

---

## The University of Paris and the Foundations of the Bohemian Reformation

---

**Vilém Herold**

(Prague)

The foundations of the currents of ideas, which led to the gradual ideological formation of the Hussite movement and of the Bohemian Reformation, have usually been linked more with the University of Oxford and particularly with John Wyclif. This influence is certain, although it is neither exclusive nor without qualifications. The search for additional sources of inspiration, of course, must not be motivated by a wish to eliminate the influence of Oxford and Wyclif, or to emphasize exclusively the influence of the local domestic tradition. Rather it is an attempt to find within the context of European thought of that time those currents which initiated or could have initiated, directly or indirectly, the genesis of ideas aiming at a rectification, that is reform, in the contemporary church.<sup>1</sup>

It is interesting that three of the outstanding personalities of the Bohemian reform movement, Vojtěch Raňkův of Ježov (Adalbert Ranconis de Ericinio), Matěj of Janov (Matthias de Janov), and Jeroným Pražský (Hieronymus Pragensis), all studied and taught, for a shorter or longer time and among other places, in Paris. The same was true of the third archbishop of Prague, Jan of Jenštejn (Iohannes de Ienzenstein) who - like his two predecessors, Arnošt of Pardubice and Jan Očko of Vlašim - was a supporter of the reforming endeavors, although both Vojtěch Raňkův and Matěj of Janov came into conflict with him for various reasons. Finally, it was under Jan of Jenštejn that the idea of so-called *translatio studii* from Paris to Prague assumed a relatively concrete form.

Let us briefly consider the above-mentioned personalities and circumstances. Before starting it is necessary to make at least two observations. First, the suggested considerations by far cannot exhaust the chosen theme because the full determination of the impact of the University of Paris on Prague would require the fullest possible exploration of the entire extent of the cultivated teaching and theories. It is important to note that, after all, the Prague alma mater had the University of Paris as its model at its very foundation.<sup>2</sup>

---

1) Hus's dependence on Wyclif's teaching was emphasized already by the Council of Constance, both in its proceedings, and in its final judgment. The idea of the Oxonian's considerable influence on the Bohemian Reformation and its program subsequently persisted - of course with differing value judgments - in both Roman and Utraquist milieu, and later the Protestant one, virtually to the present. In modern historiography a sharp confrontation of views arose from the one-sided assertion of Wyclif's almost exclusive influence on Hus by J. Loserth in his *Hus und Wiclif: Zur Genesis der hussitischen Lehre* (Prague and Leipzig, 1884).

2) Undoubtedly influential was here also the fact that the University's founder Charles IV had himself studied in his youth at the Faculty of Arts of the Parisian University. See J. Spěváček, *Karel IV: život a dílo* (Prague, 1979), 72, with a reference to the Chronicle of Beneš Krabice of Weitmíle (FRB 4, 498 and 517). As for the other model mentioned in the University of Prague's founding document, the University of Bologna famous for its school of law, it is appropriately noted in the recent history of Charles University that "albeit unwittingly this peculiar duplex derivation of the Prague *studium*

Second, it is important to keep in mind the fact that as far as philosophy and theology were concerned, as it is well known, the University of Paris was already before the mid-fourteenth century under a strong, virtually preponderant English influence, particularly that of the Oxford University. This was true of the teaching of William of Ockham, Duns Scotus, Robert Holcot, Adam Woodham, Richard Fitzralph, Thomas Buckingham, Thomas Bradwardine, Walter Burley, Richard Killington, William Heytesbury and others.<sup>3</sup> Paris still holds a large number of manuscripts of the English authors, who were just named regardless of their doctrinal orientation, or the principal subject of their philosophical and theological interest, or the degree of their influence on such Parisian thinkers as Jean de Mirecourt, Gregoire de Rimini, Johannes de Ripa, and finally also Pierre d'Ailly and Jean Gerson. Bishop Richard of Bury, a bibliophile and Walter Burley's patron, perceived the situation so one-sided that for him Minerva had forsaken Paris and had flown over to the British Isles.<sup>4</sup>

All this is mentioned in particular to emphasize that because of the existing cosmopolitanism of medieval universities and the habitual *peregrinatio academica* it is not possible to isolate and identify strictly the specific intellectual development and influence of the individual centers of learning. This was true not only of Paris and Oxford, but also of universities not treated in this article, such as the seats of learning in Italy and later in Prague, and the other newly established universities of Central Europe.

