

Matthias of Knín's Road to the 1409 Prague Quodlibet

*An Intellectual Biography and Some Notes on the Long Introductory Section to the 1409 Quodlibet**

A relatively little-known Master of Arts belonging to the group of Bohemian followers of Wyclif, Matthias of Knín was nonetheless involved in a series of events that were of paramount relevance for the academic and intellectual life at Prague University at the turn of the fifteenth century. In this chapter, I will outline Knín's career, production and activity,¹ and also present and comment on the long introductory section to the quodlibet he chaired in 1409, which is published for the first time in this volume.²

* This research was funded by the Department of Philosophy "Piero Martinetti" of the University of Milan under the Project "Departments of Excellence 2023–2027" awarded by the Ministry of University and Research (MUR). The publication of this chapter was financially supported by the European Research Council (ERC) project ACADEMIA: Reconstructing Late Medieval Quests for Knowledge: Quodlibetal Debates as Precursors of Modern Academic Practice, grant no. 949710, carried out at the Institute of Philosophy of the Czech Academy of Sciences.

¹ In the first part of this chapter, I elaborate on two articles of mine, in which I first presented Matthias of Knín's intellectual portrait and published two questions ascribed to him by manuscript notes, namely L. CAMPI, "Is Perfection of this World? A *Quaestio* on Creatures' Perfection in Terms of Propinquity to or Distance from the First Being, Ascribed to Matěj of Knín", *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale* 62 (2020), pp. 213–250: 213–221 and "A *Quaestio* on Friendship Ascribed to Matthias of Knín with Some Notes and Questions on the Academic Practices and Intellectual Life at the Prague Faculty of Arts at the Turn of the Fifteenth Century", *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 32 (2021), pp. 297–343: 297–305.

² Cf. L. CAMPI, "The Introductory Section of Matthias of Knín's Quodlibet with a Note on the Edition", in *The Greatest Debate*, pp. 341–393.

1. A Young Talented Master of Arts from the Ranks of the Prague Wycliffites

Matthias of Knín's life and academic activity can be retraced — no more than in its salient features — thanks to a few documents that have come down to us. Hailing from a locality in South Bohemia,³ Knín enrolled at Prague University among the members of the Bohemian nation and studied at the Faculty of Arts. On 9 March 1399 he was promoted for the bachelor's degree by John Hus, who delivered a customary recommendation on the occasion of his graduation, entitled *Discens factus est sciens*.⁴ In it, Hus's praise for Knín's commitment as a student, intellectual gifts, and academic achievements is introduced by a series of references to moralising tales from classical literature, chosen to stigmatise some students' vices. One of these, in particular, may have been intended by Hus as particularly apt for his pupil: do not fly too high, for, like Icarus, you might suffer graver damage once you plunge to the ground.⁵ Perhaps by that time Knín had already given evidence of his resourcefulness, if not a tendency to cut corners, as seems to have been the case a decade later, as we will see, at the meeting of masters convened to appoint the chair of the quodlibet for the ensuing year 1409.

In his recommendation, Hus refers to Knín as "Pater",⁶ a nickname that was in use not only within the circle of the Bohemian admirers of Wyclif, but also among their opponents. Testimony to this is the so-called *Missa Wyclifstarum*, a parodistic pamphlet probably composed by some students in 1410 and then modified in 1419: in the section corresponding to the Gospel, echoing the genealogical incipit of *Matthew*, the *Missa* mentions Knín as "father of nefariousness" ("pater nequicie") and puts him in close relationship with Jerome of Prague ("Knyn genuit Ieronymum athletam antichristi"), whose role as an advocate of Wyclif's metaphysical realism is stressed by making of him a sort of Anti-Paul, the

3 Matthias's name is the only one associated with the town of Knín in the *Liber decanorum*, with the exception of John Kninus Passek, who served as a dean in the last decade of the fifteenth century; cf. *Liber decanorum facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Pragensis*, vol. 1, p. 23.

4 *Liber decanorum facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Pragensis*, vol. 1, p. 339. Cf. P. DE VOOGHT, *L'hérésie de Jean Huss*, Louvain 1960, p. 47; O. PAVLÍČEK, "The Chronology of Life and Work of Jan Hus", in F. ŠMAHEL, O. PAVLÍČEK (eds), *A Companion to Jan Hus*, Leiden / Boston 2015, pp. 9–68: 16 and notes 33–34.

5 IOHANNES HUS, *Positiones, Recommendationes, Sermones*, ed. A. SCHMIDTOVÁ, Praha 1958, p. 42: "Propter quod metrum trutanicum dicit: 'O fili care, non cupias alta volare. / Nam alis si cares, gravius inde cades.'" Cf. CAMPI, "Is Perfection of this World?", p. 214, n. 2.

6 IOHANNES HUS, *Positiones*, p. 42: "Sed diceret aliquis: Ubi est testimonium pro eius premio? Respondeo: Magistrorum strictum examen et eius cognominatio sunt duo testes. Primum, scilicet examen, patet multis, cognomine vero Pater appellatur. Ergo per Grecistam: 'Est pater etate et pater ipse vocatur honore.'" The editor could not find the source for the last sentence quoted above, which is EBERARDUS BETHINIENSIS, *Graecismus*, ed. I. WROBEL, Breslau 1887, IX, p. 54, vv. 1–3: "Est pater hic cura, pater est alius genitura, / Hic pater etate, pater ille vocatur honore, / Ac summum regem facit ipsa creatio patrem."

Apostle *par excellence* of the Anti-Christ — namely, of Wyclif.⁷ As will become apparent shortly, Knín and Jerome in fact shared a strong professional bond and were most probably good friends.

In 1404 Matthias of Knín was promoted to Master of Arts by another prominent representative of the Prague Wycliffites, Stanislaus of Znojmo, and in October 1406 was elected commissioner for the examination of candidates for the bachelor's degree in Arts.⁸ According to the statutes of the Faculty of Arts,⁹ to hold the latter position it was required *inter alia* to have attended a dispute *de quolibet* as a participant in the same year — implying that he took part in 1406 in an as yet unidentified quodlibet.¹⁰

7 See P. LEHMANN, *Die Parodie im Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1963², pp. 217–223; 219–220: “Evangeliū: Liber generacionis malediccionis omnium hereticorum filiorum diaboli, filiorum Wicleph. Wykleph genuit Sneuma, Sneuma genuit Stanislau, Stanislau genuit Politz, Politz genuit Hus, Hus genuit Marcum de Grecz, [...] Michalicz genuit Knyn, qui fuit pater nequicie, Knyn genuit Jeronymum athletam antichristi, Jeronymus genuit Jessenicz usque ad transmigracionem trium nacionum et post transmigracionem Jessenicz genuit Sdislaum leprosum, cuius contagione infecti sunt multi.” Knín is also mentioned in the *Missa* as a follower of Hus's error concerning the Eucharist *sub utraque specie*; see also p. 219: “ut Hus et eius complices / dantes erroris calices, / qui circumveniunt simplices, / et nequam Austini / Knyn, Symon, Jessenicz sequitur, / De Messlik, Habart additur, / Jeronymus non tollitur, / quamvis addatur fini.” Transcriptions of the text of the *Missa* from single manuscripts previously appeared in J. LOSERTH, *Wiclif and Hus*, London 1884, pp. 348–354: 249–350; A. FRANZ, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter*, Freiburg i.B. 1902, pp. 759–761: 760; and F. PALACKÝ, *Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hussitenkrieges vom Jahre 1419 an*, Praha 1873, vol. 2, pp. 521–522. The texts published in these latter two works do not mention Knín and attribute primacy in *nequitia* to “Iacobellus” (viz. Iacobellus de Stříbro). The “transmigration” mentioned in the passage from the Gospel section refers to the withdrawal of the masters of the German university nations from Prague University after the decree of Kuttenberg (Kutná Hora) — issued by King Wenceslas IV on 18 January 1409 — which assigned three votes to the Bohemian nation and a single vote to the other three nations combined. Cf. below, note 33. See F. ŠMAHEL, “The Kuttenberg Decree and the Withdrawal of the German Students from Prague in 1409: A Discussion”, in *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter. Gesammelte Aufsätze / The Charles University in the Middle Ages. Selected Studies*, Leiden / Boston 2007, pp. 159–171; F. ŠMAHEL, M. NODL, “Kuttenberg Dekret nach 600 Jahren. Eine Bilanz der bisherigen Forschung”, *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis* 49 (2009), no. 2, pp. 19–54.

8 Cf. *Liber decanorum facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Pragensis*, vol. 1, p. 378; F. ŠMAHEL, “The Faculty of Liberal Arts 1348–1419”, in *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter*, pp. 214–315: 228, 296.

9 Cf. *Statuta facultatis artium universitatis Pragensis redacta anno 1390 cum supplemento usque ad annum 1528*, in *Statuta et Acta rectorum Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis 1350–1614*, ed. F. ŠMAHEL, G. SILAGI, Praha 2018, p. 269 (Rubr. X, 15: *Quis eligendus examinatus*): “Conclusum tunc fuit in eadem congregacione secundum maiorem partem primo ille articulus, quod nullus debet eligi in examinatore baccalariandorum, nisi ordine ipsum concernente sine fraude, si pro tunc infra muros Pragensis civitatis fuerit, responderit ipso anno in disputacione de quolibet et disputaverit ordinarie iuxta statuta facultatis artium et promissa.”

10 As for *quodlibeta* that are hitherto still undated, see O. PAVLÍČEK, “The 1409 Prague Arts Quodlibet in the Context of Prague and Central European Quodlibetal Tradition”, in *The*

With regard to his writings, we have a limited amount of indirect or direct evidence. As for the former, a *quaestio* left unasccribed in the only manuscript copy, but attributed to Jerome of Prague by František Šmahel, conveys information that Knín (described as “socius meus Kninus, magister Ma. Pater”) defended Wyclif’s realism in a regular Masters’ debate, presumably held in 1408.¹¹ Again, a “Magister Pater” is the author of a work on natural philosophy, the *Puncta*, listed by a medieval catalogue of the holdings of the college founded in Prague by Queen Jadwiga of Poland, and probably related to Knín’s teaching activity.¹²

On the other hand, three texts are explicitly attributed to Knín by the manuscript tradition, all found in a miscellaneous codex — MS Praha, NK ČR,

Greatest Debate, pp. 31–69: 47–49. As is well known, quodlibetal disputations were held at the beginning of January, which excludes Knín from having participated in the 1404 one — chaired by the anti-Wycliffite John Hübner — since he had not yet attained the academic rank of Master of Arts. He could have participated in a quodlibet from 1405 on.

- 11 The anonymous *quaestio Utrum unum terminorum inter se convertibilium, ut sic, vere negari de reliquo supponente pro aliquo, sit possibile*, transmitted by the sole MS Praha, NK ČR, X E 24, fols 191v–195r, has been republished in HIERONYMUS DE PRAGA, *Quaestio de convertibilitate et suppositione terminorum*, in *Quaestiones, Polemica, Epistulae*, ed. F. ŠMAHEL, G. SILAGI, Turnhout 2010 (= CCCM, 222), pp. 71–82: 75–76: <q>uamvis inimici earundem veritatum noctic<oracis> ingenio nec verba eorum intelligent, nec intelligere volunt, frontosa elati superbia, aut forte alia causa, quas breviter et solerter tetigerat socius meus Kninus, magister Ma. Pater.” On the dating of this *quaestio*, cf. F. ŠMAHEL, *Verzeichnis der Quellen zum Prager Universalienstreit 1348–1500*, Wrocław 1980 (= *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 25 [1980]), p. 45, no. 177 (dating the *quaestio* back to 1407/1408); “Jerome of Prague: University Questions and Polemics”, in *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter*, pp. 538–580: 575 (dating the *quaestio* back to 1408); and “Einleitung”, in HIERONYMUS DE PRAGA, *Quaestiones*, pp. xi–cxxxviii: xxxiv (dating the *quaestio* back to the “eve” of January 1409). On the semantic range of the term “socius”, including the meaning of “fellow student”, but also “younger assistant”, see O. WEIJERS, *Terminologie des universités au XIII^e siècle*, Roma 1987, pp. 265–267, and 362, n. 236. Note that in their edition Šmahel and Silagi read “nocticecati” (“nocticerati” in previous essays by Šmahel quoting this passage) instead of what in the manuscript (fol. 192v, l. 9) is transmitted as “nocticoraci”, and which I propose to emend to “nocticoracis”. Cf. CAMPI, “A *Quaestio* on Friendship Ascribed to Matthias of Knín”, p. 298, note 3.
- 12 Cf. *Catalogi librorum vetustissimi Universitatis Pragensis*, ed. Z. SILAGIOVÁ, F. ŠMAHEL, Turnhout 2015 (= CCCM, 271), *Registrum librorum collegii reczkonis* II, p. 39: “<G> 12 Super De anima magistri Stanislai; Phisicorum Hus; Puncta magistri Patris — *talium, que non cadunt*.” The title of Matthias’s work could suggest that this is a text related to teaching activity; on the semantic range of the term “punctum” with reference to academic practices, cf. O. WEIJERS, *Terminologie des universités au XIII^e siècle*, pp. 302–306; J. HAMESSE, “Approche terminologique de certaines méthodes d’enseignement et de recherche à la fin du moyen âge. *Declarare, recitare, conclusio*”, in O. WEIJERS (ed.), *Vocabulary of Teaching and Research between Middle Ages and Renaissance. Proceedings of the Colloquium London, Warburg Institute, 11–12 March 1994*, Turnhout 1995, pp. 20–22. In his essay on the catalogue of Queen Jadwiga’s college, Johann Loserth wrongly ascribed Stanislaus of Znojmo’s commentary on the *De anima* to “Magister Pater”, without mentioning his *Puncta* at all; cf. J. LOSERTH, “Der älteste Katalog der Prager Universitäts-Bibliothek”, *Mittheilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 11 (1890), no. 2, pp. 301–318: 308.

