
Wyclif's Tradition in Fifteenth Century Poland: The Heresy of Andrzej Gałka of Dobczyn

Paweł Kras

(Lublin)

There is no direct evidence that Wyclif was personally engaged in the dissemination of his ideas outside the university milieu of Oxford. Nevertheless, his anticlerical theories widely circulated throughout England and gave rise to the popular movement of Lollardy, which has been rightly termed by Anne Hudson a "premature Reformation".¹ Despite the church persecution, Wyclif's philosophical, theological and political writings spread on the European continent, gaining much popularity in the circles which criticized the corruption of the Church and the abuses of its clergy.² At the end of the fourteenth century, the ideas of the *Doctor Evangelicus* attracted a number of Czech masters at the university of Prague and fostered the growth of the Bohemian reformation.³ A century later, the Wycliffite tradition echoed in various trends of the European Reformation, which granted Wyclif an honourable place as its forerunner and "morning star".⁴ Wyclif's contribution to the development of mediaeval political theory, in particular his concept of lordship or the separation of the lay power from the ecclesiastical, has been generally acknowledged and ranks him together with such fourteenth century thinkers as Marsilius of Padua, John of Paris and William Ockham.⁵

My purpose is to discuss the circulation of Wyclif's ideas in fifteenth century Poland. The reception of Wyclif's teaching in the Polish society has been already examined by Polish historians and philosophers. Recent research has demonstrated that apart from an isolated case of Andrzej Gałka of Dobczyn the concepts of the *Doctor Evangelicus* did not find any other Polish advocates, or at least we do not know anything about them. Andrzej of Dobczyn remains the only known Polish follower of Wyclif, who deserves the name of a Polish Wycliffite or Lollard. His fascination with

¹ A. Hudson, *The Premature Reformation. Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988); on the relations between John Wyclif and early Lollardy see also M. Wilks, "Royal Priesthood. The Origins of Lollardy," in: *The Church in the Changing Society*. [CIHEC Conference in Uppsala 1977] (Uppsala, 1978) 63-70 (reprinted in M. Wilks, *Wyclif. Political Ideas and Practice*, ed. A. Hudson, (Oxford, 2000) 101-116); *idem*, "Wyclif and the Great Persecution," *Studies in Church History Subsidia* 10 (1994) 39-63 (reprinted in M. Wilks, *Wyclif*, 179-204).

² Vaclav Mudroch, *The Wyclif Tradition* (Athens, Ohio, 1979); *Wyclif in his times*, ed. A. Kenny, (Oxford, 1986) in particular the papers of G. Leff ("Wyclif and Hus : A Doctrinal Comparison," 105-126) and M. Keen ("The influence of Wyclif," 127-146).

³ F. Šmahel, "'Doctor Evangelicus super omnes evangelistas.' Wyclif's Fortunes in Hussite Bohemia," "Bulletin of Institute of Historical Research" 43 (1970) 16-34; A. Hudson, "From Oxford to Prague: The Writings of John Wyclif and his English Followers in Bohemia," *The Slavonic and East Central European Review* 75 (1997) 642-657.

⁴ M. Aston, "John Wyclif's Reformation Reputation," *Past and Present* 30 (1965) 23-51.

⁵ *From Ockham to Wyclif*, ed. A. Hudson, "Studies in Church History, Subsidia" 5 (1987); and recently edited selected papers of Michael Wilks, *Wyclif*. A modern comprehensive biography of Wyclif is still wanting; on details of Wyclif's life and work see M. Wilks, "Wyclif, Jean," in: *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* XVI, fasc. CVI-CVII (Paris, 1994) cols. 1501-1512.

Wyclif matured at the university of Cracow and developed as a result of his intensive studies of Wyclif's writings⁶. That is why it seems worthy to look again at Gałka's activity and present it in a broad perspective of the reception of Wyclif's ideas in late mediaeval Poland.

Wyclif's writings first came to Poland from Bohemia thanks to the intensive intellectual exchange between the Charles University and Poland at the turn of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries⁷. Until the university of Cracow was reopened in 1400, most Poles had studied at Prague. In consequence, the Polish intellectual elite was trained and received their academic degrees in Prague⁸. It suffices to say that twenty-five (out of thirty-one) Cracow scholars, whose names appear on the oldest list of Cracow professors from 1404, were graduates of the university of Prague. If we look at another list of Cracow professors from 1407, the number of Prague graduates is even higher and reaches about forty names.⁹ Moreover, nine of the first eleven rectors of Cracow university studied at the Charles university¹⁰. There is no doubt, that Prague was the most significant academic centre in fourteenth century Central Europe, where the first generation of Cracovian professors did not only get their grades, but also received a particular intellectual formation.

Polish students at Prague had the good opportunity to witness the discussion on church reform, which was fuelled by the ideas taught by such Czech reformers as Milič of Kromeříže, Matěj of Janov and Jan Hus. A couple of them studied under the supervision of Czech professors who adhered to Wyclif's concepts and popularised them in their academic activity (Stanislav of Znojmo, Jan Hus)¹¹. During their studies,

⁶ Most substantial studies on Andrzej Gałka of Dobczyn are incomplete and out-of-date, e.g. R. Sękowski, "Gałka z Dobczyna," in: *Z dziejów postępowej ideologii na Śląsku w XIV i XV wieku* [On a History of Progressive Ideology in Silesia in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Century] ed. E. Maleczyńska, (Warsaw, 1958); S. Kolbuszewki, *Herezja kanonika Jędrzeja Gałki* [The Heresy of the Canon Andrzej Gałka] (Wrocław, 1964); J. Garbacik, "Andrzej Gałka," in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* [Polish Biographical Dictionary] 7, 255-258; see also H.M. Świdorska, "A Polish Follower of Wyclif in the Fifteenth Century," *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 6 (1957) 88-92 and a paper by M. Schlauch, "A Polish Vernacular Eulogy of Wycliff," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 8 (1957) 53-73 (an English translation of Gałka's vernacular eulogy is also included) - unfortunately, the latter paper has a number of errors and oversimplifications. For more recent analysis of Gałka's concepts presented against a broad panorama of fifteenth century discussion on church reform see T. Wünsch, "'Nec pestifera doctrina corrumpat gregem dominicum.' Zur Konfrontation zwischen Wyclifismus und Konziliarismus im Umkreis der Universität Krakau in der ersten Hälfte des 15. Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 44 (1995) 5-26 and P. Kras, *Husyci w piętnastowiecznej Polsce* (Lublin, 1998) 193-202.

⁷ P. Kras. "Polish-Czech Relations in the Hussite Period – Religious Aspects," *BRRP* 4 (2002) 178-179.

⁸ H. Barycz, "Dziejowe związki Polski z Uniwersytetem Karola w Pradze," [The Historical Relations between Poland and the Charles University in Prague] *Przegląd Zachodni* 3 (1948) 7-41

⁹ *Album studiosorum Universitatis Cracoviensis*, ed. A. Chmiel, (Cracoviae, 1887) 1:4-5; *Statuta necnon liber promotionum philosophorum in universitate studiorum Jagiellonica ab anno 1402 ad annum 1849*, ed. J. Muczowski, Cracow 1849, 1-2; cf. J. Krzyżaniakowa, "Profesorowie krakowscy na uniwersytecie w Pradze – ich mistrzowie i koledzy," in: *Cracovia, Polonia, Europa. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza ofiarowane Jerzemu Wyrozumskiemu w sześćdziesiątą piątą rocznicę urodzin i czterdziestolecie pracy naukowej*, ed. W. Bukowski et al. (Cracow, 1995) 505.

¹⁰ J. Garbacik, A. Strzelecka, "Uniwersytet Jagielloński wobec problemów husyckich," [The Jagiellonian University towards the Hussite Problems] *Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Historia* 5/1-2 (1964) 11.

¹¹ For example in 1398 Mikołaj Kozłowski took a bachelor exam at the faculty of arts together with Jerome of Prague. Andrzej of Kokorzyn, Pełka of Wiślica and Maciej of Cracow (later bishop of Vilnius) were examined for their master's degree by Jan Hus. H. Barycz, *Dziejowe związki* 26-27; J.

the Polish students became acquainted with reformatory ideas discussed in Prague and some of them became the advocates of the nascent Bohemian reformation. On their return to Poland they brought writings of the Czech reformers and spread the news on the religious ferment in Bohemia.

It is disputable to what extent Polish students were engaged in copying and transporting to Poland the writings of John Wyclif. In contrast to religious works of popular Czech reformers, the sophisticated philosophical and theological treatises of Wyclif were probably not their primary interest. It seems that the crucial role in the import of Wyclif's works was played by Cracovian scholars who, for various reasons, left Prague and settled in Cracow. Thanks to a group of Prague professors such as Mateusz of Cracow, Jan Isner and Jan Štěkna the faculty of theology was opened in Cracow in 1397.¹² In a couple of years it became an important intellectual centre, which supported conciliar reform and took a leading position in the polemic against the Hussite doctrine. The academic staff at the university of Cracow, particularly in the newly established theological faculty, consisted mostly of the nominalists who criticised Wyclif's treatment of universals.¹³ The most uncompromising group of Wyclif's opponents was formed by the Czech scholars (Jan Štěkna, Stěpan Paleč and Mařík Rvačka) who carried on their polemic in Poland with the "Czech Wycliffites".¹⁴ Undoubtedly, Stěpan Paleč achieved the most prominent position among the Czech emigrants settled in Poland. Once an enthusiast of Wyclif and a member of the Hussite party at Prague, in 1411 he completely changed his opinions and abandoned Hus. Remaining a realist he completely rejected Wyclif's philosophical concepts and became a severe critic of the Oxford heresiarch. At the council of Constance Paleč was one of the accusers of Hus and contributed to the condemnation of his articles. His engagement in Hus's trial made his return to Bohemia impossible. That is why, after the council of Constance he came with the Polish delegation to Poland. In 1417-1421 Paleč lectured at the faculty of theology in Cracow and, in a short time, became a leader of the anti-Hussite group. He is an author of numerous treatises against Hussite and Wycliffite ideas.¹⁵

There is no doubt that Cracow scholars had access to Wyclif's writings and possessed some of them in their private collections. Unfortunately, only two fifteenth century manuscripts with Wyclif's writings have been preserved in the Jagiellonian Library. A collection of Wyclif's philosophical works in MS. BJ 848 belonged to Stěpan Paleč¹⁶. We may assume that as a former advocate of Wyclif's philosophy he had

Krzyżaniakowa, *Profesorowie krakowscy* 516-518.

