there seems to be no secure record of Conrad of Halberstadt after 1355, whose 'excerpts' from the *Sentences* allegedly come from Prague lectures. We will not discuss here an anonymous commentary that could date from this period, known as *Utrum Deus gloriosus*, which Zenon Kaluza dates to between 1377 and 1387, a few years before the so-called *Communis lectura Pragensis*: Zenon KALUZA, *Un manuel de théologie en usage à l'Université de Cracovie: le commentaire des Sentences dit Utrum Deus gloriosus*, in: L'Église et le peuple chrétien dans les pays de l'Europe du Centre-est et du Nord (XIV^e–XV^e siècles). Actes du colloque de Rome (27–29 janvier 1986), Roma 1990 (Publications de l'École française de Rome 128), pp. 107–124, at pp. 107–111. The *Communis lectura Pragensis* has been edited: Zofia WŁODEK, *Krakowski komentarz z XV wieku do Sentencji Piotra Lombarda*, I, *Wstęp historyczny i edycja tekstu księgi I i II*, *Studia mediewistyczne* 7, 1966, pp. 125–355; II, *Tendencje doktrynalne komentarza krakowskiego*, *Studia mediewistyczne* 9, 1968, pp. 245–291.

⁶ Beckhusen's date of death is unknown, but he was still active as a master of theology on 30 June 1397: *Statuta Universitatis Pragensis nunc primum publici juris facta*, eds. Antonius DITTRICH – Antonius SPIRK, Praha 1830 (Monumenta Historica Universitatis Pragensis, III), p. 31.

Conrad of Ebrach, O. Cist.

When Conrad of Ebrach died in Vienna in 1399, the Augustinian Hermit John of Retz wrote a eulogy of the Cistercian in which he gave important biographical details:⁷ “In the time of [Ebrach’s] youth he moved to the *studium* of Paris, next [he read] the *Sentences* and the Bible at the University of Bologna, after that he reigned for many years over the doctrinal chair and schools of Prague and Vienna.” Earlier in his eulogy, Retz had stated:⁸ “This is clear in his *Lectura* on the books of the *Sentences*, which he faithfully, clearly, and precisely explained, and he reduced to clear and lucid style the obscure and elevated sayings of Master Hugolino of venerable memory, whose disciple he was in Bologna. And he published this in the University of Prague.” This refers to the famous Augustinian Hermit Hugolino of Orvieto, a Parisian theologian who moved to Bologna, where he was among the first nine masters of the new faculty of theology, which opened in mid-1364, collaborating on the faculty’s statutes.⁹ We have good reason to trust John of Retz: he was in Vienna with Conrad of Ebrach for the last fourteen years of the Cistercian’s life, and before that Retz was in Prague with Ebrach. What is the evidence from the manuscripts for *Sentences* lectures at each of these four *studia*?¹⁰

Manuscript	Book I	Book II	Book III	Book IV
Bordeaux, Bibl. Municipale, 159 (ante 1402)	X + Princ. + Prol.	X	X + Princ.	X
Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 1279 (1377)	X + Princ. + Prol.	X + Princ.	X + Princ.	X + Princ.
Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, 292 (1387?)	X + Princ. + Prol.	X + Princ.		
Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, 293 (1387)			X + Princ.	X + Princ.

⁷ Iohannes DE RETZ, *Collatio in exequiis magistri Conradi de Ebraco Ordinis Cisterciensis*, ms. Rein, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. 67, f. 117r: “Nam tempore sue iuventutis ad Parysiense studium se transtulit, tandem in universitate Bononiensi *Sententias* et Bybliam <legit>, post hoc Prage et Wyenne kathedram doctoralem et scolas pluribus annis rexit.” Cf. Kassian LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach S. O. CIST. († 1399): Lebenslauf und Schrifttum*, Editiones Cistercienses, Roma 1962, p. 23 and 32; there is an edition in Kassian LAUTERER, *Johannes von Retz OESA, Collatio in Exequiis Mag. Conradi de Ebraco. Ein Nachruf für Konrad von Ebrach*, Cistercienser-Chronik 68, 1961, pp. 23–40. On Retz, see especially Adolar ZUMKELLER, *Der Wiener Theologieprofessor Johannes von Retz († nach 1404) und seine Lehre von Urstand, Erbsünde, Gnade und Verdienst*, Augustiniana 21, 1971, pp. 505–540, and 22, 1972, pp. 118–184 and 540–582; Adolar ZUMKELLER, *Johannes von Retz*, Neue Deutsche Biographie 10, 1974, pp. 566–567.

⁸ Iohannes DE RETZ, *Collatio*, ms. Rein 67, f. 116v: “Quod utique patet [pater (Conradus): *Lauterer*] in sua *Lectura* super libros *Sententiarum* quam fideliter et clare et enucleate expressit, et dicta obscura et alta venerande memorie magistri Hugolini, cuius discipulus Bononie extitit, ad stilum clarum et ludicum reduxit, quam [que: *Lauterer*] in Pragensi universitate publicavit.” Cf. K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, pp. 68, 103, 111.

⁹ On Hugolino, whose *Sentences* commentary has been critically edited, see Adolar ZUMKELLER, *Hugolin von Orvieto und seine theologische Erkenntnislehre*, Würzburg 1941 (Cassiciacum IX/2–3); Willigis ECKERMANN (ed.), *Schwerpunkte und Wirkungen des Sentenzenkommentars Hugolins von Orvieto O.E.S.A.*, Würzburg 1990 (Cassiciacum XLII); especially Adolar ZUMKELLER, *Leben und Werke des Hugolin von Orvieto*, pp. 3–42.

¹⁰ The manuscripts are described in Adolar ZUMKELLER, *Dionysius de Montina, ein neuentdeckter Augustinertheologe des Spätmittelalters*, Würzburg 1948 (Cassiciacum XI/2–3 [sic!]), pp. 18–24 (without Bordeaux); K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, pp. 54–65, but, as will become clear, not sufficiently for Naples, Oxford, and Paris (the last of which Zumkeller just mentions on p. 24). For Naples and Oxford, Zumkeller (p. 24) and Lauterer (pp. 60–61) merely state that they contain books I–III and I–IV respectively, based on Friedrich STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, 2 vols., Würzburg 1947, vol. 1, pp. 71–73.

Manuscript	Book I	Book II	Book III	Book IV
Oxford, Bodleian, Canon. Misc. 573 (1384–1385)	X + Princ. + Prol.	X + Princ.	X + Princ.	X + Princ.
(olim) Warszawa, Staatsbibliothek Abt. II, Chart. Lat. Fol. I. 390 (ante 1384)	X + Princ. + Prol.	X + Princ.	X + Princ.	X
Paris, Bibl. nationale de France, lat. 3070	X + Princ. + Prol.	X	X + Princ.	X
Napoli, Bibl. Naz. Vitt. Eman. III, VII C 25	X	X	X	
Praha, Knihovna Metropol. kapituly, C 31 (1377)		frag.		X
Würzburg, Universität., M. ch. f. 139 (1663)	d.1 + Princ. + Prol.			
Città del Vaticano, BAV, Palat. lat. 608	Princ. frag.			
Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, A.II.26	Princ. frag.			

For Vienna, the evidence is slight, because the only manuscript tied to that city is the seventeenth-century partial copy in Würzburg, calling the author a ‘professor Viennae celeberrimus’, and some of the witnesses predate Ebrach’s departure from Prague, where he is attested between early 1376 and early 1384, having left the city by mid-summer.¹¹

The evidence is much stronger for Prague. A complete Warsaw witness that, according to the library, did not survive World War II bore the colophon ‘Questions on the *Sentences* of Master Conrad of Prague of Ebrach of the Cistercian Order’.¹² The Oxford manuscript, also containing all four books, was copied in the Augustinian convent of St Thomas in Prague in 1384 and 1385, book I completed on 24 July 1384 and book IV on 26 May 1385. The copyist, the Augustinian John of Reiz, an Austrian, was then studying at the university.¹³ Now, since there is no ‘Reiz’ in Austria, and the Austrian Augustinian John of Retz studied at Prague before moving to Vienna just after Ebrach, the scribe must have been none other than John of Retz, writing the ligature ‘tz’ in a way that looks like an ‘iz’. Finally, we have the following explicit in a Krakow witness, containing all four books: “And in this are ended the questions on book IV of the *Sentences* of the reverend master Conrad of Ebrach, doctor of holy theology, read out (*pronunciate*) in Prague in the schools of St Bernard,

¹¹ A. ZUMKELLER, *Dionysius de Montina*, pp. 23 and 26; K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, pp. 31–34 and 65. The Würzburg witness stems from a manuscript copied in 1388 (during Ebrach’s Vienna period) at Rein Abbey in Austria (the same monastery that holds the codex with Retz’s eulogy), while the two-volume complete witness in Klosterneuburg was finished on St Agapitus’ day, 18 August, in the year 1387, also while Ebrach was in Vienna. For some manuscripts bearing dates, we merely have ‘termini ante quem’: the lost Heidelberg codex was in that university’s catalogue in 1396, the Bordeaux codex with all four books was owned by a Friar John de Cabanis of the Toulouse convent, who died on 5 October 1402, and there was once a copy in Erfurt in 1497. Cf. K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, p. 65.

¹² A. ZUMKELLER, *Dionysius de Montina*, p. 22; K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, p. 63: ‘Questiones super *Sententiarum* (!) magistri Conradi Pragensis de Ebraco Ordinis Cisterciensis.’

¹³ See explicits in ms. Oxford, Bodleian, Canon. Misc. 573, f. 53va (book I): “Per fratrem Iohannem de Reiz Australen natione, qui eas finivit Prage sabbato in vigilia sancti Iacobi apostoli anno Domini M^oCCCLXXXIII^o”; and f. 162rb (book IV): “Explicit opus questionum super quatuor libros *Sententiarum* reverendi magistri Conradi de Ebraco Ordinis Cystersiensium scriptum Prage in conventu sancti Thome per manus fratris Iohannis de Reiz Ordinis Fratrum Heremitarum Sancti Augustini pro tunc ibidem studentis, sub anno Domini millesimo tricesimo octogesimo quinto, feria sexta infra octavas Penthecostes.” See also the description of the manuscript in Antonius de CARLENIS, OP, *Four Questions on the Subalternation of the Sciences*, ed. Steven LIVESEY, Philadelphia 1994 (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 84.4), pp. 55–57.

finished on the vigil of St Bernard [19 August] in 1377.”¹⁴ Note that Stegmüller used the term *pronunciata* to describe what Henry Totting of Oyta did at Prague as well, *pronunciare* being a technical term in Prague. Paradoxically, the only manuscript now in Prague, Cathedral Library C 31, containing book IV and fragments of book II, also dates to 1377 (28 April), but it was copied in Padua.¹⁵

As a master, Ebrach thus probably read the *Sentences* in the young faculty of theology of Prague in 1376–1377. This fits the context well: on 17 December 1374, Emperor Charles IV donated the house of St Bernard, commonly known as the Jerusalem chapel, to the Cistercian Order on condition that the brothers of the theology faculty maintain a house of study there as in Paris. Archbishop John confirmed the arrangement 30 June 1375.¹⁶ The Cistercians probably sent for Ebrach soon afterwards, and while he is attested in Prague in early 1376, it is doubtful that he would have been able to begin lecturing on the *Sentences* in the 1375/1376 academic year.

If Master Conrad of Ebrach read – and even *publicavit* – the *Sentences* at Prague in 1376–1377, where did he first do so as a bachelor? John of Retz claims that Ebrach had studied at Paris and read the *Sentences* and the Bible at Bologna before going to Prague. A half century ago there was something of a debate between the Augustinian historian Adolar Zumkeller and Ebrach’s biographer, the Cistercian Kassian Lauterer, over whether Ebrach first lectured at Paris or Bologna respectively. Since Hugolino of Orvieto and others apparently followed the Parisian model when drawing up the statutes for the faculty of theology at Bologna, internal evidence for determining whether Conrad’s *Sentences* commentary had its origins in lectures at Paris or Bologna is problematic. Thus we find all the elements that we would expect from a bachelor of the *Sentences* at Paris, even in the Krakow manuscript, which supposedly records what Ebrach recited in Prague. First, we have Ebrach’s four *Principia* in various manuscripts, combinations of sermons and questions in which the bachelor would debate his fellow bachelors, his *socii*, before beginning the actual lectures on each book.¹⁷ For his sermons, Ebrach chose a variant of the common theme *Flumen*, ‘river’, specifically *Flumen Dei repletum est aquis*, from Psalm 64.10: ‘The river of God is filled with water.’ The Augustinian historian Damasus Trapp had found that theologians often picked a theme somehow related to their name, but Lauterer could not decipher any code in Ebrach’s theme and proposed that at Bologna theologians

¹⁴ Conradus DE EBRACHO, *In IV librum Sententiarum*, ms. Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 1279, f. 224ra: “Et in hoc terminantur questiones super quarto libro *Sententiarum* reverendi magistri Conradi d’Ebraco doctoris sacre theologie pronunciate Prage in scolis sancti Bernardi finite in vigilia sancti Bernardi 1377.” Cf. A. ZUMKELLER, *Dionysius de Montina*, p. 26; K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, p. 60.

¹⁵ Praha, Knihovna Metropolitní kapituly, C 31, f. 46va: “Hic est liber fratris Nycolai de Tusca per ipsummet scriptus in conventu Paduano anno Domini M^oCCC^oLXX^o7 finitus in die Sancti Georgii in amaritudine vini librum hunc finivi hocque stupens manus dixit quiescamus iam in hac scripture desisto fere plene etc. Trinitasque Maria laudes immensas reffero vobis cunctisque sanctis ago maximas grates etc.” This removes the doubt in K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, p. 69, that ‘Padua’ could be an error for ‘Prage’. For ‘pronunciare’, see F. STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium*, p. 158; A. ZUMKELLER, *Dionysius de Montina*, pp. 26–27; K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, pp. 32–33.

¹⁶ *Libri erectionum archidioecesis pragensis, saeculo XIV. et XV.*, ed. Clemens BOROVÝ, liber I (1358–1375), Praha 1873, p. 105, no. 219. Cf. K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, p. 30.

¹⁷ The lack of a comprehensive treatment of *Principia* has led Monica Brinzei and William O. Duba to hold a conference in the context of the THESIS project, ‘Les *Principia* sur les commentaires des *Sentences*’, in Paris, 23–24 March 2015, the proceedings of which will fill a gap in the literature.

did not follow the Parisian practice of choosing themes in this way.¹⁸ In fact, however, of the various etymologies for ‘Ebrach’, apparently a pre-German toponym, one involves water and another suggests that it is a place on a river, and either or both were no doubt in Ebrach’s mind when he chose the theme.¹⁹ We shall return shortly to Ebrach’s *Principia*. In Klosterneuburg 293, Krakow, Oxford, and the former Warsaw witness we also have questions associated with Ebrach’s inception as master, first the vesperies, from the eve of the promotion, then the question in the *aula* of the bishop the following morning, on the connected themes of supreme righteousness and mortal sin.²⁰

In the Paris-Bologna debate, Zumkeller and Lauterer agreed that Conrad of Ebrach would have lectured between 1368 and 1371, accepting Pentecost 1368 as the *terminus post quem*, because Ebrach cites Hugolino of Orvieto as general of the Augustinian Order and that was his election day, with Hugolino’s appointment as patriarch of Constantinople in 1371 accordingly as the *terminus ante quem*. In his second *Principium*, in addition to an unnamed Augustinian, Ebrach cites not one but two Dominican *socii*, opposing bachelors, suggesting to Zumkeller that Ebrach was in Paris. One was named Bartholomew and the second, identified as *Pe* elsewhere, was *actu legens eiusdem ordinis*.²¹ A papal letter dated 19 June 1368 relates that the Dominican Peter Baron had been assigned to read the *Sentences* at Paris, but many other members of his order were ahead of him in line, so Urban V ordered the chancellor to allow Peter to lecture *in secundis scolis* of the order in Paris ‘*in hieme post proxime futuram immediate sequenti vel in subsequenti immediate post illam*’, a complicated formulation that seems to indicate either one of the two academic years 1368–1369/1369–1370 or one of the two years 1369–1370/1370–1371. Zumkeller reasoned that these data fit Ebrach’s citations of two Dominican *socii* and provide the probable dates for his lectures.²²

In oppositum, Lauterer noted that the explicit to the Bordeaux witness of Conrad of Ebrach’s *Sentences* commentary states that he was ‘made master’ (*magistratus*) in Bologna, suggesting that he had been bachelor there as well, which is why John of Retz would assert that Ebrach was Hugolino’s *discipulus* at Bologna. Lauterer ruled out 1370–1371 on the grounds that Hugolino was appointed Latin patriarch of Constantinople on 10 February 1371 and yet Ebrach cited him as general of the Augustinians in lectures that, by the statutes of Bologna, were not given until April. Lauterer identified Conrad of Ebrach with the Cistercian Conrad *de Alamania*, *de Ebor*, or *de Herbera*, often mentioned in the cartulary of the

¹⁸ Damasus TRAPP, *Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century: Notes on Editions, Marginalia, Opinions and Book Lore*, Augustiniana 6, 1956, pp. 146–274, at pp. 269–272; K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, p. 82, n. 4.

¹⁹ Various internet searches pointed to ‘water’ and ‘river’ as the etymological background of ‘Ebrach’.

²⁰ Again, the literature is sporadic, and a future conference on the vesperies and *aula* is envisioned for the THESIS project.

²¹ Conradus DE EBRACHO, *Principium*, II, Kraków, f. 60vb: “Sed consequens falsum, quia vel illud bene esse esset creaturam esse personaliter Deo unitam, et hoc non, sicut patet per reverendum bacularium de Ordine Predicatorum; vel esset creaturam esse dignam Deo precise, et hoc non, per reverendum bacularium Bartholomeum Ordinis Predicatorum; aut esset creaturam esse beatum precise, et hoc non, per bacularium actu legentem eiusdem ordinis.” f. 63va: “Igitur de plano reverendi bacularii predicti, tam Bartholomeus quam Pe., contradicunt beato Thome in isto passu et contra auctoritatem Ecclesie, ut videtur, quia bulla dicit ista esse veridica, sicut dicunt dicti bachalarii, maxime legens.” Cf. A. ZUMKELLER, *Dionysius de Montina*, pp. 25–28.

²² URBAIN V, *Lettres communes*, eds. Pierre GASNAULT – Marie H. LAURENT – Michel HAYEZ – Anne-Marie HAYEZ, Paris 1954–1985, no. 22390: “Ad legendum in hieme post proxime futuram immediate sequenti vel in subsequenti immediate post illam dictum librum *Sententiarum* in secundis scolis prefati ordinis.” Cf. A. ZUMKELLER, *Dionysius de Montina*, pp. 25–28.

University of Bologna (although never as *de Ebraco* or *de Ebracho*). This Conrad was already attested as master there on 24 April 1371, again eliminating 1370–1371 as a possibility. Since he found examples of more than one Dominican lecturing on the *Sentences* at the same time not only at Paris, but also at Bologna, Lauterer thus countered that the Dominican *socius* whose name began with *Pe* was not Peter Baron, but either Peter of Aragon or Peregrinus of Toulouse, both Dominicans at Bologna who were masters by 10 August 1370. It seems that Lauterer favored Peregrinus, because at one point the *socius* is called *Per* in the Krakow witness. Peregrinus is attested as *lector* on 18 May 1370, but whether this means as a bachelor or a master is unclear. Lauterer suggested that the Carmelites lacked a *sententiarus* that year and that Friar Bartholomew filled in, which would explain references to a Dominican speaking in *scolis Carmelitarum*. Lauterer thus opted for Bologna 1368–1369 or possibly 1369–1370 for Ebrach's first lectures.²³ Lauterer cited in further support an internal reference to the 'articles among the new ones of Bologna' and another to the 'articles inserted in the statutes of the *studium* of theology of Bologna', as well as Ebrach's use of this example in book II, distinctions 8–11, question 3, article 2: 'Someone in Bologna cannot consecrate hosts that are in Rome.'²⁴

Yet Ebrach often cites 'the new articles condemned at Paris', in addition to the condemnation of 1277, and we have found a counter-example in book I, dd 45–47, a. 1, where Ebrach mentions this condition: 'If God co-acted with Socrates so that in a half hour he transferred himself from Rome to Paris.'²⁵ Moreover, the Augustinian Dionysius de Restanis of Modena already read according to Ebrach's text while he lectured on the *Sentences* at Paris in 1371–1372, and even the Augustinian John Hiltalinger of Basel, who read at Paris in the 1360s, cites 'Master Conrad in his *Lectura*'.²⁶ Lauterer hypothesized that John of Retz's mention of Ebrach's youthful time in Paris referred to arts studies from around 1355 to 1360, when Ebrach would have begun his studies in theology at Bologna.²⁷ It is far more likely, however, that a German Cistercian was sent all the way to Paris not to study arts, but for theological instruction.

Where Lauterer thought he read *Per* for *Peregrinus*, moreover, the horizontal line on the descender of *P* is not deliberate, but accidental, coming from an abbreviation on the line below making *voluntate* into *voluntatem*; where he found *Pre*, it actually stands for *Predicator* or *Predicatum*; and once where he recorded a mere *P*, it is actually *Pe*, which

²³ Conradus DE EBRACHO, *Principium*, II, Kraków, f. 61rb: 'Cuius oppositum dixit reverendus bacularius Predicatorum in scolis Carmelitarum.' Franz EHRLE, *I più antichi statuti della Facoltà Teologica dell'Università di Bologna*, Bologna 1932, p. 103; K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, pp. 17–18, 23–25, 27–29, 83–85.

²⁴ K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, pp. 25–26, citing Conradus DE EBRACHO, II Sent., d. 1, q. 1, in mss. Bordeaux, Bibliothèque Municipale, 159, f. 71vb, and Kraków, f. 68ra: 'articuli inter novos Bononienses'; II Sent., d. 34 ('44' in Bordeaux), q. 3, a. 3, in Bordeaux, f. 115va–b, and Kraków, f. 114ra: 'articuli inserti in statutis studii theologie Bononiensis'; and IV Sent., dd. 8–13, q. 3, a. 2, in Bordeaux, f. 145va, and Kraków, as a. 3, f. 165rb: 'Existens Bononie non potest hostias consecrare existentes Rome.'

²⁵ Conradus DE EBRACHO, I Sent., d. 45, a. 1 (Bordeaux 69ra, Kraków 57vb, Oxford 51vb): 'Si Deus coagere Sorti quod in medio [medietate B] hore se transferret de Roma ad [usque B] Parisius.' K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, p. 76, lists six citations of new Paris condemned articles, but there are at least eight, in addition to at least sixteen from 1277.

²⁶ A. ZUMKELLER, *Dionysius de Montina, passim*; D. TRAPP, *Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century*, p. 249; K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, esp. pp. 114–124; Iohannes DE BASILEA, *In libros Sententiarum*, ms. München, Bayerische Staatsbibl., Clm. 26711, ff. 43ra and especially 67rb: 'Et concordat cum eo Magister Conradus in sua *Lectura* quod talis forma [...] verum non fuit magister cum posuit.'

²⁷ K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, p. 19.

Cappelli expands first of all to *Petrus*!²⁸ Contrary to Lauterer, we do not know that Conrad disputed against only three *socii*, but merely that he mentions just three of them. Numerous Parisian *principia* cite few *socii*, certainly fewer than existed. Indeed, there were probably more than three at Bologna, too, and the fact that one of the Dominicans was speaking *in scolis Carmelitarum* probably reflects the practice of moving from place to place for the principal and other debates, which is why the Dominican Peter is also recorded as having responded *in scolis Heremitarum*.²⁹ In short, since Bartholomew has not been clearly identified, despite the abundant documentation for Bologna in comparison with Paris, we could still accept Zumkeller's scenario of a series of Parisian lectures dating to 1368–1369 with Peter Baron as second Dominican *socius*, after which Conrad went to Bologna and became master under Hugolino.

We could, were it not for the Augustinian Venicio Marcolino's entering the debate a quarter-century ago with an impressive study of the reception of Hugolino of Orvieto. Marcolino reasoned that, according to the Bologna statutes, a bachelor had to wait two years following his *Sentences* lectures before being licensed, again leaving only 1368–1369 for reading the *Sentences*, followed by 1369–1370 for his Bible lectures, which fits in with John of Retz's report.³⁰ Since there is no record of Ebrach's presence there beforehand, Marcolino dated his arrival in Bologna to the fall of 1367, two years later than Lauterer had estimated, leaving a year for Hugolino to influence Ebrach's doctrinal choices. Afterwards, Marcolino has Ebrach leaving Bologna in the fall of 1371, although not directly for Prague. One would be inclined to doubt Marcolino's reasoning on the same basis as we did Lauterer's, except that the Augustinian Marcolino discovered more: Dionysius of Modena is attested in the Augustinian convent in Bologna on 12 December 1368, and the document providing this evidence states that Dionysius was assigned to read the *Sentences* at Paris as a bachelor, which he did in 1371–1372, arriving in the Valois capital in 1370.³¹ Marcolino thus seems to have decided the debate definitively: Conrad of Ebrach read the *Sentences* in Bologna in 1368–1369, debating the Dominicans Bartholomew and Peter of Aragon and an anonymous Augustinian, and Dionysius of Modena took a copy of this commentary from Bologna to Paris, where John Hiltalinger of Basel was able to peruse it. The reader will have noticed the many connections between Augustinians and Cistercians. Damasus Trapp long ago characterized the relationship between Parisian theologians of both orders in the years between the Black Death and the Great Schism as 'symbiotic'.³² The example of Conrad of Ebrach demonstrates that this symbiosis was not confined to Paris, but in Bologna Dionysius borrowed from Ebrach who had borrowed from Hugolino, while in Prague John of Retz copied Ebrach's commentary and fifteen years later delivered his eulogy in Vienna.

The lectures may have been given first in Bologna, but as the Paris example in his book IV shows, Ebrach absorbed a lot from Paris, where the Cistercians were quite familiar

²⁸ K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, p. 83, citing Kraków, ff. 62rb, 63ra, 63va, 219ra, 220rb, 220va, 220vb, and 222va (cf. 223ra); Adriano CAPPELLI, *Dizionario di Abbreviature latine ed italiane*, sesta edizione, Milano 2004, p. 267b.

²⁹ Conradus DE EBRACHO, *Quaestio in vesperiis*, a. 2, Kraków, f. 218ra.

³⁰ Venicio MARCOLINO, *Das Nachwirken der Lehre Hugolins*, in: W. Eckermann (ed.), *Schwerpunkte und Wirkungen*, pp. 295–481, at pp. 382–383, rehearsing Lauterer's evidence on pp. 377–382.

³¹ V. MARCOLINO, *Das Nachwirken der Lehre Hugolins*, pp. 383 and 417–419.

³² D. TRAPP, *Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century*, pp. 251–253.

with Hugolino of Orvieto. Moreover, given that our manuscripts date from Ebrach's Prague period or later, that Ebrach read the *Sentences* again at Prague, and that Ebrach actually published his commentary there, then we can anticipate that what we have in the extant manuscripts is a process of revision. That being the case, Ebrach's citing as Augustinian general his mentor Hugolino of Orvieto, who, along with the Cistercian Pierre Ceffons and the Oxford Carmelite Osbert of Pickingham, was the last active and securely identified theologian whom Ebrach cites, does not necessarily provide any date for Ebrach's original lectures (without Marcolino's discovery concerning Dionysius) or final revision, since Hugolino, Ceffons, and Pickingham lectured on the *Sentences* in the late 1340s. Indeed, Trapp himself commented that the 'delivery and editing' of the commentary of John Hiltalinger of Basel were 'far apart' simply because, although Trapp assumed that Hiltalinger lectured in 1365–1366, the latter cites Hugolino as general of the order in some places and even as former general of the order in others.³³

Lauterer himself divided Ebrach's commentary into two redactions, a Bologna version of 'Conrad the monk', represented by the main manuscripts Bordeaux, Naples, and Paris, as well as the Basel and Vatican fragments, and a Prague redaction of 'master' or 'doctor Conrad', extant in the two-volume Klosterneuburg witness, Krakow, Oxford, the lost Warsaw codex, and the late Würzburg partial copy.³⁴ To test his schema, we have done a complete reading of Bordeaux, Krakow, and Paris, together with an edition of the *Principia* and the two questions of distinctions 9–12 of book I.³⁵

The Paris and Naples codices turn out *not* to contain unadulterated copies of Ebrach's text, but a mixed work with something of Ebrach and something of Dionysius of Modena. A related, mixed text was published in Paris in 1511 under the conflated name 'Dionysius the Cistercian' and is also extant in ms. Pamplona, Biblioteca de la Iglesia Catedral, 26, ascribed to 'Dionysius the Monk', in addition to lengthy fragments in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 16228, and Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 21191.³⁶ We have not yet been able to secure a complete reproduction of Pamplona, but for distinctions 9–12 of book I, the Paris manuscript carries the same text as the 1511 edition, which not only differs in wording from the text in Ebrach's manuscripts, but also in doctrine.³⁷ The Naples codex in turn contains the basic text shared by the Paris witness and the printed edition, with differences in wording. In parallel passages elsewhere in all manuscripts and the 1511 edition, references to Augustinians are often modified with the title 'dominus' in Naples and other citations of Augustinians are added, including theologians not cited by Conrad. In the Paris manuscript and the 1511 printing, some of these citations, old and new, now mention the Augustinians as members of 'our order', while at times references to St Bernard as 'our

³³ D. TRAPP, *Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century*, pp. 261–262.

³⁴ K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, pp. 65–69; see also V. MARCOLINO, *Das Nachwirken der Lehre Hugolins*, pp. 383–387.

³⁵ Monica Brinzei has edited for future publication the *Principia* and the continuation of the debate in the last article of book IV and in the vespers and *aula* questions. Schabel has edited dd. 9–12, publishing q. 2 in Chris Schabel, *Cistercian University Theologians on the Filioque*, *Archivum Verbi* 11, 2014, pp. 124–189, at 177–182. Preliminary results of the complete reading will be published in Monica BRINZEI – Chris SCHABEL, *Les Cisterciens de l'université. Le cas du commentaire des Sentences de Conrad d'Ebrach († 1399)*, in: Anne-Marie Turcan et al. (eds.), *Les Cisterciens et leurs bibliothèques*, Brepols, Turnhout, forthcoming.

³⁶ For Dionysius and these other witnesses, see A. ZUMKELLER, *Dionysius de Montina*; K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, pp. 114–124; and V. MARCOLINO, *Das Nachwirken der Lehre Hugolins*, pp. 415–430.

³⁷ See the edition in Ch. SCHABEL, *Cistercian University Theologians on the Filioque*.

father' have been removed, even erased, in the Paris manuscript.³⁸ It is clear that the text was modified by an Augustinian author, in more than one step. This also explains why the Paris manuscript contains Ebrach's principal questions for books I and III, but drops the sermons with the *Flumen* theme. In the 1511 edition even the principal questions have been replaced with different ones, with sermons with a theme related to – not surprisingly – Dionysius the Areopagite. Given the above and other differences between the Naples and Paris witnesses and the 1511 printing, it is possible that the Naples and Paris manuscripts contain texts between Ebrach's original and Dionysius' final text. Nevertheless, even the 1511 printing is not cleansed of all elements pointing to the original Cistercian author, which leads one to wonder about a lost, final redaction of Dionysius' text.³⁹ The discovery of the nature of the Naples and Paris manuscripts at least shows that the process of revision from Cistercian Conrad to Augustinian Dionysius took place in stages.

Marcolino determined that, expectedly, Dionysius' text agrees more with the Bordeaux manuscript of Ebrach's *Sentences* commentary than with Krakow, since Dionysius would have taken a copy of the Bologna version to Paris before the Prague redaction even existed. Naturally, our collation shows that the Paris manuscript is even closer to the 1511 edition. Dionysius' version(s), extant in part or as a whole in five manuscripts and an early printing from 1511, certainly served to pass on Ebrach's text, as even John Eck, the famous opponent of Martin Luther, recognized three years after the Paris printing.⁴⁰ But Dionysius is not part of the Prague story.

Let us concentrate on the other major *codices*: Bordeaux, representing Bologna, and Klosterneuburg, Krakow, and Oxford, preserving Prague.⁴¹ At first glance, as with many questions in the Dionysius version(s), the differences are not important, mostly changes in expression, with a few additional arguments, propositions, corollaries, or dubia in one or the other redaction. Lauterer remarked that *Principia* II and IV are absent in Bordeaux (and Paris; Naples does not contain any *Principia*), which also lacks all the sermons (actually, the first folios are missing in Bordeaux, so we merely assume this for the first sermon). All four *Principia* are present in Krakow, however, and we can add that they are also in Klosterneuburg and Oxford. In addition, the vespers and *aula* questions connected to Ebrach's inception in 1370 or early 1371 are extant solely in the Prague witnesses. It is thus probable that Ebrach did not finalize the *Principia* and inception questions until he was in Prague.

On the other hand, Lauterer found that Krakow lacks four questions in a row: the three questions for distinctions 4–7 of book I and the first question of distinctions 9–12 of the same book, there being no question for distinction 8. Here the situation is not so simple: Krakow leaves 3.5 columns blank and Klosterneuburg leaves 2.5 folios blank, and then both begin on the top of a recto with the word *Secundo* for distinctions 9–12. Oxford, however,

³⁸ For the switch to 'noster', see book I, dd. 9–12, q. 1, a. 2; dd. 19–21, a. 3; and dd. 22–26, a. 2. For Bernard, see Kraków, f. 30rb: "Concordat beatus pater noster Bernardus, libro *De interiori homine*, c. 4, circa medium: 'Tanta', inquit Bernardus"; Paris, f. 26ra–b: "Concordat beatus [26rb] ????? del., libro *De interiori homine*, c. 4, circa medium: 'Tanta', inquit Bernardus." In book I, d. 17, q. 1, a reference to 'Monachus', i.e., Jean de Mirecourt, is skipped in Paris, although the passage goes on to discuss 'praedictus doctor'.

³⁹ A. ZUMKELLER, *Dionysius de Montina*, pp. 36–46; K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, p. 124.

⁴⁰ A. ZUMKELLER, *Dionysius de Montina*, pp. 15–16; K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, pp. 114–115.

⁴¹ K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, pp. 66–67; V. MARCOLINO, *Das Nachwirken der Lehre Hugolins*, pp. 385–387, esp. nn. 50–53 for differences not mentioned here.

contains all of these questions as in Bordeaux, although it does leave a blank column and another blank space after the end of the first question of distinctions 9–12, beginning the following question on the top of the next recto. One possible explanation is that some folios dropped out of the common exemplar of these Prague witnesses. But since this would entail the unlikely scenario that the lost exemplar originally had these four questions beginning on a top recto and ending on a bottom verso, a better alternative is that they simply were not copied into the exemplar for some reason, perhaps because Ebrach intended revisions (as Lauterer suggested). All three witnesses left a section blank, but only John of Retz managed to obtain a copy of the complete text to fill in the empty space, with some room remaining. Whether the copy Retz used contained the Bologna or Prague version is impossible to say, but it is probable that Ebrach read these questions at Prague as well.

There is one further difference of some significance: in the *Principium* for the first book, at the end of article 1, Bordeaux contains an interesting catalogue of contradictions in the works of Thomas Aquinas that is not only absent in the Prague witnesses, but there is no blank space in those manuscripts either.⁴² The context is, of course, Ebrach's debate with his Dominican *socii*, who appealed to the papal bull canonizing Aquinas to assert that what Saint Thomas said was true. Ebrach countered vehemently in both the Bologna and Prague versions, but it is only in Bordeaux that we find the catalogue of contradictions, which is related to a known genre in Thomist and anti-Thomist literature. This catalogue is also contained within the fragment in the Basel manuscript and as a separate text in the Vatican fragment.

The Paris manuscript, which surely does not derive from the Prague redaction, also lacks this section of text. Although in the Paris witness this gap is within a larger section of omitted text, the end of the omission does correspond to that in the Prague witnesses. Since in the *Principium* for the third book both Paris and the Prague manuscripts refer back to Ebrach's catalogue or 'concordance' from the first *Principium*, according to which Aquinas said one thing in the *Summa* and another in the *Scriptum*, this catalogue is not an addition in Bordeaux. Unless the Paris and Prague witnesses derive from a common exemplar independent from that of Bordeaux, it seems that in both the Paris and Prague traditions it was decided independently to eliminate text criticizing Aquinas.

More editing work needs to be done, but the conclusion seems to be that Conrad of Ebrach first read the *Sentences* at Bologna in 1368–1369, having gathered materials earlier in Paris as well. A written text was produced afterwards, from which at least three copies were made. Bordeaux and fragments of the Bologna tradition stem from one. From the second descend the Paris and Naples manuscripts, the 1511 printing, and the other witnesses associated with the Augustinian Dionysius of Modena. From the third derives a slightly revised 'official' version from a lost exemplar that was published and somehow re-read at Prague in 1376–1377. This version includes Ebrach's *vesperies* and *aula* questions and the *ordinatio* of the Bologna *Principia*, toning down the anti-Thomism for the Prague audience. When Ebrach left Prague in 1384 for Vienna, where he played a role similar to that of Hugolino of Orvieto in Bologna vis-à-vis co-authoring the theology statutes, he brought

⁴² K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, pp. 85–89. For discussion, see Monica BRINZEI – Chris SCHABEL, *Thomas Aquinas as Authority and the Summa as Auctoritas in the Late Middle Ages*, in: Lidia Lanza – Jose Mehriños – Marco Toste (eds.), *Summistae: The Commentary Tradition on Thomas Aquinas's 'Summa Theologiae' (15th–18th Century)*, forthcoming.

his *Sentences* commentary, which was to have a significant impact on Viennese theology in the fifteenth century.⁴³

Two Socii: Conrad of Soltau and Menso of Beckhusen

Soon after Conrad of Ebrach's lectures, the secular *socii* Conrad of Soltau, Menso of Beckhusen, and Nicholas Gubin debated each other in their own *principia* on the four books of the *Sentences*. In his *Principia*, Soltau makes it clear that Beckhusen and Gubin are among his *socii*.⁴⁴ Less secure is the information on the Dominican Nicholas Biceps that we find in a note on f. 1ra of one of the witnesses of Soltau's commentary, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hamilton 33, which states that the questions on the *Sentences* were 'comportatae' at Prague by Soltau '*concurrentem cum Bicipite ibidem*'.⁴⁵ This will be discussed below.

By tracing the Prague careers of Conrad of Soltau, Menso of Beckhusen, and Nicholas Gubin, we can arrive at a hypothetical date for their common *Sentences* lectures. Soltau, from the diocese of Hildesheim in Lower Saxony, was the senior of the three, becoming *magister artium* under Oyta himself on 27 February 1368; the junior was Gubin, who was not made master of arts until 28 April 1372. The documentation on the promotion of Beckhusen, from the diocese of Munich, is lacking, but he was made bachelor of arts on 14 May 1368 and Pope Gregory XI described him as a master of arts on 28 January 1371. On 26 April 1370, Pope Urban V related that Soltau was teaching as master of arts in Prague, where he was already studying theology, and in his January 1371 letter Gregory XI also mentioned that Beckhusen was studying theology at Prague. Soltau was still master of arts in Prague on 27 October 1374, as was Beckhusen on 18 June, when Pope Gregory noted that Beckhusen had been studying theology there for many years. Both are mentioned in letters from November the following year, 1375, but whereas nothing is said of Beckhusen's status, Soltau was a bachelor of theology.⁴⁶ Conrad of Soltau had thus studied theology between six and seven years, from at least mid-1369 to mid-1375, before becoming bachelor, and by that time Menso of Beckhusen had done so for between five

⁴³ A. ZUMKELLER, *Dionysius de Montina*, p. 17; V. MARCOLINO, *Das Nachwirken der Lehre Hugolins*, pp. 310, 320, and 378. For his Viennese activities, see K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, pp. 43–52. It is worth noting that during the schism Ebrach served as the Roman pope's anti-abbot of Morimond at least from 1383 to 1393: K. LAUTERER, *Konrad von Ebrach*, pp. 34–43.

⁴⁴ Conradus DE SOLTAU, *Principium in IV*, mss. Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, I 16, f. 150va; Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 1282, f. 127rb: "Ex quo sequitur convenienter quod de pure credibili non potest haberi habitus cognitivus sine fide, contra magistrum meum Mensonem. Sequitur secundo quod habitus theologicus non est dicendum scientia eo modo quo philosophi locuti sunt de scientia, contra magistrum reverendum Nicolaum Gubin." Cf. Paul J. J. M. BAKKER, *La raison et le miracle. Les doctrines eucharistiques (c. 1250 – c. 1400). Contribution à l'étude des rapports entre philosophie et théologie*, 2 vols., PhD thesis, Nijmegen 1999, vol. 2, p. 151, n. 4; Włodzimierz ZĘGA, *Filozofia Boga w Quaestiones Sententiarum Mikołaja Bicepsa: krytyka prądów nominalistycznych na Uniwersytecie Praskim w latach osiemdziesiątych XIV wieku*, Warszawa 2002, p. 60, n. 143. All three succeeded each other as deans of the Faculty of Arts: Soltau, 10 Oct. 1372 – 12 March 1373; Gubin, 15 Oct. 1374 – 25 April 1375; Beckhusen, 25 April – 14 Oct. 1375 (*Liber decanorum facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Pragensis*, pars I, Praha 1830, pp. 153–167).

⁴⁵ W. ZĘGA, *Filozofia Boga*, p. 33, n. 65.

⁴⁶ *Liber decanorum*, pp. 136, 151; URBAIN V, *Lettres communes*, no. 27591 (26 April 1370); GRÉGOIRE XI, *Lettres communes*, ed. Anne-Marie HAYEZ, Paris 1993, nos. 13707 (28 Jan. 1371), 32792 (18 June 1374), 34116 (27 Oct. 1374), 37766 (8 Nov. 1375), 38282 (27 Nov. 1375).

and six years, although we are unsure if he was bachelor in mid-1375. Soltau and perhaps Beckhusen would have been eligible to lecture on the Bible in 1375–1376 and probably on the *Sentences* as early as 1376–1377. Unfortunately, only a small portion of the letters of the end of Pope Gregory's reign have been published (in summary form) from the Reg. Vat. series, and the situation is worse for the Schism, so we have no letter informing us that Soltau, Beckhusen, or Gubin is *actu legens Sententias*. Moreover, as in the case of Conrad of Ebrach's Bologna lectures, we have no explicit evidence for the date: neither the sole witness to Beckhusen's commentary, Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 826, nor the numerous *codices* of Soltau's work provide a date for the lectures.

What is certain is that all three seculars, Soltau, Beckhusen, and Gubin, were already bachelors *formati* on 31 March 1383, and that Soltau was master of theology by the end of 1384.⁴⁷ In Vienna, where bachelors read the *Sentences* over a two-year period, the term *formatus* did not indicate the completion of *Sentences* lectures, but merely of the first year of the biennial reading.⁴⁸ We do not know if *formatus* had this meaning at Prague, where bachelor lectures could have taken place over a one- or two-year period, so the latest possible dates for our three seculars were 1381–1382 or 1381–1383. In the absence of other evidence, in his book on Nicholas Biceps, Włodzimierz Zega turns to the statutes.⁴⁹ The problem is that the Prague statutes have not come down to us, so we must fill in the blanks with Paris, Bologna, and Vienna. At this time Paris stipulated that four years must elapse between the *Sentences* lectures and licensing, but this included the year of the lectures and the year of licensing; Bologna specified two and a reading of a book of the Bible, although it is unclear whether they could be concurrent; while Vienna required three years. We cannot be certain, but we can probably push the *terminus ante quem* back to mid-1381. On the other end, Vienna required six years of study in theology before the baccalaureate. Soltau and Beckhusen appear to have adhered to this, but if it applied to Nicholas of Gubin, unless he was granted a dispensation, Gubin would not have been bachelor until early 1378. If Gubin then lectured on the Bible in 1378–1379, Soltau, Beckhusen, and Gubin all lectured on the *Sentences* over one or both the academic years 1379–1380 and 1380–1381.⁵⁰

Why would Conrad of Soltau have delayed so much that he ended up with a *socius* in Nicholas of Gubin who had become master of arts four years after he did? Zega notes that at one point in his *Sentences* commentary Soltau mentions that, concerning the question 'whether in every intellection of God it is necessary for the formal and adequate object to be God', 'I responded to the master of the palace in the Roman Curia in the vesperies of a certain bachelor in the time of the lord Pope Gregory XI'.⁵¹ While Zega reminds us that Gregory XI had left Avignon and arrived in Rome in early 1377, dying there on 27 March 1378, the phrase 'Romana curia' applied to the papal curia wherever it stayed, so it could

⁴⁷ *Libri erectionum archidieoecesis pragensis, saeculo XIV. et XV.*, ed. Clemens BOROVÝ, liber II (1375–1388), Praha 1878, p. 205a, no. 349; W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, p. 33.

⁴⁸ On procedures at Vienna, see now William J. COURTENAY, *From Dinkelsbühl's Questiones communes to the Vienna Group Commentary. The Vienna 'School', 1415–1425*, in: M. Brinzei (ed.), *Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the Sentences at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth Century*, Turnhout 2015, pp. 267–315.

⁴⁹ W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, pp. 27–30 and 53–54.

⁵⁰ See also W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, p. 225, giving 1379–1381 or 1380–1381 for Nicholas Biceps.

⁵¹ Conradus DE SOLTAU, *I Sent.*, dd. 35–36, Kraków, f. 53va: "Ad quaestionem istam <Utrum in omni intellectione Dei objectum formale et adaequatum necesse sit esse Deum> respondi magistro palatii in Romana curia in vesperis cuiusdam baccalarii tempore Gregorii XI"; cited in W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, p. 32, n. 58.

also have been Avignon. Perhaps Soltau was in Avignon as a new bachelor in 1375, the result of which trip was the benefice that formed the subject of the letter of November of that year. In any event, the trip to Rome or Avignon could explain some of the delay.

Soltau's and Beckhusen's written commentaries exhibit the profound influence of the corresponding work of the Augustinian Thomas of Strasbourg (de Argentina, † 1357), who later became prior general of the Order of the Hermits of St Augustine.⁵² Strasbourg's commentary survives in at least 50 manuscripts, many of them in Polish and other Central European libraries that were uncatalogued when Friedrich Stegmüller published his repertory in 1947.⁵³ According to tradition, the Augustinian read the *Sentences* at Paris in 1336–1337 (or 1335–1337), but based on information provided in his *Principia*, disguised as part of his *Prologue* (I) in the beginning and hidden away at the end of book IV (II–IV), Zenon Kaluża demonstrated that Strasbourg's period as *sententiarius* at Paris had to have been earlier.⁵⁴ Papal letters concerning Strasbourg's main opponent among his *socii*, Peter de Croso, allowed Kaluża to correct the chronology. Doctor in theology by 11 November 1338, Peter was already licensed in theology on 22 April 1337. This means that, before the completion of the 1336–1337 academic year, Peter had already finished the requirements for becoming master. Given that, without papal intervention, bachelors were required to wait at least a year following their *Sentences* lectures to be licensed, and that on 11 September 1335 Peter was described as master of arts and bachelor of theology (bachelor *formatus*, Kaluża assumes), Kaluża reasoned that 1334–1335 was the *latest* that Peter and Strasbourg could have lectured on the *Sentences*.⁵⁵ Although that letter does not specify that Peter was *formatus*, we can add a new piece of information:⁵⁶ while the published summary of a papal letter of 23 August 1333 describes Peter as master of arts, in the complete text of the letter to Peter, however, Pope John XXII remarks that, 'ut asseritur, diu legisti in theologica [theologia a.c. s.l.] facultate'. The phrase 'you have long read in the theology faculty' would, of course include lectures on the Bible, but it does suggest that Peter (and Thomas of Strasbourg) may have been advanced enough to read the *Sentences* in 1333–1334.

While Beckhusen's text is known to survive in just one witness, Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska 826, in 1947 Friedrich Stegmüller listed 33 manuscripts containing all or part

⁵² On both commentaries, see especially P. J. J. M. BAKKER, *La raison et le miracle*, II, pp. 139–150 (Beckhusen) and pp. 151–164 (Soltau).

⁵³ F. STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium*, pp. 410–413. For some Polish manuscripts, see Maria GOLASZEWSKA – Jerzy Bartłomiej KOROLEC – A. PÓHAWSKI – Zofia K. SIEMIATKOWSKA – I. TARNOWSKA – Zofia WŁODEK, *Commentaries sur les Sentences, supplément au Répertoire de F. Stegmüller*, Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum 2, 1958, pp. 22–27, and the installment of Jerzy REBETA, Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum 12, 1967, pp. 135–137.

⁵⁴ Zenon KALUŻA, Serbi un sasso il nome: *une inscription de San Gimignano et la rencontre entre Bernard d'Arezzo et Nicolas d'Autrécourt*, in: Burkhard Mojsisch – Olaf Pluta (eds.), *Historia Philosophiae Medii Aevii*, vol. 1, Amsterdam 1991, pp. 437–466, at pp. 452–462.

⁵⁵ BENOÎT XII, *Lettres communes*, ed. Jean-Marie VIDAL, Paris 1903–1911, nos. 943 (11 Sept. 1335), 4437 (22 April 1337), and 5580 (11 Nov. 1338). The 1335 letter simply states (Città del Vaticano, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 119, f. 311r–v, no. 827): 'Dilecto filio Petro de Croso, canonico Lexoviensi, magistro in artibus et in theologia bacallario, salutem.'

⁵⁶ JEAN XXII, *Lettres communes*, ed. Guillaume MOLLAT, Paris 1904–1946, no. 61048; Città del Vaticano, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Reg. Av. 43, f. 301v, no. 599; Reg. Vat. 104, f. 257v, no. 599.

of Soltau's commentary,⁵⁷ already a very high number, and we have so far tentatively identified 26 more, listed in the chart below, mostly in previously uncatalogued Central European libraries, making Soltau's work one of the most popular of the Middle Ages:⁵⁸

Aschaffenburg, Stiftsbibliothek & Stiftskirche, Ms. Pap. 25, ff. 112v–143v (Prologus)
Augsburg, Universitätsbibliothek, II. 1. 2° 112, ff. 112r, 122r (glosses from Soltau)
Brno, Moravský zemský archiv, G 10 nr. 173, ff. 9asq. (1425)
Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek, Aa 91, ff. 208va–209rb (1405; III, q. 5, dd. 6–7)
Greifswald, Geistliches Ministerium, VII.E.77, ff. 1ra–153vb (1st 1/4 15th)
Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 457, ff. 77a–455b
Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 1280, ff. 2ra–133rb (1395)
Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 1281, ff. 1r–164r
Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 1282, ff. 13ra–171vb (1290–1300)
Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 1588, ff. 1r–243v (1427)
München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 7016, ff. 134vb–140rb (1437; tabula)
München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 18360
München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 28599, ff. 68r–68v, 163r–166v (1410; book III, q. 20, dd. 34–35, book I, qq. 15 and 17, dd. 14 and 16)
München, Universitätsbibliothek, 2° 65, ff. 1ra–144va (1385; I–IV)
Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, X.C.22, ff. 438a–439b (book III, q. 3, dd. 3–4)
Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, HB III 53, ff. 1ra–259ra (1455; I–IV)
Toruń, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, Rps 51/III, ff. 4ra–177vb (last 1/4 13th; I–IV + tabula)
Trento, Biblioteca Comunale, 1581, ff. 393a–552b (I–II)
Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, C 166, ff. 13r–173r (15th; I–IV)
(olim) Warszawa, Staatsbibliothek, Lat. Fol. I. 47 (dated 1398; destroyed in war)
Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 4164, ff. 284r–295v (book I to dd. 37–38)
Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 4468, f. 200vb (Excerptum circa dd. 28–30)
Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Guelf. 69.20 Aug. fol. (Heinemann 2671), ff. 52r–197v (1426–1427; I–IV)
Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, I F 551, ff. 260ra–va (book III, q. 3, dd. 3–4)
Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, Akc 1948/734, ff. 1–46 (1495; III–IV)
Wrocław, Biblioteka Ossolineum, 385/II, ff. 2ra–209vb (1388; I–IV + tabula)
Paris/Chicago, Les Enluminures, RefNo. 119, ff. 10r–172v (1395–1427; on auction)

⁵⁷ F. STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium*, pp. 73–75. The first *Principium*, the *Prologue*, and dd. 1–20 of book I of Soltau's commentary have been published: Zbigniew CHMYŁKO – Stanisław OBSZYŃSKI – Józef ŚWIERKOSZ – Joanna JUDYCKA, *Edycja kwestii I–IX i XI–XXI Komentarza Konrada z Soltowa do I księgi Sentencji Piotra Lombarda*, *Acta Mediaevalia* 5, 1989, pp. 24–134 (d. 8, or q. 10, had been edited by Mieczysław MARKOWSKI, *Das Problem 'An Deus sit in praedicamento substantiae' im Sentenzenkommentar des Konrad von Soltau*, in: Johann Auer – Hermann Volk (eds.), *Theologie in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Festschrift Michael Schmaus zum 60. Geburtstag*, München 1967, pp. 639–649).

⁵⁸ The list derives from library catalogues and J. TRÍŠKA, *Sententiarum Pragenses*, p. 104; Z. CHMYŁKO et al., *Edycja kwestii I–IX i XI–XXI Komentarza Konrada z Soltowa*; Jerzy Bartłomiej KOROLEC – Ryszard PALACZ, *Commentaries sur les Sentences, supplément au Répertoire de F. Stegmüller*, *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 11, 1963, pp. 140–145, at p. 141. Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Palat. lat. 330, contains something connected to the *Quaestiones* commentary of Oyta, and not Soltau's commentary per se.

Nicholas Biceps and Wycliffism in Bohemia

On the basis of the dating of the *Sentences* commentary of a supposed Dominican *socius* of Conrad of Soltau and Menso of Beckhusen, Nicholas Biceps, specialists on the University of Prague and on John Wyclif agree that the English scholar's ideas reached Bohemia well before his death on the last day of 1384, by at least 1381, and probably by 1378, given the possible early dating of the *Sentences* lectures of Soltau and Beckhusen.⁵⁹ Not only do Nicholas Gubin's data make the 1378 date unlikely, however, but in fact there is no evidence for knowledge of Wyclif's ideas in Prague before 1385. Some explanation for this faulty historiographical tradition is necessary. First, a chart of the *codices* containing Biceps' *Sentences* commentary according to Włodzimierz Zega, with 'A' or 'B' standing for one of the two versions of the text:⁶⁰

Manuscript	Book I	Book II	Book III	Book IV
P Praha, Knihovna Metrop. kapituly, C 19 (1381)	B	A + princ.	A	A
Q Praha, Knihovna Národního muzea, XVI C 4 (1422)				A
R Praha, Národní knihovna České rep., I F 20 (1416)				A
S Praha, Národní knihovna České rep., IX A 4 (n.d.)			A dd.1–14	
T Praha, Knihovna Metrop. kapituly, C 15/1 (n.d.)		A qq. 1–2		
Cambridge, Corpus Christi, 501 (n.d.)	B	B	B	B
Halle, Marienbibliothek, 4 (K. 1. 55) (1401)	B + prol.	B	B	B
Olomouc, Kapitulní knihovna, 222	B + prol.	B	B	B
Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, I Q 59 (1392)	B	princ. + B dd.1–13		B frag.
München, Bayerische Staatsbibl., Clm 27034 (1391)		princ.		
Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 659 (1390)		princ.		

Let us begin with Stegmüller's 1947 repertory of *Sentences* commentaries. The entry on Biceps relates that he lectured on the *Sentences* at Prague along with Conrad of Soltau ca. 1381.⁶¹ Stegmüller derived the date from the colophon of the main manuscript of Biceps' commentary, Praha, Knihovna Metropolitní kapituly, C 19. For Biceps' association with Soltau, Stegmüller's source must have been the note mentioned above in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hamilton 33. In 1957 Damasus Trapp⁶² found a disputed question on the eternity of the world in a Munich manuscript, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 27034, ff. 260r–261v and 270r–271v, which he tentatively identified as Biceps' *Principium* question for book II

⁵⁹ For the state of the research, see Ota PAVLIČEK, *La dimension philosophique et théologique de la pensée de Jérôme de Prague*, PhD thesis, Université Paris-Sorbonne and Charles University in Prague, 2014, pp. 35–38.

⁶⁰ The manuscripts are described in W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, pp. 69–75. Zega's book supercedes his earlier articles *Znane i nieznanie dzieła Mikolaja Bicepsa*, *Studia mediewistyczne* 34–35, 1999–2000, pp. 203–227, and *Datacja 'Komentarza do Sentencji' Mikolaja Bicepsa oraz 'Komentarzy' Konrada z Soltowa, Mensona z Beckhausen i Mikolaja z Gubina*, *Terminus* 2, 2000, pp. 113–132. For texts from IVA, see also P. J. J. M. BAKKER *La raison et le miracle*, vol. 2, pp. 251–261.

⁶¹ F. STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium*, pp. 273–274.

⁶² Damasus TRAPP, *Clm 27034. Unchristened Nominalism and Wycliffite Realism at Prague in 1381*, *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 24, 1957, pp. 320–360, at pp. 354–356.

of the *Sentences* on the following basis: Prague and Oxford are mentioned in the text in a way that suggests that Prague is the location; the question title matches the title of the first question of book II in the commentaries of both Biceps and Soltau; the nature of the text suggests that it is from a principial debate; Biceps and Soltau were *socii*; the author insults the Arts Faculty in a way that Soltau, an arts master, would not do. Without Stegmüller's 'ca.', Trapp assigned the question to 1381. Although Trapp stressed that a comparison of the question with those in the *Sentences* commentaries of Soltau and Biceps was necessary to confirm his hypothesis, his noting that the author cites Wyclif by name led Wyclif experts, most notably Anne Hudson and Anthony Kenny, to establish 1381 (or even 1378–1380, or 'by 1378'), as the *terminus ante quem* for the arrival of Wyclif's ideas on Bohemia.⁶³

Recently the foremost authority on Nicholas Biceps, Włodzimierz Zega, has argued that Trapp was correct in identifying the author of the question as Biceps (and via our own comparison we have ruled out Soltau, who has a different *Principium in II* in any case),⁶⁴ since shorter versions of the same question are in some manuscripts of Biceps' commentary,⁶⁵ although Zega concluded (we have our doubts) that the question is not a *Principium* but some sort of other disputed question.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, Zega actually strengthened the argument supporting Biceps as the first evidence for the arrival of Wyclif's ideas in Bohemia. Not only did Zega find significant verbatim borrowings from several works of Wyclif in Biceps' *Sentences* commentary proper, but he also found explicit citations of Wyclif, including one in book IV labelling as heresy Wyclif's doctrine of the eucharist and mentioning that 'Wyclif's disciples hold this'.⁶⁷ Perhaps it was in part because of the late

⁶³ For example, Anne HUDSON – Anthony KENNY, *Wyclif, John (d. 1384)*, in: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford 2004, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30122>> (November 17, 2014).

⁶⁴ See also W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, p. 35, n. 67.

⁶⁵ We can add that, aside from Aquinas, Bonaventure, Peter of Tarentaise, William of Ware, and Scotus, one of Biceps' favorite authors was the Dominican John of Paris, who is cited both in the Munich question and in the truncated version in Prague C 19.

⁶⁶ W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, pp. 65–69. Zega thought he had found Biceps' *Principium* in II. First, in Halle, Marienbibliothek, 4 (K. 1. 55), f. 62va, and Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, I Q 59, f. 114r, book II, d. 1, q. 2, 'An creare sit de nihilo producere', there is this quotation: "Et haec est opinio quam recitat Scotus et tenent doctores nostri communiter, sicut tetigi in principio super secundo. Unde per potentiam Dei activam ad se producitur prima res in esse potentiali passiva ad se." Zega finds a dubium in a question in P, with the same quotation minus 'sicut tetigi in principio super secundo', with 'Circa principium secundi Sententiarum quaestio' written in the top margin. Zega thus reasons that the Prague question is the *Principium* in II, 'Utrum ex opere creationis per Scripturas revelato possit argui et concludi infinita virtus creatoris'. There are two arguments against this: (1) the incipits to commentaries on book II routinely began 'Circa principium libri secundi', i.e., 'Concerning the beginning of book II', for example those of the Dominicans William Peter Godino, James of Metz, and Durand of Saint-Pourçain, the Franciscans Francis of Marchia, Francis of Meyronnes, and Roger Rosetus, the Cistercian John of Mirecourt, and the Carmelites (near contemporaries of Biceps) Walter of Bamberg and Arnold of Seehusen, most of which are certainly not *principia*; (2) Zega's question does not include a debate between 'socii'. – On the other hand, the question Trapp found does have a debate that appears to be between 'socii', and versions of this question are placed between Biceps' books I and II in P, ff. 49ra–va, and Wrocław, ff. 111r–113r, exactly where one would expect. Finally, since Trapp's question cites Scotus, perhaps the references above both refer to the Trapp question.