X H 18 — which is one of the most important repositories of documentary sources for enquiries on the academic activity at the Prague Faculty of Arts during the first two decades of the fifteenth century. MS Praha, NK ČR, X H 18 transmits fifty-eight complete questions, many of which have been proven to pertain to a particular disputation held in that period.¹³ Some of these texts have been recognised as having been debated during quodlibetal disputations, including those chaired by John Hus in 1411 and by Procopius of Kladruby in 1417, as well as another that must have taken place before 1398 and whose *quodlibetarius* is still unidentified.¹⁴ The number of texts contained in MS Praha, NK ČR, X H 18 that are related to Knín, and to his 1409 quodlibet in particular, is significantly greater than that of texts pertaining to other quodlibetal disputations: for MS Praha, NK ČR, X H 18 transmits only three *positiones* that were presented at Hus's and Procopius of Kladruby's *quodlibeta* respectively, while it preserves at least nine *quaestiones* that were apparently disputed at Knín's.¹⁵ To these, as mentioned, one should add three texts authored by Knín himself, the most relevant of which being one of the five copies of his *quaestio principalis* for the 1409 quodlibet, to which I will return later.¹⁶ The two further *quaestiones*, ascribed to "Magister Pater" by marginal notes found in MS Praha, NK ČR, X H 18, are separated from the *quaestio principalis* by an interposed question, which is left unattributed.¹⁷

The first one is the *quaestio Utrum cuiuslibet dependentis perfectio ex propinquitate vel distancia ad primum ens summe perfectum sit attendenda* (hereafter, UCDP),¹⁸ whose attribution to Knín I have recently defended.¹⁹ Besides showing the author's familiarity with the vocabulary and problems proper to the debates on the *latitudo formarum* — a theory that was not only known in Prague, but

-
- 13 Cf. J. TRUHLÁŘ, *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum latinorum qui in c. r. bibliotheca publica atque universitatis Pragensis asservantur*, 2 vols, Praha 1905–1906, vol. 2, pp. 115–117. On the *tabula* of contents, split between fols 1r–v and the inside back cover of MS Praha, NK ČR, X H 18, see CAMPI, "A *Quaestio* on Friendship Ascribed to Matthias of Knín", pp. 305–306 and note 28.
- 14 To this latter unidentified quodlibet is related a *quaestio* by Stephen of Pálec found in MS Praha, NK ČR, X H 18 and in another eight extant manuscripts, one of which has 1398 as its *terminus ad quem*; see J. KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace na pražské univerzitě* [Quodlibetal Disputations at the University of Prague], Praha 1971, p. 116; ŠMAHEL, *Verzeichnis der Quellen*, pp. 22–23, n. 41; P. SPUNAR, *Repertorium auctorum Bohemorum protractum idearum post Universitatem Pragensem conditam illustrans*, Warszawa 1985, vol. 1, p. 327, n. 908.
- 15 See MS Praha, NK ČR, X H 18, fols 40r–42v, 52r–52v, 118r–119v, 139r–140r, 141r–141v, 141v–142v, 143r–145v, 146r–148v, 161r–162v. Cf. KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace*, pp. 117, 119, 122–123, 129–130, 133, 135.
- 16 Cf. above, p. 85, note 59. This copy of Knín's *quaestio principalis* is not listed by Truhlář in his selective description of the manuscript's contents; cf. TRUHLÁŘ, *Catalogus*, vol. 2, p. 116.
- 17 This *quaestio Utrum in policia bene recta ludi solacia ac publica mala sunt permittenda* is found in MS Praha, NK ČR, X H 18, fols 135v–137v, and is not listed by Truhlář in his selection of the manuscript's contents; the text, however, had some circulation, since it is found in another copy in MS Praha, NK ČR, X H 9, fols 126v–128v; cf. TRUHLÁŘ, *Catalogus*, vol. 2, pp. 107–108.
- 18 Cf. MS Praha, NK ČR, X H 18, fols 152v–156v.
- 19 Cf. CAMPI, "Is Perfection of this World?", pp. 241–250.

possibly also included in the teaching curriculum of the local Faculty of Arts²⁰ — this piece of scholarship is in keeping with the philosophical trends of the Bohemian supporters of Wyclif’s metaphysical realism. In particular, in this text Knín is inspired by Stephen of Pálec’s²¹ interpretation of Wyclif’s theory that being is predicated of individuals according to different degrees in which they participate in the divine essence, and that all finite beings are essentially identical with the *ens primum in communi* (God), differing only formally from each other and from God.²² Based on this theory, Pálec described the metaphysical dependence that all created beings have on the first, divine, cause in terms of a sort of a “hanging downwards” according to different degrees of being: from the eternal and immutable being they have in the first cause down to the temporal and subject-to-change existential being they are provided with while existing as singulars *ad extra*. Pálec’s views about *dependentia* are also found in Jerome of Prague, who used the adverb “catenatim” to describe how levels of being are ordered according to different degrees, instead of Pálec’s substantive “scala”. Resuming the idea of dependence on the first cause as a hanging downwards (“*tota universitas creaturarum in modum cathene a prima causa in esse deorsum pendent*”),²³ Knín follows in the footsteps of the two exponents of the Wycliffe circle, using in his turn the term “catena”, like Jerome, but explicitly mentioning Pálec twice.²⁴ As will be clear later, a comparison between a passage from this

20 Cf. CAMPI, “Is Perfection of this World?”, pp. 224–225.

21 An older colleague of Hus at both the Arts and the Theology Faculty, from the mid-1390s Stephen of Pálec established himself as one of the prominent supporters of Wyclif’s realism among the members of the Bohemian university nation and, together with Hus’s master Stanislaus of Znojmo, acted as one of the leaders of the Czech reform movement. When he was elected dean of the Faculty of Theology in 1412, however, he decided to embrace the politics of King Wenceslas IV in support of the selling of indulgences, thus compromising his relations with the group of his former reform-minded companions. From then on, Pálec became an active opponent of Hus and his followers, acted against him at Constance, and — after Hus’s execution — could not return to Bohemia and spent his last years teaching at the University of Krakow. For a sketch of Pálec’s academic and public life, see O. PAVLÍČEK, “Stephen of Pálec’s *Quaestio de esse aeterno*: A Study and Critical Edition”, *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 84 (2017), pp. 349–378: 350–356.

22 See IOHANNES WYCLIF, *Purgans errores circa veritates in communi*, in *De ente librorum duorum*, ed. M. H. DZIEWICKI, London 1909, p. 6; *De ente praedicamentali*, ed. R. BEER, London 1891, p. 29; *Tractatus de universalibus*, ed. I. J. MUELLER, Oxford 1985, p. 368; *Triologus cum Supplemento Trialogi*, ed. G. V. LECHLER, Oxford 1869, p. 62. Cf. A. D. CONTI, “Analogy and Formal Distinction: On the Logical Basis of Wyclif’s Metaphysics”, *Medieval Philosophy and Theology* 6 (1997), pp. 133–165: 158–163; “Wyclif’s Logic and Metaphysics”, in I. C. LEVY (ed.), *A Companion to John Wyclif*, Leiden 2006, pp. 67–125: 72–78.

23 MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Quaestio* UCDD, ed. L. CAMPI, in “Is Perfection of this World?”, pp. 241–250: 241, ll. 12–25.

24 MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Quaestio* UCDD, pp. 241, ll. 24–25 (“*ut patuit per magistrum Stephanum, et dicitur ‘dependens’ a dependencia*”), 242, ll. 33–35 (“*quod quidem esse a divino Platone ‘ydeale’, ab aliis vero philosophis ‘potenciale’ vel ‘virtuale’, ‘originale’ seu ‘seminale’ nuncupatur;*

quaestio and one of the introductory materials of the 1409 quodlibet provides good reasons to trust the manuscript's attribution of this *quaestio* to Knín.

The last text ascribed to "Magister Pater" is the content which immediately follows the *quaestio* UCDP in MS Praha, NK ČR, X H 18, namely the *quaestio Utrum, si amicus et veritas dissenciant, veritas sit amico preferenda* (hereafter, USAV).²⁵ The title might suggest some kind of connection with the reception of Wyclif's theory of ideas in Prague. As is well-known, the pre-eminence of truth over friendship was maintained by Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics*: when taking the first steps in his enquiry on the universal good, the Philosopher warned his readers about the difficulties caused by the introduction of (a doctrine of) ideas by some "men who are friends of ours" — namely, Plato — and maintained that "although both friends and truth are dear to us, it is a matter of divine ordinance to prefer the truth".²⁶ Of the five versions of an *adage* inspired by this Aristotelian passage and documented by Leonardo Tarán,²⁷ the most widespread of which in modern times was "Amicus Plato sed magis amica veritas", at least two were in vogue among the Bohemian followers of Wyclif. For example, while rejecting Aristotle's eternalism in the wake of Wyclif's doctrine of ideas and of his metaphysical realism, John Hus defended the view that an eternal world does exist, but it is not the sensible one; it is, rather, the sensible world's ideal exemplar, which is eternally provided with intelligible being in God's mind.²⁸ In this context, Hus jokingly turned against Aristotle the *adage* originating precisely from his critique of Plato's ideas, claiming that all he was doing was following the methodological indications of Aristotle himself.²⁹ The popularity of the saying in Prague is also confirmed by its paraphrastic use attested in another polemical text by Hus. In a 1413 pamphlet addressed against Stephen of Pálec, who is harshly reprimanded for his about-face,³⁰ Hus presents a witty variant of the abovementioned saying: "Amicus Palecz, amica veritas; utrisque amicis existentibus sanctum est prehonorare veritatem".³¹ Such an ironic textual manipulation makes it apparent that the *adage* was widespread in Prague, certainly among the followers of Wyclif.

de quo esse reverendus magister Stephanus sufficientissime determinavit"). Cf. CAMPI, "Is Perfection of this World?", pp. 227–231; for other doctrinal points inspired by Wyclif in this *quaestio*, see pp. 231–234. Pálec's and Jerome's formulas are quoted at p. 228, note 48.

²⁵ Cf. MS Praha, NK ČR, X H 18, fols 156v–158r.

²⁶ ARISTOTELES, *Ethica Nicomachea*, I, cap. 4, 1096a16–17.

²⁷ See L. TARÁN, "Amicus Plato sed magis amica veritas: From Plato and Aristotle to Cervantes", *Antike und Abendland* 30 (1984), pp. 93–124. Cf. CAMPI, "A *Quaestio* on Friendship Ascribed to Matthias of Knín", pp. 308–313.

²⁸ Cf. L. CAMPI, "Matthias of Knín's *quaestio principalis* and Anti-Eternalism at the Prague Faculty of Arts in the Wake of Wyclif", in *The Greatest Debate*, pp. 172–173.

²⁹ Cf. CAMPI, "A *Quaestio* on Friendship Ascribed to Matthias of Knín", p. 309.

³⁰ Cf. above, p. 76, note 21.

³¹ See IOHANNES HUS, *Contra Stephanum Palecz*, in *Polemica*, ed. J. ERŠIL, Turnhout 2010 (= CCCM, 238), p. 302; cf. CAMPI, "A *Quaestio* on Friendship Ascribed to Matthias of Knín", p. 311.

As a matter of fact, however, Matthias's *quaestio* dealing with friendship is in no way related to Wyclif, but stems from the study of Books 8 and 9 of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. In it, neither explicit nor implicit references to or quotations from Wyclif or his Bohemian fellows are found, but a massive presence of excerpts drawn from Buridan's commentary on Aristotle's moral masterpiece, whose abbreviation was adopted at the Prague Faculty of Arts for teaching use from the 1380s.³² In sum, there are no grounds other than the manuscript's ascription to relate this text to Knín (which is, most probably, a *quaestio* determined for exercise or ceremonial purposes by an advanced student enrolled in the master of Arts course) — yet, nothing prevents us from trusting the ascription.³³

In the first half of May 1408, a professor of theology with a remarkable degree of academic seniority, John Eliae,³⁴ and an otherwise unknown figure, John Cifra, possibly a fellow canon of the former at the Church of St Apollinaire, accused Knín before Archbishop Zbyněk of Házmburk of a number of heresies: in particular he was charged with having defended the repeatedly condemned Eucharistic doctrine of John Wyclif, and with referring to him as “Doctor Evangelicus”. Over the years immediately preceding, though Wyclif's views had been strongly opposed by the masters of the German university nations, the group of Czech reform-minded Wycliffites could have counted on the favour of the Archbishop;

32 Cf. M. MARKOWSKI, *L'influence de Jean Buridan sur les universités d'Europe centrale*, in Z. KALUZA, P. VIGNAUX (eds), *Preuves et raisons à l'Université de Paris. Logique, ontologie et théologie au XIV^e siècle*, Paris 1984, pp. 149–163; B. MICHAEL, *Johannes Buridan: Studien zu seinem Leben, seinen Werken und zur Rezeption seiner Theorien im Europa des späten Mittelalters*, Berlin 1985, vol. 1 pp. 321–389: 334–340.

