Stanislav of Znojmo and the Arrival of Wyclif's Remanence Theory at the University of Vienna

Monica Brinzei

Stanislav of Znojmo and the Arrival of Wyclif's Remanence Theory at the University of Vienna

Monica Brînzei*

Monica Brînzei is Directeur de recherche (DR2) at the IRHT, CNRS, Paris, specializing in late medieval philosophy and intellectual history.

In 1447, when Tommasso di Bartholomeo Parentucelli, previously master of theology at the University of Bologna, was elected Pope Nicholas V, he was guided by an ambitious project: to build a library. This was the origin of what is known today as the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. It is not my goal here to retrace the history of this institution, but I will begin by pointing out that from its beginnings a special place in Nicholas's library was devoted to *Sentences* commentaries.[1]

In 1455, when Nicholas V died, his library consisted of around 800 Latin manuscripts and approximately 400 Greek manuscripts, with none in other languages. In one single room, eight cabinets gathered together the main tools for a substantial theological education: the first cabinet, Bible and glosses; the second, Augustine, Jerome, Gregory, Ambrose; in the third, Thomas Aquinas shared shelves with Albertus Magnus and a few theological treatises by other authors; the fourth cabinet was allocated to *Sentences* commentaries; the fifth collected ecclesiological treatises and *vitae sanctorum*; the sixth cabinet held canon law writings; the last two (*a sinistra versus fenestram*) were dedicated to texts from the Faculty of Arts: the Aristotelian corpus, some natural science, and rhetoric. As is clear from the above, an important priority was given to *Sentences* commentaries. As a general impression of the Pope's collection, we have the canonical texts of the genre, but he seems to have had a preference for Franciscan (Alexander of Hales, Bonaventure, Richard of Mediavilla, Peter John Olivi, John Duns Scotus, Peter Auriol) and Augustinian authors (Gerard of Siena, Thomas of Strasbourg, Gregory of Rimini). According to the medieval catalogue, the collection of *Sentences* texts was completed by a group of anonymous commentaries that are still waiting to be identified. In the majority of

* Access to copies of manuscripts consulted for this paper was assured by ERC-THESIS n° 313339. I benefited from excellent working conditions in completing this research under the aegis of ERC-DEBATE n° 771589 and RISE project PN-III-P4-ID-PCCF-2016-0064. Stephen Lahey, Ota Pavlíček and Chris Schabel read versions of this paper and provided comments and suggestions.

[1] The first inventory of his library was edited by Müntz and Fabre, *Bibliothèque du Vatican au XVe siècle d'après des documents inédits*, pp. 48–114.

cases there is just Book IV, which suggests an interest in sacramental theology. Among these anonymous works, I will focus on BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120,[2] which was described in the medieval inventory of the library from 16 April 1455 compiled by Cosme de Montserrat,[3] as follows: 'Item aliud volumen magne forme ex pergameno, copertum veluto morato cum quatuor serraturis argenteis in quarum scutis sunt arma pape Nicolai Quinti' (Another volume of parchment of large format, covered in black velvet with four silver clasps on the shields of which are the arms of Nicholas V). [4]

Indeed, it is a large, luxurious manuscript with a monogram of Nicholas V on the first folio, and many decorative details seem to emphasize the importance of the text. The codex impresses by the elegance of its decoration, style, and writing.[5] What was so special about the contents of the codex and why was it part of Nicholas V's own collection? I am not sure I can provide clear answers to these queries, but I will try to present some details that connect this manuscript with the topic of the present volume.

BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120 is no longer anonymous today, since Loris Sturlese identified these questions on Book IV of the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard as belonging to Peter Reicher of Pirchenwart, who read the *Sentences* at Vienna in 1417-19. The present study is focused on this particular codex because of its presence in the collection of the Pope Nicholas V and because Stegmüller omitted it when he compiled his catalogue on *Sentences*.[6] As Pirchenwart himself claimed at the end of the question to which this paper is devoted, he was a disciple of Peter Czech of Pulkau (ca. 1370-1425, not of Czech origin; fol. 57ra: *magister meus Petrus de Pulkau*), a famous theologian from Vienna who was present at Jerome of Prague's trial.[7] Despite Sturlese's discovery, a few years ago, when I began working with Chris Schabel on the

---

[2] The manuscript can be consulted online at this link and under the name of Peter of Pulkau: https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.1120. A codicological analysis was published in the catalogue by Pelzer, *Codices Vaticani Latini 979–1134*, p. 744. See also Manfredi, 'I codici latini di Niccolò V', pp. 180*–81*, 182.

[3] Müntz and Fabre explain why this is not Calixtus III's inventory, as was previously thought, but that of Nicholas V (†24 March), the completion of which they date to 16 April 1455, between Calixtus' election and coronation (8 and 20 April). Cf. Müntz and Fabre, *Bibliothèque du Vatican au XVe siècle d'après des documents inédits,* p. 41.

[4] Müntz and Fabre, *Bibliothèque du Vatican au XVe siècle d'après des documents inédits,* p. 70.'.

[5] See Pasut, 'Per la miniatura a Roma alla metà del Quattrocento', pp. 124, 147. For an interpretation of other decorated manuscripts from Nicholas V's library, see Pasut, 'Libri, miniatori e artisti alle originii della Vaticana', pp. 416–65.

[6] Sturlese, *Dokumente und Forschungen zu Leben*, pp. 78–82. It is missing from the list of manuscripts attributed to Pirchenwart by Stegmüller, *Repertorium commentariorum in Sententias*, n° 172, p. 283.

[7] On Pulkau, see Girgensohn, *Peter von Pulkau und die Wiedereinführung des Laienkelches*; Shank, *Unless You Believe, You Shall Not Understand*, pp. 117–22; Brinzei and Schabel, 'The Past, Present, and Future of Late Medieval Theology', pp. 201–206. Michael Shank discusses Jerome's trial from the perspective of the history of the University of Vienna: 'In visiting Vienna, Jerome was not entering neutral territory; on the contrary, a tribunal drawn from members of the Faculty of Arts supplemented by a few theologians – including Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and Peter of Pulkau – formally charged Jerome with heresy': Shank, 'University and Church in Late Medieval Vienna', p. 48. See also Walsh, 'Von Wegestreit zur Häresie', pp. 41–42.

Sentences questions of Nikolaus of Dinkelsbühl, the manuscript was still commonly attributed to Dinkelsbühl, as were many other sets of *Sentences* questions produced in the first years of the University of Vienna. In order to clarify the connection and the affiliation between these texts, we introduced the label 'Vienna Group commentaries', since all these writings were just variations of a base text compiled by Dinkelsbühl at Vienna.[8] The algorithm of fractals could better illustrate how other commentaries developed from Dinkelsbühl's original text following the same pattern. From Dinkelsbühl's autograph, Vienna, Schottenstift, MS 269, succeeding generations built up a tradition of sedimentary texts the final goal of which was to create a textbook serving theological instruction in Vienna. One of these clones is codex BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120, which belongs to the third generation of the 'Vienna Group'.[9] Among the Vienna Group, Pirchenwart's commentary on Book IV seems to be the most complete in terms of dealing extensively with all the common questions in this book,[10] which might explain why we find this text in the collection of Pope Nicholas V.

Having examined the entire text and located the explicit quotations,[11] I can offer a general overview of the contents of the codex. The table in Appendix 1 below presents the results in parallel with the first version of Book IV of Dinkelsbühl compiled from Klosterneuburg, Stifsbibliothek, MS 301, illustrating the Vienna Group's evolution from the *Urtext*. Pirchenwart thus remains close to Dinkelsbühl's original. The number of quotations from canonical authorities such as John Duns Scotus, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Durand of Saint-Pourçain is very similar, although BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120 enriches the data with additional quotations from other theologians, such as Peter of Candia and Richard FitzRalph, notably increasing the prominence of Thomas of Strasbourg, who goes from having five excerpts to twenty-five. Some of the exotic quotations, indicating connections with Parisian theologians from the second half of the fourteenth century, such as Gottschalk of Nepomuk or

[8] Brinzei and Schabel, 'The Past, Present, and Future of Late Medieval Theology', pp. 174–266; Brinzei, and Schabel, 'Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the University of Vienna'; Courtenay, 'From Dinkelsbühl's *Questiones Communes* to the Vienna Group Commentary'.

[9] Zahnd, 'Plagiats individualisés et stratégies de singularisation', pp. 129–35; Courtenay, 'From Dinkelsbühl's *Questiones Communes* to the Vienna Group Commentary', pp. 283–95; Sturlese, *Dokumente und Forschungen zu Leben,* pp. 78–82.

[10] In general, it seems that Pirchenwart tries to present a Book IV that is as complete as possible. Compared to other versions in the Dinkelsbühlian line, his treatment of individual questions is much more extensive, without adding new questions. Cf. Zahnd, 'Plagiats individualisés et stratégies de singularisation', p. 126.

[11] A list of citations was also compiled by Courtenay based on two different manuscripts: Göttweig, Klosterbibliothek, MS 261 (272), fols 1^{ra}-376^{vb} ; and Klosterneuburg, Stifsbibliothek, MS 340, fols 1^{ra}-287^{ra}. Cf. Courtenay, 'From Dinkelsbühl's *Questiones Communes* to the Vienna Group Commentary', pp. 304–15.

Richard Barbe, are taken from Dinkelsbühl and found in his autograph manuscript, Vienna, Schottenstift, MS 269.[12]

When we compare texts sharing the same tradition and belonging to the same corpus, finding *bricolage textuel*[13] is no longer a source of excitement. One way to escape platitudes or formulas such as 'medieval plagiarism' is to investigate what is not similar, what is not copied from one text to another, and therefore what the points of discontinuity inside the tradition are. Following this path, one finds that Pirchenwart distances himself from Dinkelsbühl's text by injecting new sources and ideas into ongoing theological discussions. The Cistercian James of Eltville, who read the *Sentences* at Paris in 1369-70, and whom Pirchenwart quotes five times, is an interesting case-study.[14] But the most surprising by far, although not completely unexpected after the Schism, is the presence of five explicit references to the *Tractatus de corpore Christi* of Stanislav of Znojmo, or *Stanyslaus de Bohemia*, as Pirchenwart introduces him.

Calling attention to Stanislav and his treatise is interesting with respect to the 'Vienna Group', since from its beginnings the Faculty of Theology of Vienna adopted a very cautious and moderate attitude towards polemics or controversial topics.[15] Dinkesbühl himself avoided discussing the Schism and conciliarism, although he seems to have been extremely concerned with the Jews (an issue current in the Vienna of his time);[16] and he shows some interest in the Hussites. Indeed, the longest *quaestio* in Dinkesbühl's later Melk commentary on Book IV, from after the Schism and extant in hundreds of copies, a question occupying 46 columns of text (fols 74va-86ra) in the beautiful deluxe Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 47 (dated 1426), is dedicated to the Hussites and had an impact on later discussions.[17] The *quaestio*,

---

[12] See the edition of the fragment, in which the Vienna Group quotes these two Parisians theologians via James of Eltville, in Zahnd, 'Plagiats individualisés et stratégies de singularisation, p. 223. Concerning Richard Barbe see Brinzei and Schabel, 'The Past, Present, and Future of Late Medieval Theology', pp. 221–22, n. 78. Alexander Baumgarten from University Babes-Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca is currently editing the *Sentences* commentary of Gottschalk of Nepomuk. See: http://www.zisterzienserlexikon.de/wiki/Godescalc_de_Nepomuk

[13] *Bricolage textuel* or textual patchwork was popular in medieval texts. See Calma, 'Plagium', pp. 559–68 ; and Eco, 'Riflessioni sulle tecniche di citazione nel Medioevo', pp. 461–84.