⁶⁷ W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, pp. 57 and 88–101; P. J. J. M. BAKKER, *La raison et le miracle*, II, p. 255. The Eucharist critique is in the question "Utrum corpus Christi prout est in hostia possit ab angelo videri. Gwerro" (R 35r–36r), at R 36r: [mg: Wikleph] "Opinio – immo haeresis – magistri Iohannis Wikleph, quia Christus sit in hostia solum figuraliter et non realiter, quia quando dixit Christus 'hoc est corpus meum', dicit ipse idem Wikleph [mg: Wikleff] quod sit figurativa locutio et non vera, sicut frequenter Christus comparat se aliis rebus, sicut dicit 'Ego sum pastor' vel quando dicit 'Ego sum vitis vera', non quod sit realiter vitis, sed figuraliter. Sic etiam dicit ipse Wifleph [mg: Wikleff] de isto: 'Hoc est corpus meum'. Sed hoc est haeresis,

date of Wyclif's *De Eucharistia*, ca. 1380,⁶⁸ that Zega dated Biceps *Sentences* lectures to 1379–1381 or 1380–1381, that is, as late as possible given the colophon mentioned above, which specifies that the manuscript was finished on the feast of St Francis, 4 October.

Although it is exciting to think that Wyclif's writings reached Bohemia from England with such speed and immediately found followers, this very excitement should make us cautious. *Prima facie*, there are good reasons for doubt. Zega also found Biceps quoting explicitly Peter of Candia's position on the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin in book III,⁶⁹ from Parisian *Sentences* lectures that were not given until the spring of 1379 if not the following year.⁷⁰ Indeed, if the manuscript was completed on 4 October 1381, given that 223 folios take a long time to copy, one would be tempted to place the *terminus ante quem* for Biceps' lectures themselves to the academic year 1379–1380.

Accordingly, a closer look at the colophon to Praha, Knihovna Metropolitni kapituly, C 19, is in order. What we find on f. 223va is the following in large gothic script, different from the hand of the text: 'Expliciunt questiones sentenciarum quarti libri finite in festo sancti francisci amen', that is, this book was finished on the feast of St Francis, 4 October, but it is only in yet a third hand just below that we then read: 'Anno Domini millesimo trecentesimo octuagesimo primo.' Since the colophon is not one text in one hand, but two texts in two hands, both different from the main text's, the later addition of the 1381 date could be mistaken or refer to a date other than the completion of the manuscript, such as Biceps' bachelor lectures.

In fact, Zega himself provides the evidence that the date cannot apply to the manuscript. Stegmüller had already claimed that Biceps' *Sentences* commentary survives in two redactions, and Zega dates the first (version A) to Biceps' time as *Sententiarius*, which, as we have seen, Zega assigns to 1379–1381 or 1380–1381, and the second (version B) to a second set of lectures delivered in '1386–1388 or a little later'.⁷¹ Yet Zega asserts that only version B survives for book I, and thus Prague C 19 contains a mixed text, version B for book I and version A for books II–IV.⁷² This entails the following contradiction: Prague C 19 dates to 1381 but contains a text from 1386–1388 or later.

In describing the manuscript,⁷³ therefore, Zega adds a footnote stating that the paper seems to date from the 1390s rather than 1381, proposing instead a *terminus post quem* of 1384 for the manuscript. This would explain why the book I in Prague C 19 tacitly refers to Conrad of Soltau as 'a new doctor of this university', which only became true between 31 March 1383, when Soltau was still just bachelor *formatus*, and the end of 1384. Zega

quam adhuc discipuli Wicleph tenent. Unde ibi est realiter corpus Christi in hostia et non figuraliter. Unde non est simile de isto: 'Ego sum vitis vera' et de illo: 'Hoc est corpus meum'. Et hoc approbat ex persequentibus, quia cum dicit 'Ego sum vitis vera', subiungit 'Vos palmites' et vocat esse figurativam locutionem. Sed cum dicit 'Hoc est corpus meum', addit quod pro nobis tradetur in crastino, ergo realiter denotat se esse ibi corpus verum. – Distinctio[ne] undecima quarti" (R 36v–37r), at R 37r: "Borreganus (!) revocavit errorem suum coram Nicolao papa, qui dicebat corpus Christi in pane esse figuraliter et non realiter. Et haec opinio etiam fuit Wicleph: 'Cottidie offertur sacramentaliter et non cottidie realiter, quia semel oblatus est Christus.'"

⁶⁸ Alessandro CONTI, *John Wyclif*, in: Edward N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Winter 2011, Edition, <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2011/entries/wyclif/>> (March 16, 2014).

⁶⁹ W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, pp. 55–56.

⁷⁰ Chris SCHABEL, *Peter of Candia*, in: Henrik Lagerlund (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy*, Heidelberg 2011, pp. 959a–961b, at p. 959b.

⁷¹ W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, p. 225.

⁷² W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, p. 71.

⁷³ W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, p. 71, n. 188.

also notes that in version B of book III, the reference to Peter of Candia mentions that he had been raised to the episcopacy, which first happened in late 1386, meaning that the news would not have reached Prague until early 1387.⁷⁴

Even if these references only concerned Zega's version B, we would still have trouble with the contents of version A. In all the version A witnesses to book IV, Wyclif's position is not only called heresy, a characterization that did not apply until 1381, but Biceps' words imply that Wyclif is dead:⁷⁵ 'Et haec opinio etiam *fuit* Wikleph' and 'Sed hoc est haeresis, quam *adhuc* discipuli Wikleph tenent', that is, this heresy *was* Wyclif's opinion and his disciples *still* hold it. This makes early 1385 our new *terminus post quem* for version A of Biceps' commentary as well. Indeed, the obvious anger that Biceps expresses over the issue of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, aimed particularly at Peter of Candia,⁷⁶ may suggest a date after what Paweł Krupa describes as the 'grave querelle' over the issue in Paris became known in Prague.⁷⁷ The Dominican Juan de Monzon was condemned at Paris in mid-1387 for denying the Immaculate Conception. The Avignon pope supported the condemnation, and eventually the Dominican masters left Paris rather than take an oath to support the doctrine. Safe in Prague, loyal to the Roman pope, Biceps could not only reject the Immaculate Conception in the strongest of terms, but perhaps speak about the dangers of Paris to the members of his order. We may hear an echo of this in Biceps' discussion in version A of the possible implications of being in two places at once, as happens in the sacrament of the eucharist: "First, one and the same man would be at one and the same time very hot and very cold, because he would get hot in Paris because of the heat of the air and here in Prague he would be cold because of the frost; in Paris he would be beaten and wounded by an enemy, while here he would remain at peace; there because of the pestilent air he would get sick and die, while here he would live in the healthy air; there, namely

⁷⁴ W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, pp. 63 and 65; *Liber erectionum* no. 349, p. 205a.

⁷⁵ W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, p. 57.

⁷⁶ S 147ra–148ra: "Utrum beata Virgo concepta fuerit in originali peccato. Primo ponam tres conclusiones; secundo probabo illas per auctoritates sanctorum. Prima conclusio: beatam Virginem non esse conceptam in originali peccato contradicit auctoritatibus sanctorum quorum vita et doctrina sunt ab Ecclesia probata. Secunda conclusio, quod beatam Virginem [non S] esse conceptam in originali peccato hoc non contradicit manifeste canonici Sacrae Scripturae nec rationi, nec hoc esset indecens nec incongruum si hoc Deus facere voluisset [...] Tertia conclusio: quod praedicatores et doctores Ecclesiae non habent praedicare beatam Virginem non esse conceptam in originale peccato [...] Ad idem sunt etiam doctores moderni: Thomas tertia parte, Albertus Magnus, Thomasinus, Durandus, Erweus, quos omnes vidi [...] Idem Bonaventura cardinalis qui fuit de Ordine Minorum super tertium *Sententiarum* dicit [...] Item tenet Richardus de Mediavilla de Ordine Fratrum Minorum. Idem tenet dominus Gwido Excellentior doctor de Ordine Carmelitarum. Verum tamen istis non obstantibus [147va] [...] Oppositum illius [147vb] sententiae tenet Doctor Subtilis in *Scripto*, non innixus auctoritatibus sanctorum nec rationibus, sed solum voluntate sua ductus. Similiter Gwarro super tertium *Sententiarum* quaestio 10. Similiter Petrus de Candia: ille dicit se expresse tenere contra auctoritates sanctorum, sed dicit quod ipse innitur piae fidei propter devotionem ad beatam Virginem. Et confirmat dictum suum per quandam fabulam. Narrat quod beatus Bernardus post mortem apparuit cuidam fratri sui ordinis habens maculam in peccatore. Quem, cum frater interrogasset quid sibi vult haec macula, beatus Bernardus respondit quod illam maculam haberet propter hoc quod reprehendit canonicos Lubunenses de celebratione festi Sanctae Mariae. Sed hoc est fabula, quia sancti nullam possunt habere maculam. Ideo non valet. Idem tenet Linconiensis et Allexander dictus Nequam, non ille de Hallis." Cf. W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, pp. 55–56.

⁷⁷ Paweł KRUPA, O. P., *Une grave querelle. L'Université de Paris, les mendians, et la conception immaculée de la Vierge (1387–1390)*, Warszawa 2013 (Biblioteka Instytutu Tomistycznego, Teksty i Studia 6).

Paris, he would suffer great hunger because of shortage, while here he would eat enough and be full.”⁷⁸

Assuming that there are two redactions of his *Sentences* commentary and that both are securely attributable to Nicholas Biceps himself, we seem to have the following data: 1385 as the earliest possible date for version A; 1387 as the earliest possible date for version B; and a *terminus ante quem* of mid-1390 for both versions. This is because Nicholas Biceps apparently accompanied Archbishop Jan z Jenštejna of Prague (resigned 1396, Latin patriarch of Alexandria for the Roman obedience from 1399 until his death in 1400) to Rome for the 1390 jubilee, and in *De bono mortis* the archbishop describes Biceps’ death, presumably in conjunction with the trip, and thus in late 1390 or early 1391.⁷⁹ It is interesting to note that in 1385 the same archbishop had characterized Wyclif as an extremely wicked here-siarch, and one wonders whether Biceps and the archbishop learned of Wyclif’s heretical followers around the same time.

How do we account for such an apparent delay between Nicholas Biceps’ *Sentences* lectures and the two written versions? We have seen that it was not unusual for much time to pass between the oral lectures and the written version, but why would Biceps lecture on the *Sentences* around 1379–1381, produce a written version in or after 1385, and then compose a revised version between 1387 and 1390? Perhaps Biceps was not a *socius* of Soltau and Beckhusen at all. Certainly, Soltau mentions a Dominican *socius* in his own *Principia*, but not by name, unlike in the case of Beckhusen and Gubin.⁸⁰ There are various ways to interpret the evidence noted above in one of Soltau’s manuscripts: ‘Quaestiones magistrales [...] comportatae per dominum Conradum Soltaw in studio Pragensi concurrentem cum Bicipite ibidem.’⁸¹ First, the Oxford manuscript could contain or refer to a second lecture of Soltau delivered in the 1383–1384 academic year or afterwards as master, in which case Nicholas Biceps could be a bachelor lecturing at the same time, which would explain the references to Soltau as a new doctor of the university. Zega reports colophons in a Gdansk manuscript of Soltau’s commentary indicating that the questions were *compilatae* or *editae* by Master Conrad of Soltau and *reportatae* in Prague in 1385.⁸² Second, since ‘Nicolao’ is missing, the Oxford manuscript could refer to another Biceps, and indeed there was an advanced arts student named Francis Biceps who *determinavit* under a master on 3 September 1368,⁸³ the same year that Soltau became master; since our data is incomplete, it is possible, although rather unlikely, that Francis Biceps was Soltau’s *socius* as bachelor of theology a decade later.

These explanations fail to explain the 1381 date in the colophon of the Biceps manuscript, however, so there is a third alternative: like Conrad of Ebrach and perhaps Conrad of Soltau,

⁷⁸ In the question “Quaeritur quomodo Christus est in sacramento vel alicubi sive modo quantitativo vel quomodo potest esse in diversis locis. Secundum Scotum” (R 37r–40r), at R 38r; P 159vb: “Primo quod idem et unus homo simul et semel esset calidissimus et frigidissimus, quia Parisius propter caliditatem aeris califaceret [calesceret P], et hic in Praga propter gelua frigesceret; etiam Parisius ab inimico percuteretur et vulneretur, hic in quiete maneret; ibi propter aerem pestilenticum infirmaretur et moreretur, et hic in sano aere viveret; ibi, scilicet Parisius, magnam famam pateretur propter caristiam, et hic sufficienter comederent et esset repletus.”

⁷⁹ W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, pp. 19–22 and 44–47, esp. 20, n. 18. The passage is available online in ms. Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1122, f. 78va.

⁸⁰ W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, pp. 34–38.

⁸¹ W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, p. 33, n. 65.

⁸² W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, p. 59, n. 141.

⁸³ *Liber decanorum*, p. 137; W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, p. 23, n. 26.

Nicholas Biceps delivered a second series of lectures as master, from which lectures stem the first version, and the second version is Biceps revised *ordinatio*. In fact, this hypothesis accords better with the context of the Oxford note on f. 1ra: in the same hand, a note on the inside of the back cover describes the contents as follows: “Magisterial and brief questions over all books of the *Sentences* of lord Conrad Soltaw, who was bishop of Verden, doctor of Prague, and *concurrans* with *doctor* Biceps of the same *studium* of Prague.”⁸⁴

Both notes were written after Soltaw’s death in 1407, over a quarter century after the lectures, hardly a reliable source. If they contain some truth, the fact that Biceps is called a doctor may suggest that the concurrence was at the magisterial level. Biceps could have completed or began his bachelor lectures in 1381, after or at the same time as Soltaw, Beckhusen, and Gubin, but the surviving written versions of Biceps’ commentary date from in or after 1385, perhaps based on a second lecture series delivered when both Biceps and Soltaw were masters.

Although Zega rightly describes Biceps’ commentary as ‘a compilation consisting of literal or paraphrased fragments of works of Dominican and Franciscan authors from the 13th century and the beginning of the 14th’, Zega also shows that it is worthy of our attention. It is still the most important witness to the initial arrival of Wyclif’s ideas in Bohemia, even if several years later than previously thought. It is also famous for the use of Anselm against the heretical nominalism of William of Ockham. Beyond its significance for the Prague reception of Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Peter of Tarantaise, Richard of Mediavilla, and John Duns Scotus, moreover, Biceps is an important testimony to the persistent vitality of the works of William of Ware, John of Paris, and William Peter of Godino (*Thomasinus*), and even Robert of Oxford. In the only section of his commentary that has been critically edited, 280 lines on divine simplicity, 40% is an explicit paraphrase of Francis of Marchia. Finally, Biceps is a bridge between an early generation of Prague theologians to a later, rather different one in the era of Jan Hus, who thought highly of Biceps’ intellectual abilities.⁸⁵

The precise year(s) of the lectures of Conrad of Soltaw, Menso of Beckhusen, and Nicholas Gubin is uncertain, as is the issue whether Nicholas Biceps was their *socius*, but we can at least say that the written record for philosophical theology at Prague moves in the 1370s and 1380s from the cursory lectures of Henry Totting of Oyta, to the recycled Bologna lectures of Conrad of Ebrach following Hugolino of Orvieto, to the original – albeit derivative of Thomas of Strasbourg – lectures of Soltaw and Beckhusen, and finally to the fascinating compilation of Biceps. If Biceps was remembered primarily in Prague, Ebrach’s commentary exerted an influence in Paris and Vienna, Soltaw’s was read all over Central Europe, and the works of Ebrach, Soltaw, and Beckhusen provided the models for several *Sentences* commentaries at Kraków in the first half of the fifteenth century.⁸⁶ They may not have aroused the excitement that Jan Hus and Jerome of Prague did decades later, but in a way they constitute a Golden Age of Prague theology.

⁸⁴ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Hamilton 33, f. 1ra: “Questiones magistrales et breves super omnes libros Sententiarum domini Conradi Soltaw, qui fuit episcopus Fferdensis, doctor Pragensis, et concurrans cum doctore Bicipite eiusdem studii Pragensis.”

⁸⁵ W. ZEGA, *Filozofia Boga*, pp. 44, 143, 166–170, 226, and *passim*.

⁸⁶ See the list of Kraków commentaries in their inspiration in Z. KALUZA, *Un manuel de théologie en usage à l’Université de Cracovie*, pp. 108–109, n. 5.

Zlatý věk teologie v Praze: pražské komentáře *Sentencí* z let 1375–1385, termín *post quem* pro doložení viklefismu v Čechách

RESUMÉ

Studie analyzuje dochované komentáře k *Sentencím* Petra Lombardského z období počátků pražské předhusitské univerzity. *Sentence* Petra Lombardského představují jeden z nejvýznamnějších literárních žánrů středověké filozofie. Jedná se o výsledky přednášek bakalářů teologie, které byly součástí předepsaného syllabu teologického studia a jednou z podmínek pro dosažení magisterského gradu z teologie. Nejstarší známý pražský komentář, *lectura textualis* Jindřicha Tottinga z Oyty, pochází z počátku sedmdesátých let 14. století. Čtyři další dochované výklady je možné vročit mezi roky 1376 až 1381 a jejich autory jsou cisterciák Konrád z Ebrachu, dva sekulární teologové Konrád ze Soltau a Menson z Beckhusenu, a dále dominikán Mikuláš Biceps. Text upozorňuje na tzv. *principia*, strhující debaty a výměny názorů mezi pražskými teology, jež známe z úvodních přednášek k jednotlivým čtyřem knihám *Sentencí* a které se konaly vždy před počátkem akademického roku. Konrád z Ebrachu ve svém pražském výkladu přednesl v podstatě svůj dřívější kurs z Bologně, a inspiroval tak celou řadu generačně mladších kolegů. Komentář Konráda ze Soltau se stal doslova teologickým „best-sellerem“ a dochoval se v šedesáti doposud známých kodexech. V příspěvku je věnována pozornost i významu komentáře Mikuláše Bicipita, jenž obsahuje první známé doklady o vlivu traktátů Jana Wyclifa v českém prostředí. Detailní rozbor Mikulášova výkladu a dalších zdrojů ukázal, na rozdíl od výsledků dřívějšího bádání, že vliv pojednání evangelického doktora v pražském prostředí nesahal před chronologickou hranicí roku 1385 (tedy není možné jej doložit pro roky 1378 či 1381). Zdá se, že Bicipitův výklad měl patrně vliv výhradně v pražském prostředí. Naproti tomu stopy vlivu komentáře Konráda z Ebrachu je možné doložit v Paříži či ve Vídni, Soltovův výklad byl hojně čten v celé střední Evropě. Výklady obou Konrádů i Mensona se staly dokonce modely pro několik komentářů k *Sentencím* na krakovské univerzitě během 15. století. Přestože tyto tři výklady nevzbudily zájem Jana Husa a Jeronýma Pražského o několik dekád později, jsou důležitým dokladem „zlatého věku teologie“ pražské předhusitské univerzity na počátku papežského schismatu v období před první velkou secesí nominalistických mistrů v polovině osmdesátých let 14. století.

Český překlad: Martin Dekarli

Chris Schabel
University of Cyprus
schabel@ucy.ac.cy

Monica Brinzei
L'Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes in Paris
(part of the CNRS)
mbrinzei@gmail.com

Mihai Maga
Centre for Ancient and Medieval Philosophy,
'Babeş-Bolyai' University, Cluj, Romania
mihai.maga@ubbcluj.ro

JAN OF MÝTO'S BACHELOR LECTURE ON THE PSALMS AND ITS SOURCES IN THOMAS WALEYS'S WORK. A NEW LIGHT ON ENGLISH-CZECH CONNECTIONS IN THE LATE MIDDLE AGES*

DUŠAN COUFAL

ABSTRACT

The study is, on the larger background of Prague university exegesis, analysing the bachelor lecture on Psalms by Jan of Mýto, which has been written most probably in 1395–1401 and survived in the only known incomplete copy in the codex of the National Library of Czech Republic III B 13 (Ps. exegesis 26–41,10). The author bases his study with the use of probe method on Jan's exegesis of the Psalm 29. He observes, that moral exposition with numerous exempla from the sphere of natural and social phenomena dominates Jan's exegesis, and he finds out that Jan of Mýto mostly compiled this exegesis from the lecture on Psalms written by the English Dominican Thomas Waleys († 1349?). The study observes the reception of Waleys' lecture in Bohemia during 15th century and it mentions a probable way it spread in Central Europe through Dominican order studies.

Keywords: Jan of Mýto – Thomas Waleys – Prague university – Biblical exegesis – Bachelor lectures – 14th century – Dominicans

Biblical commentaries were, in the late Middle Ages, an integral part of instruction at theological faculties of medieval universities. Leaving aside sermons, the academic exegesis of the Bible had essentially two forms. Holy Scripture was either expounded by Masters, professors of theology, or Bachelors. The exegeses of Masters were more extensive and sophisticated. Unlike the lectures of Bachelors, they consisted primarily of *quaestiones* related only indirectly to biblical exegesis.¹ One example of such an interpretation is the exegesis of the first fifty Psalms by Heinrich Totting of Oyta that first saw the light of day in Vienna after he left Prague, and which has, up to a point, survived in his own hand-written text.²

* This study came into existence as part of the scientific research activities of the Hussite Museum in Tábor.

¹ About exegesis at medieval universities see e.g. Jacques VERGER, *L'exégèse de l'Université*, in: Pierre Riché – Guy Lobrichon (eds.), *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, Paris 1984, pp. 199–232; Gilbert DAHAN, *L'exégèse chrétienne de la Bible en Occident médiéval. XII^e–XIV^e siècle*, Paris 1999, pp. 109–120; Lesley J. SMITH, *The Use of Scripture in Teaching in the Medieval University*, in: John van Engen (ed.), *Learning institutionalized. Teaching in the medieval university*, Notre Dame, Ind. 2000, pp. 229–243 (Notre Dame conferences in medieval studies 9).

² Included in the register of Friedrich STEGMÜLLER – Klaus REINHARDT, *Repertorium biblicum Medii Aevi* [digital] (hereafter RB [digital]), no 3219 <<http://www.repbib.uni-trier.de/cgi-bin/rebihome.tc/>> (November 5, 2014). For more detail about this exegesis (and its survival) see Albert LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der ersten deutschen Universitäten und zur Problemgeschichte der Spätscholastik*, Münster i. W. 1937, pp. 79–81 and 86–90 (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters. Texte und Untersuchungen, Band 33, Heft 4/5).

For now, however, we will focus on the lectures of Bachelors, as the exegesis of Prague master Jan of Mýto mentioned above in the title is exactly such a piece of work. Let us begin with the general characteristics of these lectures as they would have been taught at a medieval university.

The studies at theological faculties were naturally subject to the statutes. In the case of Prague we know only a fraction of them, so when forming our ideas about the basic outline of theological studies in Prague, we cannot, broadly speaking, manage without consulting analogous statutes of cognate faculties, such as the Viennese one.

According to the Viennese statutes the student of theology could become biblical bachelor (*biblicus*) or bachelor cursor (*cursor*), at the earliest, six years after his enrollment in theological studies. And as W. J. Courtenay has found out, in the case of the prototype Parisian faculty, it was highly unusual here for a student in the 2nd half of 14th century to finish the prescribed period of 6 years earlier.³ Within this period *theologiam audire* was his main duty. In practice it meant that he was supposed to listen to the lectures of his older colleagues bachelors, perhaps even the lectures of masters themselves. Their topics were the Bible and the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Thereafter, with the recommendation of one of the professors, a mere student became a bachelor and also a member of the theological faculty.

Recently graduated bachelors first delivered a so-called *principium* (or *introitus*) along with a commendation of Holy Scriptures (*commendatio Sacrae scripturae*) during their graduation ceremony. They mostly chose a piece of text from a book of the Bible as a basis for their speech and began to expound on the book thereafter. According to the extant excerpt from the Prague statutes the bachelor cursor was expected to read only a book of the Bible stipulated by the faculty or its Dean. The faculty was supposed to ensure that they, if possible, duly go through the whole Bible step by step. The cursor in Prague was supposed to read for one year every designated day (*omni die legibili*) and should he miss anything on any given day, he was expected to catch up with arrears of work either in the following year or during the holidays. Moreover, no one was supposed to expound on more than one chapter during one lecture, except in the instances that the chapter was too short. The bachelors then usually expounded on two books of the Bible, or their parts.

The extant excerpts of the Prague statutes, however, tell us nothing more about the exegetic method of these lectures. According to the Viennese statutes the bachelor was supposed to expound on the text *ordinate et solide* during the cursor lectures and, at the same time, to introduce *glossas notabiles*, which was in accordance with the Parisian course style. The bachelor in Heidelberg pledged *non extense, sed cursorie legere litteram dividendo et exponendo*. According to the Erfurt statutes he could, moreover, if he wanted to, touch upon even some *dubia literalia* briefly.⁴

Also based on these formal instructions it is generally assumed that the cursor's expositions were only superficial, an exegesis centered around the literal meaning without deeper

³ William J. COURTENAY, *The Course of Studies in the Faculty of Theology at Paris in the Fourteenth Century*, in: Stefano Caroti (ed.), *Ad ingenii acuitionem. Studies in Honour of Alfonso Maierù*, Louvain-la Neuve 2006, pp. 67–92, here p. 71.

⁴ For a full exposition cf. Dušan COUFAL, *Einleitung*, in: *Magistri Iohannis Hus Enarratio Psalmorum* (Ps. 109–118), eds. J. Nechutová et al., Turnhout 2013, pp. ix–lxviii, especially pp. ix–xxxiii (CC CM 253), where the reader will also find references to relevant sources and literature.

theological speculation. Even though their intention was indeed mainly to demonstrate the bachelor's familiarity with the text and the history of exegesis, as we have been recently warned by William Courtenay, it would be a mistake to consider these expositions, based on the term *cursor* or *cursorie*, superficial.⁵ The lecture of Jan of Mýto provides evidence for this.

This master from Prague was born in Vysoké Mýto in East Bohemia, probably in the sixth decade of the 14th century, but his death is mentioned as early as October 1402. He belonged to the first generation of Czech professors at Prague University, which breded the ingoing generation of Prague reformists headed by Jan Hus. He became Master of Liberal Arts in January 1385 and he was placed second out of 55 examinees, which was, in itself, a great success. Perhaps this was the reason why, sooner or later, he earned the title of Sophist (*Sophista*). He began his career as a university teacher at the Faculty of Arts in the Spring of 1389. His pedagogical activities were extensive and he was one of the most sought-after professors, a fact well documented by 31 determinations (graduation ceremonies) and 19 inceptions under his auspices. Jan is also mentioned in the years 1394–1395, first as a Dean of the Faculty of Arts, and thereafter as a Rector of the whole Three-Faculty University. Another significant honour was bestowed upon him on March 15, 1400, when he delivered a ceremonial speech, both in Czech and German, at a coronation of Queen Sophia of Bavaria, the wife of Wenceslaus IV. Several extant graduation ceremony speeches – so called recommendations (*recommendationes*) – attest to his art of rhetoric, including a commendatory speech delivered during the graduation ceremony of Jan Hus in 1393.⁶

Jan's theological studies, on the other hand, are a big unknown for us; largely because the relevant official records of Prague theological faculty have not survived. Thus it is difficult to say with any degree of certainty exactly when he entered the theological faculty and when he became a bachelor. We know that he is mentioned as a bachelor of theology around October 15, 1400, however it is not clear from the given source whether at that

⁵ W. J. COURTENAY, *The Course*, p. 74.

⁶ Jan of Mýto has been so far most comprehensively treated by Václav FLAJŠHANS in *Předchůdcové Husovi* [Hus's Predecessors], *Věstník České akademie císaře Františka Josefa pro vědy, slovesnost a umění* 14, 1905, pp. 437–443. His literary activity was described by Pavel SPUNAR, *Repertorium auctorum Bohemorum proventum idearum post Universitatem Pragensem conditam illustrans*, I, Wratislaviae etc. 1985, pp. 92–94, no 198–209 (*Studia Copernicana* 25), cf. also Jana NECHUTOVÁ, *Die lateinische Literatur des Mittelalters in Böhmen*, übersetzt von H. Boková – V. Bok, Köln 2007, pp. 281–282 (*Slavistische Forschungen* 59). His biographical data, especially from university years, more recently included in the register of Josef TRÍŠKA, *Životopisný slovník předhusitské pražské univerzity 1348–1409* [Biographical Lexicon of Pre-Hussite Prague University 1348–1409], Praha 1981, pp. 281–282, however Jan is mentioned as a priest in South-Bohemian Volyně already in December 1393, see Věra JENŠOVSKÁ (ed.), *Regesta Bohemiae et Moraviae aetatis Venceslai IV. (1378 dec. – 1419 aug. 16.)*, 1/4, Praha 1976, p. 976, no 4023. Some of his recommendations were published by Bohumil RYBA, *Promoční promluvy mistrů artistické fakulty Mikuláše z Litomyšle a Jana z Mýta na Univerzitě Karlově z let 1386 a 1393* [Graduation Ceremony Speeches of the Masters of the Faculty of Arts Mikuláš of Litomyšl and Jan of Mýto at Charles university from years 1386 and 1393], Praha 1948; Pavlína MAZÁČOVÁ has dealt with them recently, see e.g. *Recommendace Jana z Mýta na pražské univerzitě sklonku 14. století* [Jan of Mýto's Recommendations at Prague University at the End of 14th century], in: Helena Krmičková et al. (eds.), *Querite primum regnum Dei. Sborník příspěvků k počtě Jany Nechutové* [A collection of Contributions in Honor of Jana Nechutová], Brno 2006, pp. 313–321. The copy of at least one of his speeches (but also of the Heinrich Reczkow de Ribbenicz's speech) has survived also in the manuscript Universitetsbibliotek Uppsala, C 220, cf. f. 142–154v. For the only known 'quaestio' of Jan of Mýto see Jana NECHUTOVÁ, *Autorita Bible a její překlady podle kvestie Jana z Mýta Utrum sanctorum patrum* [The Authority of Bible and its Translations according to the quaestio of Jan of Mýto *Utrum sanctorum patrum*], *Česká literatura* 47, 1999, pp. 510–514.

time he was a biblical bachelor or already a bachelor of Sentences (*sententiarius*), the latter option being more probable.⁷

The second known piece of evidence of his theological studies at this point is the above mentioned lecture of Psalms.⁸ There is no need to emphasize at length that Psalms were an important part of Christian faith, piety and culture in the Middle Ages.⁹ Along with the Book of Isaiah and the Gospel of Matthew, they indisputably were the most commented on medieval biblical texts.¹⁰ The reason was simple. On one hand it is due to the presence of Psalms both in Mass Liturgy and the daily devotions, but, most importantly, the medieval theologians were convinced that the Psalms are '*totius theologiae paginae consummatio*' (P. Lombard), so they were perceived as a pivotal textbook of catechism.¹¹ Therefore it is understandable that several lectures on Psalms from the circles of Prague University of the pre-Hussite period have survived to this day: aside from the text of Jan of Mýto also the lectures of Conrad of Soltau, Mikuláš of Rakovník and Jan Hus.¹² These texts will shortly help us when examining the Sophist's lecture.

The commentary is so far known from the only manuscript from the National (formerly University) Library in Prague III B 13. It is to Jan of Mýto the text is attributed by an anonymous 15th century writer on its front end-sheet: *Lectura magistri Iohannis de Muta super secundum nocturnum Psalterii*. The manuscript comprises 196 folios covered with the handwriting of a single scribe and is dated by the codicologists to the turn of the 15th century.¹³ Nevertheless, as I will explain later, there is an indication that the text was written into the codex around the year 1414, at the earliest. It contains the exegesis of little less than 16 Psalms, while the entry begins with the 26th Psalm and ends with the 10th verse of the 41st Psalm, if calculated according to the Vulgate (i.e. Ps. 26–41,10). It is obvious, mainly because of the unfinished exegesis of the last Psalm, that we are dealing with a fragmentary text, in which case we are not able to tell how many Psalms were originally expounded by

⁷ See Ferdinand TADRA (ed.), *Soudní akta konsistoře pražské* [Judicial Files of Prague Consistory], IV, 1401–1404, Praha 1898, p. IX, note *: "Ac Johannes dictus Zophista baccalarius s. theologie, plebanus in Wolina."

⁸ See RB [digital], no 4821 <<http://www.repbib.uni-trier.de/cgi-bin/rebihome.tcl>> (November 5, 2014) and P. SPUNAR, *Repertorium*, I, p. 92, no 198. About it so far only V. FLAJŠHANS, *Předchůdcové*, pp. 441–442.

⁹ Nancy VAN DEUSEN (ed.), *The Place of the Psalms in the Intellectual Culture of the Middle Ages*, Albany 1999; Susan GILLINGHAM, *Psalms Through the Centuries*, I, Oxford 2008, pp. 77–130.

¹⁰ Arduin KLEINHANS, *Der Studiengang der Professoren der Heiligen Schrift im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert*, Biblica 14, 1933, p. 390; A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting*, p. 81. About commentaries of Psalms until 1350 Martin MORARD, *Entre mode et tradition: les commentaires des Psaumes de 1160 à 1350*, in: G. Cremascoli – F. Santi (eds.), *La Bibbia del XIII secolo. Storia del testo, storia dell'esegesi*, Firenze 2004, pp. 323–352.

¹¹ The meaning of the Psalter was accurately described by Heinrich Totting of Oyta, see A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting*, p. 87: "In hoc libro, qui dicitur psalterium, est totius theologie (!) pagine consummatio, misteriorum christi patens reservatio et leta divine laudis declaratio." For this cf. e.g. James R. GINTHER, *The Scholastic Psalms' Commentary as a Textbook for Theology: The Case of Thomas Aquinas*, in: Anne J. Duggan – Joan Greatrex – Brenda Bolton (eds.), *Omnia disce: Medieval Studies in Memory of Leonard Boyle*, O. P., Aldershot 2005, pp. 215–216 and 219.

¹² About them in a larger context of psalm exegesis in Prague at D. COUFAL, *Einleitung*, pp. xxxiii–xxxviii. About the exegesis of Conrad of Soltau more recently IDEM, *Glosovaný výklad Žalmů Konráda ze Soltau a počátky české reformace* [Commented Psalm Exegesis of Conrad of Soltau and the beginnings of Czech Reformation], in: Ota Halama (ed.), *Amica – sponsa – mater. Bible v čase reformace* [The Bible in the Time of Reformation], Praha 2014, pp. 45–84.

¹³ Cf. Josef TRUHLÁŘ, *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum latinorum qui in c. r. Bibliotheca publica atque Universitatis Pragensis asservantur. Pars prior*, Pragae 1905, p. 163, no 422. The codex along with the description is available in the database Manuscriptorium (www.manuscriptorium.com).

Jan of Mýto.¹⁴ Although we equally cannot tell with certainty when it happened, based on the above-mentioned facts from his biography and also based on the usual procedures at the Faculty of Theology, I tend to suppose that the text was written in the interval between the years 1395 to 1401.¹⁵

Jan's lecture is divided in the manuscript liturgically in two 'Nocturns'.¹⁶ It corresponds to traditional eight-fold division of Psalter in Nocturns according to the Rome daily Office (Ps. 1, 26, 38, 52, 68, 80, 97 and 109).¹⁷ On the contrary, the scribe's method of first mentioning a couple of introductory words from the verse to be expounded (at some places we find only one word) while its whole wording is inserted as late as in the closing part of the exegesis seems unusual. This was also the reason why the Czech literary historian Václav Flajšhans, who has been so far the only one who inquired into Jan's text, assumed that originally the exegesis visually took the form of an interlinear gloss, which the scribe did not apparently respect and re-wrote the text as one unit.¹⁸ Nonetheless this is a wrong assumption, because this method was most likely chosen by Jan himself, in accordance with one of his model texts that I will explore later in greater detail.¹⁹ Even the fact that interlinear glosses do appear anywhere in the text of particular verses in the closing part of the exegesis cannot change that.²⁰

When it comes to Jan's exegesis and its method per se, I have to state beforehand, that it was not in my power to study the whole text thoroughly. Therefore I will at least introduce it by analysing Jan's 29th Psalm exegesis.

Although this Psalm has 13 verses according to current counting, Jan has divided it into 14 parts.²¹ According to the title it is a song at the Dedication of the House of David. The formal structure of the exegesis is traditional. It is a continuous commentary²² which Jan first begins with a brief introduction or *accessus*, where he deals with the author, subject, structure and purpose of the Psalm. At the same time he already distinguishes here in accordance with the medieval hermeneutical theory the understanding of the Psalm on

¹⁴ V. FLAJŠHANS, *Předchůdcové*, p. 441, presumes, that Jan originally expounded the whole Psalter, but that is, with regard to his exegetic method and the scope of similar bachelor lectures, improbable. We would rather expect that he expounded this way at most Ps. 26–51, it means second and third 'Nocturn' (see below). Jan Hus expounded for instance only Ps. 109–118, even if his exposition of Ps. 118 is naturally extensive.

¹⁵ Jan of Mýto began studying theology in year 1389 at the earliest, when he became master regent at the Faculty of Arts. After 6 years of studies he would thus become biblical bachelor the very year 1395.

¹⁶ See the marginal glosses in folios 1v (Ps. 26): 'Nocturnus secundus incipit' and 149v (Ps. 38): 'Nocturnus tercius'.

¹⁷ See e.g. Annie SUTHERLAND, *English Psalms in the Middle Ages, 1300–1450*, Oxford 2015, p. 249; John HARPER, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century*, Oxford 2001, pp. 69–71.

¹⁸ V. FLAJŠHANS, *Předchůdcové*, p. 441, who has been prompted by the lecture of Mikuláš of Rakovník, which is indeed laid out like that in the manuscripts and it has a character of a gloss, see e.g. ms. National Library of the Czech Republic (hereafter NL) Prague, III D 4.

¹⁹ It is the below mentioned lecture of Thomas Waleys.

²⁰ See e.g. ms. NL Prague, III B 13, f. 13r. However, the nature and origin of these isolated glosses have to be first thoroughly examined.

²¹ The division in verses, as we know it today, was different during the Middle Ages and different systems coexisted as well, see e.g. Paul SAENGER, *The British Isles and the origin of the Modern Mode of Biblical Citation*, *Syntagma: Revista del Instituto de Historia del Libro y de la Lectura* 1, 2005, pp. 77–123.

²² For various types of exegeses see G. DAHAN, *L'exégèse chrétienne*, pp. 142–159; Jan's lecture most resembles 'le commentaire continu', see pp. 154–156.

several levels, i.e. the literal and the spiritual.²³ Jan expounds on the text about King David, referring to him as to the author of the Psalm, in the basic literal or historical sense (*ad litteram*). In the mystical or allegorical sense (*mystice sive allegorice*) he expounds it as being about the head, which is Christ, and about the body, which is Church. The main topic of the Psalm is resurrection and its purpose (*intentio*) is that those who hold hope of the resurrection were not afraid of suffering, but praised God. Anagogically, the Psalm talks about a perfect future Church, and in the end, tropologically, or rather morally (*moraliter*), about any chosen one (*electo et fideli*), who learns that his sins have been forgiven and he thanks God for it.²⁴ Jan gives to moral exegesis by far the widest scope.

Despite such a complex introduction in Jan's expounding of particular verses we encounter here only a limited number of microstructures of biblical exegesis as distinguished by Gilbert Dahan, the leading expert on medieval hermeneutics.²⁵ The basic structure of a gloss (see e.g. the exegesis of Ps. 29,4) prevails and then a so-called accumulation of exegeses (subsequent expositions indicated as: *potest etiam alio modo exponi, vel, vel potest referri, vel aliter, vel sic* etc.). Few or no other microstructures are present there. Particularly the small number of distinctions popular among the preachers is intriguing. The Sophist's exposition thus in this light does not seem to be that all-inclusive in comparison with a cognate lecture of Jan Hus.²⁶

Jan's above-mentioned exegetic preferences depended however, to a large extent, on the choice of sources he used when composing his expositions. Jan expounds the Psalm being about Christ, in terms of mysticism based on the classic Psalm commentary by Peter Lombard.²⁷ Jan speaks of the work of Lombardus simply as of a Gloss (*Glosa dicit*), (just as Jan Hus also does later for instance),²⁸ which manifests the fact that it played the role of a basic exegetic manual. We can see this practice also in an older Prague lecture by Conrad of Soltau, albeit in a different form. Conrad refers to Lombard's exposition as to *Glosa ordinaria*, while referring to a somewhat older *Ordinary Gloss* of the Cathedral School of Laon by a simple term *Glosa*. As for the historical meaning Jan of Mýto, too, consulted *Postilla literalis* by the Franciscan Nicholas of Lyra (cf. e.g. the exegesis of Ps. 29,1–2).²⁹ To a limited extent he apparently also used (cf. the exegesis of Ps. 29,10b) a standard commentary of the French Dominican Nicholas of Gorran († 1295), yet it is not possible to prove it positively based only on the analysis of the exposition of Psalm 29.³⁰

Jan of Mýto consults the aforementioned established commentaries mainly when he expounds the Psalm in the mystical sense as a Psalm about Christ, or in a historical sense as a Psalm about King David. But when he chooses the moral exposition, which is dominant in his exegesis, his apparatus is significantly richer. This happens primarily because while

²³ Henri DE LUBAC, *Medieval exegesis. The four senses of scripture*, II, transl. by E. M. MACIEROWSKI, Grand Rapids 2000; G. DAHAN, *L'exégèse chrétienne*, 5th and 6th chapter.

²⁴ Cf. ms. NL Prague, III B 13, f. 28v–29r.

²⁵ G. DAHAN, *L'exégèse chrétienne*, pp. 122–141.

²⁶ For Hus's method of the exegesis of particular verses see D. COUFAL, *Einleitung*, pp. xxix–xxi, for that matter Libor ŠVANDA, *Husova Enarratio Psalmorum: K Husově metodě výkladu žalmů* [Hus's Enarratio Psalmorum: On Hus's Method of the Exegesis of Psalms], *Studia historica Brunensia* 56, 2009, pp. 37–47.

²⁷ RB [digital], no 6637 <<http://www.repbib.uni-trier.de/cgi-bin/rebihome.tcl>> (November 5, 2014).

²⁸ D. COUFAL, *Einleitung*, p. xxv.

²⁹ There are many editions of Lyra's *Postillae* since the 15th century.

³⁰ There is no edition of the commentary as yet, for the ms. cf. RB [digital], no 5750 <<http://www.repbib.uni-trier.de/cgi-bin/rebihome.tcl>> (November 5, 2014).

doing so he summons for help numerous spiritually and morally instructional exempla which are based on the quotations from ancient and medieval literature, mainly dealing with natural phenomena. In the exposition of the 29th Psalm we can come across quotations of Aristotle, Valerius Maximus, Petronius, Horace, Pliny the Elder, Vegetius, Seneca the Younger, Isidore of Seville, Avicenna, Albert the Great, Alexander (of) Neckam, John of Hauville (*de Hauvilla*) and other personalities or anonymous works. As far as theologians are concerned, Jan refers in his moral exposition to John Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, Saint Gregory the Great or Bernard of Clairvaux.

Even though Jan of Mýto had undoubtedly an exceptional literary scope when it came to classical or secular literature, as his recommendations suggest,³¹ it is a fact that he is not the author or a compiler of the aforementioned moral instruction. He took large sections with moral exposition from another, about 70 year older, commentary of Psalms written by an English Dominican, Thomas Waleys.³²

Waleys, who was in the sources called mainly Thomas the Englishman (*Thomas Anglicus*), studied and briefly – between 1317–1321 – taught theology at Oxford. Afterwards, approximately between the years 1326–1331, he worked as a lecturer of the Dominican Order in Bologna. In Italy he got involved in the debate of *visio beatifica* in the 30's and was in papal prison for a short time. After he was released he returned to England. Waleys wrote, among others, a number of exegetic *Moralitates* on several books of the Old Testament. Thereafter, during his lecturing stay in Bologna he started to expound the psalter in a literal and moral sense, however his commentary in its extant form is unfinished (we know the exposition of Ps. 1–38,2). According to the English historian Beryll Smalley we can see a tendency in 14th century biblical exegesis to give more scope for exempla and to explaining the moral meaning of natural phenomena. The exegetists would connect collections of exempla with biblical commentaries in such a way that their text was used as a thread on which they would string non-biblical stories, and Waleys in particular was among the first who systematized the new techniques.³³

In the light of this understanding, it is not surprising that it was Waleys's exegesis that Jan of Mýto chose as one of his main sources. It undoubtedly matched his literary taste,

³¹ His knowledge of ancient literature however came mainly from medieval florilegia and such works as Ps.-Bury's *Liber de vita et moribus philosophorum antiquorum*, see the unpublished dissertation of Pavlína MAZÁČOVÁ, *Iohannis de Mutha recommendationes (Rekomendace Jana z Mýta)* [Jan of Mýto's Recommendations], Brno 2001, pp. 123–128. For the knowledge of antiquity in late medieval Bohemia in general, see e.g. Anežka VIDMANOVÁ, *Antika v literatuře středověkých Čech* [The Antiquity in the Literature of Medieval Bohemia], in: Eadem, *Laborintus. Latinská literatura středověkých Čech* [Laborintus. Latin Literature in Medieval Bohemia], Praha 1994, pp. 172–185.

³² For Waleys's lecture, its survival in manuscript and its editions cf. RB [digital], no 8245–8247 <<http://www.repbib.uni-trier.de/cgi-bin/rebihome.tcl>> (November 5, 2014); Beryl SMALLEY, *Thomas Waleys O. P.*, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 24, 1954, pp. 50–107, here primarily pp. 66–71 and Thomas KAEPPPEL – Emilio PANELLA, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*, vol. IV, Roma 1993, pp. 403–404, no 3890. Below I am relying on the edition: *Commentarius super Psalmos F. Tho. Iorgii Anglici ord. praed.*, eds. Sixtus LAMBERTUS – Paulus BERTI, Venetiis: Apud Euangelistam Deuchinum 1611 (the digitized copy Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, sg. 1552797 2 Exeg. 280), in which the Waleys's text is erroneously attributed to a different English Dominican Thomas of Jorze († 1310).

³³ Mainly Beryl SMALLEY dealt with his life and work: aside from the above mentioned work *Thomas Waleys O. P.*, cf. also *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century*, Oxford 1960, pp. 75–108, here especially pp. 80–88, where there are more details about his exegetic method and working with exempla (i.e. with the moralization of the natural and social phenomena); from here I also draw the last-mentioned statement, see p. 83.

especially when, (and we must not forget this point), the aim of the aforementioned explanation of moral meaning was to raise the reader from secular to spiritual reality. On the other hand, Jan's massive borrowing from Waleys's text does not necessarily demonstrate that he had limited creative abilities. On the contrary, Jan of Mýto, completely in accordance with what was expected from a biblical bachelor, manifested himself as an original compiler of the basic exegetic concepts of biblical texts: a doctrinary-theological one from a gloss of Peter Lombard (*mystice*), a historical one from a postil of Nicholas of Lyra (*litteraliter*) and a moral-theological one from a lecture of Thomas Waleys (*moraliter*).³⁴ However when it came to using the latter, Jan the Sophist could only follow it up to the exposition of the 2nd verse of the 38th Psalm, because Waleys's text ends there. Thus at least Jan's exposition of the last four Psalms in the manuscript III B 13 was composed with the help of other sources,³⁵ yet not necessarily in a different way, as it seems upon a cursory inspection in the aforementioned part.

No matter how close the morally instructive comparisons were to Jan's heart, this rhetorical device turns out to be unusual in lectures on the Psalms in Prague.³⁶ It is very obvious when we make a comparison with the lecture of Jan Hus, which is otherwise quite close to Sophist's exposition.³⁷ Jan Hus actually did not use exempla in his lecture at all. That is interesting, all the more so because we know that in his 3–5 years older collection of sermons *Puncta* Hus was not averse to using exempla yet, including those that came from various fables and fantastical phenomena. This transformation is attributed to Hus's embracing John Wycliffe's ideas that were against the usage of similar fabrications.³⁸ Thus there can

³⁴ Because of the delimitation of this publication I retreated from presenting an editorial illustration of Jan of Mýto's exegesis.

³⁵ I.e. f. 149v–196v. We are repeatedly dealing here above all with *Moralitates in Iob* of Saint Gregory the Great. It is noteworthy, that between the Sophist's exposition of Ps. 37,23 and 38,1, i.e. between f. 148v and 149v, there are several blank pages. This could be the consequence of the change of liturgical division from first to second Nocturn.

³⁶ Actually, except for the aforementioned Prague lectures, I am not encountering similar exempla even in the anonymous psalm expositions of Czech origin, extant in manuscripts from 15th century, for those see Jindřich MAREK, *Husitský výklad Žalmů v rukopise Národní knihovny ČR XIII G 25* [Hussite Psalm exegesis in the Manuscript of the National Library XIII G 25], *Studie o rukopisech* 37–38, 2007–2008, pp. 3–23 and Dušan COUFAL, *Kdo je 'Remigius' v Husových Enarrationes Psalmorum? K problematice citování této autority v bohemikálních výkladech Žalmů první poloviny 15. století* [Who is 'Remigius' in Hus's Enarrationes Psalmorum? To the problems of quoting this authority in bohemical expositions of the Psalms of the first half of 15th century], *Studia historica Brunensia* 58, 2009, pp. 62–64. The fact is, however, that most of these commentaries are closer more to the preacher exegetic homilies than to a university lecture, and some are already clearly of Hussite origin.

³⁷ For one such remarkable congruity in quoting Pseudo-Remigius see D. COUFAL, *Kdo je 'Remigius'*, especially pp. 58–60.

³⁸ On *Puncta* with so far most detail see Jan SEDLÁK, *XIII. Husův vývoj dle jeho postil* [XIII. Hus's Development according to his Postils], in: Idem, *Studie a texty k náboženským dějinám českým, II, Studie a texty k životopisu Husovu* [The Studies and Texts on Czech Religion History, II, Studies and Texts on the biography of Jan Hus], Olomouc 1915, pp. 395–399 and IDEM, *M. Jan Hus*, Praha 1915, pp. 83–88, who attributes the transformation mentioned precisely to Hus's embracing of the thinking of John Wycliffe. Otherwise the way Hus explains the moral meaning in *Puncta* is no different from the practice of Jan of Mýto (for that matter of T. Waleys). Let's present as an example Hus's exemplum about phoenix in the sermon at the St. Peter and Paul's saint's day, see ms. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Wien, 4310, f. 68v: "Secundo Venit in partes Cesaree Philippi [Matth. 16,13]. Racio prima: [...]. Racio 2^a moralis: Illa tota regio Fenicis dicebatur, que avis ibi conversatur inter montem Damasci et terre promissionis. Fenix secundum naturales solum comedit odorifera, dormit inter ligna aromatica et cum vixerit per 300 annos, congregat ligna aromatica, que faciliter incenduntur a radiis solis, et est masculus, et cum revixerit, ascendit montem libani et ubi sit, non veniunt serpentes. Iesus – non elegit putrida, Psalmus [118,155]: Longe

be a far more profound dimension hidden behind the aforementioned fundamental difference between the bachelor lectures of both Jans, than just a different exegetic taste.

But let's go back to the reception of Waleys's commentary by Jan of Mýto in Bohemia in the late Middle Ages, because this phenomenon leads us to some remarkable and so far unforeseen connections.

It is a lecture of the Sophist from the very end of 14th century that (to my knowledge) constitutes the oldest evidence of Waleys's commentary being known in Bohemia. Nonetheless, it is thanks to Jan of Mýto that Waleys's exegetic ideas echoed in Prague even a little later when the Hussites started giving communion to the laity under both species, bread and wine. The copy of Jan's lecture in Prague codex III B 13, generally speaking, contains very few marginalia. In Jan's exposition of the 29th Psalm we encounter them only in one place, the 10th verse, which asks: '*Que utilitas in sanguine meo, dum descendo in corrupcionem?*' The Sophist expounds here through Waleys extensively, what is the three-fold efficacy of the Blood of Jesus, and he claims that this Blood is not only very useful, but essential for a Christian, and as evidence of it he adds a quotation from the Gospel of John 6, 53: '*Nisi manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis et biberitis eius sangwinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis.*'³⁹ The scribe who wrote the manuscript at this spot noted on the edge of folio 34r: '*De sangwine Cristi; utilitas* ^{3ex}; *necessitas.*' We can explain why he took a particular interest in this matter by the fact that another of the Sophist's disciples, Jacob of Mies (Jakoubek of Stříbro), similarly promoted and defended the introduction of the lay chalice.⁴⁰ Therefore I presume that the above-mentioned scribe was at least a witness (if not a downright supporter) of the aforesaid Hussite practice, so he could have written the text around the year 1414, at the earliest. On the other hand, I have not found, so far, any direct link of Jacob of Mies's or any other Utraquists' ideas to the Sophist's or Waleys's text.

On the Czech Hussite scene, at least in the second half of the 15th century, Waleys's text was read and used directly as well, without being mediated by the Sophist. We know that because one of the extant copies of Waleys's lecture was finished in Tábor, in south Bohemia, by a supporter of the Hussite chalice Jan of Bakov in year 1466. From the marginal note in this manuscript we learn among others, that 'this material' was preached in Nymburk in central Bohemia in the years 1491 and 1492.⁴¹ We know at the same time that Waleys's exegetical work returned again to Prague University at the end of the 15th century. The German master Johannes of Lübeck († 1502), a bachelor of theology from Rostock,

a peccatoribus salus, Apocalypsis 7 [recte 22,15]: Foras canes, venefici; quievit in triduo inter aromatica, Matthei [...]; congregat ligna odorifera, id est beatos; succendit igne amoris, Luce 12[49]: Ignem veni mittere in [...]; ascendit in celum, in Symbolo: Ascendit in celum, sedet."

³⁹ Iohannes DE MUTA, *Lectura super Ps.* 29, 10, ms. NL Prague, III B 13, f. 34r; Thomas ANGLICUS, *Commentarij super Psalmos*, pp. 32–33 (*Lectura secundi nocturni*).

⁴⁰ For this cf. e.g. Howard KAMINSKY, *A History of the Hussite Revolution*, Los Angeles – Berkeley 1967, pp. 108–115; more recently Dušan COUFAL, *Polemika o kalich mezi teologií a politikou 1414–1431. Předpoklady basilejské disputace o prvním z pražských artikulů* [The Controversy over the Chalice Between Theology and Politics 1414–1431. The circumstances of the Dispute in Basel about the First of the Four Articles of Prague], Praha 2012, pp. 25–37, where we can read about Jakoubek's emphases on the necessity, the order and the usefulness of taking in the blood of Christ (by laity).

⁴¹ It is a manuscript The Archive of Prague Castle – the Library of the Metropolitan Chapter by St. Vitus (hereafter The Chapter Library) Prague, B 31. I am adopting the mentioned data from the catalogue: Adolf PATERA – Antonín PODLAHA, *Seznam rukopisů knihovny Metropolitní kapitoly pražské. První část: A–E* [The register of the Manuscripts of the Library of the Prague Metropolitan Chapter. The first part: A–E], Praha 1910, p. 201, no 330.

who converted to utraquism in Prague and from 1467 was teaching theology at the University, compiled a part of his expositions of Psalms based on Waleys's commentary.⁴² The reception of Waleys's exposition of Psalms thus had quite a long standing in Bohemia in the late Middle Ages.

We should add for the sake of completeness, that the exposition of Psalms by Thomas Waleys was not his only copied and well known text in Bohemia. In two manuscripts, apparently still from the 14th century, we find his extant commentary of Augustine of Hippo's *De civitate Dei*,⁴³ whereas one of these manuscripts belonged to Pavel of Slavikovice, a bibliophile who became a bachelor of arts and a priest in Prague.⁴⁴

Even if this study does not aim to deal with all possible ways in which Waleys's oeuvre was spreading in Bohemia, I will bring to attention at least one connection that comes to mind, thanks to the survival of Waleys's lecture on Psalms. From 19 so far known copies, 14 are extant in the continental libraries.⁴⁵ It is noteworthy that 8 of them belong to the area of Central Europe – Bamberg, Eischstätt, Melk, Prague, Regensburg,⁴⁶ Vienna, Wrocław – the geographical center of this area being Prague. It is also the only place where no less than two copies from the 15th century have survived in the Library of the Metropolitan Chapter by St. Vitus.⁴⁷ At least three, or more precisely four manuscripts belonged to Dominican convents in the cities mentioned (Eischstätt, Regensburg, Wrocław; the manuscript of

⁴² Jan of Lübeck, called Libek, was brought under research by František Michálek BARTOŠ, *Príspevky k dějinám Karlovy university v době Husově a husitské*, V, *Německý bohoslovec husitský na Karlově universitě* [The Contributions to the History of Charles University at the time of Hus and the Hussites, V, The German Hussite Theologian at the Charles University], *Sborník historický* 4, 1956, pp. 65–70, here especially pp. 67–68. An exhaustive register of literary activity of Jan of Lübeck catalogued by Pavel SPUNAR, *Literární činnost utrakvistů doby poděbradské a jagellonské* [Literary Activity of the Utraquists at the Podiebradian and Jagiellonian Era], in: Amedeo Molnár (ed.), *Acta reformationem bohemicam illustrantia* [I]. *Príspevky k dějinám utrakvismu* [The Contributions to the History of Utraquism], Praha 1978, pp. 165–269, here p. 248, no 173. Bartoš and Spunar know 3, for that matter 4 manuscripts of Libek's exegesis (they include Ps. 1–67, i.e. 4 parts) and date its origin ca. to 1494–1502. I was again comparing only the exposition of Ps. 29, meaning the exposition of Jan of Lübeck in the manuscript NL Prague, III F 14, f. 37v–47r, especially f. 43v–44r (Ps. 29, 10a), with the corresponding place of an edition of Waleys's lecture (see the note 32 above). The spirit of late utraquism manifests itself in Libek's exposition, if he inserts into Waleys's exposition the note (f. 44r): "Vereor, ne apud plerosque descendat [i.e. the Blood of Christ, DC] in corumpcionem, qui indigne calicem Domini sumunt perditis moribus vitam agentes, dum plus ad ista terrena corruptibilia affectum tendunt."

⁴³ For Waleys's commentary on the first 10 books *De civitate Dei*, which is in manuscripts and prints often supplemented with Nicholas Trevet's († after 1334) complete exposition on that very Augustine's book, cf. B. SMALLEY, *Thomas Waleys O. P.*, pp. 86–98, which warns, that the medieval scholars understood the mentioned Augustine's work as an introduction to the history of the Antiquity, which was certainly in tune with Waleys's interests.

⁴⁴ See ms. NL Prague, VII C 21 (2nd half of the 14th century) and VIII B 2 (14th/15th century), which belonged to Pavel of Slavikovice and deals primarily with material of antiquity. About this Hussite priest and his library see Karel HRUZA, *Liber Pauli de Slauikouicz. Der hussitische Codex 4937 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek in Wien und sein ursprünglicher Besitzer*, in: Gustav Pfeifer (ed.), *Handschriften, Historiographie und Recht*. Winfried Stelzer zum 60. Geburtstag, Wien – München 2002, pp. 128–152, here especially pp. 131–133. I have not investigated further which textual tradition of Waleys's work both manuscripts represent.

⁴⁵ I base it on the registry works of B. SMALLEY, F. STEGMÜLLER and Th. KAEPPELI-E. PANELLA, mentioned above, in the note 32.

⁴⁶ Now ms. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, Clm. 13501.

⁴⁷ The Chapter Library Prague, ms. B 31 and A 79/4. And apparently of Czech origin is also the manuscript Stiftsbibliothek Melk, 1861, see Christine GLASSNER, *Inventar der Handschriften des Benediktinerstiftes Melk, I, Von den Anfängen bis ca. 1400*, Wien 2000, p. 479 (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, Denkschriften 285, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Schrift- und Buchwesen des Mittelalters II,8,1).