33 Cf. CAMPI, “A *Quaestio* on Friendship Ascribed to Matthias of Knín”, pp. 315–323.

34 A member of the Bohemian university nation, John Eliae studied at the Arts, Law and Theology faculties in Prague, served as rector of Prague University in 1393, and taught theology from 1403 to 1410. As his accusation against Knín shows, he was not one of Wyclif's followers and was an opponent of Hus. Together with Andrew of Brod, in January 1409 he acted as a delegate of the Bohemian university nation before Wenceslas IV, who needed support from the University as he aspired to be enthroned as King of the Romans by the soon-to-be-elected Pope. On 18 January, the King issued a decree from Kuttenberg assigning three votes to the Bohemian nation and a single vote to the other three nations combined. According to his own testimony, Hus was visited by John Eliae and Andrew of Brod on their way back from Kuttenberg: they discovered from him that the decree had been already issued and had significantly changed the balance of votes within the University; on the same occasion, Hus claimed responsibility for the academic political advantage obtained for the Bohemian nation through his previous consultation with the King. During his deposition in Constance, Hus also reported John Eliae and Andrew of Brod's praise for his successful effort. See *Chronicon Universitatis Pragensis*, ed. J. EMLER, in *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum*, vol. 5, Praha 1893, pp. 567–588: 570a–b; *Responsiones ad depositiones testium contra m. Iohannem Hus*, in IOHANNES HUS, *Constantiensia*, ed. H. KRMÍČKOVÁ, J. NECHUTOVÁ et al., Turnhout 2016 (= CCCM, 274), pp. 212–243: 223–24. Cf. J. TRÍŠKA, *Životopisný slovník předhusitské pražské univerzity 1348–1409* [Biographical Dictionary of Pre-Hussite Prague University 1348–1409], Praha 1981, pp. 238–239; F. ŠMAHEL, *Die hussitische Revolution I–III*, Hannover 2002, vol. 2, pp. 831–832.

in April 1408, however, Zbyněk withdrew his support, mainly because of the restrictive measures on the teaching of Wyclif's thought imposed by Cardinal Francesco Ugucione, a legate of Pope Gregory XII, to whom the German masters had denounced the spreading of Wyclif's errors in Bohemia.³⁵ Some sources hostile to the Prague Wycliffites — and thereby likely to be exaggerating — hint that Knín was accused of embracing a number of heresies and describe him as being *valde, vehementer, and vehementissime* deemed *suspectus de heresi*, almost *ab omnibus*.³⁶ In the first half of May 1408, Knín was arrested and summoned before the Archbishop to abjure publicly. According to the testimony of public notaries, Knín protested resolutely, declaring that he had nothing to retract; under considerable pressure, though reluctant, he was forced to recant the views imputed to him on the occasion of a private session of the University, in the presence of the rector, Clement of Michnov, and of some masters and bachelors of Arts.³⁷

On 20 May 1408 — that is, a few days after Knín was released — the members of the Bohemian nation were convened by the archbishop and the king and ordered to abjure the list of Wyclif's forty-five articles that had already been condemned at Prague in 1403 — viz., the list which would be then definitively condemned at the Council of Constance in 1415.³⁸ The Bohemian

35 Cf. ŠMAHEL, *Die hussitische Revolution*, vol. 2, pp. 804–805; PAVLIČEK, “The Chronology of Life and Work of Jan Hus”, p. 27.

36 See *Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus vitam, doctrinam, causam in Constantiensi Concilio actam et controversias de religione in Bohemia annis 1403–1418 motas illustrantia*, ed. F. PALACKÝ, Praha 1869, p. 731: “Anno eodem examinatus est M. Pater (de Knin) ad delationem Joannis Eliae et Cifrae canonici Pragensis. Qui et abjuravit sibi imposita, scil. de remanentia panis post consecrationem; et post non longo tempore vixit”; *Processus iudiciarius contra Jeronimum de Praga habitus Viennae a. 1410–1412*, ed. L. KLICMAN, Praha 1898, p. 17: “[...] magister Mathias Knyn propter certos articulos heresim sapientes tractus fuerit ad arciepiscopum, ut abiuraret certos illos articulos: videlicet presertim unus, quod Wikleph esset evangelicus doctor, secundus articulus, quod post consecrationem manent panis et vinum”; p. 24: “[...] magister Jeronimus valde recommedaverit [sic!] magistrum Mathiam Knyn, qui est et fuit vehementer suspectus de heresi”. See also p. 16 (“valde suspectus de heresi”), p. 27 (“ab omnibus habebatur suspectus de heresi”), p. 33 (“vehementissime suspectus fuerit de heresi”).

37 On the arrest of Knín and his recantation, see *Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus*, pp. 338–340, 731; *Processus iudiciarius contra Jeronimum de Praga*, 16. Cf. ŠMAHEL, *Die hussitische Revolution*, vol. 2, pp. 813–814; PAVLIČEK, “The Chronology of Life and Work of Jan Hus”, p. 28 and note 83; M. NODL, *Das Kuttenberger Dekret von 1409. Von der Eintracht zum Konflikt der Prager Universitätsnationen*, Köln / Weimar / Wien 2017.

38 Cf. *Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus*, pp. 327–331. For an overview of the process leading to the compilation of the list of 45 errors, and relevant bibliography, see L. CAMPI, “Was the Early Wyclif a Determinist? Concerning an Unnoticed Level within his Taxonomy of Being”, *Vivarium* 52 (2014), no. 1, pp. 102–146: 102–104. Some more recent observations on the drafting process that led to the final list are presented in D. COUFAL, “Ke sporům o Viklefa a jeho 45 článků (II): Geneze artikulů a jejich odsouzení mezi Anglií a Prahou ve světle rukopisů [On the Disputes over Wyclif and His 45 Articles (II): Genesis of the Articles and Their

masters rejected them “in sensibus eorum hereticorum, erroneis et scandalosis”, prohibited their teaching, and forbade bachelors and students — possibly not masters — to possess and read Wyclif’s *Triologus*, *Dialogus* and *De eucharistia*.³⁹ On 15 June 1408, the archbishop renewed his prohibition to teach the doctrine of remanence and issued further restrictions against the reformist party.⁴⁰ The reaction of the Bohemian nation came quickly. Probably the day after the latter resolution by Zbyněk,⁴¹ for the second time in a few weeks Knín unexpectedly

Condemnation between England and Prague in Light of Manuscripts]”, *Studia Mediaevalia Bohemica* 12 (2020), pp. 33–88.

39 See *Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus*, p. 331: “Quibus quidem articulis sic lectis, idem D. Waltherus Harrasser rector, scrutatis votis omnium et singulorum magistrorum ibidem presentium, antedictam universitatem Pragensem repraesentantium, tandem secundum pluralitatem vocum per eandem universitatem conclusum fuit, quod nullus dogmatiset, praedicet vel asserat, publice vel occulte, supradictos articulos [...] sub poena praestiti juramenti”; J. SEDLÁK, *M. Jan Hus*, Praha 1915, pp. 125–127: 126: “Notum sit universis, quod nos omnes et singuli nullo penitus contradicente articulos infrascriptos Jo. Wikleff reprobamus, refutamus et prohibemus in sensibus eorum hereticis, erroneis et scandalosis, mandantes omnibus et singulis sub pena exclusionis a natione nostra, quatenus nullus hos articulos audeat tenere vel docere publice vel occulte.” Cf. ŠMAHEL, *Die hussitische Revolution*, vol. 2, pp. 814–815. The text of the abjuration (“articulos infrascriptos Jo. Wikleff reprobamus, refutamus et prohibemus in sensibus eorum hereticis, erroneis et scandalosis”) has been generally considered a sort of compromise formula which enabled the members of the Bohemian nation to teach Wyclif’s articles in a way that would make them more acceptable: see VOOGHT, *L’hérésie de Jean Huss*, p. 94, R. R. BETTS, *Essays in Czech History*, London / New York 1969, pp. 201–202; and, with less emphasis, KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace*, p. 79. Calling attention to the scarcity of information delivered by extant sources on the general assembly of the Bohemian nation, Šmahel adopted a more cautious approach to the issue: he suggested that Stephen of Paleč and Stanislaus of Znojmo, possibly worried about retaliation for their previous activity, could have persuaded their fellow countrymen to abjure Wyclif’s articles in those terms; see F. ŠMAHEL, “Le mouvement des étudiants à Prague dans les années 1408–1412”, *Historica* 14 (1967), pp. 33–75: 53–54.

40 Cf. ŠMAHEL, *Die hussitische Revolution*, vol. 2, p. 816; PAVLIČEK, “The Chronology of Life and Work of Jan Hus”, p. 28.

41 Two articles found in the *Statutes* of the Prague Faculty of Arts, and dating back to 1379 and 1391, deal with the day on which the *quodlibetarius* should be designated. The first document refers to the Saturday immediately preceding the Nativity of John the Baptist (“[1379] statutum fuit, quod decanus facultatis artium, qui pro tempore fuerit, teneatur facere generalem magistrorum omnium congregacionem, regentium et non regentium, de facultate artium, *sabbato proximo ante Nativitatem sancti Ioannis Baptiste*”); the second one indicates the same date as a second call for the general congregation, should no master have been designated during the first meeting, set for the second Saturday preceding the feast of the Baptist (“[1391] magistri in plena congregacione facultatis considerantes [...] in hoc unanimiter consenserunt, quod dictum statutum moderari deberet isto modo, quod decanus facultatis artium [...] teneatur facere generalem magistrorum congregacionem [...] *sabbato ad unam quindenam, sive mediate precedente Nativitatem sancti Ioannis Baptiste* [...]”. Si autem in dicta congregacione se nullus presentare curaverit, ex tunc decanus *sabbato proximo proxime Nativitatem precedente* de novo congreget magistros sub pena et modo [...] in qua congregacione disputaturus de quolibet per magistros presentes eligatur”). In 1408 the feast of John the Baptist fell on Sunday,

made headlines, as he voluntarily applied, before a general congregation of regent and non-regent masters of Arts regularly convened to elect the chairman of the quodlibetal disputation for the following year (starting on 3 January 1409), to assume such an appointment; in the absence of other voluntary applications, he was designated, not without causing some ill feelings and agitation.⁴²

For Knín's move entrusted the leadership of the most important annual academic event in university life in Prague to the Bohemian nation, and in particular to the circle of Prague Wycliffites, just when the tension between university nations over Wyclif's thought was at its peak.⁴³ The office was particularly burdensome and time-consuming, so that many masters preferred to pay high fines rather than take on the duty of *quodlibetarius*.⁴⁴ For in theory all the Masters of Arts —

24 June, so the first meeting must have been convened on Saturday 16, the day after the synod. Cf. *Statuta facultatis artium universitatis Pragensis*, p. 247 (Rubr. IV, 5: *De modo disputandi de quolibet, et de disputaturi elleccione*), p. 265 (Rubr. X, 3: *De disputacione de quolibet*).

42 See *Processus iudiciarius contra Jeronimum de Praga*, p. 16: "Demum, ipso ita habito pro suspecto de heresi, presentaverit se ad disputandum quodlibetum, et fuerit rumor, quod presentasset se sponte, cum hoc prius longis temporibus non fuerit factum, propterea ut in huiusmodi actu expurgaret se de suspicione tali modo; quia ex quo fuit diffamatus de heresi et tractus ad archiepiscopum ut supra ad faciendam aliis fidem de ipso, isto modo ecce talis, qui fuit suspectus omnibus, iam ascendit kathedram et est magister magistrorum." According to the statutes of the Faculty of Arts, in the absence of voluntary applications the *quodlibetarius* was to be chosen on an elective basis; in case of multiple applications, instead, the most senior candidate was to be designated for that post. See *Statuta facultatis artium universitatis Pragensis*, pp. 247–248 (Rubr. IV, 5), p. 265 (Rubr. X, 3). Knín had become Master of Arts only four years before (cf. above, p. 73), so it would not be difficult to oppose a more senior candidate to him.

