

Ota Pavlíček

The Czech Academy of Sciences,
Institute of Philosophy, Prague

JAN HUS AS A PHILOSOPHER:
THE TOPIC OF UNIVERSALS IN TWO
THEOLOGICAL CONTEXTS
OF HIS *SENTENCES* COMMENTARY
(*SUPER IV SENTENTLARUM* I, DIST. 19 AND 33)

INTRODUCTION

Together with Stanislaus of Znojmo, Stephen of Pálež, Jerome of Prague and several other less well-known personalities, Jan Hus was one of a group of Bohemian nation masters at the University of Prague which was engaged intensively with parts of John Wyclif's realist philosophy from c. 1395. This reception had a broader significance as it ushered in that of some of Wyclif's theological Church reform opinions, thus contributing to important changes at the University of Prague, the birth of the Hussite movement and the development of the Bohemian Reformation. Hus holds an important place in this group not only because he became the leading figure of the reform movement, but also because it is thanks to him that we know some of the reasons for the significant reception of Wyclif's philosophy in Prague. As a young master of arts, Hus copied Wyclif's treatises *De tempore*, *De ideis*, *De materia et forma* and *De universalibus*, to which he attached enthusiastic glosses in the Czech language including notes addressed to the masters of the German university nations. We learn from these comments that in Wyclif's realism, Hus recognised a means to help the emancipation efforts of the Bohemian university nation in relation to the three non-Bohemian nations which based their doctrines on less realist philosophical traditions.¹

¹Literature on Jan Hus's life and work is abundant. For a list of monographs published before 2014, see O. PAVLÍČEK, "The Chronology of the Life and Work of Jan Hus," *A Companion to*

However, Hus's specific standpoint in the matter of universals based on his own treatises was unclear for a long time. As far as the present research on Hus's opinion regarding the character of the being of genera and species is concerned, a significant place is held by František Šmahel's study on Jan Hus and the Wyclifite conception of universals. In his polemics against Paul De Vooght, Šmahel documented that Hus's basic conception of universals is based on Wyclif's theory, whereas De Vooght thought that Hus understood universals in a similar way to Thomas Aquinas. However, given the aim of his study, Šmahel did not embark on a detailed exploration of Hus's stances on universals based on all of his available treatises.² Another study which remains important was published as early as in 1925 by Jan Kvačala, and dealt with Hus's philosophical thought while noting the importance of universals for some of Hus's opinions in the

Jan Hus, edited by F. Šmahel, O. Pavlíček, (Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, 4), Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015, p. 9–10; which should be completed at least by P. Soukup, *Jan Hus*, Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2014. For the history of Wyclif's reception in Bohemia, see F. ŠMAHEL, "Doctor evangelicus super omnes evangelistas: Wyclif's Fortune in Hussite Bohemia," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, vol. 43 (1970), p. 16–34; a newer interpretation of the beginning of reception of Wyclif's doctrines is provided by CH. SCHABEL, M. BRINZEI, M. MAGA, "A Golden Age of Theology at Prague: Prague Sentences Commentaries, ca. 1375–1385, with a Redating of the Arrival of Wycliffism in Bohemia," *Acta Universitatis Carolinae — Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis*, vol. 55 (2015), p. 19–39; and O. PAVLÍČEK, "Wyclif's Early Reception in Bohemia and His Influence on the Thought of Jerome of Prague," *Europe after Wyclif*, edited by M. Van Dussen, P. Hornbeck, New York City: Fordham University Press, 2017, p. 89–114 who mentions older literature. For Hus's glosses see J. DAŇHELKA, "Das Zeugnis des Stockholmer Autographs von Hus," *Die Welt der Slawen*, vol. 27 (1982), p. 225–233; cf. F. ŠMAHEL, *Jan Hus: Život a dílo*, Praha: Argo, 2013, p. 39–41 and 269. The glossed manuscript is extant today as MS Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, Codex Holmiensis A 164. For the life and work of the other mentioned Bohemian masters, see P. SPUNAR, *Repertorium auctorum Bohemorum provec-tum idearum post Universitatem Pragensem conditam illustrans*, vol. 1, Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1985, p. 286–304 and 326–340. For Stephen of Pálec in particular with references to newer literature on their thought, see O. PAVLÍČEK, "Stephen of Pálec's *Quaestio de esse aeterno*. A study and critical edition," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*, vol. 84 (2017), p. 349–378. For Jerome of Prague, see F. ŠMAHEL, *Život a dílo Jeronýma Pražského: Zpráva o výzkumu*, Praha: Argo, 2010, and the multiauthored collection of essays *Jeroným Pražský: Středověký intelektuál, mučedník české reformace a brdina národní tradice*, edited by O. Pavlíček, Praha: Filosofia, 2018. In English, see T. FUDGE, *Jerome of Prague and the Foundations of the Hussite Movement*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