¹² M. Markowski, *Dzieje Wydziału Teologii Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego w latach 1397-1525* [A History of the Theological Faculty of Cracow University in the Years 1397-1525] (Cracow, 1996) 42-61 (wherein references to further literature).

¹³ M. Rechowicz, "Po założeniu Wydziału Teologicznego w Krakowie," [After the Foundation of the Theological Department in Cracow], in: *Dzieje teologii katolickiej w Polsce* (Lublin, 1975) 1:109-139; J. Domański, "Husytyzm i antyhussytyzm polski," [Polish Hussitism and anti-Hussitism] in: *Zarys dziejów filozofii w Polsce*, ed. Z. Ogonowski et al. (Warsaw, 1989) 62-65

¹⁴ J. Fijałek, *Studia* 62-68; J. Kadlec, "Czeska katolicka emigracja okresu husytyzmu na ziemiach polskich i na Śląsku," *Zeszyty Naukowe KUL* 19 (1976) 28-30;

¹⁵ *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* 25:65-67; R. Palacz, "Stefan Palecz," *Materiały i Studia Zakładu Historii Filozofii Starożytnej i Średniowiecznej* 5 (1967) 93-124; M. Markowski, *Dzieje* 122; T. Wünsch, *Konziliarismus und Polen: Personen, Politik und Programme aus Polen zur Verfassungsfrage der Kirche in der Zeit der mittelalterlichen Reformkonzilien* (Paderborn-München-Wien-Zürich, 1998) 58-59.

¹⁶ MS. 848 was copied in Bohemia around 1411 and contains four philosophical writings of Wyclif: *De universalibus* (f. 3aa-36aa), *De tempore* (*De individuacione temporis*, f. 72 ba-96bb), *De ideis* (ff. 38aa-

many more Wyclif's works in his private library. During his work at the theological faculty in Cracow he was the best expert on Wyclif's teaching, who shared his vast knowledge with his academic colleagues. After his death in 1422 his private collection became a part of the university library and his books circulated among Cracow scholars. His manuscript was used to make a copy of Wyclif's treatise *De universalibus*, (Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, MS. BJ 1855). There is some evidence to argue that Andrzej of Dobczyn was one of the Cracow masters who had access to Wyclif's writings from Paleč's collection.¹⁷

The inflow of Wyclif's works to Cracow was possible for a fairly long time. It was only after the condemnation of Wyclif's forty-five articles at the council of Constance in April 1415, that the possession of his writings were forbidden and their owners were to be persecuted as suspects of heresy. At the same time the first censors were appointed by the rector, and the university collections of books were subject to their supervision. In consequence, the access to Wyclif's writings was restricted, however, not completely suppressed. His works were confined to the private libraries of Cracovian theologians, who needed to study them in order to combat Wyclif's concepts¹⁸. Some of Cracow's scholars used various methods to retain the possession of Wyclif's writings in secret. For example, Wyclif's treatise *De universalibus* in the above-mentioned MS. 1855 was ascribed to William Malverly (*Tractatus ... Wilhelmi Anglici, ... marvelli quoque Wilhelmi*), probably to hide Wyclif's authorship and this way save the text from academic censorship.¹⁹

Despite the official restrictions, Wyclif's writings still circulated among Cracow scholars and students. In the opinion of Andrzej Gałka, Wyclif's works were easily available at the university and anyone interested in them had no problem in getting access to them.²⁰ Some of them were imported to Poland together with other Hussite books even after the outbreak of the Hussite revolution. In one of his letters Andrzej of Dobczyn referred to such books, mentioning three by title – Wyclif's treatises *De apostasia*, *De blasphemia*, and *De simonia*, which he had rented from an unknown

50ab) and *De compositione hominis* (f. 51aa-72aa). At the end of the manuscript is written the name of Stěpan Paleč.

¹⁷ The manuscript BJ 1855 was copied probably around 1449 in Cracow and contains only a single work by Wyclif *De universalibus* (f. 86a-125b). According to a note on f. 1, in 1449 the codex was donated by Andrzej Grzymała, Doctor of Medicine, to the library of the faculty of arts.

¹⁸ U. Szelińska, *Biblioteki profesorów Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego w piętnastym i początkach szesnastego wieku* [Libraries of Professors of Cracow University in the Fifteenth and the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century] (Cracow, 1966). Surprisingly, the author did not find in the Jagiellonian Library any writings of Wyclif which had belonged to private collections of Cracow professors.

¹⁹ Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, MS. 1855, f. 86a. In the opinion of W. Seńko and W.R. Thomson the scribe thought that he was dealing with the treatise *De universalibus* of William Milverly. We may argue that if Gałka was behind producing this copy, he may have intentionally put the wrong name of the author in order to mislead university censors and his colleagues. For a detailed description of both manuscripts see W. Wisłocki, *Katalog rękopisów Biblioteki Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego* [The Catalogue of Manuscripts of the Library of Cracow University] (Cracow, 1877) 1:249-250; W. R. Thompson, *The Latin Writings of John Wyclif* (Toronto, 1983) 21-24, 32, 33, 36; I.J. Mueller, "Preface," in: *J. Wyclif's Tractatus de universalibus* (Oxford, 1985) XVII-XVIII, LXXI; M. Heitzman, "Jana Wiklif'a traktat 'De universalibus' i jego wpływ na Uniwersytet praski i krakowski," [The Influence of John Wyclif's Treatise *De universalibus* on the Universities of Prague and Cracow] *Archiwum Komisji do Badania Historii Filozofii w Polsce* 2 (Cracow, 1926) 147-150; W. Seńko, "Un traite inconnu 'de esse et essentia'," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et litteraire du Moyen Age* 35 (1960) 238ff.

²⁰ *Codex diplomaticus studii generalis universitatis Cracoviensis*, ed. J. Stenzel (Cracoviae, 1873) 2:113.

Czech noble. After his escape from Poland in April 1449 he demanded their immediate return from the bishop of Cracow and warned him that the Czech owner of the confiscated books would find the way to reclaim his property.²¹

Despite close links between the universities of Prague and Cracow in the first decade of the fifteenth century, their approach to the matters of philosophy and theology evolved in a different way. While at Prague Wyclif's realist philosophy was enthusiastically accepted and adapted by most Czech scholars,²² in Cracow it did not find any followers. Despite that Cracow scholars had good knowledge of Wyclif's ideas and discussed them during their lectures and *quodlibeta*.²³ Since the outbreak of the first controversy over Wyclif's doctrine in Prague in 1403, Cracow professors became engaged in the polemic against Wyclif's concepts. In 1403 Jan Štěkna, preacher at the court of Polish king Wladislas Jagiełło and one of the first Cracow theologians, went to Prague to rebut Wyclif's ideas propagated by Stanislav of Znojmo²⁴.

The first generation of Cracow professors were ill-disposed towards Wyclif's ideas. First of all, they rebutted his philosophical teaching, focusing on the critique of Wyclif's ultra-realist concept of universals. In their commentaries they considered Wyclif's interpretation of universals a source of errors and heresies. In 1406 an unknown Cracow author of *Disputata super Isagogen Porphyrii*, rejected Wyclif's philosophical theory, calling it far more dangerous than that of Plato²⁵. Benedykt Hesse, one of the most prominent Cracow professors in the first half of the fifteenth century, devoted much energy to demonstrate principal errors embedded in Wyclif's logical presumptions. In his commentaries to Aristotle's *Physics* and Porphyry's *Isagogen* Hesse discussed absurd consequences, which resulted from the application of ultra-realist concept of *universalia* to philosophy and theology. Critical opinions on Wyclif's philosophy predominated at Cracow as most Cracow scholars adapted the nominalist interpretation of universals.²⁶

In contrast to the philosophical teaching of Wyclif, studied and commented by Cracovian scholars, his theological and ecclesiastical ideas were completely rejected and combated as heresy. In the first decade of the fifteenth century Cracow professors were well-aware of the condemnation of Wyclif's political and ecclesiastical theories by the English bishops and the papacy. After the condemnation of Wyclif's forty-five articles at Constance, Wyclif's ideas became closely associated with the Hussite doctrine. In their polemic with the Czech Hussites, Cracow professors attacked some

²¹ *Codex diplomaticus Universitatis Cracoviensis* 2:112: "Item inter libros Wicleph, quos cepistis, fuerunt quaedam volumina, scilicet de aposthasia, blasphemia, simonia etc. cuiusdam notabilis nobilis Bohemi, qui postquam audierit, non silebit cum amicis."

²² V. Herold, *Pražská univerzita a Wyclif* (Prague, 1985).

²³ M. Heitzman, *Jana Wyclifa traktat* 111-155.

²⁴ M. Heitzman, *Jana Wiclefa traktat* 139-145; J. Fijałek, *Studia* 68; J. Garbacik, A. Strzelecka, *Uniwersytet krakowski* 9-10; for more biographical information on Jan Štěkna see Z. Siemiątkowska, "Jan Szczekna," *Materiały i Studia Zakładu Historii Filozofii Starożytnej i Średniowiecznej* 5 (1965) 34-75.