43 Decades of well-documented research, mainly carried out by Czech scholars, have deepened our understanding of certain peculiarities of this academic tournament at Prague, and its public dimension and impact; cf. KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace*; V. HEROLD, P. SPUNAR, "L'Université de Prague et le rôle des disputations de quolibet à sa faculté des Arts à la fin du XIV^e et au début du XV^e siècle", in *Compte rendu de la 69^e Session de l'Union Académique Internationale*, Bruxelles 1997, pp. 27–39; P. SPUNAR, "La Faculté des Arts dans les universités de l'Europe Centrale", in O. WEIJERS, L. HOLTZ (eds), *L'enseignement des disciplines à la Faculté des arts (Paris et Oxford, XIII^e–XV^e siècles)*, Leuven 1997, pp. 467–475: 473–474; O. WEIJERS, "La 'disputatio' dans les Facultés des arts de l'Europe centrale", in *La disputatio dans les Facultés des arts au moyen âge*, Turnhout 2002, pp. 279–315: 298–312; F. ŠMAHEL, "Die Verschriftlichung der Quodlibet-Disputationen an der Prager Artistenfakultät bis 1420", in *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter*, pp. 359–386; O. PAVLÍČEK, "Parisian and Prague Quodlibeta Compared: The Transfer of the Quodlibetal Disputation between the Faculties and Jerome of Prague's Struggle against the Thematic Limitations Imposed on the Faculty of Arts", in E. JUNG (ed.), *What is New in the New Universities? Learning in Central Europe in the Later Middle Ages (1348–1500)*, Warszawa 2018, pp. 325–356; PAVLÍČEK, "The 1409 Prague Arts Quodlibet in the Context of Prague and Central European Quodlibetal Tradition".

44 Not used in Oxford or Paris, the term "quodlibetarius" was firmly established in Prague, as well as in other Central European universities founded after Prague University. See, for example, HIERONYMUS DE PRAGA, *Recommendatio artium liberalium*, in *Quaestiones*, pp. 201–222: p. 215 ("Sed ne me ulterius cum istis presbyteris mendacibus occupem, ad te, domine quodlibetarie, hominem veridicum et veracem, converto sermonem"), p. 221 ("Nonne istum magistrum nos-

both regent and non-regent — were supposed to participate in the disputation, and the *quodlibetarius* had to assign a *quaestio* to every master, as well as prepare sets of arguments against an affirmative or negative answer to each question, to which he would then resort in determining the opposite of the solution given by any participant. The sets of arguments were collected and published in a volume, which might include other materials, like an introductory speech, the opening *quaestio principalis* and a concluding speech, though the extant witnesses of these quodlibetal books display a certain variety in this respect.⁴⁵

According to what could have been the rule of rotation between university nations,⁴⁶ the post of *quodlibetarius* for the year 1409 belonged to the Bohemian nation, and it is plausible that the tense atmosphere of spring 1408 discouraged more than usual the Bohemian masters from assuming such a duty. So, that it was a young master recently charged with heresy like Knín who volunteered for this post must have caused quite a stir,⁴⁷ and contributed to the exacerbation of University tensions even further. For, according to the statutes, the *quaestiones* were to be delivered only three or four days before the opening ceremony of the quodlibet,⁴⁸ and it was obvious that Knín would take advantage of his position to provide some of his fellow Wycliffites with the opportunity to promote the philosophical views of Wyclif before a large audience — something which Knín

trum, venerandum dominum quodlibetarium diffamatum exprobratum retroactis temporibus audistis et cognovistis [...]?”); *Processus iudiciarius contra Jeronimum de Praga*, pp. 27–28: “Ad primum articulum interrogatus respondit, quod magister Jeronimus dixerit in presencia magistri Mathie Knyn, pro tunc quodlibetarii, magistrum Johannem Wikleph esse sanctum et evangelicum doctorem, et libencius velit esse cum anima sua quam cum anima beati Augustini, et regnaret in celo sicut cancer in aquis et non esset combustus.” The term occurs in the *Statuta universitatis Pragensis antiqua* in a reference to John Hus dating back to 1411 (“[...] et iussit magistro Iohanni de Hussinecz, sacre theologie baccalario formato, tunc quodlibetario [...]”), though the two rubrics devoted to the designation of the leader of the quodlibet in the statutes of the Faculty of Arts refer to him as the “disputans de quolibet” or “disputaturus de quolibet”; cf., respectively, *Statuta universitatis Pragensis antiqua*, in *Statuta et Acta*, p. 46 (*Quod omnes magistri non debent pretorium visitare. De concordia inter universitatem et Civitatem Pragensem*) and *Statuta facultatis artium universitatis Pragensis*, pp. 247–248 (Rubr. IV, 5), p. 265 (Rubr. X, 3).

45 Cf. below, pp. 85–100.

46 Cf. ŠMAHEL, “Die Verschriftlichung der Quodlibet-Disputationen”, pp. 367–368.

47 According to the 1391 statute of the Faculty of Arts, any master willing to preside over a quodlibetal disputation could apply for that post; the general congregation of masters would assign the task to the most senior among the candidates. In the event of a lack of volunteers, a new congregation would have been summoned to elect the *quodlibetarius*. Cf. above, p. 81, note 42. As noticed by Jiří Kejř, at this particular juncture in the history of conflicts among the Prague university nations, the German masters, who had the majority of votes, could easily have opposed to the election a Czech colleague as president of the quodlibet; this is why Knín had to voluntarily apply to ensure the leadership to his nation. Cf. KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace*, pp. 79–80 and note 11. Quite surprisingly, the Germans did not oppose a candidate more senior than Knín.

48 See *Statuta facultatis artium universitatis Pragensis*, p. 248 (Rubr. IV, 5).

actually did, starting from his own *quaestio principalis*.⁴⁹ Not surprisingly, then, many masters of the German university nations — including the dean of the Faculty of Arts for the semester in which Knín was designated — openly declared that they would rather leave town than take part in the event, chaired by someone who was not worthy of holding such an important role (that is, of acting as a *magister magistrorum*): someone commonly acknowledged to be a heretic, and recently prosecuted for this reason.⁵⁰ The *transmigratio* of masters did take place, but only after the quodlibet, since the King ordered the recalcitrant masters to observe the statutes and participate in the event.⁵¹ It was some time after the issuing of the Kuttenberg decree on 18 January that many masters actually left Prague University.⁵²

To face the possibility of a mass participation of his colleagues, Knín could have prepared the unprecedented and unequalled number of 148 questions.⁵³ Still, this was not the only exceptional circumstance surrounding the 1409

49 Cf. CAMPI, “Matthias of Knín’s *quaestio principalis* and Anti-Eternalism at the Prague Faculty of Arts in the Wake of Wyclif”. It is worth recalling that Knín assigned to Jerome of Prague — who had a part, if not in the organisation, at least in the execution of the 1409 quodlibet — a topic which offered him the means to reassert a realist conception of universals of Wycliffian inspiration; cf. HIERONYMUS DE PRAGA, *Quaestio de universalibus a parte rei*, in *Quaestiones*, pp. 85–95.

50 One source explicitly mentions the names of some of the prominent exponents of the German nations in this regard; see *Processus iudiciarius contra Jeronimum de Praga*, pp. 16–17: “[...] isto modo ecce talis, qui fuit suspectus omnibus, iam ascendit kathedram et est magister magistrorum. Et eo volente disputare multi magistri, videlicet Baltherus Harasser, magister Petrus Storch, magister Johannes Hofman et alii noluerunt visitare actum suum, dicentes publice se volentes pocius a Praga recedere quam actum talis suspecti de heresi visitare.” John Hofman, from the Polish nation, was the dean of the Faculty of Arts from 21 April 1408 to 1 October 1408; his presence at the 1409 quodlibet is attested, but it is also known that he left Prague after the Kuttenberg decree and moved to the University of Leipzig. Another member of the Polish nation, Peter Storch, was serving as collector of fees when Matthias of Knín was designated, and had already served the Faculty many times, including as dean in 1404; he moved to Leipzig with Hofman after the 1409 quodlibet, in which he took part. Harasser belonged to the Bavarian nation and had taken on various assignments for the Faculty, especially during the years 1400–1405; a representative of the anti-reform group, he was rector in 1403, when a meeting of all the regent masters convened by him voted for the prohibition against holding and spreading the teachings of Wyclif contained in the forty-five articles collected shortly before. Cf. ŠMAHEL, “The Faculty of Liberal Arts 1348–1419”, pp. 262, 290–295, 298; TRÍŠKA, *Životopisný slovník předhusitské pražské univerzity*, pp. 255, 462, 520.

51 Cf. *Processus iudiciarius contra Jeronimum de Praga*, pp. 16–17.

52 Cf. above, p. 78, note 34.

53 Cf. KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace*, pp. 116–136. On the number of sets of arguments actually transmitted in Knín’s quodlibetal book and hypotheses on the real number of participants, cf. PAVLÍČEK, “The 1409 Prague Arts Quodlibet in the Context of Prague and Central European Quodlibetal Tradition”, pp. 55–61; and O. PAVLÍČEK, “Catalogue of Texts in MS Praha, Knihovna Metropolitní Kapituly, L 45, Including Matthias of Knín’s Quodlibet of 1409”, in *The Greatest Debate*, pp. 109–149: 115–149.

quodlibet: for while it is certain that it was Knín who delivered the introductory speech, it is nonetheless indubitable that he did not even prepare the concluding one. As is well known, for some unknown reason, it was instead Jerome of Prague who delivered the final speech by reciting the renowned *Recommendatio artium liberalium*, in which he also praised Knín's commitment (as "homo veridicus et verax") to defend philosophical truth — that is, Wyclif's teaching.⁵⁴ The fact that a participant replaced the *quodlibetarius* in delivering the final speech looked so unusual that František Bartoš even suggested that Jerome played an active role in devising the 1409 quodlibet as a co-author of the collected material, if not as the principal author — a conclusion that Jiří Kejř and František Šmahel found unconvincing.⁵⁵

Knín's arrest and abjuration and — shortly afterwards — his designation as *quodlibetarius* for the ensuing year took place at a crucial point in the history of Prague University, from both a doctrinal and institutional viewpoint. In chairing such an important academic event, Knín achieved some fame on the Prague academic scene; we have no positive evidence, however, of his activity in Prague or elsewhere from then on, and we know for certain that he did not take part in — or, at least, contribute to — the 1411 quodlibet presided over by his former master and promoter, John Hus.⁵⁶

54 HIERONYMUS DE PRAGA, *Recommendatio artium liberalium*, pp. 199–222: 218–219: "Sed ne me ulterius cum istis presbyteris mendacibus occupem, ad te, domine quodlibetarie, hominem veridicum et veracem, converto sermonem, qui tanto magis laudandus es, quanto magis mendacibus restitisti. Et licet tua prudentia laudabilis cum preclaris habitibus, quibus exornaris, tibi ipsi sufficiat et mee laudacionis non egeat, at tamen, quod tibi ad utilitatem atque honorem cedere credimus, reticere non possumus nec debemus. Nam tu pre ceteris laudandus es, quanto pre ceteris in tam juvenili etate in virtute sciencie excessisti. Non enim ut ceteri hoc pregravissimum onus, hoc est actum Quodlibeti, verecundia urgente ex antiquato studio aut timore cuiusvis dampnusculi suscepisti, sed ceteris retroactis temporibus sibi oblatum honorem respicientibus, tu te ultro obtulisti, ymmo ut verius dicam, tibi oblatum honorem per dominum decanum facultatis arcium et magistrum reverendum cum honore accepisti docte prudenterque agens; quoniam et didicisti, *ne des alienis honorem tuum*, quod et practice fecisti, qua de re et exhinc laudandus es"; p. 220: "Erubescant igitur et confundantur singuli et universi, qui animam tuam trucidabant et te pro viribus sic angariabant; et letentur exultentque omnes, qui tempore tue maxime tribulacionis pre angustia spiritus et merore ingemiscebant super te, iam te purgatum videntes, et honorem tuum permaximum oculis conspicientes"; p. 221: "Nonne istum magistrum nostrum, venerandum dominum quodlibetarium diffamatum exprobratum retroactis temporibus audistis et cognovistis, et nonne iam sanatum ac restauratum totaliterque mundatum vestra coram presencia respicitis?"

55 See F. BARTOŠ, "Francouzský předchůdce Koperníkův a jeho ohlas na Karlově universitě v době předhusitské [Copernicus's French predecessor and his reception at Charles University in pre-Hussite Times]", *Jihočeský sborník historický* 12 (1939), pp. 36–39: 36; "Mistr Jeroným Pražský [Master Jerome of Prague]", *Jihočeský sborník historický* 14 (1941–1945), pp. 41–52: 52; KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace*, pp. 45–46; F. ŠMAHEL, "Ein unbekanntes Prager Quodlibet", in *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter*, p. 340, note 11.

