

*“Ipsa dicit, quod sic est, ergo verum.”*  
**Authority of Scripture, the Use and Sources  
of Biblical Citations in the Work  
of Jerome of Prague**

---

Ota Pavlíček (Prague)

### **Introduction**

The authority and interpretation of the Bible in the writings of the initial representatives of the Bohemian Reformation belong among important themes which have been receiving deserved attention in recent times. It is hardly surprising that the results of this research are based mainly on sermons and treatises of authors, most of whom were famous preachers or theologians.<sup>1</sup> Medieval savants found the space for all-sided development and a display of the Biblical interpretation in their sermons and theological treatises which included exegesis of Biblical passages and a commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Especially see Ota Halama (ed.), *Amica, sponsa, mater, Bible v čase reformace* [The Bible in the Time of the Reformation] (Prague, 2014) and here texts to older history, especially Dušan Coufal, “Glosovaný výklad Žalmů Konráda ze Soltau a počátky české reformace [Glossed Explication of the Psalms of Conrad of Soltau and the beginnings of Bohemian Reformation],” 45–84, Jana Nechutová, “Biblické argumenty v Husově polemice *Contra occultum adversarium* [Biblical Arguments in Hus’s polemic *Contra occultum adversarium*],” 85–93, Pavel Kolář, “*Imitatio* Kristových utrpení jako znamení příchodu soudu Kristova: K funkci vybraných novozákonních textů o pronásledování, útisku a utrpení v listech Jana Husa [*Imitatio* of Christ’s Sorrows Advertising the Advent of Christ’s Judgment: On the Function of Selected New Testament Texts of Persecution, Oppression and Suffering in the Letters of Jan Hus],” 94–108, Pavel Soukup, “Jak mohou zvěstovat, nejsou-li posláni? Autorita a autorizace kazatele u Jana Husa a jeho současníků [How Can They Preach if They Are Not Sent? The Authority and Authorization of a Preacher according to Jan Hus and His Contemporaries.],” 109–121 and Pavlína Cermanová, “Jakoubek ze Stříbra a tradice apokalyptických proroctví a jejich výkladů v husitství [Jakoubek of Stříbro and the Tradition of Apocalyptic Prophecies and Their Explications in Utraquism],” 122–142.

<sup>2</sup> Concerning the history of the Bible in the Middle Ages see, for instance, Frans van Liere, *An Introduction to the Medieval Bible* (Cambridge, 2014) and Susan Boynton, Diane J. Reilly (ed.), *The Practice of the Bible in the Middle Ages: Production, Reception, and Performance in Western Christianity* (New York, 2011).

One of the foremost early members of the Bohemian reform movement and Hus's fellow-martyr in Constance, Jerome of Prague was not a regular preacher; was never ordained to the diaconate or presbyterate; and he remained faithful to the Faculty of Liberal Arts during his entire life. It is therefore understandable that the subject of his relation to Scripture has hitherto not attracted the focused interest of researchers.<sup>3</sup> Thus also in this area Jerome was overshadowed by Hus, who not only preached in the Bethlehem Chapel and elsewhere, but also fulfilled all his pedagogical duties at the Theological Faculty, and – as a leader of the reform movement influenced by some of Wyclif's ideas – he participated in extensive theological polemics, especially after 1411.<sup>4</sup> Even so, Jerome's literary legacy – despite its relative modesty – still makes it possible to show Jerome's understanding of Scripture and its authority and how and for what he used biblical citations. Further, it can show whether he derived biblical passages from an independent study of Scripture, or whether he derived them from the works of other authors. These themes are the subject of this article.

### I. Authority of the Bible in the Work of Jerome of Prague

Medieval scholarly work involved proving conclusions not only through logical arguments – whether original or borrowed from other authors – but also with the help of generally recognised authorities. Aside from the established philosophers, theologians or glossators (of antiquity, patristic times, and the Middle Ages), ecclesiastical ordinance, above all the Bible belonged among the most important authorities.<sup>5</sup> During his lifetime, Jerome of Prague was

<sup>3</sup> On Jerome's life and work, see František Šmahel, *Život a dílo Jeronýma Pražského, Zpráva o výzkumu* [The Life and Work of Jerome of Prague, A Research Report] (Prague, 2010) and Šmahel's preface to the edition of Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestiones, Polemica, Epistulae*, eds. František Šmahel, Gabriel Silagi, CCCM 222 (Turnhout, 2010) xi–cxxxviii. My references to Jerome's texts in this article are derived from the edition in CCCM 222.

<sup>4</sup> The use and authority of the Bible in Hus are treated in a majority of texts devoted to Hus; in the older literature see especially Vlastimil Kybal, *M. Jan Hus. Život a učení* [Life and Teaching] II, *Učení 1–3* (Prague, 1923–1931), passim (importantly, for instance, I: 97–98), who in the first volume on 119–144 treats also the scriptural authority in Milíč of Kroměříž, Matěj of Janov, and Jakoubek of Stribro. Concerning Hus's interpretation of the Bible as an authority in his commentary on the *Sentences* and in polemics with theologians, see also Ian C. Levy, *Holy Scripture and the Quest for Authority at the End of the Middle Ages* (Notre Dame, 2012) 150–188.

<sup>5</sup> On the tactics of argumentation in the Middle Ages, especially concerning hidden quotations without a reference, see Zénon Kaluza, "Auteur et plagiaire: quelques remarques," in Jan A. Aertsen, Andreas Speer (ed.), *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter?* (Berlin–New York, 1998) 312–320, and Monica Calma, "Plagium," in Iñigo Atucha, Dragos Calma, Catherine König-Pralong, and Irene Zavattero (eds.), *Mots médiévaux offerts à Ruedi Imbach* (Turnhout, 2011) 559–568. The most important *florilegium*, a collection of significant citations from authorities, especially Aristotle and other ancient thinkers, is the *Auctoritates Aristotelis*. An

known to record important authorities and arguments – encountered in his studies at Oxford, Paris, and elsewhere – in a notebook, specially acquired for that purpose.<sup>6</sup> His texts reveal a remarkable multiplicity of references to both antique and medieval tradition. An important place belongs to biblical passages and to authors of biblical books, whereby Jerome in his disputations sought to demonstrate that his ideas rested on Scriptural authority.<sup>7</sup> According to Jerome's own words in his speech *Recommendatio artium liberalium*, Scripture was endowed with the highest place among authorities, and its role was irreplaceable in the strategy of his argumentation. Jerome specifically affirmed in his *Recommendatio* his reluctance to hold all he read in Wyclif's or other doctors' books as firmly as his faith. If he is to be believed, he attributes such a status only to the Bible. According to Jerome, if the Bible states that something is so, then it is the truth.<sup>8</sup> This position is in harmony with Jerome's assertion in another treatise, which states that the Scripture is infallible.<sup>9</sup>

Considering that Jerome supports his doctrinal standpoints with biblical authority, it follows from these passages that he was convinced about the harmony between those standpoints and the objective meaning of Scripture.<sup>10</sup> At

---

edition with an introductory study was published as *Les Auctoritates Aristotelis. Un florilège médiéval, Étude historique et édition critique*, ed. Jacqueline Hamesse (Louvain-Paris, 1974).

<sup>6</sup> See the explicit in MS Wien, ÖNB 4483, f. 77v, published in Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio duplex de formis universalibus et de universalibus extra signa*, 68, l. 578–581.

<sup>7</sup> A significant number of authorities in Jerome's texts was already noted by František Šmahel, "Jerome of Prague: University Questiones and Polemics," in idem, *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter/The Charles University in the Middle Ages, Gesammelte Aufsätze/Selected Studies* (Leiden and Boston, 2007) 570 and Vilém Herold, *Pražská univerzita a Wyclif, Wyclifovo učení o ideách a geneze husitského revolučního myšlení* [The University of Prague and Wyclif, Wyclif's concept of ideas and the genesis of Hussite Revolutionary thought] (Prague, 1985) 206. For an overview, compare the index in the edition of Jerome's works, CCCM 222, 285–305, particular references, however, need to be verified, especially references to Ockham and Aquinas.

<sup>8</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Recommendatio artium liberalium*, 214, l. 437–444: "Et ego, quantum ad me attinet, coram vobis profiteor me libros magistri Iohannis Wycleph legisse et studuisse, sicut et aliorum doctorum libros et in eis profiteor multa bona didicisse. Verumtamen absit a me, ut sim ita insipiens, ut quiddam in libris eius vel alterius doctoris legerim, ut hoc firme tamquam fidem teneam. Nam soli Scripture Sacre hanc servabo reverentem sequenciam: Ipsa dicit, quod sic est, ergo verum."