²⁵ Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, MS. 1941, f.22 ba; see: M. Markowski, "Stanowisko polskich średniowiecznych komentatorów Isagogi Porfiriusza wobec wiklefowskiej teorii uniwersaliów," [The Attitude of Polish Comentators of Porphyry's *Isagogen* towards the Wyclif's Theory of Universals] *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 16 (1968) 126-127; *idem*, "Metodologia nauk, logika, teoria poznania," [Methodology of sciences, logic, theory of cognition], in: *Filozofia polska w XV wieku* [Polish Philosophy in the fifteenth century], ed. R. Palacz (Warsaw, 1972) 303.

²⁶ M. Markowski, *Stanowisko polskich średniowiecznych komentatorów*, 127-130.

of Wyclif's concepts treating them as a part of the Hussite doctrine. In 1434, the Cracow professor Mikołaj Kozłowski, a university delegate to the council of Basel, brought to Cracow the work of Thomas Netter of Walden *Doctrinale fidei ecclesiae catholicae contra Wiclevistas et Hussitas*,²⁷ which contained a detailed description of Wyclif's teaching as well as an extensive and well-organised compendium of counter-arguments.²⁸ A copy of Netter's work was later annotated with the comments of Kozłowski and became an important source of information about Wyclif's ideas. The copy of Netter's *Doctrinale* was kept in the Library of the Faculty of Arts and was accessible to other Cracow scholars. Andrzej Gałka admitted that he had read Netter's work and claimed that many of his academic colleagues and students did the same thus learning basic concepts of Wyclif's teaching.²⁹

In contrast to a generally hostile attitude to Wyclif's concepts, the reformatory activity of Jan Hus was carefully watched and gained much interest among Cracow professors and students. Not until Jan Hus was condemned by the council of Constance as a follower of Wyclif, had his ideas been identified with those of Wyclif. In 1413 Jerome of Prague, Hus's colleague and one of the most zealous Czech reformers, came to Cracow and preached for a couple of days at the central market square. His sermons were attended by the crowds of Cracow inhabitants and stimulated some religious excitement. The popularity of Jerome's preaching or rather the contents of his sermons terrified the Cracow clergy. Jerome was accused of popularising the heretical concepts of Wyclif and had to answer the charges before the bishop of Cracow, Wojciech Jastrzębiec. When asked about Wyclif's ideas, Jerome denied them and swore his adherence to the doctrine of the Roman Church.³⁰ Nevertheless, he was forbidden to continue his preaching in Cracow and was forced to leave the town immediately. In his report to Cardinal Juan Carvajal, the bishop of Cracow underestimated the results of Jerome's activity in Cracow commenting with irony that the teaching of such a great philosopher was too sophisticated to be comprehended by illiterate people of his diocese (*Terra nostra ad semen suum videtur esse arida capiendum et fructum afferendum, eo quod simplex plebiculus philosophi dogmata comprehendere non valet...*).³¹

²⁷ Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska ms. 1759 (books V-VI) and ms. 1760 (books I-IV); the description of the manuscript is provided by W. Wisłocki, *Katalog rękopisów*, I, 422. Thomas Netter Waldensis, *Doctrinale Antiquitatum Fidei Catholicae Ecclesiae*, ed. B. Blanciotti, 3 vols, Venezia 1757-1759 (reprint Farnborough 1967). On Thomas Netter and his work see *A Biographical Register of the Oxford University to AD. 1500*, ed. A.B. Emden, II, Oxford 1958, 1343-4; *A Dictionary of National Bibliography*, XIV, 231-234.

²⁸ Netter's vast work consists of three parts. The first volume which deals with God, the Church and authority was written probably at the suggestion of Henry V, soon after Netter returned from a diplomatic mission to Poland (in 1419). The second volume "*De sacramentis*" was finished in 1427, and the third "*De sacramentalibus*" in 1430, shortly before Netter's death. On the continent information about Netter's work occurred on at least three occasions. It has been established that its copy was sent to the pope and was used at the council of Basel in the dispute with the Hussite delegation. During the council Cardinal Juliano Cesarini offered a copy of Netter's work to Prokop the Great, who then passed it on to Peter Payne. M. Harvey, *The Diffusion of the Doctrinale of Thomas Netter in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, in: *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages, Essays presented to Margaret Gibson*, ed. L. Smith, B. Ward, London-Rio Grande 1992, 281-283.

²⁹ *Codex diplomaticus Universitatis Cracoviensis*, II, no 157, 112; see also S. Kolbuszewski, *Herezja*, 25; P. Kras, *Husyci*, 77-78.

³⁰ "...super illis articulis damnati W. interrogatus per nos, respondebat ad singulos negative, ipsos execrando et fidem catholicam in omnis confitendo..." *Dokumenta* 506.

³¹ *Loc. cit.*, "Terra nostra ad semen suum videtur esse arida capiendum et fructum afferendum, eo quod

In July 1415 the council of Constance informed the university of Cracow about the condemnation of Wyclif's and Hus's ideas and called for the prosecution of their adherents.³² In its reply, Cracow professors declared their willingness to co-operate with the church authorities in the struggle against the Hussite and Wycliffite doctrine.³³ At the same time, Stanisław of Skarbimierz, rector of Cracow university, delivered a sermon in which he criticized former enthusiasts of the Bohemian reformation and argued that Hus should not be called a saint.³⁴ In a couple of years the anti-Hussite attitude gained in standing at Cracow. Moreover, the university authorities took necessary steps to prevent the spread of heretical ideas coming from Hussite Bohemia. In 1423, at the suggestion of Elias of Wąwolnica, a new anti-Hussite article was introduced into the university regulations. Since then, every new student at Cracow university had to reject Wyclif's and Hus's teaching at his registration, as well as to declare that he had nothing in common with heresy.³⁵ The anti-Hussite and anti-Wycliffite attitude of Cracow university was highly praised by Pope Martin V, who on various occasions expressed his gratitude for the university's engagement in the struggle against heresy.³⁶

In the 1420s and 1430s Cracow university became a centre of anti-Hussite polemic and its professors took part in the theological discussion with the Czech Hussites. As early as 1421 Hussite scholars from Prague proposed that Cracow professors hold an academic debate focused on the Four Prague Articles. In March 1421 two leading Hussite theologians, Peter Payne and Jan Cardinal, members of the Hussite delegation which came to Cracow to offer the Czech throne to the Polish king, petitioned Cracow rector Jakub of Zaborowo to arrange a date for an academic debate with Cracow scholars. Under pressure of the Polish bishops, the rector rejected their request and advised the Hussite theologians first to contact the Holy See.³⁷ More favourable opportunities to organize a public debate with Czech Hussites occurred ten years later. After the defeat of the crusading army at Domažlice, the council of Basel started negotiations with the Hussites and invited them to take part in the council debates. In these new circumstances, the king of Poland, Wladislaw Jagiełło, invited a delegation of Czech Hussites to a theological dispute with Cracow professors. The Czech delegation, including victorious commander of the Taborite army Prokop the Great and the Wycliffite theologian Peter Payne, came to Cracow at the beginning of April 1431. On 19 April the public debate between the Czech Hussites and Cracow theologians took place at the royal castle, in the presence of the king, Polish bishops and numerous high-ranking officials.³⁸ The details of that discussion

simplex plebiculus philosophi dogmata comprehendere non valet....”

³² Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, MS. 1439; *Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti*. ed. A. Sokołowski, J. Szujski (Cracow, 1878) 2:61; *Bullarium Poloniae*, ed. S. Kuraś, I. Sułkowska-Kurasiowa, (Rome-Lublin, 1988) 3:237.

³³ Hardt 4:873.

³⁴ Stanisław of Skarbimierz, *Sermones sapientiales*, ed. B. Chmielowska, (Cracow, 1979) 311-315.

³⁵ *Album studiosorum* 1:1.

³⁶ J. Garbacik, A. Strzelecka *Uniwersytet Krakowski* 32.

³⁷ M. Markowski, “Stanowisko Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego wobec petycji husyckiej z 1421 roku,” [The Attitude of the University of Cracow towards the Hussite Petition from 1421] *Materiały i Studia Zakładu Historii Filozofii Starożytnej i Średniowiecznej* 4 (1965) 358-359.

³⁸ The university of Cracow was represented by Elias of Wąwolnica, Jan Elgot, Mikołaj Kozłowski, Andrzej of Kokorzyno, Benedykt Hesse and Jakub of Paradyż ; see *Joannis Dlugosii Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, ed. G. Wyrozumski et al., Liber XII et XII 1431-1444 (Warsaw, 2001) 18-21; see also *Husitská revoluce* 3:350; *idem*, “Curriculum vitae Magistri Petri Payne,” in: *In memoriam*

are missing, but we know that it did not bring any results and the two parties remained uncompromising.