56 Šmahel concluded that Knín died in 1409, even though we have no evidence of that; cf. ŠMAHEL, "Jerome of Prague", p. 575, note 49 (where Hus's quodlibet is said to have taken place

2. The Long Introductory Section to the 1409 Quodlibet

Sources hostile to the Wycliffite circle deliver to us the information that Knín would have made himself available voluntarily to preside over the 1409 quodlibet in order to dispel any suspicion of heresy against himself; more likely — as I will argue in another contribution in this volume based partly on the choice of the topics for the questions assigned to his Bohemian Wyclif-minded fellows, but especially on the doctrinal contents of his *quaestio principalis* — Knín's main objective was rather to restore Wyclif's reputation and promote his philosophy in the context of a public debate.⁵⁷

The text of Knín's *quaestio principalis* ("Utrum summum bonum inmutabile sit creator et conservator singulorum encium universi") for the 1409 quodlibet is preserved in five fifteenth-century witnesses. Such a manuscript tradition is noteworthy, especially if one considers that no other similar question from the Prague milieu is preserved in an equal or greater number of copies: for example, the one prepared by Hus for the 1411 quodlibet is extant in three manuscripts only, and most are extant in a single copy.⁵⁸ One of the manuscript witnesses, now in Vienna (that is, MS Wien, ÖNB, 4673), explicitly ascribes the *quaestio principalis* to him; another one, now held in the Archive of the Castle of Prague (that is, MS Praha, KMK, L 45), is a codex containing the entire course of the questions and sets of arguments of his quodlibet,⁵⁹ as well as some other introductory materials which have been — surprisingly enough — almost completely overlooked so far by scholarship. These long-neglected materials, all included in the edition presented in this volume for the first time, contain the following items.

First, an *inceptio*,⁶⁰ a short opening address written in a solemn tone, enriched with a series of allusions to and implicit quotations from sources that had become

in 1410, rather than in 1411). Elsewhere, he proposed 1410 as the year of Knín's death: see *Die hussitische Revolution*, vol. 2, p. 813. Tríška proposes a very exact date of Knín's death (26/3/1410), but I was not able to check what his source is for this piece of information; cf. TRÍŠKA, *Životopisný slovník předhusitské pražské univerzity*, p. 364.

57 Cf. above, p. 83 and note 49; CAMPI, "Matthias of Knín's *quaestio principalis* and Anti-Eternalism at the Prague Faculty of Arts in the Wake of Wyclif"; KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace*, p. 79.

58 For details about the manuscript transmission of some of the extant Prague quodlibetal principal questions, see KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace*, pp. 116, 137, 148–149, 158.

59 The five copies are the following: MS Praha, KMK, L 45, fols 2r–4v; MS Praha, NK ČR, X E 24, fols 350r–354r; MS Praha, NK ČR, X H 18, fols 137r–139r; MS Wien, ÖNB, 4296, fols 50v–57r; MS Wien, ÖNB, 4673, fols 118r–120r. The ascription is found in MS Wien, ÖNB, 4673, fol. 118r, l. 35: "Questio principalis in quodlibeto magistri Patris." Cf. KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace*, pp. 116–117, which provides the following incorrect foliations: MS Praha, KMK, L 45 = 1v–9v; MS Praha, NK ČR, X E 24 = 350v–354v; MS Praha, NK ČR, X H 18 = last page indicated as 139v; MS Wien, ÖNB, 4673 = last page indicated as 122r. Šmahel gave the same foliation as Kejř's for MS Praha, KMK, L 45, and only partially amended the incorrect foliation of MS Praha, NK ČR, X E 24 (350v–354r); cf. ŠMAHEL, *Verzeichnis der Quellen*, p. 24.

60 Cf. MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Inceptio disputacionis de quolibet*, ed. L. CAMPI, in L. CAMPI, "The Introductory Section of Matthias of Knín's Quodlibet with a Note on the Edition", in *The*

quite popular at that time in Prague, and among the Wycliffites in particular: from the *Liber de causis*, Alan of Lille's *De planctu naturae*, and of course Plato's *Timaeus*.⁶¹ In this introductory section, Knín invokes divine help for the onerous task assumed, protests his own unsuitability to appropriately lead the quodlibet, and praises the masters taking part in it. Incidentally, he explicitly refers to his voluntarily engagement:

Ob hoc, cum precipue eorum movenda sint ingenia ut, nectare scienciarum repleti, ita suavem dulcedinem non tantum in seipsis contineant, quin et audientibus singulis † vel moti † diffundant (nam ea vis plenitudinis cognoscitur ut nequaquam communicative diffunditur nisi commoneatur), ideo pro exercitacione mei ceterorumque studencium informacione per ea que a venerabilibus magistris vel commotis sunt dicenda, huic laborioso operi aut oneri me voluntarie submisi, cum ceteris ne dyialectice sit confusa subtilitas, rethorice ne langwescat civilitas, ne lex grammaticae obmutescat, ne subtile quadrivialium unum e medio baniatur, ne phisica spernatur, ne methaphisica cum mathesi contempnatur, ne moralis disciplina penitus abiciatur.⁶²

Greatest Debate, pp. 352–353. Kadlec adopted “inceptio”, found in an upper marginal note in a Medieval hand in one of the two copies of Andrew of Brod’s introductory speech for his quodlibet, namely MS Praha, NK ČR, X E 24, fol. 390r; cf. Andrew of Brod, “Inceptio disputationis de quolibet cum quaestione principali ‘Utrum summa Dei sapientia, cuius legem aeternam participant omnia alia agentia, omnem veritatem possibilem distinctissime, unico actu simplicissimo, per eius puram essentiam in propria forma cognoscit[?]’”, in J. KADLEC, *Studien und Texte zum Leben und Wirken des Prager Magisters Andreas von Brod*, Münster 1982, pp. 87–90; it is worth noting that Kadlec extended the description “Inceptio disputationis” to both the opening address and the *quaestio principalis* (cf. pp. 90–111). The term “praefatio”, instead, is found in an upper marginal note in a Modern hand in the second copy of Brod’s quodlibetal introductory address, namely MS Praha, NK ČR, XIII F 16, fol. 74r [= 98r], and is the label chosen by Šmahel, in a separate individual entry, to refer to the introduction of the quodlibet, previously conflated with the rest of the introductory material; cf. ŠMAHEL, *Verzeichnis der Quellen*, p. 55.

61 Cf. MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Inceptio disputationis de quolibet*, pp. 352–353.

62 Cf. MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Inceptio disputationis de quolibet*, ll. 24–33. Knín uses the verb “submittere” to refer to his application as a *quodlibetarius*; the expression “voluntarie submisi” might also be interpreted as “I willingly accepted the assignment”; yet, such an interpretation can be based on Jerome of Prague’s witness, who referred to Knín’s voluntarily application using verbs like “suscipere” and “offerre”; above, note 54. It is worth noting that the verbs “volere” and “offerre” are used in the statutes precisely with reference to candidates volunteering to chair the quodlibet; cf. *Statuta facultatis artium universitatis Pragensis*, p. 265 (Rubr. X, 3): “magistri in plena congregacione facultatis [...] in hoc unanimiter consenserunt, quod dictum statutum moderari deberet isto modo, quod decanus facultatis artium, qui pro tempore fuerit, teneatur facere generalem omnium magistrorum congregacionem [...] ad videndum, an aliquis vel aliqui se velit seu velint facultati ad disputandum de quolibet presentare; et si unus se obtulerit, illum facultas acceptet [...]”. In the opening of his 1411 quodlibet, Hus refers to his own decision to assume the task of *quodlibetarius* using the verb “suscipere”, the same verb used

Inspired by a passage of Alan of Lille, Knín also lists some reference authorities for the main disciplines, including Ptolemy, Euclid, Milesius, Pythagoras, Cicero, Aristotle, Zeno and Donatus;⁶³ to give each line of philosophical enquiry mentioned in the above passage a guide, Knín adds to Alan's panel the names of Priscian for grammar, those of Socrates and Seneca for moral philosophy, and that of Plato, reverently described as "the divine philosopher", for metaphysics, with particular reference to his theory of ideas — alluding, in particular, to a passage from the *Timaeus* that was quite in vogue among Prague Wycliffites.⁶⁴

Similar introductory speeches are also known to survive in other Prague quodlibetal books, namely those by Andrew of Brod, John Hus, Simon of Tišnov and Procopius of Kladruba.⁶⁵ As anticipated, Knín's opening address has been recorded by Šmahel in his list of sources of university debates in Prague, but not by Jiří Kejř in his ground-breaking essay on Prague quodlibetal disputations.⁶⁶

Even more remarkably, then, Knín's introductory speech is followed by a different determination of the *quaestio principalis* than the one also transmitted by the other four witnesses, which has not been duly reported by any scholar, Kejř included, who conflated all the introductory material into a single item and did not discuss it.⁶⁷ Quite short, this text is actually a *determinatio in utramque partem*,

by Jerome to mention Knín's candidature; cf. IOHANNES HUS, *Quodlibet*, p. 6: "Movit autem me ad disputacionem de quolibet, ut verum fatear, Magistrorum meorum excusacio, videlicet reverendi Magistri Stephanni Palecz et reverendi Magistri Symonis de Tyssnow, qui vicissim per universitatem electi concorditer excusaciones posuerunt, videlicet validas, laborem difficilem ne subirent. Ego autem, qui ad hoc sum minus ydoneus, gerens curam cordialiter assiduam, ne alma nostra universitas sine exercicio in scienciis sterilesceret et ne emulis latrantibus detrahendi prestaretur occasio, laborem malui disputacionis de quolibet suscipere et, prout ingenii parvitas impeditentis exagitata variis poterit efficere, Magistrorum venerabilium excellencia ingenia ad claram dilucidacionem veritatum absconditarum, utcuque dabitur, concitare."

- 63 Reference to a pantheon of authors is also found in Hus's opening speech (cf. IOHANNES HUS, *Quodlibet*, pp. 7–8) and in that by Simon of Tišnov, who reproduces part of Alan's list, leaving aside Cicero, Aristotle, Zeno and Donatus (cf. MS Praha, Knihovna Národního muzea, V C 42, fol. 55v, ll. 11–18).
- 64 Cf. MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Inceptio disputacionis de quolibet*, ll. 45–46: "cum Platone divino philosopho ydeas rerum consanguineas in mente divina scrutari." See Plato, *Timaeus*, 29 b, p. 22, ll. 2–3. Cf. HIERONYMUS DE PRAGA, *Quaestio de universalibus a parte rei*, p. 85, l. 28; *Quaestio de formis universalibus*, in *Quaestiones*, p. 15, l. 14; *Quaestio de mundo archetypo*, in *Quaestiones*, p. 165, l. 80. Cf. Z. KALUZA, "Jérôme of Prague et le *Timée* de Platon", *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 61 (1994), pp. 57–104: 62, 63, 72, 87.
- 65 Cf. above, notes 60, 62, 63. Henry of Ribenitz's quodlibetal book opens with a list of contents followed by three pages left blank, perhaps prepared for copying the introduction and/or a short determination (about which, see below, pp. 88–91); cf. MS Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 1414, fols 2v–3v.
- 66 Cf. above, p. 86, note 60; KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace*, p. 116.
- 67 Cf. MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Determinacio brevis questionis principalis*, ed. L. CAMPI, in CAMPI, "The Introductory Section of Matthias of Knín's Quodlibet with a Note on the Edition", in *The Great Debate*, pp. 353–355; cf. KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace*, p. 116; ŠMAHEL, *Verzeichnis der Quellen*, p. 24.

firstly arguing in defence of a negative answer to the question — that is, whether the immutable highest good is creator and conservator of every single being of the universe — and secondly in defence of the affirmative answer.⁶⁸ All references in the first part of it are to Aristotle, with no quotations, and include a number of *loci classici* for the debate on the eternity of the world, which is here defended.⁶⁹ References to sources in the second part are to Aristotle, of course, but also to Boethius's *Consolatio* and to the *Timaeus*, ascribed — again — to *divinissimus Plato*.⁷⁰

A pair of references deserve a few words, as they attest Knín's interest in the topic of metaphysical *dependentia* and *colligantia*, in the terms in which they had been discussed by Stephen of Pálec and Jerome of Prague, as mentioned above while briefly presenting Knín's *quaestio* UC DP.⁷¹ Both Pálec and Jerome corroborated their views on the dependence of creatures upon the first cause by quoting Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto*,⁷² as well as a bricolage of two Aristotelian passages — one from the *De caelo*, the other from the *Metaphysics* — transmitted under the title of the *De caelo*.⁷³ The combination of these two Aristotelian sentences, which are transmitted separately by the *Auctoritates Aristotelis*,⁷⁴ is also found in an anonymous *quaestio* written in Prague and erroneously attributed to Wyclif by its editor, Rudolf Beer;⁷⁵ again, it also appears in Paul of Prague's determination of the *quaestio* that Knín assigned him precisely at the 1409 quodlibet,

68 The title being, obviously, the same as that of the main determination of the *quaestio principalis*; cf. above, p. 85.

69 Cf. MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Determinacio brevis questionis principalis*, pp. 353–354.

70 Cf. MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Determinacio brevis questionis principalis*, p. 355.

71 Cf. above, pp. 75–77.

72 See OVIDIUS, *Ex Ponto libri quattuor*, IV, 3, ed. J. A. RICHMOND, Leipzig 1990, p. 87, v. 35: “omnia sunt hominum tenui pendencia filo”; cf. PAVLÍČEK, “Stephen of Pálec's *Quaestio de esse aeterno*”, p. 363.