² See F. ŠMAHEL, "Jan Hus a viklefské pojetí universálií," *Acta Universitatis Carolinae — Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis*, vol. 21/2 (1981), p. 49–68; IDEM, "Hus und Wyclif: Opinio media de universalibus in re," in: IDEM, *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter/The Charles University in the Middle Ages. Gessamelte Aufsätze/Selected Studies*, Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2007, p. 515–525; and P. DE VOOGHT, *L'Hérésie de Jean Huss*. vol. 2, ed. 2, Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1975, p. 877–894.

field of philosophical theology.³ Zénon Kaluza links to this type of research in his erudite article on one of Hus's *quaestiones*, in which he shows that Hus was a proponent of Wyclif's theory of the creation of universals, that he understood universals as an object of faith, and that his stand was also influenced by Stanislaus of Znojmo.⁴ Besides summarising the existing research on Hus and universals, and basing my work on published but understudied sources, I have shown Hus's universals in the contexts of his doctrine on Divine ideas, the theory of creation, the created world and his comparison of God and a universal.⁵

The present study begins with a summary of our knowledge regarding Hus's commentaries on Aristotle and a presentation of those of Hus's other treatises which are the most relevant for the topic of universals. As we will see, a significant source for understanding Hus's universals, a topic which is fundamentally philosophical, is to be found in his theological works. I will then show what we learn on Hus's universals from two theological contexts of his commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*.⁶ A methodological aspect of his work should also emerge: the manner in which he composed the philosophical topic of universals existing in the created world in the theological context of his commentary, and the sources of his textual bricolage.

I. HUS'S WRITINGS AND THE TOPIC OF UNIVERSALS

We would have been most likely to see how Hus dealt with the topic of universals in his commentaries on Aristotle's logical and philosophical treatises. Hus prepared these writings for the purpose of his lectures at the Faculty of Arts of the University of Prague, where he was able to teach after his bachelor

³J. KVAČALA, "Wiklef a Hus ako filosofi," *Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk. Třída filosoficko-historicko-filologická*, Praha: Král. čes. spol. nauk, 1925, p. 1–91.

⁴Z. KALUZA, "La création des universaux selon Jean Hus. A propos de la question *Utrum omne testimonium fidei*," *Septuaginta Paulo Spunar oblata (70+2)*, edited by J.K. Kroupa, Praha: KLP, 2000, p. 367–375. This study is available also in a Czech translation: Z. KALUZA, "Stvoření univerzálií podle Jana Husa (Ke kvestii *Utrum omne testimonium fidei*)," translated by J. Žůrková, O. Pavlíček, *Filosofický časopis*, vol. 63/6 (2015), p. 893–905.

⁵O. PAVLÍČEK, "Filosoficko-teologické základy myšlení Jana Husa: Univerzálie a některá s nimi spojená témata," *Filosofický časopis*, vol. 63/6 (2015), p. 859–892.

⁶In another context, I dealt with these topics already in two studies published in Czech parts of which I use for the present article. See O. PAVLÍČEK, "Filosoficko-teologické základy myšlení Jana Husa;" and IDEM, "Husův komentář k Sentencím Petra Lombardského: nalezení filosofické a teologické střední cesty," *Via Media. Studie z českých náboženských a intelektuálních dějin*, edited by P. Hlaváček, Praha: Filosofia, 2016, p. 21–27.

graduation in 1393.⁷ In 1396 he obtained the grade of master of arts, and after two further years of lecturing became a regular master. Since he was the graduating officer in 1412 for the last time, he could have taught at the Faculty of Arts for fifteen to eighteen years.⁸ Manuscripts containing Hus's commentaries on Aristotle have yet to be found, however, and we know of them mainly thanks to the old university catalogues.⁹ The information that follows is intended to facilitate the possible future identification of one of Hus's commentaries.¹⁰