In an opinion widespread among Polish fifteenth century chroniclers and annalists, John Wyclif was directly responsible for the heretical activity of Jan Hus. A close identification of Hus's and Wyclif's teachings prevailed in Poland throughout the fifteenth century. In the *Annales* of Jan Długosz, Wyclif was considered a founder of modern heresy and a spiritual father of Jan Hus. Following Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini's comments on the emergence of the Hussite movement in his *Historia Bohemica*, Długosz claimed that Wyclif's teaching had inspired Hus to rebel against church authorities and later gave rise to the outbreak of the Hussite revolution. In his opinion the Hussite programme was nothing more than a direct adoption of Wyclif's ideas transmitted from England to Bohemia³⁹. Like most of his contemporaries, Długosz did not discern crucial differences between Wyclif and Hus. Throughout the fifteenth century, the general opinion of the close relations between Wyclif and Hus became a commonplace and later developed into a sort of a legend. In the Chronicle of the Cracow Dominicans from the beginning of the sixteenth century, Jan Hus was presented as a student of Wyclif who, before starting his preaching activity in Bohemia, had spent some time in England studying and busily copying his writings.⁴⁰

In the period of the Hussite revolution, terms "Hussites" and "Wycliffites" were used interchangeably and synonymously, i.e. modern heretics (*moderni heretici*). The identification of Czech Hussites with Wycliffites was an integral part of a negative stereotype, which was widely popularised in the countries neighbouring Hussite Bohemia.⁴¹ In the anti-Hussite laws issued by the Polish clergy Wyclif and Hus were declared the most dangerous heretics and the worst enemies of the Church. Their teachings were forbidden and their followers were to be tried on a charge of heresy. Apart from the decrees issued by the council of Constance and immediately accepted by the Polish clergy, in 1418 pope Martin V provided Polish bishops with the detailed instructions and a questionnaire on how to proceed against the advocates of Wyclif and Hus.⁴² In the anti-heretical statutes issued for the Gniezno province in 1420, there is no mention of Wyclif, and the heresy to be prosecuted is associated exclusively with the Hussite doctrine.⁴³ In Polish ecclesiastical sources, the term *Wickliffistae* always

Josefa Macka (1922-1991), ed. M. Polívka, F. Šmahel, (Prague, 1996) 146-147.

³⁹ "Haeresis Wicleph que ante annos multos Regnum Anglie gravissime infecerat in Regno Bohemiae et in civitate Pragensi, ubi tunc generale vigeant studium, per Iohannem Hus, Bohemum, reaccensa et resuscitata est..." - *Iohannis Dlugossii Annales*, Liber XI-XII 1406-1412, 41.

⁴⁰ *Memoriale ordinis fratrum Minorum a .fr. Ioanne de Komorowo compilatum*, ed. K. Liske, A. Lorkiewicz, Cracow 1888 (Monumenta Poloniae Historica, V), 136.

⁴¹ S. Bylina, *Le mouvement hussite devant les problemes nationaux*, in: *Faith and Identity. Christian Political Identity*, ed. D. Loades, K. Walsh, Oxford 1990 (Studies in Church History, IV), 57-58; idem, *Wizerunek heretyka w Polsce późnośredniowiecznej* [The Image of Heretic in Late Mediaeval Poland], "Odrodzenie i reformacja w Polsce", 30 (1985), 5-21; P. Kras, *Furor Hussitarum - husytyzm w wybranych relacjach kronikarzy z XV wieku*, in: *Uniwersalizm i regionalizm w kronikarstwie Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej* [Furor haeresis - Hussitism in the Reports of Mediaeval Chroniclers from East Central Europe], ed. U. Borkowska, Lublin 1996, 82-102; idem, *Český kacír - husita* [A Czech Heretic - Hussite], in: *Člověk českého středověku* [A Man of the Czech Middle Ages], ed. M. Nodl, F. Šmahel, Prague 2002, 248-269.

⁴² Cracow, Biblioteka Czarotoryskich, MS. 235; see also G. Lichończak, "Wojciech Jastrzębiec wobec ruchu husyckiego," [Wojciech Jastrzębiec towards the Hussite Movement], *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 99 (1992) 30.

⁴³ *Statuty wieluńsko-kaliskie Mikołaja Trąby z 1420 roku* [Statutes of Wieluń and Kalisz issued by

referred to the Czech Hussites.⁴⁴ In the questionnaire produced in 1420 for the use of a bishop's inquisitors, there is a single article concerning Wyclif's writings. It imposed on the bishops or their delegate judges, who carried out the visitation of parishes, the obligation to search out works of Wyclif, Hus and Jerome of Prague. Those who possessed such writings were to be arrested and interrogated as suspect of heresy.

Church actions against Polish Hussites and their protectors were backed by the Polish king. On 27 September 1415 the council of Constance sent a letter to Wladislas II Jagiełło (1386-1432), asking him to take severe measures against "the heresy of Wyclif and Hus".⁴⁵ In his reply of 2 August 1416 Jagiełło declared his willingness to support the Polish clergy in the persecution of heretics.⁴⁶ Despite the periods of political cooperation with the Czech Hussites, the attitude of the Polish king towards Polish adherents of the Hussite doctrine remained uncompromisingly hostile. To restrict the numbers of Poles travelling to Bohemia, in April 1424 Jagiełło enacted complex anti-heretical laws threatening Polish advocates of Hussitism with infamy and the confiscation of property.⁴⁷

Throughout the fifteenth century, the interest in the Hussite doctrine usually developed from direct contacts with the Czech Utraquists. For Polish visitors to Bohemia, the stay among the Czech Utraquists was a fascinating experience, which in some cases stimulated an interest in their religious practices. Organized groups of Polish Utraquists functioned for a couple of years in Great Poland under the protection of two nobles Abraham Zbąski and Abraham of Kęłowo. But they were suppressed as soon as their noble protectors abandoned the Hussite doctrine and reconciled with the Roman church. Other Polish advocates of Hussitism kept their religious opinions in secret. Recent research has demonstrated that Polish Utraquism was a meagre reflex of the Bohemian reformation, which did not produce any original thinker. Most people recorded in the ecclesiastical registers as Hussites were attracted by communion *sub utraque specie*. Their interest in Utraquism resulted from the sincere devotion to the sacrament of the Eucharist and was not based upon any deeper theological reflection.⁴⁸

Against such an historical background, the fascination of Cracow master Andrzej Gałka of Dobczyn with Wyclif's doctrine seems to have been completely exceptional. In opposition to the oldest literature, there is no evidence to associate Gałka with any groups of Polish Hussites from Great Poland or Cuyavia. Moreover, it is debateable whether or not Gałka should be called an Hussite, at least in reference to the period of his work at Cracow. In his writings and declarations, Andrzej of Dobczyn neither declared himself a Hussite nor even mentioned Hus by name. In his letters he did not reveal any direct interest in Hussite doctrine. Instead, he stressed a purely academic character of his study of Wyclif's writings, which inspired him to question the teaching of the church. The question if he were an undercover Hussite or only an academic Wycliffite has to remain a puzzle. There can be no doubt, however, that his intention was to present himself as a university man, an intellectual, who benefited

Mikolaj Trąba in 1420], ed. J. Fijałek, A. Vetulani (Cracow 1915-1951).

⁴⁴ *Acta capitulorum necnon iudiciorum ecclesiasticorum selecta*, ed. B. Ulanowski (Cracow 1896) 2:60-61.

⁴⁵ *Bullarium Poloniae* 3:328-239.

⁴⁶ Hardt 4:868.

⁴⁷ *Volumina legum*, ed. J. Ohryzko, (St. Petersburg, 1859) 1:38; see also P. Kras, *Husyci* 231-240.

⁴⁸ P. Kras, *Husyci*, passim.

from his academic freedom to carry out unrestricted speculation on philosophical and theological problems. Such an attitude can at least partly explain his determination in denying any charges of heresy brought against him by church authorities.

Born about 1400, probably to a peasant family in Dobczyn (in the Poznań diocese), Andrzej Gałka registered at the university of Cracow in the autumn 1420 and started his studies at the faculty of arts. He was a talented and hard-working student. In 1422, after just two years as a student, which was the minimum time period allowed by the university regulations, he became bachelor of arts. Three years later, Andrzej of Dobczyn was granted degree of master of arts and soon thereafter began lecturing at the faculty of arts.⁴⁹ Probably during the course of his studies at Cracow he was ordained priest. For almost thirty years, he taught at Cracow without being in any way suspected of heresy or error. When in the early spring 1449, it turned out that Gałka was a zealous reader and copyist of Wyclif's treatises, he was a respected professor of the age of fifty.⁵⁰

His reputation among his colleagues was very high and, although he did not obtain any degree from a higher faculty, he enjoyed enough popularity to be twice elected dean of the faculty of arts (in 1436 and in 1441).⁵¹ In the 1430s and 1440s he represented the university in various legal acts and his name appears on the list of witnesses among the most prominent Cracow professors.⁵² His high position among Cracow scholars was reinforced by his nomination to the university chapter of St. Florian in 1439. According to its statute a seat in the St. Florian chapter was reserved only for the most distinguished professors of Cracow university. Its canons were mostly recruited from prominent scholars lecturing at higher faculties.⁵³ Gałka's appointment to the St. Florian chapter seems a bit surprising as he was only master of arts and never received any higher degree.

It is hard to find out if Gałka was anyhow involved in the conciliar movement which, during his work in Cracow, was enthusiastically backed by most Cracow professors. In the turbulent period of the conflict between the council of Basel and pope Eugenius IV, the university of Cracow, together with other European universities, favoured the general council. To demonstrate their support for the council of Basel, Cracow scholars produced a couple of treatises providing the arguments for the council's superiority over the pope⁵⁴. One of these treatises, which represented the official position of Cracow university, was written by Tomasz Strzemiński and, in 1441, was presented by the university delegation to the council of Basel.⁵⁵ Defending

⁴⁹ *Album studiosorum* I, 147; *Statuta necnon liber promotionum* 15, 17.

⁴⁹ *Statuta necnon liber promotionum* 28, 32; *Księga promocji Wydziału Sztuk Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego z XV wieku* [The Promotion Records of the Faculty of Arts, the University of Cracow from the Fifteenth Century], ed. A. Gąsiorowski, et al. (Cracow, 2000) 19, 21.

⁵⁰ See T. Wunsch, *Ne pestifera doctrina* 14-16.

⁵¹ *Statuta necnon liber promotionum* 28, 32; *Księga promocji*, 29, 30, 33.