73 See STEPHANUS DE PALEZC, *Questio de mundo archetypo*: “De quo mundo dicit Philosophus, 1° Caeli, Ab hoc quidem ente dependet caelum et tota natura, id est tota universitas creata”, quoted from PAVLÍČEK, “Stephen of Pálec's *Quaestio de esse aeterno*”, p. 362; HIERONYMUS DE PRAGA, *Quaestio de mundo archetypo*, in *Quaestiones*, pp. 185–186: “[...] patet per Philosophum, 1° Celi, dicentem: ‘Ab hoc quidem ente’, scilicet Deo, ‘dependet caelum’, id est corpus celeste, ‘et tota natura’, id est tota universitas creata.”

74 See PAVLÍČEK, “Stephen of Pálec's *Quaestio de esse aeterno*”, p. 362. The quotation is the result of the merging of the two following passages: “A primo principio dependet caelum et terram” (*Metaph.*, 17, 7, 1072 b 13–14), and “A primo quidem ente communicatum est omnibus esse et vivere, his quidem clarius, his vero obscurius” (*De caelo*, 1, 9, 279 a 27); both the quotations are found in the *Auctoritates Aristotelis*, ed. J. HAMESSE, Louvain 1974, pp. 137, no. 266, and 161, no. 30.

75 The anonymous text containing the misleading reference to the *De caelo* is the *quaestio Utrum celum sit compositum ex materia et forma*, published in IOHANNES WYCLIF, *De ente praedicamentali*, pp. 258–264: 262, ll. 27–30.

in a passage in which Paul is using exactly the same wording we find in Jerome of Prague's *Quaestio de mundo archetypo* (1412?).⁷⁶

Now, Knín does not mention Ovid either in this short determination or in the *quaestio* UCDP, and — even more interestingly — in neither text does he trivially quote the Aristotelian bricolage circulating among his fellows Bohemian Wycliffites; rather, he quotes the two components separately and correctly refers to their original sources.⁷⁷ Since Knín explicitly refers to Pálež in the *quaestio* UCDP, it is likely that he is depending on him for the texts he is quoting to substantiate the same idea; still, it is also clear that he is so accurate as to check the texts he is quoting and provide the reader with correct references. Moreover, his adherence to the doctrine of *dependentia* that was popular among the Bohemian followers of Wyclif is even more evident if one considers that it occurs in the section of the short determination where Knín defends the affirmative answer to the *quaestio principalis* — the same solution given to the question in the long and main determination following it: in short, the Aristotelian passages are used, both in the *quaestio* UCDP and in the short determination to the *quaestio principalis* of the 1409 quodlibet to substantiate the view that the highest good is the *creator* and *conservator* of every created being.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ See PAULUS DE PRAGA, *Utrum mundus architipus, ad cuius similitudinem iste mundus sensibilis est productus, sit multitudo ydearum in mente divina eternaliter refulgens*, MS Praha, NK ČR, V H 13, fol. 10r, ll. 4–9: “[...] patet per Philosophum primo *Celi*, dicentem ‘Ab hoc quidem ente’, scilicet deo, ‘dependet celum’, id est corpus celeste, ‘et tota natura’, id est universitas creata, et signanter dicit ‘dependens’, id est ‘deorsum pendens’, quasi ad ruinam et casum disposita, et caderet ab esse existere nisi ab ipso deo conservaretur. Item dicit Ovidius ‘Omnia sunt hominum tenui pendencia filo’: ‘omnia hominum’, id est universa encia, que propter homini facta et creata sunt in mundo sensibili, ‘sunt dependencia tenui filo’; quam cito enim deus filium conservacionis, colligacionis et dependencie distraheret et dilaceraret, tota universitas creata in non existenciam caderet.” In the entire passage, Paul of Prague uses exactly the same wording as Jerome; cf. HIERONYMUS DE PRAGA, *Quaestio de mundo archetypo*, pp. 185–186; cf. above, p. 88, note 73.

⁷⁷ See MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Quaestio UC DP*, in CAMPI, “Is Perfection of this World?” pp. 247, ll. 92–248, l. 94: “Minor patet ex 12° *Metaphysice*, ‘ab hoc quidem ente dependet celum et tota natura’, et primo *Celi*, ab hoc ‘ente communicatum est singulis esse et vivere, hiis quidem clarius, hiis vero obscurius’; *Determinacio brevis questionis principalis*, ll. 110–120: “Idem patet <per> Aristotelem, primo *Celi et mundi*, ponentem ‘a primo ente’, quod est summum bonum singulis ‘communicatum’ et derivatum, ‘est esse et vivere hiis quidem clarius hiis vero obscurius’. [...] Quod autem secundum quesitum sit verum patet per Aristotelem, 12° *Metaphysice*, dicentem quod a primo ente, quod est summum bonum, ‘dependet’ in conservari ‘celum et tota natura’, ergo summum bonum celum et totam naturam universi encium in esse conservat, igitur questio quoad secundum quesitum est vera.”

⁷⁸ Furthermore, in both texts the two quotations from the *De caelo* 1 and *Metaphysica* 12 go together, as in a sort of *stock passage*, with a quotation from Aristotle's *Metaphysica* 2 in the short *determinatio* and with a quotation from Averroes's commentary on the same sentence in the *quaestio* on *dependentia* — and nothing similar is found in Pálež or Jerome. Cf. MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Quaestio UC DP*, p. 247, ll. 90–91; *Determinacio brevis questionis principalis*, ll. 112–114.

A comparison with the other extant Prague quodlibetal books does not entitle one to firmly conclude that short determinations of the *quaestio principalis* were regularly presented during *quodlibeta* and in the form adopted by Knín. For generally the other manuscripts containing materials known to relate to individual quodlibetal disputations have the main determination of the *quaestio principalis* preceded by a section, generally referred to by scholars as *propositio*, which consists of a few arguments offering a positive and a negative solution to the assigned question; even when they do not correspond exactly to the standard *propositiones*, they are however less elaborated than that by Knín nor are they fully developed *in utramque partem*.⁷⁹ Unfortunately, the statutes of the Faculty of Arts are of no help, as they do not go into detail in this regard. It is, of course, possible that the *quodlibetarii* were not required to publish all the introductory materials in their book, or that — were this the case — sometimes such pieces went lost in the manuscript tradition; it is also possible, and perhaps likely, that the presiding masters enjoyed a certain freedom in configuring the preliminary section of their *quodlibeta*, giving them a personal feel — as we shall consider later when briefly commenting on the main and long determination of Knín's *quaestio principalis*.

Yet another question may be raised as to who actually delivered the short determination before the audience on the occasion of the 1409 disputation: a note found in the margin of Knín's long determination to the *quaestio principalis*

79 Henry of Ribenitz presents six extended arguments for the negative answer and a single argument *in oppositum*; see MS Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 1414, fol. 4r–v. Arsen's *quaestio principalis* is preceded by a short scheme of solution, indicating two *suppositiones* and a single *quaesitum*, and providing succinct arguments against each of them, immediately followed by the relevant short objections; see MS Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 1435, fol. 259r. Hus's short determination is not only transmitted by the manuscript containing his quodlibetal book, but also found in the other two extant copies of the *quaestio principalis*, and consists of one argument against each of the two *supposita* and one against the *quaesitum*, and puts forward a single short argument *in oppositum*; see IOHANNES HUS, *Quodlibet*, ed. B. RYBA, Turnhout 2006², pp. 8–9. Michael of Malenice's solution to the *quaestio principalis* is preceded by six arguments for the negative answer, and one for the affirmative; see MS Praha, NK ČR, X E 24, fol. 205r. In his survey of the contents of Michael of Malenice's *quaestio principalis*, Šmahel indicates only five arguments for the negative answer; cf. ŠMAHEL, "Kvodlibetní diskuse ke kvestii principalis Michala z Malenice roku 1412 [Quodlibetal Discussion on the *quaestio principalis* of Michael of Malenice in 1412]", *Acta Universitatis Carolinae* 21 (1981), pp. 27–52: 44. Simon of Tišnov's short determination develops three arguments, two against the *supposita*, one against the *quaesitum*, and puts forward a single argument *in oppositum*; cf. MS Praha, Knihovna Národního muzea, V C 42, fol. 56r. Procopius of Kladruby develops one argument against the *suppositum* and one against the *quaesitum* for the negative solution, and does the same in the section for the affirmative one; see MS Praha, KMK, L 27, fol. 3r. Matthias of Legnitz's and Andrew of Brod's *quaestiones principales* do not include any short determination. For a short determination similar to Knín's, see an anonymous set of questions of probable Prague origin held by the Jagiellonian Library; cf. below, p. 93. An introduction to the various Prague quodlibetal disputations is provided by PAVLÍČEK, "The 1409 Prague Arts Quodlibet in the Context of Prague and Central European Quodlibetal Tradition", pp. 47–61.

seems to ascribe the latter to an appointed bachelor, something which might suggest that the short and previous one was presented by Knín himself just after having delivered his introductory speech. That a bachelor was in charge of the solution to the *quaestio principalis* has been generally taken for granted by scholarship;⁸⁰ Knín's correct and separate references to the individual components of the Aristotelian bricolage on *dependentia*, on which we commented above, may suggest that he was the one who publicly pronounced the short determination.⁸¹ Yet, it is of course possible that the text, as we read it, is the result of a revising process carried out by the *quodlibetarius* acting as editor after the disputation took place.

What comes next in the introductory section of Knín's quodlibetal book as transmitted by MS Praha, KMK, L 45 is the long determination to the *quaestio principalis*; as anticipated, a marginal note — reading “Hec est posicio baccalarii” — found only in MS Praha, KMK, L 45 seems to indicate that a bachelor pronounced it during the disputation.⁸² As customary in Prague *quodlibeta*, Knín's *quaestio principalis* concerns God and his attributes, asking, as has already been noted, “Utrum summum bonum inmutabile sit creator et conservator singulorum encium universi”. The *positio* is divided into four articles, according to what is assumed and asked in the title (two articles about the *praesupposita*, two about the *quaesita*), as well as putting forward arguments in an extensive and orderly way, arranging them article by article, each including several parts. Knín's long determination of the *quaestio principalis* opens with four *notabilia* — the first providing the plan of the *positio*, the second even enriched by corollaries — followed by a *suppositio* that immediately precedes the first conclusion of the first article, whose beginning is not precisely indicated by Knín; then come

80 Also, on the basis of Hus's witness; see IOHANNES HUS, *Quodlibet*, p. 48: “Gradu primo presentis actus iam posito provocatisque ingeniis Magistrorum venerabilium profundissimis, dum argumentis fortissimis est omniquaque principalis trutinata questio, quam reverendus dominus Baccalarius, ut datum est sibi a supremo Domino, sustinuit [...]”. Cf. ŠMAHEL, “Die Verschriftlichung der Quodlibet-Disputationen an der Prager Artistenfakultät bis 1420”, pp. 371–372; “Kvodlibetní diskuse ke kvestii principalis Michala z Malenic roku 1412”, pp. 31–32.

81 The Prague statutes do not specify what role, if any, was entrusted to bachelors during the quodlibet. It is worth at least pointing out here that the statutes of the Erfurt Faculty of Arts, where quodlibetal disputations were held in many ways similar to those in Prague, assign the *quodlibetarius* the duty to pronounce a solution to the *quaestio principalis* and a bachelor that of opening the discussion raising objections to the master's arguments. Cf. *Statuta facultatis arcium [Studii Erfordensis]*, in *Acten der Erfuter Universität*, ed. J. C. H. WEISSENBORN, vol. 2, Halle 1884, p. 140: “§ 94 Item quotlibetarius [*sic!*] colliget unam communem et utilem questionem moralem<,> naturalem vel metaphisicalem, quam disputet in principio quotlibet [*sic!*], ad quam respondeat unus baccalarius sibi et consequenter aliis magistris secundum ordinem, nec non doctoribus et prelati, si qui rogantur adesse, et arguere volentibus.”

82 See MS Praha, KMK, L 45, fol. 2r.

the other articles, all provided with *notabilia* and/or *suppositiones* and a proper argumentation leading to *conclusiones* and their *correlaria*.

In replying to the question assigned to him by John Hus at the 1411 quodlibet, Zdeněk of Labouň describes this method of structuring a *quaestio* as the *modus modernus*, as opposed to what he called the *modus antiquus*, consisting in clarifying the meaning and analysing the theoretical import of the terms and expressions used in the title, thus providing doctrinal premises to the determination of the question. Both ways of conceiving determinations to questions were in use in early fifteenth-century Prague and Zdeněk's own testimony suggests that there were occasions on which a master could freely choose between them — if not when orally presenting his determination, at least when publishing it.⁸³ At the same time, all the extant copies of *quaestiones principales* prepared for Prague quodlibetal disputations at the Faculty of Arts are structured according to the *modus modernus*,⁸⁴ with the sole partial exception of that by Matthias of Legnitz, which adopts a similar method but is extremely concise, covering not even two columns of a single page.⁸⁵ The standard approach is also found in one of the sets of questions preserved in the Jagiellonian Library, to which Lukáš Lička has recently called attention, whose Prague origin is probable and that manifest the

83 ZDENKO DE LABUN, *Questio astronomicalis*, ed. B. KOCÁNOVÁ, in B. KOCÁNOVÁ, “*Questio astronomicalis* Zdenka z Labouně: Kritická edice”, *Listy filologické* 139 (2016), nos 1–2, pp. 123–165: 134–65: 135: “[...] propter longam materiam questionis necesse erit, ut respondeatur secundum modum antiquum, videlicet simpliciter declarando ea, que ponuntur in titulo questionis, sine hoc, quod questio ipsa in multos articulos distingwatur, qui est modus modernus. Quia alias, si ad plenum secundum illum satisfieri deberet questionis, esset nimia prolixitas positionis materie ipsius questionis.” Even so, Zdeněk's response to the question is remarkably long, covering as it does thirty-one pages in Kocánová's edition.