Viennese Dominicans has not survived).⁴⁸ Thus it seems that the lecture given in Bologna by the English Dominican was logically spreading first of all in this (and not only in this) area within the Dominican Order and its Order's studies, and this was the way it could reach even Prague and its University either from Italy or England in the 14th century. The Dominicans of St. Kliment in Prague who were certainly the recipients of numerous literary novelties thanks to their extensive contacts with foreign lands, actually had through their Order's studies precisely in the 2nd half of 14th century close personal relations with Prague University.⁴⁹

The reception of Waleys's lecture in Bohemia shows again that the scholarly literary contacts between England and Prague, between the Englishmen and Czechs, took on many forms and did not necessarily have to be related solely to the case of John Wycliffe, as we have been recently reminded by the historian Michael Van Dussen in connection with another exposition of Psalms which was read in Bohemia, written by the English hermit Richard Rolle.⁵⁰

Jan of Mýto's bachelor lecture is therefore a text of many layers and connections, I mentioned here just some of them. Although compilatory in its nature, which is a common outcome of academic activities in the late Middle Ages, it carries specific traits that open up new prospects on intellectual work, and not only of Prague University, in the 14th and 15th centuries. To study further the bachelor lecture of Jan Sophist is thus still more than desirable.

Translated by Veronika Teryngerová

⁴⁸ See RB [digital], no 8245 <<http://www.repbib.uni-trier.de/cgi-bin/rebihome.tcl>> (November 5, 2014).

⁴⁹ For this cf. Jaroslav KADLEC, *Řeholní a generální studia při Karlově universitě v době předhusitské* [Monastic and General studies at Charles University in the Pre-Hussite Era], Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis 7, 1966, pp. 63–88, here p. 64–79 and especially Pavel ŠPUNAR, *The Literary Legacy of Prague Dominicans and the University in Prague*, in: Zofia Włodek (ed.), Société et église. Textes et discussions dans les Université d'Europe centrale pendant le moyen âge tardif. Actes du colloque international de Cracovie, 14–16 juin 1993, Turnhout 1995, pp. 91–100.

⁵⁰ See Michael VAN DUSSEN, *From England to Bohemia. Heresy and communication in the later Middle Ages*, Cambridge 2012, pp. 37–62; IDEM, *Mezi Anglií a Čechami. Preláti v Římě a šíření anglických kontemplativních textů* [Between England and Bohemia. The Prelates in Rome and the Dissemination of English Contemplative Texts], in: Pavlína Rychterová – Pavel Soukup, *Heresis seminaria. Pojmy a koncepty v bádání o husitství* [Heresis seminaria. The Notions and Conceptions in the Research of Hussitism], Praha 2013, pp. 49–73.

Bakalářská lektura Žalmů Jana z Mýta a dílo Thomase Waleyse jako její pramen. Anglicko-české vazby v pozdním středověku v novém světle

RESUMÉ

Bakalářské biblické lekture byly klasickým produktem vzdělávání teologů na středověkých univerzitách. Řadí se k nim i lektura na Žalmy pražského mistra Jana z Mýta († 1402). Patřil ke generaci českých učitelů na pražské univerzitě, která vychovávala nastupující generaci českých reformistů v čele s Janem Husem. Ačkoliv na artistické fakultě patřil k vyhledávaným mistrům, méně jasné je jeho působení na fakultě teologické. Jedním z mála dokladů je právě Janova lektura na Žalmy, dochovaná ve fragmentární podobě v jediném známém rukopise Národní knihovny ČR III B 13 (zahrnuje výklad Ps. 26–41, 10, počítáno podle Vulgáty). Vznikla nejspíše mezi lety 1395–1401 a autor studie s ní čtenáře seznamuje prostřednictvím Janova výkladu Ps. 29 (Ž 30). Ten sestává z úvodu k Žalmu (*accessus*) a doslovného (historického), alegorického (mystického) a morálního výkladu jednotlivých veršů. Převažuje morální výklad, který obsahuje četná exempla, respektive moralizaci přírodních a společenských jevů. Ve skutečnosti ale Jan z Mýta rozsáhlé pasáže morálního výkladu, včetně exemplů, nepřiznaně převzal z lekture Žalmů (ve známé podobě zahrnuje výklad Ps. 1–38, 2) anglického dominikána Tomáše Waleyse († 1349?), který studoval v Oxfordu a poté působil jako lektor řádového studia v Bologni, kde také jeho lektura vznikla. Waleys byl známý svými humanistickými sklony a zálibou v antice a patřil k prvním, kdo tyto své znalosti systematicky využil při výkladu Bible. Na druhou stranu využívání exemplů se zdá být v pražských či bohemikálních biblických lekturách (Žalmů) ojedinělé a na příkladu díla Jana Husa se lze domnívat, že zvláště po roce 1400 to může souviset i s proměnou exegetických důrazů na pražské univerzitě v souvislosti s recepcí myšlenek Jana Wyclifa. Waleysova lektura byla nicméně opisována, čtena a při exegezi využívána i v husitských Čechách přinejmenším na sklonu 15. století. Doklady pro to máme z Tábora, z pražské univerzity, ale i ze stře-dočeského Nymburka, kde byla využívána při kázání. Dochované rukopisy Waleysovy lekture pak obecně svědčí o její oblíbenosti ve střední Evropě, kde se nejspíše šířila prostřednictvím dominikánských řádových studií.

Dušan Coufal
Centre for Medieval Studies
Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague
coufald@ gmail.com

HENRY TOTTING OF OYTA AND THE PRAGUE NOMINALIST *SCHOLA COMMUNIS* BETWEEN 1366 AND 1409: A PRELIMINARY DRAFT*

MARTIN DEKARLI

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the nominalist heritage at Prague University during the late middle ages, more precisely between 1366 and 1409, and the role of Henry Totting of Oyta. It first summarises several institutional milestones of the Prague Nominalist *schola communis*, i.e. the founding of Charles College in 1366 and a series of institutional controversies from 1384 to 1409. It also provides a provisional prosopographical determination of the particular nominalist generations. Secondly, this paper also retraces Oyta's influence within the Prague controversy over the real existence of universals (*universalia realia*) in texts deeply immersed in the nominalist heritage, for example of Conrad of Soltau and John Arsen of Langenfeld.

Keywords: Henry Totting of Oyta – Prague University in the Middle Ages – Nominalism – Realism – *universalia realia*

1.

In November 1402 the famous late medieval theologian Jean Gerson († 1429) delivered a two-part lecture, known today as *Contra curiositatem studentium*, where he severely warned young Parisian students against several doctrinal *errores*. The powerful Parisian Chancellor reminded them not only of the proper difference between philosophy and theology as separate discourses with their own methodology but also the importance of logic for metaphysics. Later in his lecture he presented several suggestions on how the faculty of theology should regulate academic discourse, e.g. by the authorisation of books, together with other rigorous institutional prescripts.¹ Gerson also remarkably drew attention to one of the *moderni*, according to him, a famous intellectual, whose erudition can be compared with the old masters in tradition. He clearly said: “*Venerabilis et venerandus doctor magister Henricus de Hoyta qui pro sui merito veteribus aequari et inter eruditissimos logicos, metaphysicos et theologos*

¹ Jean GERSON, *Contra curiositatem studentium*, in: Oeuvre completes III, L'œuvre magistrale (67–105), ed. Palémon GLORIEUX, Paris – Tournai – Rome – New York 1962, pp. 224–249; in brief about the lecture see Brian Patrick MCGUIRE, *Jean Gerson and the Last Medieval Reformation*, Pennsylvania 2005, pp. 134–135; further especially Zénon KALUZA, *Les querelles doctrinales à Paris, nominalistes et réalistes aux confins du XIV^e et XV^e siècles*, Bergamo 1988, pp. 50–62; Maarten J. F. M. HOENEN, ‘Modus loquendi platoniorum’, *Johannes Gerson und seine Kritik an Platon und den Platonisten*, in: Stephen Gersh – Maarten J. F. M. Hoenen (eds.), *The Platonic Tradition in the Middle Ages, a Doxographic Approach*, Berlin – New York 2002, pp. 328–329, and M. J. F. M. HOENEN, *Via Antiqua and Via Moderna in the Fifteenth Century, Doctrinal, Institutional, and Church Political Factors in the Wegestreit*, in: Russell L. Friedmann – L. O. Nielsen (eds.), *The Medieval Heritage in Early Modern Metaphysics and Modal Theory, 1400–1700*, Dordrecht 2003, pp. 9–36.

*numeraris potest.*² Further he also added one more interesting detail, his own personal testimony on Henry's residence in Paris from studies at the College of Navarre: "*Placuit hujus doctoris inter caeteros meminisse.*"³ The unique record of one of the most prominent Parisian nominalist of the late Middle Ages provides us with rare evidence about Henry Totting of Oyta's influence in his times. It also, indirectly, implies Henry's significance towards the diffusion of Parisian nominalism within the topographic space of late medieval Central Europe, e.g. intellectual centres such as Prague, Erfurt, Vienna, Cracow, and Heidelberg.

The aim of the present paper is to outline a preliminary draft of the Prague nominalist *scho-la communis*, and to call to mind some important milestones related to the rise and fall of the nominalist tradition in institutional and doctrinal context of the Prague University between 1366 and 1409. Likewise, it will attempt to determine Henry's importance in the diffusion of Parisian nominalism. Our goal will be also retrace his influence during and after his residence in Prague from the early 1360s up to the early 1370s or shortly into the early 1380s, and the dissemination of the nominalist heritage until the Decree of Kutná Hora in 1409.

2.

It is almost impossible to reconstruct intellectual life in the first two decades after the founding of Prague University between 1347/1348 as late as ca. 1367.⁴ During the 1350s as well as 1360s only a few masters who obtained their degrees in Paris left us some traces about their intellectual activity. One of them, Master Fridmannus of Prague, had studied in Paris together with Albert of Saxony (d. 1390) in the early 1360s and it was probably he who had brought back to the newly founded Bohemian intellectual centre some of Albert's exposition on natural philosophy, perhaps on logic, e.g. *Summa naturalium*, *Quaestiones in octo libros Physicorum*, *Quaestiones supra logicam*, *Perutilis logica*.⁵ The oldest known extant exposition directly transmitted from Paris to Prague is a *reportatio* of Jean Buridan's *Prior Analytics*. The preserved text was compiled by an otherwise unknown Bohemian intellectual from the late 1350s named only as Matthias of Plana. Some other manuscripts with several of Buridan's or Oresme's commentaries, all of them approximately from the same period as Matthias's inscribed text, are preserved in several libraries in Central Europe.⁶

² Jean GERSON, *Contra curiositatem studentium*, pp. 241–242.

³ Jean GERSON, *Contra curiositatem studentium*, p. 242.

⁴ For institutional and doctrinal portrait of the Prague University and the Faculty of Liberal Arts see Michal SVATOŠ, *The Studium Generale 1347/8–1419*, in: Ivana Čornejová – Michal Svatoš (eds.), *A History of Charles University 1348–1802*, 1, Prague 2001, pp. 22–93 and František ŠMAHEL, *The Faculty of Liberal Arts 1348–1419*, in: *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter. Charles University in Middle Ages, Gesammelte Aufsätze, Selected Studies*, Leiden – Boston 2007, pp. 213–315.

⁵ Fridmann's provisional biography in Josef TRÍŠKA, *Repertorium Biographicum Universitatis Pragensis Praehussiticae 1348–1409*, Praha 1981, p. 114 and in details Harald BERGER, *Albertus de Saxonia († 1390), Conradus de Waldhausen († 1369) und Ganderus recte Sanderus de Meppen († 1401/06). Eine Begegnung in Prag im Jahr 1364*, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 106, 1998, pp. 31–50; for Albert's works preserved in Bohemia see Vilém HEROLD, *Albert von Sachsen und die Prager Universität (Biographische Anmerkungen)*, in: Joël Biard (ed.), *Itinéraires d'Albert de Saxe, Paris – Vienne aux XIV^e siècle*, Paris 1991, pp. 295–296.

⁶ Matthias of Plana's 'reportatio' of Buridan's *Prior Analytics* listed in Mieczysław MARKOWSKI, *Die Aristotelica in den mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Bibliothek des Metropolitantkapitels zu Prag*, *Acta Mediaevalia* 8, 1995, pp. 234–235; other manuscripts with mentioned commentaries registered in Mieczysław MARKOWSKI,

Nevertheless thanks to Fridmannus, Matthias and other now-unknown masters, at the early Prague Faculty of Liberal Arts the standard Parisian textbooks on the *corpus aristotelicum* of Jean Buridan (d. ca. 1360/1361) were used. Together with them arrived a vast number of expositions of the late medieval Parisian nominalism, such as Albert of Saxony, Nicole Oresme (d. 1382) and Marsilius of Inghen (d. 1396).⁷ Unfortunately we know little about the early intellectual life and activity of Prague theological studies. Of the first five original members of the Theological Faculty, only three of them are known by names – the Dominican John Moravec, the Franciscan Albert Bludův and the Augustinian Hermit Nicholas of Louny. From this period, so far only a fragment of the fourth book of the Commentary on the *Sentences* from Henry of Friemar (the Younger) survived.⁸

The institutional and doctrinal rise of the Prague nominalist *schola communis* can be traced as far back as the late 1360s. The whole process is rooted in the foundation of Charles College in 1366, by Emperor Charles IV, as an immediate reaction to the founding of other universities in Cracow (1364) and Vienna (1365).⁹ The Prague masters certainly profited from the new institutional background and they had used the newly obtained support for an immense expansion of studies. Today we can specify the circle of regent masters engaged in this enterprise, here is a list of the ‘founders generation’: Herman of Winterswick, Fridmannus of Prague, John (Ienke) Wenceslaus’s of Prague, Oto of Werder, Nicholas of Moravia, Henry de Novo Ponte, Wikbold Stutte of Osnabrück, Henry of Bronkow, John of Parim called also Witepenyngh and Henry Totting of Oyta.¹⁰ More than half of them left Erfurt for a brighter future in Prague and a real university career, especially the possibility of obtaining full academic degrees in various disciplines. Thanks to the efforts of these masters of the first generation,

Repertorium commentariorum medii aevi in Aristotelem Latinorum quae in bibliothecis Wienae asservantur, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk – Łódź 1985, p. 265 and p. 268; further Mieczysław MARKOWSKI, *Repertorium commentariorum medii aevi in Aristotelem Latinorum quae in Bibliotheca Amploniana Erfordiae asservantur*, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk – Łódź 1987, p. 176; likewise *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum medii aevi latinorum qui in Bibliotheca Jagellonica Cracoviae asservantur*, 5, eds. Maria KOWALCZYK – Anna KOZŁOWSKA – Mieczysław MARKOWSKI – Sophia WŁODEK – Marianus ZWIERCAN, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków 1993, pp. 294–296.

⁷ Comprehensive summary retracing the influence of Buridan’s expositions at universities in Central Europe can be found in Mieczysław MARKOWSKI, *L’influence de Jean Buridan sur les universités d’Europe central*, in: Zénon Kaluža – Paul Vignaux (eds.), *Preuves et raisons à l’Université de Paris: Logique, ontologie et théologie au XIV^e siècle*, Paris 1984, pp. 149–163 and Bernd Erich MICHAEL, *Johannes Buridanus. Studien zu seinem Leben, seinem Werken und zur Rezeption seiner Theorien im Europa des späten Mittelalters*, I, Berlin 1985, pp. 321–389 (especially pp. 332–340). Recent criticism against doctrinal homogeneity of the so-called Buridan’s school in Johannes M. M. H. THIJSEN, *The Buridan School Reassessed. John Buridan and Albert of Saxony*, Vivarium 42, 2004, pp. 18–42.

⁸ For the institutional development of the Prague Theological Faculty see Jaroslav KADLEC, *The Theological Faculty*, in: Ivana Čornejová – Michal Svatoš (eds.), *A History of Charles University 1348–1802*, I, pp. 123–145. Fragment of *Commentary on the Sentences* of Henry of Friemar (the Younger) listed by Adolar ZUMKELLER, *Manuskripte von Werken der Autoren des Augustiner-Eremitenordens in mitteleuropäischen Bibliotheken*, Würzburg 1966, pp. 157–158.

⁹ *Statuta Collegi Karoli Quarti*, in: Josef TRÍŠKA, *Starší pražská univerzitní literatura a karlovská tradice* [The Older Prague University Literature and Caroline Tradition], Praha 1978, pp. 75–87 and Wolfgang Eric WAGNER, *Universitätssift und Kollegium in Prag, Wien und Heidelberg*, Berlin 1999, pp. 47–48, 429–430.

¹⁰ Provisory biographical overview of all masters in J. TRÍŠKA, *Repertorium Biographicum Universitatis Pragensis Praehussiticae 1348–1409*, pp. 114, 146, 173–174, 177, 191, 288, 321–322, 407, 434, 531; for more details on Herman of Winterswick and Oto of Werder see *Studium generale Erfordense. Zur Erfurter Schul-leben im 13. Jahrhundert und 14. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 1989, pp. 209–218, 281–287; for Wikbold Stutte especially Harald BERGER, *Leben und Werk des Prager Professors und Rektors Wikbold Stutte aus Osnabrück (14. Jahrhundert)*, Sudhoffs Archiv 93, 2009, pp. 96–113.

especially at the Faculty of Liberal Arts, the golden age and expansion of using Parisian textbooks began. Today we can only partially reconstruct the process of reception and diffusion of the nominalist heritage. Institutional impact can be traced in the arts faculty statutes, dated to the end of the 1360s and the beginning of the 1370s. For our purpose only a few articles are important. According to two of them the time-tested expositions of the famous masters from Paris or Oxford had been used. That is within public lectures or exercises, masters had to employ – in *modo pronuntiandi* – the abridged questions of Buridan (*quaestiones accuratae Buridani*) and other masters (*aliorum magistrorum*).¹¹ For that reason the commentaries on the *corpus aristotelicum* of Jean Buridan, Albert of Saxony, Nicole Oresme and Marsilius of Inghen became the most important teaching models and generally accepted scientific paradigm. Therefore towards the end of third quarter of the 14th century the Prague Faculty of Liberal Arts turned into a bastion of ‘Parisian nominalism’ – deeply influenced by Buridan’s philosophical heritage. The results of detailed prolific manuscript research has displayed a certain number of expositions, but also presupposed their original vast amount.¹²

Henry Totting of Oyta was one of the masters who left Erfurt for Prague and was directly responsible for the rise of Prague’s arts studies. His residency in the Thuringian intellectual centre could be dated between 1359 and 1362/1363. According to a recent reconstruction he served there as a rector of local cathedral school.¹³ Oyta’s teaching activity at the Erfurt’s *studium generale* is certainly known, i.e. a course of his lectures with exposition of Aristotle’s *Meteora*. The preserved manuscript with the commentary, today held in Berlin, was compiled and finished in Monastery of St. Mary, sometime after 8th September in 1360.¹⁴ But during the early 1360s, for today unknown reasons, Henry left Erfurt and moved to Prague. There he had carefully performed his obligatory duty as a *magister regens* at the Faculty of Liberal Arts. During his teaching career he presumably revised most of his commentaries on the prescribed *corpus aristotelicum* and began his theological studies. As active member of the Prague Theological Faculty he compiled Gospel commentaries on Mark and John, together with his *Commentary on the Sentences* of Peter Lombard in the *lectura* form.¹⁵ More than a dozen disciples graduated under him. More precisely, within three years, between 1367 and 1370, he was the promoter of sixteen bachelors and seven

¹¹ On the use of expositions by famous masters see the record from 20th April 1367 in *Monumenta Historica Universitatis Carolo-Ferdinandae Pragensis* (= MHUP) I/1, Pragae 1830, pp. 13–14, on the abridged expositions by Buridan and other masters see the record from 13th July 1370 (MHUP I/1, p. 82).

¹² For the legacy of Buridan’s expositions extant only in Prague libraries see Jerzy B. KOROLEC, *Repertorium commentariorum medii aevi in Aristotelem Latinorum quae in Bibliotheca olim Universitatis Pragensis nunc Státní knihovna ČSR vocata asservatur*, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk 1977, pp. 20–22, 29–30, 36–37, 51, 67, 71–73, 80; further František ŠMAHEL, *Verzeichnis der Quellen zum Prager Universalienstreit*, *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 25, 1980, pp. 62–63, 87–88, 107–108, 110–111, 113–115, 117, 121–122 and finally M. MARKOWSKI, *Die Aristotelica in den mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Bibliothek des Metropolitankapitels zu Prag*, pp. 231–233, 235, 241–242, 252–253, 255. *Via communis* character some of the commentaries detected in Mieczysław MARKOWSKI, *Der Aristotelismus an den Artistenfakultäten Mitteleuropas in Spätem Mittelalter*, *Acta Mediaevalia* 15, 2002, pp. 159–160.

¹³ S. LORENZ, *Studium generale Erfordense*, pp. 42–43, 188 and Robert GRAMSCH, *Erfurt – Die älteste Hochschule Deutschlands, vom Generalstudium zur Universität*, Erfurt 2012, pp. 29–31.

¹⁴ All details about the manuscript containing Henry’s *Expositio in libros Meteorologicorum Aristotelis* with transcription of the explicit can be found in B. E. MICHAEL, *Johannes Buridanus*, p. 333, Nr. 147 and S. LORENZ, *Studium generale Erfordense*, p. 188, Nr. 13a.

¹⁵ Albert LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der ersten deutschen Universitäten und zur Problemgeschichte der Spätscholastik*, Münster 1937, pp. 12–17, 136 and current register of Henry’s works in Dag Nikolaus HASSE, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, in: Christiane Stöllinger-Löser (ed.), *Die*

masters of arts.¹⁶ The nucleus of Henry's most important heirs was formed by John of Holland, Matthew of Cracow (d. 1410), Conrad of Soltau (d. 1407) and John of Marienwerder (d. 1417). The group of these intellectuals could be regarded as a second nominalist generation.¹⁷

3.

Sometimes after 1371 Henry was accused of heresy by the cathedral *scholasticus* Adalbertus Ranconis de Ericinio (d. 1388), after a degrading search warrant he had left Prague and defended himself in Avignon court. But thanks to Henry's indefatigable activity the intellectual heritage of nominalism successfully established roots in Prague. The main pedagogical activity at the Faculty of Liberal Arts had taken over his disciples and evidently other masters. Among Oyta's successors, e.g. John of Holland or Conrad of Soltau, but also some Bohemian masters, such as John (Ienke) Wenceslaus's of Prague or Blasius Lupus (d. before 20th August 1410).¹⁸ Despite loss one of the founders, the period between the 1370s and 1380s might be regarded as a golden age of nominalism accompanied by immense and prolific teaching activity relating also to the dissemination of the nominalist heritage, although only a few commentaries of that time are preserved or known in manuscripts. Certainly the most significant institutional milestone of the Prague nominalist *schola communis* of the 1370s is associated with another member of the 'founders' generation'. Herman of Winterswick was the first fellow of Charles College, and also a venerable member of the Faculty of Liberal Arts and soon thereafter candidate of theology, who obtained on 16 February 1376 true theological licence under the Cistercian monk Conrad of Ebrach (d. 1399) himself, called up shortly before from Paris to the newly founded Cistercian College in Prague. Soon after, on 16 June 1376, Herman became professor of theology at the resident

deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters, Verfasserlexikon, Bd. 11, Nachträge und Korrekturen, Berlin – New York 2004, col. 1546–1551.

¹⁶ Jadwiga KRZYŻANIAKOWA, *Henryk Totting z Oyty i jeho prascy uczniowie* [Henry Totting of Oyta and his followers in Prague], *Roczniki Historyczne* 61, 1995, pp. 87–109 and Jadwiga KRZYŻANIAKOWA, *Profesorowie krakowscy na uniwersytecie w Pradze – ich mistrzowie i koledzy* [Cracow's professor at the University in Prague – their masters and colleagues], in: Waldemar Bukowski – Krzysztof Ożóg – Franciszek Sikora – Stanisław Szczur (eds.), *Cracovia-Polonia-Europa*, Kraków 1995, pp. 505–527.

¹⁷ John of HOLLAND, *Four tracts on logic (suppositiones, fallacie, oblicagiones, insolubilia)*, ed. Egbert P. Bos, Nijmegen 1985, pp. *13*–*42*^{*}; further Matthias NÜDING, *Matthäus von Krakau. Theologe, Politiker, Kirchenreformer in Krakau, Prag und Heidelberg zur Zeit des Großen Abendländischen Schismas*, Tübingen 2007, pp. 23–121; Hans-Jürgen BRANDT, *Universität, Gesellschaft, Politik und Pfründen am Beispiel Konrad von Soltau († 1407)*, in: Jozef Isjewijn – Jacques Paquet (eds.), *The Universities in the Late Middle Ages*, Leuven 1978, pp. 614–627; J. TRÍŠKA, *Repertorium Biographicum Universitatis Pragensis Praehussiticae 1348–1409*, pp. 275–276.

¹⁸ John of Holland's four logical treatises, compiled between 1369 and 1379, are the results of his teaching activity at the Faculty of Liberal Arts (their edition in John of HOLLAND, *Four tracts on logic /suppositiones, fallacie, oblicagiones, insolubilia/*, pp. 7–146), for some of the Conrad's commentaries see Franz Josef WORSTBROCK, *Konrad von Soltau*, in: *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters, Verfasserlexikon*, 11, Nachträge und Korrekturen, col. 882. Preliminary inquiry of Ienke's commentaries on Aristotle's *Politics* provides Vilém HEROLD, *Commentarium Magistri Johannis Wenceslai de Praga Super octo libros 'Politiconum' Aristotelis*, *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 26, 1982, pp. 53–77 and for *On the Soul* see Milan MRÁZ, *Commentarius Magistri Johannis Wenceslai de Praga super 'De anima' Aristotelis*, *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 26, 1982, pp. 79–91; further also Blasius LUPUS, *Tractatus de probatione propositionum*, Praha, NK, X.H.11, ff. 1r–6v (edition of the text in progress).

Theological Faculty. The significance of both academic events is noted in two records of the arts faculty statutes.¹⁹

However, the most prominent heir of the nominalist tradition after Henry's forced departure to Avignon and later to Paris seemed to have been Conrad of Soltau. Especially during the late 1370s and early 1380s an immense number of forty three bachelors and thirty nine masters had graduated under him overall, i.e. most of the members of the third nominalist generation. Among them intellectuals such as Albert Engelschalk, Conrad Werner's of Steynsberg (d. 1392), Henry of Hannover or Teybint, Matthias of Legnicz (d. ca. 1413) and others.²⁰ But certainly since the mid-1380s the Prague nominalist *schola communis* had to face the rise of Bohemian masters and the transformative reception of Wyclif's theological realism. In October 1384, when Conrad was elected as rector of Prague University, the institutional controversy related to the vacant college residence places between university nations broken out, followed by another over chancellor's jurisdiction. Furthermore, the university masters also resisted archbishop John of Jenstein's efforts to discipline and fully control the university.²¹ Conrad had successfully employed all of his energetic effort and delaying tactics into preserving the nominalist heritage and independence of academic discourse. But, due to the oppressive atmosphere, he decided, and more than two dozen masters and bachelors with him, to flee Prague for Heidelberg. Nevertheless, Henry's nominalist legacy was thanks to the two generations of intellectuals intensively trained in Prague preserved and further disseminated, also with his works in manuscripts, into other university centres around Central Europe, e.g. Heidelberg, Cracow, Vienna, Erfurt.²²

Sometime in the late 1380s appeared an increased attention of some Bohemian masters to several logical and philosophical treatises of John Wyclif, which powerfully influenced their doctrinal positions.²³ One anonymous anti-Hussite treatise, originated in the mid-15th century, provides us with further details. A certain Bohemian Master Mauricius, was allegedly the first, who according to an otherwise unknown witness, brought Wycliffite texts from Oxford to Prague. Bohemian masters had striven for novelties and rarities used by the Oxford master to differentiate themselves from the other three nations at the university.²⁴

¹⁹ MHUP I/1, pp. 168, 170.

²⁰ J. TRÍŠKA, *Repertorium Biographicum Universitatis Pragensis Praehussiticae 1348–1409*, pp. 16, 83, 157, 364.

²¹ W. E. WAGNER, *Universitätsstift und Kollegium in Prag, Wien und Heidelberg*, pp. 64–81; especially Martin NODL, *Auf dem Weg zum Kuttenger Dekret: Von der Versöhnung der Nationen zum unversöhnlichen Nationalismus*, Bohemia 49, 2009, pp. 52–75 and alternatively Jiří STOČES, *Pražské univerzitní národy do roku 1409* [Nations and the University of Prague up to 1409], Praha 2010, pp. 99–131.

²² Mihai Maga's register of Conrad's *Commentary on the Sentences* contains sixty two manuscripts of this work preserved in several libraries in Europe (e.g. Aggsbach, Aschaffenburg, Augsburg, Berlin, Brno, Bruxelles, Fulda, Gdańsk, Greifswald, Kraków, Lübeck, Mainz, München, Nürnberg, Oxford, Padova, Prague, Regensburg, Strengnäs, Seitestetten, Stuttgart, Toruń, Trento, Uppsala, Vatican, Warszawa, Wien, Wolfenbüttel and Wrocław, full list accessible from <<http://conradusdesoltau.thesis-project.ro/mss.html>> /12. 1. 2016/).

²³ New attempt on re-dating Wyclif's reception in Bohemia see Mihai MAGA – Christopher D. SCHABEL, *The Golden Age of Theology at Prague, Prague Sentences Commentaries, ca. 1375–1381* (in this volume).

²⁴ *Tractatus contra Hussitas*, Nürnberg, Stadtbibliothek, Cent. I, 78, f. 151: "Cum post principium studii Prage, cum collegium esset inter Iudeos, Bohemi semper cogitaverunt contra alias naciones et propter hoc semper quesierunt specialitates, ut ab aliis differrent; quapropter quidam Mauricius, postea sacre theologie doctor, ivit Uxoniam et portavit primo libros Wiklef heretici, quibus Bohemi consencientes huic divisioni et odio acceptaverunt huiusmodi libros et magna sollicitudine, licet diversificati, in eis profecerunt." (The transcription according to František Michálek BARTOŠ, *Husitství a cizina*, Praha 1931, p. 255.) The description of the manuscript in Ingeborg NESKE (Bearb.), *Die Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg. Die lateinischen mittelalterlichen Handschriften*, Teil 3, Wiesbaden 1997, pp. 16–17 (dating approximately to the mid-15th

Presumably there were also political circumstances that had endorsed the proliferation of Wycliffite treatises in Bohemia together with political contacts and intellectual cross-Channel links. The English-Bohemian alliance, supported by diplomatic correspondence, had been established and further confirmed by the marriage of King Richard II and Anne of Bohemia, officially realized in 1382. Mutual cultural or political fascination was also caused by geographical distance with the natural Channel boarder, and similarly supported by a different cultural environment.²⁵ All these tendencies drew the English texts into a wider Central European circulation. For the first time during 1380s, some tracts of *doctor evangelicus* – and proceeded by several Brinkley's logical treatises – appeared in Prague.²⁶ We can only speculate as to how it had happened, but in all likelihood, owing to the Dominican international courier connections and likewise the active *peregrinatio academica* between Oxford, Paris and Prague. The clear evidence of early reception some of the Wycliffite texts provide us text of the Dominican Nicholas Biceps (d. 1390/1391). Approximately a dozen references in his *Commentary on the Sentences* refers on several treatises of John Wyclif, proving explicit acquaintance with the tracts *De tempore*, *De incarnatione verbi*, and, in all likelihood, also with *Purgans errores circa universalia in communi* or *De universalibus*.²⁷ However, additional traces of Wyclif's other doctrinal influence among Bohemian masters during the 1380s are hidden in darkness.

Insofar distant echo of Biceps to some philosophical treatises of the Oxford master in the university milieu, although also critical, were anxiously reserved on Wyclif's ideas of the Eucharist, which stood in contrast to the negative official reaction of Prague Archbishop Jan of Jenstein. In his treatise *De consideratione*, from ca. 1385 and dedicated to Pope Urban VI, he strongly criticized Wyclif's concept of dominion and called him a most wicked heresiarch (*ille heresiarcha nephandissimus*).²⁸ The cursory reaction with reference to *doctor evangelicus* is a part of the passage where Jenstein defends ecclesiastical rights on temporal property with the example of Christ's poverty. Jenstein's indirect knowledge of Wyclif seemed to have come from his Roman communication channels, perhaps due to his long-standing contacts with the English Benedictine Adam Easton, and his residency at the papal court in Rome.²⁹ Here he presumably, on several occasions, came into contact with Jenstein. Apart from Biceps and Jenstein's criticism during the 1380s we have no further evidence for Wyclif's influence at Prague University.

century). For some aspects of the anti-Hussite polemical tracts see Pavel SOUKUP, *Die Rolle der Prager Universitätsmigration in der antihussitischen Polemik 1409–1436*, Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis 49/2, 2009, pp. 71–80.

²⁵ Michael VAN DUSSEN, *From England to Bohemia. Heresy and Communication in the Later Middle Ages*, Cambridge 2012, pp. 12–85.

²⁶ For Prague manuscript of Brinkley's *Summa logicae* (Praha, NK, III.A.11, ff. 31ra-140ra) dated between 1370–1386, see Laurent Cesalli's introduction in Richard BRINKLEY, *De propositione (Summa logicae V.1–5)*, Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge 71, 2004, p. 215.

²⁷ Włodzimierz ZEGA, *Filosofia Boga w Quaestiones Sententiarum Mikołaja Bicepsa*, [The Philosophy of God in Quaestiones Sententiarum of Nicholas Biceps], Warszawa – Bydgoszcz 2002, pp. 88–101, 226–227.

²⁸ Iohannes DE JENSTEIN, *Tractatus de consideratione*, in: Jan Sedlák, *Studie a texty k náboženským dějinám českým* [Studies and Texts on Bohemian Religious History], II, Olomouc 1915, p. 105. For all tracts defending pope Urban VI and Jenstein's controversy on church with Adalbertus Ranconis de Ericinio see Ruben Ernest WELTSCH, *Archbishop John of Jenstein, 1348–1400. Papalism, Humanism and Reform in Pre-Hussite Prague*, Hague – Paris 1968, pp. 141–149.

²⁹ Persuasive hypothesis and suggestion with more additional evidence can be found in M. VAN DUSEEN, *From England to Bohemia*, pp. 47–48, 69.

The period between 1392 and 1403 seemed to represent certain milestones or turning point in the proliferation of Wyclif's influence in Bohemia accompanied by a series of defensive strategies from nominalist masters. In 1392 the Bohemian Master Stanislaus of Znojmo (d. 1414), an eminent promoter of the Oxford master in Prague, began his academic career at the Theological Faculty. Presumably a group of young Bohemian Students hungering for knowledge gathered around him. One of them was the young Jan Hus (d. 1415), who graduated in 1393 as a bachelor of liberal arts. At that time Stanislaus had revised and completed his – now lost – commentary on Aristotle's *De anima* (*Super de anima*), and he had perhaps started working on his commentary on *Physics* (*Questiones super Physicorum Aristotelis*).³⁰ The most significant doctrinal impact and influence of Parisian sources in Prague had ended. On the other hand, Parisian and English trends gradually merged altogether. But Wyclif's theological realism considerably challenged the nominalist paradigm, especially during the series of controversies on universals and ideas.

The unbounded dissemination of Wyclif's intellectual influence among Bohemian masters was interrupted in 1403 by the official university interventions of the *terministe*. The nominalist M. John Hübner, the member of the Polish nation (*natio Polonorum*), had proposed the condemnation of forty-five articles selected from some of Wyclif's treatises.³¹ All had been arranged and supported by the rector M. Walter Harraser from the Bavarian nation along with some Prague officials of the Metropolitan Chapter, despite the strong protests of Bohemian masters, among whom are known are especially the reactions of Stanislaus of Znojmo and Stephen of Pálec.³² Shortly thereafter Hübner was provocatively elected, with the majority of nominalist votes, as the person in charge for the next quodlibetal dispute, held in early January on 1404. Hübner used the list of twenty-four articles condemned by the Blackfriars Synod during May 1372 and had added twenty-one more selected theses.³³ The official university condemnation had placed Wyclif outside the line of orthodoxy. It was an authoritative and reprehensive warning to the Bohemian adherents of the *doctor evangelicus*.

Nevertheless, official condemnation had not deterred Bohemian masters from studying philosophical or theological treatises of their beloved intellectual Oxford master, rather to the contrary. Stanislaus of Znojmo, apparently before 1404 when he completed his theological training, defended directly in his *Commentary on the Sentences* Wyclif's doctrine

³⁰ Stanislav SOUSEDÍK, *Stanislaus von Znaim († 1414). Eine Lebensskizze*, Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum 17, 1973, p. 41; all details concerning manuscripts of all mentioned works in Pavel SPUNAR, *Repertorium auctorum Bohemorum*, I, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk – Łódź 1985, pp. 301 (Nr. 824), 292 (Nr. 791).

³¹ The notarial act from 28 Mai 1403 published in František PALACKÝ (ed.), *Documenta mag. Joannis Hus*, Prague 1869, pp. 327–331.

³² The evidence is confirmed only indirectly by Jan Hus, approximately after decade later during the quarrel over the 'Reform Programme' from ca. 1413–1414, see Iohannes Hus, *Contra Stanislaum de Znoyma*, in: *Polemica*, ed. Jaroslav ERŠIL – Gabriel SILAGI, Turnhout 2010, p. 309/49–54, and similarly in Iohannes Hus, *Contra Stephanum Palecz*, in: *Polemica*, p. 282/610–620.

³³ For the list with condemned articles see František PALACKÝ (ed.), *Documenta mag. Joannis Hus*, pp. 328–330. A predominant number of articles are directed on Wyclif's ecclesiology, theory of dominion and the first three at the top of the list directly on the Eucharist. Only one article (Nr. 27) seemed to be orientated on the philosophical issue of necessity: '27. It. Omnia de necessitate <e>veniunt.' (František PALACKÝ /ed./, *Documenta mag. Joannis Hus*, p. 329), cf. Iohannes WYCLIF, *De dominio dominio*, ed. Reginald Lane POOLE, London 1890, p. 115/26: 'omnia que evenient sit necessarium evenire' and Iohannes WYCLIF, *Triialogus cum Supplementum Trialogi*, ed. Gotthard LECHLER, Oxford 1869, pp. 68–71.

of Eucharist.³⁴ Shortly afterwards he incorporated the same doctrinal position in his revised treatise *De corpore Christi* and certainly this text had elicited the so-called ‘Remanence affair’. Stanislaus’s text was sharply attacked during a university disputation by the Cistercian Monk John Sczekna (Jan Štěkna, d. ca. 1407), a former alumnus of the University of Prague, and also in one of his sermons.³⁵ Furthermore, Sczekna also accused Stanislaus of heresy before Archbishop Zbyněk Zajíc of Házmburk. The Prague archbishop had solved the situation with the convocation of a commission to scrutinise Stanislaus’s tract. During the defence before the commission Stanislaus chose a clever strategy and claimed that his treatise was written without final assertion but for university discussion (*non assertive, sed disputando*) and the second part of the text, so far unwritten, would be supplied with contrary arguments against the concept of remanence. Stanislaus’s clarification was accepted but he was forced to conduct a public abjuration and also accepted the task of completing the second part of his treatise in the form of public lecture (*publice pronunciavit*). He kept his word and finished his work on 9 February 1406.³⁶

Nevertheless, the radical nominalist master Ludolph Meistermann of Lübeck (d. 1418) transposed Stanislaus’s case into an international context. He travelled to Rome and back, stopping in Heidelberg for help with support from local nominalist confrères, apparently many of them were – thanks to the secession from late 1380s – acquainted with Prague’s intellectual milieu and maybe all the circumstances of the controversy. In Rome he accused Stanislaus of heresy at the papal court of Gregory XII and also for propagation of Wyclif’s notion of the Eucharist in his treatise *De corpore Christi*.³⁷ Stanislaus was finally personally summoned to Rome before the curial court by the authoritative papal decree from 28 May 1408. He obeyed the personal citation and in the late autumn 1408, together with Stephen of Pálež, set out the journey for Rome. The journey itself became more complicated and was interrupted by a degrading imprisonment in Bologna. His final release from prison did not come until several authoritative intercessions from the Bohemian court of Wenceslaus IV were delivered. Both prominent adherents of Wyclif came back to Bohemia after the declaration of the Kutná Hora Decree, as late as 1409.

³⁴ *Commentary on the Sentences* of Stanislaus of Znojmo hasn’t been preserved (in whole), in spite of the fact, his doctrinal position is known only indirectly, some of the quotations related to the problem of Eucharist can be found in Iohannes Hus, *Contra Stanislaum de Znoyma*, pp. 280/16–30, 353/14–23.

³⁵ Jan SEDLÁK, *Eucharistické traktáty Stanislava ze Znojma* [Eucharist treatises of Stanislaus of Znojmo], in: Jaroslav V. Polc – Stanislav Přibyl (eds.), *Miscelanea hussitica Ioannis Sedlák*, Praha 1996, pp. 100–118; summary of Stanislaus’s doctrine of Eucharist in Stanislav SOUSEDÍK, *Huss et la doctrine eucharistique ‘rémanentiste’*, *Divinitas* 21, 1977, pp. 388–392. Short biography of Sczekna in Josef TRÍŠKA, *Repertorium Biographicum*, p. 314; edition of the sermon in Jan SEDLÁK, *Kázání Štěknovo proti Viklefovi a Stanislavovi* [Sczekna’s sermon against Wyclif and Stanislaus], in: *Miscelanea hussitica Ioannis Sedlák*, pp. 300–301.

³⁶ J. SEDLÁK, *Eucharistické traktáty Stanislava ze Znojma*, p. 106. The extant record indicates Stanislaus’s ‘public’ dictate performed in his own chamber hall in Charles College (*in commodo suo collegi Karoli*), see J. SEDLÁK, *Eucharistické traktáty Stanislava ze Znojma*, p. 111.

³⁷ S. SOUSEDÍK, *Stanislaus von Znaim († 1414). Eine Lebensskizze*, pp. 47–49. Meistermann in his four logic treatises compiled in Prague (from early 1390s) discusses the theory of supposition (‘suppositio’) of Marsilius of Inghen, Thomas de Manlevelt, Albert of Saxony, and he explicitly quotes from some of their tracts on logic, all details with short biography in Egbert Peter Bos, *Towards a Logic of Fiction: Ludolph Meistermann of Lübeck*, in: Jan A. Aertsen – Andreas Speer (eds.), *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter?*, Berlin – New York 1998, pp. 809–817; for his *Questiones de relativis* further C. Reinhard HÜLSEN, *Zur Semantik anaphorischer Pronomina. Untersuchungen scholastischer und moderner Theorien*, Leiden 1994, pp. 198, 254–257, 337–392.

But Stanislaus's 'Remanence affair' with its international context had elicited gradual change by the archbishop Zbyněk Zajíc of Házemburk against Bohemian masters and started his efforts to secure the Prague theological discourse against the remanence heresy. Another Bohemian master after Stanislaus was later accused of Eucharistic heresy, the young Matheus of Knín known also as Pater (d. 1410).³⁸ In 14 May 1408 Knín was forced to abjure before the Prague archbishop's officials, although during the trial investigation any remanence heresy hadn't been proved. Authoritative investigation reinforced the archbishop's pressure on Bohemian masters and his attempts to discipline clerics, and laymen who were involved in Eucharist heresy or favoured Wyclif's tracts. Bohemian masters – now on the political defensive – had solved the situation by the convocation of the Bohemian nation on 24 May 1408 to the House of the Black Rose. In the collective abjuration they approved the university condemnation of all forty-five articles from 1403 but some additional addenda were added to the official proclamation – any of forty-five articles will be not proclaimed, indeed in heretical, erroneous and scandalous senses and meanings; also it was prohibited to read and study Wyclif's treatises, such as *Dialogus*, *Triologus* and *De eucharistia*, but only for students and bachelors of arts.³⁹ The Prague archbishop formally confirmed his vigorous attitude at the ecclesiastical synod, convoked on 18 October 1408. By authoritative statutes the study of all Wycliffite articles and books (also proclamation or university expositions) were banned, although without significant effect.⁴⁰ However, Bohemian masters modified their strategy and defence changed now to offense. During the university election of the person in charge for the next quodlibetal dispute, in late June 1408, Matheus of Knín had surprised the convocation of university masters with his voluntary submission. His proposal was, even thought, and formally accepted. The Bohemian master carefully arranged the timing of the next quodlibetal dispute and all sessions. On 3 January 1409, as was almost usually annual, a new quodlibet dispute properly began.⁴¹ Already some performed questions, deeply immersed by Wyclif's theological realism only cursorily indicated the final conclusion of the enterprise.⁴² Moreover at the end of the quodlibet session, unexpectedly and contrary to authoritative statutes, Jerome of Prague delivered his provocatively heightened *Recommendatio artium liberalium*.⁴³ He also used his eloquence in the defence of Knín's authoritative investigation and his legal abjuration but legitimate innocence. For this reason he applied nationalistic rhetoric with the argument about pure Bohemians (*puri Bohemi*) that had never been burned as heretics.⁴⁴ A further goal of Jerome's speech was also the defence of *doctor evangelicus*. He had declaratively confessed the study and usefulness of Wycliffite texts for intellectual training; however, he

³⁸ Short biography in: J. TRÍŠKA, *Repertorium Biographicum*, p. 364.

³⁹ All records in Jan SEDLÁK, *M. Jan Hus* [M. John Hus], Praha 1915, pp. 125–126.

⁴⁰ Jaroslav KADLEC, *Synods of Prague and their Statutes 1396–1414*, Apollinaris 64, 1991, pp. 271–272.

⁴¹ For authoritative university statutes see MHUP I/1, pp. 65–67, 101–102.

⁴² E.g. Jerome of Prague's *Quaestio de universalibus a parte rei* (UAPR), cf. Hieronymus DE PRAGA, *Magistri Hieronymi de Praga Quaestiones, Polemica, Epistulae*, eds. Gabriel SILAGI – František ŠMAHEL, Turnhout 2010, pp. 83–95.

⁴³ Hieronymus DE PRAGA, *Recommendatio artium liberalium*, in: Hieronymus de Praga, *Magistri Hieronymi de Praga Quaestiones, Polemica, Epistulae*, pp. 199–222. For main source of Jerome's speech (Alan of Lille's *Anticlaudianus* and also other texts) see more details in František ŠMAHEL, *Die Quelle der Recommendatio arcium liberalium des Mag. Hieronymus von Prag*, in: *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter*, pp. 387–404.

⁴⁴ Hieronymus DE PRAGA, *Recommendatio artium liberalium*, pp. 212/375, 213/398–399, 411 and Ladislav KLICMAN (ed.), *Processus iudiciarius contra Jeronimum de Praga habitus Viennae a. 1410–1412*, Prague 1898, p. 28.

was not so foolish to espouse everything from these tracts as faith. Jerome also proclaimed his faithfulness to the priority of Scripture. He had likewise legitimised his standpoint by the praxis of the university training and the usage of textbooks of pagan philosophers (*pagani philosophi*). Works, by Aristotle and others contain many errors towards the catholic faith but some of their attitudes don't prevent them from holding their many evident truths.⁴⁵ Jerome terminated his speech with the presentation of a testimonial letter from Oxford University, dated 5 October 1406, brought from England to Bohemia thanks to the courier mission of Nicolas Faulfish (Mikuláš Faulfiš) and George of Kněhnice (Jiří z Kněhnice).

The after-effect of the Knín's quodlibetal dispute came suddenly in late January 1409. The Bohemian masters had arranged, by courtesy of diplomacy with nobility around the court of Wenceslaus IV sometime early before the official university quodlibetal act, a new political alliance now with the Bohemian king. Contrary to the majority of German masters, the Bohemians pledged political support for Wenceslaus's plans associated with his international political engagement related to the Council of Pisa. The outcome of the new alliance was revealed very soon in the form of the Kutná Hora Decree.⁴⁶ The authoritative declaration of the decree represented an outer political mandate of the Bohemian king at the university, publicly announced in 26 January 1409. The document fundamentally changed the institutional character of Prague University. Former parity of votes between four university nations (such as Bohemian, Bavarian, Polish and Saxonian) in authoritative executive issues of the university was blown to pieces and Bohemian masters obtained the majority of three votes. German masters responded to the decree's declaration with a collective abjuration demanding former organisational structure under the threat of mass secession.⁴⁷ Bipartite resistance and the *status quo* regnant during the whole spring 1409 were resolved by political and secular intervention of the Bohemian king Wenceslaus IV with resolute enforcement of new order. Finally, on 16 May 1409, ca. 700–800 scholars had realized a publicly declared secession from Prague. Bohemian triumph at the home university concluded with the institutional and doctrinal supremacy.

4.

Let us attempt to retrace Henry's doctrinal influence within Prague's intellectual tradition. Some of Oyta's texts from the late 1360s had founded Prague discussions on the real existence of universals (*universalia realia*). We can directly determine the exact texts – a commentary on the Porphyry's *Isagoge* and two *quaestiones* of his commentaries on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.⁴⁸ In all these texts Henry closely follows the positions of William

⁴⁵ Hieronymus DE PRAGA, *Recommendatio artium liberalium*, pp. 214/437–215/450.

⁴⁶ František ŠMAHEL – Martin NODL, *Kuttenberger Dekret nach 600 Jahren. Eine Bilanz der bisherigen Forschung*, Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis 49/2, 2009, pp. 19–64.

⁴⁷ F. PALACKÝ (ed.), *Documenta mag. Joannis Hus*, pp. 352–353.

⁴⁸ Henricus Totting DE OYTA, *Quaestiones in Isagogen Porphyrii*, q. 5, 18. Tertia conclusio, ed. Johannes SCHNEIDER, München 1979, p. 42; further Henricus Totting DE OYTA, *Quaestiones in VII–XII libros Metaphysicae Aristotelis*, lib. VII, q. 10 (*Utrum sit necessarium ponere ideas separatas Platonicas*), Erfurt, Bibliotheca Amploniana, F 329, ff. 21va–23ra and Henricus Totting DE OYTA, *Quaestiones in VII–XII libros Metaphysicae Aristotelis*, lib. VIII, q. 6 (*Utrum universale sit substantia*), Erfurt, Bibliotheca Amploniana, F 329, ff. 35vb–39va, (edition of the two *quaestiones* on ideas and universals in progress) [Author's note]

of Ockham.⁴⁹ He explicitly denies the existence of anything universal as common nature outside the human soul, as well as its existence in individual things. Oyta also rejects the concept of ideas and their existence and supports the view that ideas are not valid according to the principles of philosophy, in spite of the fact that they are true on the basis of faith and the authority of the theologians, such as Augustine and others. Moreover, in two of his *quaestiones* on *Metaphysics*, Henry explicitly attacks Robert Grosseteste (d. 1253) and his notion of universals and ideas utterly soaked by Neoplatonic sources.⁵⁰ The same doctrinal position can be also traced in his later Parisian lectures on the *Sentences*.⁵¹

Henry's most prominent Prague successor Conrad of Soltau seemed to have shared a methodological approach and aversion against ideas, likewise universals, as his intellectual mentor. During the beginning of the 1380s, from ca. 1379 up to 1381, he lectured on the prescribed text of Lombard's *Sentences*. One passage of Conrad's *quaestio* from the first book of his commentary lucidly reveals Henry's genuine heir. Equally as his older master, Conrad strictly denies the existence of ideas in divine intellect.⁵² But Dominican Nicholas Biceps, Conrad's contender in expositions of Lombard's *Sentences*, opposed his proclaimed nominalist approach and method. Unlike Conrad, the Dominican monk accepted the doctrine of divine ideas and his inquiry of the problem is fully compiled from traditional sources and authorities, such as William of Ware, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura and John Duns Scotus.⁵³ Yet the core of the polemic between those opponents seemed to have been universals and the problem whether or not God belongs to the category of substance. Nicholas's text is important for other reasons. For the first time on Bohemian soil Wyclif's authority was used against disciples of the brother William Ockham (*discipuli fratris Wilhelmi Occam*), whose venerable Anselm call dialectical heretics (*dialecticae haereticos*).⁵⁴

Intense debates on universals between nominalist and realist masters in Prague can be detected during the 1390s. One was initiated by the Bohemian intellectual, in Hussite scholarship known as the Parisian Master (*magister Paresiensis*), Matthias of Janov (d. 1393) who is considered today as the first theologian of the Bohemian Reformation.⁵⁵ Matheus

from 3rd November 2015 – This paper was submitted at the end of March 2015 and therefore does not take into consideration the recently published edition Heinrich Totting VON OYTA, *Schriften zur Ars Vetus*, ed. Harald BERGER, München 2015].

⁴⁹ Guillelmus OCKHAM, *Summa Logicae*, lib. I, c. 15, eds. Philotheus BÖHNER – Gedeon GÁL, St. Bonaventure – New York 1974, p. 50/5 and Guillelmus OCKHAM, *Expositio in librum Porphyrii*, c. 1, §2, ed. Ernst MOODY, St. Bonaventure – New York 1978, p. 10/29–30

⁵⁰ Robertus GROSSETESTE, *Commentarium in Posteriorum analyticorum libros*, lib. I, c. 7, c. 18, ed. Pietro ROSSI, Firenze 1981, pp. 139–140, 266.

⁵¹ Henricus Totting DE OYTA, *Quaestiones in libros Sententiarum*, l. I, q. 8, a. 2, ed. Alfonso MAIERÙ, Logica aristotelica e teologia trinitaria Enrico Totting de Oyta, Appendice, in: Alfonso Maierù – Agostino Paravicini Bagliani (eds.), *Studi sul XIV secolo in Memoria di Anneliese Maier*, Roma 1981, pp. 498/68–499/105.

⁵² Conradus DE SOLTAU, *Quaestiones in quattuor libros Sententiarum*, lib. I, q. 35–36 (Praha, Národní knihovna, I.D.23, fol. 46vb): “Ego dico, si sint ponende ydee in mente divina, quia non video quam necessitate ponende sint, sed contra sanctos nolo, quia beatus Augustinus in libro 83^{us} quescionibus, quescio de ydeis, sic dicit: ‘ydee sunt plures quedam forme vel rationes rerum substantiales atque incommutabiles’.”

⁵³ Preliminary analysis of Nicholas's doctrine of ideas discussed in his *Commentary on the Sentences* provides W. ZEGA, *Filosofia Boga w Quaestiones Sententiarum Mikolaja Bicepsa*, pp. 94–95.

⁵⁴ Nicolas BICEPS, *Quaestiones Sententiarum*, lib. I, d. 8, q. 6, in: Włodzimierz Zega, *Filosofia Boga w Quaestiones Sententiarum Mikolaja Bicepsa*, p. 160/38–39.

⁵⁵ His biography in J. TRÍŠKA, *Repertorium Biographicum*, p. 363 and Jana NECHUTOVÁ, *Die lateinische Literatur des Mittelalters in Böhmen*, Köln – Weimar – Wien 2007, pp. 259–262.

studied from 1371 to 1381 in Paris, where he obtained a master's degree in 1376 under the supervision of German intellectual Gerhard Kikpot of Kalkar (d. 1394), one of the *via moderna* promoters at the Central European Universities, together with Henry of Langenstein or Marsilius of Inghen.⁵⁶ After nine years of university training as a *pauper philosophans* in Paris, he had decided to return to Prague and was engaged in active intellectual life within a circle of other Prague reform orientated intellectuals, such as Adalbertus Ranconis de Ericinio, Matthew of Cracow, Nicolas Wendlar and others. His monumental opus *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti* was written from standpoint of biblical and theological realism as a remedy project for a schismatic church and corrupted society. A further aim of Matheus's intellectual effort was pastoral care with renewal of humanity by using the spiritual praxis of frequent communion, applied likewise against wrongful expositions of the modern doctors.⁵⁷ Although the Parisian Master did not devote any special treatise on ideas, in his extensive text of *Regulae* some passages related to the problem can be found. They follow a detailed explanation of the immanent relations within the Trinity, and the relation of two regions of being – the divinity and the creation. Matheus refers to the Second Divine Person, the Son (*filius*), as an immutable and eternal form or idea of all created things (*forma vel ydea inmutabilis et eterna omni creature*).⁵⁸ He also further expands his position. The Parisian Master considers the Son as an entity overflowing with life, and as a form of all things (*vitaliter similitudo vel forma omnium*), also as the giver of forms and as a simple and general idea of all creation according to Plato's imagination (*dator formarum et una simplex ydea universali ymaginacionem magistri Platonis*).⁵⁹ Or even as the Divine Word that contains all forms of things from eternity, and is all in everything (*Verbum Dei omnium formas rerum continet ab eterno et ipsum est omnia in omnibus*).⁶⁰ The connexion of the divine realm with the creation is ensured exactly by the Divine Word. Matheus considers the second Divine Person as the general, principal rule (*regula generalis, principalis*) or as the first truth (*veritas prima*). The Divine Word as general, principal rule and first truth is a metaphysical conceptual core of his intellectual remedy project. Doctrinal sources of Matheus's concept of ideas are most likely affiliated with 1370s influential Parisian

⁵⁶ For the person of Gerhard Kikpot of Kalkar see Franz EHRLE, *Der Sentenzenkommentar Peters von Candia des Pisaner Papstes Alexanders V.*, Münster 1925, pp. 42–44, also Gilles Gerard MEERSSEMAN, *Geschichte des Albertinismus*, I, *Die Pariser Anfänge des Kölner Albertinismus*, Paris 1932, p. 9. Gerard further influence in Vienna traced also in Michael H. SHANK, 'Unless You Believe, You Shall Not Understand': *Logic, University, and Society in late Medieval Vienna*, Princeton 1988, pp. 17–35, for Cologne see Erich MEUTHEN, *Kölner Universitätsgeschichte*, I, *Die alter Universität*, Köln – Wien 1988, pp. 57, 141, 163, and also Wolfgang ERIC WAGNER, *Universitätsstift und Kollegium in Prag, Wien und Heidelberg*, Berlin 1999, pp. 114–124, 129–137.

⁵⁷ Matthias DE JANOV, *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, I, ed. Vlastimil KYBAL, Oeniponte 1908, pp. 13/29–14/14 and Matthias DE JANOV, *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, lib. IV, ar. 6, cap. 12, V, eds. Vlastimil KYBAL – Otakar ODLOŽILÍK, Praha 1926, p. 258/5.

⁵⁸ Matthias DE JANOV, *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, lib. II, trac. 1, cap. 1, II, ed. Vlastimil KYBAL, Oeniponte 1909, p. 4/16–17.

⁵⁹ Matthias DE JANOV, *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, lib. II, trac. 1, cap. 1, p. 4 and Matthias DE JANOV, *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, lib. V, dis. 8, cap. 1, Vol. VI., Liber V De corpore Cristi, eds. Jana NECHUTOVÁ – Helena KRMIČKOVÁ, München 1993, p. 153/4370–4371.

⁶⁰ Matthias DE JANOV, *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, lib. V, dis. 8, cap. 1, p. 153/4374–4375 with explicit references to Col 3,11 and 1Cor 12,6 together with 1Cor 15,28.

commentary tradition on *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, authors such as John of Ripa, Francis of Perugia, Gerhard Kikpot of Kalkar or Peter of Candia.⁶¹

Critical reaction against Matheus's concept of ideas followed very soon. Probably one year after his death, or even later in 1399, another prominent intellectual of the third nominalist generation M. John Arsen of Langenfeld (d. ca. 1404) had indirectly denied and attacked the doctrinal position of the Parisian Master. John became a member of the Prague congregation of the Bavarian nation (*natio Bavarorum*) sometime during the 1370s and during 1380s he started his academic career at the Faculty of Liberal Arts. Arsen's academic tutor was Saxonian Master Ditmar de Swerte, who joined the group of twenty-four masters and bachelors led by Conrad of Soltau with the secession for the newly founded University of Heidelberg around 1387.⁶² But unlike his intellectual master, Arsen prolonged pedagogical career was presumably connected only with the Faculty of Liberal Arts in Prague. For quodlibet dispute of M. Matthias of Legnicz (dated ca. 1394 or ca. 1399) the Bavarian master had prepared one quodlibetal *quaestio* on ideas.⁶³ One passage of Arsen's text contains a certain digression of the entire text. Here John critically argues against one concept known from Arabic Peripatetic Tradition, the notion of giver of forms (*dator formarum*).⁶⁴ This concept, employed also by Matthias of Janov in his text – is not according to Arsen – appropriate to use for the explanation of the generation. The Bavarian master espouses principles of simplicity and certain economy of thought for the explication of the process of generation. He emphasizes the correct usage of language and further admits existence of the first cause (*prima causa*), the idea as an eternal thought or eternal mind (*mens aeterna*) and as an active, separate, universal agent (*active agens separatum et universale*). Arsen conducted his indirect critique of the Parisian Master strictly on the philosophical field and he had used exclusively authoritative sources as *The Book of Causes*, Aristotle's *Physics*, Latin translation of Plato's *Timaeus* from Chalcidius.⁶⁵ His argument is influenced by one passage of the *Commentary on Aristotle's Metaphysics* from Jean Buridan and his doctrinal position is close to Henry Totting of Oyta's, treated in his abbreviation of Wodham's *Commentary on Sentences*, compiled sometimes between 1373 and 1378.⁶⁶ Additional exposition of Arsen's concept of ideas and particularly universals is largely discussed in his *Commentary*

⁶¹ More details in Martin DEKARLI, *Regula generalis, principalis, prima veritas: The Philosophical and Theological Principle of Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti of Matěj of Janov*, in: Zdeněk V. David – David R. Holeton (eds.), *Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*, Vol. 8, Prague 2011, pp. 30–41.