First and foremost, we should mention Hus's commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* in the form of glosses, which was lost sometime after it was catalogued by Bohuslav Balbín in the 17th century. According to Balbín, one of Hus's disciples added the following to the end of the book: "Signaturas in marginibus hujusce libri fecit M. Ioannes Hus, praedicator Veritatis Jesu Christi, Domini nostri Salvatoris mundi, qui pro nobis voluit mori."¹¹

Another work which might be significant for an understanding of Hus's theory of universals is his treatise *Super veteri arte*. According to František Šmahel, in the Prague context this collection usually included commentaries and *quaestiones* related to Porphyry's *Isagoge*, Aristotle's *Categories* and *On Interpretation*, Ps.-Gilbert de la Porrée's *Book of Six Principles* and Boethius's *On Division*.¹² Besides the title "Hus super veteri arte" and the signature M 57 from the catalogue of the Rečec college (*Collegium sanctissimae virginis Mariae domus nationis Bohemicae*), we know that at a certain place in the manuscript there are the catchwords "solum sunt in intellectu".¹³

A continuous entry in the library of the Bohemian nation college catalogue about Hus's glosses on Aristotle's treatises *On the Soul* and *On Generation* under

⁷ *Monumenta Historica Universitatis Carolo-Ferdinandae Pragensis*, vol. 1/1: *Liber decanorum facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Pragensis*, Pragae: Joan. Nep. Gerzabek, 1830 (=MUPR 1/1), p. 286.

⁸ Hus's pedagogical activities at the university were resumed by F.M. BARTOŠ, "Hus jako student a profesor Karlovy university," *Acta Universitatis Carolinae — Philosophica et Historica*, vol. 2 (1958), p. 9–26.

⁹ For the dating of the old catalogues and more information on their fate and significance, see *Catalogi librorum vetustissimi universitatis pragensis*, edited by Z. Silagiová, F. Šmahel, (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 271), Turnhout: Brepols, 2015, p. vii–lxxv.

¹⁰ For Hus's commentaries on Aristotle including an evaluation of their estimated modest importance, cf. F. ŠMAHEL, *Jan Hus: Život a dílo*, p. 43; and IDEM, "Jan Hus a viklefské pojetí universálií," p. 52–53.

¹¹ *Bobuslai Balbini Bohemia docta*, vol. 3, edited by K.R. Ungar, Praga: characteribus haeredum Rosenmuller per Mathiam Glatz factorem, 1780, p. 124. The entry was found by F.M. BARTOŠ, "Ze spisovatelkých počátků Husových," *Věstník České akademie věd a umění*, vol. 52 (1943), p. 29.

¹² F. ŠMAHEL, *Jan Hus: Život a dílo*, p. 239, note 56.

¹³ *Catalogi librorum vetustissimi universitatis pragensis*, p. 46. The catchwords were pointed out by F. ŠMAHEL, *Jan Hus: Život a dílo*, p. 43. According to the information provided by Dr. Zuzana Silagiová, at least some of the catchwords were present at the seventh folio.

the signature A 39 indicates that the two commentaries were bound together.¹⁴ A similar indication relates to Hus's *quaestiones* on Aristotle's *Physics*, which were available in the Reček college under the signature G 12. The commentary was likely bound with Stanislaus of Znojmo's commentary on Aristotle's treatise *On the Soul* and *Puncta* by Matthias of Knín, who is mentioned in the entry under his nickname "Pater." The catchwords in this case were "talium, que non cadunt." However, even if these works are not definitely lost, they might have been separated by rebinding. The catchwords are not known in the case of Hus's commentary on the *Physics* which was registered in the same catalogue under the signature G 16. It is unclear if this commentary is the same as the one mentioned above.¹⁵

Finally, F. M. Bartoš identified one of these *Physics* commentaries with a commentary on Albert of Orulamünde's compendium *Summa naturalium*. It therefore seemed that at least one of Hus's commentaries was extant in MS Praha, Národní knihovna ČR, X F 28. However, according to Šmahel, the identification of this work with Hus's commentary on the *Physics* is out of the question for formal reasons. Šmahel's argument does not, however, rule out that the commentary is a real work of Hus's, as there are far from negligible textual similarities with Hus's authentic works.¹⁶

The inaccessibility of Hus's commentaries on Aristotle does not mean, however, that there is no source allowing the examination of his philosophical opinions. The topic of universals is present in Hus's extant *quaestiones*, especially in *Quaestio de testimonio fidei christianae* (UOTF), *Quaestio de effectu indesinibili* (UPEP), *Quaestio de materia prima* (UMPN), *Quaestio de optima dispositione universi* (UAPE) and in the *quaestiones* and other parts of his *Sentences* commentary prepared in c. 1407–1409.¹⁷

¹⁴ *Catalogi librorum vetustissimi universitatis pragensis*, p. 136.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 39.