Anyway, we shall see this ambiguity markedly at the very least in the case of two of the protagonists, who were earlier cited as exemplifying Bohemia's contacts with the University of Paris, namely Vojtěch Raňkův of Ježov and Jeroným of Prague. Moreover, we will encounter the names of some of the enumerated English thinkers more or less notably, in a positive or a negative sense, within the context of Czech striving for ecclesiastical reform.

\* \* \*

Let us begin with Vojtěch Raňkův of Ježov.<sup>5</sup> His studies in Paris date in part prior to the founding of the University of Prague. He graduated there as a bachelor as early as 1344 and as a master of liberal arts in 1346. Like other students from the Bohemian Lands in Paris, Vojtěch was registered as a member of the English nation,<sup>6</sup> and he held the office of *procurator nationis Anglicanae* from 1350 to 1351. In the following year he was unanimously elected *socius domus de Sorbona Parisius*, that is a fellow of the foremost college named after the founder of the

---

*generale* foreshadowed the subsequent independence of the Law School of Prague in 1372. See the account by M. Svatoš in *Dějiny univerzity Karlovy* (Prague, 1995), I, :35.

3) The list of scholars was compiled by Z. Kaluza, " 'Translatio studii': Kryzys Uniwersytetu paryskiego w latach 1380-1400 i jego skutki," *Studia Mediewistyczne* 15 (1974) 85-86.

4) *Ibid.* 86-87.

5) The basic source is J. Kadlec, *Leben und Schriften des Prager Magisters Adalbert Ranconis de Ericinio* (Münster, 1971), which contains all known writings of Vojtěch, posthumously published from an edition prepared by R. Holinka and J. Vilikovsky.

6) Two other Vojtěchs from Bohemia studied at the University of Paris at the time – Vojtěch Bludův [Adalbert Bludonis], later one of the early theology professors at the University of Prague, and *Adalbertus de Praga, clericus Karoli, Romanorum et Bohemiae regis*, subsequently a canon of the Vyšehrad chapter. See Kadlec, *Leben und Schriften* 3 n. 7.

University of Paris. In 1355 he became the first (and the last) Czech to be chosen rector of the Parisian University, and while in office he steered through the adoption of statutes *de modo legendi libros artium in scholis*. Following the customary course of studies in theology, he received the degree of bachelor in 1363 and much later, on the basis of his commentaries on the Sentences of Lombard, also the doctorate of theology. This happened apparently on the basis of a recommendation of the future archbishop of Prague, Jan of Jenštejn, who otherwise provided lodgings for Vojtěch after the latter's first return to Prague in 1366. That was particularly important for the new doctor inasmuch as he had lost the income from the canonry at Prague Cathedral of St. Vitus, an office which he had previously obtained with much difficulty from Avignon.

Vojtěch Raňkův of Ježov retained an extraordinary respect for the University of Paris and he strongly emphasized that he would have been a churlish, renegade son, had he wanted to belittle his spiritual mother and teacher, or to conceal her fame and glory. He stressed that he owed the Parisian seat of learning all that he was and all that, with the help of God, he was destined to become.<sup>7</sup>

Vojtěch likewise valued his studies at Oxford which, as a member of the English University nation in Paris, he had apparently visited as early as 1347 or in 1353-54. It is very interesting in this connection that he obtained there a codex with two treatises, *De paupertate (pauperie) Salvatoris* and *Defensio curatorium contra fratres mendicantes*, by Richard Fitzralph, a fellow of Balliol College and chancellor of Oxford University, who was also archbishop of Armagh (+ 1360). It is intriguing that this manuscript, existing to this day, is actually an autograph of Fitzralph, also known as Armachanus, according to his Irish see. The personal encounter with Fitzralph and the knowledge of his work affected the Bohemian scholar most strongly. At the same time, embracing the views of Fitzralph's treatises spoiled his relations with the Parisian Franciscans who boycotted his university acts and nicknamed him *secundus Armachanus*. Particularly relevant here was the treatise *De paupertate Salvatoris*, which supported Pope Clement VI's campaign for church reform through a return to the original impoverished *ecclesia primitiva*, and also assailed the now highly enriched so-called mendicant orders. The degree or exclusiveness of Fitzralph's influence, however, remains an open question. It is clear that somewhat later Fitzralph's work inspired John Wyclif in his campaign at Oxford against the riches of the church, and against the mendicants.<sup>8</sup>