⁶² MHUP I/1, pp. 236, 241–242, for a short biography of Ditmar de Swerthe, see J. Trška, *Repertorium biographicum*, Prague 1981, pp. 92–93.

⁶³ Iohannes Arsen DE LANGEWELT, *Utrum ydee aliqua ratione cogente propter generationem rerum naturalium sunt ponende*, Stralsund Stadarchiv HN NB 24, q. 9, ff. 222va–223va (the edition of the text in preparation), for preliminary study see Martin DEKARLI, *Prague Nominalist Master John Arsen of Langenfeld and his Quaestio on Ideas from around 1394/1399*, in: Zdeněk V. David – David R. Holeton (eds.), *Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice* 9, Prague 2014, pp. 35–53.

⁶⁴ AVICENNA, *Liber de philosophia prima sive scientia divina*, lib. IX, cap. 5, eds. Simone VAN RIET – Gérard VERBEKE, Louvain – Leiden 1980, pp. 490, 493. For the concept Giver of Forms especially see Dag Nikolaus HASSE, *Avicenna's 'Giver of Forms' in Latin Philosophy, especially in the Works of Albertus Magnus*, in: Dag Nikolaus HASSE – Amos Bertolacci (eds.), *The Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Reception of Avicenna's Metaphysics*, Berlin – Boston 2012, pp. 225–249.

⁶⁵ *Liber de causis*, I.1., ed. Adriaan PATTIN, Louvain [1966], p. 46; ARISTOTLES, *Phys.* II, 3, 195b15–195a26 and *Phys.* II, 7, 198a14–198b9; PLATO LATINUS, *Timaeus a Calcidio translatus commentarioque instructus*, 28c, ed. Jan Hendrik WASZINK, London 1962, p. 21/11–13.

⁶⁶ Iohannes BURIDANUS, *In Metaphysicen Aristotelis questiones argutissimae*, lib. VII, q. 9, Paris 1518, ff. 46va–47ra and Adam WODEHAM, *Super quattuor libros Sententiarum. Abbrevatio Henrici Totting de Oyta*, lib. III., d. 14, q. 3,

on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* from 1399, important evidence of his pedagogical activity at the Faculty of Liberal Arts.⁶⁷

The first known criticism of Wyclif's theological realism, from nominalist positions, provides us an anonymous logical treatise, a *sophistria* textbook, which some of its parts originated in the years 1394–1396.⁶⁸ The anonymous author, obviously a nominalist master, refers to the problem of universals and ideas within the context of simple supposition (*suppositio simplex*). He introduced dissimilarities of the supposition concept between ancient masters (*antiqui*) on one side, such as Plato and his successors like John Duns Scotus, Richard Brinkley, John Wyclif, and modern authors (*moderni*) on the other side, such as Jean Buridan, Thomas Manlevelt, Thomas of Cleves, Marsilius of Inghen.⁶⁹ In a detailed exposition of the problem, the anonymous nominalist author extensively analyses theories and consequences of nominalist masters. Nevertheless, explication itself precedes preliminary reference to the unacceptability of Plato's position (i.e. the postulate of common ideal nature distinct from singulars and the term is simply a supposition for common nature), and elusive remarks with direct references to Scotus's, Brinkley's, Wyclif's position (all masters, according to the anonymous author, postulate common nature indistinct from singulars, existing in many separate singulars and the term is an adequate supposition for common entity).⁷⁰ In other passage our unknown master admits the existence of real universals as reasonable and as a position that might be adopted.⁷¹ But some other passages offer arguments against the existence of real universals. There, however, our anonymous author draws attention to inappropriate consequences of realism.⁷²

At the turn of the 14th and the 15th century, a series of sharpened-edged doctrinal controversies erupted among nominalists and realists. A key figure emerged, once again, John Arsen of Langenfeld as a genuine defender of the Prague nominalist intellectual tradition. The best evidence provides us extant quodlibetal enchiridion from ca. 1400, especially his *quaestio*

dub. 5, ed. John MAJOR, Paris 1512, fol. 121rb; for the dating of Henry's text see William J. COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham, An Introduction to his Life and Writings*, Leiden 1978, pp. 146–147, 223–228.

⁶⁷ Iohannes Arsen DE LANGEWELT, *Quaestiones in I–II, IV–X, XII libros Metaphysicae Aristotelis*, Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Mss. 699, ff. 81vb–82vb, 89va–93rb (edition of both questions in preparation). The whole text extant as 'reportatio' of Andrew Willenbach, description of the manuscript in Jan LEGOVICZ – Roman DUDAK – Zofia SIEMIĄTKOWSKA (eds.), *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum medii aevi latinorum qui in Bibliotheca Jagellonica Cracoviae asservantur*, 5, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków 1993, pp. 86–89.

⁶⁸ Egbert Peter Bos (ed.), *Logica modernorum in Prague about 1400, The Sophistria Disputation 'Quoniam quatuor' (MS Cracow, Jagiellonian Library 686, ff. 1ra–79rb), with a partial reconstruction of Thomas of Cleves' Logica*, Leiden – Boston 2004 with some addenda in Earline Jennifer ASHWORTH, *Logic Teaching at the University of Prague around 1400 A.D.*, in: Mordechai Feingold (ed.), *History of Universities 21/1*, Oxford 2006, pp. 211–221.

⁶⁹ E. P. Bos (ed.), *Logica modernorum in Prague about 1400*, trac. I, q. 55, pp. 149–161, further for 'antiqui' and 'moderni' in the later Middle Ages see William J. COURTENAY, *Antiqui and Moderni in Late Medieval Thought*, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48, 1987, pp. 3–10 and Maarten J. F. M. HOENEN, *Categories of Medieval Doxography. Reflections on the Use of 'Doctrina' and 'Via' in 14th and 15th Century Philosophical and Theological Sources*, in: Philippe Büttgen – Ruedi Imbach – Ulrich Johannes Schneider – Herman J. Selderhuis (eds.), 'Vera doctrina'. Zur Begriffsgeschichte der Lehre von Augustin bis Descartes, Wiesbaden 2009, pp. 63–84.

⁷⁰ E. P. Bos (ed.), *Logica modernorum in Prague about 1400*, trac. I, q. 55, pp. 150/21–151/3. Yet, editor's alleged reference to Wyclif's *De universalibus* (p. 150/27, Nr. 135) is on the work *Tractatus de universalibus (maior)* of Stanislaus of Znojmo, in Stanislaus DE ZNAIM, *Tractatus de universalibus (maior)*, in: Iohannes Wyclif, *Miscellanea philosophica*, Vol. II., ed. Michael Henry DZIEWICKI, London 1905, p. 1/7–8.

⁷¹ E. P. Bos (ed.), *Logica modernorum in Prague about 1400*, trac. I, q. 64, p. 178/24–25: "Nota quod suppositio ista <sc. universalia realia sunt ponenda> est opinabilis vel probabilis, igitur admittenda."

⁷² E. P. Bos (ed.), *Logica modernorum in Prague about 1400*, trac. II, q. 2 and q. 11, pp. 351/19–28 and 367–368.

principalis.⁷³ Now, unlike his earlier quodlibetal question for Matthias of Legnicz discussion, Arsen's critical attitude turned directly against John Wyclif and the doctrinal positions presented in some of his treatises or in the texts of his Bohemian adherents. First, Arsen in his question rejects existence of universals outside of the human soul (*universalia nullum habent esse extra animam*) and the position that the essences of singular entities are equal to the common entities (*quiditates rerum singularium non sunt res communes*). Further he certainly confirms the conducting role of intellect as a creative act and origin of universals in things, not real essences of things existing ontologically outside of them.⁷⁴ His doctrinal position is supported by the adoption of authoritative positions of Aristotle, Averroes, Boethius and others old masters. Second, the Bavarian master drew attention on Wyclif's explication of numerical relation between individuals and universals. He mocks and caricatures some implications of Wyclif's notion of formal distinction and especially the relation between species and individuals, with ironical consequence of identity between a common donkey (*asinus communis*) and the King of France's donkey.⁷⁵

Arsen's coeval, M. John Otto of Münsterberg (Jan ze Ziębic, d. 1416) – a member of the Polish nation (*natio Polonorum*) – followed and certainly supported him, certainly with others, in an anti-Wycliffe campaign against Bohemian promoters of *doctor evangelicus*. John Otto started his academic career at the beginning of the 1380s and in Prague he achieved several academic degrees. During the 1390s his career took an excellent upward turn, and he was appointed to several university official services (e.g. in 1395 as a Dean of the Faculty of Liberal Arts, in 1398 as a Rector of Charles University).⁷⁶ In all likelihood Münsterberg entered a debate on universals during some university debate. The evidence is confirmed in his several independent *quaestiones* preserved today in Vienna.⁷⁷ Expositions related to universals can be also found in his commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* (dated ca. 1400).⁷⁸ Münsterberg in his philosophical questions rejects not only Plato's universals (*universale Platonicum*), as separated entities and universal in causation (*universale in causando*), but also signs of Ockhamists (*signum occhamisticum*).⁷⁹ He further explicitly argues against Wyclif's concept of universals, i.e. universal in essence (*universale in essen-*

⁷³ Johannes Arsen de Langewelt, *Utrum primum mutans immutabile sit cum aliquo proprie componibile*, Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, HS 1435, ff. 259r–267r; further conclusion follows František Šmahel, *Ein unbekanntes Prager Quodlibet von ca. 1400 des Magisters Johann Arsen von Langenfeld*, in: František Šmahel, *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter*, pp. 336–358.

⁷⁴ Johannes Arsen de Langewelt, *Utrum primum mutans immutabile sit cum aliquo proprie componibile*, Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, HS 1435, ff. 265v–266r; transcription of the passage in F. Šmahel, *Ein unbekanntes Prager Quodlibet von ca. 1400 des Magisters Johann Arsen von Langenfeld*, p. 348.

⁷⁵ Johannes Arsen de Langewelt, *Utrum primum mutans immutabile sit cum aliquo proprie componibile*, Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, HS 1435, f. 266v; transcription of the passages in F. Šmahel, *Ein unbekanntes Prager Quodlibet von ca. 1400 des Magisters Johann Arsen von Langenfeld*, p. 349. Arsen explicitly paraphrases one passage from Wyclif's tract *De universalibus*, cf. Johannes Wyclif, *Tractatus De universalibus*, ed. Ivan J. Mueller, Oxford 1985, p. 185/59–65, also Johannes Wyclif, *Purgans errores circa universalia in communi*, in: *De ente librorum duorum*, ed. Michael Henry Dziewicki, London 1909, pp. 37–48.

⁷⁶ Münsterberg's brief biography can be found in J. Triška, *Repertorium biographicum*, pp. 279–280.

⁷⁷ Detailed study in Mieczysław Markowski, *Die Stellungnahme des Johannis von Münsterberg gegenüber Universalien*, *Acta Mediaevalia* 8, 1995, pp. 57–68.

⁷⁸ Johannes de Münsterberg, *Quaestiones in I–XII libros 'Metaphysice' Aristotelis*, lib. VII, q. 32, München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 26929, ff. 61va–62vb; further about the manuscript see Mieczysław Markowski, *Buridanica quae in codicibus manu scriptis bibliothecarum Monacensium asservantur*, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk – Łódź 1981, pp. 104–106.

⁷⁹ M. Markowski, *Die Stellungnahme des Johannis von Münsterberg gegenüber Universalien*, p. 59.

do). John Otto's own solution and concept of universals is largely influenced by authors such as Thomas Aquinas, Giles of Rome, accompanied with the authority of Aristotle, Averroes, and Boethius.⁸⁰ Unlike Arsen Münsterberg fulfilled his destiny in Leipzig, where he departed after the forced secession in 1409 and there he continued to spread the intellectual legacy of Prague's nominalist *schola communis*.⁸¹

Since the early 1390s in spite of the disparately compelled doctrinal, institutional and political efforts to utterly control the university, nominalist masters finally failed in their endeavour to control academic discourse and to preserve their intellectual heritage in Prague. Between 1403 and 1409 even more powerful political and nationally motivated struggles were inflamed that vigorously undermined their positions. Discussions suddenly abandoned strictly academic discourse and college rooms. Both camps had mobilized and recruited secular and ecclesiastical power outside the university walls. However, after several months of stretched progressive political enforcement of the Kutná Hora Decree in 1409, doctrinal and intellectual hegemony of nominalism was subdued, defeated and the great epoch declined with the secession from Prague and departure to Leipzig and elsewhere.⁸² After all, the intellectual heritage of *doctor evangelicus*, thanks to his eager and forethoughtful Bohemian disciples, seized control over the Prague academic discourse and his theological realism completely succeeded, as well as replaced Buridan, and his heritors, as scientific paradigm.

⁸⁰ M. MARKOWSKI, *Die Stellungnahme des Johannis von Münsterberg gegenüber Universalien*, p. 62. Comprehensive study of Münsterberg's metaphysics and some influence of Jean Buridan and Marsilius of Inghen detected in Feliks KRAUSE, *La conception sapientiale de la métaphysique et son rang dans la hiérarchie médiévale des sciences d'après de Jean de Ziebiec*, *Studia Mediewistyczne* 31, 1994, pp. 41–70 and Feliks KRAUSE, *La nature de l'être primaire et sa relation avec le monde selon Jean de Ziebiec*, *Acta Mediaevalia* 8, 1995, pp. 45–56.

⁸¹ For doctrinal development of the University in Leipzig see Enno BÜNZ, *Gründung und Entfaltung. Die spätmittelalterliche Universität Leipzig*, in: Enno Bünz – Manfred Rudensdorf – Detlef Döring (eds.), *Geschichte der Universität Leipzig 1409–2009*, I, Leipzig 2009, pp. 174–217. Some reactions against Wyclif's notion of universals and explicitly his Prague's followers (presumably Stanislaus of Znojmo) in Leipzig traced in Mieczysław MARKOWSKI, *Z lipskich dyskusji nad universale reale* [From Leipzig's discussions on universals], *Studia Mediewistyczne* 29, 1992, pp. 63–73 and Vilém HEROLD, *Die Polemik mit der Prager 'hussitischen' Auffassung der platonischen Ideen in der Handschrift der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig 1445*, in: Jaroslav Pánek – Miloslav Polívka – Noemi Rejchrtová (eds.), *Husitství, reformace, renesance*, II, Praha 1994, pp. 565–583.

⁸² František ŠMAHEL, *The Kutteneberg Decree and the Withdrawal of the German Students from Prague in 1409: A Discussion*, in: *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter*, pp. 159–171 and Enno BÜNZ, *Die Leipziger Universitätsgründung – eine Folge des Kutteneberger Dekrets*, *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis* 49/2, 2009, pp. 55–64.

Jindřich Topping z Ooty a pražská nominalistická *schola communis* mezi lety 1366–1409. Předběžný náčrt

RESUMÉ

Článek se pokouší formou předběžného náčrtu zmapovat nominalistické dědictví na pražské univerzitě v chronologickém rozmezí mezi roky 1366 až 1409, s přihlédnutím k osobnosti německého intelektuála Jindřicha Toppinga z Ooty. Upozorňuje na význam založení Karlovy koleje jako výrazného stimulu pro expanzi pražských univerzitních studií v následujících dekádách 14. i 15. století, k němuž došlo zásluhou úzké skupiny zakladatelů. Dále se pokouší stručně postihnout genealogii pražské nominalistické školy, jež svůj rodokmen odvozuje zejména od Jindřicha Toppinga z Ooty. Příspěvek dále představuje řadu institucionálních kontroverzí mezi roky 1384 až 1409 (spor o obsazování míst v kolejích a kompetence kancléře, odsouzení čtyřiceti pěti tezí Johna Wyclifa, remanenční aféra Stanislava ze Znojma, včetně událostí před vydáním Dekretu kutnohorského). V druhé části článek upozorňuje na význam některých Jindřichových textů pro doktrinální spor o reálnou existenci obecnin, sleduje jejich vliv v rámci pražské nominalistické tradice (v Komentáři k *Sentenciám* Konráda ze Soltau či v kvestii o idejích Jana Arsena z Langenfeldu) a na základě některých doposud neznámých či zcela nevyužitých nominalistických pramenů shrnuje doktrinální rozepře mezi nominalisty a realisty na přelomu 14. a 15. století.

Martin Dekarli

Arbeitsgruppe Volkssprachliche Texte des Spätmittelalters

Institut für Mittelalterforschung

Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien

martin.dekarli@oeaw.ac.at

martin.dekarli@gmail.com

THE PREACHING OF HENRY TOTTING OF OYTA*

JAN ODSTRČILÍK – FRANCESCA BATTISTA – RICCARDO BURGAZZI

ABSTRACT

This joint paper focuses on three previously unstudied sermons written by Henry Totting of Oyta, a famous theologian of the 14th century who started his career at the *studium generale* in Erfurt and was then active at the universities of Prague, Paris and Vienna. Riccardo Burgazzi examines the sermon *On the Passion of the Lord*, Francesca Battista the sermon *On the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, and finally Jan Odstrčilík the sermon *On the Nativity of John the Baptist*. Each of these sermons represents not only distinctive thematic areas, but were also written at different times and demonstrate the variety of influences that affected Totting's way of thinking: The sermon *De passione Domini* is probably one of his oldest recorded sermons and it still bears traces of Totting's career as a master of liberal arts. The Marian sermon *De assumptione BMV* shows a very firm scholastic structure and gives a relevant contribution to the contemporary area in Assumption theology. And finally the sermon *De nativitate Iohannis Baptiste* is a worthy and uncommon testimony of the early reception of Petrarch in Central Europe.

Keywords: University of Prague – Henry Totting of Oyta – Medieval Sermon – Liberal Arts – Marian Theology – Petrarch

Totting's life and his preaching activity**

Jan Odstrčilík

Henry Totting of Oyta was one of the most important masters of the first decades of the Universities of Prague and Vienna who was also active at the University of Paris and the Erfurt *studium generale*.¹ He was probably born in Oyta, today's Friesoythe, in East Frisia

* Research leading to this publication was supported by a grant provided by Charles University Grant Agency (GA UK), No. 1124413, entitled *Prague Teacher Henricus Totting de Oyta in the Medieval Bohemical Manuscripts from Corpus Christi Library in Cambridge: An Analysis and an Edition of Selected Parts of his Works*, carried out at the Faculty of Arts at the Charles University in Prague. The research of Jan Odstrčilík leading to these results has from 7/2013 received funding from the European Research Council under the European community's Seventh Framework programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement No. 263672.

** The article is mainly based on three studies prepared for a book Henry Totting of Oyta: *Three Sermons of a Late Medieval Intellectual, De passione Domini, De assumptione beate Virginis Marie, De nativitate Iohannis Baptiste* (in print). It also introduces, however, some new findings.

¹ Totting's biography is mainly drawn from Albert LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta: Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der ersten deutschen Universitäten und zur Problemgeschichte der Spätscholastik*, Münster 1937 (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters 33/4–5). Important new findings were made by Sönke LORENZ, *Studium generale Erfordense: Zum Erfurter Schulleben im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 1989. For a summary of recent research see Dag Nikolaus HASSE, *Totting, Heinrich, von Oyta*, in: Burghart Wachinger et al. (eds.), *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters, Verfasserlexikon*, vol. 11, Nachträge und Korrekturen, Berlin 2004, col. 1542–1556. See also the biographical introduction in Harald BERGER, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta: Schriften zur Ars vetus*, München 2015, pp. 7–9.

(Ostfriesland) in North-Western Germany in the diocese Osnabrück.² Not much is known about the first twenty or thirty years of his life. The mention of Henry Totting of Oyta appears in a note from the year 1360 in a Berlin manuscript where he is called rector of the Marienstift School in Erfurt.³

Henry Totting of Oyta stayed in Erfurt for several years and held important offices there. His name again appears in a petition to Pope Urban V dated January 17, 1363 in which he is called *rector superior studii generalis et sollemnioris Alamannie arcium Erfordensis*.⁴ This title brought him some problems as we learn from a petition written three years later (May 28, 1366)⁵ by Charles IV himself on behalf of Totting. Obviously, the papal court understood Totting's claim from 1363 to be the rector of the university in Erfurt and they applied the term *rector universitatis studii Erfordensis* in their consent in which they granted him the expectation of a benefice in Osnabrück. This fact provoked some of Totting's enemies (*sui emulatores*)⁶ to accuse him at the papal court of the false usage of the title in order to acquire the benefice,⁷ since there was no official university in Erfurt at that time (it was not founded until 1392).⁸ The Holy Roman Emperor and the Czech King denied that Totting had called himself rector of the university and excused his usage of the title *rector studii generalis arcium Erfordensis* by *loquendi consuetudinem* ('by the usual way of speaking') in Erfurt, *propter magnam studencium multitudinem, qui ad prefatum locum plus, quam ad aliquem alium locum totius Alamannie confluere consueverunt* ('because of the large number of students who came to that place more often than to any other place in all of Germany').⁹ This petition seems to have resolved the case.

The first certain mention of Totting in connection with Prague University is one year earlier. In the rotulus of Charles IV from June 20, 1365, Totting is called a *magister in artibus, studens in sacra theologia in universitate* ('master of arts, a student in theology at

² Research is virtually unanimous on the birth place of Henry Totting of Oyta, see A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, p. 7. Only Wilhem Hanisch has suggested that Totting could be born also in Oythe which is today a part of the city of Vechta, see Wilhelm HANISCH, *Heinrich Totting aus Oythe und Konrad von Vechta: Zwei Oldenburger in der Geschichte Böhmens*, Veröffentlichungen der ostdeutschen Forschungsstelle im Lande Nordrhein-Westfalen, Reihe A, 12 (Nordrhein-Westfalen und der deutsche Osten 9–11), Dortmund 1967, p. 70 and p. 79, note 6. The both places are situated in Lower Saxony and are about 50 km apart.

³ Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Lat. fol. 411, fol. 101rb: *Explicit metaurorum datum a magistro Hinrico (de Oyta, nunc magistro in sacra theologia egregio) regente apud beatam virginem (in Erfordia) anno domini M^o CCC^o LX^o in die dominico post nativitatem beate virginis*. Words in the brackets are written by another later hand in cursive. The note was found first by Bernd MICHAEL, *Johannes Buridan: Studien zu seinem Leben, seinen Werken und zur Rezeption seiner Theorien im Europa des späten Mittelalters*, I. Teil, Berlin 1985, p. 333, and the interpretation in Sönke LORENZ, *Studium generale Erfordense: Zum Erfurter Schulleben im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 1989, p. 188. The original transcription by Bernd Michael included an error ('apud beatum' instead of 'apud beatam'), which I corrected upon an inspection of the manuscript.

⁴ S. LORENZ, *Studium generale Erfordense*, p. 186.

⁵ *Monumenta Vaticana res gestas Bohemicas illustrantia* (furthermore MVB), tomus III, No. 703, pp. 433–434.

⁶ MVB, tomus III, No. 703, p. 434.

⁷ On the problem of the name 'studium generale', see S. LORENZ, *Studium generale Erfordense*, p. 186.

⁸ The first papal bull was already issued in 1379 by Clement VII. However, because he was the Avignon Pope and the Holy Roman Empire finally decided to side with the Roman one, the bull lost its force. The second papal bull followed in 1389 issued by the Roman Pope Urban VI and after three years of preparation the teaching began in 1392, see S. LORENZ, *Studium generale Erfordense*, p. 56.

⁹ MVB, tomus III, No. 703, p. 433.

the university').¹⁰ Considering the short time between the petition of 1363 and the rotulus of 1365, it is plausible that Totting moved to Prague soon after the first petition.¹¹

The academic career of Henry Totting of Oyta seems to be stable. In the above-mentioned petition of Charles IV of May, 28 1366, Henry Totting is named as *cursor in theologia et magister in artibus* ('cursor in theology and master of arts'). The *Liber decanorum* of the Faculty of Arts records his teaching activity: between 1367 and 1370 Totting promoted sixteen bachelors and seven masters.¹² Probably shortly after the petition from 1366 he was also ordained a priest.¹³

The breaking point in Totting's life comes in 1369/1370. During this academic year Totting, as bachelor of theology, defended six controversial theses in a disputation.¹⁴ Adalbertus Rankonis de Ericinio (Vojtěch Raňkův z Ježova, ca. 1320–1388), a *scholasticus* of the Metropolitan Chapter of St. Vitus Cathedral was present at the disputation and strongly disagreed with Totting. Gradually the conflict escalated to the extent that he accused Totting of heresy at the papal court in Avignon in 1371.¹⁵ Henry had to leave Prague and undergo a two-year trial before he was finally acquitted on 12 August 1373.¹⁶

Not much is known about Totting's activities in the following years. He may have come back to Prague¹⁷ or stayed in France.¹⁸ In any case, Totting is certainly attested in Paris in

¹⁰ It was previously supposed that Totting had studied at Charles University in the 1350s, see A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, p. 10. This was based on a false dating of a petition of Charles IV to 1355, in which Totting was called Master of Arts and student of theology, Heinrich DENIFLE, *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400. Erster Band. Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*, Berlin 1885, pp. 591–595. The correct dating is, however, ten years later, i.e. 1365, see MVB, tomus III, *Acta Urbani V. (1362–70)*, Praha 1944, No. 585, pp. 353–355. See also S. LORENZ, *Studium generale Erfordense*, pp. 186–187 and D. N. HASSE, *Totting, Heinrich, von Oyta*, col. 1543. However, Harald Berger recently defended Totting's stay in Prague in the 1350s on the basis of two principal arguments: Firstly, Totting had to obtain his master's degree at some university. And since he was called a Master in Prague during his stay in Paris in 1370s and 1380s, he could only have obtained it in Prague. Secondly, in the above-mentioned note from 1360 from Erfurt Totting is already called a master, so he had to obtain his grade before he came to Erfurt, see H. BERGER, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta: Schriften zur Ars vetus*, p. 9. This does not seem to be convincing, since the usage of the title 'magister' could signify simply a teacher, see S. LORENZ, *Studium generale Erfordense*, pp. 190–191 and Mariken TEEUWEN, *The Vocabulary of Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages*, Turnhout 2003, pp. 95–97. This does not exclude completely the possibility of Totting's study in Prague in the 1350s; it is still possible that new evidence will appear or that a careful analysis of Totting's early works composed in Erfurt will establish his connection to Prague.

¹¹ S. Lorenz stresses that Charles IV in his petition of 28 May 1366 speaks about 'many years' ('multi anni') which Totting spent at the University of Prague and in Erfurt, S. LORENZ, *Studium generale Erfordense*, p. 189.

¹² Jadwiga KRZYŻANIAKOWA, *Henryk Totting z Oyty i jego prascy uczniowie*, p. 90; *Liber decanorum facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Pragensis ab anno Christi 1367 usque ad annum 1585*, pars I, Praha 1830, p. 133sqq.

¹³ Franz FLASKAMP, *Der Wiedenbrücker Stiftspropst Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Westfälische Kirchengeschichte* 51 and 52, 1958/1959, p. 16; A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, p. 8.

¹⁴ Published by A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, pp. 20–21. Republished by Jaroslav KADLEC, *Adalbert Rankonis de Ericinio*, Münster 1971, pp. 14–15.

¹⁵ J. KADLEC, *Adalbert Rankonis de Ericinio*, pp. 14–19.

¹⁶ A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, p. 24 and D. N. HASSE, *Totting, Heinrich, von Oyta*, col. 1544. On the contrary, Kadlec mentions the date 13 August 1373, see J. KADLEC, *Adalbert Rankonis de Ericinio*, pp. 14–16.

¹⁷ A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, p. 28; S. LORENZ, *Studium generale Erfordense*, p. 190.

¹⁸ William J. Courtenay concluded that one of Totting's very important works, the *Abbreviatio* of Adam Wodeham's Commentary on Peter Lombard's Sentences was written in Paris around 1375 or between 1373 and 1378, see William J. COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham: An Introduction to his Life and Writings*, Leiden 1978, pp. 146–147.

the year 1377 when he is mentioned in the *Liber procuratorum nationis Anglicanae*.¹⁹ Totting's career in Paris was crowned by achieving a licentiate in theology in 1380.²⁰

At that time the situation in Paris was becoming difficult for German masters because they sided with the Roman Pope Urban VI against the Avignonese Pope Clement VII in the Papal Schism. For this reason many of them decided to leave Paris and return to the Holy Roman Empire in the early 1380s. Henry Totting of Oyta was among them and he arrived in Prague possibly as early as 1381.²¹

Back at the university in Prague he became its vice-chancellor and started to teach at the Faculty of Theology, but he did not stay for long. In 1384 he left the city and came to teach at the newly established Faculty of Theology in Vienna. It is supposed that it was his friend from Paris, Henry of Langenstein (c. 1340 – February 11, 1397), who invited him.²² His decision might also have been influenced by the early nationalist conflict in Prague over the filling of vacant positions in Charles College in 1384.²³

Totting also held important offices in Vienna. In 1385 he acted as a representative of the chancellor of the university and was elected dean of the Faculty of Theology in 1388 and again in 1395. He died May 12, 1397,²⁴ only a few months after his friend Henry of Langenstein.²⁵

There are many works written by Totting.²⁶ He is well known especially for his commentaries on the works of Aristotle²⁷ and on Peter Lombard's Sentences.²⁸ However, as a member of the university and a priest, his task was also to preach on many occasions. Thirty-five

¹⁹ A master Gerardus de Pellikem asked the congregation of the English nation to admit 'Henricum de Euta and Jacobam de Krakovia, quia essent magistri alibi et non Parisius' ('because they were masters somewhere else and not in Paris') to the university feast together with other masters, see *Auctarium Chartularii Universitatis Parisiensis*, vol. 1, ed. Henricus DENIFLE, Paris 1894, col. 527 and Thomas SULLIVAN, *Parisian Licentiates in Theology, A.D. 1371–1500. A Biographical Register*, Voll. II, *The Secular Clergy*, Leiden – Boston 2011, p. 526.

²⁰ See T. SULLIVAN, *Parisian Licentiates in Theology*, pp. 525–528.

²¹ See A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, pp. 31–34. About the whole situation see also Zenon KALUZA, 'Translatio studii': Kryzys uniwersytetu paryskiego w latach 1380–1400 i jeho skutki, *Studia Mediewistyczne* 15, 1974, pp. 71–108.

²² It was A. LANG, who already expressed this opinion, see A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, pp. 37–38. See also D. N. HASSE, *Totting, Heinrich, von Oyta*, col. 1545. Kreuzer points out that both masters (i.e. Henry Totting of Oyta and Henry of Langenstein) were called 'principales' of the renewed University in Vienna by the Vienna Annals in the year 1384 and that they both received the first payment on the same day, see Georg KREUZER, *Heinrich von Langenstein: Studien zur Biographie und zu den Schismatrakaten unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Epistola pacis und der Epistola concilii pacis*, Paderborn – München – Wien – Zürich 1987, p. 80, note 238.

²³ A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, pp. 31–36. However, Martin Nodl has shown that the conflict actually happened after Totting's departure. His decision could therefore have been motivated by better financial terms in Vienna. See Martin NODL, *Dekret kutnohorský*, Praha 2010, p. 77.

²⁴ Originally it was supposed that Totting died on May 20, 1397, see A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, p. 43. This was based on a preserved entry in *Acta facultatis artium Vindobonensis*, see Paul UIBLEIN (ed.), *Acta facultatis artium universitatis Vindobonensis 1385–1416*, Graz – Wien – Köln, 1968, p. 149. However, Paul Uiblein found the right date in two necrologies, see ibidem, p. 149, note 5. See also H. BERGER, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta: Schriften zur Ars vetus*, p. 9.

²⁵ The Vienna years are well documented by Albert Lang, see A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, pp. 37–43.

²⁶ See A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, pp. 43–137. Modern additions in D. N. HASSE, *Totting, Heinrich, von Oyta*, col. 1542–1556.

²⁷ For Totting's works concerning the Faculty of Arts see S. LORENZ, *Studium generale Erfordense*, pp. 197–200 and Olga WEIJERS, *Le travail intellectuel à la Faculté des arts de Paris: textes et maîtres (ca. 1200–1500): IV. Répertoire des noms commençant par H et J (jusq' à Johannes C.)*, Turnhout 2001, pp. 68–73.

²⁸ See the study by Martin Dekarli in this volume. List of the commentaries to the Sentences of Peter Lombard, see Friedrich STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium commentariorum in sententias Petri Lombardi*, Würzburg 1947, pp. 156–160.

sermons have been attributed to Henry Totting of Oyta, of which thirty-one have been preserved to date.²⁹ Some of them seem to survive only in a single manuscript, like the sermon *De beata Virgine (On the Blessed Virgin)*.³⁰ Others are preserved in numerous copies, like the sermon *De conceptione Mariae Virginis (On the Conception of the Virgin Mary)*³¹ in at least thirteen manuscripts. Albert Lang gathered forty manuscripts containing at least one of the Totting's sermons. Without any special effort we were able to add to his list twenty-two more manuscripts. Thus, there are certainly many more manuscripts yet to be discovered and the following numbers therefore should be understood as very preliminary.

The majority of the manuscripts are kept today in a small number of libraries. Surprisingly, very few can be found in today's Czech Republic.³² Some other manuscripts, however, can be directly linked to Prague.³³ Most manuscripts are preserved in Graz, Universitätsbibliothek (eight manuscripts), Vienna, Nationalbibliothek (eight manuscripts), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (six manuscripts), Klosterneuburg, Augustiner-Chorherrenstift (five manuscripts), and Erfurt, Universitätsbibliothek (four manuscripts).³⁴ Klosterneuburg and Graz almost certainly had more manuscripts containing works of Henry Totting of Oyta and future research will try to locate them. So far, none of Totting's sermons have been found in Paris although he almost certainly preached there, too.

Although Totting's sermons are usually associated only with Vienna,³⁵ it seems probable that as a priest and a student of theology Totting was already active as a preacher in the 1360s and certainly later, when he received a licentiate in theology.³⁶ Albert Lang, in the only extant monograph on Henry Totting of Oyta, identified thirty-four sermons and categorized them into five groups:³⁷ sermons on the feast days of Jesus (eight sermons), sermons on the feast days of the Virgin Mary (eleven sermons), sermons on the feast days of saints (eight sermons), sermons on special occasions (five sermons) and finally Sunday sermons (two sermons). In the *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters*

²⁹ Lost sermons are known from the Catalogue of the Carthusian monastery in Aggsbach and were a part of cod. B 10: *De assumptione Mariae* (inc. 'Exaltata sum in Libano', Eccl. 24,17), On the feast of one of the apostles (inc. 'Quam pulchri super montes pedes annunciantis', Is. 52,7), *Pro defunctis* (inc. 'Abraham mortuus est', Ioh. 8,52), and finally a sermon *Ad clerum* (inc. 'Deponentes mendacium loquimini veritatem', Eph. 4,25). The sermon *De assumptione Mariae* might have been found by Francesca Battista, see footnote 67.

³⁰ Erfurt, Universitätsbibliothek, Amplon. quart. 150, fol. 270r–274r, inc. 'Murus est, edificemus super, Cantico-rum ultimo. Universi conditor orbis ordinatissima disposizione.'

³¹ Inc. 'Consurget virga de israel, Num. 24,17. Sanctissime Virginis Marie matris Dei.'

³² There is only one manuscript in Prague (Praha, Národní knihovna, VIII F 10) and one in Olomouc (Olomouc, Vědecká knihovna, M I 323), both containing the already mentioned most successful sermon *De conceptione Mariae Virginis*.

³³ These include Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Library, 524 and 534, St. Florian, Stiftsbibliothek, XI 97, and Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket, C 212.

³⁴ Exceptional is the Universitätsbibliothek in Kassel. Although it keeps only one manuscript with Totting's sermons, it is the manuscript which contains their highest number (12), see Konrad WIEDEMANN, *Manuscripta theologica. Die Handschriften in Folio* (Die Handschriften der Gesamthochschul-Bibliothek Kassel – Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel 1,1), Wiesbaden 1994, pp. 139–142.

³⁵ Cf. A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, pp. 113–115, and others.

³⁶ It was only Václav Novotný, who supposed that 'assuredly many of them [i.e. sermons of Henry Totting of Oyta] have their origins in Prague and especially it is necessary to point out the sermon cycles on the body of Christ and his resurrection' ('jistě mnohé svými začátky sahají do Prahy, při čemž zvláště nutno vytknouti také cyklus kázání o těle Kristově a jeho z mrtvých vstání'), see Václav NOVOTNÝ, *Náboženské hnutí české ve 14. a 15. století*, část 1, *Do Husa*, Praha 1915, p. 97.

³⁷ A. LANG identified thirty-four, see A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, pp. 113–123.

1350 bis 1500 also a sermon *De contemptu mundi* (*On the contempt of the world*),³⁸ which was unknown to Albert Lang, is listed.³⁹ In various manuscripts it was attributed, e.g., to Iodocus Weiler,⁴⁰ Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl,⁴¹ and Henry of Langenstein.⁴² However, the name of Henry Totting of Oyta is attested, e.g., in Clm 7601.⁴³

The audience of the sermons as well as the occasions on which they were delivered, are known only rarely. Especially precious are the sermons *De nativitate Domini*,⁴⁴ *In adventu Domini*,⁴⁵ and *De novo sacerdote*.⁴⁶ All of them are persevered in the manuscripts with the note that they were held in the Carthusian monastery of Mauerbach, which was situated near to Vienna.⁴⁷ For two of them we know even the dates: *In adventu Domini* was preached in 1387 and *De novo sacerdote* in 1391. The audience of these sermons probably consisted of monks and perhaps other secular clergy. However, Totting was a teacher at the Faculty of Theology as well, which means that he preached sermons also for an academic audience. Traces of these groups can be found in allocutions mentioning *scholares* and *doctores*. It is possible that the communication strategies and the structures of the sermons differ according to audience, but this is difficult to answer, since there are almost no editions and studies on them.⁴⁸

For these reasons we have chosen three different sermons for our preliminary comparative study: one out of each of the three main categories of sermons: *De passione Domini* (*On the Passion of the Lord*)⁴⁹ as an example of the preaching on Jesus Christ, *De assumptione BMV* (*On the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary*)⁵⁰ as an example of Marian preaching, and *De nativitate Iohannis Baptiste* (*On the birth of John the Baptist*)⁵¹ as one of the sermons on saints. Each of the selected sermons seem to be written at a different point in Totting's career or for a slightly different audience.

³⁸ Inc. 'Videte itaque, quomodo caute ambuletis, Eph 5,15. Ubi sciendum, quod apostolus Paulus consciens secretorum.'

³⁹ *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters 1350 bis 1500* [CD-ROM], based on the preparatory work of J. B. SCHNEVER, ed. Ludwig HÖDL – Wendelin KNOCH, Münster 2001, under the lemma Henricus Totting de Oyta.

⁴⁰ Melk, Benediktinerstift, Cod. 211.

⁴¹ München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 3409, fol. 149r.

⁴² Wien, Schottenstift, 125.

⁴³ Inc. 'Sermo bonus Hainrici de Oyta de contemptu mundi etc. Videte quomodo caute ambuletis, non quasi insipientes, sed ut sapientes redimentes tempus, quoniam dies mali sunt [...] Ubi sciendum, quod apostolus Paulus', see München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 7601, fol. 120va.

⁴⁴ Inc. 'Mane videbitis gloriam Domini, Ex 16,7 [...] Quia caligantibus atque.'

⁴⁵ Inc. 'Letare filia Syon, quia ecce ego venio [...], Zach 2,10. Beatus ille propheta David.'

⁴⁶ Inc. 'Qui bene presunt presbiteri duplici honore digni habentur. Scribitur prima ad Thy. 5°. Lex divina copiose.'

⁴⁷ See A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, pp. 41, 122.

⁴⁸ To date only Gustav Sommerfeld has published two sermons in full and another one in part: *In adventu Domini* or *De gradibus obedientiae*, inc. 'Letare filia Syon, quia ecce ego venio [...] Zach 2,10. Beatus ille propheta David', see Gustav SOMMERFELD, *Zu Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 25, Innsbruck 1904, pp. 598–603. *In adventu episcopi Pataviensis Viennam*, inc. 'Protegit te nomen dei Jacob, Psalmo 19. Si in Jacob attendimus', see Gustav SOMMERFELD, *Zwei politische Sermones des Heinrich von Oyta und des Nikolaus von Dinkelsbühl (1388 und 1417)*, Historisches Jahrbuch 26, 1905, pp. 320–323. *De adventu Domini*, inc. 'Ecce salvator tuus venit, Ysaie 62, 11 [...] Pro sancti spiritus impetranda gracia', see Gustav SOMMERFELD, *Aus der Zeit der Begründung der Universität Wien*, Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 29, Innsbruck 1908, pp. 296–297.

⁴⁹ Inc. 'Erit vita tua quasi pendens ante te, Dt 28. In hiis verbis mystice nobis proponitur.'

⁵⁰ Inc. 'In Ierusalem potestas mea, Eccli 24 et in epistula nunc instantis festivitatis. Reverendi patres et domini, virgo hodie gloriosa.'

⁵¹ Inc. 'Quis putas puer iste erit? Luce primo et in hodierna festivitatis ewangelio. Reverendi patres et domini, sacra, sicut nostis.'

Sermo de passione Domini: Erit vita tua quasi pendens ante te (Deut 28,66)

Riccardo Burgazzi

The *Sermo de Passione Domini* (inc. 'Erit vita tua') by Henry Totting of Oyta has remained unpublished until now, and consequently unknown to critics.⁵² It is known from five extant manuscripts today: Augsburg, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. II. 1. 2° 171, fols. 173va–177ra (around 1363),⁵³ Augsburg, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. II. 1. 2° 172, fols. 178ra–181va (first half of the 15th century),⁵⁴ Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, A X 91, fols. 34v–37v and 148r–150r (mid-15th century),⁵⁵ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Library, 524, fols. 136r–139r (around 1400 and 1404)⁵⁶ and fragmentary in Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket, C 229, fols. 264r–265r (14th century).⁵⁷ All of the codices are miscellanies of religious works written by various authors; the only evident similarity in their contents is the insertion of a long narrative treatise on the Passion of Christ immediately after the sermon in the manuscripts Augsburg, Cod. II. 1. 2° 171 and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Library, 524.⁵⁸

The sermon is divided into four parts: a prologue and three chapters. The prologue introduces the biblical quotation from Dt. 28,66: 'Erit vita tua quasi pendens ante te' ('And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee'),⁵⁹ and announces the subsequent themes. The three chapters are structured in a very regular way. Each of them begins with a very similar phrase, followed by a quadripartite analysis, and a conclusion.

Henry Totting of Oyta proposes to interpret the 'mystical' words of Dt 28,66 by meditating on the figure of Jesus as 'the book of life', which should be studied as a very proper, delicate and salutary exemplar, in order to correct our defects, to know the value of charity and to comprehend the fruit of eternal salvation. When Moses says 'Erit vita tua quasi pendens ante te', the Holy Spirit (who is the guide of this book) makes his disciples good doctors in three ways: he makes (*reddit eos*) them benevolent (*benivolos*), when he says *vita tua*; he makes them docile (*dociles*) when he emphasizes *pendens*; and he makes them

⁵² Totting also wrote another sermon on the same topic, inc. 'Nolite me vocare Noemi [...], Ruth 1,20. Consuetum est in principio', see A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, p. 116.

⁵³ See Hardo HILG, *Lateinische mittelalterliche Handschriften in Folio der Universitätsbibliothek Augsburg: Cod. II. 1.2 91–226*, Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Augsburg: Reihe 1. Die lateinischen Handschriften, vol. 2, Wiesbaden 1999, p. 266.

⁵⁴ H. HILG, *Lateinische mittelalterliche Handschriften*, p. 271.

⁵⁵ Beat Matthias von SCARPATETTI, *Katalog der datierten Handschriften in der Schweiz in lateinischer Schrift vom Anfang des Mittelalters bis 1550*, Bd. 1, *Die Handschriften der Bibliotheken von Aarau, Appenzell und Basel, Text- und Abbildungsband*, Dietikon – Zürich 1977, signature A X 91. The text in this manuscript is divided between two different sections of the codex and is unfinished. The cause is a scribal error between fols. 150r and 150v, which was likely prompted by the word 'meditacionem', after which another text (on Christ's burial) begins.

⁵⁶ Montague Rhodes JAMES, *A Descriptive Catalogue of The Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College Cambridge*, vol. II, Cambridge 1912, p. 475. The sermon *Erit vita tua* is situated before five other texts: a long narrative treatise on the Passion of Christ (also present in Augsburg, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. II. 1. 2° 171) and four shorter meditative works (fols. 172rb–173vb; 173vb–174vb; 174vb–178va; 178va–182v) on the same topic.

⁵⁷ Margarette ANDERSON-SHMITT – Monica HEDLUND, *Mittelalterliche Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Uppsala. Katalog über die C-Sammlung Bd. 3. C 201–300*, Stockholm 1990, p. 117.

⁵⁸ Augsburg, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. II. 1. 2° 171, fols. 177ra–264ra and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Library, 524, fols. 139ra–172rb, inc. 'Ut igitur vitam et miracula eiusque mirabilia opera que gessit'.

⁵⁹ All English translations are cited according to the Douay-Rheims Bible <<http://www.drbo.org/lvb/index.htm>> (December 31, 2014).

attentive (*attentos*), when he adds *ante te*. The whole sermon develops around an analysis of these three adjectives, which date back to the rhetorical tradition attributed to Cicero and in particular to the first book of *De ratione dicendi ad C. Herennium*.⁶⁰

The Holy Spirit makes the disciples benevolent when he says '*Erit vita tua*', because he wins their goodwill by speaking about life, which is usually very dear and sweet to men. Using this premise, Henry Totting explains that Christ represents the *causa* of our life, in every sense of the term: efficient, formal, material, and final. Then, he expands upon each of these points in turn. According to Totting, the best way to study the book (i.e. Christ) is to meditate on the Passion. Jesus laid (*iacuit*), sat (*sedet*) stood (*stetit*) and was hanged (*pependit*) for us. The second of the four parts of the sermon is based on these static verbs. In its conclusion, Totting makes an observation regarding the word *quasi*, from the verse in Deuteronomy: while Christ was hanging in front of the 'insolent eyes' of Jews completely, he hung in front of the 'mental eyes' of Christians only partially, because they believe that, through the crucifixion, Jesus went to sit at the right hand of the Father. Finally, the Holy Spirit makes disciples – that is, us – attentive (*attentos*) when he adds *ante te*, for instance every time we hear the chant *Ecce lignum* on Good Friday or we see a carved or painted image of the crucifix. According to this concept, later supported with further biblical quotations, Totting underlines four uses we can get from meditating on artistic representations⁶¹ of the Passion.

Was this sermon, authored by a master of liberal arts, written for Sunday homilies or was it to be read by an educated or academic public? Does it reveal anything about the university environment? Was it composed as an aid to a private and silent contemplation, or for public reading?⁶² Certainly, as previously mentioned, the work *Erit vita tua* of Henry Totting of Oyta presents typical structure of academic texts.⁶³ A contextualization of the sermon *Erit vita tua* should be looked for in the first stages of Totting's academic career. The *terminus post quem non* for the dating of the sermon is given by Augsburg, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. II. 1. 2° 171 and it is around the year 1363. Therefore, this work could have been written while he was rector of the *studium generale* in Erfurt, or very soon after his coming to Prague; and only after this year it could have been summarized by John of Zazenhausen (ca. 1310/20–1380) in the prologue of his two unpublished narrative treatises on the Passion.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ "Principium est, cum statim auditoris animum nobis idoneum reddimus ad audiendum. *Id ita sumitur, ut attentos, ut dociles, ut benivolos auditores habere possimus.*"

⁶¹ From the edition in preparation: "*Et assidue cum depictam vel sculptam ymaginem crucifixi intuemur: quare hoc nisi ut diligenter librum crucis inspicimus? Et qualia quantaque pro nobis passus sit attendamus?*"

⁶² Louis-Jacques Batallion states about medieval sermons: "We have now to ask questions about the relation between the written text that was preserved and the oral form in which it would normally have been delivered as a sermon. First, was there always a spoken form? Some of the texts presented as sermons may have been spiritual treatises cast in the form of sermons as a literary device but actually made to be read and meditated upon: what Michel Zink calls 'preaching in an armchair'." See Louis-Jacques BATAILLON, *Approches to the Study of Medieval Sermons*, Leeds Studies in English 11, 1980, p. 21.

⁶³ Each chapter, indeed, announces a theme ('*reddit [...]*'), demonstrates it through four steps, and finally comes to a conclusion ('*ergo [...]*').

⁶⁴ This author in fact wrote two different treatises on this same topic, one in Latin and one in German: see Tobias A. KEMPER, *Die Kreuzigung Christi. Motivgeschichtliche Studien zu lateinischen und deutschen Passionstraktaten des Spätmittelalters*, Tübingen, 2006, pp. 141–143 and 151–153. A textual comparison between Henry's sermon and John's prologue clearly shows that the latter resumed the work of the first and used it as a prologue for his

Since applying Aristotelian logic to theology and reasoning on the work of Peter Lombard⁶⁵ were milestones in the career of any medieval scholar, in order to place a sermon into an academic context, it is important to check whether it uses those two authors. The sermon *Erit vita tua* indeed cites both of these authorities. The use of Aristotle made here by Totting is fully conventional, but it should be noted that the Philosopher is quoted in order to introduce a strictly logical reasoning on the types of 'cause' (Christ is the efficient, formal, material and final cause of our life).⁶⁶ As for Peter Lombard, Henry Totting cites him to support his thesis on Christ intended as the material cause for our lives. So, both these quotations are not inserted to be commented on, but (as all the other quotations present in the sermon) in order to support the ideas which Henry Totting is sustaining.

What is remarkable is the kind of rhetoric used to organize the reasoning itself, or rather the presence of the adjectives of the Ciceronian tradition: *benivolos*, *dociles* and *attentos*. It seems that Totting, who was not yet a theologian while he was writing this text, was influenced by his studies in *liberal arts*. Thus, the sermon is, on the one hand, very formally structured, as a typical scientific text; on the other hand, the metaphor of the book combined with the words *more boni doctoris* (Henry says that Holy Spirit behaves as a good doctor who studies Moses' words), with the Ciceronian rhetorical tradition and with the presence of philosophical terminology of an Aristotelian nature refer, once again, to an academic environment.

Whether this sermon was actually delivered orally or meant to be read in private is a different question, impossible to answer without some new explicit evidence (such as an authorial statement). In conclusion, it is very plausible that this sermon was delivered to a well-educated audience; and the renowned *studium generale* in Erfurt could have been the right place to compose it. Therefore, a contextualization of the sermon *Erit vita tua* should be looked for in the first stages of Henry Totting of Oyta's academic career.

The multiple faces of Mary in the sermon *In Ierusalem potestas mea* (Eccli 24,15)

Francesca Battista

Mary has multiple faces in the Middle Ages. Those selected by Totting in his unedited sermon *In Ierusalem potestas mea* (*My power in Jerusalem*),⁶⁷ transmitted by four

works; see Jan ODSTRČILÍK – Riccardo BURGAZZI – Francesca BATTISTA, *Combining Active and Contemplative Life. Three Sermons of a Late Medieval Intellectual Henry Totting of Oyta*, Bern 2015 (in print).

⁶⁵ Within the year 1371 (when he left for Avignon to defend himself from the charge of heresy) Henry Totting of Oyta had already completed his first commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, see A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, p. 17; but he had written many commentaries on Aristotle before he started to write commentaries on the Sentences, see D. N. HASSE, *Totting, Heinrich, von Oyta*, col. 1542–1556.

⁶⁶ The exegetes referred to the four Aristotelian causes to give a logic structure to their sermons; this use was firstly proposed by Guerric of Saint Quentin († 1245); see in this regard: Jacques VERGER, *L'esegesi dell'Università*, in: Pierre Riché – Jean Châtillon – Jacques Verger, *Lo studio della Bibbia nel Medioevo latino*, Brescia 1989, pp. 112–113.

⁶⁷ Inc. 'In Ierusalem potestas mea, Eccli 24 et in epistula nunc instantis festivitatis. Reverendi patres et domini, virgo hodie gloriosa.' Totting wrote three other sermons on the Assumption: 1) *Ascendit de deserto*, Ct 8,5; 2) *Sic in Sion firmata sum*, Eccli 24,15 (see footnote 75); 3) *Exaltata sum in Libano*, Eccli 24,17. See A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, pp. 118–119. The last of these sermons is supposed to be lost but, in my opinion, it might be the sermon contained in Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, incipit *Exaltata sum in Libano Eccli. 24. Reverendi patres et domini quam sit solempnis et suavis festivitas hodierna*, Ms. 163, fols. 264r–275v.

manuscripts known to date (14th–15th century),⁶⁸ position him within the Assumption theology of the time, between tradition and new spiritual needs.

The faces emerge in the telling of the *historia assumptionis*⁶⁹ which is based on the traditional exegesis of the triple Jerusalem and its interpretation as *visio pacis* ('vision of peace'), transmitted probably by Augustine.⁷⁰ The story of Mary's Assumption should be understood as the praising of her role in the history of salvation which is described through three stages *fastidivit* ('despised'), *custodivit* ('guarded'), *acquisivit* ('acquired') in three *membra* according to the university form of preaching. First, the *inventio* of the theme is given by the quotation from Eccli 24,15 (*In Ierusalem potestas mea*), which was the standard pericope read for the feast of the Assumption. Afterwards, there is the *prothema* introducing the main topic by quoting Saint Bernard. The conventional preacher's request to the audience to pray and the *introductio thematis*, in which Totting explains the nature of the feast, that is the Assumption of Mary into Heaven, follow. Then comes the *divisio*⁷¹ in which the theme is repeated in order to be divided and confirmed by biblical quotations. Totting states that the biblical verse Eccli 24,15 (*In Ierusalem potestas mea*) can be associated to the image of the triple kind of Jerusalem (carnal, spiritual, celestial), the triple type of peace (carnal pleasure, peace of mind, eternal beatitude) and the triple form of Mary's *potestas* (rigorous, gracious, glorious). This division is confirmed by specific biblical quotations (*confirmatio partium*) ranging from literal, through allegorical, to anagogical meaning, from the old Jerusalem to the new Jerusalem.

⁶⁸ Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 163, fols. 259v–264r; Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Lat. fol. 690, fols. 208r–212v; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College library, 534, fols. 126v–130r; Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket, C 212, fols. 84r–90v. For the description of the manuscripts, see: Maria MAIROL, *Die datierten Handschriften in der Steiermark außerhalb der Universitätsbibliothek Graz bis zum Jahre 1600*, Katalog der datierten Handschriften in lateinischer Schrift in Österreich 7, Vienna 1988, Hill Museum and Manuscript Library <<http://www.vhmdl.us/research2014/catalog/detail.asp?MSID=9563>> (April 4, 2016); *Codices manuscripti latini in folio* (Mss. lat. fol.), Handschriftenkataloge der Königlichen Bibliothek und Preussischen Staatsbibliothek Berlin, Dienst-kataloge in Kopien 14; M. R. JAMES, *A Descriptive Catalogue*, vol. 2, pp. 584–586; Jiří KEJŘ, *Díla pražských mistrů v rukopisech knihovny Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis 26/2, 1986, pp. 109–148; Margarete ANDERSSON-SCHMITT – Monica HEDLUND, *Mittelalterliche Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Uppsala: Katalog über die C-Sammlung*, vol. 3, Mss. C 201–300, Acta Bibliothecae R. Universitatis Upsaliensis 26/3, Stockholm 1990, pp. 33–37. The relationship of the manuscripts, the critical edition of the sermon, a more detailed description of its structure, the issues of the date and place of the sermon composition and its audience are included in the forthcoming study.

⁶⁹ See Rachel FULTON, *Quae est ista quae ascendit sicut aurora consurgens?: The Song of Songs as the Historia for the Office of the Assumption*, Mediaeval Studies 60, 1998, pp. 55–122.

⁷⁰ As for the 'divisio quietis' and its 'subdivisiones' Totting explicitly states that he bases them on Bernard ('recte' Guerric of Igny) sermon in 'omnibus requiem quesivi'.

⁷¹ An anonymous unedited sermon (Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket, C 197, fols. 7r–8v) on the Feast of Assumption with the incipit "*In Ierusalem potestas mea et legitur exemplariter in hodiernae festivitatis officio. Doctor gloriosus beatus Ieronimus potestatem atque exaltacionem virginis mariae exprimere [...] cupiens*" adopts the very same *divisio*. Besides, the first and third sermon parts are substantially and formally very similar to Totting's sermon one. A hypothesis on the relationship between these two sermons will be given in a study in press. The exact relationship between these two sermons is not completely clear. This issue will be a matter of future investigation. Another unedited Assumption sermon (Escorial Library, Real Bibl. de S. Lorenzo, O.I.8.III, fol. 242r–242v) by a Cistercian Guillelmus de Populeto (13th century?) is different from Totting's.

JERUSALEM	PEACE	MARY'S POWER
<p>Carnalis civitas (‘carnal city’) <i>Ierusalem Ierusalem, que occidis prophetas</i>, Mt 23,37</p> <p>(‘Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets’)</p>	<p>Voluptas carnis (‘carnal pleasure’) <i>Deceperint populum meum dicentes: Pax, pax et non erat pax</i>, Ez 13,10 (‘Because they have deceived my people, saying: Peace, and there is no peace’)</p>	<p>Rigorousa potestas (‘rigorous power’)</p>
<p>Spiritualis civitas (‘spiritual city’) <i>Pulchra es amica mea, suavis et decora sicut Ierusalem</i>, Ct 6,3 (‘Thou art beautiful, O my love, sweet and comely as Jerusalem’)</p>	<p>Tranquillitas mentis (‘peace of mind’) <i>Gracia vobis et pax multiplicetur</i>, I Pt 1, 2 (‘Grace unto you and peace be multiplied’)</p>	<p>Graciosa potestas (‘gracious power’)</p>
<p>Supernalis civitas (‘supernal city’) <i>Que sursum est Ierusalem, libera est; que est mater nostra</i>, Gal 4,26 (‘But that Jerusalem, which is above, is free: which is our mother’)</p>	<p>Beatitudo eternitatis (‘eternal beatitude’) <i>Deus pacis det vobis pacem sempiternam</i>, II Thess 3,16 (‘The Lord of peace himself give you everlasting peace’)</p>	<p>Gloriosa potestas (‘glorious power’)</p>

After the introductory section, the *historia assumptionis* follows with an extended treatment in three sermon parts. The audience virtually participates in Mary’s journey towards the palace of God through three phases. The first focuses on the *rigorosa potestas* that allows the Blessed Lady to defeat all the devil’s temptations represented by the carnal Jerusalem and its false peace; the second is devoted to the exploration of Mary’s *graciosa potestas* which is in the spiritual Jerusalem and is connected to the fact that she is full of grace; the journey concludes in the celestial Jerusalem rejoicing in the *visio pacis*, the perpetual vision of God. This three-stage analysis, together with specific aspects of the manuscript tradition of the text reveal a specific Mariology whose features are covered in the following sections.

The belief in Mary’s sinlessness and power is often associated with her bodily assumption to the palace of God and exemplified by the parallelism Mary-Eve (integrity *versus* sin). The fact of the corporeal rise of Mary has been questioned after the early appearance of the apocryphal texts on the topic.⁷² A significant contribution to the development of the doctrine of the Assumption was made by the *Tractatus de assumptione BMV* (around the end of the 11th c.), attributed erroneously to Augustine. The so-called Pseudo-Augustine⁷³ gave birth to a theological tendency in support of the bodily assumption of Mary, which

⁷² See Michel van ESBROECK, *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge*, Aldershot 1995, pp. 265–285; Brian REYNOLDS, *Gateway to Heaven, Marian Doctrine and Devotion Image and Typology in the Patristic and Medieval Periods*, vol. 1, New York 2012, pp. 293–329; Stephen J. SHOEMAKER, *Marian Liturgies and Devotion in Early Christianity*, in: Sarah Jane Boss (ed.), *Mary: The Complete Resource*, London – New York 2007, pp. 130–145.