<sup>9</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de universalibus extra signa*, 46, l. 1001–1002: "[...] quod est contra infallibilem scripturam [...]"

<sup>10</sup> On Jerome's doctrinal standpoints, see Zénon Kaluza, *Études doctrinales sur le XIVe siècle* (Paris, 2013), especially the following parts that represent new editions of Kaluza's older studies: "Le chancelier Gerson et Jérôme de Prague," 207–252; "Jérôme de Prague et le *Timée* de Platon," 253–300; "La question de Jérôme de Prague disputée à Heidelberg," 301–332 and Ota Pavliček, *La dimension philosophique et théologique de la pensée de Jérôme de Prague* (Unpublished dissertation: Paris-Prague, 2014). See also Herold, *Pražská univerzita a Wyclif*, 204–219; idem, "Wyclifs Polemik gegen Ockhams Auffassung der platonischen Ideen und ihr Nachklang in der tschechischen hussitischen Philosophie," in Anne Hudson, Michael Wilks (eds.), *From Ockham to Wyclif* (Oxford, 1987) 185–215; idem, "Wyclif und

the same time, he assumed that it was necessary to seek and find such a real objective sense of Scripture – hence it was a matter of a sense in a certain way hidden. This conclusion is proven by a brief passage from the polemic with Blažej Vlk. Here Jerome maintains that – thanks to their schooling in the logic of Scripture – scholars (*clerici*) find its right meaning (*rectus sensus*), which was exactly the sense that Jerome discerned in the given passage.<sup>11</sup> This passage – important for understanding the authority, which Jerome attributed to the Bible – undoubtedly bears the traces of Wyclif’s influence. Its object is the problem of essential predication, which also occurs in Wyclif’s *De universalibus* against the background of statements such as “Deus est homo,” which corresponds to Jerome’s statement “Creator est creatura.”<sup>12</sup> Jerome’s reference to scholars schooled in the logic of Scripture is symptomatic of Wyclif’s work, inasmuch as we find this reference in a connection with the essential predication also in Wyclif’s treatise *De ideis*.<sup>13</sup> Most likely Jerome here drew his inspiration for his argumentation in this as well as in the earlier-cited passages. This, however, does not automatically mean that his approach was identical with Wyclif’s hermeneutics of Scripture and with the requirements which followed from it for Wyclif.<sup>14</sup>

---

Hieronimus von Prag. Zum Versuch einer ‚praktischen‘ Umwandlung in der spätmittelalterlichen Ideenlehre,” in Reijo Työriñoja, Anja Inkeri Lehtinen, and Dagfinn Føllesdal (eds.), *Knowledge and the Sciences in Medieval Philosophy* (Helsinki, 1990) III: 212–223; idem, “Der Streit zwischen Hieronymus von Prag und Johann Gerson, Eine spätmittelalterliche Diskussion mit tragischen Folgen,” in Sophie Włoddek (ed.), *Société et Église: Textes et discussions dans les universités de l’Europe centrale au moyen âge tardif* (Turnhout, 1995) 77–89; Christine Blättler, *Delikt: Extremes Realismus* (Sankt Augustin, 2002); Šmahel, *Život a dílo Jeronýma Pražského*, 239–337.

<sup>11</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Disputatio magistri Blasii Lupi contra magistrum Hieronymum de Praga in materia universalium realium cum responsionibus eiusdem*, 119, l. 69–81: “Deinde concedo quod creator est creatura, quia factor est factura, ut patet de Christo, de quo Jeronimus in fine primi libri super epistolam ad Galatas inquit: ‘Nos libere proclamamus non esse periculum eum dicere creaturam, quem vermem, esse crucifixum, esse hominem et maledictum tota spei nostre reverencia profitemur.’ Concedo etiam quod creator est creatum, quia est ens communissimum, quod in predicatione essentiali et non formali est creator et creatura. Verumtamen heresis est ariana dicere pertinaciter quod Christus dumtaxat est creatura, et sic clerici in loyca Scripture sacre nutriti talia et similia recto sensu pertranseunt, vero clerici vanitates tamquam ceci palpitantes de leni offendunt etc.”

<sup>12</sup> See also Alessandro Conti, “Wyclif’s Logic and Metaphysics,” in Ian C. Levy (ed.), *A Companion to John Wyclif* (Leiden, 2006) 99–102.

<sup>13</sup> Attention was already called to the third objection of the second chapter of this treatise by Herold, *Pražská univerzita a Wyclif*, 89–90.

<sup>14</sup> On this theme – in connection with Jerome’s concept of universals, see Ota Pavlíček, “*Scutum fidei christianae*: The Depiction and Explanation of the Shield of Faith in the Realistic Teaching of Jerome of Prague in the Context of His Interpretation of the Trinity,” *BRRP* 9 (2014) 91–94, where on p. 92, n. 80, there are the most important relevant sources and literature for the exegesis of Scripture by Wyclif.

## II. The Use of the Bible in the Works of Jerome of Prague

Jerome's extant works consist especially of philosophical *quaestiones*. It is there that most of the biblical citations are found in support of ideas in the areas of philosophy and philosophical theology. To the collection of texts, in which Jerome used the Bible in support of his scholarly standpoints, it is necessary to add the polemic with Blasius Lupus (Blažej Vlk), and the commented depiction of the Shield of Faith (*scutum fidei*). Shortly, it will be shown from the systematic explication of Jerome's biblical citations that there is a whole series of doctrinal motives linked in his work with biblical argumentation. These concern especially the theme of God and Ideas in God's mind; the theme of the creation of the sensible world, and God's dominion over it; the theme of the first matter; and the theme of created universals. In addition to using biblical citations in support of doctrinal stands, we find throughout Jerome's work occurrences of rhetorical utilisation of biblical citations. Such a utilisation involves citations, which attest to Jerome's rhetorical abilities, but are not based on any scholarly standpoint. For that reason, such citations do not require a detailed explication, and we will thus treat them rather summarily. With a few exceptions, we shall rely on the detailed index of biblical references in the authoritative edition of Jerome's writings.<sup>15</sup>

Our mapping of specific utilisation of the Bible in Jerome's writings will commence with the theme of Ideas in God's mind, that is, with Jerome's Christian Platonism. To support the view of the presence of a multitude of Ideas in the Divine mind, Jerome repeatedly used the segment from Sirach 42: 24–25, in which, according to Jerome, there is a discussion of a bipartite division of the universe into the eternal intelligible being of things and their temporal being in existence. While the Ideas in the Divine mind correspond to the first type, things in the sensible world correspond to the second type. Moreover – in the introduction to the passage – Jerome bolstered the authority, wisdom, and experience of the author of Sirach by implicit references to verses from Sirach 34: 12 and 39: 3.<sup>16</sup> Jerome's other biblical authority for the multiplicity of Ideas (to which the multiplicity of created things corresponds) was John 1: 3–4, which he used with Augustine's verse

<sup>15</sup> For an annotated list of Jerome's works, see Šmahel, *Život a dílo Jeronýma Pražského*, 239–337. For the index CCCM 222, 285–287. The index includes several items without the pages of occurrence, specifically Exod 5: 25, Eccles 12: 9, Lk 18: 20, Jn 17: 21, 1 Cor 3: 16, 3: 18 a 1 Pet 5. I could discover only 1 Cor 3: 16 and 3: 18, which may be considered as the context of Jerome's citation of 1 Cor 3: 17, see CCCM 222, 236, l. 29–32.