In order to nail down exactly Fitzralph's influence it would be necessary to refer to Vojtěch's philosophical, as well as theological works, neither of which

---

7) Forma Magistri Adalberti Magistris universitatis Pragensis missa: "Absit a me, ut tam decore matris mee et alumpne graciousitatem tamquam filius degener abscondam. Absit, ut eius gloriam, que toti mundi resplendet, reticeam. Si quid sum, Parisiensi <universitati> debeo, quidquid sum et quidquid, divina favente clemencia, futurus sum." Kadlec, *Leben und Schriften* 269-270.

8) At present the manuscript is held by the Austrian National Library in Vienna, as Nr. 1430. F. 1r contains notes of ownership: "Iste est liber magistri Adalberti Rankonis de Enricinio in Boemia. Et fuit reverendi domini Ricardi, primatis Yberniae, doctoris eximii sacrae theologiae, quam ipsemet dominus Ricardus composuit contra fratres mendicantes in curia Romana ad instantiam Clementis papae VI." See Kadlec, *Leben und Schriften* 12. Concerning Wyclif's indebtedness to Fitzralph, a fellow member of Balliol College at Oxford, see above all H. B. Workmann, *John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church* (London, 1926) 1:126; 131.

unfortunately have survived except for small fragments.<sup>9</sup> Even if a detailed textual comparison were possible, however, it hardly would demonstrate that Fitzralph was Vojtěch's sole model, at the same time an Oxford model, properly speaking mediated through Paris. We have the right to assume that the teaching of some of the other Paris masters must have left its traces. For that, however, we lack evidence as yet.

Nevertheless it is certain that Vojtěch's demonstrative and lasting attachment to the Bohemian reformist wing followed shortly in Prague. It is attested by two friendly letters that he sent from Paris to Konrad Waldhauser in 1365, in which he complained about the Franciscans' boycott of his *Sentences*, and about their nitpicking to find some incriminating material to send to the pope against him.<sup>10</sup> Calling Waldhauser his best friend, Vojtěch sent his greetings also to Jan Milíč of Kroměříž (*amicum meum specialissimum*) and to other friends.

Later in Prague Vojtěch confirmed his sympathies also by deeds. As the *scholasticus* of the chapter at the St. Vitus Cathedral in Prague, he opened his house to Matěj of Janov (who characterized himself as remaining forever a *pauper philosophans*), and he undoubtedly held a protective hand over other representatives of the Bohemian reform movement, all of whom esteemed him highly. Tomáš Štítný of Štítné, for instance, called him "a man of terrific reason and of wondrous memory."<sup>11</sup>

Inasmuch as we lack direct evidence about a concrete influence of the Parisian milieu on Vojtěch's reformist views, a certain guidance could be afforded at least by a detailed examination of the remnants of his library, or more properly of the codices which he owned or used.<sup>12</sup> As far as his own writings are concerned, the primacy of place undoubtedly belongs to his treatise *De frequenti communione*, which corresponds to the practice introduced by Milíč in Jerusalem, and then supported and theoretically justified by Matěj of Janov. With a certain hyperbole it is

---

9) J. Kadlec, the editor of Vojtěch's writings, calls attention to the fragmentary character of his subject's literary legacy. It is regrettable that we have lost – unless they have not yet been identified – Vojtěch's philosophical lectures from his time at the Faculty of Arts of the Paris University, inasmuch as he must have composed the customary commentaries on Aristotle's works. Exceptions are five brief early philosophical treatises, and the statutes of the University of Paris, *De reformando modo legendi in artibus*, which he put forth as the university's rector. Similarly we have lost Vojtěch's commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, his fundamental work in theology, which he explicitly mentioned in a letter to Konrad Waldhauser. Finally, only the polemics of Jan of Jenštejn acquaint us with Vojtěch's treatise *De scismate* which might have influenced the ecclesiological views of Matěj of Janov and Jan Hus.