⁷³ *De assumptione beatae Mariae Virginis*, see Aurelius AUGUSTINUS HIPONENSIS, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 6, ed. Jacques Paul MIGNE (Patrologia Latina 40), Paris 1863, col. 1141–1148.

had a substantial influence throughout the Middle Ages.⁷⁴ It seems to have influenced Totting too: in his unedited sermon *Sic in Sion firmata sum* ('So I was established in Sion'), he extensively refers to the Assumption debate, supporting Pseudo-Augustine's *rationes*. He presents the position of those who consider them *non demonstrative*, not able clearly to persuade (*evidenter convincere*) about the issue of the bodily assumption of the Virgin, but declares that they are in fact sufficient to prove the issue itself (*ad probandum quescionem illam*) because they are based on both Scripture and faith, and they are also appreciable because they were made for the sake of increasing faith and piety (*ad augmentum fidei et pietatis*).⁷⁵

Although in the Assumption sermon *In Ierusalem potestas mea*, while Totting does not seem to quote Pseudo-Augustine directly, he clearly follows his teaching. This supposition appears to be in part supported by the usage of the principal *auctoritas* of the corporeal assumption agnosticism, the Pseudo-Jerome,⁷⁶ which is quoted with no concern for the context of the work and the author's purpose. It is noticeable that Totting observes Pseudo-Augustine's doctrine but incorporates various diverging points. The relationship between Mary's and God's power slightly changes. In Pseudo-Augustine there is a special emphasis on the Lord's power as the explanation of Mary's prerogatives (divine maternity, perpetual virginity, sanctity). The use of the formula *potuit, decuit, ergo fecit* ('he could do it, it was proper to do it, therefore he did') is especially emblematic in this way. In Totting's sermon, even if it is clearly declared that Mary's *potestas* is given by the all-powerful God,⁷⁷ the Blessed Lady seems to gain a more specific individuality. The sermon is in fact an eulogy of her special power. Furthermore, Mary's *potestas* continues to be associated with her state as a pure virgin, but there is also a great emphasis on her role as merciful mother. The recurrent image of Mary as Queen of heaven (*Maria Regina*) seated on Christ's right hand, indicates clearly her part played in the redemption of humankind. She is the *Mediatrix* of Divine Grace.

In Totting's sermon, the importance given to Mary's mediating role is drawn from Bernard of Clairvaux.⁷⁸ Assuredly, we come across quotations from the Cistercian master more often than any other non-biblical source. It seems Henry Totting would have these in most cases at first hand from Bernard, because they are quite long and often accurate. At any rate, it is certain that Totting had a special interest in the *doctor marianus* since, among the

⁷⁴ See Giuseppe QUADRIO, *Il trattato 'De assumptione B. Mariae Virginis' dello pseudo-Agostino e il suo influsso nella teologia assunzionistica latina*, Roma 1951.

⁷⁵ The reference is based on Jan Odstrčilík's transcription currently in progress (he will prepare the critical edition of several Henry Totting de Oyta's sermons) and on the study of the two manuscripts which preserve the sermon (Lambach, Stiftsbibliothek, Ccl 73, fols. 150r–153r; Kremsmünster, Stiftsbibliothek, CC 97, fols. 122r–126v). See footnote 107.

⁷⁶ See Albert RIPBERGER, *Der Pseudo-Hieronymus-Brief IX 'Cogitis me': ein erster marianischer Traktat des Mittelalters von Paschasius Radbert*, Freiburg 1962.

⁷⁷ "Omne quod vult in celo et in terra tanto utique potencius quanto plenius introivit in potencias Domini, ita ut non sit ei impossibile apud Deum omne verbum."

⁷⁸ For Bernard's assumption sermons see Gerhard B. WINKLER – Alberich ALTERMATT – Denis FARKASFALVY – Polycarp ZAKAR (eds.), *Bernhard von Clairvaux sämtliche Werke: lateinisch/deutsch*, vol. 8, Innsbruck 1997, pp. 526–619.

saints, apart from Mary he is the only one, along with John the Baptist, to be selected as the subject of specific sermons.⁷⁹

Generally speaking, Totting takes from Bernard his special appeal to praise Mary especially using it in a soteriological perspective. It is clear that, for Totting, Mary's greatness and admirable dignity is rooted in the mystery of the Incarnation. In any case, the focus is shifted especially on her powerful openness and willingness to help human creatures.

Especially in the central and later Middle Ages there is a general interest in Mary's emotions and affective piety; mystics, such as Saint Bernard, had a very influential role in the development of Christian spirituality. Thus, Totting seems in part perfectly integrated in the general tendencies of the time.

In Totting's sermon, Mary's power cannot be explained only in terms of mercy and purity but also as an exemplary model of moral behavior that should be imitated in order to get the *armatura Dei* ('armor of God') and extinguish the 'fiery darts' of temptation.⁸⁰ Indeed, the German theologian depicts the Blessed Lady as a woman of great ethical qualities. She opposes the vices of the auditors of his preaching. This is also confirmed by the scribe himself as shown by the following passage that was most likely originally a marginal note afterwards incorporated by the copyist/collector in the running text and that testifies to the usage of this sermon as a model sermon: "*Hic introduci possunt vicia auditorum que intelliguntur per feces, scilicet avaricia, superbia, luxuria, que fetere faciunt odorem clericorum et quod nomen Christi in ecclesia blasphematur.*" ("Here the vices of the auditors may be introduced, that are understood as feces, that is, avarice, pride, lust, that make stink the smell of the clerics, and also that the name of Christ is blasphemed in the church.")⁸¹

Among the vices mentioned above, especially that of avarice gains a special place in the sermon. Totting connects it to three biblical passages: *in puncto ad inferna descendunt* ('in a moment they go down to hell', Job 21,13), *et relinquunt alienis divitias suas* ('and they shall leave their riches to strangers', Ps 48,11), *hec lata via istorum scandalum ipsis* ('this way of theirs is a stumbling block to them', Ps 48,14); and to their related three *dubitaciones*: 1) for which reason the iniquitous leave their goods to foreigners (*alieni*); 2) why the impious suffer because of narrowness even if their *via* is said to be *lata* and the just have their foot in a large space; 3) for which reason the doubts enounced can be applied also to the devout. The responses to the three questions are found in Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos* and in Guerric of Igny.

It is relevant to note that Augustine's instruction receives special light in Totting through the quotation of the *Opus Imperfectum in Mattheum* by Pseudo-Chrysostom. Totting insists on the relevance of virtuous behavior evoking the precepts of a life regulated by justice (*iusticia*) and discipline, which is a preparation for the eternal life: "*Arta via que ducit ad vitam est omnis iusticia. Et dicitur arta, quia intra regulam veritatis et discipline est inclusa et ambulantes in ea non quod delectat faciunt, sed quod debent.*" ("The narrow way that

⁷⁹ Albert Lang refers to two sermons devoted to Bernard of Clairvaux: The first with the incipit *Lex Dei eius in corde*, the second begins *Omnis qui se exaltat*, Luc 14,11, see A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, p. 119.

⁸⁰ 'Ut possimus omnia tela nequissimi ignea extinguere.'

⁸¹ It is the only passage of the entire text in which an impersonal tone giving instruction to the preacher is used. For the notion of the usage of live sermons as model sermons and their related practical examples see Siegfried WENZEL, *Latin Sermon Collections from Later Medieval England: Orthodox Preaching in the Age of Wyclif*, New York 2005, pp. 3–4 and 16–20.

leads to life is perfect justice. And it is said to be narrow because it is included between the norm of truth and discipline and those that go through it make it not because it delights, but because they must.”⁸² What is particularly remarkable is that this notion of ‘right mode of life’ is connected to the just and appropriate use of goods. Hence, the German theologian seems to be quite acquainted with one of Pseudo-Chrysostom’s primary subjects of the discourse, poverty, and with his ideal of the virtuous life in which wealth itself is not condemned, but only those who are rich without being charitable.⁸³

The last part of Henry’s preaching contains a further striking image of the Blessed Lady that emerges by analyzing the sermon manuscript tradition. Probably, it stands under the influence of the fourteenth century pre-reformation Bohemian environment.

All manuscripts read the same passage: “*Ut enim supernorum civium unita multitudo a laboribus suis beata et concors requiescit, sic et ipsa [sc. Maria] ab omni dolore et labore quieta gaudet se illis convivere, et esse in illis.*” (“Therefore as a united multitude of supernal citizens, blessed and concordant takes a rest from its sufferings, so she herself [sc. Mary] free from all pain and suffering is pleased to live together with them and to be among them.”) However, the following part has an important variation in the manuscripts. While three of the four codices continue: “*Quasi una ex illis, licet excellencior sit universis. Et paulo post: vere, potestas eius est in Ierusalem, quod enim vult omnes volunt.*” (“As she was one of them, although she exceeds in excellence all. And a little later: indeed, her power is in Jerusalem and what she wants, all want.”), the manuscript Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 163 differs significantly: “*Quasi una ex illis, licet excellencior sit universis, et Paulo plus. Vere, potestas eius est in Ierusalem, quod enim vult omnes volunt.*” (“As she was one of them, although she exceeds in excellence all and even more Paul. Indeed, her power is in Jerusalem and what she wants, all want.”)

This variant passage seems partly to recall in part the famous letter of Pope Innocent III (September 11, 1210), addressed to the bishops of Palencia and Burgos, and included in the *Decretales*, which contain a prohibition for Spanish abbesses to exercise the priesthood. This interdict is explained with the fact that “*licet beatissima Virgo Maria dignior et excellentior fuerit Apostolis universis, non tamen illi, sed istis Dominus claves regni caelorum commisit*” (“though the Blessed Virgin Mary exceeded in dignity and excellence all the Apostles, it was to them and not to her that the Lord has given the keys of the kingdom of heaven”).⁸⁴ The text variant in Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 163 especially seems partly to

⁸² *Homilia xviii*, see Johannes CHRYSOSTOMUS, *Opera omnia, quae exstant*, vol. 6, ed. Jacques Paul Migne (Patrologia Graeca 56), Paris 1862, col. 734–735.

⁸³ For the theme richness-poverty see especially J. CHRYSOSTOMUS, *Opera omnia, quae exstant*, vol. 6, col. 722 and 933 (already noted by Cesare MAGAZZÙ, *Motivi encratici nell’Opus Imperfectum in Mattheum*, in: Giulia Sfameni Gasparro (ed.), *Agathē elpis: studi storico-religiosi in onore di Ugo Bianchi*, Roma 1994, p. 430). For a comparison with Chrysostom’s homilies on poverty see Wendy MAYER, *John Chrysostom on Poverty*, in: Pauline Allen – Wendy Mayer – Bronwen Neil (eds.), *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity, Perceptions and Realities*, Leipzig 2009, pp. 69–111. According to Wendy Mayer, Chrysostom’s homilies on poverty do not seek to create a new social system, but both poverty and wealth should remain. Anyway, the poor gain a central place in the homilist’s social vision. The poor have fewer economic obstacles to gain salvation. Besides, poverty is providential because it gives hope of salvation. Indeed, voluntary poverty, which is directly connected to almsgiving, can be adopted by everyone; it corrects souls and leads to a virtuous life. Thus, the rich benefit from the poor: moral education and prayers to ask God to be merciful towards him who has been charitable.

⁸⁴ Emil FRIEDBERG (ed.), *Liber extravagantium decretalium*, vol. 2., Leipzig 1881 (Reprint Graz 1959), liber V, tit. 38, c. 10, col. 886–887.

evoke this sentence. In fact, it is declared that Mary owns a special nature that overcomes all human beings (*universis*), and even Paul (the Apostle). Besides, though it is not explicitly declared that Mary received the keys to Heaven from God, a related image that insists on her power was used, that of the *Regina coeli*: ‘*digna et electa mater est regis regum et domini dominancium*’ (‘[Mary] is the worthy and chosen mother of the King of Kings and Lord of Lords’). Furthermore, it is particularly noticeable, that in one of the four manuscripts which preserve Totting’s sermon, namely the manuscript Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Lat. fol. 690, some lines later, the scribe replaces the word *populi* with *apostoli*, probably as result of the ambiguity contained in this passage.

In conclusion, Totting appears perfectly integrated in the mainstream of the theological tradition of the Assumption that recognizes the special nature of Mary as Mother of God, *Mediatrice* and Intercessor. At the same time, the ambiguity of some of the sermon passages and the authorial scribe writing open issues on the usage of the sermon and reveal a latent participation of the theologian to the new matters of the time, expressed by the urgent need of the Church for renewal and discussion of the religious status of women.⁸⁵

Vita activa and vita contemplativa in the sermon De nativitate Iohannis Baptiste (Luc 1,66)

Jan Odstrčilík

The last important group of Totting’s sermons, which will be discussed in this joint article, are the sermons on other saints (and other occasions).⁸⁶ There are eight sermons in this group, but only six are attested in manuscripts known today. The sermon on the feast of an unknown apostle⁸⁷ as well as the sermon *Pro defunctis* (For those who passed away),⁸⁸ seem to be lost.⁸⁹ From the rest we have two sermons *De omnibus sanctis* (On all Saints),⁹⁰

⁸⁵ The issue around the female priesthood and in general about women’s suitability to transmit God’s word had to have attracted much interest in Totting’s age. In fact, not much before Wycliffe’s support of lay people preaching revealed a weapon of ‘encouragement to women, whose sex debarred them the priesthood’, see Patricia CRAWFORD, *Women and Religion in England: 1500–1720*, London – New York 1993, p. 25. In the similar historical period, analogous concerns involve also the mystic Bridget of Sweden. She calls Mary ‘Mother of Wisdom’ (*Sermo*, feria II, lectio I–II) and ‘magistra apostolorum’ (*Sermo*, feria VI, lectio I) that taught the Apostles before being assumed to heaven, see Mary Ellen WAITHE, *A History of Women Philosophers. Medieval, Renaissance and Enlightenment Women Philosophers A. D. 500–1600*, vol. 2, Boston 1989, p. 183; Claire Lynn SAHLIN, *Birgitta of Sweden and the Voice of Prophecy*, Woodbridge – Suffolk – Rochester – New York 2001, p. 97. For a discussion of the change of the meaning of the ordination during the Middle Ages (from a ‘functional’ to a ‘sacramental’ definition) and its connection to women, see Gary MACY, *The Hidden History of Women’s Ordination: Female Clergy in the Medieval West*, Oxford 2008.

⁸⁶ A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, pp. 119–120.

⁸⁷ From the incipit is known only the biblical quotation on which it is based, i.e. ‘*Quam pulchri super montes pedes annunciantis*’, Is 52,7.

⁸⁸ As in the case above, from the incipit is known only the biblical quotation, i.e. ‘*Abraham mortuus est*’, Joh. 8,52.

⁸⁹ See the introduction above.

⁹⁰ Sermon with the inc. ‘*Gaudete et exultate*’, Mt 5,12, ‘*Beatus Augustinus in libro de cura pro mortuis agenda*’ and another sermon with the inc. ‘*Vidi civitatem sanctam Iherusalem*’.

two on St. Bernard,⁹¹ one *De caritate cuiusdam doctoris* (On the charity of some master),⁹² and finally a sermon *De nativitate Iohannis Baptiste* (On the birth of John the Baptist).⁹³ In this part, the focus will be put on the last of these sermons.

The sermon *De nativitate Iohannis Baptiste* is known from three manuscripts: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Library, 534, fols. 130v–133v,⁹⁴ St. Florian, Augustiner-Chorherrenstift, XI 97, fols. 76r–78v⁹⁵ and Innsbruck, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Tirol, 180, fols. 58r–63r.⁹⁶ The most remarkable one is the manuscript from St. Florian which was written as early as 1383 and was bought to Prague, as is attested in the owner's note on the pastedown.⁹⁷ The composition of the manuscript seems to prove its Bohemian origin as well.⁹⁸ The manuscript in Innsbruck is a copy of the St. Florian manuscript written around 1400 and is, therefore, not relevant for the study. The last manuscript comes from Cambridge. Even though it is slightly younger than the manuscript from St. Florian, its origin can also be traced to Bohemia.⁹⁹ It is therefore highly probable, that the sermon was composed during Totting's stay in Prague between 1381 and 1384.¹⁰⁰

The sermon has a rather clear structure in its first part. It is based on the quotation from Luc 1,66: '*Quis putas puer iste erit?*' ('What an one, think ye, shall this child be?')

What follows, seems to be a typical sermon on this topic. Totting speaks about different *mirabilia* (miracles), connected with the birth of John the Baptist (numbers added):

- 1) *Sanctus Iohannes Baptista mirifice et humanitus, inconsuete ante conceptum eius in utero est ab angelo festive nunciatus,*
 - 2) *in utero a Spiritu Sancto repletive sanctificatus,*
 - 3) *post nativitatem eius ex utero a parentibus insolite nominatus.*
- 1) Saint John the Baptist was announced miraculously and humanly, unusually before his own conception in the womb and joyfully by the angel,
 - 2) [he was] sanctified by being filled by the Holy Spirit in the womb,
 - 3) after his nativity from the womb, he was named unusually by his parents.¹⁰¹

⁹¹ Inc. '*Lex Dei eius in corde*' and '*Omnis qui se exaltat*', Luc. 14,11., see A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, p. 119.

⁹² Inc. '*Mandatum novum dedi vobis ut diligatis invicem sicut dilexi vox. O homo, ecce tue forme sive discipline.*' See A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, p. 120, incipit enlarged according to Wien, Schottenstift, 41 (Hübl 40), fol. 32rb.

⁹³ Inc. '*Quis putas puer iste erit? Luce primo et in hodieerne festivitatis ewangelio. Reverendi patres et domini, sacra, sicut nostis.*'

⁹⁴ M. R. JAMES, *A Descriptive Catalogue*, vol. 2, pp. 484–486.

⁹⁵ Catalogue description in Albin CZERNY, *Die Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek St. Florian*, Linz 1871, pp. 43–44.

⁹⁶ Catalogue description of the manuscript in Walter NEUHAUSER, *Katalog der Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Innsbruck. Cod. 101–200*, Wien 1991, pp. 162–167. This manuscript was previously unknown to the research on Henry Totting of Oyta, cf. A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, p. 119 and J. KEJŘ, *Díla pražských mistrů v rukopisech knihovny Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, p. 136.

⁹⁷ Anno <domini M> CCC LXXX III in <stu>dio Pragen<si> comparatus est ille liber per magistrum Geor(iu)m (?) plebanum in .nst(er?). Et constetit VII flor(en)is minus 4^{or} g(ross)is), see Alexander PATSCHOVSKY, *Quellen zur böhmischen Inquisition im 14. Jahrhundert*, Weimar 1979, p. 318.

⁹⁸ The most striking are articles of some heretics written on the pastedown, which are excerpted from one of the sermons of Matthew of Kraków, which was delivered in Prague in January 24, 1384, see A. PATSCHOVSKY, *Quellen zur böhmischen Inquisition im 14. Jahrhundert*, pp. 318–323. This addition confirms the dating of the rest of the manuscript to 1383. The codex also contains the sermon *De corpore Christi* of Jan Milič on fols. 78v–82r.

⁹⁹ J. KEJŘ, *Díla pražských mistrů v rukopisech knihovny Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, pp. 136–142.

¹⁰⁰ See the introduction.

¹⁰¹ All quotations are from the upcoming critical edition, which will be a part of a future longer study.

For a short comparison a sermon on the same biblical quotation *Quis putas puer iste erit*,¹⁰² composed by Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl (ca. 1360–1433) sometime after the Council of Constance can be used.¹⁰³ The reason for this choice is that Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl was one of the Totting's students and later a younger colleague at Vienna University. We could therefore expect that the style of preaching might be similar:

*"Cum parentes et cognati ac vicini beati Iohannis Baptiste vidissent et considerassent magna mirabilia et insolita, que Deus circa eum fecit, atque singularia privilegia, que sibi Deus contulit, quorum aliqua fuerunt ipsius ab angelo anuncciatio, nominis sui ab eodem angelo expressio, patris per taciturnitatem punicio, ipsius pueri a sterili matre concepcio, eius ad Christi presenciam exaltacio, ipsius in matris utero sanctificacio et post suam natiuitatem officii ligue patris sui restitucio."*¹⁰⁴

"After the parents and the relatives and neighbours of blessed John the Baptist had seen and reflected upon the great and unusual wonders which God made around him, and the privileges which God brought to him, of which some of them were announced by the angel, the announcement of his name by the same angel, the father's punishment through silence, the conception of the same child by a sterile mother, his leaping for joy in the presence of Christ, his sanctification in the mother's womb and after his birth a restoration of the use of his father's speech."¹⁰⁴

Totting as well as Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl, follow their propositions almost mechanically. They often use expressions such as *Dixi primo*, *Dixi secundo*, *Dixi tercio* (I stated first, second, third), *ubi advertendum* (here should be noted), *dubitacio* (doubt) etc. A very similar structure can also be found in Totting's other sermons, e.g. *De assumptione BMV* (inc. '*In Ierusalem potestas mea, Eccli 24 et in epistula nunc instantis festivitatis. Reverendi patres et domini, virgo hodie gloriosa.*'), discussed previously in this study by Francesca Battista. On the other hand, there are also sermons with a very different organizational principle, like the sermon *De passione Domini*, (inc. '*Erit vita tua*'), studied previously here by Riccardo Burgazzi. The sermon on the Passion of Christ does not include a single *dixi*, *innuitur*, or *dubitatur*. Instead, it is based on how the Holy Spirit makes his disciples *benivolos*, *dociles* and *attentos*.¹⁰⁵

Totting often uses enumerations in the sermon *De nativitate Iohannis Baptistae*, which are further explained by using new lists of evidence which are sometimes expanded by other enumerations. For example, Totting begins with the statement on the unusual annunciation of the birth of John the Baptist. Here, he quotes verses from Luc 1,13: "*Ne timeas, Zacharia, quoniam exaudita depreacio tua et uxor tua pariet tibi filium et vocabis nomen eius Iohannem.*" ("Fear not, Zachary, for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elizabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John.") According to Totting, in these verses *tria innuuntur* ('three things are meant'), i.e. the appearance of the angel, the naming of John and fulfillment of the father's prayers. In the same way, he proceeds in the major part of the sermon.

The real break in the structure comes at the point when Totting discusses the *sanctitudo vite* ('holiness of the life') of John the Baptist. Totting stops addressing all items in the lists

¹⁰² The whole inc.: '*Quis putas puer iste erit? Ita scribitur Luc 1 (66). Cum parentes et cognati ac vicini.*'

¹⁰³ Alois MADRE, *Nikolaus von Dinkelsbühl: Leben und Schriften*, Münster 1965, pp. 238–239.

¹⁰⁴ Quoted according to Sankt Pölten, Diözesanbibliothek, Cod. 22, fol. 1r.

¹⁰⁵ See above.

individually and proceeds only in one way. Totting also starts to quote different authors than those in the first part, mainly Pseudo-Prosper's *De vita contemplativa* and Petrarch's *De vita solitaria*. Accordingly, the topic slowly shifts from John the Baptist to the more general subject of solitude and later even to the tension between the *vita contemplativa* ('contemplative life') and the *vita activa* ('active life'). Whereas Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl focuses on the private virtues of John the Baptist until the end of the sermon, for Totting it is only a starting point. Henry Totting of Oyta obviously wanted to discuss a different matter, which comes finally expressed in the question: "*Numquid omnes viri ecclesiastici volentes esse participes contemplative vite debent urbes deserere?*" ("Do all clergymen, who want to participate in the contemplative life, have to leave cities?")

To be able to answer this question, Totting distinguishes three different types of *solitudo*: *loci*, *temporis* and *mentis*. Although he admits the importance of the first two ('solitude of place' and 'solitude of time'), he stresses that only the *solitudo mentis* ('solitude of the mind'), is what really matters and this is what the aim of anybody who wants to live the *vita contemplativa* must be. According to Totting, this *solitudo mentis* is achievable even for clergy and scholars in the cities, and they can even reach a higher perfection of this solitude, because of their activity.

Totting is speaking here about "*virī ecclesiastici, scholastici, precipue autem prelati et aliorum pastorum et doctorum*" ("ecclesiastics, scholastics, but mainly prelates both of other shepherds and masters"). It shows how close both the worlds were: the students and teachers were usually also clerics and Totting was no exception. Although he used to preach for Carthusian monks in Mauerbach¹⁰⁶ – the order, which tried to seclude itself from the rest of the world more than others – Totting himself was very active at the university and here he defends his position.

There is also another sermon in which Totting alludes to a similar topic. It is one of his three sermons On the Assumption of Virgin Mary, i.e. *De assumptione BMV* (inc. '*Sic in Sion firmata sum*', Eccli 24^o. '*Reverendi patres et domini, solempnem festivitatem assumptionis*').¹⁰⁷ In the first third of the sermon Totting argues that Virgin Mary was perfect in both kinds of life, i.e. *vita activa* and *vita contemplativa*. Totting quotes again (amid other authors) Pseudo-Prosper's *De vita contemplativa*. He even comes to a similar question as in the sermon *De nativitate Iohannis Baptiste: An vita contemplativa impediatur per vitam activam?* (Whether the *vita activa* hinders the *vita contemplativa*?) And although Totting says that it seems to be so, he quotes Thomas Aquinas who argues the contrary: "*Exercitium vite active confert ad contemplativam, quod quietat interiores passiones, ex quibus fantasmata proveniunt, per que contemplacio impeditur.*" ("The exercise in active life helps contemplative life, because it calms inner passions, from which phantasmata come out, which hinder contemplation.")¹⁰⁸ Totting summarizes this part of his sermon,

¹⁰⁶ See p. 6.

¹⁰⁷ The following part is based on the working transcription of Lambach, Stiftsbibliothek, Ccl 73, fols. 150r–153r and Kremsmünster, Stiftsbibliothek, CC 97, fols. 122r–126v, which were previously unknown to Lang, who knew only Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, 2^o Ms. theol. 109, cf. A. LANG, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta*, p. 119.

¹⁰⁸ THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa theologiae*, II^a–II^{ae}, Editio Leonina, q. 182 a. 3 co. <<http://www.corpusthomicum.org/sth3179.html>> (April 4, 2016).

in which again his two backgrounds are clear, a life as a cleric as well as a teacher at the university:

“Hic ergo normam vivendi sumant omnes christicole, precipue autem aliorum pastores, doctores et prelati, omnesque viri ecclesiastici, claustrales et seculares, sacerdotes et studentes ad quos plus aliis utriusque vite pertinet exercitium diligenterque attendant, ut ita se exercent in actione, quod perfici mereantur in contemplatione.”

“All Christians should take precepts of life from this source, and especially shepherds of others, doctors and prelates, all men of the church, monks and seculars, priests and students, to whom more than to others exercise of both lives pertains, they should industriously strive to exercise themselves in action in such a way, that they should deserve to become perfect also in contemplation.”

Between the two worlds – secular and religious – there seem to be quotations from Petrarch’s book *De vita solitaria*. They are actually the longest ones in the sermon, taking more than 300 words. This means that they have a very privileged position in comparison to more usual sources used in the sermon such as Thomas Aquinas, Augustine, or Peter Lombard. Totting firstly introduces Petrarch’s book as one of the *hystoriis autenticis* (‘authentic histories’) and quotes a long passage from the second chapter of the second book about Adam who was lucky alone, but fell into misery in the company, and about other men seeking solitude. For the second time, Totting pronounces his name openly and recommends his book as further reading on the subject.

In the both cases Petrarch is quoted almost verbatim. There is only one, although significant, difference in comparison to the book: the biblical references, such as *ut patet Genesis 2^o et 3^o capitulis* or *Genesis 28*, are interpolated into Petrarch’s text. It is not clear whether or not it is an addition made by Totting. However, they are probably motivated by the effort to adapt Petrarch’s text for the usage in the context of preaching.

Totting’s choice of Petrarch, although uncommon, is not incomprehensible. *De vita solitaria* was read and used by different groups of readers, the religious one included¹⁰⁹ and the problem of *vita activa* and *vita contemplativa* was discussed in Petrarch’s works again and again, as in *De otio religioso*, *De secreto conflictu cuararum mearum*, or *De remediis utriusque fortune*.¹¹⁰ His ideas were even close to the one of the Carthusian order, to which he was connected.¹¹¹

Unfortunately, we know almost nothing about Petrarch’s usage in Prague in the second half of the 14th century. According to the inventory of Czech and Slovak manuscripts containing the works of Petrarch, there is only one manuscript of *De vita solitaria* dated to the 14th century.¹¹² This could suggest that Totting learnt about Petrarch while he was still in Paris and that he served as a cultural transmitter or adaptor who introduced a new text to the academic audience in Prague.

¹⁰⁹ See Karl A. E. ENENKEL, *Einleitung*, in: Francesco PETRARCA, *De vita solitaria*, Buch I, *Kritische Textausgabe und Ideengeschichtlicher Kommentar*, ed. Karl A. E. ENENKEL, pp. XVII–XVIII.

¹¹⁰ K. A. E. ENENKEL, *Einleitung*, p. XIX.

¹¹¹ Cf. Demetrio S. YOCUM, *Introduction: Petrarch and the Carthusians*, in: Petrarch’s Humanist Writing and Carthusian Monasticism: The Secret Language of the Self, Turnhout 2013, pp. 1–26.

¹¹² Vyšší Brod, Klášterní knihovna, Ms CXLVI; see Erwin RAUNER, *Petrarca-Handschriften in Tschechien und in der Slowakischen Republik*, Padova 1999, pp. 455–456.

Conclusion

The sermons of Henry Totting of Oyta provide a remarkable testimony of many aspects of medieval preaching. The sermon *De passione Domini* is the oldest of Totting's sermons identified to date and it probably still bears traces of Totting's career as a master of liberal arts. The Marian sermon *De assumptione BMV* shows a very firm scholastic structure and gives a relevant contribution to the contemporary and controversial area of the Assumption theology; it bridges tradition and new spiritual concerns. On the other hand, the sermon *De nativitate Iohannis Baptiste*, featuring only at the first sight a similar construction with *De assumptione BMV*, is a worthy and uncommon testimony of the early reception of Petrarch in Central Europe in the context of preaching.

Although a lot remains to be done in this field, these three cases already show different aspects of Totting's work, that is, liberal arts, theology, as well as humanism. Totting was knowledgeable in all the three fields and was able to use them meaningfully in his sermons. Although the discussed sermons cannot be identified with absolute certainty as being written during his stay in Prague, their Prague origin is in one case very likely, in another case probable and in the last case possible. The sermon *De nativitate Iohannis Baptiste* is preserved in the manuscript dated to 1383,¹¹³ which was for sure bought by a scholar in Prague. The sermon *De assumptione BMV* is attested in manuscripts of Czech origin¹¹⁴ and in one of the oldest manuscripts can be found together with the sermon *De nativitate Iohannis Baptiste*,¹¹⁵ which suggest a similar date and place of origin. Last, but not least, the sermon *De passione Domini* is persevered in a manuscript written around 1363,¹¹⁶ i.e., around the time in which Totting moved from Erfurt to Prague.

At the same time, however, it is perhaps not necessary to insist on pinpointing individual texts to particular places of origin in a case like this one: Henry Totting of Oyta led a typical life of a late medieval intellectual – he gathered knowledge, ideas, and inspiration at a variety of places where he stayed, worked, studied, and taught. Prague formed part of this complex network: it was a significant stop in Henry Totting's career and it remains a crucial spot on the intellectual map of late medieval Europe.

¹¹³ St. Florian, Augustiner-Chorherrenstift, XI 97, fols. 76r–78v, see above.

¹¹⁴ Cambridge, Corpus Christi Library, 534, fols. 126v–130r, and probably also Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, C 212, fols. 84r–90v.

¹¹⁵ Cambridge, Corpus Christi Library, 534, fols. 126v–130r and 130v–133v.

¹¹⁶ Augsburg, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. II. 1. 2° 171, fols. 173va–177ra.

Kazatelství Jindřicha Tottinga z Oyty

RESUMÉ

Přestože se dochovalo více než třicet kázání Jindřicha Tottinga z Oyty († 1397), dostalo se jim v minulosti jenom skromné vědecké pozornosti, a jejich obsah a charakter tak zatím zůstávají v drtivé většině neznámé. Společný článek tří autorů si proto bere za cíl představit tuto stránku Tottingovy činnosti, a to především na příkladu předběžných analýz jeho tří kázání zastupujících jeho hlavní tematické okruhy.

Riccardo Burgazzi se zabývá kázáním *O utrpení Páně* (*De passione Domini*), které datuje do počátku 60. let 14. století. Jedná se o jeden z nejstarších dochovaných Tottingových textů vůbec. Tomu se zdají odpovídat i výrazné vlivy *artes liberales* v podobě ciceronské rétorické tradice a aristotelské terminologie. To by mohlo ukazovat na vznik kázání ještě před Tottingovou cestou do Prahy, kde započal studium teologie.

Francesca Battista se věnuje mladšímu kázání *O nanebevzetí blahoslavené Panny Marie* (*De assumptione Beate Marie Virginis*). Tottingovy názory jsou v souladu s hlavními proudy teologické tradice, které uznávají zvláštní povahu Panny Marie jako boží rodičky a zprostředkovatelky (*mediatrix*). Zvláště patrné je ovlivnění sv. Bernardem. Pozornost je věnována také rukopisům, v nichž je kázání dochováno a které dokazují, že kázání bylo aktivně používáno jako modelové.

Za poslední příklad bylo zvoleno kázání *O narození Jana Křtitele* (*De nativitate Iohannis Baptiste*), které zkoumá Jan Odstrčilík. Kázání se podařilo datovat do období okolo roku 1383, tedy do doby, v níž Jindřich Totting z Oyty pobýval v Praze. Na první pohled standardní kázání překvapuje ve své druhé polovině dlouhými citáty z Petrarkovy knihy *De vita solitaria*, které jsou postaveny na úroveň tradičních autorit. Totting tak prokazuje nejenom znalost v té době moderního díla, ale především odvahu použít jej v kazatelském kontextu pro svoje téma, totiž otázku, zdali může být z podstaty své činnosti kněz či akademik účasten *vita contemplativa*.

Jan Odstrčilík
Institut für Mittelalterforschung ÖAW, Wien
jan.odstrcilik@oeaw.ac.at

Francesca Battista
Charles University, Prague
frabattis29@gmail.com

Riccardo Burgazzi
Prospero Editore, Milano
riccardo@prosperoeditore.com

Section II:

*Prague University in the Intellectual
Space of Medieval Europe*

THE CHARTERS OF FOUNDATION OF PRAGUE AND NAPLES: THE MODELS AND THEIR REUSE

FULVIO DELLE DONNE

ABSTRACT

In 1348, when Charles IV, king of Bohemia and of the Romans, founded the University of Prague, he (or, better, his *dictator*, Nicholas Sortes) used some others sources as stylistic and argumentative models. This way, the charter of foundation appears to be a *cento* of other letters written for the University of Naples (founded in 1224) by Emperor Frederick II Hohenstaufen and his son Conrad. It is an evident example of the stylistic and functional reuse of one of the most important letter-collections of the 13th century: the rhetoric models attributed to Petrus de Vinea (maybe exported to Bohemia by Henricus de Isernia), which gained a huge diffusion and became a forceful symbol of power all around Europe.

Keywords: University of Prague – University of Naples – Charles IV of Bohemia – Frederick II Hohenstaufen – Petrus de Vinea

The charter of foundation of a University is a very important document: it shows the methods that the founder wants to follow and nothing can be left to chance. In particular, the charter of foundation of the Prague University, issued by Charles IV on the 7th of April 1348,¹ marks the birth of the first university beyond the Alps and east of Paris. Charles IV founded his university as King of the Romans (that is as Emperor *in pectore*), or as King of Bohemia?² And consequently, what did Charles intend to do? Historians of political institutions and scholars of diplomatic have already given some answers to these questions, but also, perhaps, philology and rhetoric can give their contribution.

It is quite well known that the founding charter of Charles is organized as a *cento* of some letters contained in the collection attributed to Petrus de Vinea (ca. 1190–1249), who was prothonotary and logothete of Emperor Frederick of Swabia (Hohenstaufen).³

¹ The document is edited in: Venceslaus HRUBÝ (ed.), *Archivum coronae regni Bohemiae*, II, Pragae 1928, pp. 67–69, n. 62; Karl ZEUMER – Richard SALOMON (eds.), *Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum*, VIII, Hannoverae 1910–1926 (MGH, Const., VIII), pp. 580–581, nr. 568. Obviously, the first charter was issued by pope Clement VI, 26 january 1347: the charter is edited in Ladislaus KLICMAN (ed.), *Monumenta Vaticana res gestas Bohemicas illustrantia*, I, Acta Clementis VI, Pragae 1903, pp. 495–496; and in *Constitutiones et acta publica*, pp. 245–246, nr. 132.

² Cfr. Václav CHALOUPECKÝ, *Karlova universita v Praze 1348–1409*, Praha 1948, pp. 26–43; Miloslava KUBOVÁ, *Univerzita založená Karlem IV. Obraz o zakladatelské činnosti univerzitní císaře Karla IV.*, Acta universitatis Carolinae – Historia universitatis Carolinae Pragensis 11/1–2, Praha 1970, pp. 7–31; Roderich SCHMIDT, *Begründung und Bestätigung der Universität Prag*, Blätter für deutsche Landesgeschichte 114, 1978, pp. 695–719; František ŠMAHEL, *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter*, Leiden – Boston 2007, p. 6 ff.

³ About the so-called Letter-collection of Petrus de Vinea, transmitted in 4 main redactions (shorter in 5 or in 6 books, longer in 5 or in 6 books: the shorter in 6 books was the most common), cfr. especially Hans Martin SCHALLER, *Zur Entstehung der sogenannten Briefsammlung des Petrus de Vinea*, Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung

Already Heinrich Denifle, in 1885,⁴ identified the source of the Charles charter in three other documents issued by Frederick Hohenstaufen and his son Conrad for the universities of Naples and Salerno. The relationships with these models were then explored and clarified by Vojtěch Jaromír Nováček,⁵ in the edition prepared by *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*⁶ and in a comprehensive study by Benoît Grévin about the European influence exercised by the rhetorical style of the letters of Petrus de Vineia.⁷ However, the charter of foundation of the University of Prague is a very interesting example of political re-use of rhetorical models, and therefore deserves new attention about its method of composition and its purposes.

The charter of foundation of 1348 uses particularly three letters transmitted by the letter-collection attributed to Petrus de Vineia: one is a letter issued by Frederick II in 1224 (III 11 in the Petrus de Vineia's letter-collection), with which the emperor invited the scholars to come to Naples, where he had just founded his *Studium generale*, which can be considered the first state University in the world.⁸ The two others documents were issued by Conrad IV, the son and heir of Frederick II, who in 1252–1253 decided to punish the rebel city of Naples by transferring the University to Salerno (III 12 and III 10 in the Petrus de Vineia's letter-collection).⁹

The organization of the prose cento is quite similar to various and frequent rhetoric creations produced in that period in France and England, and similarly based on the letters attributed to Petrus de Vineia.¹⁰ But here the most remarkable thing is the typology of sources: they are documents specifically related to the university, even if they are not technically privileges, or diplomas, like the charter of Prague, but rather circular letters of invitation for students. A detailed comparison can clarify the relationships between the documents: a graphic system in Appendix can reveal everything in a schematic way.

The letter of foundation issued by Frederick II in 1224 (Petrus de Vineia's letter-collection III 11) is not very broadly used (the comparison is highlighted by underlining): there are only two short parts. The first is in the phrase in which Charles affirms that the students should no longer be forced to wander around the world, to beg in foreign lands in order to quench their craving for learning; the second, just a little bit longer, is where he says that in

des Mittelalters 12, 1956, pp. 114–159 (reprinted in: Id., *Stauferzeit. Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, Hannover 1993, pp. 225–270); Id., *L'epistolario di Pier della Vigna*, in: Stefano Gensini (ed.), *Politica e cultura nell'Italia di Federico II*, Pisa 1986, pp. 95–111 (reprinted in German in: H. M. Schaller, *Stauferzeit*, pp. 463–478); Fulvio Delle Donne, *Autori, redazioni, trasmissioni, ricezione. I problemi editoriali delle raccolte di dictamina di epoca sveva e dell'epistolario di Pier della Vigna*, ArNoS. Archivio normanno-svevo 2, 2009, pp. 7–28.

⁴ Heinrich Denifle, *Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*, Berlin 1885, p. 587.

⁵ Vojtěch Jaromír Nováček, *Prameny zakládací listiny university Pražské, vydané Karlem IV. dne 7. dubna 1348*, Praha 1890, p. 22.

⁶ *Constitutiones et acta publica*, pp. 580–581.

⁷ Benoît Grévin, *Rhétorique du pouvoir médiéval. Les Lettres de Pierre de la Vigne et la formation du langage politique européen XIII^e–XIV^e siècle*, Rome 2008, pp. 716–721.

⁸ The letter is edited in Fulvio Delle Donne, 'Per scientiarum haustum et seminarium doctrinarum'. *Storia dello Studium di Napoli in età sveva*, Bari 2010, pp. 85–91, n. 1, with bibliography (pp. 9–10) about the problem of the state-university. The volume reprint the article 'Per scientiarum haustum et seminarium doctrinarum': *edizione e studio dei documenti relativi allo Studium di Napoli in età sveva*, *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il medioevo* 111, 2009, pp. 101–225. The Petrus de Vineia's letter-collection is now edited, commented and translated in Italian by the 'Centro europeo di studi normanni': Edoardo D'Angelo – Fulvio Delle Donne – Alessandro Boccia – Teofilo De Angelis – Roberto Gamberini (eds.), *L'epistolario di Pier della Vigna*, Soveria Mannelli 2014.

⁹ The letters are edited in F. Delle Donne, *Per scientiarum haustum*, pp. 111–114, n. 13, and pp. 116–120, n. 15.

¹⁰ Cfr. B. Grévin, *Rhétorique du pouvoir médiéval*, pp. 566–662.

the *Studium generale* there will be doctors, masters and pupils of all faculties, to whom he promises excellent goods and grants royal gifts and special protection during their travels, their stay or their return.

More fundamental still are the first and the second letters issued by Conrad in 1252 and in 1253 for Salerno (Petrus de Vineia's letter-collection, respectively III 12 and III 10). The virtuosity of the author in reusing his models is very impressive: he creates intersections and inextricable intertwining between these two principal models, used as a basis for his composition. So he takes bigger parts from the two Conrad's letters, and adds two smaller fragments from Frederick's charters: the schema is really remarkable for its organizational accuracy and can show its precision if we summarize with the aid of letters of the alphabet: B / C / B / C / A / B / C / B / A / B.¹¹

Apart from the protocol, which shows that the charter is organized as a bulla and not as a letter, because it is for the perpetual remembrance of the matter (*'ad perpetuam rei memoriam'*) and is not directed to specific recipients, in the analysis previously made by other scholars, only the early results are not drawn from other sources.¹² Actually, even those few lines of the preamble, whose content vaguely recalls the first of Conrad's letters, are taken from other letters. In particular, the phrase *'cogitationi regali iugiter occurrunt, animi precipua reddimur anxietate solliciti'* is taken from Petrus de Vineia's letter-collection III 22, addressed in 1249 to the king of France. In the beginning of that letter, on a military expedition to the Holy Land and not to the university – this is an exception by comparison with other models – we can indeed read: *"Inter tot et tanta diversa curarum genera, quae cogitationibus nostris indesinenter occurrunt, precipua reddimur anxietate cordis solliciti."* In addition, the formula *'aciem mentis nostrae'* is used in Petrus de Vineia's letter-collection I 5,2 and V 1,4; the formula *'mentis affectione complectimur'* is used in Petrus de Vineia's letter-collection II 21,1. And also the *incipit*, *'Inter desiderabilia cordis nostri'*, is very usual in the epistolary prose of that period and can be read in the letters of Pope Innocent III,¹³ or in the samples formal letters collected by Richardus de Pofi to;¹⁴ and we can add it is used also in a letter by Clement VI addressed to king John of Bohemia in 1346:¹⁵ this way there were many possibilities in finding the more appropriate source.

Summarizing, every part of the Charter reproduces specific sources and models. Also the charter issued by Clemens VI in 1347 used parts taken from another document for Pisa (1343);¹⁶ but it reused only in small parts and, above all, the author was the same. Therefore the situation is very different: how can we interpret it? For Anton Blaschka the reused parts of the text did not completely succumb to the style of the original *dictator*, and this was

¹¹ Cfr. B. GRÉVIN, *Rhétorique du pouvoir médiéval*, p. 720.

¹² Actually, Anton BLASCHKA, *Vom Sinn der Prager hohen Schule nach Wort und Bild ihrer Gründungsurkunden*, in: Rudolf SCHREIBER (ed.), *Studien zur Geschichte der Karls-Universität zu Prag*, Freilassing – Salzburg 1954, p. 56, quickly notes that some parts are taken from letter III 24 by Petrus de Vineia, but it is incorrect (maybe it was just a mistake instead of the III 22).

¹³ Jacques Paul MIGNE (ed.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*, CCXVI, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1855, ep. 30 (col. 823), ep. 34 (col. 828), ep. 91 (col. 891).

¹⁴ The letter-collection of Richardus de Pofi is still unedited: the letters are usually nr. 205 e 261.

¹⁵ *Constitutiones et acta publica*, p. 116, line 1 (doc. 90).

¹⁶ Cfr. especially Georg Heinrich KAUFMANN, *Geschichte der deutschen Universitäten*, II, Stuttgart 1896, p. 7, in note; Frank REXROTH, *Deutsche Universitätsstiftungen von Prag bis Köln. Die Intentionen des Stifters und die Wege und Chancen ihrer Verwirklichung im spätmittelalterlichen deutschen Territorialstaat*, Köln 1992, pp. 64–66.

evident especially in the reorganization of the *cursus*.¹⁷ This is quite correct and true, but we have to analyze the question with increased precision.

First of all, every possible interpretation depends on the author's identification. As it turns out, the *dictator* was Nicholas Sortes, the French secretary of Charles IV:¹⁸ this notary, probably brought to Prague the fruits of the rhetorical teachings of the French schools, where the reuse of models drawn from Petrus de Vinea's Letters was usual and frequent.¹⁹ But, I think this circumstance was not enough. There was also in Prague an important tradition of reading and using of the letters attributed to Petrus de Vinea. That letter-collection was imported there by Henricus de Isernia, who was a distinguished *dictator*, and he worked for a long time in the chancellery of the last Swabian kings of Sicily, and then, after the death of Manfred (the battle of Benevento, 1266) and Conradin (after the battle of Tagliacozzo, 1268), went into exile in Bohemia, where he, also called *Henricus Italicus*, became protonotary of the royal chancery.²⁰ In Prague Henricus founded also a school of rhetoric, where he spread the knowledge of the art of writing *dictamina* and epistles throughout Bohemia, in its both theoretical and practical form. Excluding the manuscripts containing his *dictamina*,²¹ his teaching in Bohemia is probably demonstrated also by the spread in the same region of the letter-collection attributed to Petrus de Vinea.²² We have many examples of artistic reuse of that material, especially in the period of Ottokar II and in the first years of Wenceslaus II: they can demonstrate the deep impact of the Sicilian *ars dictaminis* on the culture, not only for the redaction of official chancellery documents, but also for the instruction of scholars.²³ That kind of style usually identified the prose production in an absolute manner not only in Bohemia or in southern Italy, but all around Europe. The figure of Henricus de Isernia is particularly relevant: he is a concrete example of the implementation of a 'socio-stylistic network'.²⁴ The rhetorical style developed in the central-southern part of Italy was fully identifiable, but it did not characterized the production of a unique chancery: indeed, the same style was used both in the imperial and in the papal chancery, that is, in the two centers of power, which at that time were in violent conflict. The only way of spreading that style was offered by schools of *dictamen*, locally operating in *Terra Laboris*, and in particular around Montecassino, the place where *ars dictaminis*

¹⁷ A. BLASCHKA, *Vom Sinn der Prager hohen Schule*, pp. 56–57.

¹⁸ Cfr. V. HRUBÝ in the introduction to the edition of the document, *Archivum coronae*, II, p. 67, and A. BLASCHKA, *Vom Sinn der Prager hohen Schule*, p. 54. But here the source of this information is not explicitly declared, reported also by SCHMIDT, *Begründung*, p. 697; Ferdinand SEIBT, *Karl IV. Ein Kaiser in Europa, 1346–1378*, München 1987, p. 181, and in Jana NECHUTOVÁ, *Die lateinische Literatur des Mittelalters in Böhmen*, Köln – Weimar – Wien 2007, p. 188.

¹⁹ Cfr. B. GRÉVIN, *Rhétorique du pouvoir médiéval*, pp. 566–629.

²⁰ Cfr. Hans Martin SCHALLER, *Enrico da Isernia*, in: *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, XLII, Roma 1993, ad vocem. For further bibliography cfr. now Richard PSIK, *Henricus de Isernia and his 'Invectiva prosotetrasticha in Ulricum Polonicum'*, *ArNoS. Archivio Normanno-Svevo* 4, 2013–2014, pp. 75–102.

²¹ Cfr. Cracow, Bibliotheka Jagiellońska, ms. 439; Klagenfurt, Archiv der Diözese Gurk, ms. XXXI b 12; Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, ms. XII B 12; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, ms. 3143.

²² Cfr. Hans Martin SCHALLER, *Handschriftenverzeichnis zur Briefsammlung des Petrus de Vinea*, Hannover 2002, especially mss. 11, 78, 97, 239, 389, connected with the court of Prague, and the mss. 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, originally preserved in Prague; ID., *Zur Entstehung der sogenannten Briefsammlung*, pp. 148–151.

²³ Cfr. B. GRÉVIN, *Rhétorique du pouvoir*, pp. 708–716.

²⁴ Cfr. Fulvio DELLE DONNE, *Le dictamen capouan: écoles rhétoriques et conventions historiographiques*, in: Anne Marie Turcan Verkerk – Benoît Grévin (eds.), *Le dictamen dans tout ses états. Perspectives de recherche sur la théorie et la pratique de l'ars dictaminis (XI^e–XV^e siècles)*, Turnhout 2015, pp. 191–207.

was invented in the eleventh century.²⁵ The teaching of the highest rhetorical techniques was probably transmitted through occasional courses, or through exchanges of letters and rhetorical *certamina*, attested by a large number of manuscripts, which just for convenience we can classify as extravagant letter-collections by Petrus de Vinea (or Thomas of Capua).²⁶ These lessons and these exchanges of letters allowed the refinement of rhetorical techniques through imitation of stylistic models;²⁷ at the same time, however, a common sense of belonging to an intellectual group developed, to a professional class of notaries and *dictatores*: they made that identifiable prose style their own distinctive character, on both a literary and social level. In this socio-stylistic network Henricus de Isernia represented an important junction point, especially when he arrived in Bohemia, where he imported from southern Italy the Latin *Stilus supremus*, by using the same teaching methods and the same transmission systems in rhetorical knowledge and stylistic ideals.

So, when Charles founded his University in Prague, the letter-collection attributed to Petrus de Vinea was almost certainly well known, as were the epistles used as models for the foundation charter of 1348. We cannot think that, in the opinion of Nicholas Sortes, the evident re-use of phrases taken from other well-known letters could go unnoticed, especially for those who studied rhetoric or its masters, that is the primary recipients of the Charter. Benoît Grévin, in his important study about the huge European spread of Petrus de Vinea's style describes that kind of propagation in the age of Charles IV as 'rhetoric autumns', to characterize its last use, but maybe also its decadence, just represented by the charter of foundation, in which the reorganization of the text was not very imaginative or innovative, but demonstrates only a mechanical 'copy and paste'.

Actually, we can admit that in all the medieval era there was no great attention to originality: a writer could usually 'steal' the work of other writers, without the risk of accusations of plagiarism. But, on the other hand, Petrus de Vinea was immediately considered an *auctor* that is as a respectable writer, as an author worthy of reverence and veneration. His organized letter-collection or *summa* contains many letters certainly not attributable to him, because they date back to periods that do not coincide with the years in which he was active. For this reason, the letters contained in his collection or *summa* were decontextualized and deeply correct, to become models, that is *dictamina* attributable to an *auctor*, whose name was a guarantee of formal perfection.²⁸

In short, most likely Nicholas Sortes deliberately decided to use the letters of the collection attributed to Petrus de Vinea. In that collection, all the letters were written in the name of the Emperor Frederick II for the University of Naples, also the two which – as we have said – were issued by Conrad when he decided to move the University to Salerno. But only

²⁵ About these questions and about the connections between Cassino and Rome cfr. especially Filippo BOGNINI, *Un'ipotesi per la cronologia del Breviarium di Alberico di Montecassino*, *Filologia mediolatina* 11, 2004, pp. 265–280; ALBERICO DI MONTECASSINO, *Breviarium de dictamine*, ed. Filippo BOGNINI, Firenze 2008.

²⁶ About these manuscripts cfr. H. M. SCHALLER, *Handschriftenverzeichnis*.

²⁷ In this context Henricus de Isernia, in his work about the 'epistolare dictamen', theorizes the 'imitatio' by the teacher as a technique for refining the rhetorical art: cfr. Josef TRÍŠKA, *Prague Rhetoric and the Epistolare dictamen (1278) of Henricus de Isernia*, *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 3/3, 1985, pp. 183–200: 196.

²⁸ Cfr. Fulvio DELLE DONNE, *Auctor e auctoritas nelle raccolte epistolari del XIII secolo*, in: Edoardo D'Angelo – Jan Ziolkowski (eds.), *Auctor et Auctoritas in Latinis medii aevi litteris. Author and Authorship in Medieval Latin Literature*, Firenze 2014, pp. 291–301.

a careful historical and philological examination allows to surely attribute these letters to Conrad: for all the people who read them, in the fourteenth century, the situation seemed different and they were the letters of an Emperor.²⁹

In the middle of the 13th century in the court of the Emperor Frederick II some *dictatores*, under the leadership of Petrus de Vinea, assimilated and completely reorganized in political and propagandistic ways the rhetorical techniques of the *ars dictaminis* developed in the previous centuries. The imperial chancellery in that period became the privileged laboratory of the development of a particular rhythmic prose, whose style was recognizable for the emphatic and metaphorical obscurity. That style fully represented the imperial sovereignty, the highest form of secular power, but it was not simply linked with a short particular moment in the history of the Swabian dynasty. When the kingdom of Frederick II and of his sons Conrad and Manfred collapsed, some *dictatores* transmitted that style to the posterity, by transforming the chancellery documents in *dictamina*, and by creating collections of exemplar texts, fully representative of the imperial rhetoric and ideology. The *dictatores* who practiced that style and who went into exile, like Henricus de Isernia, Petrus de Prece or Nicolaus de Rocca,³⁰ were employed in all the most important chancelleries and they spread the rhetoric models attributed to Petrus de Vinea all around Europe, from northern Italy to France, from England to Spain, from Germany to Bohemia, by completely transforming the political language.

In conclusion, the Charter of foundation of Prague University had different levels of meaning. There was a primary level of immediate communication: Charles announced the foundation of the University; granted his protection of the students during their journey and during their stay in the town; and prescribed the same *curriculum studiorum* and the same principles of self-government found in Bologna and in Paris. There was another rhetorical level, based on the elegance of communication: they used the most beautiful and perfect stylistic models of that period. And there was a last, but not least symbolic level: rhetoric, culture and knowledge were vehicles for the assertion of a particular imperial power.

Nicholas Sortes and then Charles IV could use other models, taken from the papal tradition,³¹ but they chose the imperial ones, which were easily recognizable. The style of that model, the style of Emperor Frederick's chancellery was, or better still, had to be recognizable: it was useful not only to declare the identity of the sender, but also his majestic height and his magnificence. For this reason, the chancellery style of that period can be considered a 'symbol of power', which can be shown just like other visible and

²⁹ Cfr. F. DELLE DONNE, *Autori, redazioni, trasmissioni*, pp. 7–28; and ID., *Un'inedita epistola sulla morte di Guglielmo de Luna, maestro presso lo Studium di Napoli, e le traduzioni prodotte alla corte di Manfredi di Svevia*, *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales* 74, 2007, pp. 225–245.

³⁰ About Petrus de Prece cfr. now Fulvio DELLE DONNE, *Pietro da Prezza (Petrus de Prece, Petrus de Precio)*, in: *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* 83, Roma 2014, sub voce; for Nicolaus de Rocca cfr. the introduction to NICOLA DA ROCCA, *Epistolae*, ed. Fulvio DELLE DONNE, Firenze 2003.

³¹ Cfr. for example Erik VAN MINGROOT, 'Sapientie immarcescibilis'. *A Diplomatic and Comparative Study of the Bull of Foundation of the University of Louvain (December 9, 1425)*, Leuven 1994, who compares the charter of foundation of the University of Leuven (1425), to some 'dictamina' of Richard of Pofi, which were often used and reused for the foundation or re-foundation of some 'studia'.

tangible objects studied by Percy Ernst Schramm,³² such as sceptres and crowns.³³ And for the same reason Charles IV almost certainly reused that style as a concrete instrument of power, to represent himself as an Emperor, as the real heir and descendant of that great Emperor who, just like him, founded another state university.³⁴

FULVIO DELLE DONNE

Zakládací listiny univerzit v Praze a Neapoli: modely a jejich využití

RESUMÉ

Je dobře známo, že zakládací listina pražské univerzity, kterou Karel IV. vydal 7. dubna 1348, je vytvořena jako *cento* z různých listin obsažených ve formulářové sbírce přisuzované Petrovi z Viney (cca 1190–1249), jež byl protonotářem a logothetem císaře Fridricha II. Štaufského. Jejím zdroji byly především tři listiny. První byla vydána Fridrichem II. v roce 1224 (III 11 ve formulářové sbírce Petra z Viney) a císař ji pozval scholáry k cestě do Neapole, kde právě založil první státní univerzitu na světě. Zbylé dvě listiny byly vydány Konrádem IV., synem Fridricha II., který v letech 1252–1253 dočasně přemístil neapolskou univerzitu do Salerna (III 12 a III 10). Podrobné srovnání (viz appendix) osvětluje vztah mezi těmito dokumenty.

Mikuláš Sortes, francouzský sekretář Karla IV., který sepsal zakládací listinu pražské univerzity, přinesl pravděpodobně do Prahy plody rétorické výuky na francouzských školách, na nichž bylo zvykem časté opakované využívání modelových listin Petra z Viney. Také v Praze se však vyskytovala významná tradice čtení a opětovného používání listů připisovaných Petrovi z Viney, jehož formulářová sbírka se dostala do Prahy díky Jindřichovi z Isernie, uznávanému *dictatorovi* z jižní Itálie a vzorovému tvůrci „socio-stylistické sítě“.

Mikuláš Sortes se vědomě rozhodl použít listiny napsané jménem císaře Fridricha. Švábská císařská kancelář vyvinula totiž zvláštní rytmickou prózu, jejíž styl – „symbol síly“ – byl rozpoznatelný svou důraznou a metaforickou mlhavostí. Díky tomu měla zakládací listina pražské univerzity různé významové úrovně: zaprvé úroveň bezprostřední komunikace, a to samotným oznámením založení univerzity; dále rétorickou úroveň, postavenou na eleganci komunikace; a nakonec v neposlední řadě úroveň symbolickou zaměřenou na prosazování velikosti císařské moci.

Český překlad: Jan Odstrčilík

Fulvio Delle Donne
Università della Basilicata
(Dipartimento di Scienze umane)
fulvio.delledonne@unibas.it

³² Cfr. above all Percy Ernst SCHRAMM, *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, Stuttgart 1954–1956.

³³ Cfr. Fulvio DELLE DONNE, *Culture as a symbol of power in the kingdom of Sicily during the Swabian period*, in: Ingrid Baumgärtner – Mirko Vagnoni – Megan Welton (eds.), *Representations of power at the Mediterranean Borders of Europe (12th–15th century)*, Firenze 2014, pp. 15–28.

³⁴ In a similar way, in relation to a reuse by Charles IV of the sculpture on the gate of Capua, built by Frederick II, cfr. Johannes FRIED, *Das Mittelalter. Geschichte und Kultur*, München 2009, pp. 437–438.