84 See HENRICUS DE RIBENICZ, *Utrum in ordine essentiali rerum universi tantum unum supremum principem esse sit necesse*, MS Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 1414, fols 4r–11r; MATTHIAS DE LEGNICZ, *Utrum summum bonum summe volibile omnium citra se causa productiva sit a nobis summe cognoscibile*, MS Stralsund, Stadtarchiv, HS 1067, fol. 207ra–b; IOHANNES ARSEN DE LANGENVELT, *Utrum primum mutans inmutabile sit cum aliquo proprie componibile*, MS Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 1435, fols 259v–266r; ANDREAS DE BRODA, *Utrum summa Dei sapientia, cuius legem aeternam participant omnia alia agentia, omnem veritatem possibilem distinctissime, unico actu simplicissimo, per eius puram essentiam in propria forma cognosci*, MS Praha, NK ČR, X E 24, fols 169r–178r; MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Questio principalis*, ed. L. CAMPI, in CAMPI, “The Introductory Section of Matthias of Knín's Quodlibet with a Note on the Edition”, in *The Great Debate*, pp. 356–372; IOHANNES HUS, *Quodlibet*, pp. 8–48, MICHAEL DE MALENICZ, *Utrum Deus ex infinita potentia, sapientia et bonitate mundum sensibilem ex nichilo temporaliter productum conservet, ne in nichilum redigatur*, MS Praha, NK ČR, X E 24, fols 205r–210r; SIMON DE TISSNOW, *Utrum a summo bono creatore et conservatore omnium dependeat optima dispositio universi*, MS Praha, Knihovna Národního muzea, V C 42, fols 56r–62r; PROCOPIUS DE CLADRUB, *Utrum primum principium rerum naturalium possit aliquem effectum absque secundo principio concurrente producere et de novo productum in esse perpetuo tempore naturaliter conservare*, MS Praha, KMK, L 27, fols 1v–7v / MS Praha, NK ČR, V H 13, fols 222v–226r. Besides Hus's *quaestio principalis*, only Brod's has been published so far: cf. above, note 59.

85 Cf. above, p. 92, note 84.

salient characteristics of Prague quodlibetal books:⁸⁶ the set preserved in codex 736 transmits no introductory speech, but both a short determination *in utramque partem* and a long determination structured according to the *modus modernus*.⁸⁷ Possibly, quodlibetal chairmen preferred to employ a method enabling them to show their mastery in clearly dividing the question into its parts and putting forward their own arguments in an extensive and orderly manner; probably, they were required to divide their determination into articles and further subdivisions that would become — as will be clear shortly — the targets of detailed criticism by the attending masters.

The main philosophical tenets expressed in Knín's *positio* and the debts paid to Wyclif and Hus will be the object of further analysis in the present volume.⁸⁸ Leaving aside here the tacit borrowings from Wyclif and Hus — which provide the core arguments of Knín's solution to the *quaestio principalis* — the influence of the following sources can be detected: explicit references are all to Peripatetic sources: two are to Aristotle's *Physics* (one to Book 3, one to Book 7) and two to his *Metaphysics* (one to Book 2, one to Book 12), two are to Averroes's commentaries (one to *Physics*, Book 1, one to *Metaphysics*, Book 12), and one is to the *Liber de causis* (ascribed to the "Auctor *De causis*");⁸⁹ implicit references are to non-Aristotelian authors: namely Augustine (one to Book 5 and one to Book 8 of his *De trinitate*), and one to Book 1 of Damascenus's *De fide orthodoxa*.⁹⁰ It is worth at least cursorily pointing out that implicit sources are mostly of Platonic inspiration and, especially as regards Wyclif and Hus, deliberately selected with the aim of opposing the Aristotelian view of the eternity of the world.

The *positio* to Knín's *quaestio principalis* is followed by a long and detailed counter-argumentation, covering almost half of the introductory materials to the 1409 quodlibet, that surprisingly has not been particularly emphasised by scholars dealing with Prague *quodlibeta* so far.⁹¹ Possibly proceeding according to academic seniority, all the masters taking part in the quodlibet had to raise objections against the *positio* in what Šmahel has described as a "mirror position,"⁹² but

86 L. LIČKA, "Buridan Wycliffised? The Nature of the Intellect in Late Medieval Prague University Disputations", in M. GENSLER, M. MANSFELD, M. MICHAŁOWSKA (eds), *The Embodied Soul. Historical-Analytical Studies on Nature, Mind and Action*, Dordrecht 2002, pp. 277–310: 282–84.

87 See MS Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 736, fols 81r–84v.

88 Cf. CAMPI, "Matthias of Knín's *quaestio principalis* and Anti-Eternalism at the Prague Faculty of Arts in the Wake of Wyclif".

89 Cf. MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Questio principalis*, ll. 178, 179, 180, 207, 212, 257.

90 Cf. MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Questio principalis*, ll. 127–132, 138–140, 150–153.

91 It occupies fols 4v–9v of L. As with the opening speech and the short determination, the counter-argumentation is also not indicated in the catalogue compiled in KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace*, p. 116. Some references to it are cursorily found in ŠMAHEL, "Kvodlibetní diskuse ke kvestii principalis Michala z Malenic roku 1412", p. 31, note 17.

92 ŠMAHEL, "Kvodlibetní diskuse ke kvestii principalis Michala z Malenic roku 1412", p. 31.

Prague masters used to call “argumenta”⁹³ Until recently, only one witness of the masters’ discussion has been taken into some account, namely the one relating to the 1412 quodlibet, led by Michael of Malenice: it is transmitted by a manuscript held in the National Library in Prague, in which the objections put forward by thirty-seven masters are recorded and associated with their names.⁹⁴ Based most probably on the notes they had been taking during the event, the masters objected to one or more parts of the *positio*, without following a specific order. Some subdivisions of Malenice’s *quaestio principalis*, therefore, received more than one objection and some, all corollaries, received none; yet, each of the main subdivisions (suppositions and conclusions, but also some corollaries) of the text

93 See, for example, MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Incepcio disputacionis de quolibet*, ll. 47–50: “Eius igitur inplorato auxilio, qui summe potens existit ad iuvandum, summe sapiens ad dirigendum et summe benivolus ad perficiendum, actu isto utar tripharie. Primo questionem intimatam proponendo, cuius intelligenciam profunde magistri mei reverendi subtilibus argumentis sigillatim penetrabunt”; the section devoted to the counter-argumentation of Simon of Tišnov’s *quaestio principalis* is introduced by an interlinear note reading “Argumenta contra posicionem”; cf. MS Praha, Knihovna Národního muzea, V C 42, fol. 58v; as for Hus, cf. above, note 80.

94 See MS Praha, NK ČR, IX F 7, fols 35r–41v; the foliation given in KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace*, p. 148 must be corrected. A summary table of the masters’ objections is provided by ŠMAHEL, “Kvodlibetní diskuse ke kvestii principalis Michala z Malenic roku 1412”, pp. 48–49. The table ascribes several objections to the rector, Sulek of Hoštka, although the first name of a master associated with the objections is that of the dean of the Faculty of Arts, Mark of Hradec, which is found nearly at the end of fol. 35v. Šmahel discusses Kejř’s opinion that the arguments preceding those ascribed to Hradec are to be considered as put forward by the rector, being more inclined to admit it only for the paragraph immediately preceding the objections by Mark, which is neatly separated from what precedes and follows by a line left blank (cf. p. 33 and note 21). It is not at all clear what the role of the rector was during the *quodlibeta*, especially if he was the first to object to the *quaestio principalis* and the first to determine the questions assigned by the *quodlibetarius*, as generally assumed; in this regard, it is worth pointing out that Matthias of Legnitz’s quodlibetal book introduces the first question following the *quaestio principalis* in this terms: “Circa disputacionem de quolibet reverendi magistri Mathie de Legenicze prima questio disputata erat ista, ad quam more solito decanus facultatis arcium solet respondere [...]” (MS Stralsund, Stadtarchiv, HS 1067, fol. 209v). Yet, Hus assigns the rector the first question, and it is possible that customs had changed over time; see IOHANNES HUS, *Quodlibet*, p. 49. It is however likely that an important role, at least in institutional terms, was played by the dean of the Faculty of the Arts, especially in consideration of the fact that the quodlibet lasted several days, possibly up to two weeks, and it seems improbable that all the masters, the rector included, could guarantee their participation in the event in its entirety. In this regard, the testimony of Procopius of Kladruby is eloquent: in his concluding speech, after having expressed his gratitude for the help provided by God, holy Mary and the patron saints of the kingdom, he thanks all the participants from the rector to the students and, speaking of the dean, says, “Insuper gratiarum acciones referro domino decano facultatis arcium, qui per presenciam suam continuam hunc actum decoravit [*ms. decoraverit*]” (MS Praha, KMK, L 27, fol. 121r). Incidentally, Procopius’s quodlibetal book opens with a list of participants, probably according to the order of seniority, which does not correspond to that in which questions are assigned; the name of the rector is not associated with any question contained in the book; cf. MS Praha, KMK, L 27, fol. 1v.

has at least one objection, so that the *positio* is completely objected to in its essential parts. References to sources are not provided, while cross-references to the parts of the *positio* that are objected to are given.

Some of the features of Malenice's record of the masters' discussion are also found in other Prague *quodlibeta*, but a variety of approaches differentiates the single documents. Henry of Ribenitz's quodlibetal book does not contain any record of the masters' arguments, but a detailed refutation, carried out in the first person, of the six arguments for the negative answer presented in the articulated *propositio* preceding the *positio*;⁹⁵ as in ordinary *quaestiones disputatae*, the refutation makes it clear what can be conceded and what must be denied, argument by argument, providing opposite answers.⁹⁶ Matthias of Legnitz's concise *quaestio principalis* is followed by arguments against individual parts of it, regardless of the order in which they are disposed.⁹⁷ No similar sections are known to be extant for the *quodlibeta* by John Arsen of Langenfeld and Andrew of Brod. Deferring until later some considerations about Hus's quodlibet, Simon of Tišnov and Procopius of Kladruby's counter-argumentations contain a great number of objections against singular parts of the *quaestio principalis*, according to the order of the parts and with references to sources and cross-references to the parts of the *quaestio principalis* that are the object of criticism.⁹⁸ None of these texts bears traces of the names of the masters who put forward the arguments.⁹⁹

The *argumenta* following Knín's *quaestio principalis* display features that are quite similar to the ones by Simon of Tišnov and Procopius of Kladruby: with a single exception, the objections are presented ordinately from the first corollary of the second *notabile* of the first article down to the last corollary of the last conclusion of the last article; no master's name is recorded in the margins of the objections; references to sources are provided,¹⁰⁰ and cross-references to the parts of the *positio* that are refuted are given. All this entitles one to conclude that this section of Knín's quodlibetal book, as well as those found in Simon of

95 Cf. above, note 79.

96 See MS Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 1414, fols 9v–11r: 9v (“Ad rationes ante oppositum. Ad primam, quando arguitur [...] concedo [...]”), 10r (“Ad secundam, quando arguebatur [...] concedo [...] respondeo [...] nego [...]”).

97 See MS Stralsund, Stadtarchiv, HS 1067, fols 207r–209r: 207rb (Contra secundum articulum et contra probacionem eius arguitur sic”), 208va (“Item contra tercium articulum et principaliter contra terciam conclusionem”), 208vb (“Item arguitur contra primam conclusionem tercii articuli”), 209ra (“Contra primam suppositionem”).

98 See MS Praha, Knihovna Národního muzea, V C 42, fols 58v–62r; MS Praha, KMK, L 27, fols 8r–12v.

99 Obviously, in the case of Henry of Ribenitz's refutation of the arguments for the opposite solution, it is clear that they are the work of a single individual, probably the same one who determined the question.

100 References are to Aristotle (not always through the *Auctoritates*), Averroes, Peter Lombard, Boethius on Porphyrius, Plato's *Timaeus*, two implicit quotations from Wyclif's *De universalibus*, and Pseudo-Augustine's *De spiritu et anima*.