<sup>16</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de formis universalibus*, 21, l. 199–208. The same passage is found in *Quaestio de universalibus a parte rei*, 87, l. 75–84 and in *Quaestio de mundo archetypo*, 186–187, l. 767–775. For the praise of the author of the book Sirach see the text of the Vulgate, Eccles 34: 12 (*multa vidi errando et plurimas verborum consuetudines*) and Eccles 39: 3 (*occulta proverbiorum exquiret et in absconditis parabolarum conversabitur*).

division and punctuation: “Et quod factum est, in ipso vita erat.”<sup>17</sup> According to Jerome’s interpretation of this verse, it is evident that the living being (*esse vitale*) of everything made is the ideal being in the Word.<sup>18</sup> Further, Jerome used in support of the multiplicity of Ideas a part of Psalm 146: 5. He states that Ideas are necessary for wisdom, which is a component of his broader argument (based especially on Augustine’s *Quaestio de ideis*),<sup>19</sup> and because God’s wisdom is infinite, as we read in the cited psalm, it was necessary to maintain, according to Jerome, that Ideas are in God’s mind.<sup>20</sup>

In support of the existence of the world of Ideas – and their exemplary function toward the world perceptible by senses – Jerome additionally used biblical passages, according to which visible ages (*saecula visibilia*) are based on invisible ages (*saecula invisibilia*). Jerome relied here on Hebrews 11: 3, which states that, on the basis of invisible ages, the visible ages were made, and he adopted Augustine’s interpretation, according to which invisible ages are exemplary for temporal ages.<sup>21</sup> Jerome then continues with the statement that in Scripture the expression *saecula* is often limited to the intelligible being of the temporal age, which is the intent of the author of Revelation 1: 6, when he speaks about “for ever and ever” (*saecula saeculorum*); it is also the intent of the angel in Revelation 4: 9. The expression *saecula saeculorum* is actually found in this sense in many other places in the Bible.<sup>22</sup> Similarly to the difference between temporal ages and their base in eternity, Jerome also points out the distinction between the temporal human days and the eternal duration of divine days or years, citing Job 10: 5, Psalms 76: 6, 83: 11, and 101: 28, and 2 Peter 3: 18. Thus, he again stresses the biblical foundation of the teaching on Ideas, including their essential identity with God, from whom (according to Jerome) they differ only formally.<sup>23</sup>

According to Jerome, God created – in the first moment of time (*in primo instanti temporis*) on the basis of the Ideas – all the created things and, to be

<sup>17</sup> See Aurelius Augustinus, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV*, l. 13–17. For a brief explanation and the role of these verses and their punctuation in Augustine, see, for instance, Eddie Leroy Miller, *Salvation History in the Prologue of John* (Leiden, 1989) 53–54. On the importance of punctuation – and the problems connected with it – see literature cited in Günter Wagner (ed.), *An Exegetical Bibliography of the New Testament* (Macon, 1987) III: 12.

<sup>18</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de formis universalibus*, 24–25, l. 298–302: “Sed super hec omnia eminet celestis metaphysici auctoritas, qua intonat: “Et quod factum est, in ipso vita erat.” Relativum autem refert verbum, ac si aperte exprimat, quod cuiuslibet rei facte esse vitale, quod est esse ydeale sive intelligibile, vitaliter est in verbo [...]”

<sup>19</sup> See Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de formis universalibus*, 16, l. 25–50.

<sup>20</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de formis universalibus*, 26, l. 334–339.

<sup>21</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de mundo archetypo*, 181, l. 584–585 and l. 599–604.

<sup>22</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de mundo archetypo*, 181, l. 605–611. On the expression *saecula saeculorum* in the Vulgate, see especially Gal 1: 5; Eph 3: 21; Phil 4: 20; 1 Tim 1: 17; 2 Tim 4: 18; Heb 13: 21; 1 Pet 4: 11; Rev 1: 18; 4: 9–10; 5: 13; 7: 12; 10: 6; 11: 15; 14: 11; 15: 7; 19: 3; 20: 10; 22: 5.

<sup>23</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de mundo archetypo*, 182, l. 614–628. The reference to Ps 73 is actually a citation from Ps 83, about this see below, 85–86.



sure, in their secondary external causes; in their own existence; in genus or species; or in the seminal causes. Among others, Jerome supports this assertion by scriptural testimony, specifically he refers to Wisdom (*Sapientiae*) 18: 1 that is the Wisdom of Sirach.<sup>24</sup> As shown later, the use of this biblical book, as well as the surrounding text, attest that Jerome adopted this reference from Wyclif's treatise *De ideis*. Wyclif's standpoint is also close to Jerome's assertion, according to which the first created thing is the first matter (*materia prima*), in which all things reside in potentiality. In the context of the creation of the first matter, Jerome's second use of Hebrews 11: 3 is of interest. In this second interpretation, Jerome maintained that any material form – whether substantial or accidental – is preceded by the highest intelligible form. Jerome considered this evident from the treatise *De Trinitate* of Boethius, according to whom forms without matter are reasons of things (*rationes rerum*) which in an intelligible manner are in God's mind. It was this distinction which, according to Jerome, the "heavenly philosopher" Paul (*sic.*) had in mind in Hebrews 11: 3, when he stated that the ages were founded by God's Word, so that visible ages were derived from ages invisible.<sup>25</sup>

Jerome referred to the Bible also in enumerating the various names for the first matter, the first created thing created in the first moment. In his enumeration one finds an implicit reference to Genesis 1: 2, and subsequently explicit references to what ancient thinkers thought about the introductory verse of the Bible. It is here a matter of Jerome's effort to show that also the Bible and later ancient authors spoke about the first matter, although they attributed to it other names and interpretations.<sup>26</sup> As far as the creation of the universe was concerned, in one of his *quaestiones* Jerome presented a thesis from Plato's *Timaeus*, according to which fire and earth were the fundamentals of the physical world. Jerome supported this thesis by the first verse of the Bible (Genesis 1: 1), according to which in the beginning God created heaven and earth. He again thereby demonstrated that his thinking was in harmony with the Bible. In the background we also see an effort to produce a harmony between parts of Plato's teaching and the Bible, inasmuch as Jerome identified Biblical heaven with Plato's fire. Nevertheless, his effort for harmony stemmed from Augustine, because he added that not even Augustine – in his *De civitate Dei* – doubted that Plato designated heaven by the term fire.<sup>27</sup> In any case, according to Jerome, God – after creating (*creatio*) all things on the basis of intelligible being – conserves (*conservatio*) this created potential being, that is the first matter, and rules over it (*gubernatio*). Jerome ascribed God's rule to the Holy Spirit and substantiated this claim by a reference to Psalm 144:

<sup>24</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de mundo archetypo*, 185, l. 719–725.

<sup>25</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de potentia materiae primae*, 150–151, l. 297–305.

<sup>26</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de potentia materiae primae*, 142–143, l. 51–64.

<sup>27</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de universalibus a parte rei*, 94, l. 289–295.

9, according to which the Lord has mercy on everything created by him.<sup>28</sup>

Jerome employed argumentation from the Bible also for the theme of the created universals, which occupy in Jerome's texts the key position of forms, internal principles, or causes of singulars – the theme which is one of the important features of Jerome's realism. According to him, universals are present in the singulars essentially, and only formally distinct.<sup>29</sup> Jerome supported his lengthy argumentation (for the necessary existence of real universals) using Genesis 1: 24, which he introduced by a partial verse from the 2 Corinthians 3: 18. According to Jerome, God created everything living in genus, and all animals and reptiles according to their species. Who would maintain that “an extraordinary philosopher” intended in this case “genus” and “species” as mere human concepts, he would succumb, according to Jerome to dementia (*dementia*). According to his interpretation – in this passage by the words “genus” and “species” – Moses had in mind the universal natures, that is, the real universals, in which the things subordinated to them are created.<sup>30</sup> Therefore, even the realism of the universals, for Jerome, is guaranteed by the authority of the Bible.

To support the realism of universals, Jerome in an interesting way adjusted the depiction of the Shield of Faith (*scutum fidei*) which is itself derived from Ephesians 6: 16. The purpose of this illustrative aid rested in a demonstration of the similarity between the Divine essence and the universal. According to Jerome, as the Holy Trinity has a common essence, so the trinity of, for

<sup>28</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de convertibilitate terminorum*, 76, l. 120–123.

<sup>29</sup> See, for instance, Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de veritatibus generalibus*, 6–7, l. 34–60. See on this also the explications and the important textual corrections in this *quaestio* by Kaluza, “La question de Jérôme de Prague disputée à Heidelberg,” 301–332.