¹⁶ On the similarities, see F.M. BARTOŠ, "Ze spisovatelských počátků Husových," p. 29–34. For the polemics with Bartoš, see F. ŠMAHEL, "Jan Hus a viklefské pojetí universálií," s. 53. For a comparison with Hus's works, see M. CEDLOVÁ, "K Husovu autorství výkladu Summy Naturalium Alberta Velikého," *Husův sborník*, edited by R. Řičan, M. Flegl, Praha: Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1966, p. 35–41. Cedlová leaned to Bartoš's opinion according to which the commentary is Hus's work.

¹⁷ Hus's *quaestiones* were published in *Magistri Iohannis Hus Questiones*, edited by J. Kejř, (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 205), Turnhout: Brepols 2004. Hus's *quaestio* UAPE, the *quaestio principalis* from the 1411 quodlibetal disputation, was published together with an extensive preparation of the quodlibetal disputation for the second time thanks to Dr. Gabriel Silagi: *Magistri Iohannis Hus Quodlibet*, edited by B. Ryba, ed. 2, (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 211), Turnhout: Brepols, 2006, p. 8–27. For a completion of the text in the form of a polemics with the *quaestio*'s conclusions, see p. 27–48. For an introduction to the Prague quodlibetal disputations, see J. KEJŘ, *Kvodlibetní disputace na pražské universitě*,

Studying Hus's thought in these writings reveals that the topic of universals is connected with all three levels of being of things about the existence of which Hus was persuaded, i.e. with the ideal being in God's mind; the potential being of all creatable things in secondary causes or prime matter; and with the being of things in proper existence in the created world. It is already clear from the titles that part of the aforementioned *quaestiones* has a theological dimension, and the topic of universals also appears there in theological contexts. Zénon Kaluza has pointed out that this is the case of *quaestio* UOTF, in which Hus states that the testimony of Christian faith supports the existence of universals.¹⁸ There cannot be much doubt that Hus's *Sentences* commentary also presents the theological context of his reasoning. In consequence, however, we have to admit that a reconstruction of Hus's position in the matter of universals often depends on those of his theological writings which overlap with philosophy. In these writings, Hus could not, or did not want to, treat in detail the topics he had previously dealt with at the Faculty of Arts. On the one hand, this presents an obstacle to any analysis of Hus's universals, as we may understand his position in too simplified a manner. On the other hand, we may see an important part of Hus's method, i.e. how he rooted his philosophical opinions in theological contexts.

II. HUS'S UNIVERSALS IN THEOLOGICAL CONTEXTS

a) *Sentences Commentary, Book I, Distinction 33: Universals and the Divine Properties*

The topic of universals became a part of one of Hus's public appearances at the Council of Constance. At one point, Pierre d'Ailly, who led the interrogation, took a note which was delivered to him the day before and, on that basis, asked if Hus held the existence of universals *a parte rei*, i.e. really present in singulars. Hus replied positively and started to enumerate authorities in support of this position, including Anselm of Canterbury. D'Ailly, however, inferred that Hus also held the heretical doctrine of Eucharistic remanence.¹⁹ The instruction

Praha: Universita Karlova, 1971; and F. ŠMAHEL, "Písemné záznamy kvodlibetních disputací na pražské univerzitě do roku 1420," in: IDEM, *Alma mater Pragensis*, Praha: Karolinum, 2016, p. 326–348. The *Sentences* commentary was published as IOHANNES HUS, *Super IV Sententiarum*, edited by V. Flajšhans, M. Komínková, (Spisy M. Jana Husi, 4–6), Praha: Nákladem Jaroslava Bursíka, 1904–1906. The four capital letters (the first letters of the first four words of the title) in brackets represent an older custom of referring to the Bohemical *quaestiones*.