[14] For the reception of James of Eltville in Vienna, see Brinzei and Curut, 'From Author to Authority: The Legacy of James of Eltville in Vienna', pp. 419–78.

[15] Marielle Lamy dedicates a short chapter ('Retentissements à l'Université de Vienne et dans le monde germanique') to the reaction of the Faculty of Theology at Vienna concerning the debate over the Immaculate Conception that shook Paris in the late fourteenth century. Letters from students in Paris to masters in Vienna attest that the latter were informed and tried to avoid similar debates. See Lamy, *L'immaculée conception: étapes et enjeux d'une controverse*, pp. 587–91. On the attitude of the Vienna Faculty of Theology towards the Hussites, see the recent book by Traxler, *'Firmiter Velitis Resistere': Die Auseinandersetzung der Wiener Universität mit dem Hussitismus*.

[16] See the example of the forced baptism of Jewish infants in Brinzei, Friedman, and Schabel, 'The Reception of Durand's *Sentences* Commentary', pp. 295–341.

[17] Brinzei and Schabel, 'The Past, Present, and Future of Late Medieval Theology', p. 259.

'Whether it is by evangelical law necessary for salvation to take the sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds', deals with Hus's position on the Eucharist, but it does not contain any reference to Stanislav, unlike Pirchenwart's version. Dinkelsbühl is thus not Pirchenwart's source.

Are Pirchenwart's comments on Stanislav's treatise a personal contribution to the Viennese theological debate? The answer is an emphatic no. His master, Peter of Pulkau, whose memory is praised at the end of Pirchenwart's *quaestio* for Distinction 10 of Book IV, is the key to explaining Pirchenwart's interest in Stanislav's treatise, since, in his *Vespera*, Pulkau introduces Stanislav into Viennese theology. Jan Sedlák was the first to identify the reference to Stanislav in the *Vespera* in Vienna, ÖNB, MS 4300, fols 10^{r}-21^{r},[18] but he had doubts about the authorship, since the text is dated to several years after Pulkau's lectures on the *Sentences* (1410 versus 1403-05). Pirchenwart's reference to the title of the *Vespera*, however, in combination with the name of his master confirms that this text is by Pulkau.[19]

Pirchenwart mentions Stanislav when he deals with the topic of Distinction 10 of Book IV[20] in connection with the issue of transubstantiation, emphasizing Stanislav's belief in the remanence of the bread and wine post-consecration. Pirchenwart presents him as someone who is not yet well known amongst Viennese theologians. We do not have information about the circulation of Stanislav's texts in Vienna while Pirchenwart was active. The six surviving fifteenth-century manuscripts of Stanislav's treatise arrived in Vienna[21] only in the sixteenth century.[22] He thus gives all the basic information: Stanislav is a theologian from Prague who wrote a small treatise entitled *De corpore Christi.*[23]

---

[18] Sedlák, *Eucharistické traktáty Stanislava ze Znojma,* pp. 359–60. I am grateful to Ota Pavlíček for assistance with this text. Girgensohn indicates another copy of Pulkau's *Vespera* in Vienna, Schottenstift, MS 351, fols 231^{v}-240^{v}. Cf. Girgensohn, *Peter von Pulkau und die Wiedereinführung des Laienkelches*, p. 168.

[19] In this paper I will limit my interpretation of Pulkau's *Vespera*; my doctoral student Luciana Cioca will focus on this in one of the chapters of her dissertation on the tradition of vesperial *quaestiones*: 'From Inceptor to Magister: The History of Vesperial Questions at the Medieval Universities'.

[20] Peter of Pirchenwart, *Sent. IV*, dist. 10, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120, fols 48^{rb}-57ra: 'Ad declaratione distinctionis decime queritur: utrum corpus Christi et sanguis Christi in consecratione Eucharistie realiter sub speciebus panis et vini fiant et contineantur'.

[21] Vienna, ÖNB, MSS 4308, 4315, 4483, 4509, 4515 and also the 'P 30' that belonged to the library of the *Collegium Nationis Bohemorum*. Cf. Spunar, *Repertorium auctorum Bohemorum*, p. 288.

[22] See Spunar, *Repertorium auctorum Bohemorum*, p. 457.

[23] Peter of Pirchenwart, *Sent. IV*, dist. 10, art. 3, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120, fol. 53va: 'Unde quidam magister theologie nomine Schanyslaus de Bohemia quendam tractatulum Prage suscripsit, quem tractatum *De corpore Christi* intitulavit, in quo dicit sine tamen assertione quod panis per sanctificationem et quandam mirabilem non tamen suppositalem unionem ad corpus Christi fit corpus Christi et econverso corpus Christi fit panis, et cum hoc quod propria substantialitate naturali iste panis sit aliud a corpore Christi quo ad ipsius corporis propriam substantialitatem, quia dicit: "Panis est aliqua propria substantia naturalis et suppositum proprium aliud quam sit corpus Christi", et huius sanctificationem panis et admirabilem unionem ipsius ad corpus Christi vocat transubstantionem panis in corpus'. This detailed presentation is in contrast with the way he mentions the name of Altavilla (Eltville) when he opposes to Stanislav this Cistercian theologian, who was very trendy in Vienna at that time. I am grateful to Ota Pavlíček for providing access to the edited fragments of Stanislaus's treatise *De corpore*

A short introduction to Stanislav will help us evaluate Pirchenwart's reference to his treatise. Stanislav was one of the major figures of the Reform movement in Bohemia.[24] Known as Jan Hus's professor in Prague, Stanislav is probably the person who introduced his famous pupil to the teachings of Wyclif. A few treatises by him are extant and they enjoyed a large circulation in the Czech lands, some of them eventually reaching Vienna.[25] These texts form the profile of a philosophical mind concerned with the status of universals,[26] the theory of propositions,[27] and epistemology, but also a polemical spirit who did not easily tolerate certain doctrines and customs of the Church. The treatise of Stanislav that Pirchenwart quotes is a pastiche, if not an abbreviated form, of Wyclif's treatise *De Eucharistia*. Hus himself recognized Stanislav's support of remanence theory, when, in a letter addressed to his astronomer and mathematician friend Christian of Prachatice, Hus attests (*scio certitudinaliter*) to Stanislav's conviction (*tenuit et in scripto sententialiter scripsit*) of the 'remanence of the bread' after consecration, to which he dedicated a treatise.[28]

Pirchenwart's project is to compose an all-embracing question on eucharistic doctrine, presenting different conceptions. According to this plan, Stanislav seems to be a *passage obligé*, because he was a partisan of Wyclif's controversial doctrine of remanence.[29] The framework of the discussion is given by the third article of Distinction 10, Book IV, where Pirchenwart asks if the transubstantiation of the bread and wine during the sacrament of Eucharist occurs in one or two mutations from one substance to another.[30] At one point, Pirchenwart refers to an old error mentioned by Peter Lombard in Distinction 11, according to which the substance of the bread remains after the consecration. In fact, Lombard embraced the position of Hugh of St

Christi by Sedlák, 'Mgri Stanislai de Znoyma Tractatus primus de Eucharistia', pp. 100–20 and also to inform me about the online manuscripts from Prague.

[24] Stephen Lahey is currently working on a monograph on Stanislaus. Meanwhile a series of his public lectures on Stanislaus is accessible on his *Academia* account. Also see Sousedík, 'Stanislaus von Znaim', pp. 37–56; Šmahel, 'Wyclif's Fortune in Hussite Bohemia', pp. 467–89.

[25] For a list of Stanislaus's manuscripts, see Spunar, *Repertorium auctorum Bohemorum*, pp. 289–304.

[26] See Lahey, 'Stanislaus of Znojmo and Prague Realism', paper presented at the 'Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice' Conference, Prague 2014.

[27] Nuchelmans, 'Stanislaus of Znaim (d. 1414) On Truth and Falsity', pp. 314–41.

[28] Wyclif, *De Eucharistia tractatus maior*, ed. by Loserth, pp. 46–7 n. 1; *Documenta mag. Joannis Hus*, p. 56: 'Vos scitis, quomodo Palecz loquebatur prius in domo vestra. Et scio certitudinaliter quod Stanislaus tenuit et in scripto sententialiter scripsit « de remanencia panis »; et a me quaesivit antequam disturbium incepit, si vellem idem sensum tenere. Ecce postea iuravit et abiuravit […] dixit per iuramentum quod tractatum illum non perfecit'. On this passage see also Brinzei and Curut, 'From Author to Authority: The Legacy of James of Eltville in Vienna', pp. 428–9.

[29] Sousedík characterized Stanislaus's position on remanence as neutral, a view not shared by De Vooght in his analysis of Stanislaus's doctrine. Sousedík, 'Huss et la doctrine eucharistique "rémanentiste"', pp. 383–407; Herold, 'Jan Hus: A Heretic, A Saint, or a Reformer?', p. 17. We should add here that Stanislaus revised the second part of his treatise on more orthodox lines after he was accused of heresy.

[30] This is also the longest article of this *quaestio*: Peter of Pirchenwart, *Sent. IV*, dist. 10, art. 3, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120, fols 51^{vb}-57ra: 'Tertius articulus est: Utrum transubstantio seu substantialis versio sit una mutatio vel due'.

Victor from *De sacramentis*, who maintained that during the consecration there is a transformation of substance (*substantiam converti in substantiam*).[31] Opposed to this conception were the partisans of the 'remanence' of the substance of the bread and wine in union with Christ's body and blood. In Distinction 12 this so-called error is analyzed in depth by Lombard. According to Pirchenwart, this error is defended *sine tamen assertione* by Stanislav, who based his theory on the authority of Pope Innocent III's *Firmiter*, which source Stanislav simply borrowed from Wyclif. To this quotation, Pirchenwart counter-attacks with another from Innocent III, *De officio*, Part 4, Chapter 10, where the Pope says that during the consecration the accidents of the bread remain without a subject.[32]

In order better to understand Pirchenwart's reaction to Stanislav's position, we should go back to the Prague theologian's text and follow its reception as I present it in text 2A of the Appendix. 2A shows[33] how Stanislav attacks the Church when he criticizes the way that this institution decides what is *catholice credendum* based on two types of authorities: textual and individual. Stanislav says that the Church reads and sings and thus embraces the theory of the non-remanence of the bread and the theory of the accidents remaining without a subject solely on the basis of the opinion of saints and famous doctors. Since the Church can be mistaken and deceived in accepting and following opinions, Stanislav continues, it does not seem that this alone should make this opinion something one must believe. To emphasize the fallibility of the Church, Stanislav then introduces the topic of the current Schism, when people of all ranks, both clergy and lay, accepted as the true pope Pedro de Luna, that is, Benedict XIII, the pope of Avignon (or, for Stanislav and today's Church, the antipope), just as they had accepted Robert of Geneva as Clement VII. Stanislav is not original in using this example, since Wyclif himself referred to the 'antipope' Robert of Geneva, as opposed to 'our pope Urban', at least three times in his treatise. Stanislav chose to be rather ironic, and we can easily measure his sarcasm with the long enumeration of the 'antipope's' partisans: *religiosi et sacerdotes, doctores, magistri, et scolares, reges, duces, comites, barones, milites et reliqui de vulgo*. All these followers of popes and antipopes are the very people who denied the truth of his position on remanence. Stanislav concludes: the sacrament is a profound mystery inspired by God, and

[31] Hugh of St Victor, *De sacramentis*, II, 8, 9, col. 468. Cf. Peter Lombard, *Sententiae in IV Libris*, IV, dist. 11, cap. 1, p. 296.13.
[32] Peter of Pirchenwart, *Sent. IV*, dist. 10, art. 3, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120, fol. 53va: 'Et quod non valeat ista sua responsio patet manifeste ex scripto Innocentii III, *De officio misse* parte quarta, cap. 10, ubi manifeste ponit quod accidentia facta consecratione stent sine subiecto et solvit ibi etiam auctoritates aliquas quas predictus doctor pro se allegat'.
[33] See below, p. XXX

the Church should follow this inspiration, not the human interpretations pertaining to non-remanence or the subsistence of accidents without a subject.