APPENDIX

1

Charles IV, king of Bohemia and of the Romans, issues the charter of foundation of the University of Prague, 7 April 1348¹

Karolus, Dei gracia Romanorum rex semper augustus et Boemie rex, ad perpetuam rei memoriam.

Inter desiderabilia cordis nostri² et que cogitacioni regali iugiter occurrunt, animi precipua reddimur anxietate solliciti, specialiter convertentes aciem mentis nostre,³ *qualiter regnum nostrum* Boemie, quod pre ceteris hereditariis aut eufortune adquisicionis honoribus et possessionibus prerogativa mentis affeccione complectimur,⁴ cuius exaltacionem *omni, qua possumus, diligencia procurantes*, ipsius honori intendimus totis conatibus et saluti, **sicut rerum victualium ad dispensacionem divini nominis natura profluente tripudiat, sic ad nostre provisionis edictum prudentum virorum copia nostris artificialiter temporibus decoretur, ut fideles nostri regnicole, qui scienciarum fructus indesinenter esuriunt, per aliena mendicare suffragia non coacti paratam in regno sibi mensam propinacionis invenient, et quos ingeniorum nativa subtilitas ad consilia reddit conspicuos litterarum sciencia faciat eruditos, nec solum compellantur, aut supervacuum reputent ad investigandas gyrum terre sciencias** circuire, **naciones expetere peregrinas** aut, ut **ipsorum aviditatibus satisfiat, in alienis regionibus mendicare, sed gloriosum estiment extraneos alios ad suavitatem odoris et gratitudinis huiusmodi participium evocare.**

Sane ut tam salubris et laudabilis animi paret concepcio fructus dignos, *regni ipsius fastigia tripudialibus novitatis volentes primiciis augmentari, in nostra Pragensi metropolitica et amenissima civitate, quam terrene fertilitatis fecunditas et plenitudine rerum amenitas localis reddunt utiliter tanto negotio congruentem*, instituendum, ordinandum et de novo creandum *consulta utique deliberacione* previa duximus *studium generale*, in quo siquidem studio doctores, magistri et scolares erunt in qualibet facultate, quibus bona magnifica promittimus et eis, quos dignos viderimus, regalia donaria conferemus, omnes et singulos doctores, magistros et scolares in profectione et qualibet facultate ac, undecunque venerint, veniendo, morando et redeundo sub nostre maiestatis speciali protectione et salva gardia retinentes, *firmam singulis fiduciam oblaturi, quod privilegia, immunitates et libertates omnes, quibus tam in Parisiensi, quam Bononiensi studiis doctores et scolares auctoritate regia uti et gaudere sunt soliti, omnibus et singulis illuc accedere volentibus liberaliter impertimur et faciemus ab omnibus et singulis inviolabiliter observari.*

In quorum omnium testimonium et ad certitudinem pleniorum presentes fieri iussimus et bulla aurea typario nostre maiestatis impressa precepimus communiri.

Datum Prage anno Domini millesimo trecentesimo quadragesimo octavo, indiccione prima, VII Idus Aprilis, regnorum nostrorum anno secundo.

¹ Here is reprinted (with some small corrections in punctuation) the text edited in *Archivum coronae regni Bohemiae*, pp. 67–69, nr. 62. The parts taken from the doc. 2 are underlined; the parts taken from the doc. 3 are in italics; the parts taken from the doc. 4 are in bold; the parts taken from the doc. 5 are doubly underlined.

² For this incipit, ‘Inter desiderabilia cordis nostri’, cfr. *supra* and the notes 12, 13 and 14.

³ For this formula, ‘aciem mentis nostre’, cfr. *supra*.

⁴ For this formula, ‘mentis affeccione complectimur’, cfr. *supra*.

Frederick II, king of Sicily and emperor, issues the letter of foundation of the University of Naples and invites all the students, 5 June 1224⁵

Fridericus Dei gratia Romanorum imperator semper augustus et Sicilie rex, archiepiscopis, episcopis et aliis ecclesiarum prelatiis, marchionibus, comitibus, baronibus, iustitiariis, camerariis, comestabilis, baiulis, iudicibus et universis per regnum Sicilie constitutis fidelibus suis presentes litteras inspecturis gratiam suam et bonam voluntatem.

Deo propitio per quem vivimus et regnamus, cui omnes actus nostros offerimus, cui omne quod agimus imputamus, in regnum nostrum desideramus multos prudentes et providos fieri per scientiarum haustum et seminarium doctrinarum, qui facti discreti per studium et per observationem iuris iusti Deo serviant, cui serviunt omnia, et nobis placeant per cultum iustitie, cuius preceptis omnes precipimus obedire. Disponimus autem apud Neapolim amenissimam civitatem doceri artes et cuiuscumque professionis vigere studia ut ieiuni et famelici doctrinarum in ipso regno inveniant unde ipsorum aviditatibus satisfiat, neque compellantur, ad investigandas scientias, peregrinas nationes expetere nec in alienis regionibus mendicare. Bonum autem hoc rei nostre publice profuturum intendimus, cum subiectorum commoda speciali quadam affectionis gratia providemus, quos, sicut convenit, eruditos pulcherrima poterit spes fovere et bona plurima promptis animis expectare; cum sterilis esse non possit accessio, quam nobilitas sequitur, cui tribunalia preparantur, sequuntur lucra divitiarum, favor et gratia comparantur. Insuper studiosos viros ad servitia nostra non sine magnis meritis et laudibus convocamus, secure illis qui discreti fuerint per instantiam studii iuris et iustitie regimina committentes.

Hilares igitur et prompti satis ad professiones quas scolares desiderant animentur, quibus ad inhabitandum eum locum concedimus ubi rerum copia, ubi ample domus et spatiose satis et ubi mores civium sunt benigni; ubi etiam necessaria vite hominum per terras et maritimas facile transvehuntur, quibus per nos ipsos utilitates querimus, conditiones disponimus, magistros investigamus, bona promittimus et eis quos dignos viderimus donaria conferemus. Illos siquidem in conspectu parentum suorum ponimus, a multis laboribus liberamus, a longis itineribus et quasi peregrinationibus absolvimus. Illos tutos facimus ab insidiis predatorum et qui spoliabantur fortunis suis et rebus longa terrarum spatia peragrantes, scolas suas levioribus sumptibus et brevioribus cursibus a liberalitate nostra se gaudeant assecutos. De numero autem prelatorum, quos ibi duximus destinandos, mittimus magistrum R. de Benevento iudicem et magistrum B. de Ysernia fideles nostros civilis scientie professores, viros magne scientie, note virtutis et fidelis experientie, quam nostre semper exhibuerunt et exhibent maiestati: de quibus sicut de aliquibus regni nostri fidelibus fiduciam gerimus plenior. Mittimus quoque ... et ... in tali scientia ... et ... in tali etc.

Volumus igitur et mandamus vobis omnibus qui provincias regitis, quique administrationibus aliquibus presidetis ut hec omnia passim et publice proponatis et iniungatis sub pena personarum et rerum, ut nullus scolaris legendi causa exire audeat extra regnum nec infra regnum aliquis audeat addiscere alibi vel docere, et qui de regno sunt extra regnum in scolis, sub pena predicta eorum parentibus iniungatis ut usque ad festum sancti Michelis

⁵ The letter is transmitted by Petrus de Vineâ's letter-collection, III 11. Here is reprinted the text edited in F. DELLE DONNE, *Per scientiarum haustum*, pp. 85–91, nr. 1.

nunc proximum revertantur. Conditiones autem quas scholaribus concedimus erunt iste: in primis quod in civitate predicta doctores et magistri erunt in qualibet facultate. Scolares autem, undecumque venerint, securi veniant morando, stando et redeundo, tam in personis quam in rebus nullam sentientes in aliquo lesionem. Hospitium quod melius in civitate fuerit scholaribus locabitur pro duarum unciarum auri annua pensione, nec ultra extimatio eius ascendet. Infra predictam autem summam et usque ad illam omnia hospitia sub extimatione duorum civium et duorum scholarium locabuntur. Mutuum fiet scholaribus ab illis qui ad hoc fuerint ordinati secundum quod eis necesse fuerit, datis libris in pignore et precario restitutis, receptis a scholaribus fideiussoribus pro eisdem. Scholaris vero qui mutuum recipiet iurabit quod de terra aliquatenus non recedet donec precaria restituet: vel mutuum ab eo fuerit exsolutum, vel alias satisfactum fuerit creditori. Predicta autem precaria a creditoribus non revocabuntur, quamdiu scolares voluerint in studio permanere. Item omnes scolares in civilibus sub eisdem doctoribus et magistris debeant conveniri. Omnes igitur a modo, qui studere voluerint in aliqua facultate, vadant Neapolim ad studendum, et nullus sit ausus pro scolis extra regnum exire, vel infra regnum in aliis scolis addiscere vel docere: et qui sunt de regno extra regnum in scolis, usque ad festum sancti Michelis proximum venturum, sine more dispendio revertantur. De frumento autem, vino, carnibus piscibus et aliis, que ad victum pertinent, modum nullum statuimus, cum in hiis omnibus abundet provincia, que vendentur scholaribus secundum quod venduntur civibus et etiam per contradam.

Vos igitur ad tantum et tam laudabile opus et studium invitantes, conditiones subscriptas vobis promictimus observare et personis vestris honorem conferre per nos, et precipere generaliter ut ab omnibus conferatur.

Datum Siracusie, V Iunii, XII indictionis.

3

Conrad IV, king of Sicily, orders the reorganization of the Studium and moves it to Salerno, providing teachers and students in the old living conditions. February 1252⁶

Conradus etc. iustitiario etc.

Sollicitudo continua curas nostras exagitat, *qualiter regnum nostrum Sicilie, naturaliter rerum victualium ubertate fecundum, prudentum virorum copia nostris temporibus artificialiter decoremus, ut fideles nostri regnicole, scientiarum fructus, quos indesinenter esuriunt, per aliena querere pomeria⁷ non coacti, paratam in regno sibi mensam propositionis inveniant: et quos ingeniorum nativa fertilitas ad consilia reddit alta conspicuos, litterarum scientia faciat eruditos*. Ad quod licet progenitorum nostrorum nos clara prioritas invitet exemplis, dum eorum temporibus sic diversarum scientiarum in regno studia floruisse comperimus, ut non solum ad incolas filios sed ad externos etiam extendisse probetur *suavitatem odoris*: nos tamen super hoc tanto libenter sine cuiusquam inductione concurrimus, quanto

⁶ The letter is transmitted by Petrus de Vineia's letter-collection, III 12, as issued by Emperor Frederick II. Here is reprinted the text edited in F. DELLE DONNE, *Per scientiarum haustum*, pp. 111–114, nr. 13.

⁷ In the version usually transmitted by the redaction 'shorter in 6 books', the most common, we can read 'mendere suffragia' instead of 'querere pomeria': cfr. *L'epistolario di Pier della Vigna*, p. 494. This and the examples in the next notes can demonstrate that Nicholas Sortes surely used a copy of that redaction as model.

per hoc utiliter honori nostro consulere credimus, et exaltationem omnimodam regni nostri *omni qua possumus diligentia procuramus*.

Volentes itaque super hoc antiquorum gratam renovare temperiem, et regni nostri fastigia tripudialibus novitatis nostre primitiis augmentare, universale studium in civitate nostra Salerni, consulta nuper⁸ deliberatione, providimus reformandum: ut civitas ipsa antiqua mater et domus studii, sicut puritate fidei et situs amenitate prefulget, sic renovata quasi paranympa scientie, et singularium hospitalaria facultatum, docentibus et addiscentibus se prebeat gratiosam. Ad hoc igitur tam salubre convivium magistros quoslibet et scolares hilariter invitamus, fidelitati tue mandantes quatenus presens beneplacitum nostrum per iurisdictionem tuam solemniter studeas publicare, firmam singulis fiduciam oblaturus, quod immunitates et libertates omnes, quibus olim tempore divi Augusti tam in Neapolitano quam Salernitano studio uti et gaudere sunt soliti, faciemus universis et singulis illuc ire volentibus inviolabiliter observari.

4

Conrad IV, king of Sicily, orders to give the master Petrus de Casoli an annual salary of 12 golden ounces, to come and deliver lectures at the *Studium* moved to Salerno. June 1253⁹

Conradus Dei gratia Romanorum in regem electus, Ierusalem et Sicilie rex Petro de Casoli gratiam suam et bonam voluntatem.

Noster instanter, quem in subditorum semper emolumenta dirigimus, sollicitatur affectus, qualiter regni nostri Sicilie preclara possessio, **sicut rerum ubertate victualium ad dispositionem divini numinis natura profluente tripudiat, sic ad nostre provisionis edictum, virorum** perfectione scientium, fortuna favente, valeat fecundari. Ad quod, etsi progenitorum nostrorum nos memoranda prioritas invitet exemplis, dum diversarum scientiarum dudum in regno studia floruisse comperimus et multos artium beneficio liberalium munitis provectos ad ardua, quos nativa ruditas honoris et glorie reddidisset indignos, sic nos super his et priorum tempora reviviscere volumus ut que per intervalla quantalibet quassata videntur, iam passa, desidiam sub iuventutis nostre primordiis seniliter iuvenescent: ac dum fideles nostri regnicole paratam sibi mensam propositionis inspexerint, non **solum supervacuum** sibi **reputent** aliena proinde flagitare suffragia, **sed gloriosum existiment** **exteros alios ad gratitudinis huiusmodi participium evocare**. Cumque civitatem Salerni, antiquam profecto matrem et domum studii, tam marine vicinitatis habilitas, **quam terrene fertilitatis fecunditas reddant utiliter tanto negotio congruentem**, generale studium in civitate ipsa mandavimus reformari, ut, quam **localis amenitas rerum placiditate**¹⁰ gratificat, docentibus et addiscentibus undique collecta commoditas efficiat gratiosam.

⁸ In the version usually transmitted by the redaction 'shorter in 6 books' we can read 'utique' instead of 'nuper': *L'epistolario di Pier della Vigna*, p. 494.

⁹ The letter is transmitted by Petrus de Vineia's letter-collection, III 10, as issued by Emperor Frederick II. Here is reprinted the text edited in F. DELLE DONNE, *Per scientiarum haustum*, pp. 116–120, nr. 15.

¹⁰ In the version usually transmitted by the redaction 'shorter in 6 books' we can read 'plenitudine rerum' instead of 'rerum placiditate': *L'epistolario di Pier della Vigna*, p. 486.

Te igitur, quem antequam fidei prescripta sinceritas et prestita dudum felicitis memorie domino patri nostro grata servitia nobis efficaciter recommendant, de cuius etiam experta scientia, probitate cognita et doctrina probata in conspectu nostro iam pluries multorum testimonio claruerunt, ad celebranda communis studii eiusdem festiva solennia hilariter providimus invitandum, fidelitati tue precipiendo mandantes, quatenus de favore et gratia nostra securus ad civitatem ipsam, ob reverentiam maiestatis nostre, personaliter recturus accedas. Et ut certam concipias de gratie nostre liberalitate fiduciam, firmiter tenere te volumus quod in adventu tuo, in signum fecundioris auspicii, de valore annuo XII unciarum auri tibi faciat nostra munificentia provideri.

Datum in obsidione Neapolis.

5

Frederick II, king of Sicily and emperor, writes to the king of France, Louis IX, to inquire about his fleet: it left for the Holy Land and suffered severe damage due to a storm. 1249¹¹

Regi Francorum esistenti in partibus Ultramarinis, ut rescribat ei sui status continentiam et processus.

1. Generali qua cunctos amplectimur fidei participatione Christicolae, sed speciali qua uestram diligimus affectione personam, inter tot et tanta diuersa curarum genera, quae cogitationibus nostris indesinenter occurrunt, precipua reddimur anxietate cordis solliciti et affectamus instanter de uobis audire ueridica noua, quae placeant et scire plenarie in Terrae Sanctae subsidium uestrae peregrinationis euentum, uelut qui, teste supremo Iudice, semper ipsam amore negotii desiderauimus prosperam et affectione personae semper uotorum conformitate felicem [...].

¹¹ The letter is transmitted by Petrus de Vineia's letter-collection, III 22. Here is reprinted just the initial part of the text edited in *L'epistolario di Pier della Vigna*, pp. 518–519.

THE EFFECTS ON THE UNIVERSITY OF PRAGUE TO THE HUNGARIAN ROYAL COURT IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY*

PÉTER HARASZTI SZABÓ

ABSTRACT

The University of Prague played a central role in the education of the Hungarians in the 14th century. From the identified career paths, it has been made clear that many of them belonged to the Royal Court at least with family bonds. Why was it worthwhile for them to study at a university, in order to be part of the court? According to Peter Moraw, university studies were also persuasive enough to compete with the traditional factors of military service or family backgrounds and wealth, in order to attend the royal court. Prague was indeed a very illustrious element of the educational web of Central Europe, but apart from Moraw, there is another observation in defining the importance of university studies: the majority of Hungarian noble students in Prague came from the courtly nobility, so the exemplary role of the Hungarian Angevin Kings can be suggested here. But this function will be discussed in detail at another stage of my research.

Keywords: Hungarian students – Career paths – Hungarian Royal Court – Medieval University in Prague

In my paper I focus on the life of Hungarian students at the university of medieval Prague, and, mainly, on their relations with the royal court. Piecing the path of their careers together, we are informed about the role a university played in the 14th-century Kingdom of Hungary, about the importance of higher education, or about the extent to which the royal court was considered as a model by the nobility in the given period.

The significance of the *studium generale* in Prague – founded in 1348 by Charles IV, Holy Roman Emperor and King of Bohemia – has received quite unfair treatment in research in the field of university history in Hungary. In Hungary, little interest has been shown in that medieval university in Prague;¹ the work of György Székely stands out among those researching the subject.² Concerning Prague, research has been marked by the Hussite movement; the Hungarian students at the university have mostly been studied only in that particular context. It seems really interesting, however, that several defining figures of 14th-century Hungary studied in Prague. This present work was realized as part of a larger research programme. In the course of the programme, I aimed to collect all available data on as many Praguian students as possible. Numerous factors contribute to the reason of studying abroad. In my paper, based on the data so far collected, I intend to

* Maintained by the MTA-ELTE History of Universities Research Group (213TKI738).

¹ István BARTHA, *L'Université Charles de Prague et la Hongrie*, Revue d'Histoire Comparée 26, 1948, pp. 213–227; Sándor TONK, *Erdélyiek egyetemjárása a középkorban*, Bukarest 1979, pp. 23–25.

² György SZÉKELY, *A huszitizmus visszhangja Magyarország népeiben*, Budapest 1954; György SZÉKELY, *A huszitizmus és a magyar nép*, I–II, Századok 90/3, 1956, pp. 331–367; 90/4–6, pp. 556–590.

raise questions – concerning the period between the founding of the university and the early 15th century – and to outline methodological possibilities. Furthermore, relying on a few examples, I mean to analyse whether the royal court was able to influence families in their decision of sending one family member or another to university.

1. 14th century Hungarian students in Prague: their numbers, their place of origin and their social status

Researchers dealing with the university of Prague struggle with a serious lack of sources, as opposed to similar institutions in more fortunate areas, because – predominantly due to the destruction of World War II – the majority of university registries and other documents are lost or have been destroyed. The *matriculae* of the faculties of theology and medicine are completely missing,³ while the sources from the faculties of liberal arts and law (a separate university of law from 1372) contain only a few years of *matriculae*.⁴ Mostly, however, only data concerning achievements of degree and admissions to examinations are available, and they mention, primarily, only degrees of *baccalaureus* and *magister*, and sometimes of *doctor* or *licentiat*, at the faculty of liberal arts from 1367 and, in the case of the university of law, from 1372. These circumstances significantly constrain researchers already at the onset of their work. Nevertheless, there have been important results pertaining to the two, less known faculties. The investigations conducted by Karel Beránek⁵ need to be highlighted here, similarly to those by František Šmahel, who collected information concerning known students of the faculty of medicine up to 1409,⁶ and, in 2001, Jaroslav Kadlec wrote the history of the theological faculty.⁷

The goal of the university of Prague, founded in 1348, was to satisfy the educational needs of the Kingdom of Bohemia and, secondly, of the Empire. Also, it was the obvious intention of Charles IV for his university to function as an educational center for the Kingdoms of Poland and Hungary, and also for Austria.⁸ This is attested to, besides the high number of foreign students, by the division of student nations: Bohemian, Bavarian, Saxon and Polish

³ Michal SVATOŠ, *The Studium Generale*, in: Ivana Čornejová – Michal Svatoš – Petr Svobodný (eds.), *A History of Charles University, I (1348–1802)*, Prague 2001, p. 55.

⁴ Only a short matriculation list survived over the centuries, from the Saxon university nation of the university of laws (1373–1375, 1382–1383). The Faculty of Liberal Arts preserved the Dean's book alone (1367–1585). František ŠMAHEL, *The Faculty of Liberal Arts 1348–1419*, in: František Šmahel, *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter. Gesammelte Aufsätze / The Charles University in the Middle Ages. Selected Studies*, Leiden – Boston 2007, pp. 250–251.

⁵ Josef ADAMEC – Karel BERÁNEK – Ludmilla HLAVÁČKOVÁ – Jana NOSÁKOVÁ – Eva ROZSÍVALOVÁ (eds.), *Biografický slovník pražské lékařské fakulty 1348–1939*, I–II, Praha 1988.

⁶ František ŠMAHEL, *Magister und Studenten der Prager Medizinischen Fakultät bis zum Jahre 1409*, in: František Šmahel, *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter. Gesammelte Aufsätze / The Charles University in the Middle Ages. Selected Studies*, Leiden – Boston 2007, pp. 103–158.

⁷ Jaroslav KADLEC, *The Theological Faculty*, in: Ivana Čornejová – Michal Svatoš – Petr Svobodný (eds.), *A History of Charles University, I (1348–1802)*, Prague 2001, pp. 123–148.

⁸ Michal SVATOŠ, *Praha*, in: J. M. M. Hermans – Marc Nelissen (eds.), *Charters of Foundation and Early Documents*, Coimbra 1994, pp. 32–33; František KAVKA, *Die Gründung der Universität in Prag und ihre Bedeutung für die Entwicklung der tschechischen Kultur*, in: Zofia Kozłowska-Budkowa et alii. (eds.), *Les universités européennes du XIV. au XVIII. siècle. Aspects et problèmes (Actes du Colloque International à l'Occasion du VI. Centenaire de l'université Jagellone de Cracovie 6–8. Mai 1964)*, Genève 1967, p. 30; Josef EMLER (ed.), *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, IV, Pragae 1873–1932, p. 518.

nations. It is impossible to decide when the first students from Hungary appeared. The first, who is confirmed to have studied here, was Tamás son of Pál, a canon from Transylvania, in 1355.⁹ His name, however, appears not in university documents but in a petition, addressed to the pope. But this petition was misquoted or misread by its publisher, Henrik Denifle, and, as a consequence, was also mistakenly received by Sándor Tonk,¹⁰ for it was not in 1355 but in 1365 that Tamás son of Pál studied in Prague.¹¹ Denifle even mistook Tamás son of Pál for a certain *Thomas Ungarus*, appearing in 1371, who is identical with Tamás Ethiopis from Rohonc.¹² In 1371, Thomas Ungarus was admitted to examinations for *baccalaureus* degree at the *artes* faculty, and he received his degree in the same year, while Charles IV recommended Tamás son of Pál to the Pope as worthy of the degree of *baccalaureus* – already in 1365. That is why the starting date of the research should be set for the year 1365.

Concerning the period between 1365 and 1401, it can be stated, relying on previous research evidence, that altogether 110, unquestionably Hungarian, students attended the university of Prague, while, in the case of further 56 people, it is not possible to confirm without doubt whether they had Hungarian origins. Naturally, a student would sometimes attend multiple faculties. In the case of the students examined, there were five probable occurrences. *Nicolaus Bleyweger de Rivulo Dominarum*, *Nicolaus Ungarus*, *Petrus de Strigonia*, in his case, three students might be identical to him, *Bartholomeus Ungarus de Strigonia*, and *Johannes Wittich de Molenbach*.¹³ Out of the 110 cases of enrolment, it is in 62 cases that students successfully passed their examinations, which is 56%. This means a wide spectrum of degrees from *baccalaureatus* to *doctor*. Forty *artium baccalaureus*, five *licentiatius artium*, twelve *magister artium*, and further three *baccalaureus* of law and two *doctor* of law (probably in canon law) degrees are known, up until the year 1401. It shows an interesting Central European peculiarity that the most popular faculty, in contrast with the universities of ‘old Europe’, is not the legal faculty but the faculty of liberal arts, offering the fundamentals. The same is true for Hungary, for more than two thirds of the students studied there, while only one third chose the faculty of law. Students from Hungary were members of the Bohemian student nation, though a few appeared in other nations as well. At the same time, it is truly surprising that in the Bohemian nation, the ratio of Hungarian students was the same as that of Moravian students (15%).¹⁴ Károly Kapronczay could only report one

⁹ S. TONK, *Erdélyiek*, p. 334; R. R. BETTS, *The university of Prague: 1348*, Slavonic and East European Review 27, 1948, p. 215.

¹⁰ Henrik DENIFLE, *Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*, Berlin 1885, pp. 591, 594.

¹¹ Fredericus JENŠOVSKÝ (ed.), *Monumenta Vaticana res gestas Bohemicas illustrantia, sumptibus comitorum regni Bohemiae ediderunt et recensendos historiae Bohemicae fontes delegate*, III, Pragae 1944, p. 354; Vladimír RÁBIK (ed.), *Monumenta Vaticana Slovaciae*, II/1, Trnava – Romae 2009, p. 503.

¹² For Thomas de Rechnitz, a student at the University of Vienna, is probably identical with Thomas Ungarus, appearing in Prague in 1371. However, according to Henrik Denifle, neither of the numerous students in Vienna, under the name of Thomas de Ungaria, was Ethiopis. Henricus DENIFLE – Aemilius CHATELAIN (eds.), *Auctarium Chartularii Universitatis Parisiensis. Liber Procuratorum Nationis Anglicae (Alemanniae) in Universitate Parisiensis*, I (1333–1406), Parisiis 1894, p. 839.

¹³ The Prosopography of the Prague University of Law mistakenly attached him to the Hansa region. Projekt ‘Prosopografie Pražské právnické univerzity v letech 1372–1419’, <http://www1.cuni.cz/~borovic/matrika/projekt_en/vysledky/cesi/cesi.htm> (November 9, 2014).

¹⁴ M. SVATOS, *The Studium Generale*, p. 74.

Hungarian student at the faculty of medicine in Prague,¹⁵ while information is uncertain concerning nine Hungarian students at the faculty of theology.¹⁶

According to Peter Moraw, the faculties of *artes* and theology were sites of education for the ‘middle classes’, while wealthier nobles primarily preferred the faculty of law. This middle class occupied positions under the most important ones.¹⁷ I can neither approve nor disapprove of this claim from a Hungarian perspective, since the reconstruction of the social status of students has been realized only to a slight extent, to about one third. Preliminarily, it can be claimed that about half of the students with known background came indeed from the gentry, who then found their way into positions considered as more (or, sometimes, the most) significant. The Hungarian gentry, in this period, was a somewhat new layer of society, its formation began around the early 13th century, but only the acts of 1351 ended the process ‘officially’. Apart from outlining its formation, all that can be said is that the gentry comprised the soldierly elements of the royal castle system (castle-warriors) – dissolved by the end of the 13th century –, and also royal servitors and (still) independent landowners. Among their numerous privileges, the most significant was that they were directly under the jurisdiction of the king. They primarily acted within county borders and held offices there (vice-*ispán* – a royal officer in charge of a county, a count –, castellan, noble magistrate or juryman, but the majority of royal bailiffs came from their ranks as well),¹⁸ predominantly as noble retainers (*familiaris*) of a greater landowner. This relationship, however, was different from the one in the West, the parties could dissolve this form of feudal link any time. Their numbers were high, in Szabolcs county about 60% of landowners belonged to this stratum.¹⁹ One of the best ways for them to rise was to enter royal service, which, at that time, demanded heavy financial sacrifice, be it the gentry entering military service or other means. The source of their power was, of course, the size of their lands, and, according to the research of Pál Engel, their position was enhanced if they could trace their ancestry to one of the kindreds of the Árpadian era, since then they would already possess lands of greater size.²⁰ We do not mean a homogeneous group: the size of their estate, their lineage and the efficiency of their service would greatly influence their social standing within the

¹⁵ Károly KAPRONCZAY, *Adatok a prágai egyetem magyar orvosi vonatkozásaihoz (1348–1850)*, Orvostörténeti Közlemények 89–91, 1980, p. 223; Károly SCHRAUF, *Magyarországi tanulók a bécsi egyetemen*, Budapest 1892, p. 171; Johannes Nep. GERZABEK (ed.), *Liber Decanorum Decanorum Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Pragensis, ab anno 1367 usque ad annum 1585. E Codice membranaceo illius Aetatis nunc primum luce donatum*, Praeae 1830, p. 373. His name, however, does not appear in Šmahel’s cited paper, neither in Karel Beránek’s relevant database.

¹⁶ K. KAPRONCZAY, *Adatok*, p. 223. It is in the case of two students that theological studies can be presumed, but only one of them studied in the 14th century: Nicolaus de Czypcz (1376), who was ‘ain guet ler von der mess’, *Liber decanorum*, p. 172; Josef TRÍŠKA (ed.), *Životopisný slovník předhusitské pražské univerzity, 1348–1409* (Repertorium Biographicum Universitatis Pragensis Praehussiticae, 1348–1409) Praha 1981, p. 385. It is hard to identify the last seven students.

¹⁷ His observations mainly focus on the Holy Roman Empire. Peter MORAW, *Careers of graduates*, in: Peter Moraw (ed.), *Gesammelte Beiträge zur deutschen und europäischen Universitätsgeschichte*, Leiden – Boston 2008, pp. 411–412.

¹⁸ A királyi emberekre ld: Pál ENGEL, *Királyi emberek Valkó megyében*, in: Csukovits Enikő (ed.), *Honor, vár, ispánság – Válogatott tanulmányok*, Budapest 2003, pp. 578–600.

¹⁹ Pál ENGEL, *Szabolcs megye birtokviszonyai a 14.–16. században*, in: Csukovits Enikő (ed.), *Honor, vár, ispánság – Válogatott tanulmányok*, Budapest 2003, p. 602.

²⁰ Pál ENGEL, *Szabolcs megye*, p. 619.

otherwise (theoretically – as stated in the decree of 1351) uniform nobility.²¹ The dominant voices of county life aspired to country-wise dominance, and the university was an appropriate place to draw attention to themselves.²² In mapping their careers, several obstacles appear which hinder the understanding of the lives of the individuals.

Due to the proximity of Prague, one would expect students to come in greater numbers from the western and northwestern parts of the Kingdom of Hungary. Their places of origin – in cases where they are identifiable – indicate, however, that Hungarian students went to Prague from all regions of the country. Students arrived to the capital of Bohemia from the majority of the counties in Upper Hungary (today primarily belonging to Slovakia), but one finds students from Győr, Baranya, or even Bihar and Zaránd counties, in other words from the southern and eastern parts of Hungary. The numbers of students from Transylvania (21) and from Esztergom (11) are outstandingly high. This fact can be explained by the good domestic reputation of the university of Prague, but, naturally, the initial difficulties of the other three universities founded in this region (in Vienna, Cracow and Pécs) must also be taken into account.²³

Hungarian students in Prague did not form their own student nation, they belonged to the Bohemian one, but their number was not insignificant.²⁴ If one accepts that education at the university actually began in the mid-1350s, then Hungarian students appeared quite early.²⁵ Students in Prague arrived from almost every region of the country, which indicates the great reputation of the university. This research might produce an interesting outcome: in some cases it might manage to supplement known archontologies.²⁶ The research of the social status of students is, however, not finished yet: relying on the names provided, numerous students were of bourgeois origins, but several open questions remain.

²¹ FRANCISCUS DÖRY – GEISA ÉRSZEGI – GEORGIUS BÓNIS – JOHANNES BAK – SUSANNA TEKE – VERA BÁCSKAI (eds.), *Decreta Regni Hungariae Gesetze und Verordnungen Ungarns 1301–1490*, I–IV, Budapest 1976–2012, pp. 124–140.

²² The sociological analysis of Hungarian nobility and the exploration of the definitive moments in their lives were carried out by Erik Fügedi, while it was Elemér Mályusz who discussed the internal structure of (and changes within) the gentry. ERIK FÜGEDI, *Az Elefánthyak – A középkori magyar nemes és klánja*, Budapest 1992; ELEMÉR MÁLYUSZ, *Zsigmond király uralma Magyarországon*, Budapest 1984, p. 133–149.

²³ GYÖRGY SZÉKELY, *A pécsi és óbudai egyetemalapítások helye a közép-európai egyetemalapítási hullámokban*, in: CSIZMADIA ANDOR (ed.), *A 600 éves jogi felsőoktatás történetéből, 1367–1967. A pécsi egyetemtörténeti konferencia anyagából* (1967. október 12.), Pécs, pp. 117–129.

²⁴ In research conducted by Hana Václavů we find a great number of students of uncertain origin, but it can be certainly claimed that there were more students from Hungary in Prague between 1367/1368–1398 than those 68, assuredly of Hungarian origin, suggested by Hana Václavů in 1977. HANA VÁCLAVŮ, *Počet graduovaných a negraduovaných studentů na pražské artistické fakultě v letech 1367–1398 a jejich rozdělení podle původu do univerzitních národů*, *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis* 17/1, 1977, p. 23.

²⁵ HASTINGS RASHDALL, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, II, Oxford 1895, p. 215; M. SVATOŠ, *The Studium Generale*, p. 34.

²⁶ András, canon of Kalocsa, can be mentioned as an example, from 1376, or László Berzencei, canon of Váradi, from 1381, whose family name was previously never referred to in the sources. JOHANNES SPURNY (ed.), *Album seu Matricula Facultatis Juridicae Universitatis Pragensis ab anno Christi 1372 ad annum 1418 E Codice membranaceo illius Aetatis nunc primum luce donatum, plenoque nominum indice auctum: Codex diplomaticus Universitatis eiusdem: originem, incrementa, privilegia, iura, beneficia...cui item personarum rerumque index, atque [...] imagines exhibentes subnecuntur*, Pragae 1834, pp. 31, 35. The case of ‘Nicolaus de Swecia’, canon of Esztergom, is similarly intriguing. The toponym Swecia is suspicious in itself, and it proves difficult to reconcile with his position of canon in Esztergom. In solving the question, the work of Josef Tříška has been helpful, where students with origins indicated as de Swecia appear multiple times, primarily in the Saxon nation. In one case, with ‘Carolus de Swecia’, his church office is indicated (archdeacon of Uppsala), and also: ‘canonicus Strenginensis’. Strenginensis refers to the town of Strängnäs of modern Sweden. Strigoniensis, therefore, most probably was the result of misunderstanding or misreading. J. TŘÍŠKA, *Životopisný*, pp. 61, 26, 29; BRANISLAV VARSÍK, *Slováci na pražskej univerzite do konca stredoveku*, Bratislava 1926, p. 23.

2. The exploration of student careers

As mentioned before, serious problems arise in outlining the career paths of students. The first factor which hinders identification is the usage of names. The documents present 19 students simply with the identifier *Ungarus*, or with name forms such as *de Ungaria*, *de Pannonia*. The second hindering factor is the multiplicity of Hungarian settlements with identical names. It is from this perspective that the case of Mihály from Toplica proves difficult – in his case it is hard to decide whether he comes from Toplica (Topuszkó) in Slavonia, or from one of the identically named settlements in Trencsén, Nógrád, Szepes, Sáros, Hunyad or Temes counties.²⁷ A third factor also appears among the problems surfacing during the analysis of name use. It is uncertain whether an individual actually comes from the settlement written next to his name in the sources. Várad, Esztergom, Pécs, but even the names of counties often indicate centres of church administration rather than birthplaces. For instance, it is known about *Dionisius archidiaconus de Jauriensis* (registered in 1376)²⁸ that he is identical with Dénes Hédervári,²⁹ and, as his birthplace, the diocese (and the archdeaconate within) is given, not one of his family's estates. In his case his church office is known, but perhaps not every student gave his benefice so accurately. Thus, one may understand why the identification of citizens of towns proves difficult as well. As a further problem, even students who successfully passed their examinations would fail to indicate their degrees after returning home.

Fortunately, there are numerous factors which help identify the individuals. The most obvious assistance, unquestionably, is indicating the church office. Several cases are known where due to the name use, there was little chance for identification, but providing secular or ecclesiastical offices in university documents helped identify the individual in question. *Emericus prepositus de Ungaria*, from 1367, is a great example.³⁰ Since Imre Cudar was appointed provost of Kalocsa that year,³¹ and no other provost called Imre has been found in the given period, it might be he, I presume, who is mentioned in the documents in Prague.

Further assistance is provided in identifying the social status of an individual by the titles used in connection with him in university documents, for instance, see *nobilis*, *servus domini*, *baro*, *hospes*. Separating individuals of bourgeois and noble origins is possible only in fortunate cases. With Prague, however, this help is rare, for with seven individuals the term *dominus* appears,³² while with only one does the term *baro*; in the majority of cases with the title *dominus*, ecclesiastical offices are known of. The only baron, Fridericus de Scharfynek from 1378,³³ is supposedly identical with Frigyes Scharfenecki claiming to be

²⁷ Iván BORSA – Norbert C. TÓTH – Bálint LAKATOS – Elemér MÁLYUSZ (eds.), *Zsigmondkori Oklevéltár*, I–XII, Budapest 1951–2014, II, Nr. 1488, 922; Dezső CSÁNKI – Nagy Antal FEKETE – Ferenc ÖRDÖG, *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában*, I–V, Budapest, 1890–2002, I, pp. 268, 312, II, p. 67, IV, p. 196, V, p. 142.

²⁸ *Album seu Matricula*, p. 31.

²⁹ Béla RADVÁNSZKY – Levente ZÁVODSZKY (eds.), *Hédervár család Oklevéltára*, I–II, Budapest 1909, I, pp. 1, 64–65, 97.

³⁰ *Liber Decanorum*, p. 134.

³¹ József ÜDVARDY, *A kalocsai főszékeskáptalan története a középkorban*, Budapest 1992, pp. 47–48.

³² *Liber Decanorum*, p. 207; *Album seu Matricula*, pp. 31, 56, 38, 12.

³³ *Album seu Matricula*, p. 65.

from Sárfenék, since Louis I (the Great) gifted Scharfeneck to the family two years earlier, thus identification becomes possible.³⁴

It also might help to know if an individual attended a different university as well, or another faculty at the same one, in cases where different names are used. However, no such case has been found in Prague. If I referred to the use of degrees as a hindering factor, now I must mention it as a helpful one as well, since retracing degree use might identify the individual. According to the documents of the faculty of liberal arts in Prague, *Georgius de Foro Caseorum* was admitted to examinations of *baccalaureus* degree in 1393,³⁵ which he passed *sub mag. Jo. de Mutha*. In domestic and in secondary sources, György Késmárki, canon of Szepes – later vice secret chancellor and provost of Szepes –, is often mentioned. When in 1400, Hermann Lomnici (a Praguian student himself) resigned from his position of canon of Szepes and continued his studies in Padova,³⁶ Boniface IX gave Lomnici's benefice in the chapter to Késmárki.³⁷ György Késmárki is mentioned in the document of the 9th of November, 1400 as *baccalaureus artium*. The place of issue and the degree positively suggest that the two individuals are identical, considering that so far the place where Késmárki obtained his degree has been unknown.³⁸

Name usage, as opposed to what has been discussed, serves neither only to hinder – if sobriquets and cognomens are explored. In Prague, *Johannes Malacz* (whose surname means pig) is an example to mention.³⁹ Since the 'de' preposition is missing from his name, I found, after some research – presuming that it is not a toponym but a proper name –, the family Arany and (on Pál Engel's genealogical table) János (Johannes) himself.⁴⁰

Thus, these are the factors that affect this research. Considering this all, in general, it can be stated that in the case of one fourth of the students of undoubted Hungarian origins, we possess solid biological data, or assumed possibilities for identification. Upcoming research will, hopefully, improve this ratio.

3. The role of the royal court in peregrination abroad

Hungarian nobility, in the Anjou period, meant aulic nobility, and this explains the high number of connections between the court and university students of noble rank. Belonging to the court meant a significant raise in status, thus it is by no means surprising that many

³⁴ Frigyes himself lived in the royal court as 'strenuus miles', at least he is thus mentioned in 1404. Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltár Diplomatikai Fényképtár (MNL OL DF) 200390.

³⁵ *Liber Decanorum*, p. 288.

³⁶ Arnold IPOLYI – László FEJÉRPATÁKY – Vilmos FRAKNÓI – Antal PÓR – Tivadar ORTVAY (eds.), *Monumenta Vaticana Historiam Regni Hungariae Illustrantia*, Series I/1–6, Series II/1–3, Budapestini 1887–1909, I/4, *Bullae Bonifacii P. M. 1396–1404*, Budapestini 1889, p. 249. Márta Török does not reject the idea of him belonging to the family Berzevici and, thus, of his noble lineage. Márta TÖRÖK, *Az egyházi közélet mobilitása a szepesi káptalanban*, PhD dissertation, 2011, p. 175.

³⁷ *Ibidem*.

³⁸ Bónis mentions no university studies. György BÓNIS, *A jogtudó értelmiség a Mohács előtti Magyarországon*, Budapest 1971, pp. 101, 114–120; M. TÖRÖK, *Az egyházi közélet*, p. 172; Norbert C. TÓTH, *A székes- és társaskáptalanok prépostjainak archontológiája 1387–1437*, Budapest 2013, p. 83.

³⁹ *Liber Decanorum*, p. 187, 203, 205.

⁴⁰ Pál ENGEL, *Magyar középkori Adattár – Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301–1457, Középkori magyar genealógia* (CD-ROM), Arany (Bencenci, Piskinci család).

attempted to enter the direct proximity of the king. The royal court of Hungary played a crucial role in controlling and shaping political life, social order and culture as well. According to Pál Engel, only one court existed, which accompanied the king on his journeys, the *aula*. Its members comprised possessors of the most significant *honor* estates (landed properties given with offices) – that is, statewide offices –, who received (alongside with those *honors*) further offices (including those of *ispán* and castellan) and lands from the king – but only for as long as the king desired.⁴¹ However, this concept of the court focuses only on the immediate surroundings of the king; while there was another – from the perspective of aulic jurisdiction –, the *curia*, where central courts of law and their personnel were situated.⁴² Members of the court included the king's knights, his noble retainers, and even his pages. Ecclesiastic personnel, in charge of satisfying the spiritual needs of the royal family, gathered in the royal chapel.⁴³ The court, however, consisted of further clerical people, besides the clergy of the royal chapel, including the prelates who composed the royal council, together with the most significant office-holders. The composition of the royal council, however, was not made permanent in that period yet. Thus, the Hungarian court consisted of the royal council (comprising the holders of *honors* and offices, as well as the prelates); the pages, knights and noble retainers of the court (*aula*); and the clergy of the chapel. Due to their significance, the roles of the judicial bodies in the *curia* (including employees of the chancellery and of the offices of chief judges) need to be mentioned here, counting them as part of the royal court.⁴⁴ Professionals in the economy (connected to the king through private law), not only lessees of royal chambers or of incomes in toll or salt, but royal physicians and educators of royal princes are to be included here as well. Becoming a member kindled the possibility of a bright future, for which many would go as far as putting everything they owned in pawn, so that they could, for example, draw attention to themselves in armed service.⁴⁵ Others, however, would try to do the same through education.

Based on preliminary investigations, more Praguian students from the Hungarian nobility had connections to the court than students of noble origins in Vienna, for example; but their numbers were less than those studying in Italy.⁴⁶ All this suggests that, in this period, certain factors made the capital of Bohemia a more favoured destination than Vienna. Asking questions and exploring the issue are not to be neglected, nor are they without antecedent. According to Hans Jürgen Brandt, the framework for research in university history is formulated by the personal interlocking of academic society and the courts, as well as that of the bourgeoisie and the ecclesiastical sphere.⁴⁷ Peter Moraw claims that royal councilors in the Holy Roman Empire are to be considered as a network of relations, rather than

⁴¹ Pál ENGEL, *Nagy Lajos bárói*, Történelmi szemle 28/3, 1985, p. 406.

⁴² András KUBINYI, *A Mátyás-kori államszervezet*, in: Gyula Rázsó – László V. Molnár (eds.), *Hunyadi Mátyás – Emlékkönyv Mátyás király halálának 500. évfordulójára*, 1990, pp. 62–69; Ágnes KURCZ, *Lovagi kultúra Magyarországon a 13–14. században*, Budapest 1988, pp. 34–37.

⁴³ Lajos Bernát KUMOROVITZ, *A budai várkapolna és a Szent Zsigmond-prépostság történetéhez*, Tanulmányok Budapest múltjából XV, 1963, pp. 114–115.

⁴⁴ Iván BERTÉNYI, *Az országbírói intézmény története a XIV. században*, Budapest 1976, pp. 41–50.

⁴⁵ Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltár Diplomatikai Levéltár (MNL OL DL) 40990.

⁴⁶ The number of those who went on to study in Vienna after Prague might increase the number in Vienna. For Praguian students of noble origins, who also were related to the court, Prague was the first university platform.

⁴⁷ Hans Jürgen BRANDT, *Universität, Gesellschaft, Politik und Pfründen am Beispiel Konrad von Soltau*, in: Jacques Paquet – Jozef Ijswijn (eds.), *Les universités à la fin du moyen âge*, Louvain 1978, p. 614.

individually.⁴⁸ Parts of a network of relations which involved family and the native soil, as well as those they met during their careers or their studies.⁴⁹ As mentioned before, based on the careers so far analysed, it is probable that the proportion of nobles was relatively high at the university. It is a novelty, considering the previously rather aristocratic university studies in Central Europe (or at least Hungary), that most of them came from the gentry.⁵⁰ This aspect is attributed not only to the standards of the university of Prague but also to its proximity, since it was relatively cheap to reach. Since until the mid-14th-century, the nearest universities to Hungary were found in Italy and in the Kingdom of France, all the expenses, pains and dangers of travel, as well as the costs of the studies and examinations, rendered it accessible only for the richest youths to study.⁵¹ That is why the foundation of the universities of Prague, Vienna or Cracow was of outstanding significance. One might also say that Central European universities proved profitable for the monarchs as well, since from then on they could pick and choose from a great number of educated, ecclesiastical or secular, individuals.⁵²

Due to the costs of studying at university, the patronal role of monarchs often appears in primary and secondary sources, and it was the same at the beginning of Hungarian peregrination.⁵³ A similar practice can be observed during the reign of Louis the Great: for example, in 1345, for the sake of István Szigeti (later to become bishop of Nyitra, then

⁴⁸ Peter MORAW, *Conseils princiers en Allemagne au 14ème et au 15ème siècle*, in: Peter Moraw (ed.), *Gesammelte Beiträge zur Deutschen und Europäischen Universitätsgeschichte: Strukturen, Personen und Entwicklungen*, Leiden 2008, p. 548.

⁴⁹ The well-known relations between János Budai and Tamás Pöstyéni are accommodated into this network of relations, and also the relations between and the elevation of the aforementioned secret chancellors and vice secret chancellors. The example of László Csapi, a student in Prague in 1409, is a questionable one in that his 'dominus', Mátyus Pálóci sent his son, Péter, to university; as it is possible that Csapi, previously related to the Perényi family, saw Imre Perényi as a model for his studies in Prague. Csapi later became counsellor and attendant to Sigismund. *Liber Decanorum*, p. 406, 408. Cf.: 1430. október 13. *Regesta Imperii*: <http://www.regesta-imperii.de/id/1430-10-13_3_0_11_2_0_1941_7851>, 1431. július 30; <http://www.regesta-imperii.de/id/1431-07-30_3_0_11_2_0_2911_8769>, 1422. január 13; <http://www.regesta-imperii.de/id/1422-01-13_1_0_11_1_0_5275_4707> (November 9, 2014). Péter E. KOVÁCS, *Emperor Sigismund's coronation in Rome*, in: Péter E. Kovács – Kornél Szóvák (eds.), *Infima Aetas Pannonica. Studies in Late Medieval Hungarian History*, Budapest 2009, pp. 140, 142.

⁵⁰ Also, many have called attention to the fact the peregrination of the bourgeoisie was more significant than previously believed. Cf: Rainer Christoph SCHWINGES, *On recruitment in German Universities from the Fourteenth to Sixteenth Centuries*, in: Rainer Christoph Schwinges (ed.), *Studenten und Gelehrte: Studien zur Sozial und Kulturgeschichte deutscher Universitäten im Mittelalter*, Leiden 2008, p. 40; András KUBINYI, *A középkori magyarországi városhálózat hierarchikus térbeli rendje kérdéséhez, Településtudományi Közlemények*, 23, 1971, pp. 58–78.

⁵¹ The expenses of students ('baccalaureus' and 'magister') at the university of Vienna has been published by Sándor Tonk. S. TONK, *Erdélyiek egyetemjárása*, p. 115. According to Tonk, the university of Vienna was one of the cheapest in the region, compared to Leipzig or Prague. Šmahel claims that poor students paid 6–10, average ones 14, while the wealthy paid 24 or more groats during registration at the university of laws. František ŠMAHEL, *Pražské universitní studentstvo v předrevolučním období 1399–1419. Statistickosociologická studie*, Praha 1967, pp. 39–40. The statutes indeed state the registration fee as 6 groats, but without the 'matricula' of the three faculty university, no precise data is accessible. In contrast, the registries of the Saxon nation at the university of laws, which are left only from a few years, shows that most students paid 1–2 groats. M. SVATOŠ, *The studium generale*, p. 55; *Liber decanorum*, I, pp. 46–51.

⁵² Elemér MÁLYUSZ, *Zsigmond király központositó törekvései Magyarországon, Történelmi Szemle* 3/2–3, 1960, p. 176.

⁵³ We know, for example, of the case of Elvinus – brother of Boleszló, bishop in Vác –, sent to Paris by Béla III to pursue musical studies. György SZÉKELY, *Magyar tanárok és hallgatók az európai egyetemeken az Árpád korban*, *Levéltári Szemle* 45, 1993, p. 5.

archbishop of Kalocsa), the King and the Queen Mother appealed to Pope Clement VI.⁵⁴ Later, the King and Queen Mother Elisabeth made an appeal for the *baccalaureus* degree of *Nicolaus Nicholai*, student in Paris.⁵⁵ Then, István Szigeti himself appealed similarly to the pope in the case of another Parisian student, Péter Verebélyi, so that he could obtain the degree of *magister*.⁵⁶ Thus, this patronal role of monarchs (and taking on this role, in the case of Szigeti) is known of; however, in the case of Prague, I have not found such an unambiguous relation between the monarch and the students. Yet, several factors are to be considered.

Out of the individuals with identified noble origins, a markedly high number were linked to the court, predominantly through familial relations. Every brother of Imre Cudar – who, as royal chaplain, had access to the court – served there.⁵⁷ Ágnes Kurcz and György Bónis claim that the eldest brother, Péter, could arrange his brother's entry into the court – and also their education –, who, importantly, had started out as a page in the court in 1343 and was still doing the same service in 1352.⁵⁸

The father of Dénes Hédervári – Miklós Hédervári III, the Queen's master of the doorkeepers – was a knight of the court (*aule regie miles*) in 1348,⁵⁹ and Pál son of György – the father of Miklós of the Šubić family (*nepos comitis de Breberio*, studying in Prague in 1377),⁶⁰ – also became royal page in 1380, and then knight of the court in 1393.⁶¹ *Johannes Malacz* (mentioned before) appears in the documents of the faculty of liberal arts in 1379, whose father, Miklós Aranyi Malac is referred to as royal page in 1351.⁶² Miklós, the father of Lőrinc Mezölaki Zámbo (provost of Pozsony),⁶³ appears in 1361–64 as a youth in the Queen's household, just as his uncle, István.⁶⁴ János, the father of Frigyes Scharfeneck, was a knight of the *aula* in 1376.⁶⁵

Yet, probably the most well-known of them are Imre Perényi and Stibor Beckói, also known as Stibor the Younger. Perényi appears in Prague in 1384, when he is admitted to *baccalaureus* examinations, but he never obtains his degree.⁶⁶ Similarly to Scharfenecki, he was already a member of the royal *aula*. Apart from his father, Péter, being a knight of the court between 1359 and 1387,⁶⁷ Imre Perényi appears among the royal pages in 1388, after

⁵⁴ Asztrik GÁBRIEL, *Magyar diákok és tanárok a középkori Párizsban*, Archivum Philologicum (Egyetemes Philológiai Közlöny) 4–9, 1938, p. 9–10.

⁵⁵ *Ib.*

⁵⁶ A. GÁBRIEL, *Magyar diákok és tanárok*, p. 10.

⁵⁷ Simon, Miklós and György served as a page in 1352, while Mihály in 1357 and István in 1360 did so. Á. KURCZ, *Lovagi kultúra*, p. 302.

⁵⁸ Á. KURCZ, *Lovagi kultúra*, p. 301.

⁵⁹ Á. KURCZ, *Lovagi kultúra*, p. 292.

⁶⁰ *Album seu Matricula*, p. 32. As it currently stands, either he or Miklós Malac was the first secular nobleman to study at the university and maintain a secular career in the history of Hungarian peregrination.

⁶¹ Á. KURCZ, *Lovagi kultúra*, p. 289, 303. According to the Prosopography Research Group at the university of laws in Prague, the nephew of Brebiri comes was of French origin, which is a mistake. Projekt 'Prosopografie pražské právnické univerzity v letech 1372–1419' <http://www1.cuni.cz/~borovic/matrika/projekt_en/vysledky/cesi/cesi.htm> (September 16, 2014).

⁶² Á. KURCZ, *Lovagi kultúra*, p. 302.

⁶³ *Album seu Matricula*, pp. 37–38.

⁶⁴ Á. KURCZ, *Lovagi kultúra*, p. 303; P. ENGEL, *Magyarország világi*, II, p. 262.

⁶⁵ P. ENGEL, *Magyarország világi*, I, p. 486.

⁶⁶ *Liber decanorum*, p. 222. Josef Trška, however, writes about him obtaining the degree. J. TRŠKA, *Životopisný slovník*, p. 98.

⁶⁷ P. ENGEL, *Magyarország világi*, II, p. 190.

returning home.⁶⁸ Stibor the Younger, the son of the voivode of Transylvania, was admitted to examinations in 1400 in Prague and received his *baccalaureus* degree in 1401.⁶⁹ His father, Stibor Stiborci, was knight of the court in 1388⁷⁰ and the most loyal man of King Sigismund. Others, however – according to our data – became related to the court only a long time after finishing their studies. This category includes Miklós Alcsebi, Benedek Makrai and, supposedly, István Upori, as well as – among others of foreign origin – János Uski (Ústí nad Labem) from Bohemia.

Benedek Makrai received his *baccalaureatus* at the *artes* faculty in 1384⁷¹ and became *magister* in 1387.⁷² But his desire to learn led him to Vienna,⁷³ Paris⁷⁴ and Padova,⁷⁵ which greatly influenced his later life.⁷⁶ After his participation in the uprising of 1403 and his release, he became advisor to Sigismund, then, in 1420 the lay governor of the bishopric of Eger, and even comes Palatinus Lateranus.⁷⁷

In 1402, Miklós Alcsebi, son of Jakab, – who had received a *baccalaureus* degree in Prague in 1385 – became lord lieutenant of the royal chapel to King Sigismund.⁷⁸ *Artium magister* already in 1418,⁷⁹ it is unknown exactly where he received his degree, although Vienna cannot be ruled out, where Alcsebi studied as well.⁸⁰

It cannot be claimed without question that István Upori was also a student of Prague, but there are signs that indicate this. A charter of Pope Boniface IX from 1392 refers to Upori

⁶⁸ Á. KURCZ, *Lovagi kultúra*, p. 304.

⁶⁹ *Liber decanorum*, pp. 358, 365.

⁷⁰ Á. KURCZ, *Lovagi kultúra*, p. 296.

⁷¹ *Liber Decanorum*, p. 225.

⁷² *Liber Decanorum*, p. 250.

⁷³ By the name of Benedictus de Macra de Ungaria, in 1385. Paul UIBLEIN (ed.), *Acta Facultatis Artium Universitatis Vindobonensis 1385–1416. Quellen zur Geschichte der Universität Wien*, 2. Abteilung, Graz – Wien – Köln 1968, pp. 5, 20–21, 23, 37, 41, 48, 54, 62, 63–67.

⁷⁴ Benedictus de Makra de Hongaria néven 1395-ben. *Auctarium Chartularii*, I, p. 989.

⁷⁵ Endre VERESS, *Matricula et acta Hungarorum in Universitate Patavina studentium (1264–1864)*, Budapest 1905, pp. 5–6.

⁷⁶ Renáta SKORKA (ed.), *Eberhard Windecke emlékiratai Zsigmond királyról és koráról*, Budapest 2008, p. 30; József GELCICH – Lajos THALLÓCZY (eds.), *Raguza és Magyarország összeköttetéseinek oklevéltára*, Budapest 1887, p. 846. He was held captive up until 1408, and the circumstances of his release go back to his university studies. Tamás Ethiopis, mentioned above, studied in Prague in 1371 under the name of Thomas Ungarus, then became a fellow student to Makrai in Paris. Ethiopis was born in the diocese of Győr and became ‘procurator’ of the English nation at the university of Paris in 1408. *Auctarium Chartularii*, I, p. 839; *Auctarium Chartularii*, I, p. XXXV; *Zsigmondkori*, II, Nr. 6376; *Auctarium Chartularii*, I, p. 928. Recorded as amicus Benedicti de Makra on the 8th of June, 1406. *Auctarium Chartularii*, II, p. 839.

⁷⁷ P. ENGEL, *Magyarország világi*, II, p. 153; *Zsigmondkori*, VII, Nr. 1835.

⁷⁸ *Liber Decanorum*, pp. 232–233.

⁷⁹ József LUKSICS (ed.), *XV. századi pápák oklevelei*, I–II, Budapest 1931–1938, I, p. 57.

⁸⁰ Willy SZAIVERT – Franz GALL – Kurt MÜHLBERGER (eds.), *Die Matrikel der Universität Wien*, I–VIII, Wien – Köln – Graz – Weimar 1956–2014, I, p. 18. Alcsebi, on the 2nd of February, 1412, – in his letter as governor (‘gubernator’) of Budafelrhévíz – expresses his gratitude to his sister, Katalin, and his brother-in-law, István, for educating him. “Ab infantia sua educantes in diversis locis et partibus, quibus litterarum viget scientia, causa studii in eorum sumptibus et expensis fovissent et conservassent.” *Zsigmondkori*, III, Nr. 1677. His brother-in-law came from the family Gatályi, cf. P. ENGEL, *Genealógia (CD-ROM)*, Gatályi család; Antal ÁLDÁSY, *Magyar czímeres emlékek*, III. füzet, Budapest 1926, pp. 27–28. His familial relations to the Gatályi family of Zemplén county explains László Gatályi’s studies in Cracow and his admission to the royal court. On the 17th of September, 1421, he appears as a royal bailiff in the charter of Judge Royal Péter Perényi. *Zsigmondkori*, VIII, Nr. 983.

as *magister in artibus* and a student of canon law.⁸¹ Considering the timeframe⁸² and the name of the students, three individuals can be taken into account. Two of them studied in Vienna (*Stephanus de Ungaria* in 1377,⁸³ and a student under the same name in 1383),⁸⁴ while the third one, *Stephanus Ungarus* studied in Prague, in 1379.⁸⁵ In the case of the first two, the well-preserved documents from the university of Vienna do not report any degrees received, but *Stephanus Ungarus* in Prague was admitted to *baccalaureus* examinations, and he is already *artium magister* under Master Albert Engelschalk in 1382.⁸⁶ His usage of the rank, amongst other students of the name *de Ungaria*, thus suggests that Upori also received his degree in Prague. This, however, does not rule it out that unearthing new information might question the identification of Upori with *Stephanus Ungarus* in the future.⁸⁷

It goes without saying that this is not a peculiarity of Prague; the same tendency is observed in Vienna and Italy. What makes Prague special is the great number of noble students with courtly relations in the 14th century, when compared to Vienna⁸⁸ or even to Italy.⁸⁹

From the individuals listed above, the families Cudar, Hédervári and Šubić (lords of Bribir) belonged to the wealthiest of nobles, while the others contributed to the emerging, or already well-to-do gentry. For them, the universities of Central Europe (first and foremost, the one in the centre of emperors, in economically strong Prague) meant a type of easy-to-reach universities. Prague, in particular, was not as demanding financially as Italy but was considered as more prestigious than Vienna. Scanning through the list of students, we find that – compared to Paris or Italy, but even to the others nations of the university of Prague – the ratio of bourgeois names to (presumably) noble ones is exceedingly high. Who, thus, could not afford Italy, but financial issues did not force him to go to Vienna, would look at

⁸¹ *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I/3, pp. 207–208.