⁵² P. Kras, *Kariera uniwersytecka Andrzeja Gałki z Dobczyna* [University Career of Andrzej Gałka of Dobczyn], "Roczniki Humanistyczne. Historia", 48/2 (2000) 247-264.

⁵³ K. Morawski, *Historia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego* [A History of the Jagiellonian University] (Cracow, 1900) 1:95-98, 220.

⁵⁴ *Traktaty profesorów krakowskich w obronie soboru w Bazylei zostały wydane przez W. Bucichowskiego, Polskie traktaty koncyliarystyczne z połowy XV wieku* [Textus et studia historiam theologiae in Polonia exultae spectantia, 23] (Warsaw, 1987).

⁵⁵ Thomae de Strzempino, "Determinatio Basiliensis seu tractatus communis universitatis Cracoviensis," in: *Polskie traktaty* 167-230; M. Markowski, M. Markowski, "Uniwersytet Krakowski a

the conciliar programme, Cracow professors Tomasz Strzemiński, Jan Elgot and Benedykt Hesse adapted and developed a double concept of the Church which consists of the invisible and eternal *corpus mysticum* of the Church headed by Christ, and the visible and earthly *corpus politicum* presided over by the pope. The *corpus mysticum* of the church is granted God's favour and currently nourished by the gifts of the Holy Spirit, thus it is infallible and intact by human errors. In contrast to that, the earthly church is a political organization (*societas politica*), which is ruled either by God's or by human laws. Such an ecclesiastical concept let the Cracow professors undermine the position of the pope and challenge the idea of the pope's infallibility. Jesus Christ remains the only head of the universal Church and the status of the pope is that of an honourable representative of Christ, who rules the political body of the church on earth⁵⁶.

Gałka's attitude to the conciliar movement looks rather ambiguous. There is no direct evidence to argue that master Andrzej was anyhow engaged in the conciliar activity, despite the fact that most of his teachers or friends were conciliarists. In his letter to Cracow professors Gałka made critical comments on their support for the general council. On the one hand he reminded his former academic colleagues of their treatise sent to Basel, in which they backed the supremacy of the council. In addition, he drew a comparison between the withdrawal of the university's support for the council and his isolation in the academic milieu after his adherence to Wyclif's ideas came to light. Frustrated and disappointed by the general ostracism he encountered at the university, he openly questioned the credibility of his academic colleagues. He accused them that in the same way they had betrayed the conciliar reform, they had also abandoned him in his conflict with the bishop of Cracow. On the other hand, however, he considered the whole conflict between the council and the pope shameful and redundant. In his opinion, everyone who takes part in the discussion on council's or papal supremacy in the Church is Antichrist. Such a person denies or ignores the supreme position of Christ as the founder and head of the universal Church to whom none is higher or equal in power⁵⁷.

It is noteworthy that the failure of the conciliar movement at the university of Cracow overlapped with the disclosure of Gałka's fascination with Wyclif's doctrine. We do not know if such a coincidence was only accidental. Despite the growing pressure from King Casimir IV the Jagiellon – who soon after his coronation in 1447 accepted obedience to pope Eugene IV – the Cracow professors remained loyal to the council of Basel⁵⁸. When at the end of 1448 the most powerful supporter of the university – Cracow bishop, Zbigniew Oleśnicki – reached an agreement with pope

sobory pierwszej połowy XV wieku,” [University of Cracow and the Councils of the First Half of the Fifteenth Century] *Acta Mediaevalia* 12 (1999) 205-208.

⁵⁶ Benedykta Hesse, “*Lectura super evangelium s. Mathaei capitulorum 16 et 18 fragmenta selecta*,” ed. W. Bucichowski, in: *Polskie traktaty* 203-207; Benedykta Hesse, “*Tractatus brevior*,” ed. W. Bucichowski, in: *Polskie traktaty* 32-34; cf. W. Bucichowski, “Koncepcja ‘corpus politicum’ w eklezjologii Benedykta Hesse,” *Przegląd Tomistyczny* 1 (1984) 193-203. The concept of the Church presented in the treatises of Cracow professors has been recently analyzed by T. Wünsch (*Konziliarismus* 202-213; 296-313) and M. Markowski, *Uniwersytet Krakowski* 196-205.

⁵⁷ *Codex diplomaticus Universitatis Cracoviensis* 2:112. “Quisne vobiscum contra hanc fidem praedictam dispensavit? Nec enim maior Christus aequalis. Si dicitur esse maior, ut puta papa vel concilium tunc talis est Antichristus, extollitur omne quod dicitur Deus (2. Tess., 2, 3-4).”

⁵⁸ *Joannis Dlugosii Historiae Polonicae*, V, ed. A. Przezdziecki, in: *Opera omnia*, XIV (Cracow, 1879) 50; cf. K. Morawski, *Historia* 1: 380-381.

Eugeny IV, university conciliarists found themselves isolated. Nevertheless, they yielded to the demands of the Polish king and recognized Eugene IV only as late as July 1449, and only after the abdication of the anti-pope Felix V and the closing of the council of Basel.⁵⁹

The first open conflict between Gałka and the church authorities broke out at the end of 1448, when he was accused of disseminating some unknown errors.⁶⁰ The character of this controversy remains unclear. We do not know the reason why Gałka was put on a trial and interrogated by the bishop of Cracow. According to the citation issued by the bishop he was accused of some charges concerning the faith (...*ad respondendum certis articulis fidem concernentibus...*).⁶¹ As a result of the trial Gałka lost his canonry in St. Florian's and was sentenced to six month penance in the Cistercian monastery in Mogiła near Cracow.⁶² It seems that even if at that time the bishop of Cracow charged Gałka with heresy, the first trial was a warning intended to put an end to his secret interests in the ideas condemned by the Church. The relatively light penance suggests that its main purpose was not to punish Andrzej of Dobczyn for heresy but rather to discipline him. Nevertheless, the accusations were severe enough to put Gałka under close supervision.⁶³

The rector of Cracow university and his academic colleagues were completely stupefied by Gałka's trial. Some of them were puzzled by the news about Gałka's stay in the Mogiła monastery and thought that Andrzej of Dobczyn had become a monk⁶⁴. The information on his conflict with the bishop of Cracow shocked the university's scholars. The general condemnation of Gałka in the university milieu facilitated the discovery of his Wycliffite writings and enabled his further persecution. It seems that even Gałka's friends were too frightened by his conflict with the church authorities to remain loyal to him. At the beginning of April 1449, one of his colleagues turned over Gałka's book to Jan Elgot, vicar-general of Cracow bishop. After its careful examination it turned out that the book contained Wyclif's ideas. The bishop's official was quick in charging Gałka with heresy and launched an inquisitorial procedure against him. In consequence, Gałka's apartment in Cracow was searched and the Church authorities seized his private library, finding there numerous writings of Wyclif and a certain English follower of Wyclif (*opera eiusdem Wykleph et illius Anglici, complicitis eiusdem*).⁶⁵ Moreover, some of Wyclif's treatises were annotated with

⁵⁹ *Codex diplomaticus Universitatis Cracoviensis* 2:119; cf. K. Morawski, *Historia* 1:385; K. Pieradzka, "Uniwersytet w służbie państwa i wobec soborów," in: *Dzieje Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego* [A History of Cracow University], ed. K. Lepszy (Cracow, 1964) 1:124-125; M. Markowski, *Uniwersytet krakowski* 210.

⁶⁰ In 1445 Andrzej Gałka accused one of his colleagues Jan Kanty (canonized in 1452) of accumulating church benefices. His sharp attack on a highly respected Cracow theologian surprised most members of the faculty of arts, who declared their support for Jan Kanty. M. Wiszniewski, *Historia literatury polskiej* [The History of Polish Literature] (Cracow, 1841) 4:235.

⁶¹ *Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti* 1:349.

⁶² *Codex diplomaticus Universitatis Cracoviensis* 2:105; *Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti* I, part, 67-68; Various reasons for the first interrogation of Gałka have been discussed by S. Kolbuszewski (*Herezja* 33) and J. Garbacik (*Gałka Andrzej* 256).

⁶³ In the letter to bishop Piotr Nowak of Wrocław, the Cracow professors called the Gałka controversy *infandum scelum*. *Codex diplomaticus Universitatis Cracoviensis* 2:106.

⁶⁴ *Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti*, 2/2:67-68.

⁶⁵ *Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti* 1/ 2:69. It seems possible to identify Wyclif's friend mentioned in Elgot's report with Peter Payne, an uncompromising advocate of Wyclif's doctrine among Czech Hussites. In Bohemia and Poland he was known as Peter English (*Petrus Anglicus*). Jan Elgot

Gałka's comments, leaving no doubt about his adherence to ideas condemned by the church. Among the confiscated writings there were also some songs and poems in the vernacular written by master Andrzej, probably including a Polish "eulogy of Wyclif".⁶⁶ Jan Elgot, who as first examined Gałka's books, was shocked by the discovery of the vernacular poems, which might be used to popularise Wyclif's ideas outside the university. No less, he was horrified by the names of Polish noblemen to whom Gałka intended to give some of his writings. On the margins of Gałka's books Elgot found the names of Piotr Szafraniec, Cracow sub-chamberlain, Andrzej Tęczyński and Łukasz Górka, voyevod of the Poznań province.⁶⁷ In the opinion of Cracow's vicar-general, Gałka's books not only proved his fascination with heretical ideas, but also demonstrated his involvement in anticlerical activity.⁶⁸

Undoubtedly, some of Wyclif's demands, such as the critique of clerical possession of temporal goods, might look very attractive to Polish nobles, matching their current political goals. We may assume that Gałka tried to convey some of Wyclif's anticlerical arguments to the nobles, ill-disposed to the privileged position of the clergy. In addition, a conflict over the payment of tithes which broke out in 1430s may have encouraged master Andrzej of Dobczyn to propagate Wyclif's concepts among the Polish noble opposition. The internal situation of the Polish kingdom after the death of Wladislas II Jagiełło in 1434, offered favourable opportunities to the circulation of anticlerical ideas coming from Hussite Bohemia. The ruling group which came to power in 1434 was headed by Zbigniew Oleśnicki, bishop of Cracow and an eager protector of church interests. Unfortunately, we do not know what kind of relations linked Gałka with the leaders of the noble opposition against Oleśnicki's rule. It will remain a tempting hypothesis to see his conflict with bishop Oleśnicki as a by-product of the political struggle between the two opposite camps.