<sup>30</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de universalibus extra signa*, 46, l. 999–1010. This biblical argument for reality of the universals attracted also other Bohemian realists, like Stanislav of Znojmo, Štěpán of Pálec, and Jan Hus. As shown below (p. 86–87), their original inspiration most likely came from Wyclif, who presented this argument in the treatise *De universalibus*, which Jerome used as his point of departure. His emphasis on the mental debility of the deniers of the universals is in a remarkable harmony with Hus's assertion, according to which a rejection of the universals was contrary to a sound mind (*mens sana*). This coincidence indicates a possible influence of one thinker on the other – possibly Jerome's on Hus – considering the dating of the texts to 1407 and 1408/9 respectively. Hus's solution of this problem, however, was inspired especially by Stanislav of Znojmo, whose treatise was mistakenly published as a work of Wyclif. See Stanislav of Znojmo, *De universalibus*, c. 5, in *Miscellanea philosophica*, ed. Michael H. Dziewicki (London, 1905) II: 27, l. 34–28, l. 27, idem, *De universalibus realibus*, in Jan Sedláč, *M. Jan Hus* (Olomouc, 1915) 84\*–85\*, Jan Hus, *Quaestio de testimonio fidei christianae*, in *Quaestiones*, ed. Jiří Kejř, CCCM 205 (Turnhout, 2004) 8–9, l. 157–201. Pálec used the argument in Štěpán of Pálec, “Positio reverendi magistri Stephani de Palecz de universalibus,” ed. Ryszard Palacz, in idem, “La ‘Positio universalibus’ d’Etienne de Palecz,” MPP 14 (1970) 129, l. 525–531 and also commented on it in *Commentarius in I-IX capitula tractatus De universalibus Iohannis Wyclif Stephano de Palecz ascriptus*, c. 2, ed. Ivan Müller (Prague, 2009) 137. Concerning Hus's source, see “La création des universaux selon Jean Hus, À propos de la question Utrum omne testimonium fidei,” in Jiří K. Kroupa (ed.), *Septuaginta Paulo Spunar oblata (70+2)* (Prague, 2000) 368–371.



instance, Augustine, Jerome, and Ambrose also possesses a common essence.<sup>31</sup> In his explication of the Shield of Faith, Jerome understandably also employed a scriptural witness, explicitly referring to John 10: 30 which, according to him, speaks of a common essence of the Father and Christ. In the commentary, we should not omit a supplement, important not only for Jerome's metaphysics, but also for his spirituality. In this passage, he stresses the importance of the harmony (*convenientia*) of the uncreated world for the harmony of the created world, including the created soul – a harmony about which, according to him, Paul spoke. Specifically, it is a matter of his words from Romans 11: 36.<sup>32</sup>

All things in a certain manner refer to God in Jerome's interpretation of the universe. According to him, God is the highest being (*supremum ens*), from which everything comes (*terminus a quo*) and to which everything returns (*terminus ad quem*). Jerome argues for this – in principle Neo-Platonic – vision of God by a mention of Proclus, but apparently also by a reference to Revelation 1: 8, according to which – just as for Jerome – God is Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end.<sup>33</sup> It appears from Jerome's statements that according to him only God is in the right sense of the word. Therefore, according to Jerome, nobody could perceive the existence of any created thing, without in some degree becoming conscious of – or perceiving – the existence of God. Similarly, according to Jerome, one says about any created thing that it is good only because it analogically – that is, according to different degrees – participates in the Divine goodness. Jerome seeks to support also these theses in the Bible, specifically in the Luke 18: 19, which reads that nobody, except for God himself, is good.<sup>34</sup>

As mentioned earlier, Jerome's writings also contain many instances of biblical citations, which can be considered rhetorical. As far as the *quaestiones* and doctrinal polemics are concerned, at the beginning of *Quaestio de convertibilitate terminorum* Jerome perhaps touched on Exodus 35: 23–27, and certainly referred to Mark 12: 42.<sup>35</sup> According to the editors of his writings, Jerome – at the end of the first part of his polemic with Blažej Vlk – hinted at the story of Daniel 6: 22.<sup>36</sup> In a lively discussion with the same master he then used a verse from Romans in allusion to Vlk's venomous words,<sup>37</sup> according

<sup>31</sup> For a basic orientation see František Šmahel, "Das „Scutum fidei christianae magistri Hieronymi de Praga“ in der Entwicklung der mittelalterlichen trinitarischen Diagramme," in Alexander Patschovsky (ed.), *Die Bildwelt der Diagramme Joachims von Fiore, Zur Medialität religiös-politischer Programme im Mittelalter* (Ostfildern, 2003) 185–210, for supplements 263–277. More on this in Ota Pavlíček, "Scutum fidei christianae," 72–97.

<sup>32</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Scutum fidei christianae*, 197, l. 89–94. A reference to Rom 11: 36 can complete the index in the edition.

<sup>33</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de convertibilitate terminorum*, 80, l. 261–264.

<sup>34</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de convertibilitate terminorum*, 78, l. 186–193.

<sup>35</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de convertibilitate terminorum*, 73, l. 7–12.

<sup>36</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Disputatio magistri Blasii Lupi contra magistrum Hieronymum de Praga in materia universalium realium cum responsionibus eiusdem*, 116, l. 206–208.

<sup>37</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Disputatio magistri Blasii Lupi contra magistrum Hieronymum de*

to which Jerome had violated the basic principles of argumentation (*petitio principii*).<sup>38</sup> Finally in the context of the debate about universals – and about the importance of the harmony of the world of Ideas for the harmony of the sensible world – Jerome considered it important to define the distinction between things and the signs of things. For this purpose, he used as examples three biblical passages (Exodus 15: 25, Genesis 28: 18, and Genesis 22: 13), which refer to signs of things. This use of Bible, however, does not directly prove Jerome's doctrinal stand, and as such it, therefore, represents a rhetorical use.<sup>39</sup>

From the remainder of Jerome's extant literary legacy – including especially letters, records of trials, and his retraction in Constance – his *Recommendatio* is the most interesting for our purpose.<sup>40</sup> Aside from other (for instance proto-national) ideas, we encounter in the second part of this treatise arguments in defence of the study of Wyclif's works at the University of Prague. More broadly, one can speak of defending the freedom to study in the academy even writings that contain heterodox ideas, as long as they also contain ideas that are orthodox.<sup>41</sup> In his *Recommendatio*, he addressed the students and the masters of the Bohemian university nation and selected numerous biblical citations in support of his argumentation.<sup>42</sup> One of the im-

*Praga in materia universalium realium cum responsionibus eiusdem*, 133, l. 9–15.

<sup>38</sup> Blasius Lupus, *Disputatio magistri Blasii Lupi contra magistrum Hieronymum de Praga in materia universalium realium cum responsionibus eiusdem*, 132, l. 2–7.

<sup>39</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de universalibus a parte rei*, 85, l. 11–16.

<sup>40</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Recommendatio artium liberalium*, 201–222. Concerning Jerome's inspiration in the first part of the *Recommendatio*, which came from the writings of *Anticlaudianus* Alan of Lille, see František Šmahel, "Die Quelle der *Recommendatio arcium liberalium* des Mag. Hieronymus von Prag" in idem, *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter*, 387–404, or the updated version of this text in idem, *Život a dílo Jeronýma Pražského*, 293–302. Again I can refer to the list of Jerome's writings in idem, *Život a dílo Jeronýma Pražského*, 239–337. It is also worth mentioning that that Jerome spoke before King Wenceslaus on a theme from Jn 13: 15 and before King Sigismund on the theme *Mandatum novum do vobis* from Jn 13: 34 (Šmahel, 324, mistakenly cites 13,13). If these texts at all survived, they have not yet been discovered.

<sup>41</sup> On this see František Šmahel, "The Idea of the "Nation" in Hussite Bohemia," *Historica* 16 (1969) 175–180, for the context see Šmahel, "The Idea of the "Nation" in Hussite Bohemia," 143–247 and idem, "The Idea of the "Nation" in Hussite Bohemia," *Historica* 17 (1969) 93–197 and also idem, "Leben und Werk des Hieronymus von Prag," CCCM 222, xxxviii–xxxix. On the problem of the freedom of study and teaching at the University of Prague, see Olivier Marin, "*Libri hereticorum sunt legendi* – Svoboda výuky na pražské univerzitě [Freedom of Teaching at the University of Prague] (1347–1412)," *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis* 42 (2002) 33–58 and Martin Nodl, "Veřejné versus soukromé, Odpřísahnutí hereze v pražském univerzitním prostředí [Public versus Private. Abjuration of Heresy in the Prague University Milieu]," in Martin Nodl and František Šmahel (ed.), *Rituály, ceremonie a festivity ve střední Evropě 14. a 15. století* [Rituals, Ceremonies, and Festivities in Central Europe in the Fourteenth and the Fifteenth Centuries] (Prague, 2009) 385–414.