From the text of the third column of the table of Appendix 2A, we can see how Pirchenwart first reproduces Stanislav's position and then reacts by defending the Church. He attacks Stanislav by saying that he is neither a saint nor someone famous enough for the Church to take into consideration his position on remanence, which actually is not even an opinion, but merely an ancient error already rejected by the Church. Two remarks on Pirchenwart's responses: first, he tactically avoids commenting on the schismatic example, which is an embarrassing episode in the Church's history. Second, he does not connect Stanislav's position with Wyclif, but just with an old error mentioned by Peter Lombard citing Ambrose. The Viennese theologian defends strongly what he considers the true path: a treatise like that of Stanislav is dangerous and erroneous in many respects, and it must be said firmly that the bread does not remain and is not annihilated, but converted into Christ's body.

Pirchenwart builds up his offensive with a long list of seventeen authorities that begins with Augustine and ends with Thomas Aquinas (gathering names like Ambrose, Gregory, Bede, and Lombard, all quoted either by Stanislav or by the Lombard), to emphasize the mistaken nature and singularity of Stanislav's view in the face of the tradition of the Church and of its doctors. According to Pirchenwart, the list of authorities proves the falsity of Stanislav's doctrine,[34] and he repeats that it is nothing new, since the Prague theologian just reiterates the old error mentioned by the Lombard. This list of authorities, printed as Appendix 1, should be understood as a tool against heresy. Pirchenwart was not the first one to use it, since he borrowed it verbatim from his master Peter of Pulkau.[35] In fact, at the end of the question, Pirchenwart praises the memory of his master, the venerable Peter of Pulkau:

> Et hunc errorem cum aliis tribus erroribus circa sacramentum eukaristie venerabilis *magister meus, magister Petrus de Pulka*, pulchre, lucide et clare eradicat et evellit, impossibilitatem quo ad aliqua et heresim quo ad cetera eius dicta declarando *in questione vesperiarum suarum que est: Utrum in sacramento altaris sit aliquid substantie panis.* Ubi etiam oppositum, scilicet veritatem, manifeste rationibus et auctoritatibus sanctorum fundat et ex Ecclesie determinatione deducit, ut partim superius tractatum est.

[34] Peter of Pirchenwart, *Sent. IV*, dist. 10, art. 3, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120, fol. 54^{rb}: 'Ex hiis omnibus patet falsitas periculosi erroris antiqui nuper per Stanislaum doctorem pragensem resumpti dicentis in Eukaristia facta consecratione panem et vinum substantialiter manere, cuius oppositum verum est et sufficienter ab Ecclesia determinatum, prout cuilibet Christiano sufficere debet, ut liquet ex predictis'.
[35] See Appendix 1, pp. XXXX

(In the question of his Vesperies entitled 'Whether there is anything of the substance of the bread in the sacrament of the Eucharist', my venerable master, master Peter of Pulkau, beautifully, lucidly, and clearly uproots and tears out this error with three others concerning the sacrament of the Eucharist, declaring its impossibility with respect to some of its statements and its heresy with respect to the rest. He also manifestly establishes the opposite there, namely the truth, with arguments and authoritative passages of the saints and he deduces it from the determination of the Church, as was partially treated above.)[36]

Pirchenwart must have had Pulkau's text before his eyes, since he lets us know that in his *Vespera* question Pulkau argued against some heretical doctrines, gives its title, and mentions the four types of error that in fact provide the structure for Pulkau's *Vespera*. Pulkau's *Vespera* is dated 1410 in Vienna, ÖNB, MS 4300, fol. 21^{r} (*per consequens de tota questione vesperiarum. Anno domini 1410*),[37] so it is post Stanislav's treatise.

It appears that this *Vespera* was successful among Viennese theologians. Girgensohn lists a second codex of Pulkau's *Vespera* (Vienna, Schottenstift, MS 351, fols 231^{v}-240^{v}) [38], and I have found two more copies, one in Vienna, ÖNB, MS 4736, fols 125^{r}-132^{v} and the second one in Sankt Paul im Lavanttal, Stiftsbibliothek MS 245/4, fols 212^{r}-222^{r}. The Sankt Paul catalogue attributes this *Vespera* to Paulus Wann de Kemnat, a later theologian from Vienna (*Sentences* lectures 1454, master 1460),[39] based on the *tabula* of the manuscript: *fo. 212 Questiones vesperiales de corpore Christi. M. p. Wann*.[40] Paul Wann was preoccupied with the Hussites, to judge from the fact that he had in his personal library a codex containing the condemned articles of Hus from Constance and other sermons and documents from the Council.[41] The text from Sankt Paul im Lavanttal, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 245/4 omits the title of Pulkau's question, but the rest of the text is identical with the copy in Vienna, ÖNB, MS 4300. Since Paul Wann is certainly not the author, it is possible that the Sankt Paul witness belonged to Paul's collection, suggesting that for a long time in Vienna the remanence doctrine was associated more with Stanislav than with Wyclif.

[36] Peter of Pirchenwart, *Sent. IV*, dist. 11, art. 1, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120, fol. 57ra (emphasis mine).
[37] The reference to the date of the treatise seems to be added with a different ink, but by the same hand, which might be Pulkau's. I cannot confirm this since I have worked with a microfilm.
[38] Girgensohn, *Peter von Pulkau und die Wiedereinführung des Laienkelches*, p. 168.
[39] For the most detailed account of this theologian, see Huber and Worstrock, *Paul Wann (Paulus de Kemnat, aten)*, cols 711–22. See also Binder, *Die Lehre des Nikolaus von Dinkelsbühl*, pp. 145–47.
[40] See Christine Glassner's inventory online: http://www.ksbm.oeaw.ac.at/stpaul/inv/mss4.htm.
[41] See the contents of Stuttgart, WLB, MS I 91 and the attribution: *Iste liber est Pauli Wann.* For a full description of the manuscript, see Autenrieth, *Die Handschriften der Ehemaligen Hofbibliothek Stuttgart*, pp. 163–67.

As mentioned, Pirchenwart tacitly borrows a critical tool from his master's *Vespera* in order to attack Stanislav, a list of authorities that contains arguments that Pulkau had formulated against the Prague theologian. Pulkau starts his question by listing a series of errors surrounding the sacrament of the Eucharist, which he calls *benedictum sacramentum altaris*. The list opens with an error, inspired by Augustine's exposition of Psalm 54, according to which the host is merely a sign of the body of Christ, which heresy Peter Lombard discussed extensively in his *Sentences*.[42] The second, related one Pulkau labels the *pestilentissimus error* of one John Scotus, which Berengar *publice dogmatizavit*, that the *verum corpus* of Christ is not in the sacrament of the Eucharist, but only the material bread and wine:

> Ex hiis verbis Veritatis longe postea secundus error et pestilentissimus pullulavit, ponens quod in sacramento altaris sit solum panis materialis et vinum materiale et non verum corpus Christi quod traxit de Virgine, nec eius verus sanguis quem fundit in cruce realiter et vere secundum substantiam, sed quod solum corpus et sanguis Christi sit ibi in substantia panis et vini ut in sacramento et signo. Nunc errorem primo incidit Johannes Scotus, non ille doctor Scotus qui Subtilis vocari solet, sed alius illius nominis eo longe prior, quem sequendo Berangarius ipsum renovavit et publice dogmatizavit cum suis *sequacibus, quorum novissimus fuit Johanes Bikleff* heresiarcha recentissimus. Cuius tertius articulorum anno Domini 1380 ab archiepiscopo Cantuarensi et 8 episcopis et 30 magistris Londoniis dampnatorum erat ille: Christus non est in sacramento altaris identice et vere et realiter in propria persona corporali. Hii asserere presumpserunt substantiam panis non converti in corpus Christi nec vinum in sanguinem, sed Christum dixisse significantem: Hoc est corpus meum, sicut dixit Apostolus: Petra autem erat Christus, I Cor. 10, acsi dicens: 'Hoc demonstratum', scilicet panis, 'est significatum vel figura corporis mei'. Huius erroris occasionem secundum Magistrum d. 10 quarti sumpserunt, ut predixi, ex verbis Veritatis quibus instruxit 12 secum remanentes dicens: Spiritus est qui vivificat etc., quasi dicens, secundum beatum Augustinum Super Ps. 54 prellegato: 'Spiritualiter intelligite que locutus sum'.
>
> (Long afterwards, from these words of the Truth there sprouted a second and extremely pernicious error that posited that in the sacrament of the altar there is only material bread and material wine and not the true body of Christ that he received from the Virgin, nor his true blood that he shed on the cross really and truly according to the substance, but rather that the body and blood of Christ are only there in the substance of the bread and wine as in a sacrament and a sign. Now the first to fall into this error was John Scotus, not that doctor Scotus who is

[42] Petrus Lombardus, *Sententiae in IV Libris*, IV, dist. 10, cap. 1, pp. 290–04.

accustomed to be called Subtle, but another of that name well before him. Following him, Berangar revived [this error] and publicly pronounced it as dogma along with his followers. The newest of them was John Wyclif, the most recent heresiarch. Of his articles that were damned by the Archbishop of Canterbury and eight bishops and thirty masters in London in the year of the Lord 1380, the third one was this: Christ is not in the sacrament of the altar identically and truly and really in his own bodily person. They dared to assert that the substance of the bread is not converted into the body of Christ nor the wine into the blood, but rather that Christ said, 'This is my body' intending, just as the Apostle said, 'The rock was Christ' in I Corinthians 10, as if so say, 'This thing pointed to', namely the bread, 'is a significate or a figure of my body'. Following the Master in distinction 10 of the fourth book, as I said above, they took the pretext for this error from the words of the Truth with which he instructed the twelve remaining with him, saying 'It is the spirit that brings to life' etc., as if to say, according to the blessed Augustine on Psalm 54 cited above, 'Understand spiritually the things that I have said'.)[43]

This passage contains the only refererence to John Wyclif in Pulkau's entire *Vespera*, which suggests that in 1410 in Vienna Wyclif was not the focus of the reaction to the remanence doctrine. According to Pulkau, this is an old doctrine originating with John Scotus – whom Pulkau feels he has to distinguish from John Duns Scotus for the reader.[44] Among Eriugena's followers ranks the latest heresiarch Wyclif, a modern theologian whose errors are said to have been condemned in 1380. In expanding on his presentation of the error, Pulkau writes as if he has no direct access to Wyclif's text, instead discussing the doctrine of remanence in terms of an old theological controversy with many references to Peter Lombard's Distinctions 10-11 from Book IV and merely linking Wyclif to Eriugena's teaching.