10) The letters were published by Kadlec, *Leben und Schriften* 332-338.

11) Tomáš Štítný also donated to Vojtěch as an expression of gratitude his *Knížky šestery o obecných věcech křesťanských*, Before his departure to Avignon, where he would die in 1374, Milíč of Kroměříž entrusted to Vojtěch the protection of his religious institute Jerusalem. See Kadlec, *Leben und Schriften* 49-50. - Concerning Matěj of Janov see further below.

12) Kadlec, *Leben und Schriften* 57-58, lists several manuscripts, which constitute a preserved fragment of the once extensive library, which Vojtěch bequeathed to the Benedictine Monastery of Břevnov in March 1388. I. Hlaváček in "Studie k dějinám knihoven v českém státě v době předhusitské II.," AUC-HUCP VI/2, 48-61, presents a list (which he had discovered) of 24 manuscripts that Vojtěch sent from Avignon. Among the French authors of these manuscripts, who might have influenced Vojtěch, we find the names of Godefroid de Fontaines (*Quodlibeta*), Hugo de s. Victore, and especially Guillaume d'Auvergne (*De universo*), whose significant influence on Hus has been recently identified; see n. 35 below.

possible to say that this practice would subsequently culminate in the Utraquist demand of lay chalice.<sup>13</sup> Even in this case, however, we lack the evidence of a possible "Parisian inspiration." Finally, as for Vojtěch's lost treatise *De scismate*, it is assumed that it might have been inspired by John Wyclif's work. In the absence of the text, it would be difficult to argue that it might have eventually influenced Hus's ecclesiological views. What is certain is that Hus esteemed Vojtěch highly and bestowed on him the honorific appellation of *rhetor limpidissimus*.<sup>14</sup> Even in this instance, however, we seem to be closer to Oxford than to Paris as a source.

As for the existing homiletical writings of Vojtěch, it is possible to say that his Würzburg speech and particularly his synodal sermons of 1385 show a number of consonant traits with Milíč of Kroměříž and with the latter's synodal sermons. The critique of contemporary conditions in the church and proposals for their rectification form a common axis of sorts for the reform movement already in the reign of Charles IV, and a fortiori after the onset of the Great Schism. The use of identical citations from the Scripture or from patristic literature does not by itself prove mutual dependencies or Parisian sources, inasmuch as it might be simply a matter of *loci communes*.<sup>15</sup>

There is also an area of Vojtěch's conduct which, rather than documenting a reformist zeal, reveals more a certain imbalance of character and sheer cussedness in this otherwise remarkable figure of cultural and intellectual history of Bohemia before Hus. Here belongs his confrontation with Archbishop of Prague, Jan of Jenštejn, concerning escheatage, the concept of purgatory, and the feast of the Visitation of Blessed Virgin Mary, as well as his charges of heresy, filed with the Roman Curia against Heinrich Totting of Oyta, a German professor at the University of Prague. The last mentioned encounter might be seen more as a sign of the emerging confrontation between the Bohemian nation and the other university nations in Prague.

The presumption of a national dimension in Vojtěch's mind appears to be distinctly confirmed by his last will and testament of 1388 which set up a foundation

13) An abbreviated version of this treatise was also adopted by Matěj of Janov under the title *Determinacio venerabilis viri Magistri Adalberti Ranconis, magistri in artibus et doctoris in theologia Parysiensis* do svého základního díla *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti (liber III., tractatus 3., caput 7)*. See Matěj of Janov, *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, ed. Vlastimil Kybal, 2:86-92. How substantially the main promoter of communion *sub utraque*, Jakoubek of Stříbro, drew on Matěj of Janov's eucharistic treatises, was just convincingly demonstrated by Helena Krmíčková, *K počátkům kalicha v Čechách* (Brno, 1997), especially 86-113. She concludes that "Jakoubek derived more than half of his work not only in substance, but also in form, from Matěj of Janov" (*ibid.*, 110).

14) See Jan Hus, *Positiones, Recommendationes, Sermones* ed. A. Schmidtová (Prague, 1958) 126.