<sup>42</sup> Inasmuch as it is largely a matter of rhetorical use of biblical citations, let a list of them here suffice: Prov 2: 14–15, 5: 9 a 24: 16, Eccl 7: 2, Job 2: 1–10, 3 Ezd 3: 12, Mt 7: 6, 1 Cor 5: 6, Gal 5: 9, Jude 12: 13, Rev 12: 3–4.

portant points of this passage in his *Recommendatio* is his call to the students and the masters to firmly hold onto the discovered truth (*veritas agnita*). In this context, Jerome referred to an important quotation from 1 Esdras 3: 12 about the truth which is victorious over everything. It was this concept which was also used in another context by Jan Hus and which later, in a modified form, was to become the motto of the Bohemian Reformation.<sup>43</sup> It, however, already cropped up in earlier German Prague tradition.<sup>44</sup>

Considering the use of the Bible in Jerome's writings, it is also remarkable that he supported the harmony between his ideas and Scripture by naming the biblical authors as philosophers. As far as the subject of the Ideas is concerned, the author of the book Sirach becomes "an ancient Hebrew philosopher" (*vetustus Hebreorum philosophus*),<sup>45</sup> John the Evangelist enjoys "the authority of a heavenly physician" (*caelestis metaphysici auctoritas*),<sup>46</sup> and the Apostle Paul is "a heavenly philosopher" (*caelestis philosophus*).<sup>47</sup> While discussing the creation of the world, Jerome mentioned Moses as "the wisest philosopher of the Hebrews" (*sapientissimus Hebreorum philosophus*),<sup>48</sup> in another place – in connection with realistic interpretation of Genesis 1: 24 – he called Moses "an extraordinary philosopher" (*philosophus eximius*),<sup>49</sup> and he designated – in connection with the analogical predication of good about created things – the Evangelist Luke as "a philosopher" (*philosophus*).<sup>50</sup>

How can one explain the designation of biblical authors as philosophers, especially since they figure in a theological context? If we disregard Jerome's certain possible humanistic tendencies,<sup>51</sup> it seems probable that he meant to show and stress that the biblical authors were philosophers. Such a banal conclusion, however, can have its consequences. From this point of

<sup>43</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Recommendatio artium liberalium*, 216, l. 484–486. On this quotation within the context of the Czech milieu, see František M. Bartoš, *Z dějin hesla Pravda vítězí* [From the History of the Motto: Truth Prevails] (Prague, 1947). F. M. Bartoš does not mention the use of this quotation by Jerome; likewise he failed to note its use by Prokop of Plzeň. On the last, see Vilém Herold, "Husovo 'Pravda konečně vysvobodí' a kostnický koncil [Hus's 'The Truth Will Finally Set You Free' and the Council of Constance]," in Irena Šnebergová, Václav Tomek and Josef Zúmr (eds.), *Rozjímání vpřed i vzad. Karlu Kosíkovi k pětasedmdesátinám* [Reflections Forward and Back. For the Seventy-Fifth Birthday of Karel Kosík] (Prague, 2001) 148–149 and 164, note 4.

<sup>44</sup> At least Konrád of Soltau, see Coufal, "Glosovaný výklad," 52.

<sup>45</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de formis universalibus*, 21, l. 199.

<sup>46</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de formis universalibus*, 24, l. 298–299.

<sup>47</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de potentia materiae primae*, 150–151, l. 303–304.

<sup>48</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de potentia materiae primae*, 150, l. 282–283.

<sup>49</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de universalibus extra signa*, 46, l. 1006–1007.

<sup>50</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de convertibilitate terminorum*, 78, l. 193.

<sup>51</sup> See also František Šmahel, "Poggio und Hieronymus von Prag, Zur Frage des hussitischen Humanismus," in Hans-Bernd Harder, Hans Rothe, Jaroslav Kolár, and Slavomír Wollman (ed.), *Studien zum Humanismus in den Böhmisches Ländern* (Cologne and Vienna, 1988) 75–91.

view, the Bible would become – if not a philosophical text – then at least a text that included the treatment of philosophical subjects, such as the creation of the world. In addition, this hypothesis is supported by the fact that Jerome in his *Quaestio de potentia materiae primae* spoke in connection with his – biblically based – theory of creation exactly about “Christian philosophy” (*christiana philosophia*).<sup>52</sup> Jerome might have intended – with the help of designating the biblical authors as philosophers and the right meaning of the Bible as Christian philosophy – to defend his right to deal with the earlier-mentioned philosophical themes (which were incontestably also theological) even at the Faculty of Liberal Arts, that is, among philosophers, where Jerome presented his *quaestiones*. This kind of effort would correspond with Jerome’s claim for the right to treat Ideas in the Divine Mind not only at the Theological, but also at the Arts Faculty, as he requested in his *Quaestio de formis universalibus*.<sup>53</sup> Considering the limited basis in the sources, it is important to stress that here we are moving on a hypothetical plane. Future research into the use of Scripture by other philosophers might provide a further insight into Jerome’s interpretation of biblical authors as philosophers.

### III. The Sources of Biblical Citations in the Writings of Jerome of Prague

One might assume from the study of Jerome’s texts that he derived all his biblical citations directly from Scripture, based on independent research. Like the texts of other scholastic authors, however, Jerome’s writings also contain numerous implicit borrowings, including citations from the Bible.<sup>54</sup> As we shall see from compared textual passages below, Jerome drew most of his biblical citations in his *quaestiones* from sources other than the scriptural texts. While the earlier mentioned biblical citations (save for sheer exceptions) are listed in the index of Jerome’s works, it is possible to supplement this index by the proven borrowings that follow. Considering this fact, we present the comparison of texts here *in extenso*.

In the case of Jerome’s use of three biblical citations for the illustration of the difference between things and the signs of things in *Quaestio de universalibus a parte rei*, Jerome’s source was undoubtedly Augustine’s treatise *De doctrina christiana*. Jerome used not only the same biblical citations, but used them for the same purpose and even the connecting text corresponds in both passages:

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de potentia materiae primae*, 151–152, see also the passage about scriptural authority, above, p. 71–73.

<sup>53</sup> See, especially, Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de formis universalibus*, 17.

<sup>54</sup> On this scholastic practice see the literature listed in note 5 above.

Aurelius Augustinus, <i>De doctrina christiana</i> <sup>55</sup>	Hieronymus de Praga, <i>Quaestio UAPR</i> <sup>56</sup>
<p>Omnis doctrina vel rerum est vel signorum, sed res per signa discuntur. Proprie autem nunc res appellavi, quae non ad significandum aliquid adhibentur,</p> <p>sicuti est lignum, lapis, pecus atque huiusmodi cetera; sed non illud lignum quod in aquas amaras Moysen misisse legimus, ut amaritudine carerent neque ille lapis quem Iacob sibi ad caput posuerat neque illud pecus quod pro filio immolavit Abraham. Hae namque ita res sunt, ut aliarum etiam signa sint rerum. [...]</p>	<p>Quantum igitur ad primum articulum, nota differentiam rerum atque signorum. Unde res in proposito voco, quae non adhibentur ad significandum alicuius rei alterius gracia, cuiusmodi res sunt lignum, lapis, pecus cum ceteris, sed non illud lignum, quod in aquas amaras Moysen misisse legimus, nec ille lapis, quem Iacob capiti supposuit erexitque in titulum fundens oleum desuper, nec illud pecus, quod Abraham patriarcha pro filio ymolavit. Hec enim ita res sunt, ut et signa rerum aliarum esse non desinant.</p>

Also Chalcidius's Latin translation of Plato's dialogue *Timaios* provided Jerome with inspiration for biblical references. Here Jerome selected the passage concerning the first verses of the Bible (Genesis 1: 1–2) and their interpretation by ancient thinkers. Let us recall that Jerome interpreted this biblical passage as the creation of the first matter:

Calcidius, <i>Commentarius</i> <sup>57</sup>	Hieronymus de Praga, <i>Quaestio UMPP</i> <sup>58</sup>
<p>Quorum sapientissimus Moyses non humana facundia sed diuina, ut ferunt, inspiratione u egetatus,</p> <p>in eo libro qui <i>De genitura mundi</i> censetur, ab exordio sic est profatus, iuxta interpretationem septuaginta prudentium: "Initio deus fecit caelum et terram, terra autem erat inuisibilis et incompta", ut uero ait Acyles: "Caput rerum condidit deus caelum et terram, terra porro inanis erat et nihil", uel ut Symmachus: "Ab exordio condidit deus caelum et terram, terra porro fuit otiosum quid confusumque et inordinatum." Sed Origenes asseuerat ita sibi ab Hebraeis esse persuasum quod in aliquantum sit a uera proprietate deriuata interpretatio; fuisse enim in exemplari: "Terra autem stupida quadam erat admiratione." Omnia tamen haec in unum aiunt concurrere ut et generata sit ea quae subiecta est uniuerso corpori silua [...].</p>	<p>Moyses uero sapientissimus Hebreorum philosophus diuersis eam nuncupat nominibus propter diuersam proprietatem eius extra genus. Nam nec uocat eam terram propter sui uersis corporibus subiectibilitatem, nec aquam propter eius in respectu omnium formarum capacitatem, nec uero abyssum propter capacitatis eius per varias formas inexhaustibilitatem, uti patet in tractatu suo, quem de genitura mundi conscripsit, sed hoc iuxta interpretationem septuaginta prudentium [primi Deuteronomii <i>ed.</i>]. Symachus uero uerba predicti philosophi sic interpretatus est: Terra porro inanis erat et nichil. Aquila uero sic: Terra uero inuisibilis erat et incompleta. Origenes uero in interpretatione sua dicit, sibi ab Hebraeis fuisse persuasum, sic fore in exemplari Moisi: Terra uero erat stupida, digna quoque admiratione. Omnia tamen haec christiani per hoc aiunt in unum concurrere ut designent generatam quae subiecta est universo corpori primordiale materiam, uti declarat subtiliter magnus Augustinus super Genesim ad litteram.</p>

<sup>55</sup> Aurelius Augustinus, *De doctrina christiana*, I, 2.

