

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 Bottaiová'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 Johannes 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 Johannes 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 Zunkeller just mentions on p. 24). For Naples and Oxford, Zunkeller (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 explicit in ms. Oxford, Bodleian, Canon. Misc. 573, f. 53va (book I): “Per fratrem Iohannem de Reiz Australem 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 tricentesimo octagesimo 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 LIVESSEY, 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 Toting 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 ipsum scriptus in conventu Paduano anno Domini M°CCC°LXX7 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 Almania, de Eborā, 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 bacularii, 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 *sententiarius* 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 [mediatate 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*, *Archa 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 München, 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'Aurécourt*, 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^o 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^o 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 nieznanne 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. Gwero" (R 35r–36r), at R 36r: [mg: Wikleph] "Opinio – immo haeresis – magistri Iohannis Wikleph, quia Christus sit in hostia solum figuratiter 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 figuratiter. Sic etiam dicit ipse Wiflaph [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: 'Expliciu[n]t questione[s] sententiarum 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 innoxius auctoritativus sanctorum nec rationibus, sed solum voluntate sua ductus. Similiter Gwarro super tertium *Sententiarum* quaestion 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 Alexander 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 mendiants, 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 heresiarch, 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 frigeret; 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 caritatem, et hic sufficienter comederet 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 sylabu 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 nezbudily 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 Brnzei
L'Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes in Paris
(part of the CNRS)
mbrnzei@gmail.com

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