15) For instance, Vojtěch in his sermon, given in Würzburg, but written during his studies in Paris, deals very critically with the contemporary state of the clergy, and includes a quote from the prophet Jeremiah, "Greus perditus factus est populus meus, pastores eorum seduxerunt eos" (Jer. 50.6), which Milíč of Kroměříž also chose as the theme of his second synodal sermon, exuding an identical spirit. See Kadlec, *Leben und Schriften* 151; Milíč of Kroměříž [Iohannis Milicii de Cremsir] *Tres sermones synodales* eds. V. Herold and M. Mráz (Prague, 1974) 71-100. Vojtěch's synodal sermon in Prague contains, for instance, the significant quote from Gregory the Great (Homiliae XL in Evangelia, lib. I, hom. 17) "Ecce mundus sacerdotibus plenus est, sed tamen in messe Dei rarus invenitur, qui valde operatur, quia officium quidem sacerdotale suscipimus, sed opus officii non implemus," which was used also by Milíč of Kroměříž in his synodal sermons; see his *Tres sermones synodales* 57, 58.

from his sizable fortune. Its income of forty florins per year was to support students who wished to study philosophy or theology in Paris or Oxford. The *scholasticus* of the metropolitan chapter at the St. Vitus was to administer the foundation, but only if he was a Czech. Otherwise the management fell to the chapter dean to be assisted by three other canons. The eligibility for scholarships was limited to those students whose parents were Czechs.<sup>16</sup> It is not known to what extent Vojtěch might have been motivated by the experiences of poverty in Paris of Matěj of Janov, whom he had subsequently accommodated in his own house. What is certain is that at the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth centuries the scholarships were utilized by Czech students primarily at Oxford. Parenthetically, this was undoubtedly to a large extent a consequence of the intensified Bohemian-English relations in consequence of the marriage of Charles IV's daughter and Wenceslaus IV's sister, Anne, to the English King, Richard II. The Oxford scholarships then were crucial in the encounter and dissemination of Wyclif's writings and ideas in Bohemia.<sup>17</sup>

Let us, however, return to Paris. The second of the earlier mentioned protagonists of the Bohemian reform movement, Matěj of Janov, known locally also as *Magister Parisiensis*, lived and studied in Paris between the years 1373 and 1381. It is unnecessary to deal here with the background of this figure, inasmuch as he was the subject of a presentation at a previous symposium in this series (Brno 1994) by Jana Nechutová, the editor of the Fifth Book (or the 6<sup>th</sup> volume) of his *Regulae*.<sup>18</sup>

It is possible to focus here on the Parisian context of his life and work. Also in his case it would seem that the lengthy and intensive studies in the French capital must have left profound traces in his philosophical and theological views. Concerning his principal work, *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, he noted the following: "Non enim indoctas fabulas secutus hec scribo, sed ea, quae per novem annis Parisius a magistris meis didici et reportavi."<sup>19</sup> As for his stay in Paris, we know that Matěj of Janov, like Vojtěch Raňkův, also was a member of the English university nation; we know that he became a master in liberal arts in 1376, and that he was subsequently appointed *magister regens in artibus*, which meant that his task was to explicate the philosophical writings, prescribed by the university statutes, especially the works of Aristotle. We also know that he embarked on the regular course of theological studies, but could not complete them evidently because he lacked sufficient financial resources.<sup>20</sup>

It is, however, extremely difficult to determine exactly what Janov learned, or recorded for his use, from his mentors during his nine year stay in Paris. That is true

16) Kadlec, *Leben und Schriften* 58-59.

17) See František Šmahel, " 'Doctor evangelicus super omnes evangelistas': Wyclif's Fortune in Hussite Bohemia," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 43 (1970) 11-34, and Anne Hudson, *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988).

18) Jana Nechutová, "Matěj of Janov and His Work *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*: The Significance of Volume VI and its Relation to the Previously Published Volumes," BRRP. 2: 15-24. See also the basic monograph, Vlastimil Kybal, *M. Matěj z Janova, Jeho život, spisy a učení* (Prague, 1905), reprinted in the series *Pontes Pragenses* (Brno, 2000) on the initiative of the Hussite Theological Faculty, Charles University, Prague.