<sup>56</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de universalibus a parte rei*, 85, l. 9–21.

John Wyclif's writings were an important source for Jerome not only concerning their doctrinal content, but also concerning biblical quotations.<sup>59</sup> Most likely such a derivation is also valid for Jerome's frequent citation from the book of Sirach 34: 12 and 42: 24, which – very much as Wyclif had done in *De ideis* – he used to support the existence of eternal intellectual being of temporal things:

Johannes Wyclif, <i>De ideis</i> <sup>60</sup>	Hieronimus de Praga, <i>Quaestio</i> USFU <sup>61</sup>
Argumentum patet de isto magno doctore Hebreorum Ecclesiastico, qui 34° capitulo [24° ms.] sui libelli dicit se vidisse plurimas verborum consuetudines et intelligencias. Ipse, inquam, 42° <capitulo> sui libri sic scribit de Deo Patre: "Magnalia sapientie sue decoravit, qui est ante seculum et usque in seculum." Et sequitur "omnia hec vivunt et manent usque in seculum." Nec exponit quid sane quomodo omnia ista magnalia vivunt eternaliter, nisi ut postillantes exponunt, quod vivunt in suis rationibus potencialibus aut intelligibilibus. Unde, exponens modum quo debet intelligi, subdit: "Omnia duplicia, unum contra unum, et non fecit quidquam deesse," acsi diceret omnes creature habent duplex esse, unum esse intelligibile contra unum actuale.	Item ille vetustus Hebreorum philosophus, qui se dicit plurimas verborum consuetudines et intelligencias vidisse, insuper versucias proverbiorum parabolarumque intellexisse, 42. cap. libri sui scribit in hec verba, sapientie Dei opera magnificans: "Omnia hec," inquit, "vivunt et manent usque in seculum, omnia duplicia, unum contra unum."  Et quid est "unum contra unum," nisi quia uni esse existere correspondet unum esse intelligibile et ideo omnia duplicia, quia temporalia eternalibus subducta? Patet ex hiis, quam clara sit de hiis rebus huius Hebrei philosophi sententia, etc.

<sup>57</sup> Calcidius, *In Platonis Timaeum*, § 276, in *Commentaire au Timée de Platon*, ed. Béatrice Bakhouché (Paris, 2011) I: 504, l. 13–24.

<sup>58</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de potentia materiae primae*, 142–143, l. 51–68.

<sup>59</sup> For an analysis of the influence of Wyclif's writings on Jerome's work and on the beginning of the reception of Wyclif's ideas in Bohemia, see Ota Pavlíček, "Wyclif's Early Reception in Bohemia and his Influence on the Thought of Jerome of Prague," in *Europe after Wyclif*, ed. Michael Van Dussen and Patrick Hornbeck, forthcoming. On the second theme, see František Šmahel, "Wyclif's Fortune in Hussite Bohemia," in idem, *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalters*, 467–489; Herold, *Pražská univerzita a Wyclif*; Anne Hudson, "From Oxford to Prague: The Writings of John Wyclif and his English Followers in Bohemia," in eadem, *Studies in the Transmission of Wyclif's Writings* (Aldershot, 2008), II, 642–657; Włodzimierz Zega, *Filozofia Boga w Quaestiones Sententiarum Mikolaja Bicepsa* [The Philosophy of God in the *Quaestiones Sententiarum* of Nicholas Biceps] (Warsaw, 2002), 88–101; Šmahel, *Život a dílo Jeronyma Pražského*, 179–183; Michael Van Dussen, *From England to Bohemia: Heresy and Communication in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2012) 63–85; František Šmahel, *Jan Hus, Život a dílo* [Jan Hus, Life and Work] (Prague, 2013) 37–39. Cf. Anne Hudson, "The Survival of Wyclif's Works in England and Bohemia," in *Studies*, XVI, 29–41 and eadem, "From Oxford to Bohemia: Reflections on the Transmission of Wycliffite Texts," *SMB* 2 (2010), 25–37. For additional literature, see Zega, *Filozofia Boga*, 88–89, note 251.

<sup>60</sup> Johannes Wyclif, *De ideis*, c. 1, MS Praha, Národní knihovna XXIII F 58, fol. 170v. I am indebted to Vilém Herold for kindly providing me with a critical edition of this treatise which I used for my research. Influence of Wyclif's treatise *De ideis* on *Quaestio de mundo archetypo* of Jerome was already noted by Herold, *Pražská univerzita a Wyclif*, 204–219.

<sup>61</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de formis universalibus*, 21, l. 199–208.



A similar case is Jerome's utilisation of John 1: 4, at least as far as the *Quaestio de mundo archetypo* is concerned. It is true that Jerome could have found the very quotation from John with Augustine's division of verses and punctuation directly in the Bible or in Augustine's text. But considering the use of a different punctuation and explication with the help of Augustine's argument from *De Trinitate* (which coincides with Wyclif's), it is more than likely that here – at least in part – Jerome was inspired by Wyclif's treatise *De ideis*:

Johannes Wyclif, <i>De ideis</i> <sup>62</sup>	Hieronymus de Praga, <i>Quaestio UMAQ</i> <sup>63</sup>
Argumentum patet 7 <sup>o</sup> Confessionum, ubi beatus Augustinus dicit se invenisse in quodam libro greco Platonis totam theologiam huius Evangelii et inter alia invenit hanc sententiam: "Quod factum est, in ipso vita erat." Tercio, quia magnus Augustinus, qui cum tanta sollicitudine et gracia rimatus est sensum Scripture, exponit hunc textum ad hunc sensum, quod omnis creatura fuit eternaliter vita in Deo. Unde 4 <sup>o</sup> De Trinitate 3 <sup>o</sup> <capitulo>, sic scribit: "Quia ergo unum est Verbum Dei, per quod facta sunt omnia, per ipsum facta sunt omnia, secundo quod est incommutabiliter veritas, ibi principaliter atque incommutabiliter sunt omnia simul. Non solum, que nunc sunt in universa creatura hac, verum etiam que fuerunt et que ventura sunt. Ibi nec fuerunt, nec futura sunt ibi, sed tantum sunt. Et omnia vita sunt et omnia unum sunt. Sic enim omnia per ipsum facta sunt, etiam corpus quod in se vita non est, per se ipsum non fieret, nisi in ipso, antequam fieret, vita esset."	Sed super hec omnia eminent celestis metaphisici auctoritas, qua intonat: "Quod factum est in ipso vita erat." Quod magnus Augustinus, qui magna sollicitudine et gracia rimatus est sensu <m> sacre Scripture, sic exponit, quod omnis creatura fuit eternaliter in Deo. Unde 4 <sup>o</sup> De Trinitate sic scribit: "Quia ergo unum est verbum Dei, per quod facta sunt omnia, quod est incommutabiliter veritas, ibi principaliter aut incommutabiliter sunt omnia simul, non solum, que nunc sunt in universa creatura hac, verum etiam, que fuerunt et que ventura sunt. Ibi nec fuerunt nec futura sunt [ibi], sed tantum sunt, et omnia vita sunt et omnia unum sunt. Sic enim per ipsum omnia facta sunt, etiam corpus, quod in se vita non est, per se ipsum non fieret, nisi in ipso, antequam fieret, vita esset."

The same *quaestio* of Jerome reveals additional borrowings of biblical passages from Wyclif's *De ideis*. As the first instance, we can note the reference and interpretation of the text of Hebrews 11: 3, which Jerome, just like Wyclif before him, identifies erroneously as Hebrews 5. As can be seen, Jerome does not refer to the authority of Anselm, instead he is satisfied with Augustine's interpretation from *De civitate Dei*:

<sup>62</sup> Johannes Wyclif, *De ideis*, c. 1, f. 170r.

<sup>63</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de mundo archetypo*, 187, l. 776–789.