After mentioning the third error concerning the sacrament of the Eucharist, damned at the Council of Ephesus and labelled here a *scelleratissima heresis*,[45] Pulkau comes to the fourth

[43] Peter Pulkau, *Questio in vespera*, art. 1, Vienna, ÖNB, MS 4300, fol. 10^{v} (emphasis mine). Since this is a simple transcription and not a critical edition, I give only select variants. Sankt Paul, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 245/4 reads thus: Scotus] scolasticus || Londoniis] *exp*. These variants may suggest further confusion about Wyclif.

[44] The remark concerning the distinction between John Scotus Eriugena and John Duns Scotus seems to reflect a common confusion toward the end of the fourteenth century, since we find a similar note in Jean Gerson when he mentions Eriugena as a follower of the Amalrician heresy of c. 1200: 'Et autem iste Johannes Scotus non ille de Ordine Minorum sed alter qui transtulit libros Dionysii de graeco in latinum longe ante ipsum'. Cf. Gerson, *De concordia metaphysica cum logica*, p. 638. I am grateful to Irene Caiazzo alerting me to the passage from Gerson.

[45] Peter Pulkau, *Questio in vespera*, art. 1, Vienna, ÖNB, MS 4300, fol. 11^{r}: 'Tertius error fuit quorumdam hereticorum qui ad quasdam difficultates circa hoc sacramentum evadendum in tantam vesaniam prorumperunt ut dicerent quod caro filii hominis, quam oportet manducare ad consequendum vitam eternam iuxta promissionem Christi, non esset caro Christi de Virgine sumpta, sed quod semper in ecclesia inveniretur aliquis talis sanctus homo per plenitudinem gratiarum et virtutum ad tantam dignitatem profectus quod illius caro vel corpus verbo Dei coniungeretur, et sic manducata daret vitam eternam a Christo promissaram. Sed hec heresis scelleratissima dampnata est in Ephesina Synoda 150 episcoporum, presidente auctoritate Romane ecclesie Cyrillo Alexandrino, qui canones eiusdem concilii dictavit et eiusdem synodi nomine epistolariter eosdem per totam ecclesiam

and final error, to which he devotes a paragraph in introducing Stanislav to the scene.[46] In order to combat errors 2, 3 and 4 and to demonstrate the heretical character of these theological positions, Pulkau presents in the second article of his *Vespera* the same list of theological authorities that is found in Pirchenwart's *Sentences*. The only difference is the conclusion of the two Viennese theologians, where Pirchenwart focuses only on Stanislav's doctrine while Pulkau employs the list to respond to three errors. The passages in the *Vespera* of Pulkau and in the *Sentences* of Pirchenwart thus reveal a difference in attitude.[47] While Pulkau tends to be more general against the eucharistic errors, Pirckenwart aims his attacks strictly at Stanislav, to whom he refers explicitly many times (*magister nomine Schanyslaus de Bohemia*, *predictus doctor*, *prenominatus doctor*, *per illum magistrum sit periculose resumptus et inutiliter palliatus*, *per Stanislaum doctorem Pragensem resumpti*, *addit magister Stanislaus*), whereas Pulkau has only one reference (*sine tamen eius assertione magister Stanislaus in tractatu quem Prage de presenti conscripsit materia*). The same remark also applies to copy-paste passages: Pirchenwart's question abounds in verbatim quotations from Stanislav, so he surely had not only Pulkau's text but also Stanislav's on his desk, but so far in Pulkau's *Vespera* I have found only a few quotations from Augustine shared also by Stanislav's text. This is not sufficient to conclude that Pulkau took them from Stanislav, since Augustine quotations can be very common and could have come to Pulkau from a third source.[48] Moreover, when Pulkau includes

---

transmisit scribens contra eumdem in hec verba sic: « ad misticas benedictiones accedimus et sanctificamur participes sancti corporis et pretiosi sanguinis Christi omnium nostrum redemptoris effecti, non communem carnem percipientes – quod absit – nec ut viri sanctificati et verbo coniuncti secundum dignitatis unionem, aut sicut divinam possidentis habitationem, sed vere vivificatricem et ipsius Verbi propriam carnem factam », ut allegat Engelbertus abbas Addmontensis tractatu secundo, capitulo 11, ex antiquis canonibus'. For a reference to the text of the Council of Ephesus, see *Collectio Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis (5BAV 1341), Synodus Ephesina*, *preface Canon.*

[46] Peter Pulkau, *Questio in vespera*, art. 1, Vienna, ÖNB, MS 4300, fol. 12^{r-v}: 'Quartus error et novissimus est quorumdam modernorum quem cum suis apparentiis et motivis sub protestatione recitat sine tamen eius assertione Magister Stanislaus in tractatu quem Prage de presenti conscripsit materia, dicens quod tenendum est panem et vinum post consecrationem non solum sacramentum sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Ihesu Christi esse et in veritate sensualiter frangi manibus, sacramentum tractari et fidelium dentibus atteri'.

[47] We can compare here the answers of the both masters: Peter of Pulkau, *Questio in vespera*, art. 2, Vienna, ÖNB, MS 4300, fol. 15^{v}: 'Ex hiis patet falsitas secundi, tertii et quarti errorum'. And Peter of Pirchenwart, *IV Sent.*, dist. 10, art. 3, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120, fol. 54^{rb}: 'Ex hiis omnibus patet falsitas periculosi erroris antiqui nuper per Stanislaum doctorem Pragensem resumpti dicentis in Eukaristia facta consecratione panem et vinum substantialiter manere, cuius oppositum verum est et sufficienter ab Ecclesia determinatum'.

[48] Here is Stanislaus's reference to Augustine that is shared by Pulkau: Stanislaus of Znojmo, *De corpore Christi*, Prague, MS G VI 26, fol. 45^{r}: 'videntur expresse sonare quod ibi sit panis et quod accidentia non sint sine subiecto, sicut specialiter *sanctus Augustinus in libro quodam Soliloquiorum*, qui per modum dialogi scriptus est, dicit de accidentibus in hec verba: "Illud vero quod interrogasti, quis concesserit aut cui posse fieri videatur ut illud quod est in subiecto maneat ipso intereunte subiecto? Monstruosum enim et a veritate alienissimum ut illud quod non esset nisi in ipso esset, etiam cum ipsum non fuerit, possit esse." *Et in libro Retractationum*, ubi non fuit immemor sacramenti altaris et conversionis panis in corpus Christi, ubi etiam sex dicta in precedenti libro Soliloquiorum modicum minus caute moderat et exponit et rectificat et septimum dictum retractat, nullam penitus facit mentionem de verbis iam allegatis'. This reference can be found in Peter of Pulkau, *Questio in vespera*, art. 2, Vienna, ÖNB, MS 4300, fol. 14^{r}: 'expresse videntur sonare quod ibi sit panis et non stent accidencia sine subiecto. Et specialiter

Stanislav in his list of heretical figures he does not seem to copy from Stanislav's text, and in his commentary, Pulkau ignores all of Stanislav's ecclesiastical subtleties and critiques, to which Pirchenwart reacts promptly.

Indeed, it is not even clear whether Pirchenwart even knew that someone other than Stanislav had recently defended the same ideas, since Stanislav never mentions Wyclif by name, and in Pulkau's text, there is only the one passing reference to Wyclif mentioned above. The table from Appendix 3[49] may betray the connection between Wyclif and Pirchenwart via Stanislav.

By affirming that Stanislav is the one who revives the old error, it seems that Pirchenwart was of the opinion that Stanislav was alone in resurrecting it. Are Pulkau and Pirchenwart actually ignorant of the fact that Stanislav was preceded by Wyclif? Or do the two Viennese theologians simply hold their tongue about Wyclif, since he was a condemned author in Vienna (as evidenced in the trial of Jerome of Prague), and moreover, as mentioned above, a general abhorrence of conflict characterized Vienna? Should we advance the idea that, just after the Schism, Wyclif's concept of transubstantiation was not known in Vienna, and that he was solely perceived as a modern *sequax* of an ancient heresy? Did Wyclif's eucharistic teaching enter the local theological milieu via Pirchenwart, viewed through Stanislav's glasses? Yet the oldest known extant manuscript of Wyclif from Vienna containing his *De Eucharistia* dates to 1410, and the next copy is from 1418,[50] but they were written in Bohemia where they had been kept until the mid-sixteenth century. Why, then, did a theologian such as Pirchenwart, who had the ambition of producing an exhaustive set of questions on the *Sentences*, fail to note that Stanislav's doctrine was not just the reincarnation of an error discussed in Lombard, but the reiteration of a more current view? And why did those who wrote on the *Sentences* at Vienna before Pirchenwart remain quiet about the theory of remanence? Pirchenwart's attitude may then reflect a relative ignorance of Wyclif in Vienna between 1410 and 1418. If we take into consideration that Hus was officially condemned in Constance in 1415, it is interesting to note the silence of Viennese theologians on this topic before 1418 and how this attitude changed after 1420, as has been demonstrated recently by Christina Traxler. [51]

---

beatus Augustinus in quodam libro Soliloquiorum per modum dialogi scripto dicens in hec verba: "Illud vero quod interrogasti, qui concesserat aut cui fieri posse videatur ut illud quod est in subiecto maneat ipso intereunte subiecto? Monstruosum enim et a veritate alienissimum est ut illud quod non esset nisi in ipso esset, etiam cum ipsum non fuerit, possit esse." *Et in libro Retractationum,* ubi non immemor conversionis panis in corpus Christi, sex eiusdem libri modicum minus caute posita rectificans et septimum retractans, nullam facit mentionem de verbis iam allegatis'(emphasis mine).

[49] See pp. XXXX.

[50] Wyclif, *Trialogus*, trans. by Lahey, 'Introduction', p. 29.

[51] Traxler, '*Firmiter Velitis Resistere'. Die Auseinandersetzung der Wiener Universitat mit dem Hussitismus.*

In contrast, Berengar of Tours, who, according to Pulkau, *renovavit et publice dogmatizavit* the error of Eriugena, was well known in Vienna for his deviation on the Eucharist. Indeed, Wyclif himself considered the defense of Berengar against accusations of heresy to be key to vindicating his own position on remanence.[52] Berengar's heresy had consisted in part in a denial of substantial change, claiming instead that it is absurd to hold that the substance of the bread and the wine does not remain after consecration. In other words, Berengar held a remanence theory. In 1059 he was forced to recant and to take what is known as the *confessio Berangarii*, the famous confession of faith taken before Pope Nicholas II. Even this forced confession caused later commentators difficulty, however, because it did not reject remanence explicitly and stated that after the consecration there is not only a sacrament but also the true body of Christ, which the priests and faithful truly break and chew when they break and chew the host, a concept Berengar abhorred.[53]

Peter Lombard mentions the episode in his Distinction 12 of Book IV, arguing that the breaking and chewing should apply to the sacrament and not to the true body of Christ. In the gloss on Gratian's *Decretum*, Bartholomew of Brescia (†1258) agreed that only the *species* of the bread are broken and chewed, not the body of Christ, further asserting that during the sacrament the substance of the bread and the wine does not really remain, but only their appearance or accidents (see text below). Eventually, this became an issue on which theologians commented extensively and to which Wyclif, like Stanislav, paid particular attention. According to Stanislav, who closely follows Wyclif, the Glossator is wrong. In fact, Wyclif and thus Stanislav consider the gloss to be heretical, since in the literal sense (*de virtute sermonis*), if only the accidents of the bread remained, then these accidents would be at once a sacrament and the real body of Christ, and so the body of Christ would be both his body and a sign of his body.[54]

---

[52] See the interpretation of Bakker, *La Raison et le miracle: les doctrines eucharistiques,* pp. 282–84.