Whatever purpose lay behind the production of the vernacular writings, the church authorities found them heretical and extremely dangerous.⁶⁹ Jan Elgot was so surprised by his findings that he immediately informed the bishop of Cracow about the results of his search in Gałka's apartment and took the first steps to put Gałka on a trial. On the one hand, he consulted Dominican inquisitor Albert on how to proceed

had a chance twice to meet Peter Payne in Cracow (in 1421 and 1431). In 1431 Jan Elgot represented the university of Cracow in the public debate with the Hussite theologians, among whom the foremost position was held by Peter Payne. *Joannis Dlugosii Annales Liber XI et XII (1431-1444)* 19-21.

⁶⁶ The text of the eulogy was found in the Göttingen University Library early in the nineteenth century and was first published in 1816. A detailed analysis of the manuscript in Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel MS. 306 (previously Helmstadt MS. 200) which contains the eulogy: J. Zathey, "Pieśń o Wiklfie' i jej zapomniana melodia," [The Eulogy of Wyclif and Its Forgotten Melody], *Pamiętnik Literacki* 44 (1955) 172-187. The title is written in red by a different hand: "*Excellentia magistri Johannis Wicleph edita ab Andrea de Dobschino olim magistro artium Cracoviensis. Ex vetustissimo exeplari Po[lonorum] litere et ortographie.*"

⁶⁷ After the death of king Wladislas Jagiełło Zbigniew, Oleśnicki presided over the regency council and practically decided on Polish policy. On the noble opposition in fifteenth century Poland and the impact of Hussite doctrine on the Polish nobility see P. Kras, "Hussitism and the Polish Gentry," in: *Lollardy and the Gentry in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. M. Aston and R. Collins (Stroud-New York, 1997) 183-198.

⁶⁸ The letter of Jan Elgot to Zbigniew Oleśnicki was written at the beginning of April 1449 (*Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti* 1/2:68); see J. Mikulka argued that there were some direct contacts between Peter Payne and Andrzej Gałka (*Polské země a hereše v době před reformaci* [Prague, 1969] 107).

⁶⁹ *Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti* 1/ 2:69.

against Gałka. On the other, he sent a letter to the Cistercian abbot of Mogiła, warning him against the dangerous man, who was undergoing penance in the monastery. The vicar-general of Cracow asked the abbot to search out his room and to confiscate all his books. Contrary to Elgot's intentions, the Cistercian abbot sent Gałka to Cracow as soon as he learnt about the heresy charges brought against him.⁷⁰ At the same time Andrzej of Dobczyn somehow found out that he had been accused of heresy, and took the first chance to flee. According to the report of Jan Elgot, the Cistercians transported Andrzej of Dobczyn on a cart to Cracow, where he managed to mislead his escort and hide in the town.⁷¹ The church authorities searched the whole town, but they did not find Gałka. As it turned out later, he hurriedly escaped from Cracow and found refuge at the Silesian court of Bolko V in Głogówek.⁷² In his letters from Silesia, Gałka stresses that he was so terrified by the violent actions of the Cracow clergy against him and his property that he had to flee Poland to save his life. In addition, he completely denied all charges of heresy and attempted to demonstrate his innocence. In the letter to the bishop of Cracow, Andrzej of Dobczyn claimed that the persecution against him started by the Cracow clergy was illegal and against Holy Scripture. He reminded the bishop of the fact that neither had he been formally accused nor convicted of heresy.⁷³ Thus, his rights were violated as he had no chance to present his arguments and had been condemned for heresy without a trial. That is why he refused to be interrogated by the ecclesiastical court, but decided to prove his innocence at the royal court instead. In his opinion, he was maliciously accused of heresy by the clergy who intended to suppress the spread of Wyclif's teaching.⁷⁴

From Silesia, Gałka wrote a letter to an unknown Polish nobleman complaining about false accusations and the unjust treatment he had experienced from the bishop of Cracow. He asked the noble for intervention on his behalf at the royal court, declaring his willingness to come back to Poland and answer all charges brought against him by the clergy. In addition, he supplemented his letter with a short commentary on Wyclif's critique of the contemporary clergy and attached a copy of his vernacular eulogy of Wyclif.⁷⁵ It seems that Gałka had much confidence in his noble friend and expected that he would offer him the necessary assistance in the conflict with the bishop of Cracow.

In the light of his letters and the vernacular "eulogy of Wyclif", it is clear that Andrzej Gałka was an advocate of Wyclif's philosophy and theology. In his writings he openly acknowledged his interest in the ideas of the *Doctor Evangelicus* and admitted that he had been reading and copying Wyclif's writings for almost twenty years. He mentioned by title five writings of Wyclif he had read and studied: *De universalibus*, *De ideis*, *De simonia*, *De blasphemia* and *De apostasia* and claimed to have known

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 69-70.

⁷¹ *Ibid.* 70.

⁷² The sequence of events from the examination of one of Gałka's books to his escape from Cracow is presented in the letters of Jan Elgot, vicar-general in the diocese of Cracow to his superior bishop Zbigniew Oleśnicki. See: T. Wünsch, *Ne pestifera doctrina* 16-20.

⁷³ *Codex diplomaticus Universitatis Cracoviensis* 2:111: "Ego vero xx. Annis in Studio Cracoviensi in Collegio cum Magistris et aliquot annis Canonicus in ecclesia Sancti Floriani, domum in claustro Mogiła, usque ad ultimum diem egressus mei de dicto claustro, semper mansi liber, *nec vocatus, nec citatus, neque iudicatus, neque convictus, nec respondi de aliqua secta, quam dicunt haeresim vel errorem.*"

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 114-115.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 115-118.

others.⁷⁶ His access to Wyclif's writings provided him with good knowledge of Wyclif's logic and realist concept of universals. In opposition to the nominalist philosophy prevalent at Cracow, Gałka adapted an ultra-realist theory of universals claiming that the real being of universals was the only plausible approach to matters of philosophy and theology. In his opinion the realist concept of universals made it possible to explain basic church dogmas such as the unity and separation of three Persons of the Holy Trinity⁷⁷ or the two natures of Jesus Christ.⁷⁸ Among Gałka's letters preserved in the Archive of the Wrocław Archbishopric there is a separate paper sheet, on which Andrzej of Dobczyn drew a diagram of the Holy Trinity and supplied it with a short commentary. The unity and separateness of the three persons of the Trinity is compared there to the three physical states of water (ice, snow, and vapour) and the three dispositions of the human soul (memory, reason, and will)⁷⁹. Adopting Wyclif's realist approach to universals, Gałka demonstrates that the Trinity is one being due to his divine substance, however, at the same time all Persons of the Trinity remain separate due to his various forms and attributes.⁸⁰

Gałka's commitment to Wyclif's philosophy made him ready to defend publicly the realist concept of universals as well as to demonstrate its practical application in the domain of theology.⁸¹ Referring to his teaching experience at the university in Cracow, Gałka criticised its professors for their ignorance and incompetence in matters of philosophy. In his opinion, by the rejection of Wyclif's teaching, they lacked necessary knowledge to study philosophical and theological concepts. With irony he argued that their ignorance of Wyclif's writings made them similar to a blind man who can not recognise colours.⁸²

It seems, however, that it was not Wyclif's philosophy, but rather his anticlerical ideas that most impressed Andrzej of Dobczyn. In his great admiration for Wyclif, Gałka shared the enthusiasm of the Czech masters from the Charles University and

⁷⁶« Sed tamen hoc sponte fateor quod legi et scripsi pluribus annis libros magistri Johannis Wicleph de uiversalibus et de ideis, de simonia, blasphemia. » (*Ibid.* 111. In the same letter he also mentioned Wyclif's treatise "De apostasia", which he had rented from a certain Czech noble (*Ibid.* 112).

⁷⁷ John Wyclif, *De uiversalibus* 108-110.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 214-8; 222-6.

⁷⁹ Wrocław, Archiwum Archidiecezjalne MS. IA 1e (Mittelalter des Bischof Petrus, 1447-1456) X 84; Gałka's concept may have been inspired by Jerome of Prague, who produced a similar diagram of the Holy Trinity and supplied it with his philosophical commentary (Prague, Národní knihovna MS. V E 28 ff. 130a-b). F. Šmahel has found and identified eleven such diagrams, which differ among one another in their contents and order of presentation, but serve to illustrate the same concept of the Trinity, based upon the realist philosophy. F. Šmahel, "Příspěvek k soupisu literární pozůstalosti M. Jeronýma Pražského trinitární diagramy." *Studie o rukopisech* 33 (1999-2000) 29-45 (Gałka's diagram was reproduced on p. 43).

⁸⁰ *Codex diplomaticus Universitatis Cracoviensis* 2:112. In the letter to the Cracow professors Andrzej of Dobczyn presented a syllogism, which applies the realist philosophy to the concept of the Holy Trinity: "Sine praedicto notitia (i.e. the realist teaching of Wyclif on the Holy Trinity - PK) non potestis veraciter solvere illum sillogismum: haec essentia divina est pater, haec essentia divina est filius, ergo filius est pater, similiter illum Cristus in triduo fuit corpus, Cristus in triduo fuit anima. Aor est Bor, sunt articuli fidei, quia Cristus est sepultus, non secundum animam et descendit ad inferos non secundum corpus, quod tunc fuit in sepulcro, nec secundum divinitatem quae et sic est immobilis." Gałka borrowed that syllogism from Wyclif's treatise *De uiversalibus* 108-9.