Tišnov's and Procopius of Kladruby's,¹⁰¹ underwent a careful process of editing and is to be considered as an *ordinatio* in which the objections — probably raised in a scattered manner by the masters during the public debate, as we read them in the record that followed Malenice's *quaestio principalis* — are re-organised and integrated in a polished text revised for publication.¹⁰²

The collections of masters' *argumenta* already briefly commented upon, with the exception of Henry of Ribenitz's, share a common feature which is not found in the corresponding section of Hus's quodlibet, as they often contain allocutive forms in the second person plural (*dicitis, ponitis, vestra positio*, etc.),¹⁰³ while Hus's counter-argumentation is introduced by a statement suggesting that what follows is the work of his wits and that, moreover, this is what was usually the case in similar circumstances: "Sed tamen more consweto contra aliqua ex iam dictis propter meliorem informacionem replicabo".¹⁰⁴ For the rest, Hus's counter-argumentation follows the order of exposition of the parts objected to and provides references and cross-references like the other records of the debates that are likely to have undergone an editorial process. Considering the differences between Knín's, Hus's and Malenice's texts, Šmahel came to the tentative conclusion that, on the occasion of Hus's quodlibet, the bachelor was appointed to present

101 To them, one should add the two sets of questions to which Lukáš Lička has recently drawn attention (cf. above, note 86), namely MS Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 649, fols 3r–7r, and MS Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 736, fols 84v–91r. The former does not transmit the *positio*, but only the objections to it; they are not ascribed to any individual and are not addressed to each section of the *positio*, but follow the order of exposition; the latter, on the other hand, does transmit the *quaestio principalis*, then a series of objections follow, not referring to every single subdivision of the *quaestio*, but regularly according to the order of exposition, starting from the first conclusion on. Both the sets give references to sources.

102 The *argumenta* following Matthias of Legnitz's *quaestio principalis* include references to sources and this might be a clue that they are not just a copy of a *reportatio* of the immediate reactions of the masters, as seems to be the case with Michael of Malenice's. The editorial activity carried out on Matthias of Legnitz's quodlibetal book is also suggested by the use of imperfect tense in the following passage: "Circa disputacionem de quolibet [...] prima questio disputata erat ista"; cf. above, note 94.

103 For some samples of the plural allocutions from the sections of *argumenta* from the quodlibetal books of Matthias of Legnitz, Michael of Malenice, Simon of Tišnov, and Procopius of Kladruby respectively, cf. MS Stralsund, Stadtarchiv, HS 1067, fol. 208v ("ut vos dicitis"); MS Praha, NK ČR, IX F 7, fols 35v ("dicitis"), 36r ("dicitis"), 36v ("dicitis"); MS Praha, Knihovna Národního muzea, V C 42, fol. 62r ("Ex quibus omnibus iunctis videtur quod tota vestra positio sit minus bene posita"); MS Praha, KMK, L 27, fol. 8r ("Item contra probacionem in qua dicitis [...]"). Furthermore, the Cracowian set of questions including the *quaestio principalis* ends it with the following indication: "Ista pro nunc de materia presentis questionis sunt dicta cum reverencia et correccione vestra" (MS Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 736, fol. 84v). As for sixteen plural forms found in the section of *argumenta* from Knín's quodlibetal book, cf. MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Argumenta contra questionem principalem*, ed. L. CAMPI, in CAMPI, "The Introductory Section of Matthias of Knín's Quodlibet with a Note on the Edition", in *The Great Debate*, pp. 372–394: ll. 642, 658, 684, 717, 799, 818, 824, 835, 847, 908 1029, 1030, 1133, 1153, 1214, 1292.

104 IOHANNES HUS, *Quodlibet*, p. 27.

the *positio* prepared by the *quodlibetarius* and that Hus himself pronounced the “mirror position” against the bachelor’s determination.¹⁰⁵

An analysis of Knín’s introductory materials and their comparison with other similar texts, especially those dating from 1409 on, suggest that most of the *argumenta* were put forward by the masters taking part in the quodlibet, and then, in most cases, arranged by the *quodlibetarius* according to the order of the parts of the *positio* to which they object. The record of Malenice’s disputation may suggest that the *argumenta* were noted down during the debate; it is also possible that the masters chairing the quodlibet used to ask their colleagues to submit later a revised version of their objections — something which might explain the presence of references to sources that are missing in Michael of Malenice’s *reportatio* of the debate. These two possibilities are not mutually exclusive. The presence of cross-references provided not only in a generic form (like “contra primam conclusionem”), but also quoting specific passages *verbatim*, may enable one to attribute their addition to a *quodlibetarius*, like Knín and others, while he was editing the masters’ revised objections.

As for the second person plural pronouns or verbs, it is difficult to decide if they were due to courtesy formulas or instead were intended to address more than one person. As a matter of fact, it seems that “tu” and “vos” were used in Prague without strict consistency. In speeches that we might expect to be comparable in solemnity to the introductory session of a quodlibet, such as recommendation speeches on the occasion of students’ graduations, the use of “tu” and “vos” was not standardised: for example, in his recommendation for a certain Martin from Croatia, who was older and not very close to him, Hus systematically addressed him as “tu”; on the other hand, sometimes Hus even switched between using “tu” and “vos” in the same recommendation speech.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, it is worth pointing out that we have evidence that it was common practice for the dean of the Prague Faculty of Arts to convene meetings of the masters by addressing several people using the second plural form for the verbs, but the second singular for the vocative allocutive — whether this was due to the fact of addressing mainly the senior among pairs, or each one individually, is unclear.¹⁰⁷ It is uncertain, then, if this is also the case with the similar formula transmitted by one of the three manuscript witnesses of Hus’s quodlibet at the end of the *positio* to the *quaestio principalis*, just before the beginning of the counter-argumentation: “et tantum

105 Cf. ŠMAHEL, “Kvodlibetní diskuse ke kvestii principalis Michala z Malenic roku 1412”, pp. 31–32.

106 Cf. IOHANNES HUS, *Positiones*, pp. 46–50, 66–68. I am grateful to Petra Mutlová for calling my attention to these passages.

107 Cf. *Liber decanorum facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Pragensis*, vol. 1, p. 103: “Item in decanatu mag. Henrice de Homberg die 8 mensis Julii, facta congregatione magistrorum de consilio facultatis sub hac forma: Magister reverende! sitis hodie hora 17 in concilio facultatis ad videndum, utrum [...]”; cf. also pp. 104, 107, 109, 111, 118, 119, 121, 131, 278, 280, 282, 322, 325, 326, 375, 451.

dixerim de questionis materia, magister reverende, vestra cum informacione”.¹⁰⁸ Attributable to the bachelor in charge of pronouncing the *positio*, this phrase could be understood as addressed either to the attending masters, according to the use of combining singular vocative and plural verbal forms, or to the *quodlibetarius*, resorting to the plural for the sake of courtesy. This latter practice seems attested in some sets of arguments found in Knín’s quodlibetal book, for the use of plural forms in arguments prepared to object to those of a single master can hardly be interpreted otherwise.¹⁰⁹ In the light of this latter piece of evidence from quodlibetal materials, although it cannot be excluded that the masters’ objections to the *quaestio principalis* were expressed in the plural form because they were addressed not only to the bachelor, but also to the *quodlibetarius*, who had appointed the former to pronounce the *positio* on his behalf, it is nonetheless more likely that they should be understood as formulas of deference towards a single individual — that is, the *quodlibetarius*, or the bachelor as a spokesman of the latter.¹¹⁰

As for Hus’s unprecedented self-attribution of the “mirror position”, one may wonder whether some change occurred in the way quodlibetal disputations were performed between 1411 (Hus) and 1412 (Michael of Malenice). Yet, since Knín’s (1409), Simon of Tišnov’s (1416) and Procopius of Kladruba’s (1417) share very similar features and Michael of Malenice’s record of the debate attests that the objections were raised by the attending masters, not by the *quodlibetarius* alone, Hus’s expression “more consweto” is likely to refer to the practice of putting forward some *argumenta* against the *positio* before the *argumenta* of the attending masters, not to the personal duty of the *quodlibetarius* to argue against the whole *quaestio principalis*. Maybe Hus’s purpose was to stress that what he was introducing was his own *ordinatio* of the masters’ arguments, something which should be considered as one of his pieces of scholarship.¹¹¹ Yet, that some of the objections were raised by the *quodlibetarius* himself seems probable, based on the fact that the record of the masters’ debate at Michael of Malenice’s quodlibet does

108 See MS Wien, ÖNB, 4673, fol. 125v; cf. the apparatus of variants in IOHANNES HUS, *Quodlibet*, p. 27.

109 See MS Praha, KMK, L 45, fols 65v (“ordo, quem vos ponitis”), 66r (“nec eiam per rationem, quia maxime per vestram, quam posuitis”), 102v (“Et si forte dixeritis”, “erit oppositio inimica per vos ratione illius quarte partis”, “patet solucionem non valere, qua forte dicitis”). These passages can be read in their context in the editions by Zuzana Lukšová and Karel Dobiáš in this volume.

110 From a study of the contents of the long determination of the 1409 *quaestio principalis*, and the substantial use made of Wyclif and Hus as implicit sources on pivotal doctrinal issues, it is clear that the text delivered by the bachelor conveyed Knín’s own and renowned views. See CAMPI, “Matthias of Knín’s *quaestio principalis* and Anti-Eternalism at the Prague Faculty of Arts in the Wake of Wyclif”, pp. 153–178: 178.

111 In this respect, the sentence ascribable to the bachelor quoted above, found in only one of the manuscript witnesses, is possibly a remnant of the oral performance, later removed during the editorial process by Hus.

not ascribe the first arguments, covering the whole of the first page and at least half of the second, to any master in particular.¹¹²

A survey of the section devoted to the counter-argumentation in Knín's quodlibetal book provides pieces of evidence not only corroborating the conclusion that it is the result of an editorial revision carried out by the *quodlibetarius*, but also suggesting that some of the objections are to be ascribed to Knín himself. For instance, one of the objections raised against the *positio* overtly refers to one of the sets of arguments that Knín had compiled before the quodlibetal disputation took place to react against the solution offered by the master to whom he had assigned a *quaestio* and that would be presented only after the masters' debate following the determination of the *quaestio principalis*. The whole argument consists in such a reference: "Contra primam partem conclusionis vide argumenta in illa questione 'Utrum inter omnia encia universi tantum primum ens est summe simplex'".¹¹³ What follows is an articulated refutation of the second part of the conclusion mentioned in the quoted text, in all respects analogous to those collected in the rest of this section. It seems to be excluded that Knín would have circulated his sets of arguments prior to the quodlibet — otherwise, they would have proved completely ineffective during the debate. Even so, it is unlikely that a master taking part in the disputation would have opted for developing an argument consisting merely in a generic reference to one of those sets, that the other attending masters would not know; it is therefore more convincing that it was Knín himself who decided to mention his own arguments against a particular question when, editing the section collecting the masters' *argumenta*, he had to deal with an objection raised against the second part of a conclusion found in the *positio*, but not against the first part of it.

Further clues that the arguments against the *positio* were originally authored not exclusively by Knín, but also — mainly — by the attending masters, and then edited by Knín himself, can be detected. For example, some of the sources found in the counter-argumentation are theological in nature: there are some references to biblical books and one to Peter Lombard; moreover, the last argument put forward in the last objection is introduced by the words "Confirmatur theologie".¹¹⁴ Now, the themes of the *quaestiones principales* of the Prague *quodlibeta* at the Faculty of Arts usually concerned God, his attributes, or the world's dependence on divine direction. As pointed out below in this volume, Knín nonetheless preferred to discuss the topic in metaphysical terms, without referring to revealed theology.¹¹⁵ It is of course possible that, in objecting to the *positio*, a *quodlibetarius*

112 The first "dicitis" is found in the isolated paragraph preceding the objections ascribed to Mark of Hradec, attributed by Šmahel to the rector; cf. above, note 94. It is possible that the previous objections are to be ascribed to Malenice himself.

113 See MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Argumenta contra questionem principalem*, ll. 912–913.

114 See MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Argumenta contra questionem principalem*, 1288–1289.

115 Cf. CAMPI, "Matthias of Knín's *quaestio principalis* and Anti-Eternalism at the Prague Faculty of Arts in the Wake of Wyclif", pp. 174–175.

could refer to theological authorities; yet, this does not seem the case with Knín. On the other hand, it is documented by the 1412 quodlibet that objections put forward by the masters taking part in the quodlibet also dealt with revealed theological arguments.

Again, it is worth pointing out that, in one case, the conclusion reached in the *quaestio principalis* is said to be partly “dubia”, partly “non bene fundata”, and it is explained why it is not sound; yet, the opposite is not demonstrated.¹¹⁷ Even if it was probably pronounced by a bachelor, we have grounds to maintain that the *positio* was perceived as conveying Knín’s views. It is therefore more likely that critical remarks of this kind were made by someone else, not by Knín himself, especially the latter: would Knín have been willing to publicly say that one of his own conclusions was not well-formed?

At the end of the present investigation of the long introduction of Knín’s quodlibetal book, some questions are still waiting to be answered; yet, hopefully a series of problems concerning the nature of some materials, their authorship, and in general the methods and practices in use at the Arts quodlibetal disputations at Prague have been profitably discussed, and — at least — have been shown to deserve further comparative enquiries and in-depth analyses.

This long introduction — as well as of those pertaining to other Prague *quodlibeta* — until now have been generally overlooked. Yet, as I hope to have shown, a detailed analysis of it promises to enable scholars to come to a better understanding of academic practices and intellectual life in fifteenth-century Prague.

¹¹⁷ See MATTHIAS DE KNIN, *Argumenta contra questionem principalem*, ll. 1232–1239.