[53] This episode is well summarized by Rosier-Catach: 'Si Béranger reste dans la mémoire officielle de l'Eglise catholique comme le héraut d'une thèse « hérétique », selon laquelle le pain et le vin subsistent après la conversion eucharistique, le corps du Christ étant présent comme un signifié dans un signe, son influence sur la théologie sacramentaire fut marquante et durable, à double titre. D'une part, pour justifier sa position, Béranger introduisit un dossier de citations d'Augustin sur le signe, pour permettre la redéfinition du sacrement en tant que tel. D'autre part, toujours dans le même but, il inaugura un mode de réflexion logico-linguistique sur les formules sacramentelles: il chercha, à partir de l'analyse de certains énoncés, à l'aide de la grammaire et de la dialectique, à prouver une thèse théologique'. Rosier-Catach, *La parole efficace*, p. 36; see also the entire first chapter, pp. 35–98. On Berengar, see Häring, 'Berengar's Definitions of *Sacramentum*', pp. 109–46; Van den Eynde, 'Les définitions des sacrements pendant la première période', pp. 182–228; Macy, 'Berengar's Legacy as Heresiarch', pp. 47–67; Hankey, '*Magis … Pro nostra Sententia*', pp. 213–45.

[54] Wyclif, *De Eucharistia,* ed. by Loserth, c. 7, p. 225, ll. 7-29.

Pirchenwart responds that Bartholomew's interpretation is actually correct and agrees when *Bartholomeus glosator* urges that everyone *iuxta illum intellectum sane intelligat verba Berengarii* (see the text in Appendix 2C). Accepting Bartholomew's explanation that the accidents of the bread are just a representation or an appearance of the bread, one can avoid the charge of heresy, since it is wrong to believe that during transubstantiation the *corpus Christi realiter dividiretur.* After Pirchenwart has finished the presentation of Bartholomew's position, he introduces a more modern authority, James of Eltville, a Cistercian who read the *Sentences* at Paris in 1369-70,[55] thus revealing his source for this section of text. Unlike with Stanislav, Pirchenwart does not provide any further information about Eltville beyond his name, which suggests that Pirchenwart's public was well acquainted with Eltville's authority. The frequent references to the Cistercian Eltville within the Vienna Group commentary on the *Sentences* support this hypothesis. I can also add the example of Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 3546 containing the *quaestiones* on the *Sentences* of the Carmelite Arnold of Seehausen (1404-05), the *socius* with whom Pulkau debated as bachelor during his *principia*,[56] who incorporated at the beginning of his Book IV the entirety of the six questions of Eltville's own Book IV. So there is no doubt that Eltville's text circulated and was read and commented on in Vienna.[57]

In fact, however, the passage that Pirchenwart takes from Eltville was already borrowed by the Cistercian from the Augustinian Thomas of Strasbourg (*Sent.* IV, dist. 12, quaest. 2, art. 3), from lectures delivered at Paris c. 1334-35, complete with the remark that it is a wonder that Pope Nicholas II and so many bishops in attendance accepted such a confession without further clarification. This example is one of the many parallel passages between Strasbourg and Eltville that Paul Bakker has found in this context,[58] but whereas the two Parisian theologians merely express their bewilderment, Pirchenwart adds a possible explanation and stresses that Berengar's confession should not be understood literally (*non oportet verba sue confessionis tam stricte intelligi*) as we can read in the table of Appendix 2C.[59]

---

[55] The latest volume in the series *Studia Sententiarum* is a collection of papers dedicated to this German Cistercian educated in Paris. See *The Cistercian James of Eltville (†1393). Author in Paris and Authority in Vienna*, ed. by Brinzei and Schabel.

[56] The *Vespera* of Pulkau also contains a marginal note where we find this testimony, fol. 17^{r}: 'ut diffuse probavi in primo meo principio contra magistrum meum Arnoldum'. This shows that Pulkau was debating on the remanence topic in his *principia*. More generally on *principia* in Vienna, see Zahnd, 'Disputing without *socii',* (forthcoming).

[57] See Brinzei and Curut, 'From Author to Authority: The Legacy of James of Eltville in Vienna', pp. 421–22.

[58] Bakker and Schabel, '*Sentences* Commentaries of the Later Fourteenth Century', esp. p. 455; Bakker, *La Raison et le miracle: les doctrines eucharistiques*, pp. 73–82.

[59] See p. XXX

From a parallel reading of the texts in Appendix 2C, we can deduce that Pirchenwart seems to be unaware of Thomas of Strasbourg's role in the story.[60] The Viennese theologian is thus confronting Stanislav, who is actually repeating Wyclif's statement on Berengar's confession, with James of Eltville, who is also just repeating Thomas of Strasbourg's solution on this matter. This example shows the on-going debate surrounding Berengar's confession and the perpetuation of the two positions (*pro* and *contra*) inspired by him. At the same time, since Thomas of Strasbourg wrote a few decades before Wyclif, this provides a broader perspective on the context in which Wyclif and Stanislav referred to Berengar's confession. Wyclif and Stanislav non only defended Berengar's initial statement and his denial of the substantial change of the bread and wine during consecration, but they also confronted a long tradition of theologians reading the *Sentences*, who rejected Berengar's first position, as we saw through the examples of Thomas of Strasbourg, James of Eltville and Peter of Pirchenwart. Thus Wyclif and Stanislav were not merely reviving an ancient 'heresy', but also battling a long history of scholastic interpretation.

Conclusion

Quaestiones from lectures on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard at the medieval universities constitute our main evidence for instruction in faculties of theology, an often unexplored source for unexpected information. In this study I have aimed to illustrate how a micro-lecture of a few unedited texts can provide a more detailed picture of the reception of Wycliffism at the University of Vienna. Peter of Pirchenwart's exhaustive set of questions on Book IV of the *Sentences*, from lectures delivered at Vienna in 1417-19, reveal the critical context of their composition just after the Great Schism and in the aftermath of the condemnation of Jan Hus at the Council of Constance on 6 July 1415.[61] Even in his own day, Pirchenwart's text was probably already recognized as an important work in this genre, which would help explain why the luxurious manuscript BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120, analysed in this paper, was commissioned for Pope Nicholas V's private library. Could it also be that the pope was motivated to seek a copy of Pirchenwart's *Sentences* because the Viennese theologian denounced as heretical the position on the Eucharist of Stanislav of Znojmo, Jan Hus's

[60] We can see from the table of quotations that Pirchenwart quoted the Augustinian theologian in other contexts, but there are no references to Thomas in this question of Pirchenwart.
[61] See Bakker, 'Réalisme et remanence. La doctrine eucharistique de Jean Wyclif', pp. 87–112, esp. pp. 87–9.

professor?[62] At the University of Vienna, Pirchenwart seems to have been a pioneer in adopting a firm stance against Stanislav's doctrine of the remanence of the substance of the bread and wine in the sacrament of the altar and against Stanislav's sarcastic attitude toward the Church. Pirchenwart expends much energy in devoting more than ten columns of his distinction 10 of Book IV of his *Sentences* to combatting Stanislav's dangerous position and to refuting the Czech master's sharp critiques.

Inspired by his master Peter of Pulkau, who 'beautifully, lucidly, and clearly uproots and tears out this error', Pirchenwart attacks the heretical core of Stanislav's position without linking the Prague theologian to John Wyclif, but rather opposing Stanislav with Peter Lombard's much earlier work. Comparing Wyclif's, Stanislav's and Pirchenwart's texts, it appears that Stanislav summarized Wyclif while Pirchenwart had before his eyes just Pulkau's *Vespera* and Stanislav's writing. Pirchenwart quotes from the first three of the nine chapters of Stanislav's treatise defending Wyclif's position, and it is possible that Pirchenwart was ignorant of the link between Stanislav and Wyclif on the remanence doctrine. This ignorance may be related to a general tendency at the University of Vienna, since we cannot find any other traces of reaction to Wyclif. Nikolaus of Dinkelsbühl, a major figure preceding Pirchenwart, is another example of the lack of reaction to Wyclif's doctrine at Vienna, although Dinkelsbühl seemed to be more sensitive to Hussitism.[63] In contrast to Vienna, the University of Prague had close connections to Oxford, with exchanges between students from Prague and Oxford taking place already in the fourteenth century.[64] Perhaps Wyclif's texts were not as accessible in Vienna as in Prague, making it more likely that remanence theory in Vienna was still attached to Stanislav's name in the late 1410s, a hypothesis reinforced by another copy of Pulkau's *Vespera*, attributed to a later theologian, Paul Wann.

While there is doubt about Pirchenwart's knowledge of Wyclif, there is no doubt that BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120 and Pirchenwart's *quaestiones* on the *Sentences* provide evidence for the reception of Wyclif's doctrine in the Faculty of Theology at Vienna just after the Schism. The evidence so far shows that Stanislav's *De corpore Christi* provoked a reaction to the doctrine of remanence, probably marking one of the first stages of the entrance of Wyclif's Eucharistic teaching into the Viennese theological debates.

[62] Another copy of this commentary, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1119, was in Nicholas V's collection, but this rather modest and small codex lacks the entire debate between Pirchenwart and Stanislaus.
[63] See footnote 17 above.
[64] Šmahel, 'Wyclif's fortune in Hussite Bohemia', p. 472. Similar conclusions were arrived at by Trapp, 'Clm 27034: Unchristened Nominalism and Wycliffite Realism at Prague in 1381', p. 320.

Appendices

This section contains three appendices. Appendix 1 provides a list of authoritative quotations in Book IV of Pirchenwart's *Sentences* commentary, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120, presented in parallel with the authorities quoted in the first version of Book IV of Dinkelsbühl's *Sentences* commentary, Klosterneuburg, Stifsbibliothek, MS 301.

The second appendix with three sets of tables (Appendix 2A, 2B, 2C) supplies some textual evidence on which I base my argument concerning the connections between the authors discussed in the paper. Appendix 3 offers a parallel between article 2 of Pulkau's *Vespera* and distinction 10, article 3, of Book IV of Pirchenwart's *Sentences* commentary, which philologically speaking is an additional witness to Pulkau's text, showing that Pirchenwart must have had Pulkau's text before his eyes.