Johannes Wyclif, <i>De ideis</i> <sup>64</sup>	Hieronymus de Praga, <i>Quaestio UMAQ</i> <sup>65</sup>
Et istum sensum pretendit Ad Hebreos 5 <sup>o</sup> ubi sic scribit: “Fide intelligimus aptata esse secula verbo Dei, ut ex invisibilibus visibilia fierent.” Et ista secula invisibilia exponit Augustinus, 12 <sup>o</sup> De civitate Dei <capitulo> 19 <sup>o</sup> , et Anselmus, Proslogion 21 <sup>o</sup> de exemplaribus temporalibus seculorum.	Et alias pro utraque parte notum est et confirmatur hoc correlarium cum sua probacione per Apostolum Ad Hebr. 5 <sup>o</sup> , ubi sic scribit: “Fide intelligimus aptata esse secula verbo Dei, ut ex invisibilibus visibilia fierent”. Que secula invisibilia exponens Augustinus XII De civitate Dei, 19, dicit ea secula exemplaria temporalium seculorum.

The immediately following passage in Jerome’s *quaestio* is another borrowing from Wyclif; this time it is the matter of verses from Revelation 1: 6 and 4: 9. In addition to the same sequence of biblical passages as in Wyclif, the borrowing is attested also by the same punctuation and a close resemblance of the connecting text. It is no less significant that the passage in both Wyclif and Jerome connects directly to the passage, which was compared earlier:

Johannes Wyclif, <i>De ideis</i> <sup>66</sup>	Hieronymus de Praga, <i>Quaestio UMAQ</i> <sup>67</sup>
Unde videtur istum terminum ‘seculorum’ limitare istum terminum ‘secula’ ad supponendum pro esse intelligibili seculi temporalis, ut Apocalypsi 1 <sup>o</sup> : “Ipsi gloria et imperium in secula seculorum.” Sic enim iuravit angelus per viventem “in secula seculorum.” *Ad istum sensum utitur ecclesia in fine oracionum ‘in secula seculorum’, dicit *<beatus> Apostolus Iohannes.	Unde multocius in Scripturis iste terminus <i>seculorum</i> videtur limitare istum terminum <i>secula</i> ad supponendum pro esse intelligibili seculi temporalis, ut Apostolus. Ideo “ipsi gloria et imperium in secula seculorum”. Illo sensu eciam utitur ecclesia in fine oracionum, cum dicit: “per omnia secula seculorum”. Sic eciam innuit Angelus per “viventem in secula”, Apocalypsi Iohannis.

Jerome found in Wyclif’s treatise *De ideis* additional biblical arguments for the relationship between the intelligible eternal world and the sensible temporal world. A proof of dependence is also furnished by the sequence of the biblical passages used (Psalm 76: 6, Job 10: 5, Psalm 73: 11, Psalm 101: 28, 2 Peter 3: 18), one of which is identified erroneously in both Wyclif and Jerome, because it is a reference to Psalm 83: 11 instead of 73: 11. It is a continuation of a fairly long passage, adopted by Jerome from the treatise *De ideis*:

<sup>64</sup> Johannes Wyclif, *De ideis*, c. 2, f. 175v.

<sup>65</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de mundo archetypo*, 187, l. 599–604. Jerome notes the authority of Hebrews also in his *Quaestio de potentia materiae primae*, in which he gives the correct reference, i.e. 11: 3. I could not find this passage in Wyclif’s treatise *De materia et forma*, on which Jerome drew substantially for his *quaestio*. See Pavlíček, “Wyclif’s Early Reception in Bohemia and his Influence on the Thought of Jerome of Prague.”

<sup>66</sup> Johannes Wyclif, *De ideis*, c. 2, f. 175v.

<sup>67</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de mundo archetypo*, 181, l. 605–611.

Johannes Wyclif, <i>De ideis</i> <sup>68</sup>	Hieronymus de Praga, <i>Quaestio</i> UMAQ <sup>69</sup>
<p>“Cogitavi,” inquit Psalmista, “dies antiquos et annos eternos in mente habui,” Psalmo 76°. Illi autem non sunt dies formaliter nostrorum temporum ad extra, quia Iob querit: “Numquid sicut dies hominis dies tui, et anni tui sicut humana sunt tempora?,” quasi diceret ‘non’. Ideo Psalmo dicitur 73°: “Melior est dies una in atriis tuis duper milia,” nec mirum quia Psalmo 101° dicitur: “Tu autem idem ipse es, et anni tui non deficient.” Quotquot enim videntur anni, dies, instancia vel tempora, omnia sunt essentialiter eadem simplex eternitas, licet ideata intellecta differunt racione. Et in isto sensu fuit iste piscator Petrus edoc-tus, 2<sup>a</sup> Petri 3°, ita scribens: “Ipsi gloria nunc, et in diem eternitatis.”</p>	<p>Patet, quia si secula a seculis exemplantur, igitur et dies a diebus, cum secula temporalia sunt numero dierum numerata. Hoc eciam correlarium affirmat Psalmista David: «Cogitavi dies antiquos», id est temporales, «et annos eternos in mente habui», Psalmo 76. Illi inter dies eterni non sunt formaliter dies nostrorum ad extra temporum, quia Iob querit: «Nunquid dies hominis dies tui et anni tui sicut humana sunt tempora?», quasi diceret, quod non. Nec sunt formaliter divina essencia, de quibus Psalmo 73 dicit: «Melior est dies una in atriis tuis super milia», sed sunt essentialiter eadem simplex eternitas, quod innuitur Psalmo 101: «Tu autem idem ipse es et anni tui non deficient». Et isto sensu videtur esse coactus piscator Petrus II<sup>a</sup> Petri 3° scribens: “Ipsi gloria nunc et in die eternitatis”.</p>

Finally, the last important biblical borrowing from *De ideis*<sup>70</sup> in this *quaestio* is the reference to, and the interpretation of, Sirach 18: 1 which Jerome, just like Wyclif, cites as *Sapientiae* 18. The name of the book, just as the context of the passage in Jerome – which evidently is a lengthy borrowing from Wyclif – surely enables us to state that Jerome again adopted the passage from *De ideis*:

Johannes Wyclif, <i>De ideis</i> <sup>71</sup>	Hieronymus de Praga, <i>Quaestio</i> UMAQ <sup>72</sup>
<p>Idem ergo est iudicium de homine et de qualibet materiali creatura, quod omnes facte sunt in suis causis secundis in primo instanti temporis, vel in propria existencia, vel in genere ac in specie, vel in racione seminali, quia Sapientie 18° dicitur: “Qui vivit in eternum creavit omnia simul”</p>	<p>Et quodlibet esse preter primum est temporale et caducum, quia omnes mundi creature in primo instanti temporis facte sunt, et hoc vel &lt;in&gt; suis causis secundis et extrinsecis, vel in propria existencia, vel in genere vel specie, vel racione seminali, quod patet ex testimonio Scripture. Nam Sapientie 18° scribitur: «Qui vivit in eternum, creavit omnia simul». Quodlibet eciam tale est caducum.</p>

Jerome found inspiration in Wyclif, this time in the treatise *De universalibus*, even concerning the realistic interpretation of the verse Genesis 1: 24. This is attested by the common use of the term “eximius philosophus” in reference to Moses, as well as by the fact that the argumentation of Jerome’s *Quaestio de*

<sup>68</sup> Johannes Wyclif, *De ideis*, c. 2, f. 175v.

<sup>69</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de mundo archetypo*, 182, l. 614–628.

<sup>70</sup> Chapter one of *De ideis* also contains a reference to Rom 11: 36 (f. 37v). Wyclif, however, used it in this treatise a bit differently than Jerome. Jerome, however, might have adopted this reference – in connection with the teaching about the soul – from another text.

<sup>71</sup> Johannes Wyclif, *De ideis*, c. 3, f. 179r.

<sup>72</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de mundo archetypo*, 185, l. 719–725.

*universalibus extra signa* is by and large based on the above-mentioned treatise.<sup>73</sup> Jerome, however, further adjusted Wyclif's argument, partly through a reduction, partly through an expansion (including the use of the expression "facie revelata Deum" from 2 Corinthians 3: 18).<sup>74</sup> The resulting text attacks more radically the philosophical positions close to nominalism. It so happens that – in distinction from Wyclif – we find in Jerome attacks on those authors, according to whom genera and species are merely human concepts or terms, stemming from dementia (*dementia*):

Johannes Wyclif, <i>De universalibus</i> <sup>75</sup>	Hieronymus de Praga, <i>Quaestio USEA</i> <sup>76</sup>
Nam quando ille eximius philosophus et propheta Moyses dixit, Genesis 1 <sup>o</sup> : «producat terra animam viventem in genere suo, iumenta, et reptilia et bestias terrae secundum species suas», non intellexit terminum vel conceptum humanum per 'genus' et 'speciem', sed naturas universales communicatas multis suppositis, ut loquitur Commentator. Et ita de aliis dictis Scripturae sacrae.	Nec valet dicere, uti quidam dicunt, quod institutio humana constituit genus et speciem, tum quia tunc non foret genus et species ante institutionem humanam, quod est contra infallibilem scripturam, ubi ab eo, qui facie revelata Deum vidit, ad hominum perpetuam memoriam conscriptum est, quod creavit Deus omnia animantia in genere suo, universas bestias atque reptilia secundum species suas. Quis enim in tantam incurrat demenciam, ut hunc philosophum eximium audeat dicere hoc loco per genus et speciem humanum conceptum intellexisse vel terminum? Verum hoc loco per genus et speciem naturas universales intendit, in quibus res eis inferiores create sunt.

