

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 GLORIEAUX, 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 Metropolitankapitels 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 (Ienko) 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, *Universitätssifti 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 Praagensis 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 Schulleben 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 Universaliistentreit*, *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 Mięczyślav MARKOWSKI, *Der Aristotelismus an den Artistenfakultäten Mitteleuropas in Späten 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, oblicaciones, insolubilia)*, ed. Egbert P. Bos, Nijmegen 1985, pp. *13*–*42*^{*}; further Matthias NUDING, *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, oblicaciones, 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 'Politicorum' 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 Wiclef 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 preceded 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 Włodzimirz 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, *Triologus 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 Sedláka*, 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 Sedláka*, 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 Znaïm († 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*, Pragae 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 GAL, 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 quaedam 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 MEERSSEMANN, *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. Holetton (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. TRÍŠKA, *Repertorium biographicum*, Prague 1981, pp. 92–93.

⁶³ Johannes 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. Holetton (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. TRÍŠKA, *Repertorium biographicum*, pp. 279–280.

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

⁷⁸ Johannes DE MONSTERBERG, *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 Johans 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 Johans 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 Ziebigce*, *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 Ziebigce*, *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 Toting z Oyty 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 Totinga z Oyty. 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 Totinga z Oyty. 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