Appendix 1

University Theologian	Peter of Pirchenwart, IV *Sentences* BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1121	Nikolaus of Dinkelsbühl, IV *Sentences* Klosterneuburg, MS 301
John Duns Scotus, OFM	221	193
Thomas Aquinas, OP	197	128
Bonaventure, OFM	145	97
Durand of Saint-Pourçain, OP	116	59
Thomas of Strasbourg, OESA	25	7
Adam Wodeham, OFM	19	3
Richard of Mediavilla, OFM	14	16
Landolfo Caracciolo, OFM	10	5
Albertus Magnus, OP	6	1
Stanislav of Znojmo	**5**	**0**
James of Eltville, OCist	5	2
Henry of Langenstein	5	5
Robert Holcot, OP	4	4
John Baconthorpe, OCarm	3	0
Peter of Palude, OP	3	6

Peter of Tarentaise, OP	3	0
John Klenkok, OESA	3	0
Peter Auriol, OFM	2	3
Thomas Bradwardine	2	2
Alexander of Hales, OFM	2	2
Richard FitzRalph	2	1
William of Auxerre	1	1
Gottschalk of Nepomuk, OCist	1	1
Godfrey of Fontaines	1	1
Hugolino of Orvieto, OESA	1	1
Richard Barbe (Magister)	1	1
Theodoric of Hammelburg	1	1
Paul of Perugia, OCarm	1	0
Peter of Candia, OFM	1	0
Scotellus, OFM	1	0
Francis of Meyronnes, OFM	1	0
William of Ockham, OFM	1	0
Gerhardus Germani	1	0
Nicole Oresme	1	0
Magister Marius	1	0
Peter of Pulkau	1	0

Appendix 2A

Wyclif, *De eucharistia,* c. 5, p. 125 and c. 9, pp. 315-16	Stanislav of Znojmo, *De corpore Christi*, Prague, NK, MS G. VI 26, fols 48^{v}-49^{r}	Peter of Pirchenwart, *Sent. IV*, dist. 10, art. 3, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120, fol. 53^{va-b}
Et ex istis credo diffinicionem Urbani nostri cum suis episcopis tenere antiquam fidem Romane ecclesie, licet Robertus cum suis teneat ficticiam Avinone de transsubstanciacione; nec videtur alter eorum dignus in	Et *si Ecclesia legit et cantat hoc solum sequens et acceptans opinionem sanctorum et famosorum doctorum in hac materia*, et cum *Ecclesia in acceptatione et secucione opinionum potest fallere et*	Ulterius dicit prenominatus doctor quod *si Ecclesia legit et canit* quod 'accidentia stent sine subiecto' quemadmodum facit in festo corporis Christi, quod *hoc solum* facit *sequens et acceptans opinionem sanctorum et famosorum doctorum in hac*

papam recipi, nisi declarare sciverit istam fidem, cum docere fidem katholicam sit precipuum illorum officium. […] ideo sicut docemur in practica noscere istam fallaciam: Robertus Gibbonensis asserit sic cum suo clero, ergo verum; et secta sua tanta probabilitate negat consequenciam istam: Urbanus noster cum suis cardinalibus sic determinat, ergo verum.	*falli, non videtur quod* ex hoc solo sit *illud katholice credendum*. Quot enim episcopi cum Petro de Luna, prelates, prelati spirituales ecclesie, religiosi et sacerdotes, doctores, magistri, et scolares, reges, duces, comites, barones, milites et reliqui de vulgo tenent et dicunt summum pontificem esse apud Petrum de Luna et fuisse apud Robertum Genonensem, et nos illud dictum credimus non esse verum! Similiter nec illi credunt tenendum edictum de nostra parte esse verum! Et cum hoc sacramentum corporis Christi sit nimis alti misterii, quomodo non a sapientibus et prudentibus absconditum, qui forte plus sensui humano quam divine inspirationi voluerunt inniti! Si tamen Ecclesia tenet hoc ex inspiratione Dei, quod non remaneat panis et quod accidentia stant sine subiecto, tunc utique est katholicum.	*materia*. Et dicit consequenter quod *Ecclesia in acceptatione et secutione opinionum potest fallere et falli.* Quare sibi *videtur quod istud non sit katholice credendum*. Et indubie multum mirandum est de scripto istius doctoris. Si enim Ecclesia *sequens et acceptans opinionem sanctorum et famosorum doctorum in acceptatione et secucione talium potest fallere et falli* ut sibi videtur. […] /fol. 53^{vb}/ […] Et merito respondere habet quod sic, cum ipse non sit sanctus vel saltem non habetur pro tali nec aliquo modo ita famosus est sicut illi quorum opinionem Ecclesia in hoc acceptavit et sequitur; ymmo dico quod in hoc isti qui suam opinionem sequuntur et acceptant periculose fallunt et falluntur. Nec meretur dici opinio, sed est error antiquus et sufficienter per Ecclesiam reprobatus, ut satis patet ex dictis, licet iam per illum magistrum sit periculose resumptus et inutiliter palliatus. Unde puto quod suus tractatulus quo ad plura puncta sit erroneus et periculosus. Teneri ergo debet pro firmo illud quod supra dictum est, scilicet quod panis non manet in Eukaristia nec annihilatur, sed convertitur in corpus Christi, ut patet per Magistrum in littera

		allegantem ad hoc beatum Ambrosium manifeste ad hoc loquentem.

Appendix 2B

Wyclif, *De eucharistia*, c. 5, p. 126, l. 11-23	Stanislav of Znoymo, *De corpore Christi*, Prague, NK, MS G VI 26, fols 46^{v}-47^{r}	Peter of Pirchenwart, *Sent. IV*, dist. 10, art. 3, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120, fol. 54^{vb}
Secundo confirmatur ex evangelio Apostoli I, Cor. X, 14, 16, 17, ubi primo precipit: *Fugite et ab ydolorum cultura*. Et adiungit: *Calix benediccionis cui benedicimus nonne communicacio sanguinis Christi est? et panis quem frangimus nonne participacio corporis Domini est? quoniam unus panis et unum corpus multi sumus*; ubi manifeste patet quod loquitur de pane et vino materialibus, que post benediccionem sunt hoc sacramentum; et iterum manifestum est quod hic utitur predicacione tropica et non ydemptica, dum intelligit panem et vinum figurare unionem ecclesie cum Christo qui est res huius sacramenti.	Et videtur nimis difficile vel quasi inpossibile efficaciter defendere quod non remaneat panis post consecracionem in altari, cum Apostolus dictat I Cor. 10: *Panis quem frangimus, participatio corporis domini est.* Et non est facile defendere quod ibi per panem Apostolus intelligat accidentia, cum eciam ibi dicat: *Calix benediccionis, cui benedicimus, nonne communicacio sanguinis Christi est?* Ubi videtur quod per calicem non possit ibi intelligi vas vel accidencia vini vel sanguinis Christi in se, sed ipsum vinum in calice. Nam benedicciones, quibus Christus principaliter et post eum sacerdotes ministri Ecclesie instrumentaliter accepto pane et calice verbis benedicunt eis dicentes *hoc est corpus meum, hic est sanguis meus*, ille, inquam,	Sed contra hanc solutionem arguit Sthanislaus prenominatus dicens quod 'videatur nimis difficile vel quasi impossibile efficaciter defendere quod non remaneat panis in sacramento altaris, cum dicat Apostolus I Cor. 10: *Panis quem frangimus nonne participatio corporis Domini est?*' Et subdit: 'Nec est facile defendere quod per panem intelligat accidentia, cum etiam ibi dicat: *Calix benedictionis cui benedicimus nonne communicatio sanguinis Christi est?* Ubi per calicem non videtur posse intelligi vas vel accidentia vini vel sanguinis Christi, sed ipsum vinum, cum benedictiones Christi et sacramentum de quibus loquitur non sint nisi consecrationes transubstantive que non

	benedicciones nonnisi consecraciones, sanctificationes et transsubstanciaciones passive non vasi, non sanguini Christi nec accidentibus, sed pani et vino conveniunt, cum illa sola transsubstancientur in corpus et sanguinem Christi.	conveniunt vasi nec sanguini Christi nec accidentibus, sed solum pani et vino qui transubstantiantur in corpus et sanguinem Christi'.

Appendix 2C

Thomas of Strasbourg, *Sent. IV*, dist. 12, quest. 2, art. 3, ed. Venice 1564, fol. 103[rb]	James of Eltville, *Sent. IV*, quest. 4, Cambrai, BM, MS 570, fol. 238[vb]	Peter of Pirchenwart, *In IV Sent*., dist. 10, art. 3, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120, fol. 54[vb]
Ad primum respondeo cum Bartholomaeo Brixiensi in apparatu super illo verbo *frangi* quod ly 'frangi' et 'atteri' non debet referri ad corpus Christi, sed solum ad species sacramenti. Quod probat Bartholomaeus ibidem per auctoritatem Augustini iam inductam. Et idem Apparator hortatur quemlibet legentem ut iuxta istum intellectum sane intelligat verba Berengarii ne incidat in maiorem errorem ac heresim quam ipse Berengarius [fuit], quia revera valde enormis error esset credere quod corpus Christi realiter divideretur. Et ideo saepius miratus sum quod papa Nicolaus cum tot episcopis umquam acceptaverunt istam	Et eandem solutionem ponit Bartholomeus in apparatu suo super verbo *frangi* sic quod li 'frangi' et 'atteri' non debent referri ad corpus Christi, sed solum ad species sacramenti. Et probat hoc auctoritate beati Augustini, et ponitur *De consecratione*, d. 2. [...] Idem etiam Bartholomeus ibidem hortatur quemlibet legentem ut iuxta illum intellectum sane intelligat verba Berengarii ne incidat in maiorem heresim quam ipse Berengarius, quia sine dubio enormis esset error credere quod	Et eandem solutionem ponit Bartholomeus in apparatu suo super verbo *frangi* dicens quod li 'frangi' et 'atteri' non debent referri ad corpus Christi, sed solum ad species sacramenti. Et probat hoc auctoritate Augustini, et ponitur *De consecratione*, d. 2. [...] Idem etiam Bartholomeus glosator *Decreti* hortatur quemlibet legentem ut iuxta illum intellectum sane intelligat verba Berengarii ne incidat in maiorem heresim quam ipse Berengarius, quia sine dubio enormis esset error credere quod corpus Christi realiter divideretur. Et ideo bene mirandum est, ut dicit Iacobus de Altavilla, quod papa Nicolaus cum centum et 12 episcopis istam confessionem Berengarii recepit sine maiori declaratione veritatis. Sed forte Ecclesia confessionem eius sub planis verbis, apertis, et captabilibus ab omnibus recepit propter infamiam sui

confessionem sine lucidiori declaratione veritatis.	corpus Christi realiter divideretur. Et ideo bene admirandum est quod papa Nicholaus cum centum 12 episcopis istam confessionem recipit sine maiori declaratione veritatis.	erroris quam apud omnes publice incurrererat, ut apparet omnibus ipsum hoc revocasse quod dixerat verum corpus Christi non esse in altari neque sumi, sed solum panem. Quare non oportet verba sue confessionis tam stricte intelligi ut sonant in superficie, quia hoc esset in maioris heresim ruere, ut pretactum est.

Appendix 3

Peter of Pulkau, *Questio in Vesperis*, art. 2, Vienna, ÖNB, MS 4300, fol. 15^{r-v}; Sankt Paul im Lavanttal, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 245/4, fol. 216^{r-v}	Peter of Pirchenwart, *IV Sent.*, dist. 10, art. 3, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1120, fols 53^{v}-54^{rb}
Item <auctoritate> beati Augustini in libro *Sententiarum Prosperi* dicentis: 'Nos autem in specie panis et vini quam videmus, res invisibiles, id est carnem et sanguinem, honoramus, nec similiter pendimus has duas species sicut ante consecrationem pendebamus, cum fideliter fateamur ante consecrationem panem esse et vinum quod natura formavit, post consecrationem vero carnem et sanguinem Christi, quod benedictio consecravit.' Idem, *De verbis Domini*, sermone 2: 'Dixi', inquid, 'vobis quod, ante verba Christi, quod offertur panis dicatur, sed cum verba Christi deprompta fuerint iam non panis dicitur, sed corpus Christi appellatur'.- Item <auctoritate> beati Gregorii in omelia paschali dicentis: 'Species et similitudo illarum rerum vocabula sunt, que ante fuerunt,	Item ad hoc est Augustinus in libro *Sententiarum Prosperi* dicentis: 'Nos autem in specie panis et vini quam videmus, res invisibiles, id est carnem et sanguinem, honoramus, nec similiter pendimus has duas species sicut ante consecrationem pendebamus, cum fideliter fateamur ante consecrationem panem esse et vinum quod natura formavit, post consecrationem vero carnem et sanguinem Christi, quod benedictio consecravit.' Idem, *De verbis Domini*, sermone 2: 'Dixi', inquid, 'vobis quod, ante verba Christi, quod offertur panis dicatur, sed cum verba Christi deprompta fuerint, iam non panis dicitur, sed corpus Christi appellatur'. Item beatus Gregorius in omelia paschali dicit: 'Species et similitudo illarum rerum vocabula sunt, que ante fuerunt, scilicet panis et vini'. Et habetur *De consecratione*, dist. 2.