Our tracking of Jerome's sources will be concluded by two biblical citations, which he adopted from Wyclif's treatise *De dominio divino*. The first instance concerns Psalm 144: 9, which Jerome used in *Quaestio de convertibilitate terminorum* in his explication of the term *gubernatio*, that is, of the divine rule over the created world. We cannot say for certain that Jerome adopted this theory of Wyclif's, but it is certain that, for his *quaestio*, roughly one half of Jerome's text about the convertibility of terms<sup>77</sup> was borrowed from

<sup>73</sup> See Pavlíček, "Wyclif's Early Reception in Bohemia and his Influence on the Thought of Jerome of Prague."

<sup>74</sup> Cf. the text of the Vulgate, 2 Cor 3: 18: "Nos vero omnes revelata facie gloriam Domini speculantes in eandem imaginem transformamur a claritate in claritatem tamquam a Domini Spiritu."

<sup>75</sup> Johannes Wyclif, *Tractatus de universalibus*, c. 2, ed. I. J. Mueller (Oxford, 1985) 69, l. 381–389.

<sup>76</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de universalibus extra signa*, 46, l. 999–1010.

<sup>77</sup> Convertibility of terms (a simple conversion) establishes the rules for the substitution of a term, for instance of the subject, for another term, for instance the predicate, and vice versa, as far as it concerns the quantity (*universalis, particularis, infinita, singularis*) and the quality (*affirmativa, negativa*) of a predication. The logical square of opposition of predications and their matter (*naturalis, contingens, remota*) organise and introduce the laws of conversion, which are necessary for the formation of syllogisms. On this briefly,

Wyclif's treatise.<sup>78</sup> It concerns also the following passage, which contains the incriminated Psalm 144: 9:

Johannes Wyclif, <i>De dominio Divino</i> <sup>79</sup>	Hieronymus de Praga, <i>Quaestio UUTI</i> <sup>80</sup>
Nam ex infinitate sue potencie producit opus ex puro esse intelligibili, ut ex fine remotissimo, ad esse existere creature: quod ex hoc conservat in esse creato, quod est finis secundus infinitum distans a priori: et tercio, actu gubernacionis, suaviter et misericorditer conservatum gubernat; quem actum regiminis Psalmus cxliv. 9 sic expressit: <i>Suavis Dominus in universis et miseraciones eius super omnia opera eius.</i>	Cum Deus ex infinitate sue potencie produxit opus ex puro esse intelligibili, ut ex remotissimo termino ad esse existere causaliter, quod ex hoc conservat in esse creato, quod est terminus secundus infinitum distans a priori. Et tercio actu gubernacionis potissime creatum et misericorditer conservatum suavissime gubernat. Qui termini ut actus regiminis imprimuntur, cum dicitur: „Suavis dominus in universis etc“.

Finally, Wyclif inspired in Jerome's *quaestio* also the use of Luke 18: 19 in connection with the analogical predication of good (*bonitas*):

Johannes Wyclif, <i>De dominio Divino</i> <sup>81</sup>	Hieronymus de Praga, <i>Quaestio UUTI</i> <sup>82</sup>
Sed si subtiliter attendamus, magis distanter et equivoce dicitur quelibet creatura bona quoad Deum cui adheret, quam accidens quoad subiectum cui inheret: quia sicut accidens non potest habere bonitatem vel essenciam nisi computando bonitatem subiecti cui inhereat; sic creatura, nisi participando bonitatem Dei cui adhereat. Ideo, propter analogiam et equivocacionem bonitatis Dei ad bonitatem creatam, dicit Salvator, Luc. xviii.19, Nemo bonus nisi solus Deus.	Quodsi subtiliter attenditur, magis distanter et equivoce quelibet creatura dicitur bona quoad Deum, cui adheret, quam accidens quoad subiectum, cui inheret, quia sicut accidens non potest habere bonitatem vel essenciam nisi computando bonitatem subiecti, cui inheret, sic nec creatura [inheret – creatura: inheserit, sic nec creaturam <i>ms.</i> ], nisi computando bonitatem Dei, cui adhereat. Et propter hanc analogiam ac equivocacionem bonitatis Dei ad bonitatem creatam dicit ille mixtus ex supremo et infimo intellectu philosophus: „nemo bonus, nisi solus Deus“.

Aristoteles, *APr.*, II, 53a 3–14. See, for instance, Louis Groarke, *An Aristotelian Account of Induction, Creating Something from Nothing* (Montreal and Kingston, 2009), especially 129–137. Medieval scholars dealt with convertibility within the framework of introductions to logic, in connection with the logical square and equipollence, or as a part of syllogistics. See Peter of Spain, *Summule logicales*, ed. Lambert M. de Rijk (Assen, 1972), especially 8, 10, 14–15, 22, 35, 40, 62, 153, William of Sherwood, *Introductiones in logicam, Einführung in die Logik*, ed. Hartmuth Brands and Christoph Kann (Hamburg, 1995) 60–62. I introduce this explanation to make it clear that the basic theme of Jerome's *quaestio* is remote from Wyclif's theory of God's rule, and it cannot be excluded that Jerome only utilised Wyclif's text as a stuffing of his *quaestio* for a demonstration of his solution of convertibility, without adopting Wyclif's ideas from the borderland of philosophy and theology.

<sup>78</sup> For this, see again Pavlíček, "Wyclif's Early Reception in Bohemia and his Influence on the Thought of Jerome of Prague."

<sup>79</sup> Johannes Wyclif, *De dominio Divino libri tres*, c. 2, ed. Reginald L. Poole (London, 1890) I: 13, l. 17–14, l. 13.

<sup>80</sup> Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de convertibilitate terminorum*, 76, l. 117–123.

## Conclusion

Our study has shown that, according to Jerome's assertion, Scripture occupied the highest place as an authority. If his statements are taken seriously, he was convinced about the existence of an hidden objective meaning of the Bible and this meaning corresponded with his doctrinal standpoints. In other words, it follows from Jerome's assertions that he was persuaded about harmony between his thought and the correct meaning of the Scripture. Nevertheless, considering the number of other authorities used, he avoided the principle of *sola scriptura*. The inspiration and the acknowledged guarantor of the correct biblical interpretation were for him the works of St. Augustine, whose interpretations he frequently adopted from the writings of John Wyclif. As we have shown, it was from Wyclif that Jerome had borrowed most of the biblical quotations for his own texts. These citations concerned mostly the creation – a theme, which for Jerome included Ideas in God's Mind; the problems around the creation of the first matter; as well as certain themes from the sensible world and the relationship of that world to the intelligible world in the Divine Mind. Considering these borrowings, it is not possible to speak in the case of Jerome about a fully autonomous scriptural interpretation. An exception, showcasing his autonomy of interpretation, is the *Recommendatio*, but here it is more a matter of a rhetorical use of the Bible than a usage in the support of standpoints in philosophy or theology. The above assessment does not cast doubt on the idea that Jerome developed considerable effort to support his conclusions with the authority of the Bible. On the contrary, it appears that – although he was not formally a graduate in theology – Jerome managed to utilise skilfully the Scripture and demonstrated that his ideas were in harmony with the Bible. Apparently with regard to his belonging to the Faculty of Arts, he also stressed the philosophical character of Scripture. From his viewpoint, the Bible was a text written – at least in part – by philosophers.<sup>83</sup>

Translated from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David

<sup>81</sup> Johannes Wyclif, *De dominio Divino*, c. 3, I: 21, l. 9–17.

<sup>82</sup> I base this citation on my own reading and emendations of the manuscript MS Prague, NK, X E 24, f. 193v. Cf. Hieronymus de Praga, *Quaestio de convertibilitate terminorum*, 78, l. 185–193.

<sup>83</sup> I wish to thank the Jan Hus Educational Foundation for supporting my research. This article also received financial support from the CENDARI project financed by the European Union under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, realised at King's College London.