⁸² Sándor Tonk supposes 1,5–2 years of study for both the BA and the MA levels but admits that they may have lasted even longer, and he assumes the average age for registration, based on István Hajnal and others, to be between 13 and 16. Thus we can calculate with 6–8 years, if we take graduation around 20–21 years of age to be the average. Tonk, however, calls attention to the fact that students from Transylvania would go to university as adults. In the case of Hungary, in a more restrictive sense (that is, without Transylvania), further research is necessary to reach a conclusion. S. TONK, *Erdélyiek egyetemjárása*, pp. 97–98.

⁸³ *Die Matrikel der Universität*, I, p. 6.

⁸⁴ *Die Matrikel der Universität*, I, p. 13.

⁸⁵ *Liber Decanorum*, p. 190.

⁸⁶ *Liber Decanorum*, pp. 203–204.

⁸⁷ His family was also affected by his studies. One of his sisters, Ilona, married into the Semsei family, she became the wife of János Semsei, a wealthy landowner in Abaúj county. They had several children, including János, later to become archdeacon in Pankota. Of him it is known that he studied in Vienna in 1413, under the name of Johannes de Zemsche archidiaconus de Pankotha in ecclesia Agriensi. His family belonged to the upper layer of the wealthy county gentry, who bore more than one county offices, adding to their merits with military service as well. Among his relatives, it is his highly influential uncle, Bishop Upori, who can be assumed to be his patron. István KÁDAS, *Középkori család- és birtoktörténet. A Semseiek*, in Fons 20, 2013, p. 440; P. ENGEL, *Magyarország világi*, II, p. 212; I. KÁDAS, *Középkori*, pp. 445–448.

⁸⁸ According to Anna Tüskés, only 7% of the whole student body were of noble rank, which is not a high number, considering the more than 7200 students she gave account of. Even after László Szögi with the University History Research Group (founded since then) canvassed Tüskés's data and found only 6600 students between 1365 and 1526. In Prague, however (considering only the period explored in my research), this proportion was 10%. Anna TÜSKÉS, *Magyarországi diákok a bécsi egyetemen 1365–1526*, Budapest 2008, p. 10.

⁸⁹ This applies, however, only to individuals related to the court, not to those who served there (for instance, at the chancellery). This research, at a further stage, might be modulated by comparing the courts of Hungary, Austria and Bohemia, and also by contrasting it with the studies of Polish students in Prague.

Prague as the obvious choice in the region. The university of Cracow was virtually inoperative until the dawn of the 15th century, and the university of Vienna had to be founded again by Albert III in 1383, which, moreover, was permitted to set up a theological faculty only in 1384.⁹⁰ Compared to them, education was carried on undisturbed in Prague, despite such internal conflicts as the separation of the faculty of laws,⁹¹ and the debates concerning Charles College, which eventually led to the first departure of German students to the recently founded universities of Heidelberg and Cologne.⁹²

Undisturbed education, renowned teachers, good accessibility and its central role in the Empire made Prague a popular university in 14th-century Central Europe. From a Hungarian perspective, this was primarily apparent in the case of lower level (liberal arts) education. Many were satisfied with a *baccalaureus* or *magister* degree in liberal arts, and few would proceed further. Only in thirty cases altogether can it be supposed that a student attended another university as well, which is slightly less than one quarter of cases.⁹³ This suggests, first, that universities in Italy still proved too expensive, and secondly, that it was primarily at the initial stage of studies that Prague was considered as popular. Prague would produce only a minimal number of trained jurists, popular in the West, and even fewer would later get into the royal court.⁹⁴ Elemér Mályusz pointed out that even ecclesiastic personnel would hardly need an especially high level of education in Hungary. Even Pope Boniface IX, in one of his charters from 1389, prescribed only that canons should learn singing, reading, and also Latin language and composition.⁹⁵ What follows is to conclude that the university of Prague was one of, but not the most important of educational institutions for the Hungarian intelligentsia.

The royal court, however, not only meant financial support but a cultural model as well. That Hungarian peregrination was predominantly ecclesiastic is considered evident. Gaining secular positions in Hungary (and, in several known cases, even ecclesiastical ones) would require no university qualification, for it was defined by the proper lineage, familial connections and relations with the court. Still, why would it benefit Imre Perényi (coming from an actual military family) or János Malac and Stibor the Younger – or even Benedek Makrai, all of them secular individuals, to go to university?

The answer is manifold and sometimes varies per person. For an individual from the lower strata of the nobility, it was drawing the attention of the monarch to themselves and gaining better positions that led them to university. This can be assumed in the case of Benedek Makrai.⁹⁶ He came from the Gacsalkéri family of the kindred of Szentemágócs, his

⁹⁰ H. RASHDALL, *The Universities*, II, pp. 237–238.

⁹¹ Jiří KEJŘ, *The Prague Law Faculty and the Law University*, in: Ivana Čornejová – Michal Svatoš – Petr Svobodný (eds.), *A History of Charles University*, Prague 2001, pp. 152–154.

⁹² M. SVATOŠ, *The Studium generale*, pp. 78–79.

⁹³ The majority of them would choose the university of Vienna as a second stage, while others would move between the universities of Cracow, Bologna, Padova and Paris. Only four students attended more than one further universities (György Kassai, Benedek Makrai, Leó parish priest in Nagycsűr, and Lőrinc Zámbo). Benedek Makrai stood out amongst them, who attended three more universities after Prague.

⁹⁴ The suggestion of György Bónis, concerning the legal qualifications of Polish individuals, is worth considering. He claims that politicians played a more important role than jurists did in the development of Poland. György BÓNIS, *A jogtudó értelmiség a középkori Nyugat – és Közép-Európában*, Budapest 1972, p. 139.

⁹⁵ Elemér MÁLYUSZ, *A konstanzi zsinat és a magyar főkegyúri jog*, Budapest 1958, pp. 109–110; *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I/3, p. 3.

⁹⁶ G. BÓNIS, *A jogtudó*, p. 116; E. MÁLYUSZ, *A konstanzi*, pp. 108–109.

father's name was Balázs. One of his siblings, István was the *vice-ispán* of Baranya county, while his other brother, Sebestyén, was *ispán* of the salt monopoly in 1397 and is mentioned as such in 1403 as well,⁹⁷ – also, according to his title, as *litteratus*⁹⁸ – which indicates a certain relation with the court. This atmosphere may have benefited Benedek's education. In his case, we can mainly count personal ambitions and family influence which – although through deviations – brought him success.

With Imre Perényi, locating this reason proves more difficult. It is intriguing that, even though the Perényis rose from the service of the Drugeth family⁹⁹ and predominantly held the offices of castellan and *ispán* (maybe certain offices in the court as well),¹⁰⁰ the military family of the day sends one of its sons to university, who does not even plan to pursue an ecclesiastical career. It cannot be ruled out, however, that that is what he was intended for. He had two brothers, Miklós and János, who fell at Nikopol, in the service of Sigismund. Miklós was known to be a loyal devotee of Sigismund, and it was he who got his brothers into the court.¹⁰¹ His father, Péter, who died around 1388, presumably intended to ensure the career of his son, Imre, through university education.¹⁰²

The Aranyi family was part of the wealthy nobility of Hunyad county. One of the first significant members of the family, István, was a noble magistrate in Hunyad in 1333.¹⁰³ His son, Miklós, entered the court and became an 'aulic youth' (*aulae iuvenis*) in 1351. His son was János, whose name is mentioned in the documents of the university of Prague. He had the name 'Malac' (pig) recorded as his own, probably after the cognomen of his father, in the documents of the *artes* faculty in Prague. In his case it is beyond doubt that it was the dream of the gentry to rise higher which motivated his studies. The extent to which this later affected his family depends on how connected János Malac was to István Aranyi, Director of Royal Affairs (*Causarum Regalium Director*) who later reached a high standing, and his family. All that is certain is that János himself became *ispán* of Hunyad by the end of the 14th century.¹⁰⁴

Besides the desire to draw attention to themselves, besides the desire for better offices and richer benefices, a further factor can be suggested, which may correspond with the relationship between university studies and the royal court, as so far discussed: the influence of the mentality of the royal court. The royal court served as a pool for the most qualified scholars of the country, for Louis the Great liked surrounding himself with qualified individuals. For example, János Bredenscheid (known abroad simply as 'the legist of the Hungarian king'),¹⁰⁵ Pál Jägerndorf from Silesia,¹⁰⁶ or Péter Verebélyi (mentioned above),

⁹⁷ *Zsigmondkori*, II, Nr. 2378–2380.

⁹⁸ P. ENGEL, *Genealógia*, Szentemágócs nem 6. tábla Gacsalkéri család.

⁹⁹ Erik FÜGEDI, *Ispánok, bárók, kiskirályok*, Budapest 1986, p. 314.

¹⁰⁰ P. ENGEL, *Magyarország világi*, II, pp. 189–190.

¹⁰¹ E. FÜGEDI, *Ispánok*, p. 314.

¹⁰² János Szepesi, later to pursue a considerable ecclesiastic career, entered the university of Padova as a layman, still referred to as 'miles', if we consider him identical with 'd. Johannes miles, filius quondam [...] comes domini regis Hungariae', recorded on the 17th of January, 1379. E. VERESS, *Matricula et Acta*, p. 3.

¹⁰³ P. ENGEL, *Genealógia*, Aranyi (Bencenci, Piskinci család).

¹⁰⁴ P. ENGEL, *Magyarország világi*, I, p. 248.

¹⁰⁵ G. BÓNIS, *A jogtudó*, p. 36.

¹⁰⁶ G. BÓNIS, *A jogtudó*, p. 33.

also a chaplain of King Louis.¹⁰⁷ The appearance of Professor Bartolomeo Piacentini from Padova in the royal court, right in the early 1360s, is also of great significance. He is presumed to have been invited by Bishop Vilmos of Pécs from the Hungarian-Venetian peace talks in Zára (Zadar) in 1358 and was later appointed counsellor to Louis the Great.¹⁰⁸ A further crucial example is the growth of the royal library during the reign of Louis.¹⁰⁹ A glorious part of the loot from King Louis's Neapolitan campaign was the royal library of Naples. Presumably, these volumes included a pseudo-Aristotelian 'mirror of princes', titled *Secreta Secretorum*.¹¹⁰ Here one may mention the King's act of founding a university, since being a patron of culture at such a high level may have greatly inspired members of the court to gain knowledge. Cultural influences the court had, however, might also include such earlier ones as the appearance and propagation of the ideals of chivalry in the early 13th century, or the early 14th-century organisation of the oligarchic household modelled on the royal court,¹¹¹ and what Ágnes Kurcz points out is exactly the differences between churches founded by religious orders during the era of Charles I and that of Louis the Great. While Charles I preferred to support the Franciscans, his son would lean toward the Pauline Fathers, and Kurcz successfully revealed that lords (under both Charles's and Louis's reign) would follow and copy the trends of the royal court when founding their own churches.¹¹² In his monography on King Sigismund, Elemér Mályusz noted – concerning the Anjou period – that in the fields of culture, civilisation and art, it was the court and the king that could define what is beautiful and what society should feel as such, and he gives a list of further examples (although predominantly from the 15th century) when lords copied the artistic and cultural norms of the royal court.¹¹³ Literary works and book culture might shed light on the role of the court as a model in the Anjou period, though not much was left to us from that age. As an example, the so-called Néksei Bible can be mentioned from the Caroline era, possibly ordered from Bologna by Charles I's Master of the Treasury,¹¹⁴ and maybe the codex *Moralia in Job*, copied in Visegrád around 1367 on the request of János Bredenscheid, royal diplomat and jurist.¹¹⁵ It may have had significant influence on the outstanding number of Hungarian students in Prague in the 1380s that the second son of Charles IV, Sigismund, – after lengthy diplomatic negotiations – moved to the Hungarian royal court in 1379. The place of origin of Sigismund, potentially considered as the central figure of the decades to follow, and the interests related to his person played a large role in that the nobles of the court went to Prague. They, in turn, would also be considered models for other nobles, who felt the future of one of their relatives safer with university education, besides traditional military-courtly service.

¹⁰⁷ Royal chaplains are worth mentioning in this context, see, for example János Garai (lord lieutenant of the royal chapel and royal envoy) or Bálint Alsáni and István Szigeti. A. GÁBRIEL, *Magyar diákok és tanárok*, p. 11; Kinga KÖRMEVICH, *Studentes extra Regnum 1183–1543*, Budapest 2007, p. 177.

¹⁰⁸ Tamás FEDELES, *Studium Generale Quinqueecclesiensis*, in: Tamás Fedeles – Gábor Sarbak – József Sümegi (eds.), *A pécsi egyházmegye története*, I, Pécs 2009, p. 557.

¹⁰⁹ Á. KURCZ, *Lovagi kultúra*, p. 223.

¹¹⁰ Emil JAKUBOVICH, *Nagy Lajos király oxfordi kódexe, a bécsi Képes Krónika kora és illuminátora (Egy képpel)*, Magyar Könyvszemle 3–4, 1930, pp. 382–393; Dezső DERCSÉNYI, *Nagy Lajos kora*, Budapest 1941, p. 138.

¹¹¹ Gyula KRISTÓ, *Csák Máté*, Budapest 1986, p. 168.

¹¹² Á. KURCZ, *Lovagi kultúra*, pp. 155–156.

¹¹³ E. MÁLYUSZ, *Zsigmond király*, p. 243.

¹¹⁴ Dezső DERCSÉNYI, *Nagy Lajos kora*, Budapest 1941, pp. 137–138.

¹¹⁵ D. DERCSÉNYI, *Nagy Lajos*, p. 139.

4. Summary

The university of Prague exceeded in significance to the ones in Vienna or Cracow in 14th-century Central Europe, and was one of the most important universities of the time from a Hungarian perspective. In defining its role, the exploration and analysis of student careers are of primary importance. It becomes clear from the known careers that several important individuals studied in Prague, and many were closely connected to the royal court. For the nobility, gaining better positions may have been a crucial goal. According to Peter Moraw, university education (primarily, earning a degree) offered such opportunities as social rank, lineage, wealth or military service did.¹¹⁶ As opposed to those, however, their value was constant all across Europe. University career, lineage, service, military merits: the more one possessed the greater their chance was for success. Others, however, looked at the court as a model, which, through its mentality, cultural variety and effervescence, urged them to begin university studies. Thus, it seems that higher education was, at the same time, a means for drawing attention to oneself and for living a better, financially more secure life. Nevertheless, the court may have proven exemplary in more than the arts: its influence in studying abroad is also apparent.

PÉTER HARASZTI SZABÓ

Význam pražské univerzity pro uherský královský dvůr ve 14. století

RESUMÉ

Pražská univerzita sehrála ústřední roli v uherském vzdělávání ve 14. století. Na základě identifikace profesních drah jejích studentů uherského původu autor ukazuje, že mnozí z nich náleželi ke královskému dvoru, a to přinejmenším svými rodinnými vazbami. Proč se jim tedy vyplatilo věnovat se studiu na univerzitě? Podle Petera Morawa univerzitní studia měla dostatečnou váhu na to, aby mohla soutěžit s ostatními tradičními faktory přispívajícími k přijetí na královský dvůr, jako byla vojenská služba, rodinné zázemí či bohatství. Praha byla velmi proslulým místem ve vzdělávací síti střední Evropy. Vedle kritérií uvedených P. Morawem existují i další, určující význam univerzitních studií. Většina uherských šlechtických studentů na pražské univerzitě pocházela z dvorské nobility, takže lze hypoteticky předpokládat, že velkou roli hrál příklad uherských anjouovských králů. Tento aspekt však bude probrán v jiné fázi autorova výzkumu.

Český překlad: Jan Odstrčilík

Péter Haraszi Szabó

Ph.D. student Eötvös Loránd University,

Assistant research fellow, MTA – ELTE History of Universities Research Group

szabo.szpeter@hotmail.com

¹¹⁶ P. MORAW, *Careers of graduates*, p. 403.

UBERTO DECEMBRIO: A HUMANIST IN PRAGUE AT THE END OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

DANIELA PAGLIARA

ABSTRACT

Two brief letters, written by Uberto Decembrio during a diplomatic mission on behalf of Gian Galeazzo Visconti, provide a lively sketch of Bohemian life and customs at the end of the 14th century, as seen through the eyes of an Italian humanist. In the wake of the travel reports, the epistles also offer subject matter related to the cultural policies of Charles IV, creator of the the Studium Generale as well as a tireless promoter of the development of the arts. The Italian scholar reveals his intellectual curiosity and ethnographic interests as well, describing aspects and the unusual habits of the city of Prague, while not shying away from expressing a personal opinion.

Keywords: Bohemia – Italian Humanism – Charles IV – the Prague University – geographical and chorographic literature

Uberto Decembrio has received little attention from scholars, and only a few of his writings are available in print today. We know very little about his family and his youth.¹ He was born in Vigevano around the middle of the 14th century and probably studied in Pavia. From 1391 onwards, Decembrio was secretary to Peter Filargis of Candia, a theologian at the Visconti court who became the bishop of Piacenza (1386), Vicenza (1388) and finally of Novara in 1389 (Vigevano belonged to this diocese). In 1409 Filargis ascended the papal throne as Alexander V (1409–1410), elected by the Council of Pisa.² Decembrio followed the bishop during his diplomatic mission to Prague seeking the title of duke for Gian Galeazzo Visconti (1351–1402).³ The latter pursued a policy of expanding his territory, aimed

¹ For Uberto Decembrio see Mario BORSA, *Pier Candido Decembrio e l'Umanesimo in Lombardia*, Archivio Storico Lombardo 10, 1893, pp. 5–75, 358–441; *Id.*, *Un umanista vigevanasco del secolo XIV*, Giornale Iugustico 20, 1893, pp. 81–111, 199–215; Paolo VITI, s.v. *Decembrio, Uberto*, in: Dizionario biografico degli Italiani 33, Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, Roma 1987, pp. 498–503.

² After so many years of division within the Catholic Church (1377–1417), many cardinals and theologians became aware of the need for an ecumenical council that forced the popes to the agreement or will appoint another which all Christendom would obey. Several cardinals adhered to this movement, among them Baldassarre Cossa, the future Pope John XXIII, and Peter Filargis. On March 25th 1409 the Council of Pisa was started in order to restore unity in the Church. It is noteworthy that neither Gregory XII, the legitimate pope, nor Benedict XIII recognized the authority of the Council. All the attempts to deal with the two pontiffs were in vain, so in June the Council pronounced the sentence of deposition of Gregory XII and Benedict XIII, starting the conclave to elect a new pope. Peter of Candia was consecrated Pope in July. See Walter ULLMANN, *The Origins of the Great Schism: a study in fourteenth century ecclesiastical history*, London 1948; Marzieh GAIL, *The Three Popes: an account of the great Schism*, New York 1969; Paolo BREZZI, *Lo scisma d'Occidente come problema italiano*, Archivio della R. Deputazione romana di Storia Patria 10, 1944, pp. 392–450.

³ James HANKINS, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, II, Leiden – New York – København – Köln 1991 (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition, XVII/1), pp. 105–117.

at the formation of a vast centralized state, and therefore would have taken advantage of the contemporary crisis of the major Italian powers. His main purpose was to receive official recognition from the emperor, because it would not only enhance his personal prestige, but also legitimize his claim to territories already conquered.⁴

The exact date of Decembrio's journey is uncertain, it probably took place at the end of the 1393, or perhaps at the beginning of 1394, and they stayed there till August 1395. On 5 September 1395, Decembrio had surely returned to Milan, because Visconti was proclaimed duke and Filargis delivered a Latin oration.⁵ Years later, in a letter written to the duke and the duchess of Milan in 1477, his son Pier Candido, seeking to reclaim a house that had belonged to Uberto, said his father had stayed there 'per spacio de tri ani'.⁶ During the long period of his stay in the Bohemian capital, Uberto was able to observe some of the peculiar aspects and habits of the city of Prague and its University.

The Italian humanist leaves us a vivid description of his impressions in two letters preserved in a manuscript in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan (Ambros. B 123 sup., ff. 221r–222v), of which I hope soon to prepare a critical edition.⁷ These letters were sent to a friend, who was erroneously identified as Coluccio Salutati by Attilio Hortis back in 1880⁸ – an error probably caused by the fact that this collection of letters includes two actually sent to Salutati.

The letters are preserved in the latter part of the Ambrosian manuscript. During his lifetime, Decembrio had probably never intended to collect and arrange his letters. This may explain the small number of these letters (thirty four, including also those of the recipients),

⁴ After Gian Galeazzo's death, Uberto established himself in Milan and in 1404 passed from Peter of Candia's service into that of Filippo Maria Visconti. In Milan Uberto took part in the Greek lessons taught by Emanuel Chrysoloras. Decembrio collaborated with the Byzantine scholar in the drafting of the translation of Plato's *Republic*. With regard to this translation, see J. HANKINS, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, I, pp. 108–117. See also Mario VEGETTI – Paolo PISSAVINO (eds.), *I Decembrio e la tradizione della 'Repubblica' di Platone tra medioevo e umanesimo*, Atti del Convegno internazionale, Pavia – Vigevano 24–27 maggio 2000, Bibliopolis, Napoli 2005 ("Saggi Bibliopolis" 75), in particular, Daniela MUGNAI CARRARA, *La collaborazione fra Emanuele Crisolora e Uberto Decembrio: ideologia signorile all'origine della prima versione latina della 'Repubblica' di Platone e problemi di traduzione*, pp. 211–235; Antonio ROLLO, *Gli inizi dello studio del greco in Lombardia*, pp. 237–265.

⁵ The oration, not available in print, can be read in ms. Ambros. B 116 sup., ff. 30r–34v. For its description, Giliola BARBERO, *Coluccio Salutati nel ricordo di Giovanni Tinti e di Antonio Loschi*. Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B 116 sup., in: Teresa De Robertis – Stefano Zamponi – Giuliano Tanturli (eds.), *Coluccio Salutati e l'invenzione dell'Umanesimo*. Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 2 novembre 2008 – 30 gennaio 2009, Mandragora, Firenze 2008, pp. 95–97.

⁶ C. MAGENTA, *I Visconti e gli Sforza nel castello di Pavia e loro attinenze con la Certosa e la storia cittadina*. Documenti, II, Milano 1883, p. 388: "Mio padre olim dicto Uberto de Vigievano, homo de bona fama e de reputazione, altre volte fu mandato in Boemia cum lo episcopo de Novaria, dicto domino Petro de Candia, per obtenir la dignità ducale da lo imperatore Vincislao a Prago, ove, dimorato per spacio de tre ani, revene cum lo dito privilegio ducale."

⁷ The Ambros. B 123 sup. is composed of two different manuscripts, the first 77 folii contain seven books of Petrarch's *Seniles*; and then it gathers the majority of the works of Uberto Decembrio. The codex was probably copied from an original autograph, or in any case very close to the author. One of the scribes was Pier Candido Decembrio, who copied ff. 79r, 131r and 216v–237r and added many rubrics. For the description of the manuscript see Mirella FERRARI, *La "littera antiqua" a Milan, 1417–1429*, in: R. Autenrieth (Hg.), *Renaissance- und Humanistenhandschriften*, München 1989 (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs. Kolloquien 13), pp. 13–29. See also Francesco PETRARCA, *Manoscritti e libri a stampa della biblioteca ambrosiana*, eds. Marco BALLARINI – Giuseppe FRASSO – Carla Maria MONTI, Milano 2004, pp. 55–56, 149.

⁸ Attilio HORTIS, *La città di Praga descritta da un umanista nel MCCCXCIX*, Archeografo triestino 7, 1880, pp. 439–451.

despite the wide range of acquaintances and relationships that he must have had with many of his contemporaries during his long stay at the Filargis' service. The extant collection was compiled by his son Pier Candido, who, thirty years after his father's death,⁹ had problems in dating them and in identifying their correspondents. From a philological point of view, it should be noted that the collection of letters begins with the following *inscriptio*: *Uberti Decembrii viri eruditissimi epistolarum liber incipit feliciter* (f. 216v). The first letter (ff. 216v–217v) is addressed to Coluccio Salutati (in capital letters we can read: '*Ubertus Colucio pierio sal.*').¹⁰ The third, the fourth, the fifth and the sixth letters have the same addressee, a friend (*ad amicum*), and they present annotations on the margin written by the copyist-editor Pier Candido, concerning contents and recipient. The third deals with the consolation from the miseries of human life; the other three were written while Uberto was in Prague, but only the last two describe the city. Their rubrics read: '*Ad eundem Pragensis urbis et nonnulla de moribus populi in ea existentis*'; '*Ad eundem de eadem urbe et moribus incolarum copiosius*'. But who was this friend?

Certainly he was a member of the Visconti court, if Decembrio referred to him writing '*in cancellaria illustris communis heri tecum plerumque loqui soleo*'. The mystery of his identity is soon solved, with reasonable certainty; we can identify him as Antonio Loschi, a prominent figure of Lombard humanism and a fierce and lively opponent of the positions taken by Salutati during the war between Milan and Florence. Indeed, Loschi's *Invectiva in Florentinos* (1397) provoked the passionate response of his former 'mentor' Salutati, who composed his *Invectiva in Antonium Loscum* as a manifesto celebrating *Florentina libertas*.¹¹

The *communis herus*, mentioned by Decembrio in his letter, was undoubtedly the powerful lord of Milan, Gian Galeazzo Visconti, as we can infer from a note in the right margin (mostly likely written by Pier Candido) where we can read: '*Iohannis Galeacii primi ducis Mediolani*.' The letters have a colloquial tone, and they are very different from those sent to Salutati, full of rhetorical devices. Uberto himself at the beginning writes to his interlocutor not to expect an *ornatus sermo*, because he will use his *materna vox*.¹² He describes the efforts of the journey during the freezing winter, between mountains covered with snow and impracticable paths. So these letters represent historical documents of considerable importance, because they are not only one of the most ancient descriptions of Prague made by a humanist (although Petrarch, referring to his journey in Prague in 1356, had already written some reflections on the city),¹³ but they are also the result of personal observations.

⁹ Uberto died in Treviglio, on April 7th 1427. His corpse was then moved to Milan and buried in Sant'Ambrogio's Church.

¹⁰ See Francesco NOVATI, *Aneddotti viscontei. I: Uberto Decembrio e Coluccio Salutati; II: Il viaggio del Decembrio in Boemia e la vera data dell'ambasceria viscontea a Venceslao re de' Romani*, Archivio Storico Lombardo 19, 1908, pp. 193–216. Another letter of the Ambros. B 123 is addressed to the Florentine secretary Salutati at f. 224r.

¹¹ See Stefano Ugo BALDASSARRI, *La vipera e il giglio. Lo scontro tra Milano e Firenze nelle invettive di Antonio Loschi e Coluccio Salutati*, Roma 2012; Vittorio ZACCARIA, *Antonio Loschi e Coluccio Salutati (con quattro epistole inedite del Loschi)*, Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti. Classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti 129, 1970–1971, pp. 345–387; ID., *Le epistole e i carmi di Antonio Loschi durante il cancellierato visconteo (con tredici inediti)*, Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Memorie. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche 18, 1975, pp. 367–443.

¹² Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Ambros. 123 B sup., f. 221r: "Non ex me ornatum exigas sermonem. Materna tibi voce loquar quicquid ad os primum defluat."

¹³ Francesco PETRARCA, *Le familiari*, IV, ed. Vittorio ROSSI, Firenze 1933–1942. See *Fam.* XXI 1: "Ego vero nichil barbarum minus, nichil humanum magis profiteor me vidisse quam Cesarem et aliquot circa eum summos viros, [...] mites et affabiles, etiam si Athenis athicis nati essent."

In the first letter he seems to be impressed by the living conditions of this foreign people he calls *aquilonalis populus*, to wit, that they build their house with wood instead of stone, and have wood stove instead of fireplace. Decembrio writes that is very astounding *in tam acerbo gelu*, in bitterly cold weather, to see women half-naked, with light clothes, embracing their babies, while he himself was wrapped up in a fur-lined coat. But they think that it's a way to make the babies stronger and to get them used to the frigid climate. Decembrio uses this occasion to draw a parallel between them and ancient Italic people mentioned in a famous passage of Virgil's *Aeneid*: "*Natos ad flumina primum deferimus saevoque gelu duramus et undis*."¹⁴ At this point the main interest of the writer seems to be almost anthropological or ethnographic. He refers of the strange custom of these women who every Saturday bathe together and show their nudity without shame, while men are everywhere: "*Publicis astantium oculis nuditatem ostendere non verentur in publicum apertis genitalibus*." On the right margin of the folio there is the following note: '*Attende*'.¹⁵ All that, seems to him, barbaric and shameless ('*inverecundum et barbarum michi prorsus apparuit*').¹⁶ Then he goes on to describe their *domestica convivia* ('family banquets'), in which meat and bread were plentiful: from a large platter in the middle of the table, everyone serves himself with his hands. Rather than wine, they drink beer.

After these observations Decembrio adds that at first glance Prague seems a notable city, and inserts a note of historical interests, namely, that it was here that he met the '*rex Ungarie et totius Alemanie flos*',¹⁷ the king of Hungary and flower of the German nobility, gathered there in order to ensure the harmony of the two Marquises of Moravia. He surely refers to the two brothers Iodocus and Procopius, sons of the Margrave of Moravia. The Italian delegation, led by Giorgio Cavalli, stayed in Prague for a long time but was prevented from acting by unfavorable coincidences including the negotiations for the conclusion of peace between the Marquis of Moravia, Iodocus and Procopius. The dispute ended with the imprisonment of Wenceslas, who was accused of favoring Procopius. Only after the liberation of the Emperor Wenceslas in the autumn, could the skill of the diplomats bring the negotiations to a successful conclusion with the granting of the title of duke so earnestly sought by Visconti.

The letters ends with a comparison between Rome and Prague: both cities are divided by a river, respectively, the Tiber and the Vltava. Decembrio takes the opportunity to recall the famous bridge erected on 16 arches at the behest of Charles IV. Certainly, this was the consequence of the broader project of Charles IV to brighten up the city that had become the archbishopric in 1344. But in this first letter Decembrio limits his description of the city to a sketchy allusion, a simple mention. Then our humanist bids Antonio Loschi farewell,

¹⁴ Ambros. 123 B sup., f. 221r. Cf. Verg. Aen., IX 603–604.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid. At this point it seems inevitable the comparison between these lines and the well-known and most famous letter of Poggio Bracciolini on the German baths. In this letter on the baths of Baden, written in 1416, Bracciolini celebrates the freedom of costumes of the natural environment of Baden, where the women-nymphs playfully joke in their chaste nudity, because the purpose of life is pleasure. Poggio BRACCIOLINI, *Lettere*, I/3, ed. Helene HARTH, Firenze 1984, p. 123: "Nam cuivis licet visendi, colloquendi, iocandi ac laxandi animi gratia aliorum balnea adire ac adstare, adeo ut et cum exeunt et cum ingrediuntur aquas feminae maiori parte corporis nudae conspiciantur. Nullae aditus custodiae observant; nulla ostia prohibent; nulla suspicio inhonesti. [...] Ego autem ex deambulatorio omnia conspicebam, mores, consuetudines, suavitatem victus, vivendi libertatem ac licentiam contemplatus. Permirum est videre qua simplicitate vivant, qua fide."

¹⁷ Ambros. 123 B sup., f. 221v.

with the promise that he will write and inform him more accurately as soon as he finds something new: "*Certiora tibi scribam cum plura videro, nunc sum novus incola terre. Vale, Prage IIII. Nonas Martij.*"¹⁸

Shortly afterwards he wrote the second letter, which clearly reveals a change in the author's attitude. Decembrio himself says: "*Multa que primus adventus et rei novitas iudicare non permisit experientia propius nota fecit.*"¹⁹ Only at that time, it was clear to him what kind of people lived in Prague, what kind of traditions and customs they had. He seems to be able to understand more in depth the nature of this people. Uberto admires the magnificence of the buildings in the city as well, the buildings stand out for their height and the public squares are adorned and tidy.

Even though Decembrio's letters exhibit his humanistic formation, they also reveal his intellectual curiosity and ethnographic interests. He writes about the unusual spectacle of cock fights, whose champions are worth more than thoroughbred horses. He warns his friend: '*Causam vide*' ('Points out the cause'). In simple and coarse Latin, he describes in detail the stages of the contests and reports hearing that these birds were fed with garlic and sour foods to make them more aggressive. He focuses mainly on the custom of these people to bet on '*in ancipiti huius cristate avis victoria*' ('on the uncertain victory of these crested birds').²⁰ The spread and popularity of these shows of fighting between roosters probably have a historical reason in Prague. In fact the cock was associated with San Vito [St. Vitus], the patron of the city. In the Nordic countries San Vito is often represented with a rooster. Besides, the cock was the animal sacred to the pagan god Svantovid, and because of the similarity of that name with Saint Vitus, there had been a transfer of the property from the heathen to the saint.²¹

Subsequently he goes on to describe the relationship between men and women. Decembrio censures the extreme freedom enjoyed by Bohemian women, and a marginal note reads: *Mala consuetudo*. The note is an autograph of Pier Candido, but we don't know if it derives from the original of Uberto and so it can be considered as a personal opinion of the author, or if his son expresses his own idea. So it seems that he thinks it is immoral that women exert authority over their husbands: "*Dominium, ut apparet, quod est sordidum, in maritos assumunt.*"²² Most men are feckless and spend most of their time in taverns or brothels, "*ad tabernas meritorias se conferunt*"²³ Under such conditions, modesty and virtue cannot be observed. The only exceptions are the few men who are artists and teachers of art.

At this point, our author offers some brief remarks on Prague University. When, following the issuance of the Papal Bull in January 1366, the *Studium generale* was founded in Prague at the king's request, the charter text prescribed the same educational system and customs that were in use in Bologna and Paris. We know that the first phase of university development was completed with the foundation of the *Collegium Carolinum* in 1366, established by Charles IV for masters of the faculties of Arts and Theology. The university of Paris was taken as a model. Probably Uberto Decembrio refers to this study structure when writes: "*Studium hic satis magnum viget*

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Johann Georg KOHL, *Austria*, Philadelphia 1844, p. 18.

²² Ambros. 123 B sup., f. 222r.

²³ Ibid.

in artibus, potissimum in theologica facultate. In legibus vero et medicina non ita."²⁴ Indeed we know the passion, nourished by the king, for the theological writings of St. Augustine. It formed the basis of his spirituality, acquired during his long stay in Italy.

The perplexity of the author could in part be related to the fact that there was a structural difference between Italian universities and most universities outside Italy. Non-Italian universities, with the exception of Montpellier, were composed of four faculties, namely theology, law, medicine, and philosophy (including the arts), among which theology was predominant. Italian universities (except Salerno) were founded as schools of Roman and Canon Law which were supplemented by some preparatory courses in grammar and rhetoric. During the thirteenth century, the teaching of medicine was established in Bologna and elsewhere, and medicine, together with the Aristotelian philosophy, grammar and rhetoric and mathematics came to constitute an independent faculty often competing against law. Italian universities never had a separate faculty of theology; and theological education in Italy was always limited to the schools of the religious orders and to a few sporadic courses within the faculty of medicine and arts.

Decembrio's comments on the study structure of Prague University are limited to these few words, to which he adds that the number of students is around ten thousand.

Immediately after referring to the *Studium*, the attention of Decembrio is focused on the religious architecture of the city. He reminds his friend the work begun under the reign of Charles IV was left incomplete because of his death. He also celebrates the beauty and richness of the marble of the church of the Virgin Mary, where, for two days after his death, citizens could view the mortal remains of the emperor. The humanist is surprised by the fact that, in this church, religious functions are celebrated night and day. Concerning the Chapel of St. Wenceslas I, famous for its mosaics and frescoes, he only relates the story of the prince, revered as a saint by the Catholic Church. The humanist touches on the cruel murder of Wenceslas I, duke of Bohemia, victim of the brutal hand of his brother and his mother. Decembrio manifests all his painful disapproval. It is interesting to note that an allusion to this event is also found in the *Historia Bohemica* of Enea Silvio Piccolomini.²⁵

Then there is a brief reflection on the danger of the countryside. Indeed, the risks of traveling were a recurrent *topos* in the literature of that period.

The last part of the letter consists of a long discussion of the geographical names of the region, in which the author develops a series of arguments drawn largely from his humanistic formation. Since Visconti was a great patron of learning who collected a noteworthy library containing both Greek and Latin books, Decembrio had been able to broaden and deepen his knowledge through the study of the classics.

Since the middle of the fourteenth century a process of rebirth of geographical and chorographic literature had started and Decembrio does not depart from the methods that were characteristic of the contemporary and their production.²⁶ In effect, Decembrio's reflections

²⁴ Ambros. 123 B sup., f. 222r.

²⁵ Enea Silvio PICCOLOMINI, *Historia Bohemica*, XV, eds. Joseph HEJNIC – Hans ROTHE, Köln 2005.

²⁶ Among the many merits attributed to Francesco Petrarca there is also to have promoted these studies, both discovering and putting into circulation the works of Latin authors such as Pomponio Mela (*De chorographia*), Pliny the Elder (*Naturalis historia*), Gaius Julius Solinus (*Collectanea rerum memorabilium*) and Isidore of Seville (*Etymologiae*). It will be also important Chrysoloras' contribution to these studies: coming in Italy in 1397, he brought many Greek manuscripts and one of them contained the *Geography* of Ptolemy. See Sebastiano GENTILE, *L'ambiente umanistico fiorentino e lo studio della geografia nel secolo XV*, in: Luciano Formisano – Gloria

are based solely on the interpretation of classical texts. Thus, his discussion relies on sources like Isidore of Seville, or Lucan's *Pharsalia*. In some cases, he introduces a personal comment, such as '*Hoc non probo, ut existimo*'. It is worth noting what he writes about the name Bohemia. Decembrio argues that the region was once called *Boetia* and that the name derives from the constellation Boeotes.²⁷ In support of his claim, he cites a passage from Lucan's *Pharsalia*: '*Boetii coiere duces*',²⁸ but the quotation is inapt, because the Latin author is talking about Boeotians, inhabitants of Boeotia, a region in Greece. We cannot know for sure if Uberto is trying to dignify his statements with recourse to the authority of Lucan, while aware of the misinterpretation, or if, instead, it is an unintentional error due to the fact that he always quotes from memory. Certainly this was not an exception among the humanists. To confirm this, at the end of the letter, Decembrio admits that he has not been able to find a copy of Lucan in all of Prague: '*Nam nunc cum magna librorum hic adsit inopia, quem consulam nescio*'.²⁹ So he asks his friend to let him know as soon as possible what the Latin author wrote about the names of these Nordic peoples: '*Precor ut aquilonalium nomina populorum a Lucano perscripta transmittas*'.³⁰

In conclusion, Decembrio refrains from a negative judgment on the culture of these people who, despite knowing the name of Caesar and having experienced his yoke, are ignorant of Latin culture.³¹

Certainly, we are dealing with a kind of intellectual humanist claim. This is not the place to delve into issues related to the concept that the Italian writers and humanists had of the Nordic peoples. Humanists emphasized the features of the *barbarus* which were contrary to their own value system as men of learning.³² It was a common practice in Italy call the rest of the world *ultramontani barbari*. In that regard, we recall that the same Petrarch, who had also expressed his admiration for the people of Prague, in some of his letters, extolled the greatness of Italy, protected from the *furor barbaricus* thanks to the Alps.³³ It is worth

Fossi – Paolo Galluzzi (eds.), Amerigo Vespucci. La vita e i viaggi, Firenze 1991, pp. 11–45. Closely related to the renewal of historiographical canon, which introduces in the historical writing excursus of physical geography, anthropology and politics, it started a process of rebirth of geographical and chorographic treatises between Humanism and Renaissance. See, in this regard, the recent contribution of Domenico DEFILIPPIS, *La rinascita della corografia tra scienza ed erudizione*, Bari 2001. See also Numa BROCC, *La geografia del Rinascimento. Cosmografi, cartografi, viaggiatori. 1420–1620*, Modena 1989; Manlio PASTORE STOCCHI, *La cultura geografica dell'Umanesimo*, in: Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli (ed.), *Optima Hereditas. Sapienza giuridica romana e conoscenza dell'ecumene*, Milano 1992, pp. 563–586; Francesco PRONTERA, *Geografia e geografi nel mondo antico*, Bari 1990.

²⁷ Cf. Giovanni BOCCACCIO, *Genealogiae deorum gentilium libri*, VII–VIII, ed. Vittorio ZACCARIA, in: G. Boccaccio, *Tutte le opere*, ed. Vittore Branca, Milano 1964–1998.

²⁸ Luc. Phars. III 174.

²⁹ Ambros. 123 B sup., f. 222v.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid. "Hic enim liber ignotus est, licet Cesaris nomen de quo agit, sit hic et ubique notissimum, cuius iugum maiorum suorum sentire cervices."

³² Gábor ALMÁSI, *I Valacchi visti dagli italiani e il concetto di barbaro nel Rinascimento*, Storia della Storiografia 52, 2007, pp. 49–66; Luca D'ASCIA, *Coscienza della Rinascita e coscienza antibarbara. Appunti sulla visione storica del Rinascimento nei secoli XV e XVI*, in: Renzo Raggianti – Alessandro Savorelli (eds.), *Rinascimento: mito e concetto*, Pisa 2005, pp. 1–37; Massimo DONATTINI, *Il giardino e la muraglia. Le Alpi nella letteratura geografica del Rinascimento*, in: Rosanna Gorris Camos (ed.), *Les montagnes de l'esprit. Imaginaire et histoire de la montagne à la Renaissance*, Aosta 2005, pp. 183–208.

³³ See Francesco PETRARCA, *Res seniles*, VII/1, in: F. PETRARCA, *Res seniles*, eds. Silvia RIZZO – Monica BERTÉ, Firenze 2006–2014. For Italian scholars of the Renaissance the concept of humanism contrasted with that of barbarism. They used this distinction as a means for expressing a fierce cultural pride.

remembering that the first part of the Ambrosian manuscript, containing the *Seniles*, was copied by Modesto Decembrio, but the rubrics and marginal glosses are Uberto's. He was very familiar with Petrarch.

Our study doesn't represent an attempt to examine the ways Italian humanistic scholars thought about the foreign culture, but it aims to reconstruct a particular moment in European political history through the eyes of one of its protagonists, who, at the same time, while remaining faithful to the principles of the *studia humanitatis*, in some passages, undresses the role of official secretary and lets us see his human and intellectual curiosity.

DANIELA PAGLIARA

Uberto Decembrio: humanista v Praze na konci čtrnáctého století

RESUMÉ

Uberto Decembrio z Vigevana se zatím dočkal jen malé vědecké pozornosti a pouze nemnoho z jeho děl bylo vydáno tiskem. Od roku 1391 působil jako sekretář Petra Filargi z Kandie, františkánského teologa na viskontiovském dvoře a biskupa novarského, kterého v roce 1393 doprovázel na jeho diplomatické misi do Prahy, v níž strávil přibližně dva roky. Během této doby měl možnost pozorovat některé zvyky a zvláštnosti pražského města i jeho univerzity, již charakterizoval těmito slovy: „*Studium hic satis magnum viget in artibus, potissimum in theologica facultate: in legibus vero et medicina non ita.*“ Své dojmy a postřehy shrnul Uberto Decembrio ve dvou dopisech napsaných svému příteli a zachovaných v rukopise v Ambrosiánské knihovně v Miláně. Oba listy představují historické doklady značné důležitosti, protože poskytují nejenom jeden z nejstarších popisů Prahy od humanistického autora (třebaže Petrarka ve svém popisu cesty do Prahy z roku 1356 již dříve zachytil některé své dojmy z města), ale jsou také výsledkem osobního pozorování. Decembriova práce prozrazuje vedle jeho humanistického vzdělání a studia Platona také autorovu intelektuální zvědavost a etnografické zájmy. Decembrio tak popisuje například kohoutí zápasy, Karlův most se šestnácti klenbami a velkolepost svatovítské katedrály. Druhý dopis končí úvahami o původu pojmenování českých zemí. Uberto Decembrio se dotýká také vraždy sv. Václava a vyjadřuje s ní svůj bolestivý nesouhlas.

Český překlad: Jan Odstrčilík

Daniela Pagliara
Università degli Studi 'G. d'Annunzio', Chieti-Pescara
(Dipartimento di Lingue, Letterature e Culture moderne)
dany.pagliara@gmail.com

JOHN OF MARIGNOLLI AND THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL PROJECT OF CHARLES IV

IRENE MALFATTO

ABSTRACT

In 1355 an Italian Franciscan, John of Marignolli, was asked by Charles IV to compose a chronicle of Bohemia. His *Chronicon Bohemorum* is conserved into three manuscripts, two of which are now in Prague's National Library. Marignolli's work followed a project of historiographical renovation: Charles aimed to rewrite Bohemian historiography in order to celebrate his election as Emperor. It was Marignolli's task to collect all the previous chronicles, revise them and bring about a brand new universal narrative leading to contemporary Bohemian history. Shortly after Marignolli's death, Charles IV gave the Bohemian writer Přibík Pulkava of Radeníň the same appointment: in 1374 he wrote an alternative *Chronica Bohemiae*, copied beside Marignolli's one in both of the Prague manuscripts. These two chronicles are very different from one another: it's likely that Charles didn't appreciate Marignolli's work and asked Pulkava to write a text more suitable for his purposes.

Keywords: John of Marignolli – Charles IV – Prague – historiography – manuscripts – Přibík Pulkava of Radeníň – Bohemian chronicles

The foundation of Prague's University in 1348 took place during a great wave of cultural and political renovation that characterized Bohemia in the middle of the 14th century. In 1344 Prague became an Archbishop's seat, with Ernest of Pardubice as the first Archbishop; in 1355, it became the capital city of the Holy Roman Empire, after the coronation of Charles IV. Charles, 'king of the Romans' since 1346, was eager to celebrate Bohemian history if it had reached its peak during his reign. Therefore, besides his project of *renovatio studiorum*, connected with the academic foundation, there was a project of what could be called a 'historiographical renovation', aimed to reconsider Bohemian history in a celebrative fashion. In other words, Charles' program exemplifies the need of the new power for a new narrative to legitimate itself.¹ During his reign there was a wide production of chronicles connected in some way with the imperial court: all these works tried to re-elaborate past chronicles in order to convert Bohemian history into a path of celebration of Charles IV's deeds.²

In twenty years, between 1353 and 1374, five chronicles of Bohemia commissioned by Emperor Charles had been written. All these works were based on previous Bohemian

¹ Marie BLÁHOVÁ, *Die Hofgeschichtsschreibung am Böhmischem Herrscherhof im Mittelalter*, in: Rudolf Schieffer – Jaroslav Wenta (eds.), *Die Hofgeschichtsschreibung im Mittelalterlichen Europa*, Toruń 2006.

² Marie BLÁHOVÁ, *Kroniky doby Karla IV*, Praha 1987; Bernd-Ulrich HERGEMÖLLER, *Cogor adversum te. Drei Studien zum literarisch-theologischen Profil Karls IV. und seiner Kanzlei*, Warendorf 1999, pp. 385–387; Jana NECHUTOVÁ, *Die lateinische Literatur des Mittelalters in Böhmen*, Köln – Weimar – Wien 2007, pp. 162–167.

chronicles, combined and rearranged into a new structure oscillating between world and local history.

Francis of Prague, in 1353, wrote a second *recensio* of his chronicle (*Chronicae Pragensis libri III*),³ adding a prologue dedicated to Charles IV and some information about the emperor's activities, like a paragraph on the university foundation. The chronicle, a combination of world and local history, is a continuation of Cosmas' one and is widely based on Peter of Zittau's Königsaal chronicle;⁴

John of Marignolli, between 1355 and 1358, wrote a universal chronicle starting with the world's creation entitled *Chronicon Bohemorum*,⁵ whose last section – the one about Bohemian history – is based on Cosmas' and Dalimil's chronicles;⁶

Neplach of Opatovice, around 1362, wrote a *Summula chronicae tam Romanae quam Bohemicae*,⁷ in which he connected Bohemian and world history by collecting excerpts from previous chronicles (Cosmas and his continuators for Bohemian history, Martin of Troppau for world history);⁸

Beneš Krabice of Weitmile, between 1372 and 1374, wrote a *Cronica ecclesiae Pragensis*⁹ which is widely based on Francis of Prague and Peter of Zittau, and that culminates with the parallel biographies of Charles IV and Ernest of Pardubice;¹⁰

Príibík Pulkava of Radenín, in 1374, wrote the last chronicle commissioned by Charles IV, known simply as *Chronica Bohemiae* (it does not have an official title).¹¹ The narration starts with the building of the Tower of Babel, but the chronicle does not have a proper universal structure since it deals from its beginning with the mythical origins of the Czech people and with Bohemian history. Pulkava's work is based on Cosmas and his continuators and it has been enriched with sources and information directly provided and supervised by Emperor Charles.¹²

Among all these chronicles, John of Marignolli's is the only one preceded by a prologue written apparently by the Emperor himself. Although it is quite certain that the prologue's author wasn't Charles but Marignolli, the text seems to express Charles' ideas on history and politics and is full of literary quotations reflecting the Emperor's readings.¹³

³ FRANCISCUS PRAGENSIS, *Chronicon*, ed. Jana ZACHOVÁ, Praha 1997 (*Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum. Series nova*, I). The chronicle's 'recensio prima' was written in the early 1340's on demand of the bishop John IV of Dražice.

⁴ M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Kroniky doby Karla IV.*, pp. 564–567; B.-U. HERGMÖLLER, *Cogor adversum te*, pp. 385–386; J. NECHUTOVÁ, *Die lateinische Literatur*, pp. 162–163.

⁵ JOHANNIS DE MARIGNOLA, *Chronicon*, ed. Josef EMLER, Praha 1882 (*Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, III), pp. 485–604.

⁶ M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Kroniky doby Karla IV.*, pp. 580–583; B.-U. HERGMÖLLER, *Cogor adversum te*, p. 386; J. NECHUTOVÁ, *Die lateinische Literatur*, pp. 165–166.

⁷ JOHANNIS NEPLACHONIS abbatis Opatovicensis, *Chronicon*, ed. Josef EMLER, Praha 1882 (*Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, III), pp. 443–484.

⁸ M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Kroniky doby Karla IV.*, pp. 583–585; B.-U. HERGMÖLLER, *Cogor adversum te*, p. 386; J. NECHUTOVÁ, *Die lateinische Literatur*, pp. 164–165.

⁹ BENESSIUS DE WEITMIL, *Chronicon*, ed. Josef EMLER, Praha 1884 (*Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, IV), pp. 457–548.

¹⁰ M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Kroniky doby Karla IV.*, pp. 567–571; B.-U. HERGMÖLLER, *Cogor adversum te*, pp. 386–387; J. NECHUTOVÁ, *Die lateinische Literatur*, pp. 163–164.

¹¹ PRZIBIK DE RADENIN dictus PULKAVA, *Chronicon Bohemiae*, ed. Josef EMLER, Praha 1893 (*Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, V), pp. 1–326.

¹² M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Kroniky doby Karla IV.*, pp. 572–580; B.-U. HERGMÖLLER, *Cogor adversum te*, p. 387; J. NECHUTOVÁ, *Die lateinische Literatur*, pp. 166–167.

¹³ For a complete analysis of Charles' prologue to Marignolli's chronicle B.-U. HERGMÖLLER, *Cogor adversum te*, pp. 374–380.

A paragraph of this prologue is crystal clear about Charles' aims regarding historiography: "*Cronicarum antiquas et novas hystorias maxime Boemorum obscure conscriptas per venerabilem patrem, fratrem Johannem dictum de Marignolis de Florentia ordinis Minorum, Bysinianensem episcopum, nostre imperialis aule commensalem, transcurri mandavimus, amputatis obscuris verborum ambagibus et superfluis resecatis ac interpositis quibusdam utilibus.*"¹⁴ ("I gave the venerable father, friar John of Marignolli from Florence, from the Franciscan Order, bishop of Bisignano and our imperial court's chaplain, the order to search for all the ancient chronicles and the latest historiographical works, mostly the Bohemian ones, written in such an obscure fashion, in order to remove from them the convoluted language, cut off the superfluous information and add something useful.")

After Charles' prologue there is the author's response. Marignolli explains: "*Ego frater Johannes dictus de Marignolis de Florentia [...] cronicarum boemicalium ystorias obscure quidem pristinae conscriptas in unum magis lucide compendium [...] duxi regulandas, ut, que prius obscura clausit umbrositas, concepti operis sententia reddat manifesta.*"¹⁵ ("I, friar John of Marignolli from Florence, [...] decided to summarize the narratives of all these obscure Bohemian chronicles written in the past, in order to write a clearer compendium [...] and in order to shine more light on things that were before shrouded by an intense obscurity.")

John of Marignolli was a Franciscan friar from Florence. It seems that Charles met him in 1355, when he went to Italy for his imperial coronation, and he asked him to join his imperial court in Prague.¹⁶ Marignolli was a man of learning (he taught at Bologna *Studium* around 1332)¹⁷ and had been also the protagonist of an extraordinary travel experience: in 1338 he had been sent to the Far East by the Pope for diplomatic reasons, and he had travelled around Asia for fifteen years.¹⁸

We don't know the true reasons of Charles' choice for Marignolli: probably the Italian friar showed some literary competence in other works, but the attribution of these works to Marignolli is nowadays uncertain.¹⁹ Definitely he was a great intellectual: this is evident due to the large amount of quotations we can find in his *Chronicon Bohemorum*. Those

¹⁴ Johannis DE MARIGNOLA, *Chronicon*, p. 492.

¹⁵ Johannis DE MARIGNOLA, *Chronicon*, p. 493.

¹⁶ Girolamo GOLUBOVICH, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente francescano*, IV, Firenze 1923, p. 268. It seems however that Marignolli had already been in Prague in 1353, because of his description of a miracle that occurred in St. Agnes' church during this year (Johannis DE MARIGNOLA, *Chronicon*, pp. 521–522), but there is no evidence of that. Marie BLÁHOVÁ, '... ad probos mores exemplis delectabilibus provocemus ...'. *Funkce oficiální historiografie v představách Karla IV.*, in: Tomáš Borovský – Libor Jan – Martin Wihoda (eds.), *Ad vitam et honorem. Profesoru Jaroslavu Mezníkovi přátelé a žáci k pětadesátým narozeninám*, Brno 2003, p. 112.

¹⁷ Marignolli's name is written in the *Chartularium Studii Bononiensis Sancti Francisci* relating to the year 1332. *Analecta Franciscana sive chronica aliaque varia documenta ad historiam fratrum minorum spectantia*, XI, Firenze 1970, pp. 13–14.

¹⁸ For further information on Marignolli's life and travels: Anastaas VAN DEN WYNGAERT, *Sinica Franciscana*, I, Firenze 1929, pp. 515–518; Girolamo GOLUBOVICH, *Biblioteca*, pp. 257–271; Irene MALFATTO, 'Plus curiosus quam virtuosus': Giovanni de' Marignolli e il suo resoconto di viaggio (1338–1353), *Itineraria* 12, 2013, pp. 55–81; Kateřina KUBÍNOVÁ, *Jan Marignola a jeho 'cestopis'*, in: Petr Sommer – Vladimír Liščák (eds.), *Odorik z Pordenone: z Benátek do Pekinga a zpět. Setkávání na cestách Starého světa ve 13.–14. století*, Plzeň 2006, pp. 95–106.

¹⁹ Igiovanni Giacinto SBARAGLIA, *Supplementum et castigatio ad scriptores trium ordinum S. Francisci a Waddingo aliisve descriptos*, Roma 1806, pp. 436–437; G. GOLUBOVICH, *Biblioteca*, p. 308.

references show an impressive knowledge of the Bible, exegesis, theology and philosophy.²⁰ Marignolli's writing style, moreover, was highly rhetorical, well finished and somewhat 'baroque'.

Maybe John of Marignolli raised the interest of Charles IV because of his Asiatic experience as well. 14th-century Bohemia, after all, was characterized by an interest towards the East: one of the most common versions of one of the most famous medieval travel books, Odoric of Pordenone's *Relatio*,²¹ was actually Bohemian (it was written by Henry of Glatz around 1340). Furthermore, the first manuscript circulation of another well-known travel account also happened in Bohemia, with William of Boldensele's *Liber de quibusdam ultramarinis partibus*,²² written in 1336. Moreover, since the beginning of the 15th century there were Czech translations of Marco Polo's *Divisament dou monde* and Mandeville's *Travels*,²³ it is probable that these works, in their Latin versions, were already known and read by Bohemian people in the previous century.

Charles IV himself, as we can read in Marignolli's *Chronicon*, was personally interested in the 'marvels of the East'. It seems he created at his imperial residence in Prague a sort of enclosure full of exotic beasts: Marignolli, when describing his trip to southern China, finds out that "*sunt etiam monstruosi serpentes et fere, sicut habet in clausura sua Pragensi dominus imperator Carolus*"²⁴ ("there are also monstrous snakes and beasts, like the ones Emperor Charles keeps in his enclosure in Prague").

John of Marignolli proposes a partition of his *Chronicon Bohemorum* into three books. The first book, entitled *Thearcos*, narrates the history of the world from Adam to the building of the Tower of Babel; the second and the third book are set to show sacred and mundane histories in parallel, tales of Kings and Emperors (the second book, entitled *Monarchos*) and bishops and popes (the third book, entitled *Ierarchos*) from the world's beginning up to the present. In the second and third book the author focuses more and more on Bohemian history: the real 'Bohemian chronicle', in fact, is limited to the second part of books II and III.²⁵

An important model to Marignolli is Godfrey of Viterbo's *Pantheon* (12th century),²⁶ which is often quoted as a source. The *Pantheon* represents an example of an encyclopaedic chronicle, a kind of text usually written by Franciscan and Dominican authors in late Middle Ages. Marignolli, like them, inserts lots of digressions in his chronicle. Concerning the choice to narrate in parallel religious and mundane rulers' deeds, another important model

²⁰ For further information on Marignolli's cultural background: Anna-Dorothee VON DEN BRINCKEN, *Die universalhistorischen Vorstellungen des Johann von Marignola OFM*, Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 49/3, Köln – Graz 1967, pp. 297–339.

²¹ Odoricus DE PORTU NAONIS, *Relatio*, ed. Anastaas VAN DEN WYNGAERT, Firenze 1929 (Sinica Franciscana I), pp. 379–495.

²² Henricus CANISIUS, *Antiquae Lectionis. Antiqua monumenta nunc primum edita et notis illustrata*, V, Ingolstadt 1601–1604, pp. 95–142.

²³ J. NECHUTOVÁ, *Die lateinische Literatur*, pp. 167–168.

²⁴ Iohannis DE MARIGNOLLIS, *Chronicon Bohemorum. Excerpta de rebus orientalibus*, ed. Irene MALFATTO, 2013 <<http://ecodicibus.sismelfirenze.it>> (April 15, 2016), p. 22.

²⁵ For further information on *Chronicon Bohemorum* structure M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Kroniky doby Karla IV.*, pp. 581–582; Kateřina ENGSTOVÁ, *Marignolova kronika jako obraz představ o moci a postavení českého krále*, Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica 6, Praha 1999, pp. 79–80.

²⁶ Gotifredus VITERBIENSIS, *Pantheon*, ed. Georg WAITZ, Hannover 1872 (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores, 22), pp. 107–307.

is Martin of Troppau's *Chronicon Pontificum et imperatorum* (13th century).²⁷ However, John of Marignolli does not always seem to respect his intention to clarify Bohemian historiography, betraying in some way the Emperor's will. He interprets Charles' invitation to 'superfluis resequare' ('cut off superfluous information') and 'quaedam utilia interponere' ('add something useful') in a very personal way. In the first and second book he inserts a lot of long digressions not exactly pertaining to the matter, but strictly related to his personal experience: his travel to the Far East. These digressions, when recollected together, can be read as a complete travel account: a very important document about diplomatic relations between Popes and Mongolian Emperors in the 14th century. Moreover, Marignolli's narrative can be seen as an important source on Oriental world geography and habits.²⁸

Marignolli justifies his unusual digressions by insisting on their supposed 'necessity'. We can read, for example, a passage in which he reports his trip to Ceylon, insisting on the usefulness of his account: "*Verum quia materia requirit, et credo delectabile et aliquibus proficuum, hystoriam de Seyllano duximus presentibus inserendam, dummodo placeat Cesaree maiestati; si vero non placeat obelus citius emendabit.*"²⁹ ("As a matter of fact, because the subject requires it, and because I think it would be pleasant and useful to somebody, I decided to insert here this information about Ceylon. I will continue as long as His Majesty likes; if it does not please him, I will immediately emend it with a mark.")