scilicet panis et vini'. Et habetur *De consecratione*, dist. 2. Item beatus Bernhardus in quodam sermone *De corpore Christi* dicit: 'Hostia quam iam vides iam non est panis et vinum, sed caro et sanguis eius qui pependit in cruce pro mundi vita'. [P 216v] Item beatus Anselhmus in tractatu *De corpore Christi* dicit: 'Cum ad benedictiones misticas operante invisibiliter verbo divino corpus in corpus, substantia in substantiam sit mutata, sicut in mensa nuptiali aqua in vinum mutata, solum affuit vinum in quod mutata est aqua, sic in mensa altaris solum adest corpus Domini in quod vere mutatus est panis.' Et infra subdit: 'De aqua nichil remansit in mutatione illa, de pane vero mutato ad peragendum sacri institutum misterii sola remanet species visibilis.' Et infra: 'In misteriis,' inquit,' vera est dominici corporis substantia absque visibili specie sua et est vera species visibilis panis, sed absque sua substantia'. Item <auctoritate> venerabilis Hugonis 2 *De sacramentis* parte 8va dicentis: 'Quemadmodum species illic cernitur cuius res vel substantia ibi esse non creditur, sic res ibi veraciter et substantialiter presens creditur cuius species non cernitur. Videtur enim species panis et vini et substantia panis et vini non creditur'. Et infra cap. 9: 'Per verba sanctificationis vera panis et vera vini substantia in verum corpus et sanguinem Christi convertitur, sola specie panis et vini remanente et substantia in substantiam transeunte. Conversio enim ipsa non secundum unionem sed secundum transitionem credenda est'.	Item beatus Bernhardus in quodam sermone *De corpore Christi* [54ra] dicit: 'Hostia quam iam vides iam non est panis et vinum, sed caro et sanguis eius qui pependit in cruce pro mundi vita'. Item Beatus Anselmus in tractatu *De corpore Christi* dicit: 'Cum ad benedictiones misticas operante invisibiliter verbo divino corpus in corpus, substantia in substantiam sit mutata, sicut in mensa nuptiali aqua in vinum mutata, solum affuit vinum in quod mutata est aqua, sic in mensa altaris solum adest corpus Domini in quod vere panis est mutatus.' Et infra subdit: 'De aqua nichil remansit in mutatione illa, de pane vero mutato ad peragendum sacri institutum misterii solum remanet species visibilis panis, sed absque sua substantia'. Item venerabilis Hugo 2 *De sacramentis* parte octava dicit: 'Quemadmodum species illic cernitur cuius res vel substantia ibi esse non creditur, sic res ibi veraciter et substantialiter presens creditur cuius species non cernitur. Videtur enim species panis et vini et substantia panis et vini non creditur'. Et infra cap. 9: 'Per verba sanctificationis vera panis et vera vini substantia in verum corpus et sanguinem Christi convertitur, sola specie panis et vini remanente et substantia in substantiam transeunte. Conversio enim ipsa non secundum unionem sed secundum transitionem credenda est'.

Item Innocentius *De officio misse* super illo verbo canonis: f*regit* etc., expresse dicit quod 'substantia panis transit, sed accidentia remanent.'	Item Innocentius *De officio misse* super isto verbo canonis: *fregit* etc., expresse dicit quod substantia panis transit, sed accidentia remanent.
Harum auctoritatum plures aperte sonant substantiam panis non manere, alie vero substantiam panis transire. Transire autem desitionem denotat, iuxta sententiam Hugonis ultimo inductam.	Harum auctoritatum plures aperte sonant substantiam panis non manere, alie vero substantiam panis transire. Transire autem desicionem denotat, iuxta sententiam Hugonis ultimo inductam.
Item communiter sancti doctores, ymmo decreta conciliorum, utuntur hiis verbis 'species panis et vini,' astruentes [W 15v] katholice existentiam corporis et sanguinis Christi in hoc sacramento dicendo sub speciebus panis et vini ea veraciter contineri, et non sic utuntur hiis verbis 'panis et vinum' nisi rarissime attribuendo vocabula specierum substantiis prius eis affectis, iuxta verba beati Gregorii preallegata. Sed utique convenientius et congruentius dicerent sub pane et vino illas res sacramenti contineri. Igitur per hunc modum loquendi manifeste sententiant propositum.	Item communiter doctores sancti, ymmo decreta conciliorum, utuntur hiis verbis 'species panis et vini,' astruentes katholice existentiam corporis et sanguinis Christi in hoc sacramento dicendo sub speciebus panis et vini ea veraciter contineri, et non sic utuntur hiis verbis 'panis et vinum' nisi rarissime attribuendo vocabula specierum substantiis prius eis affectis. Iuxta verba beati Gregorii preallegata. Sed utique congruentius et convenientius dicerent sub pane et vino istas res sacramenti contineri. Igitur per hunc modum loquendi manifeste sententiant propositum.
Item eadem secunda pars conclusionis probatur ex alio, nam Christus ante consecrationem corporis et sanguinis sui dixit: *'Non bibam de generatione vitis donec regnum Dei veniat'*; et post consecrationem sumpsit suum sanguinem; igitur non mansit ibi substantia vini, et per consequens nec substantia panis, neque hodie manet a simili. Consequentia nota et maior patet per textum evangelii Luc. 22 dicentem: *'Desiderio desideravi hoc pascha manducare vobiscum antequam patiar. Dico enim vobis, quia ex hoc non manducabo illud donec impleatur in regno Dei'. Et accepto calice gratias egit, et dixit: 'Accipite, dividite inter vos. Dico enim vobis quod non bibam de generatione vitis donec*	Item idem probatur ex alio, nam Christus ante consecrationem corporis et sanguinis sui dixit: 'Non bibam de generatione vitis donec regnum Dei veniat;' et post consecrationem sumpsit suum sanguinem; igitur non mansit ibi substantia vini, et per consequens nec substantia panis, neque hodie manet a simili. Consequentia nota et maior patet per textum ewangelii Luc. 22 dicentem: *'Desiderio desideravi hoc pascha manducare vobiscum antequam paciar. Dico enim vobis, quia ex hoc non manducabo illud donec impleatur in regno Dei'. [V 54rb] Et accepto calice gratias egit, et dixit: 'Accipite, dividite inter vos. Dico enim vobis quod non bibam de generatione vitis, donec regnum Dei*

regnum Dei veniat'.'. Qui calix, secundum Bedam, ad vetus pascha pertinet, et sequitur de novo: *Et accepto pane gracias egit, et fregit, et dedit eis dicens: 'Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem'. Similiter et calicem, postquam cenavit, dicens: 'Hic est calix novum testamentum in meo sanguine, qui pro vobis effundetur'.* Minor probatur, quia hoc expresse habetur in *Glosa* super illud Ruth 3: *Cumque comedisset et bibisset*, dicente quod Christus commedit et bibit in cena cum corporis et sanguis sui sacramentum discipulis tradidit. *Unde quia pueri communicaverunt carni et sanguini et ipse participavit eisdem*. Idem plane videtur velle Ysidorus *Super Leviticum*, scilicet quod Christus seipsum sumpserit per hoc quod ewangeliste dicunt: Accepit, dedit discipulis suis. Et beatus Ieronimus ad Elbidiam dicens: 'Dominus Ihesus, ipse convina et convinium ipse comedens et qui comeditur.' Et hoc rationabiliter ut aliis exemplum manducandi daret, sicut et baptizatus est quando baptismi sui in se condidit sacramentum, quia in omnibus primatum tenens se docuit esse principium, *De consecratione*, dist. 4, 'Proprie in morte'. Ideo Sanctus Thomas pro illo allegat hec metra vulgata: 'Rex sedet in cena, cinctus turba duodena: se tenet in manibus, se cibat ipse cibus'. Ex hiis patet falsitas secundi, tertii et quarti erroris.	*veniat'.* Qui calix, secundum Bedam, ad vetus pascha pertinet, et sequitur de novo: *Et accepto pane gracias egit, et fregit, et dedit eis dicens: 'Hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis tradetur. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem.' Similiter et calicem, postquam cenavit, dicens: 'Hic est calix novum testamentum in meo sanguine, qui pro vobis effundetur.'* Minor probatur, quia hoc expresse habetur in *Glosa* super illud Ruth 3: *Cumque comedisset et bibisset*, dicente quod Christus comedit et bibit in cena cum corporis et sanguis sui sacramentum discipulis tradidit. *Unde quia pueri communicaverunt carni et sanguini et ipse participavit eisdem*. Item plane videtur velle Esicius *Super Leviticum*, scilicet quod Christus seipsum sumpserit per hoc quod ewangeliste dicunt: Accepit, dedit discipulis suis. Et beatus Ieronimus ad Elbidiam dicens: 'Dominus Ihesus Christus, <ipse> convina et convinium ipse comedens et qui comeditur.' Et hoc rationabiliter ut aliis exemplum manducandi daret, sicut et baptizatus est quando baptismi sui in se condidit sacramentum, quia in omnibus primatum tenens se docuit esse principium, *De consecratione*, dist. 4, 'Proprie in morte'. Ideo Sanctus Thomas pro illo allegat hec metra vulgata: 'Rex sedet in cena, cinctus turba duodena: se tenet in manibus, secibat ipse cibus'. Ex hiis omnibus patet falsitas periculosi erroris antiqui nuper per Stanislaum doctorem pragensem resumpti dicentis in Eukaristia facta consecratione panem et vinum substantialiter manere cuius oppositum verum est et sufficienter ab Ecclesia determinatum, prout cuilibet Christiano sufficere debet, ut liquet ex predictis.