¹⁸Z. KALUZA, "La création des universaux selon Jean Hus," p. 367–375.

¹⁹*Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, edited by F. Novotný, vol. 8, Praha: Nadání Františka Palackého, 1932, p. 75–76.

according to which d'Ailly asked his question was based on John Wyclif's doctrine of remanence, which in some of his later works he did indeed connect to philosophical realism.²⁰ Hus, however, denied such a consequence, and as shown by Stanislav Soušedík, did not hold the same Eucharistic doctrine as Wyclif.²¹ What, however, was Hus's understanding of universals?

The basic point of Hus's realism is his conviction that universals and the entities subordinated to universals (for example the genus of animal, the species of man, and the individual Socrates) are essentially identical.²² At the same time, genera and species are at the same places as the subordinated entities²³, as they are communicated to particulars.²⁴ Thus, universals are really present in singulars. In Hus's view, singular humans are the species of man by participating in this species, thus having a common specific nature which is a part of their essence, although for example Socrates and Plato are two numerically distinct singular essences.²⁵ As far as the difference between universals and singulars is concerned, universals differ from singulars in their non-accidental components. Seen from another perspective, it is a difference of formal components belonging to the essence of a singular. The prerequisite for such a distinction is therefore the essential identity of the formal components, and this distinction corresponds for Hus to a formal distinction. The concept of formal distinction was also used by other Prague scholars, and by Wyclif, who was himself influenced by John Duns Scotus.²⁶

²⁰P.J.J.M. BAKKER, "Réalisme et rémanence. La doctrine eucharistique de Jean Wyclif," *John Wyclif: logica, politica, teologia*, edited by M.-T. Fumagalli Beonio Brocchieri, S. Simonetta, Firenze: SISMEL, 2003, p. 87–112.

²¹For Hus's stance on the Eucharist, see S. SOUŠEDÍK, "Huss et la doctrine eucharistique rémanentiste," *Divinitas*, vol. 21 (1977), p. 383–407; and IDEM, *Učení o eucharistii v díle M. Jana Husa*, Praha: Vyšehrad, 1998.

²²IOHANNES HUS, *Super IV Sententiarum*, I, d. 33, c. 3, p. 150, l. 13–15: "[...] universale et suum singulare sunt idem essentialiter. [...] idem sunt homo specificus et Sortes, quia eadem essentia [...]."

²³Ibidem, I, d. 37, c. 4, p. 158, l. 37–39: "[...] et sic materia prima dicitur esse ubique, quia ubicunque est materiatur. Et universalis dicitur esse ubique, quia ubi <que> sunt eorum singularia."

²⁴Ibidem, I, d. 4, c. 3, p. 57, l. 42–44: "[...] qui est species humana, que est communis humanitas communicata singulis particularibus hominibus."

²⁵Ibidem, I, d. 4, c. 6–8, p. 62, l. 27–34: "[...] Sortes et Plato ponunt in numerum, i.e. sunt distincte essencie. [...] plures homines singulares sunt unus homo communis participacione, i.e. conveniencia speciei, [...] et tres homines sunt una natura specifica, que non ponit in numerum cum tribus hominibus, cum sit essentia illorum trium hominum."

²⁶Ibidem, I, d. 24, c. 4, p. 130, l. 31–36: "[...] aliqua vero distinguntur proprietatibus non accidentalibus et rationibus formalibus, ut universale et eius singulare, ut homo et Sortes — et exinde causatur numerus non essentialium distinctarum, sed rationum et proprietatum formalium, secundum quas quodammodo ponunt in numerum." For the concept of formal distinction

Concerning the formal components of singulars' essence, the quiddity of each thing comprises a genus and a species (a specific difference). This quiddity as the essence of a singular comes into actual existence thanks to a pure act actively and a pure possibility materially, i.e. on the basis of potential presence in prime matter. Hus calls this process substantial quidditative production (*productio substantialis quiditativa*).²⁷ Granted that all singular people (including future and past men) do not exist at once, Hus was persuaded that universals precede singulars in time.²⁸ He also thought that universals precede singulars by the priority of nature, which corresponds to his position according to which universals are the causes and forms of subordinated entities.²⁹