19) See Kybal, *M. Matěj z Janova* 10. Matěj of Janov esteemed the University of Paris as the supreme seat of wisdom and learning, and called it the sweetest mother and teacher; *ibid.* 24.

20) On Matěj's Parisian studies see particularly Kybal, *Matěj z Janova* 9-17.

also of his crucial work, *The Rules of the Old and the New Testament*. His purpose in writing it, as he states, was "to diminish at least a little the plenitude of unrighteousness, and in order to - having reignited somewhat the frozen love by the words of Christ's and the Apostles' law - arouse in some individuals the holy ardor for the house of God."<sup>21</sup>

It is impossible to determine the exact degree to which the avowed aim of the *Regulae* was inspired or co-inspired by the intellectual milieu of the University of Paris. These imponderables include specifically his efforts to recognize and to distinguish the true and the false Christianity, and his justification and endorsement of frequent communion by the laity, as the most effective means for the affirmation of the true Christianity and for the protection against the false one.<sup>22</sup>

Moreover, the latter part of Janov's Parisian stay coincided with the period of the Great Schism, which reflected the efforts of either maintaining or terminating the French ascendancy over the papacy. This period was also perceived as one of declining scholarly standards and of diminished fame for the University of Paris. These concrete circumstances nourished a revival of the ancient idea of *translatio studii*. The theory of a migratory character of learning had its origin in antiquity, lingered on in the Middle Ages, and stipulated a periodic shift of the centers of erudition, for instance, from Egypt to Greece, and from Greece to Rome.<sup>23</sup> While Bury's notion of a shift of learning from France to England was largely metaphorical,<sup>24</sup> now the idea of transferring the university of Paris to Prague emerged in a concrete form.<sup>25</sup>

The project undoubtedly grew out of the earlier lively contacts which developed between Charles IV and his chancellor Jan of Středa and the French court, and which subsequently continued in the time of Jan of Jenštejn. The latter studied in Paris for two years and the French King Charles V recommended him for the degree of doctor of laws.<sup>26</sup> According to an existing report by Jan of Jenštejn from September of 1381, the Bohemian and Roman King Wenceslaus IV planned to write a letter to Pope Urban VI about his intention "toto desiderio laborare, qualiter predicta Universitas <sc. Parisiensis> in Pragam transferatur." At the same time, he mentions his wish to discuss this matter with the papal legate in Prague. By coincidence, it was this legate, Pileo de Prata, who was welcomed on his entry to

21) Cited in Kybal, *Matěj z Janova* 42. To identify concrete instances of specific Parisian scholars' influence is also impeded by the fact that Matěj of Janov belonged to those medieval authors who – with the exception of the Scripture – made few references to other sources.

22) An important consideration from the viewpoint of Bohemian Reformation's origins is the fact that Matěj – inspired in Paris by his study of Sts. Augustine and Jerome – embraced the principle that biblical studies were the indispensable source of theological understanding, and should be *primum et fundamentale* for every Christian; see Kybal, *M. Matěj z Janova* 25. On Matěj's biblicism see also Nechutová, "Matěj of Janov," 16.

23) For a broad treatment of this theme see E. Jeuneau, *Translatio studii – The Transmission of Learning: A Gilsonian Theme* (Toronto, 1995).

24) See n. 4 above, and the relevant text.

25) See detailed treatment in Kaluza "Translatio studii."

26) For a survey of the life, work, and teaching of Jan of Jenštejn see J. V. Polc, "Jean Jenštejn," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 8: 558-565, cited from J. V. Polc, *Česká církev v dějinách* (Prague, 1999) 81-111. Jan of Středa, the chancellor of Charles IV, had already corresponded with the future King of France, Charles V.

Prague at the Gate of Kutná Hora by a brilliant oration of Vojtěch Raňkův of Ježov.<sup>27</sup>

Had this *translatio studii* occurred, Prague, which had already been the center of the Roman Empire under Charles IV, would have become under his successor Wenceslaus IV, as a Roman King, a center of European learning by inheriting the traditions of the University of Paris. But this was not to be for various reasons. Above all, Bohemia's cultural and political tilt toward England prevailed following the earlier-mentioned marriage of Anne of Bohemia to Richard II in 1382.