Bibliography:

Manuscripts:

Besançon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 198
Göttweig, Klosterbibliothek, MS 261 (272)
Klosterneuburg, Stifsbibliothek, MS 47
—, MS 301
—, MS 340
Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 570
Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. lat. 1119
—, MS Vat. lat. 1120
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 3546
Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, MS G. VI 26
Sankt Paul im Lavanttal, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 245/4
Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, MS I 91
Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS 4300
—, MS 4308
—, MS 4315
—, MS 4483
—, MS 4509
—, MS 4515
—, MS 4736
Vienna, Schottenstift, MS 269
—, MS 351

Primary Sources:

Bibliothèque du Vatican au XVe siècle d'après des documents inédits. Contribution pour servir à l'histoire de l'humanisme, ed. by Eugène Müntz, Paul Fabre (Paris: E. Thorin, 1887)

Collectio Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis (5 BAV 1341), Synodus Ephesina, *preface Canon.* <http://ccl.rch.uky.edu/node/10454> [accessed 24 July 2019]

Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus vitam, doctrinam, causam in Constantiensi concilio actam et controversias de religione in Bohemia annis 1403-1418 motas illustrantia quae partim adhuc inedita, partim mendose vulgata, nunc ex ipsis fontibus hausta, ed. by Franciscus Palacky, (Prague: Fridericus Tempsky, 1869)

Hugh of St Victor, *De sacramentis christianae fidei,* ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, CLXXVI (Paris: Garnier, 1880), cols 173-618

Jean Gerson, 'De concordia metaphysica cum logica', in *Œuvres Complètes,* vol. IX: *L'œuvre Doctrinale (423-491),* ed. by Palemon Glorieux (Paris: Declées&Cie, 1973), n° 466, pp. 632–42

John Wyclif, *De eucharistia tractatus maior. Accedit tractatus De eucharistia et poenitentia sive de confessione*, ed. by Johann Loserth (London: Trübner, 1892)

—, *Trialogus*, trans. by Stephen Lahey (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Jacobus de Altavilla, *Quaestiones super Sententias*, Besançon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 198

Processus Iudiciarius contra Jeronimum de Praga habitus Viennae A. 1410-1412, ed. by Ladislav Klicman, Historický archiv, 12 (Prague: Česká akademie, 1898)

Petrus Lombardus, *Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae, Tomus II. Liber III et IV*, ed. Collegii s. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas (Rome: Grottaferrata, 1981)

Peter of Pulkau, *Questio de vespera*, Vienna, ÖNB, MS 4300, fols 10^{r}-20^{v}

Peter of Pirchenwart, *In IV librum Sententiarum*, BVA, MS Vat. lat. 1119, 1120

Thomas de Argentina, *Scriptum in IV Sententiarum* (Venice, 1564)

Secondary Works

Autenrieth, Johanne, Virgil E. Fiala, and Wolfgang Irtenkauf, *Die Handschriften der ehemaligen Hofbibliothek Stuttgart,* vol. 1,1: *Codices ascetici*(Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1968)

Bakker, Paul J. J. M., *La Raison et le miracle: les doctrines eucharistiques, c. 1250 - c. 1400: contribution à l'étude des rapports entre philosophie et théologie*, 2 vols (Nijmegen: Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, 1999)

—, 'Réalisme et remanence. La doctrine eucharistique de Jean Wyclif', in *John Wyclif Logica, Politica, Teologia*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale Milano, 12-13 febbraio 1999, ed. by M. Fumagalli Beonio Brocchieri and Stephano Simonetta (Florence: Sismel - edizioni del Galluzzo, 1999), pp. 87–112

Bakker, Paul J. J. M., and Christopher Schabel, '*Sentences* Commentaries of the Later Fourteenth Century', in *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, ed. by G. R. Evans, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 425–64

Binder, Karl, *Die Lehre des Nikolaus von Dinkelsbühl über die unbefleckte Empfängnis im Licht der Kontroverse*, Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie, 31 (Vienna: Herder, 1970)

Brînzei, Monica, and Christopher Schabel, 'The Past, Present, and Future of Late Medieval Theology: The Commentary of Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl', in *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, ed. by Philipp W. Rosemann, vol. 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), pp. 174–266

Brînzei, Monica, Russell L. Friedman, and Chris Schabel, 'The Reception of Durand's *Sentences* Commentary, with Two Case Studies: Peter Auriol (†1322) and Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl (†1433)', in *Durandus and His Sentences Commentary: Historical, Philosophical and Theological Issues*, ed. by Andreas Speer, Guy Guldentops, Thomas Jescke, and Fiorella Retucci, Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales – Bibliotheca (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), pp. 295–341

Brînzei, Monica, and Ioana Curut, 'From Author to Authority: The Legacy of James of Eltville in Vienna', in *The Cistercian James of Eltville († 1393). Author in Paris and Authority in Vienna*, ed. by Monica Brînzei and Christopher Schabel, Studia Sententiarum, 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018), pp. 419–78

Brînzei, Monica, and Christopher Schabel, 'Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the University of Vienna on the Eve of the Reformation', in *What is New in the New Universities? Learning in Central Europe in Later Middle Ages (1348-1500)*, ed. by Elzbieta Jung (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN, 2018), pp. 358–442

Calma, M. B. (see Brînzei), 'Plagium', in *Mots médiévaux offerts à Ruedi Imbach*, ed. by Inigo Atucha, Dragos Calma, Catherine König-Pralong, and Irene Zavattero, FIDEM – TEMA (Turnhout-Porto: Brepols, 2011), pp. 559–68

Courtenay, William, J., 'From Dinkelsbühl's *Questiones Communes* to the Vienna Group Commentary. The Vienna "School"', in *Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the Sentences at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth century*, ed. by Monica Brînzei, Studia Sententiarum, 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015), pp. 268–316

Eco, Umberto, 'Riflessioni sulle tecniche di citazione nel Medioevo', in *Ideologie e pratiche del reimpiego nell'alto Medievo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medievo, 46 (Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medievo, 1999), pp. 461–84

Girgensohn, Dieter, *Peter von Pulkau und die Wiedereinführung des Laienkelches. Leben und Wirken eines Wiener Theologen in der Zeit des großen Schismas*, Veröffentlichungen Des Max-Planck-Institut für Geschichte, 12 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964)

Glassner, Christine, *Papierhandschriften aus Spital am Pyhrn (Signaturenreihe: 1/4 –376/4*, <http://www.ksbm.oeaw.ac.at/stpaul/inv/mss4.htm> [accessed 29 July 2019]

Hankey, Wayne, J., '*Magis ... Pro nostra Sententia*: John Wyclif, his Medieval Predecessors and Reformed Successors, and a Pseudo-Augustinian Eucharistic Decretal', *Augustiniana*, 45 (1995), 213–45

Häring, Nicholas M., 'Berengar's Definitions of *Sacramentum* and their Influence on Medieval Sacramentology', *Medieval Studies*, 10 (1948), 109–46

Herold, Vilém, 'Jan Hus - A Heretic, a Saint, or a Reformer?', *Communio Viatorum*, 45 (2003), 6–23

—, 'The Spiritual Background of the Czech Reformation: Precursors of Jan Hus', in *A Companion to Jan Hus*, ed. by František Šmahel and Ota Pavlíček (Leiden: Brill, 2016), pp. 69–95

Huber, Alfons, and E. J. Worstbrock, 'Paul Wann (Paulus de Kemnat, aten)', in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon,* vol. 10, ed. by Burghart Wachinger, Gundolf Keil, Kurt Ruh, Werner Schröder, and Franz J. Worstbrock (Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), cols 711–22

Lahey, Stephen, 'Stanislaus of Znojmo and Prague Realism: First Principles of Theological Reasoning'. Paper presented at 'Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice' Conference, Prague 2014

–, ‘Stanislaus of Znojmo and the Ecclesiological Implications of Wyclif’s Divine Ideas’, in *Before and After Wyclif*, ed. by Luigi Campi and Stefano Simonetta (Milan, forthcoming)

Lamy, Marielle, *L’immaculée conception: étapes et enjeux d’une controverse au Moyen Age (XIIe-XVe siècles)* (Paris: Institut d’Etudes Augustiniennes, 2000)

–, ‘Berengar’s legacy as heresiarch’, in *Auctoritas und Ratio, Studien zu Berengar von Tours*, ed. by Peter Ganz, R.B.C. Huygens, and Friedrich Niewöhner (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1990), pp. 47–67

Manfredi, Antonio, ‘I codici latini di Niccolò V. Edizione degli inventari e identificazione dei manoscritti’, in *Studi e documenti sulla formazione della Biblioteca apostolica vaticana*, vol. 1, Studi e testi, 359 (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1994)

Nuchelmans, Gabriel, ‘Stanislaus of Znaim (d. 1414) On Truth and Falsity’, in *Medieval Semantics and Metaphysics*, ed. by Edbert P. Bos, Artistarium Supplementa, 2 (Nijmegen: Ingenium Publishers, 1985), pp. 314–41

Pasut, Francesca, ‘Per la miniatura a Roma alla metà del Quattrocento: il “Miniatore di Niccolà V”’, in *Niccolo V nel sesto centenario della nascita. Atti del Convegno internazionale, Sarzana 8-10 ott. 1998*, ed. by Franco Bonatti, Antonio Manfredi (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2000), pp. 103–55

—, ‘Libri, miniatori e artisti alle originii della Vaticana: tra Niccolò V e Sisto IV’, in *Le origini della Biblioteca Vatica tra umanesimo e Rinascimento (1447-1534)*, ed. by Antonio Manfredi (Vatican City: Storia della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2010), pp. 416–65

Pelzer, Auguste, *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codices manu scripti recensiti. Codices Vaticani Latini 679-1134* (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1931)

Rosier-Catach, Irène, *La parole efficace. Signe, rituel, sacré* (Paris: Vrin, 2004)

Sedlák, Jan, *Eucharistické traktáty Stanislava ze Znojma* (Brno, 1906)

—, ‘Mgri Stanislai de Znoyma *Tractatus primus de Eucharistia’*, in *Miscellanea husitica Ioannis Sedlák* (Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1996), pp. 100–20

Schabel, Christopher, and Monica Brînzei, eds, *The Cistercian James of Eltville († 1393). Author in Paris and Authority in Vienna*, Studia Sententiarum, 3 (Brepols: Turnhout, 2018)

Shank, Michael, H., *'Unless You Believe, You Shall Not Understand'. Logic, University, and Society in Late Medieval Vienna*, Princeton Legacy Library (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988)

—, 'University and Church in Late Medieval Vienna: *Modi Dicendi et Operandi*, 1388-1421', in *Philosophy and Learning. Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Maarten J. F. M. Hoenen, J. H. Josef Schneider, andGeorg Wieland, Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, 6 (Leiden – New York – Köln: Brill, 1995), pp. 43–59

Šmahel, František, "Wyclif's Fortune in Hussite Bohemia", in František Šmahel, *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter. Charles University in the Middle Ages*, Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, 28 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 467–89

Sousedík, Stanislav, 'Stanislaus von Znaim († 1414). Eine Lebensskizze', *Medievalia Philosophica Polonorum* 17 (1973), 37–56

–, 'Huss et la doctrine eucharistique "rémanentiste"', *Divinitas*, 21 (1977), 383–407

Spunar, Pavel, *Repertorium auctorum Bohemorum provectum idearum post Universitatem Pragensem conditam illustrans*, Studia Copernicana, 25 (Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk, Łódź: Institutum Ossolinianum – Officina Editoria Academiae Scientiarum Polonae, 1985)

Stegmüller, Frederich, *Repertorium commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, vol. 1 (Würzburg: Schöningh, 1947)

Sturlese, Lorris, *Dokumente und Forschungen zu Leben und Werk Dietrichs von Freiberg* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1984), pp. 78–82

Traxler, Christina, '*Firmiter Velitis Resistere'. Die Auseinandersetzung der Wiener Universitat mit dem Hussitismus vom Konstanzer Konzil (1414-1418) bis zum Beginn des Basel Konzils (1431-1449)* (V&R Unipress, 2019)

Trapp, Damasus, 'Clm 27034: Unchristened Nominalism and Wycliffite Realism at Prague in 1381', *Recherche de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 24 (1957), 320–60

Van den Eynde, Damien, ‘Les définitions des sacrements pendant la première période de la théologie scolastique (1050-1235)’, *Antonianum*, 24/1 (1949), 182–228

Zahnd, Ueli, ‘Plagiats individualisés et stratégies de singularisation. L’évolution du livre IV du commentaire commun des *Sentences* de Vienne’, in *Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the Sentences at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth century*, ed. by Monica Brînzei, Studia Sententiarum, 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015), pp. 85–265

—, ‘Disputing without *socii.* The *Principium* on Book IV of Conrad of Rothenburg, Vienna 1408/09’, in *The Rise of a New Genre of Scholasticism: Principia on the Sentences in the Fourteenth Century* ed. by Monica Brînzei and William Duba, Studia Sententiarum 6 (Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming)

Walsh, Katherine, ‘Von Wegestreit zur Häresie: Zur Auseinandersetzung um die Lehre John Wyclifs in Wien und Prag an der Wende zum 15. Jahrhundert’, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 94 (1986), 25–47