⁸¹ *Codex diplomaticus Universitatis Cracoviensis* 2: 114.

⁸²*Ibid.* 112; see: J. Fijałek, *Mistrz Jakub z Paradyża i Uniwersytet Krakowski w okresie soboru bazylejskiego* [Master James of Paradyż and the University of Cracow in the Period of the Council of Basel] (Cracow, 1900) 124.

the Taborites. He extolled Wyclif's courage to disclose the lies and abuses of the modern clergy.⁸³ In his Polish vernacular eulogy, Wyclif is presented as one of the greatest Christian thinkers to whom goes merit for revealing uncorrupted teaching of Christ to the faithful.⁸⁴

Poles, Germans,
All nationalities,
If you doubt the account of Christian faith
And all written works,
Wycliff will tell the truth

He has no equal;
There will be no pagan
Or Christian master,
No one will be greater
Until the day of judgement.⁸⁵

Commenting on the persecution of Wyclif, Gałka argued that the church's condemnation of the *Doctor Evangelicus* resulted from the anger and envy of the clergy who had become the main target of Wyclif's attacks. In his writings, Wyclif uncovered the abuses of the clergy and demonstrated a direct discrepancy between their life and Christ's teaching.⁸⁶ That is why priests, offended by Wyclif's critique, launched a broad campaign aimed at suppressing the circulation of his ideas. Apart from the ecclesiastical bans on Wyclif's writings, they also used various means of propaganda to destroy Wyclif's reputation and present him as a dangerous heretic. To the great joy of master Andrzej, despite the church's persecution, Wyclif's ideas were widely disseminated and attracted many Christians.

In his critique of the modern church, Gałka pointed out the donation of the Emperor Constantine the Great, which he considered a turning point in the Church history. Accepting the authenticity of Constantine's donation, he claimed that the Emperor had endowed the Church with property and privileges as well as granted secular power to pope Sylvester and the clergy.⁸⁷ In his opinion, the imperial gift

⁸³ On the perception of Wyclif among English Lollards see: Ch. von Nolcken, "Wyclif, Another Kind of Saint," *Studies in Church History Subsidia* 5 (1987) 429-442; On the fascination with Wyclif in Hussite Bohemia see F. Šmahel, *Doctor evangelicus* 26-34; *idem*, *Idea národa v husitských Čechách*, (Prague, 2000²) 162-164.

⁸⁴ "Pieśń o Wiklefie (cantilena vulgaris in laudem magistri Johanni Wiklifi)," in: *Wybór tekstów staropolskich. Czasy najdawniejsze do 1543 roku* [Selections from the old-Polish writings till 1543], ed. S. Vrtel-Wierczyński, (Warsaw, 1969) 192; the latest edition in: *Chrestomatia staropolska. Teksty do roku 1543*, ed. W. Wydra, R. Rzepka (Wrocław-Warsaw-Cracow, 1995²) 288-290; a new literary analysis of Gałka's eulogy in T. Michałowska, *Średniowiecze (Wielka Historia Literatury Polskiej)* [The Middle Ages in The Great History of Polish Literature] (Warsaw, 1996) 534-545 (here also further references to literature)

⁸⁵ Andrzej Gałka of Dobczyn, "Song on Wycliffe," trans. M. Mikoś, in: *Medieval Literature of Poland. An Anthology* [Garland Library of Medieval Literature, v. 82, Series B] (New York-London, 1992) 143.

⁸⁶ *Codex diplomaticus Universitatis Cracoviensis* 2:112.

⁸⁷ The legend of Constantine's donation became a commonplace in the critique of the corrupted church by various religious movements (Waldensians, Lollards and Hussites). Cf. J. Gonnet, "La Donazione di Constantino presso gli eretici medioevali," *Bolletino della Societa ali Studi Waldesi* (decembre 1970) 17-29; A. Molnar, *A Challenge to Constantinianism, The Waldensian Theology in the Middle Ages* (Geneva, 1976). On the circulation of the legend about Constantine's donation in mediaeval England see: B. Smalley, *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century*, (Oxford, 1960) 195-6.

violated God's will and overturned the primary objectives of Christ's Church. Referring to a widely circulated legend on the Constantine's donation, he presented the story of the angel's voice which had been heard during the donation, warning against the venom pouring into the Church with imperial endowment.⁸⁸ Constantine's donation brought about the decline of morality and discipline, as well as the renunciation of Christ's teaching by the clergy. Showing the fatal consequences of the church endowment, Gałka reminds of Christ's call for poverty, stressing that those who want to be perfect should remain poor and get rid of earthly goods. In opposition to Christ's commandment, the modern clergy betrayed their mission, becoming wealthy and powerful.⁸⁹ Down the ages, the church had undergone a thorough transformation and imperial priests (*saecerdotes Caesari*) endowed with temporal goods replaced Christ's priests (*sacerdotes Christi*).⁹⁰ In the opinion of Andrzej of Dobczyn, thanks to Wyclif the abuses of the Constantinian clergy were brought to light and the true teaching of Christ was revealed to the faithful once again.⁹¹

Reproaching modern clergy with the betrayal of Christ, Gałka favoured Wyclif's call for a reform which would restore the simplicity and purity of the church. Such a reform should be based upon the Holy Scripture which following Wyclif he regarded as the only genuine source of Christ's teaching. Christ's instructions preserved in the Gospel provided the guidelines for every Christian on how to live and praise God. They were absolutely necessary and sufficient to pursue a perfect Christian life on earth. Consequently, there was no need to take part in rituals and religious

⁸⁸ Pope Silvester the First,
gained power from the tail
Of Constantine, the snake;
His venom seeps year after year
From the side of the Church.

(Andrzej Gałka of Dobczyn, *Song on Wycliffe*, 144).

On the back page of the cover in MS. 306 Helmst. in the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel, there is a Latin marginal gloss referring to the story of Constantine's donation: "Hodie effusum est venenum in ecclesia dei, in curia caesaris." J. Zathey, *Pieśń o Wicklefie* 173.

⁸⁹ Wyclif presented his opinions on Constantine's donation in various writings, e.g. *De apostasia*, ed. M.H. Dziewicki (London, 1889) 40-1; *De blasphemia*, ed. M.H. Dziewicki (London, 1893) 8-10; *De civili dominio*, ed. J. Loserth (London, 1900) 2:107-8; *Triologus* 307; 408-9; *De ecclesia*, ed. J. Loserth (London, 1886) 372-3; *De potestate papae* 120-4. On Wyclif's criticism of the donation of Constantine and its role in the Church history: H. Workman, *John Wyclif* (London, 1926) 2:77-8; G. Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages*, (Manchester, 1967) 2:526-7 and 531. On the reception of the legend of Constantine's donation in the Lollard writings see A. Hudson, *The Premature Reformation* 335.

⁹⁰ *Codex diplomaticus universitatis Cracoviensis* 2:115: "Magister Johannes Wicleph vult et docet, quod sacerdotes moderni non sacerdotes Christi, sed sunt sacerdotes Caesari, hoc est Caesaris Constantini, qui Constantinus dedit provincias, possessions, agros, civitates, castra, praedia, villas, decimas, frugum terrae, vexilia et omnes alias pompas, quas hodie faciunt sacerdotes, scilicet Christus non dedit ipsis hoc, et non placent Christo haec, sed potius Antichristo."

⁹¹ Andrzej Gałka of Dobczyn, *Song on Wycliffe* 143-144:

From ideas in the mind of God
To their image in the minds of men –
He (i.e. Wyclif – PK) uncovered
Universal matters,
Hidden to many sages.
About Church unity,
The ecclesiastical Eucharist
The power of Antichrist,
The wickedness of present-day priests,
He wrote accurately.

ceremonies introduced into the church's practice by the Constantinian clergy. Master Andrzej of Dobczyn had no doubt that the church teaching did not have any value unless it was based on Scripture. That is why Gałka denounced the superfluity of all religious practices which did not originate from Scripture. In his letters he openly criticizes the adoration of the Eucharist, confirmation and auricular confession to a priest. Denying any value to such rituals, he claims that the apostles never knelt down in the adoration of the Eucharist or expected individual confession of sin from the faithful.⁹² In consequence, Andrzej of Dobczyn ridicules all outer forms of piety which accompany the adoration of the Eucharist, such as playing music or lighting candles. Consequently, he goes on to reject the feast of *Corpus Christi*, which was fostered by the clergy to encourage popular devotion.⁹³

Commenting on the sacrament of penance, he argues that every Christian is granted God's absolution when he shows sincere contrition for his wrongdoings. The sacrament of penance relies on a direct personal relation between God and the penitent. Priests have no power to forgive sins and impose penance on God's behalf. Doing so, they usurp and abuse God's rights. Moreover, Gałka denies priestly absolution any validity for only God possesses perfect knowledge of human souls. That is why only God has exclusive power to show mercy to the people who truly regret their sins.⁹⁴ Following Wyclif's arguments, Andrzej of Dobczyn treated all above-mentioned church ceremonies and rituals as human inventions, introduced by the greedy clergy to extract more money from the faithful.⁹⁵

The critique of church corruption provided Gałka with arguments to challenge the privileged position of priests in the relations between God and the faithful. He claimed that the validity of the sacraments depended only on God's will, and the sacraments administered by the worldly priests had no value. Here, we can easily notice Wyclif's idea of the common priesthood, which inspired Gałka to question the very existence of the clergy. In his opinion, a priest has no special gifts conferred to him by God and therefore the clergy's claim to their supremacy over the laity lacks any foundation.