This overall tendency is also characteristic for the third figure of the Bohemian Reformation to be discussed in this study, Jeroným Pražský, a philosopher and a close friend of Hus.<sup>28</sup> It is characteristic for him inasmuch as he commenced his foreign studies in 1399 in Oxford where he became thoroughly acquainted with the still fresh philosophical and theological legacy of John Wyclif. Here he studied and copied the writings of the *doctor evangelicus*, which subsequently he would often cite. Wyclif would become his lasting revered and imitated model until his own gruesome death in Constance in 1416.<sup>29</sup>

Despite that, Jeroným's relatively brief stay at the University of Paris in 1404-1406 was extraordinarily important at least for three reasons. First, it was in Paris that Jeroným, once again as a member of the English university nation, obtained his first degree of master of arts in 1405, and subsequently also taught in Paris as *magister regens in artibus*.

Second, it is definitely demonstrable that Jeroným pursued his studies in Paris very intensively, taking notes for his major work, described as "magnum quodam volumen, quod agregavit Parisius, Anglie et in aliis studiis, ubi fuit, de materia universalium realium."<sup>30</sup> Although this magnum opus has not survived, subsequent research made it possible to determine exactly what were the Parisian sources and foundations of Jeroným's teaching about the universals and the Ideas. This was partly thanks to detailed researches in manuscripts during which František Šmahel discovered certain hitherto unknown works of Jeroným, and partly thanks to detailed analyses undertaken by Zenon Kaluza in the Bibliothèque Nationale, inspired by Stanislav Sousedík's discovery of citations from John Scot Eriugena. Once more we retrace the route through the medium of the University of Paris to the soil of the British Isles, to the Irish philosopher of the ninth century, as well as to his Neoplatonic inspirer Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite.<sup>31</sup>

---

27) See Kaluza, "Translatio studii," 96. Vojtěch's oration was published by Kadlec, *Leben und Schriften* 174-181.

28) On Jerome of Prague see, especially, František Šmahel, *Jeroným Pražský* (Prague, 1966), and by the same author, "Leben und Werk des Hieronymus von Prag," *Historica* 13 (1966) 81-111.

29) See František M. Bartoš, "Kostnický proces M. Jeronýma Pražského," *Sborník historický* 4 (1956) 60; Vilém Herold, "Wyclif und Hieronymus: Zum Versuch einer 'praktischen' Umwandlung der Metaphysik in der spätmittelalterlichen Philosophie," in *Knowledge and the Sciences in Medieval Philosophy* (Helsinki, 1990) 3:212-223.

30) J. Sedlák, "Filosofické spory pražské v době Husově," *Studie a texty* 2 (1915) 211.

31) František Šmahel, "Prolegomena zum Prager Universalienstreit: Zwischenbilanz einer Quellenanalyse," in *The Universities in the Late Middle Ages* (Louvain, 1978) 242-253; S. Sousedík, "M. Hieronymi Pragensis ex Johanne Scoto Eriugena excerpta," *Listy filologické*, 98 (1975) 4-7; Z. Kaluza, "Le chancelier Gerson et Jérôme de Prague," *AHDLMA* 51 (1984), 81-126, and especially Appendix II, "Jérôme de Prague, Érigène et le corpus dionysienne de l'Université de Paris," *ibid.* 117-126.

Third, Jeroným's life was fatefully affected by a three-day academic disputation which he conducted in the faculty of arts of the University of Paris in 1406. Conducted within the walls of St. Bernard's Church, the exercise was devoted to the issue of the universals, and Jeroným's provocative endorsement of Wyclif's constructs aroused notable attention, as well as indignation.

The commotion around the disputation necessitated Jeroným's precipitous departure from Paris and later engendered lethal consequences for him in Constance, where the chancellor of the University of Paris at the time of the disputation, and now one of the conciliar fathers and Jeroným's judges, the famous theologian Jean Gerson would excoriate the accused with these words: "Hieronyme, et tu, cum esses Parisiis putabas te esse Angelum cum eloquentia tua, et turbasti universitatem ponens multas in scholis conclusiones erroneas, cum earum correlariis, et presertim in materia universalium, et de ideis, et alia cum plurima scandalosa."<sup>32</sup> The disputation was not forgotten even after Jeroným's immolation. It would be brought up in a similar spirit at the Council of Basel by Gerson's pupil Gilles Charlier, who had participated personally in the exercise of 1406.<sup>33</sup>