According to Hus's definition in *Quaestio de testimonio fidei christianae*, the testimony of Christian faith confirms the quidditative production of the essential component of singular substances. More precisely, Hus mentions the Biblical account of Creation from Gen 1,21–25 which tells us about the creation of all living entities in genera and species. As already mentioned by Zénon Kaluza, in this *quaestio* Hus contends that the realism of universals belongs to the ideas which every Christian must believe. By this theological standpoint, he says implicitly that scholars not supporting realism are not good believers. Explicitly, however, he says merely that only insane people can oppose his opinion on universals.³⁰

in the works of Bohemian realists, see mainly S. SOUSEDÍK, "Pojem *distinctio formalis* u českých realistů v době Husově," *Filosofický časopis*, vol. 18/6 (1970), p. 1024–1029. See also important additions to the debate by Z. KALUZA, "Le chancelier Gerson et Jérôme de Prague," in: IDEM, *Études doctrinales sur le XIV siècle: théologie, logique, philosophie*, Paris: Vrin, 2014, p. 225–227; and IDEM, "La question de Jérôme de Prague disputée a Heidelberg," in: idem, *Études doctrinales sur le XIV siècle*, p. 309–310. For a comparison of Wyclif's opinion with the thought of Duns Scotus and in general to Wyclif's realism which influenced Hus's thought, see A. CONTI, "Wyclif's Logic and Metaphysics," *A Companion to John Wyclif: Late Medieval Theologian*, edited by I.C. Levy, (Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, 4), Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2006, p. 67–125 (for the formal distinction, see p. 72–78).

²⁷ IOHANNES HUS, *Quaestio de testimonio fidei christianae*, in *Magistri Iohannis Hus Questiones*, p. 3–9. By this process, however, substances do not emerge in the sense of compounds of matter and form. For more on this, see Z. KALUZA, "La création des universaux selon Jean Hus."

²⁸ IOHANNES HUS, *Super IV Sententiarum*, I, d. 19, c. 6, p. 117, l. 10–11: "[...] species homo precedit multa sua singularia temporaliter et naturaliter."

²⁹ Cf. on that also IOHANNES HUS, *Quaestio de materia prima*, in *Magistri Iohannis Hus Questiones*, p. 161, l. 64–65: "[...] omne superius est forma sui inferioris, et non sequitur exinde, quod sit pars eius superaddita, [...]."

³⁰ See IOHANNES HUS, *Quaestio de testimonio fidei christianae*, p. 3–9. For a complete analysis of this *quaestio*, see Z. KALUZA, "La création des universaux selon Jean Hus." Kaluza shows Hus's dependence on Stanislaus of Znojmo and John Wyclif and on the basis of theirs texts he clarifies Hus's position. The Bohemian realists found the argument based on Gen 1,21–25 most probably in Wyclif's *De universalibus*. See IOHANNES WYCLIF, *Tractatus de universalibus*, c. 2, edited by I.J. Mueller, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985, p. 69, l. 381–389. Besides Hus and Stanislaus of

Understood as a whole, Hus presents his approach to the universals as a middle way between two extreme standpoints. He does so in the context of his *Sentences* commentary I, dist. 33, where he presents a compromise *opinio media* in the debate on God's properties. After an introductory summary, Hus sets a *quaestio* entitled *Utrum proprietates in divinis sint idem realiter cum essentia et personis*, and lays down preliminarily arguments for a negative solution to the question.³¹ In the following exposition, Hus mentions Gilbert de la Porrée's († 1154) position, according to which the divine properties are neither the divine Essence nor Persons, i.e. that for example Paternity is neither the Father nor the divine Essence. As we read in Hus's *Sentences* commentary, Gilbert revoked this standpoint at the Council of Rheims, which is Hus's allusion to Gilbert's Trinitarian doctrine, which Bernard of Clairvaux labelled as heretical, leading Gilbert to having to defend himself before the pope in 1147–1148.³² Partisans of the second extreme opinion presented by Hus defend the idea that divine properties are the divine Essence as well as Persons really and according to reason (*re et ratione*), i.e. that there is no difference between properties and God, as God is just the divine Essence and Persons. If someone speaks about Paternity, it is only a derived word (*abstractum pro concreto*).³³ In this way, Hus presented two contradictory standpoints which are two extreme solutions on the topic. In the first case, divine properties are absolutely different from the divine Essence and Persons, whereas in the second case, divine properties are absolutely identical with the divine Essence and Persons. According to the Czech theologian, both opinions are false, and it is necessary to choose a middle way. In Hus's view, divine properties are identical with the divine Essence and Persons and differ formally.³⁴