Marignolli was extremely proud of his trip to Asia. He used the opportunity as collaborator to this important literary work to incorporate his personal feats into the narrative. Nevertheless, the Bohemian section of Marignolli's chronicle is not particularly original: the author, showing a quite superficial knowledge of Bohemian history, reports the narration of Cosmas and his continuators without inserting anything new.³⁰ Although reading Marignolli's chronicle is interesting even to analyse its reuse of the sources and its particular representation of Charles IV's power,³¹ it is clear that the Italian friar's authorial idea was mostly to fill the history of the world with the account of his trip to Asia rather than to focus on Bohemian history. Therefore, the sections of the chronicle recounting his travels are undoubtedly the most interesting and original ones. But as this was not in accordance with the design of the *Chronicon Bohemorum*, John of Marignolli as historiographer seems to have disappointed his patron.

Let's now focus on the *Chronicon Bohemorum*'s manuscript transmission.³² Marignolli's work is copied completely into only one manuscript, conserved in Prague's National

²⁷ Martinus OPPAVIENSIS, *Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum*, ed. Anna-Dorothee VON DEN BRINCKEN, 2014, <<http://www.mgh.de/ext/epub/mt/index.htm>> (January 18, 2016).

²⁸ Iohannis DE MARIGNOLLIS, *Chronicon Bohemorum*; I. Malfatto, 'Plus curiosus quam virtuosus'; K. Kubínová, *Jan Marignola a jeho 'cestopis'*.

²⁹ Iohannis DE MARIGNOLLIS, *Chronicon Bohemorum*, p. 8.

³⁰ The only subject that was quite new in Bohemian historiography is Marignolli's consideration on Charles' dynasty, that he made come from the pagan gods Jupiter and Saturn. M. Bláhová, "... ad probos mores"; K. Engstová, *Marignolova kronika*.

³¹ Marignolli's attempt to legitimate Charles' power as Roman emperor is highly researched in Czech literature. Marie Bláhová, *Odras státní ideologie v oficiální historiografii doby předhusitské*, Folia Historica Bohemica 12, Praha 1988; M. Bláhová, "... ad probos mores"; K. Engstová, *Marignolova kronika*.

³² Marie Bláhová, *Poznámka k recepci České kroniky Jana Marignoly z Florencie ve středověkých Čechách*, in: Helena Krmičková – Anna Pumprová – Dana Růžicková – Libor Švanda (eds.), *Querite primum regnum Dei*, Brno 2006.

Library (shelfmark I D 10).³³ Another manuscript in the same library (shelf mark I C 24)³⁴ contains only a few excerpts of the text and a third manuscript, now at the Marciana Library in Venice (shelfmark lat. X 188 [3628]),³⁵ contains only the first book and the beginning of the second. All these manuscripts belong to the 15th century and they are collections of heterogeneous texts, mostly focused on historical works and documents pertaining to Bohemia, especially to the period of Charles IV.

The two Prague manuscripts are very similar in the outlook as well as in the content. Most of the texts included are from the 14th century and are related to Charles IV and his reign. The only main difference between the two is the way they deal with Marignolli's *Chronicon*. Manuscript I D 10 is a composite book, in which the texts copied in the 15th century are placed side by side with interpolated documentary materials of the 17th century. Among the other contents,³⁶ the presence of Marignolli's and Pulkava's chronicles (ff. 1r–102v; ff. 109r–215r) is significant because both are products of Charles IV's guidelines on historiography. We will focus later on the connection between these two works.

Manuscript I C 24 dates from the second half of the 15th century. Its content is partially similar to the other manuscript, but it contains more texts related to Charles IV, his court and his intellectual entourage. The manuscript actually seems to be a copy of a miscellaneous book produced in Prague during the second half of the 14th century. In this manuscript we find Pulkava's chronicle (ff. 1r–82r), a list of Bohemian kings and bishops (ff. 83r–87v), the *Vita* of Charles IV (ff. 90r–112v), the text of the *Bulla Aurea* (ff. 171v–185v) and some excerpts from Marignolli's chronicle (f. 202r/v). The presence of excerpts from Marsilius of Padua's *Tractatus de translatione imperii* (ff. 190v–198r) and from Petrarch's *De sui ipsius et multorum ignorantia* (ff. 203r–205v) is interesting as well, because of the links of both authors with the imperial court. Significant also is the presence of excerpts from Godfrey of Viterbo's *Pantheon* (ff. 206v–315r) and of Martin of Troppau's *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum* (ff. 198v–201v): these works were important sources to Marignolli's *Chronicon Bohemorum*, so they were probably significant within Prague's culture of the time.³⁷

At f. 205v an 18th century lector steps in remarking his removal of some sheets because, as he states, they contain useless materials, not pertaining to the principal subject of the manuscript, which is history.³⁸ So the manuscript, after this intrusion, lost some material: perhaps, we lost some texts that we could imagine similar to the ones of Petrarch and Marsilius, the only texts not following historiographical topics. This is a great loss, because this manuscript – or better its antigraph – seems to have been an interesting outcome of Prague's cultural milieu during Charles' reign.

³³ Josef TRUHLÁŘ, *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum latinorum qui in C. R. bibliotheca publica atque Universitatis Pragensis asservantur*, I, Praha 1905, pp. 54–55.

³⁴ J. TRUHLÁŘ, *Catalogus*, pp. 39–41.

³⁵ Giuseppe VALENTINELLI, *Bibliotheca manuscripta ad S. Marci Venetiarum. Codices mss. Latini*, VI, Venezia 1873, pp. 99–101.

³⁶ Remarkable too is the presence of the *Vita* of Charles IV (ff. 216r–238v). For a full description of the manuscript's contents J. TRUHLÁŘ, *Catalogus*, pp. 54–55.

³⁷ For a full description of the manuscript's contents J. TRUHLÁŘ, *Catalogus*, pp. 39–41. See also: M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Poznámka k recepci*, pp. 337–340.

³⁸ The text of the gloss is: "Hic sequebantur miscellanea quaedam theologica partim etiam philosophica et poetica, ad historiam parum aut nihil facientia. Ut autem in hoc volumine uberioris historiae locus esset, omnia illa folia inutilia eieci, et chartam puram, in qua conformia credentibus scriberentur, substituendam esse putavi."

In both manuscripts Marignolli's *Chronicon Bohemorum* is placed side by side to Pulkava's *Chronica Bohemiae*. The latter was composed in 1374, about twenty years after the former (which was composed between 1355 and 1358). Both works, as we said, are chronicles of Bohemia written on Charles IV's demand. We have already seen the programmatic declaration included in Marignolli's *Chronicon*'s prologue; let's now inspect Pulkava's work more closely.³⁹

This author, like Marignolli, came from an academic background: we know that he was 'doctor artium' and teacher at St. Egidius' school in Prague, similar to Marignolli who had been teacher as well at the franciscan *Studium* of Bologna. As we said, Pulkava's work starts off as an universal chronicle, like Marignolli's, but is strictly focused on Bohemian history from its beginning.

Its conclusion, in particular, is very interesting when compared with Marignolli's prologue. Pulkava's *Chronica Bohemiae*'s *explicit* reads: "*Explicit cronica Boemorum, quam [...] Przbico de Tradenina, arcium liberalium doctor, congregavit ac composuit ab origine terre Boemie omnium ducum et regum, qui suis temporibus ipsam gubernaverunt et in ea regnaverunt, ex omnibus cronicis omnium monasteriorum et quorundam baronum, ubicunque potuit conquirere. Scitoque tamen istud, quod omnes res fabulose et non vere ac fidei dissimiles sunt obmisit et reiecte, sed quod verum et certum est, de eis excerptum, hoc est in hac cronica mandato predicti imperatoris positum. Nam illas omnes res certas et veras ac gesta seu facta sue terre Boemie idem imperator, quam pervalide super omnes alias suas terras dilexit, solus omnibus cronicis monasteriorum et baronum visis et cum summa diligencia perlectis memorato Przbiconi demandavit ex eis unam cronicam veram et rectam conscribere et in unum volumen redigere.*"⁴⁰ ("Here ends the Bohemian Chronicle that [...] Pribik of Radenin, doctor in Arts, collected and composed on Charles IV's invitation. He composed this chronicle by collecting all the chronicles that he could find at monasteries and at some secular lords' libraries, wherever he could trace them. And you have to know that all things that are imaginary, not true and opposite to our faith, have been left out and refused. Only what is true and certain, selected from those works, has been included in this new chronicle, according to the emperor's will. The emperor himself, indeed, after having looked at all those chronicles from monasteries and lords, and after having read them carefully, asked the above-mentioned Pribik to collect and put together all these certain and true information, like Bohemian facts and deeds, in a fair and true chronicle, in one book.")

The emperor's guidelines given to Pulkava seem to be similar to the ones expressed in Marignolli's *Chronicon Bohemorum*. We can compare Marignolli's prologue and Pulkava's conclusion:

³⁹ For further information on the comparison of Marignolli's and Pulkava's works M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Odráz státní ideologie*; M. BLÁHOVÁ, "... *ad probos mores*".

⁴⁰ PRZIBICO DE RADENIN dictus PULKAHA, *Chronicon Bohemiae*, ed. Josef EMLER, Praha 1893 (*Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, V), p. 207.

Marignolli: <i>Cronicarum antiquas et novas hystorias maxime Boemorum obscure conscriptas [...] transcurri mandavimus.</i>	Pulkava: <i>Congregavit ac composuit [...] ex omnibus cronicis omnium monasteriorum et quorundam baronum, ubicunque potuit conquirere.</i>
Marignolli: <i>Amputatis obscuris verborum ambagibus et superfluis resecatis ac interpositis quibusdam utilibus.</i>	Pulkava: <i>Omnes res fabulose et non vere ac fidei dissimiles sunt obmisce et reiecte, sed quod verum et certum est, de eis excerptum, hoc est in hac cronica mandato predicti imperatoris positum.</i>
Marignolli: <i>Cronicarum boemicalium ystorias obscure quidem pristinae conscriptas in unum magis lucide compendium [...] duxi regulandas.</i>	Pulkava: <i>Ex eis unam cronicam veram et rectam conscribere et in unum volumen redigere.</i>

In both circumstances Charles explicitly invited the authors to collect all existing Bohemian chronicles checking and revising them in order to write a unique historiographical book, which would have been free from useless and superfluous material.⁴¹

Yet it's clear to notice that between the two books' programmatic declarations there are some slight but significant differences: in Marignolli's prologue the intention of '*superflua resecare*' was joined to the one of '*quaedam utilia interponere*'. Moreover, it seemed that he especially wanted to remove useless rhetorical affectations ('*obscurae verborum ambages*') that made the contents less clear. Pulkava's chronicle *explicit*, on the other hand, clearly expresses the intention of cutting out from previous chronicles all the information that seemed '*fabulose et non vere ac fidei dissimiles*', in order to put first only things that were specifically '*certe*' et '*vere*' (the word '*verum*' is often repeated).

In the end, comparing these two texts we can assume that Marignolli interpreted Charles' guidelines in his own way and took advantage of his chronicle's universal and encyclopaedic structure to enrich the contents with the narration of his own experience. The topics of the long digressions placed in the first part of *Chronicon Bohemorum* actually seem to match perfectly with Pulkava's definition of '*fabulose, non vere ac fidei dissimiles*': Marignolli consistently spices up his account with curious oriental legends and fictitious experiences (for example, his meeting with the queen of Sheba or the location of the Garden of Eden). Furthermore, he writes several paragraphs about costumes and rituals of Buddhists and Hinduists, telling the reader how much he admires their authentic and sincere faith.⁴²

It's really probable that Charles didn't appreciate Marignolli's work, which seems also incomplete. After the Italian's death the Emperor reformulated his request to another writer: yet this time he chose a real Bohemian, not a foreigner, to whom he asked for a chronicle that would have been a true 'Bohemian chronicle', despite of the universal structure. Above all, he wanted him to restrict his narrative to real historical facts, without legends, curiosities or oddities.

⁴¹ For a comparison of Marignolli's prologue and Pulkava's explicit M. BLÁHOVÁ, "*... ad probos mores*", pp. 115–117.

⁴² Iohannis DE MARIGNOLLIS, *Chronicon Bohemorum. Excerpta de rebus orientalibus*.

This hypothesis could be confirmed by the way in which Marignolli's text is treated in manuscript I C 24: the manuscript contains only three paragraphs extracted from the whole work, which fit into only one folio (folio 202 recto and verso). Furthermore, under the copied text there is an annotation made by a later reader of the manuscript, which shows a great lack of interest towards Marignolli's work: the reader addresses the copyist directly, in German: "*Hastu nit mehr gwüsst oder khönet, so hettest diss auch wol bleiben lassen.*" In English, it could sound like this: "Were you not able to find anything better in this text? Then you should have better avoided copying it at all!"⁴³

In conclusion, some words on the Venice manuscript: it's a 15th century manuscript composed in Slesia in connection with the work of Nicholas Tempelfeld and shows a completely opposite reception of the text.⁴⁴ The *Chronicon Bohemorum*, in fact, is copied there concerning only his more 'universal' section, the one that contains the digressions about Marignolli's journey. The narration of Bohemian history is totally omitted. Therefore it's clear that the manuscript was produced in a different context (it indeed belongs to a different branch of the tradition).⁴⁵ We can assume it also by paying attention to its contents: it is less focused on Charles IV and more heterogeneous.⁴⁶

The treatment of Marignolli's text in the Venetian manuscript exemplifies another way the text had been understood: a collection of exotic curiosities about Asia rather than a chronicle of Bohemia with celebratory purposes.

IRENE MALFATTO

Jan Marignola a historiografický projekt Karla IV.

RESUMÉ

Ze všech českých kronik napsaných během vlády Karla IV. (celkem pět textů vzniklých mezi lety 1353 až 1374) je pouze kronika Jana Marignoly uvozena významným prologem. Podle něho prý císař požádal v roce 1355 tohoto italského mnicha, aby shromáždil všechny dřívější kroniky zachycující českou historii, zhodnotil je a přišel s novým všeobecným narativem. Marignolova práce měla sledovat projekt historiografické renovace: Karel si přál přepsat českou historii za účelem oslavy svého zvolení císařem. Univerzální vyprávění mělo sahát od počátku světa až do tehdejší současnosti. Františkán měl však vlastní plány. Pochyboval o císařově výslovném vybidnutí „*superflua resecare*“ z dřívějších kronik a „*quaedam utilia interponere*“, namísto toho protkal své dílo mnohými odbočkami, které se nevztahovaly k české historii, vycházely však z jeho osobní zkušenosti. V roce 1338 byl totiž Marignola vyslán na Dálný východ jako papežský legát a během své dobrodružné cesty navštívil centrální Asii, Čínu, Indii, Blízký východ a Svatou zemi. V jeho *Chronicon Bohemorum*, jak je výsledné dílo nazýváno, proto v první části hovoří například o budhistických rituálech, uvádí legendy o pozemském ráji a popisuje různá *mirabilia*.

Marignolovo dílo, které je zachováno ve třech rukopisech, z nichž dva jsou uloženy v Národní knihovně v Praze, zřejmě Karla neuspokojilo. Proto v roce 1374 požádal Přibíka Pulkaavu z Radenína, aby napsal další alternativní českou kroniku. Pulkaavova *Chronica Bohemiae*, která je dochována ve dvou rukopisech uchovávaných

⁴³ M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Poznámka k recepci*, p. 337.

⁴⁴ M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Poznámka k recepci*, p. 335.

⁴⁵ For further information on the *Chronicon Bohemorum*'s *stemma codicum* Heribert A. HILGERS, *Zum Text der 'Cronica Boemorum' des Johannes de Marignolis*, *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch* 15, 1980, pp. 143–154; Iohannis DE MARIGNOLLIS, *Chronicon Bohemorum. Excerpta de rebus orientalibus*, pp. V–VII.

⁴⁶ For a full description of the manuscript's contents G. VALENTINELLI, *Bibliotheca manuscripta*, pp. 99–101.

Národní knihovnou v Praze (I D 10, I C 24), je velmi odlišným dílem. Její autor se zaměřil výhradně na českou historii, a co více, zdůraznil, že „*omnes res fabulose et non vere ac fidei dissimiles sunt obmisse et reiecte*“, čímž pravděpodobně odkazoval na neobvyklý obsah Marignolův. Nedostatečné ocenění díla italského mnicha se odráží i v jeho rukopisném dochování.

Český překlad: Jan Odstrčilík

Irene Malfatto
International Society for the Study of Medieval Latin Culture (S.I.S.M.E.L.)
Firenze, Italy
irene.malfatto@gmail.com

CHARLES IV AND LEARNED ORDER: THE DISCOURSE ON KNOWLEDGE IN ‘*DER MEIDE KRANZ*’

LENA OETJENS

ABSTRACT

By establishing the University of Prague, Emperor Charles IV pursued a synthesis of religion and knowledge, which itself helped to define his self-conception as a ruler. The vernacular poetry of the Prague Court in the fourteenth century also bears witness to intense contemporary interest in the natural sciences and the dynamic strategies of legitimation via Christian argument. A case in point is the poetry of Heinrich of Mügeln. Charles IV plays a special role in ‘*Der meide kranz*’ in which Heinrich of Mügeln presents him as a wise and venerable ruler. He builds on known models, such as Alan of Lille’s ‘*Anticlaudianus*’, and maps a court situation whose inherent and depicted order invites a specific evaluation of the ruler. I shall consider Heinrich’s definition of philosophy, which is expressed via an angel-motif, and how the text gives fresh insight into Charles’s image as a reformer of the empire.

Keywords: Heinrich of Mügeln: ‘*Der meide kranz*’ – Charles IV as a judge – philosophy – arranging nature

1. Introduction

Heinrich’s poetry has been assessed critically, not least for his distinctive manner of presenting and distinguishing content. S. Köbele contrasts Frauenlob’s generic preference for ambiguity (intentional vagueness and paradox) with Heinrich’s obsessive pleasure over recurring decision-making processes.¹ Meanwhile, ‘*Der meide kranz*’ has been described as a static system by Ch. Huber, owing to its supposed lack of innovation as compared to Alan of Lille’s ‘*Anticlaudianus*’.²

Making distinctions for Heinrich is not an end in itself, but rather serves to emphasize something else. Let us consider how Emperor Charles IV acts as judge in the first part of Heinrich’s poem. The device of judgement appears in other contemporary texts, but

¹ Susanne KÖBELE, *Frauenlobs Lieder – Parameter einer literarhistorischen Standortbestimmung*, Tübingen 2003 (= Bibliotheca Germanica 43), p. 252: “Mügeln setzt sich poetologisch und konzeptionell entschieden von Frauenlob ab. Auf dessen Poetik einer nicht mehr geschlossen-allegorisch hierarchisierten widersprüchlichen Sinnvielfalt reagiert er mit einer fast obsessiven Lust an *underscheit* und *ordnung*, Ordnungen in Unterordnungen unablässig wiederholend. Mit dieser Einstellung fügt Mügeln sich ganz in die Tendenz des Spätmittelalters, das immer entschiedener Wissen als Unterscheidungskwissen, Rationalität als vernunftgeleitete Unterscheidungsfähigkeit definiert.”

² Christoph HUBER, *Die Aufnahme und Verarbeitung des Alanus ab Insulis in mittelhochdeutschen Dichtungen. Untersuchungen zu Thomasin von Zerkläre, Gottfried von Straßburg, Frauenlob, Heinrich von Neustadt, Heinrich von St. Gallen, Heinrich von Mügeln und Johannes von Tepl*, München 1988 (= Münchener Texte und Untersuchungen 89), p. 305: “Der eigentliche Anstoß des ‘*Anticlaudianus*’ ist abgeschnitten. Mügeln entwickelt keine Erneuerungshandlung, sondern ein statisches System. Die bereits festliegende Zuordnung der Mächte erfährt eine Klärung, nicht eine Veränderung als ‘restitutio’.”

Heinrich of Mügeln completes his multi-stage discussion about the order of knowledge with a self-referential reflection. ‘*Der meide kranz*’ combines the decision-making process with the representation of emperor and poet. E. Schlotheuber refers to the importance of creating a successful image of Charles IV as a ruler with secular and sacrosanct power: “*Nicht mehr die Interessensdurchsetzung mittels Gewalt, die in Turnieren und Fehden ihren gesellschaftlich akzeptierten Ausdruck fand und Leben und Handeln des Vaters Johann maßgeblich bestimmt hatten, sondern vielmehr die friedliche Beilegung der Konflikte auf dem Verhandlungsweg oder vor Gericht sollten nun ausschlaggebend sein. [...] Um friedliche Konfliktlösungen zu ermöglichen, musste im umkämpften Böhmen jedoch erst eine Legitimationsbasis, also gleichsam erst Raum geschaffen werden – ein Weg, den der Luxemburger mit der Sakralisierung der eigenen Machtsphäre energisch beschritt.*”³

Reactions to the same statement in the poem vary, especially about a delicate role of Heinrich’s angel-motif. A critical eye to Heinrich’s notions about philosophy helps for understanding the structure and intention of ‘*Der meide kranz*’.

2. Charles IV as Judge in the Literature of fourteenth-century Prague

As E. Schlotheuber emphasizes, Charles IV did not correspond to the traditional image of his chivalrous ancestors. Rather, he replaced warfare with diplomacy and founded the University of Prague. To earn the respect of noblemen, he needed to dominate public space and to establish a claim to power with a specific projection of himself as a wise and venerable ruler.⁴

This tension between knowledge and faith grew large in the contemporary discourse, as we see in a well-known letter to Charles IV, probably written by his chancellor Johann of Neumarkt.⁵ He speaks, for instance, of the risks of logic and mathematics.⁶ As an example of possible imbalance, we read: “*Suscitare ab ignorancie nebulis, imprudens Episcopo, assumpti laboris contempnas ineptias, a squalenti sterilitate declinans oculos tui intellectus ad amena paradisi florentia semper nemora ymaginacione beata conuerte! Astrorum*

³ Eva SCHLOTHEUBER, *Der Ausbau Prags zur Residenzstadt und die Herrschaftskonzeption Karls IV.*, in: Prag und die großen Kulturzentren Europas in der Zeit der Luxemburger (1310–1437). Internationale Konferenz aus Anlass des 660. Jubiläums der Gründung der Karlsuniversität in Prag, 31. März – 5. April 2008, Praha 2008, pp. 601–621, p. 602f.

⁴ E. SCHLOTHEUBER, *Der Ausbau Prags zur Residenzstadt*, p. 608f.: “Die ungeheuren Anstrengungen [...] entspringen vielmehr der Notwendigkeit, die eigene Rolle zeremoniell und symbolisch innerhalb der Gesellschaft zu verankern und mit allen zur Verfügung stehenden Medien, in Architektur und Skulptur, in Schrift und Bild umzusetzen. Dieser Strategie verdanken wir auch die vielen schriftlichen Zeugnisse sowohl aus Karls eigener Feder als auch aus der Feder hofnaher Kreise.”

⁵ Cf. Christoph HUBER, *Alanus ab Insulis in mittelhochdeutschen Dichtungen*, p. 260f, Michael STOLZ, *Vivus est sermo tuus. Religion und Wissen in der Prager Hofkultur des 14. Jahrhunderts*, in: Klaus Ridder – Steffen Patzold (edd.), *Die Aktualität der Vormoderne. Epochenentwürfe zwischen Alterität und Kontinuität* (Europa im Mittelalter 23), Berlin 2013, pp. 267–294.

⁶ M. STOLZ, *Vivus est sermo tuus*, p. 288: “Nam philosophia contempta ad eam nunc supernaturalem philosophiam intellectus mei aciem dispono conuertere, que non rationum probabilium argumentis innititur, non loyca cauillatione distrahitur, non mathematica persuasione fulcitur, sed in eo beatam sibi sedem vendicat, in eo veritatis fundamenta metatur, qui lapis abscisus de monte sine manibus sue virtutis inuicta potencia sustinet vniuersa.”

loca, cursus et numeros cum suo Ptolomeo, Esculapio vel Hermete relinquo Egipciis, et imperatoris eterni, domini Dei pro te crucifixi, comitare vestigia.”⁷

The letter reveals how some refused to make a radical choice for one way over another. This sort of rejection of knowledge makes no sense in an intellectual capacity. The solution might be again to combine knowledge with virtue by turning to an authority who – with secular and sacrosanct power at the same time – can decide about the balance of knowledge and faith. Nonetheless, the letter gives insight into contemporary events at the Prague Court: whereas Charles IV realizes an extensive religious programme (e.g., elevating Prague to an archbishopric, founding the university after the model of Paris, building St. Vitus Cathedral and sponsoring many reliquaries), there were also critical noblemen and scholars around him. Poetry makes it possible to expound different aspects of an issue, even delicate and controversial ones, as long as the texts do not overstep accepted limits. Charles IV was a patron of literature and arts: they were means of expressing his status and self-conception.⁸ We know of other texts that served such a function, such as the anonymous dialogue ‘*Cogor adversum te*’⁹ or the ‘*Sangspruchdichtung*’.

‘*Der meide kranz*’, which means ‘The Garland of the Virgin’ was composed shortly after the year 1355. The poet, Heinrich of Mügeln, was a learned lay person with a clerical education. In ‘*Der meide kranz*’ Heinrich probes the tensions between knowledge and faith, and he combines the cult of the Virgin Mary¹⁰ with the question of the world order.

The first book presents a debate between twelve personified domains from the arts and sciences. The Emperor Charles IV acts as judge. In his verdict, he chooses *Theologia* as victor. She has the honour of setting the first gemstone in the garland of the Virgin. That verdict is in turn confirmed by the personifications of nature and the twelve virtues. The second book then contains a debate between nature and the virtues, in which the figure *Theologia* acts as a mediator, and ends by granting precedence to the virtues.¹¹ *Natura* still enforces her stature and views via an exploration of the cosmological order and the twelve signs of

⁷ M. STOLZ, *Vivus est sermo tuus*, p. 290; transl. L. Oetjens: “Be taken up from the fogs of ignorance, silly bishop! You should disdain the foolishness of the effort you undertook! Turn through blessed musing the eyes of your mind from a squalid wasteland to the pleasant, ever flowering groves of paradise. The places, paths and numbers of the stars with their Ptolemy, Aesculapius and Hermes, leave them to the Egyptians, and rather follow the trace of the Eternal Emperor, the Lord God, who was crucified for you.”

⁸ František KAVKA – Rosemarie BORÁN, *Am Hofe Karls IV.*, Stuttgart 1990, p. 158f.: “Die Hochachtung vor der Kunst und die Verehrung der Schönheit überhaupt hatten an Karls Hof ihre zeitgebundenen, religiös-philosophischen Wurzeln. Grundlage war die Lehre des heiligen Augustinus, die davon ausging, daß sich der Erkenntnisprozeß über das Auge vollziehe: Erst durch die Widerspiegelung in der menschlichen Seele nehmen Gegenstände und durch sie ausgedrückte Eigenschaften tatsächliche Gestalt an. Man glaubte, Schönheit in der Natur sowie in den Schöpfungen menschlicher Hände verbinde als höchstes Gut die irdische mit der überirdischen Welt, durch das Empfinden des Schönen näherte sich der Mensch ‘unsichtbar an der Hand geführt’ Gott.”

⁹ Bernd-Ulrich HERGMÖLLER, *Cogor adversum te: drei Studien zum literarisch-theologischen Profil Karls IV. und seiner Kanzlei*, Warendorf 1999. He identifies some common ground for philosophical arguments in ‘*Cogor adversum te*’ and ‘*Der meide kranz*’, here p. 70f.: ideas of the emanations, the contrast between the sinful world and the divine realm of heaven, Charles’s judgement as highest judicial authority on earth.

¹⁰ F. KAVKA, *Am Hofe Karls IV.*, p. 155: “Das Interesse an kontemplativer Literatur brachte Karls Hof in enge Beziehung zur Bewegung der ‘devotio moderna’ (neue Frömmigkeit). [...] Zeugnis der Verehrung der Gottesmutter legen die Dichtungen Heinrichs von Mügeln sowie das von Ernst und offenbar auch Karl IV. inspirierte Werk des Dichters der Prager Kartause, Konrad von Haimburg, ‘Laudes Mariae’ (Marienlob) ab.”

¹¹ This part especially refers to the ‘Anticlaudianus’; Ch. HUBER, *Alanus ab Insulis in mittelhochdeutschen Dichtungen*; Johannes KIBELKA, *Der ware meister. Denkstile und Bauformen in der Dichtung Heinrichs von Mügeln*, Berlin 1963.

the zodiac. Yet in the closing twelve lines, the narrator – called the *meister* – upholds *Theologia*'s preference. As a whole, we have, then, a three-stage evaluative process involving science, theology, nature and the virtues. The Emperor Charles through his action gives a prefiguration of the emergent final judgement. Heinrich installs Charles IV as an instance of ordering knowledge, himself focused on the sciences. The seven liberal arts are framed by *Philosophia* and *Theologia*, and joined additionally by three subjects: *Phisica*, *Alchimia*, and *Metaphisica*.

In a close reading I want to ask, on the basis of its angel-motif, how Heinrich of Mügeln engages and develops the tension between knowledge and Christian faith. Angels, of course, symbolize at once both religious and cosmological forces.

3. Heinrich of Mügeln's Idea of Philosophy and the Discursive Angel-Motif

Since the reception of Aristotle and the new dynamism of learning in the twelfth century, the significance of philosophy as such was being reassessed. Philosophy was commonly divided into natural, moral and metaphysical philosophy.¹² Ch. Huber identifies different concepts of philosophy in Heinrich's poetry.¹³ '*Der meide kranz*' seems to give a crude series of philosophical variants at first. But based on separate Latin characterisation of another text by Heinrich (Clm 14574, 145v–146r),¹⁴ Huber finds an order which is perhaps not consistent with what then seemed 'modern', but was nonetheless comprehensible: "*Mügeln isoliert aus der alten umfassenden philosophia die oberste Theoriestufe, die antike 'Theologie', und placiert sie als 'Metaphysica' zwischen Naturlehre und eine christlich-dogmatisch verstandene Theologie.*"¹⁵

In the debate between the arts in the first book it is important to separate belief in angels¹⁶ from cosmological knowledge concerning celestial movers¹⁷ (though these may overlap with angels in a Christian perspective¹⁸). Angels and celestial movers appear several times in the '*Der meide kranz*', and their respective valuation differs in each case.

At the beginning of the first book (MK 69–118, 119–896) the emperor puts the arts in their place, and especially criticizes the natural sciences, while at the same time he extols *Theologia*. The twelve speakers (with 50 lines each) are consecutively mated with attributes appropriate to their skills and field of activity, and by a special closing turn linked

¹² Jürgen SARNOWSKY, *Zur Entwicklung der Naturerkenntnis an den mittelalterlichen Universitäten*, in: Peter Dilg (ed.), *Natur im Mittelalter*, Berlin 2003, pp. 50–69; here p. 52.

¹³ Christoph HUBER, *Philosophia-Konzepte und literarische Brechungen*, in: W. Haug – B. Wachinger, *Literatur, Artes und Philosophie. Reisensburger Gespräch*, Tübingen 1992, pp. 1–22; here pp. 16–18.

¹⁴ J. KIBELKA, *Der ware meister*, p. 40; Karl STACKMANN (ed.), *Die kleineren Dichtungen Heinrichs von Mügeln. Zweite Abteilung, mit Beiträgen v. M. STOLZ*, Berlin 2003 (= Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters 84), p. 30: Inc. I. *Philosophia in se cunctas recludit ciencias [...]* II. *In fretum parens fluminum [...]* III. *Quid motor primus sit, indicat philosophia.*

¹⁵ Ch. HUBER, *Philosophia-Konzepte und literarische Brechungen*, p. 18.

¹⁶ The Bible twice evokes the number of the angels: Dan. 7,10: "Millia millium ministrabant ei, et decies millies centena milia assistebant ei."; Apoc. 5,11: "Et vidi et audiui vocem angelorum multorum in circuitu throni et animalium et seniorum et erat numerus eorum milia milium." Thomas Aquinas discusses the question in his '*Summa theologiae*', 1a 1ae, quaest. 50, art. 3: "Utrum angeli sint in aliquo magno numero."

¹⁷ ARISTOTLE, *Metaphysica*, XII, 8.

¹⁸ Cf. Calcidius' translation and commentary of PLATO's *Timaeus*.

to the Incarnation. While they mean to recommend themselves to the emperor, they inflate their claims; the natural sciences stand out by their over-estimation of their abilities. The emperor pronounces his verdict in light of that. *Aritmetica*, for one, can count many things and explain number-relations. Her skills are essential for statesmen and merchants (MK 354–359). But in the end she oversteps the limit (MK 361–368): “*Ich zalt uß gottes herzen gar / der engel und der geiste schar. / des mag ich in der kronen stan, / sint ich nach zal gegeben han / hie gottes kinde sin gelit, / das in das herze wart gesmit / der meit, von eines wortes kraft / mit geistes flichtikeit durchsaft.*”¹⁹ Charles’s verdict says she cannot count everything: Christ’s wounds are countless (MK 815–820). It is remarkable that Charles does not criticize the enumerating of angels here.

Philosophia and *Metaphisica* overlap somewhat and call for nuance; the latter is not clearly separable from philosophy and theology. *Philosophia* claims to have invented the order of nature, and the ability to explain it, including the angels and God (MK 137–140): “*Und wie das got hab keine stat, / und wie der engel wegen gat / gein im nach der naturen ler, / und wonet uß der achten sper.*”²⁰ The emperor’s verdict contradicts that claim: the natural order comes from God and is part of his Creation (MK 793–799): “*Mich dunkt die erste meit / von stören und geben seit, / und wozu hat nature pflicht, / daruf sie buwet ir geticht. / die letzte, wer des hersche gar / und ouch naturen gebe nar.*”²¹

Metaphisica addresses cosmology, too. She straddles the divide between nature (*naturen fluß*, MK 644) and the other arts. Her example points at certain angels (MK 657–659): “*Ouch ist das von der lere min, / wie das der engel achte sin, / die alle speren wegn in tat.*”²² Charles IV reacts very aggressively this time; her teaching contradicts his faith: “*Die eilften lobt ich immer me: / nu dunkt mich, wie ir tichten ste / swerlich gein dem gelouben min: / sie lert mich, wie acht engel sin.*”²³ The risk of conflict between claimed knowledge and established faith is apparent here. Although the aspects of counting (MK 361–368) and celestial movers (MK 137–140) have been mentioned before, *Metaphisica* oversteps the theological limit. From a religious point of view, angels are countless because of their myriad number (the Bible is certainly clear on more than eight) or because they are non-material beings (as

¹⁹ Annette VOLFING, Heinrich von Mügeln: ‘*Der meide kranz*’. A Commentary, Tübingen 1997, p. 106: “I counted the hosts of angels and spirits from God’s heart. Therefore I may rightly stand in the crown, since I have given limbs in number to God’s child, who was forged into the heart of the maiden, who was permeated with the moisture of the Spirit through the power of one Word.”

²⁰ A. VOLFING, ‘*Der meide kranz*’, p. 45: “And [I teach] how God has no location and how the movement of the angels goes against him according to the teachings of natural philosophy, and how [he] lives beyond the eighth sphere.”

²¹ A. VOLFING, ‘*Der meide kranz*’, p. 185: “It seems to me that the first maiden speaks of corruption and generation and the rightful operations of Natura. That is the basis of her teaching. The last one speaks of him who is the absolute ruler and also gives nourishment to Natura.”

²² A. VOLFING, ‘*Der meide kranz*’, p. 165: “My teaching also states that there are eight angels who actually move all the spheres. God’s providence moves as a final cause.”

²³ A. VOLFING, ‘*Der meide kranz*’, p. 186: “The eleventh one I always praised: yet it now seems to me that her teaching stands squarely in opposition to my faith. She teaches that there are eight angels.”; Michael STOLZ, *Artes-liberales-Zyklen. Formationen des Wissens im Mittelalter*, Tübingen – Basel 2004 (Bibliotheca Germanica 47), p. 574: “An der Metaphysik tadelt der kaiserliche Richter, dass sie zu wenig genau zwischen den Bewegern der acht Himmelsphären und der zahllosen Engelschar der himmlischen Hierarchien unterscheide; dies impliziert, dass die Metaphysik ungerechtfertigterweise von ihrem Gebiet der Seinsordnungen (hier der Sphärenbeweger) zu jenem der Theologie (hier der Engelshierarchien) übertrete (vv. 853–858).”

Thomas Aquinas explained).²⁴ *Metaphisica* names herself *kunst gottes* and does not accept that faith does not have to be completely explicable.

Theologia is undoubtedly the winner. Charles IV praises her and does so again via the angel-motif (MK 857–861): “*Die letzte engel ane zal / setzet: der ich geleuben sal. / nie falschen spruch ich in ir fant: darum üch allen si bekant, / das sie die wirde süle han.*”²⁵ The layman emperor considers matters with an eye to his own salvation. The effect is cumulative. Charles himself combines knowledge and *zucht* (MK 893–896), and the verdict ensues: “*Natura spricht, es si ein ban, / wer kunst will ane sitten han; / kunst ane zucht sie achtet nicht, / wann sie hat alle kunst geticht.*”²⁶ Nevertheless, the discussion about the angels (including the cosmological aspects) that is finally decided by Charles’s verdict illustrates Huber’s approach to the systematization of philosophy and supports his view that *Metaphisica* advocates and represents an ‘ancient’ conception of knowledge.

In the second part of the first book (MK 897–1356), the arts and the virtues proceed to *Natura*, they confirm Charles’s verdict, and *Theologia*’s priority. At this point, *Natura* builds the garland of the Virgin, and she sets twelve equal gemstones in it (MK 1347–1356).²⁷

In the second book, where the virtues are ranked (MK 1357–2288), angels stand in for created beings, while Heinrich makes four particular virtues discuss the fall of Lucifer as the beginning of evil. The main thing here is keeping peace, and we should note how the peace-loving virtues – justice, humility, truth, peace – are emphasized with an eye to Charles himself as an idealized emperor.²⁸

The virtues and *Natura* argue over their relative standing. The virtues point to the bad example of the vanquished hybris of the ‘artistic’ skills or disciplines in the first book. By contrast, the virtues themselves use arguments of faith following the model of *Theologia*. *Theologia*’s verdict will thus affirm the virtues, but conclude that they belong together as ordained by God (MK 2257–2272).²⁹ We find an instance, here too, of the angel-motif, when Heinrich makes Lucifer’s fall³⁰ the subject of discussion. Four of the virtues speak

²⁴ Cf. note 16.

²⁵ A. VOLFING, ‘*Der meide kranz*’, p. 186: “The last one puts forward angels without number: Her I shall believe. I never found an untrue statement in her and for that reason she shall have the honour.”

²⁶ Transl. L. Oetjens: “*Natura* says it is a disgrace if someone means to have skill without good form; she has no regard for skill without good form, for she herself has fashioned every skill.” Cf. A. VOLFING, ‘*Der meide kranz*’, p. 200.

²⁷ A. VOLFING, ‘*Der meide kranz*’, p. 232: “Die tugend und der künste schar / des tichtes forme nigen gar / und die Natur, und gink zuhan, / da sie die richsten kronen fant, / die alle schon gar übertrit, / wann sie got selber hat gesmit, / und kronte da die maget rich. / zwelf stern in der kronen glich / da stunden; ewik was ir schin. / – hie sal des buches ende sin.”

²⁸ The theological virtues – love, hope, faith – close and culminate the complete list.

²⁹ A. VOLFING, ‘*Der meide kranz*’, p. 332f.: “The third argument is as follows: before nature was created, [and] the heavens, the sea and all things, the angels and the circle of the stars – before that, God must have possessed virtue, out of which the existence of *Natura* emanated. Without virtue, God could not have brought about the creation of nature. Virtue is widely called ‘God’, in all seriousness. One says, ‘The virtue caritas was the virtue of God and [identical with] God himself.’ By this it is clearly proven that *Natura* derived her nourishment from God’s virtue, without any doubt: therefore virtue shall have the [highest] honour.”

³⁰ Isaiah 14,12–15: “*Quomodo cecidisti de caelo, lucifer, qui mane oriebaris; corruisti in terram qui vulnerabas gentes. qui dicebas in corde tuo, in caelum conscendam, super astra Dei exaltabo solium meum, sededo in monte testamenti in lateribus aquilonis; ascendam super altitudinem nubium, ero similis Altissimo. verumtamen ad infernum detraheris in profundum laci.*”

about the sin of pride,³¹ which is punished by God, and which here leads to a clash over the angel-motif already familiar from the discourse on the arts in the first book:

Gerechtikeit (justice) connects the fall from Heaven with the Fall of Man. Moreover, she calls herself the guard of heaven by pointing out her evenhandedness, and warns in addition against the danger of pride (MK 1537–1548): “*Ich hūte gottes herzen pfort: / scharf ist mins rütelinges ort, / darin die hochfart sich versneit, / das sie muß immer tragen leit: / min hant sie und ir engel all / treip von dem himmel hin zutal. / da sie ufbruch ir wille truk. / ouch uß dem paradis ich sluk / den ersten menschen, da er brach / den apfel von des boumes dach. / der bruch der widerspenikeit / muß von mir immer tragen leit.*”³²

Demütikeit (humility) has been involved in the First Fall, too. Her duty is to discern between good and evil (MK 1800–1808): “*Min hant den ersten engel stiß / gewaldik in der helle tal, / darinn er ewik bliben sal: / sust ich den menschen nider hie, / der minen wek erkante nie. / gewalt wer an mich halden wil, / des fal hat endelosen zil. / wo ich nicht vor dem menschen ge, / zu gott er kummet nimmer me.*”³³

Warheit (truth) is an essential element of Creation; she thus also is a key touchstone and criterion (MK 1855–1866): “*Ich bin sin wort und ouch sin kint: / von mir gesat die himmel sint, / die stern und ouch der speren kraft; / das mer got in mir hat geschafft, / die erde, für und ouch die luft, / die engel und der helle gruft. / got an mich möchte nicht gesin, / des bin ich aller tugnde schrin. / min hant der himmel geiste helt. / welch mensche das sich von mir spelt / und minen stik verleßet gar, / das schert sich von der engel schar.*”³⁴

Fride (peace) follows with a reference to the celestial movers, but she concentrates on the Harmony of the Spheres, and renounces any counting (MK 1974–1984): “*Durch mich sint alle dink gesacht: / der helle grunt der ist gemacht, / das in dem himmel fride han, / die gottes willen han getan. / die engel wegten nimmer glich, / wem sie nicht gottes fride rich. / ich in dem himmel wart bekant, / da ich den ersten engel bant / und dampfte in der flammen glut / der argen slangen übermut. / wo min der mensche nicht engert, / sin ere schranzet gottes swert.*”³⁵

The shared presence here of the angel-motif accentuates these voices within the cycle of the twelve virtues. Together they evoke repeatedly and concretely the risk of pride for

³¹ Cf. Ch. HUBER, *Alanus ab Insulis in mittelhochdeutschen Dichtungen*, p. 292, n. 160.

³² A. VOLFING, ‘*Der meide kranz*’, p. 260: “I guard the gateway to God’s heart. The tip of my spear is very sharp; Pride pricked herself on it, so that she must always bear [the signs] of suffering. My hand drove her, and all her angels, down from heaven, once they had turned their will to sin. I also thrust the first man out of Paradise, once he plucked the apple from the top of the tree. The sin of disobedience must always suffer pain through me.”

³³ A. VOLFING, ‘*Der meide kranz*’, p. 286: “My hand thrust the first angel violently into the pit of hell, where he shall remain eternally. Down here I [deal] in a similar manner with that man who never recognised my path. Whoever tries to maintain power without me – his fall will have no end [K. Stackmann]. If I do not walk before a man, he will never come to God.”

³⁴ A. VOLFING, ‘*Der meide kranz*’, p. 293: “I am his word and also his child. The heavens are formed by me [K. Stackmann]. Through me God created the stars, and also the power of the spheres, the sea, the earth, fire and also the air, the angels and the pit of hell. God could not exist without me. For that reason, I am the shrine of all the virtues. My hand holds the spirits of heaven. Any man who separates himself from me and leaves my path completely, he cuts himself off from the bands of the angels.”

³⁵ A. VOLFING, ‘*Der meide kranz*’, p. 304: “All things are created through me. The foundations of hell are made so that those who have carried out the will of God may enjoy peace in heaven. The angels would never move regularly if they were not richly endowed with the peace of God [1978]. I became well known in heaven when I bound the first angel and extinguished in the pyre of flames the arrogance of the evil serpent. Where a man does not desire me, his honour will be cutdown by the sword of God.”

human salvation. With the cosmological extension to the celestial movers there is surely an intended link to Charles' verdict in the first book. The present four virtues represent a devout deterrent from the exaggeration of scientific ambition. In this way we can understand the messages of these virtues as credits to the emperor.

After *Theologia's* verdict in favour of the virtues – and despite a seeming end to the work (MK 2288: '*hie sal des buches ende sin*') – *Natura* goes on to share a cosmological model. According to HUBER she engages a tension between astrology and ethics.³⁶ The beginning of her speech recalls the structure of *Theologia's* speech before the virtues. Yet in a second element of her discourse, *Natura* adds cosmological and astronomical facts without any angelic references before enumerating the twelve zodiacal signs and explaining their meanings (MK 2289–2380). In the end, the narrator cuts her off and also cuts her down to size with the same argument used earlier by *Theologia* (MK 2281–2392): "*Der meister dises buches spricht: / got die nature hat geticht, / die engel und die speren breit / und was das zentrum wunders treit, / in wisheit und in tugent, kraft: / davon Natur-en wurde slafft, / und sal sich tugent glichen nicht, / sint sie von tugent ist geticht: / die tugent, in der got geschuf / die dink in sines wortes ruf, / die selbe tugent die was got / und got die tugent sunder spot.*"³⁷

The *meister* of the book refers to the angel-motif again and views the angels as part of Creation. He resolves the whole model of the text twice: Creation comes from God, but in the view of mankind, the order of this text comes from the poet, just as the regulation of knowledge and faith comes from the emperor.³⁸

4. Arranging Nature

Heinrich of Mügeln illustrates with his decision-making processes a dynamic system that still needs an authority like Charles IV, the ideal ruler who – thanks to his virtues and ability to discern and make distinctions – articulates a workable balance between knowledge and faith. In the context of the emperor's verdict in the first book, Ch. Huber refers to

³⁶ Ch. HUBER, *Alanus ab Insulis in mittelhochdeutschen Dichtungen*, p. 298.

³⁷ A. VOLFING, '*Der meide kranz*', p. 345f.: "The Master of this Book speaks: God has formed *Natura*, the angels and the wide spheres and all the marvels of the centre with wisdom and with virtue and power. It follows that the authority of *Natura* is vitiated and ought not to compare itself to virtue, since it itself is formed by virtue: the virtue with which God created all things through his Word, this same virtue was God and God was virtue without doubt."

³⁸ Michael STOLZ, *Heinrichs von Mügeln Fürstenpreis auf Karl IV. – Panegyrik, Herrschaftslegitimation, Sprachbewusstsein*, in: J. Heinze – L. P. Johnson – G. Vollmann-Profe (ed.), *Literatur im Umkreis des Prager Hofes der Luxemburger*. Schweinfurter Kolloquium 1992, ed. Berlin 1994 (= *Wolfram-Studien* 13), pp. 106–141, p. 140: "Der neunte Hymnus im dritten Buch [der '*Consolatio*' des Boethius, L. Oetjens] überhöht diese Bildlichkeit des Herrschers, des weisen und gerechten Lenkers noch mit folgenden Worten: '[...] tuo splendore mica; tu namque serenum, / tu requies tranquilla piis, te cernere finis, / principium vector dux semita terminus idem.' Vor diesen Zeilen offenbart sich die kosmisch-ontologische Dimension, welche Mügeln's Preisspruch zugrunde liegt. Der Monarch erscheint als ein metaphysisch überhöhtes Abbild jenes schöpferischen Ursprungs und bewirkt – wie dieser zugleich Ausgangspunkt und Ziel – die Ausgießung des dichterischen Lobes. Auf einer hierarchisch tieferen Stufe partizipiert der Dichter damit am Wesen des gottähnlichen Herrschers, welches er einerseits im Vollzug der ästhetischen Gestaltung schafft. Deutlich wird dieses interaktive Verhältnis nicht zuletzt in dem Minimalpaar der Verben 'tichte' und 'richte', welche jenen die Beständigkeit dichterischen Gesangs und herrscherlichen Wirkens beinhaltenden Schlußpassus von Strophe 19 (vv.15/17) reimend umschließen."

similarities with Dante's *'De monarchia'* (III, 15, 15): "*Sic ergo patet quod auctoritas temporalis Monarche sine ullo medio in ipsum de Fonte universalis auctoritatis descendit: qui quidem Fons, in arce sue simplicitas unitus, in multiplices alveos influit ex habundantia bonitatis.*"³⁹ *'De monarchia'* was known in fourteenth-century Prague, where Cola di Rienzo visited in 1350, and he wrote the first 'cisalpine' commentary.⁴⁰ Dante's work describes the perfect ruler as a universal one, but he also mentions the boundaries of human knowledge. In this context, the angel-motif appears in the third book:

III.3.1. "*Multa etenim ignoramus de quibus non litigamus. 2. Nam geometra circuli quadraturam ignorat: non tamen de ipsa litigat; theologus vero numerum angelorum ignorat: non tamen de illo litigium facit; Egiptius vero civilitatem Scitharum ignorat, non propter hoc de ipsorum civilitate contendit.*"

III.15.12. "*Cumque dispositio mundi huius dispositionem inherentem celorum circulationi sequatur, necesse est ad hoc ut utilia documenta libertatis et pacis commode locis et temporibus applicentur, de curatore isto dispensari ab Illo qui totalem celorum dispositionem presentialiter intuetur. Hic autem est solus ille qui hanc preordinavit, ut per ipsam ipse providens suis ordinibus queque connecteret. 13. Quod si ita est, solus eligit Deus, solus ipse confirmat, cum superiorem non habeat.*"⁴¹

Although Dante has a different aim with his political theory, I think there is a similar intention to create a balance between religion and power when he evokes the unfathomable mystery of Creation, yet at the same time presents the monarch as the needed ruler at hand.⁴² By establishing the University of Prague, Emperor Charles IV pursued a synthesis of religion and knowledge.⁴³ The ruler, who had known an excellent education and was himself deeply pious, rated learning highly for its symbolic and practical significance.⁴⁴ He also acted self-assuredly in that he did not invoke the Pope even once in the founding charter: "*Im Hintergrund steht hier das Ringen zwischen kaiserlicher und päpstlicher Macht*

³⁹ Ch. HUBER, *Alanus ab Insulis in mittelhochdeutschen Dichtungen*, p. 461.

⁴⁰ We do not know whether Charles was aware of the work; from his point of view the commentary takes an exaggerated attitude against the Pope. Francis CHENEVAL, *Die Rezeption der Monarchia Dantes bis zur Edition Princeps im Jahr 1559. Metamorphosen eines philosophischen Werkes*, München 1995, pp. 249–257.

⁴¹ Richard KAY (ed.), *Dante's Monarchia*, Toronto 1998, p. 96/316, transl. p. 97/317: "III. [...] For we are ignorant of many things, about which we do not dispute. For example, the geometer is ignorant of how to square the circle, but he does not dispute about it. Again, the theologian is ignorant of how many angels there are, but he too does not dispute it. So also, the Egyptian is ignorant of the cultural of the Scythians, but he does not consequently argue about their culture. [...] 15.12. And because the disposition of this world, who is called the inherent of the circling of the heavens, it is necessary that the caretaker of the world be established by one who contemplates the total disposition of the heavens as forever present, so that the beneficial doctrines of freedom and peace may be applied appropriately to diverse times and places. Such a one can only be he who preordained this disposition so that by means of it he might in his providence link every thing to its assigned role. 13. If it is so, God alone elects, he alone confirms, since he has no superior."

⁴² F. KAVKA, *Am Hofe Karls IV.*, p. 151: "Das politische Denken des karolinischen Hofes wurde allerdings auch von Thomas von Aquin und – besonders die Frage des Verhältnisses von Kaiser- und Papsttum – sogar von Dantes Werk beeinflusst. Seine Schrift *'Monarchia'*, die er Karls Großvater Heinrich VII. widmete und die die Kirche wegen Antipapalismus verboten und öffentlich verbrannt hatte, wird kaum Hoflektüre gewesen sein. Gedanken aus diesem Werk, übertragen in die philosophische Dichtung *'Die göttliche Komödie'*, haben aber mit Sicherheit am Prager Hof Wirkung gezeigt. Bei Karl IV. kann die Kenntnis dieser Schrift lediglich angenommen werden, als gesichert gilt sie jedoch bei Kanzler Johann von Neumarkt, der in seiner Bibliothek nicht nur über das Werk selbst, sondern auch über einige Kommentare hierzu verfügte."

⁴³ Cf. M. STOLZ, *Vivus est sermo tuus*.

⁴⁴ Cf. Eva SCHLOTHEUBER, *Der weise König. Herrschaftskonzeption und Vermittlungsstrategien Kaiser Karls IV. (1378)*, in: *Hémecht: Zeitschrift für Luxemburger Geschichte* 63, 2011, pp. 265–279.

im 14. Jahrhundert. Vordenker der zeitgenössischen Staatphilosophie wie Dante, Marsilius von Padua und Ockham vertreten den kaiserlichen Parteienstandpunkt und propagieren eine Trennung der kaiserlichen und päpstlichen Gewalt. Sie legitimieren den säkularen Herrschaftsanspruch mit dem Argument, dass die Macht dem Kaiser von Gott und der Natur direkt zuflüsse, ohne über den Papst vermittelt werden zu müssen.”⁴⁵

In the case of the university, a judicious balance of knowledge and faith also directly implicates the faculty of theology, because Charles’s foundation ended the monopoly of Paris and Oxford.⁴⁶ But, with this orientation to theology, Charles also strengthened the aura of his own authority, which was based on his image as a wise and venerable ruler.⁴⁷

The role of nature relating to God as the Creator and to mankind has been much discussed in medieval poetry. U. Friedrich points out that nature has been used equally as topos (*natura formatrix*) and as an independent principle (*mater generationis*).⁴⁸ After the emperor’s verdict, Heinrich of Mügeln continues discussing the dominance between *Natura* and the virtues. *Theologia* prefers the virtues, but explains also their relation. At the very end, it is the *meister*’s turn, and he can also put the poem into the right order (MK 2281–2392). Stolz outlines the meaning of Heinrich of Mügeln: “*Als ein prominenter Vertreter erscheint dabei der Dichter Heinrich von Mügeln, der mit seiner tiefen Gelehrsamkeit einen Brückenschlag zwischen der lateinischen und der volkssprachigen Kultur seiner Zeit herstellte. Für die Frage nach der Reflexion und Inszenierung von Rationalität in der mittelalterlichen Literatur ist Mügeln ein wichtiger Zeuge, da er in seinem dichterischen Werk die Vernunft nicht nur thematisiert, sondern in ihrer Leistung und Gefährdung auch diskursiv vorführt. Mügeln operiert dabei auf dem Fundament scholastischer Philosophie und Theologie und strebt [...] nach einer Synthese von Glauben und Vernunft. Die rationalitätskritischen Tendenzen, wie sie in der zeitgenössischen Mystik begegnen, sind Mügeln fremd. Und doch zeigt er in seiner poetischen Praxis durch kalkulierte Maßnahmen die Grenzen des Rationalen auf.*”⁴⁹

‘*Der meide kranz*’ can be regarded as a panegyric on Charles IV, of course. Heinrich of Mügeln also acts as an artist in his own right. He valorizes as such his own distinctive manner of ordering content as a way to communicate intellectual and even cosmic order.

⁴⁵ Frank REXROTH, *Deutsche Universitätsstiftungen von Prag bis Köln. Die Intentionen des Stifters und die Wege und Chancen ihrer Verwirklichung im spätmittelalterlich deutschen Territorialstaat*, Köln – Weimar – Wien 1992, p. 77; M. STOLZ, *Artes-liberales-Zyklen*, p. 575.

⁴⁶ M. STOLZ, *Artes-liberales-Zyklen*, p. 574: “Der Artes-Wettstreit lässt sich als Reflex des mit der Aristoteles-Rezeption unter Druck geratenen Wissenschaftsgefüges betrachten. [...] Die Theologie steht an der Spitze der mittelalterlichen Fakultäten, so auch an der 1347/48 gegründeten Prager Universität, mit der man Mügelns ‘*Der meide kranz*’ in Zusammenhang gebracht hat. Das seit den Anfängen der Prager Universität bestehende Theologie-Studium führte zur Aufhebung der bis anhin geltenden Monopolstellung von Paris und Oxford. In diesem Zusammenhang ist die kaiserliche Entscheidung von ‘*Der meide kranz*’ zu sehen.”

⁴⁷ Cf. Peter MORAW, *Prag. Die älteste Universität in Mitteleuropa*, in: P. Moraw, *Gesammelte Beiträge zur deutschen und europäischen Universitätsgeschichte: Personen, Strukturen, Entwicklungen*, Leiden 2008, pp. 79–100.

⁴⁸ Udo FRIEDRICH, *Die Ordnung der Natur: Funktionsrahmen der Natur in der volkssprachlichen Literatur des Mittelalters*, in: P. Dilg (ed.), *Natur im Mittelalter*, Berlin 2003, pp. 70–83.

⁴⁹ Michael STOLZ, *Vernunft. Funktionen des Rationalen im Werk Heinrichs von Mügeln*, in: Klaus Ridder (ed.), *Reflexion und Inszenierung von Rationalität in der mittelalterlichen Literatur*, Blaubeurer Kolloquium 2006, Berlin 2008 (= Wolfram-Studien 20), pp. 205–228, p. 206f.

Karl IV. als Ordnungsstifter: Der Wissensdiskurs in *‘Der meide kranz’*

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Mit der Gründung der Prager Universität strebte Kaiser Karl IV. eine Balance von Religion und Wissen an, die sein Herrschaftskonzept insgesamt prägt. Ein Blick auf die vernakulare Dichtung am Prager Herrscherhof des 14. Jahrhunderts bezeugt eine intensive Auseinandersetzung mit den Erkenntnissen der Naturwissenschaften und der christlichen Weltordnung. In *‘Der meide kranz’* kommt Karl IV. eine besondere Rolle zu: Heinrich von Mügeln stellt ihn als gelehrten und sakral-theologischen Herrscher dar. Er konstruiert anhand bekannter Vorbilder wie dem *‘Anticlaudianus’* Alans von Lille Entscheidungssituationen, deren inhärente Ordnung spezifisch auf die Urteilsfähigkeit Karls IV. zugeschnitten ist und ihm als Richter zugleich kaiserliche und sakrosankte Macht zuspricht. Das Engelsmotiv, das zugleich religiös und (in Hinsicht auf die Sphärenbewegung) naturwissenschaftlich besetzt ist, legt die diskursive Spannung des Textes offen.

Lena Oetjens
University of Zurich
Deutsches Seminar
lena.oetjens@ds.uzh.ch

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE 2015

HISTORIA UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE PRAGENSIS

The First Decades of Prague University: Transforming Intellectual Space in 14th Century Central Europe

Tomus LV. Fasc. 1

Published by Charles University,
Karolinum Press, Ovocný trh 5/560, 116 36 Praha 1
www.karolinum.cz
Prague 2016

Cover proposal Jana Ratajová and Kateřina Řezáčová

Graphic design Kateřina Řezáčová

Typeset by DTP Karolinum press

Printed by Karolinum Press

ISSN 0323-0562 (Print)

ISSN 2336-5730 (Online)

MK ČR E 18593

Editorial Board address: Ústav dějin UK a archiv UK, Ovocný trh 5, 116 36 Praha 1
petr.svobodny@ruk.cuni.cz