In conclusion, I would like to make two observations. In the last few years the detailed exploration of Jeroným's work, including the context of his stay at the University of Paris, has confirmed the importance of the teaching about the universals and the Ideas as the philosophical and the philosophico-theological component in the formation of the Hussite reform program. This hitherto rather neglected component can in fact provide a better handle on the conflicts at the Council of Constance and on the genesis of the Hussite upheavals than the more emphasized critique of contemporary state of the church and a call for its reform. The source of the teaching about the universals and the Ideas is Platonism, or more precisely (1) the Platonic realism springing in many respects from St. Augustine's *Quaestio de ideis*, and (2) also the heterodox Pseudo-Dionysian Neoplatonism which Jeroným learned to know in Paris. It is my view that here we can see the crux of the conflict. This trend was abhorrent to the nominalistically oriented philosophers and theologians, such as Gerson and Pierre d'Ailly.

A striving for rectification, or reform, was necessarily implied by the ideal, raised up by Hus and his colleagues, which was that of a prototypical world of Ideas [*mundus archetypus*], a world that was luminous, beautiful, harmonious, unchangeable, and eternal, and that stood in contrast with the sensually perceptible world [*mundus sensibilis*] of the ordinary everyday experience. In its consequences such a concept of rectification harbored an impetus to radical solutions, and it actually led to them in the Hussite Revolution. It is most likely that the council fathers at Constance sensed the explosiveness of the Bohemian ideal, and could not bring themselves to adopt an indulgent attitude. After all, Gerson had emphatically warned the Prague Archbishop, Konrád of Vechta, against "such a heresy and its authors" already in 1414.<sup>34</sup>

---

32) Vilém Herold, "Der Streit zwischen Hieronymus von Prag und Johann Gerson: Eine spätmittelalterliche Diskussion mit tragischen Folgen," in *Société et Église: Textes et discussions dans les universités de l'Europe centrale au moyen âge tardif* (Turnhout, 1995) 77-89.

33) Kaluza, "Le chancelier Gerson," 81.

34) František Palacký, ed. , *Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus vitam, doctrinam, causam...illustrantia*

The second and last observation concerns the central theme of this study. At first sight, it might not seem that any notable results came out of the attempt to assess the learning cultivated at the University of Paris for its potential input into the Bohemian Reformation. Yet, the effort was not in vain. Our journey of exploration uncovered certain broader ramifications without which the foundations of the Bohemian Reformation can neither be understood nor explained. In particular, the mentioned recent research on Jeroným probably indicates one of the directions of further exploration which will aim at detailed examinations of manuscripts, at comparative studies of texts, and at efforts to sort out and identify such texts.<sup>35</sup> The Bibliothéque Nationale and other significant manuscript collections of Europe still contain many unknown territories, which await their explorers. Conscious of the enormous losses of manuscripts over the last six centuries, I do not wish in the least to enter the realm of phantasies. But is it really beyond belief that somewhere could still be found a Parisian commentary by Raňkův or by Janov on Aristotle or Lombard, inasmuch as we know that the explication of the two authors was obligatory for all lecturers? This appeal, however, I wish to leave as an incentive to the younger generation of researchers.

(Translated from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David)

---

(Prague, 1869) 523-528.

35) Remarkable fresh findings from such textual comparisons are offered in Anežka Vidmanová, "Hus a Vilém z Auvergne," *Studie o rukopisech* 18 (1979) 29-47, and Jiří Kejř, "Kdo je 'Parisiensis' ve spisech Husových?" *Studie o rukopisech* 18 (1979), 3-27. These studies have revealed a considerable direct or mediated influence of, as well as numerous citations from, Guillaume d'Auvergne and Jean Quidort de Paris in Hus's works *Postilla adumbrata* and *Leccionarium bipartitum*, and in his commentary *Super IV Sententiarum*. Earlier such passages had been considered unidentifiable quotations from Matěj of Janov, who was -- as mentioned earlier -- also known in Bohemia under the name of *Magister Parisiensis*. These findings, of course, represent further significant evidence of the Parisian University's input into the intellectual genesis of the Bohemian Reformation.