The scattered and fragmentary evidence makes it hardly possible to evaluate

⁹² *Codex diplomaticus universitatis Cracoviensis* 2:112: "... cum tamen in coena Domini non legimus duodecim apostolos Domini flexisse genua coram predicto sacramento, nec in primitiva ecclesia sic flectabant prout et ... apparet evidenter apud Graecos et alios cristianos." Wyclif's most complete treatment of the sacrament of Eucharist is presented in his treatise *De Eucharistia*, ed. J. Loserth (London, 1892). Wyclif denied the church doctrine of transubstantiation and instead proposed a sacramental or figurative interpretation of Christ's presence in the sacrament of the altar. Andrzej Gałka could learn his arguments in Wyclif's writings he claimed to have read: John Wyclif, *De simonia* 39, 69; *idem, De blasphemia* 20-1; *idem, De apostasia* 65. See also J.I. Catto, "John Wyclif and the Cult of the Eucharist," in: *The Bible in the Medieval World. Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, ed. K. Walsh, D. Wood [*Studies in Church History Subsidia* 4] (Oxford, 1985) 271-273.

⁹³ It seems that Gałka accepted Wyclif's critique of the Eucharist treated as idolatry. J.I. Catto, "John Wyclif," 274-282.

⁹⁴ *Codex diplomaticus universitatis Cracoviensis* 2:112: "de confessione auriculari coram sacerdote et de manum impositione, quae imposito ab Hirco habet ortum, sacerdos dicens verba absolutionis saepe dicit falsum et mentitur posito, quod confitens abscondet aliqua peccata sua propter verecundiam et non recutet ipsa coram cacerdote et Deus ex certo iudicio nobis occulto non dimittat peccata sic confitendi, et non sequitur: Ego te absolvo, si apud Deum es absolutus, ergo ego se absolve." Gałka's arguments against auricular confession followed Wyclif's criticism of that sacrament in his *De blasphemia* 140, 142-4 and 117. Cf. T. Wünsch, *Ne pestifera doctrina* 14-16.

⁹⁵ *Codex diplomaticus universitatis Cracoviensis* 2:112-113.

the extent of Gałka's knowledge of Wyclif's teachings. His writings shed little light on how well he knew Wyclif's theology and to what extent he was acquainted with his anticlerical ideas. According to his statements, he adhered to Wyclif's realist logic and, in particular, accepted the realist concept of universals. As far as his ecclesiastical opinions are concerned, it might be assumed that he shared Wyclif's arguments against the corruption of the clergy which had originated from the donation of the Emperor Constantine. One may suggest that if he had read the five works of Wyclif mentioned in his letters, he would also have learnt about Wyclif's concept of the church treated as the community of the elect, as well as his denial of Christ's presence in the sacrament of the Eucharist. In his writings, however, Andrzej of Dobczyn did not declare his adherence to any of the most radical ideas of Wyclif's doctrine. Thus, it may be argued that in his fascination with Wyclif's teaching he stopped at the same point as Hus, rejecting Wyclif's critique of the most fundamental Church dogmas.

Gałka's fate after his escape to Silesia is obscure and disputable. He may have settled in Silesia at the court of his protector Bolko V or moved to Bohemia joining the Czech Utraquists. In recent studies, it has been argued that Gałka left Silesia for Tabor where, in 1451, he was met by Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, an envoy of the emperor Frederick III to the Czech diet in Prague.⁹⁶ In his report from the visit at Tabor, Piccolomini described a bitter discussion he had with certain Galechus on the Utraquist Communion and Constantine's donation.⁹⁷ According to the Czech historians František Bartoš and František Šmahel, Gałka left Tabor in 1452 and retired to a parish living in Podvéki.⁹⁸

Gałka's adherence to Wyclif's teaching cast a shadow on the reputation of the whole university of Cracow, which had to take counter-measures to prevent any further circulation of Wyclif's ideas.⁹⁹ Moreover, Cracow professors were outraged by Gałka's controversy and took a concerted effort to demonstrate that they had nothing in common with the heretical interests of their former colleague. In their letter to the bishop of Wrocław, Andrzej of Dobczyn was called a black sheep (*ovis morbida*) among the university flock.¹⁰⁰ Probably from the same time comes a malicious comment, which was inserted into the university registers above the note with Gałka's registration. An unknown scribe wrote that Gałka had been the worst heretic, with whom everybody had words (*hereticus pessimus cum quo disputabant cuncti*).¹⁰¹

Moreover, church authorities carried out the interrogations of Gałka's friends outside the university. In 1450, the Church officials in the Poznań diocese interrogated

⁹⁶ *Der Briefwechsel des E. Sylvio Piccolomini*, ed. R. Wolkan, (Vienna, 1918) 4/1:36. There are some serious doubts if the person met in Tabor by Piccolomini can be identified with Andrzej of Dobczyn. Piccolomini called his Tabor disputant John Galechus instead of Andrew Gałka. In addition, it is worth mentioning that the term "Gałka" functioned only as a nickname of Andrzej of Dobczyn, and it was used never used in any official documents.

⁹⁷ H. Kaminsky, "Pius Aeneas among the Taborites," *Church History* 28 (1959) 308; J. Mikulka, "Polští kněže husite v Čechach," [The Polish Hussite Priests in Bohemia], *Slezký sborník* 57 (1959) 174.

⁹⁸ F.M. Bartoš, "Osudy polskeho husity w Taboře a v Čechach," [The Fortune of the Polish Hussite in Tabor and in Bohemia] *Jihočeský sborník historický* 41 (1972) 111-114; *Husitská revoluce* 4:132. In opposition to the above-mentioned Czech scholars, some Polish historians have argued that there is no evidence to identify Gałka with the priest whom Piccolomini met at Tabor, e.g. S. Kolbuszewski, *Herezja* 86-88; J. Zathej, *Pieśń o Wiklefie* 171-87.

⁹⁹ K. Morawski, *Historia* 2:309.

¹⁰⁰ *Codex diplomaticus Universitatis Cracoviensis* 2:107.

¹⁰¹ *Statuta necnon liber promotionum* 17.

priest Marcin of Śrem asking him about his contacts with Andrzej Gałka. Despite such an action, the ecclesiastical registers did not record any followers of Gałka's ideas.¹⁰²

Apart from Gałka, it is hard to find any other advocates of Wyclif's ideas in fifteenth century Poland. It may be argued that Wyclif's theory of lordship and the critique of clerical dominion over secular things had some indirect influence on the political treatise *Monumentum pro rei publicae ordinatione* written by Jan Ostroróg (1430-1501). In his *Monumentum* Ostroróg advocated the idea of a sovereign state, opposing any church involvement in the secular government. In accordance with that principle Ostroróg criticised papal taxation imposed on the Polish Church, regarding it as unbearable interference of a foreign power in the internal affairs of an independent state. He also criticised obligatory payments for sacerdotal offices required by the Holy See. The ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the laity became another target of Ostroróg's critique.¹⁰³ There is no evidence that Jan Ostroróg had access to Wyclif's writings or was familiar with his political theories. Nevertheless, Ostroróg's concept of the state's sovereignty in the matters of policy, finance and jurisdiction, as well as his idea of the separation of church and state, look similar to some of Wyclif's political theories. It is more plausible to argue that Ostroróg's ideas stemmed from the tradition of the Polish political thought and were inspired by the writings of Mateusz of Cracow, Paweł Włodkowic and Jan of Ludzisko.

To conclude, it seems that Wyclif's philosophical and theological ideas were too complex and sophisticated to gain any interest outside the intellectual elite of Polish mediaeval society, concentrated at the university of Cracow. Wyclif's writings circulated exclusively in the academic milieu of Cracow, where they were copied, studied and discussed. His realist concept of universals was rejected by most Cracovian professors, who preferred the nominalist philosophy. In the period of the confrontation between the Bohemian reformation and the Roman Church, Wyclif's ecclesiastical theories were associated with Hussite doctrine and combated as heretical errors. In such circumstances the fascination of a single Cracow intellectual, Andrzej Gałka, with Wyclif's ideas looks completely isolated. During his twenty years working at Cracow, Andrzej of Dobczyn busily studied and commented on Wyclif's writings, producing even the vernacular poem in honour of the *Doctor Evangelicus*. Moreover, to the great horror of church authorities, he attempted to popularise some of Wyclif's anticlerical ideas among the Polish nobility. The sudden discovery of his secret interests in Wyclif's doctrine transformed him from a reliable man of good faith (*homo honestus fidei rectae*) into a dangerous rebel and the enemy of the church (*homo tam periculosus gregi dominico et hostis fidei Christianae*).¹⁰⁴ Condemned by his university colleagues and prosecuted by the Church authorities he was forced to leave his homeland and spent the rest of his life in exile.

¹⁰² *Acta capitulorum* 2:172.

¹⁰³ Jan Ostroróg, "Monumentum pro Reipublicae ordinatione," ed. M. Bobrzyński, in: *Starodawne prawa polskiego pomniki* 5/1 (Cracow, 1878) (Polish translation "Memoriał o naprawie Rzeczypospolitej," published in: *700 lat myśli polskiej. Filozofia i myśl społeczna XIII-XV wieku*, ed. J. Domański, (Warsaw, 1978) 1:241-253); thorough study of Ostroróg's political thoughts in W. Sobociński, "Memoriał Jana Ostroroga a początki reformacji w Polsce," [Jan Ostroróg's *Monumentum* and the Beginning of the Reformation in Poland], *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce* 3 (1958) 9-51 and 4 (1959) 35-79.

¹⁰⁴ *Codex diplomaticus universitatis Cracoviensis* 2:105.