Znojmo, it was employed also by Jerome of Prague (*Quaestio de universalibus extra signa*, in: *Magistri Hieronymi de Praga Quaestiones, Polemica, Epistulae*, edited by F. Šmahel, G. Silagi [Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 222], Turnhout: Brepols, 2010, p. 45–46, l. 996–1010), who draws from Wyclif without any doubts, and Stephen of Pálec (*Positio reverendi magistri Stephani de Palecz de universalibus*, edited by R. Palacz, in: R. PALACZ, "La Positio de universalibus d'Étienne de Palec," *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, vol. 14 [1970], p. 129, l. 525–531).

³¹ IOHANNES HUS, *Super IV Sententiarum*, I, p. 149, l. 22–34: "Queritur hic, utrum proprietates in divinis sint idem realiter cum essentia et personis. Videtur, quod non, quia sequeretur, quod paternitas esset filiacio, et sic Pater esset Filius. Consequens falsum, ergo et questio. Consequencia probatur. Nam si paternitas est essentia divina, et filiacio est eadem essentia divina: tunc sequitur, quod filiacio est paternitas. 2º sequitur, quod Pater Deitate esset Pater [...]."

³² Ibidem, p. 149, l. 35 – p. 150, l. 2. For Gilbert's life, work and thought, see L. VALENTE, "Gilbert of Poitiers," *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy: Philosophy Between 500 and 1500*, vol. 1, edited by H. Lagerlund, Dordrecht: Springer, 2011, p. 409–417, who mentions further literature.

³³ IOHANNES HUS, *Super IV Sententiarum*, I, d. 33, p. 150, l. 2–5. For the full text of this and the following passage, see the comparison below.

³⁴ Ibidem, p. 150, l. 6–8.

Although Hus's discovery of a middle way may seem an original idea, it becomes clear in comparison with other texts that Hus found his solution elsewhere and used it for his textual bricolage.³⁵ As we can see in the following juxtaposition, he treated the topic in the same way as Thomas Aquinas. Nevertheless, St Thomas did not put an emphasis on the middle way between the two extremes:

Thomas de Aquino <i>Super Sent.</i> , lib. I, d. 33, q. 1, a. 2	Iohannes Hus <i>Super IV Sententiarum</i> , lib. I, d. 33 ³⁶
Respondeo dicendum, quod circa hoc sunt tres opiniones.	Pro questione primo sciendum est, quod
Porretani enim dixerunt, quod proprietates sunt in personis ut assistentes, et non sunt ipsae personae. Sed hoc non potest esse; quia aut proprietas aliquid est in re; et sic si non est persona in qua est, oportet ibi esse compositionem; aut nihil est in re; et sic non erit distinctio personarum secundum rem.	Porrotanus dixit, quod proprietates non sunt essentia divina, nec etiam persone; videlicet, quod paternitas nec esset Pater nec essentia divina; sicut paternitas Sortis nec est Sortes, nec species humana. Sed postea in consilio Remensi retractavit. ³⁷
Et ideo alii dicunt, sicut dixit Praepositinus, quod proprietates sunt ipsae personae secundum rem, nec distinguuntur a personis etiam secundum rationem, nec aliquo modo. Unde dixit, in divinis tantum esse essentiam et personas; et proprietates negavit. Sed cum dicitur paternitas, sumitur abstractum pro concreto; [...].	Alia opinio dixit, quod proprietates in divinis sunt essentia divina et persone, re et ratione. Unde posuit, in divinis tantum essentiam et personas, et cum diceretur paternitas, dixit, quod ponitur abstractum pro concreto.
Et ideo dicimus, quod proprietates et personae sunt idem re, sed differunt ratione, sicut et de proprietatibus et de essentia dictum est. [...]	Et quia neutra istarum opinionum vera est, ideo oportet dari medium, sicut proprietates sint essentia et persone realiter, sed differant ab essentia et personis formaliter.

³⁵ On this method, see M. BRINZEI (CALMA), "Plagium," *Mots médiévaux offerts à Ruedi Imbach*, red. I. Atucha, D. Calma, C. König-Pralong, I. Zavattono, Turnhout: Brepols, 2011, p. 559–568.

³⁶ IOHANNES HUS, *Super IV Sententiarum*, I, d. 33, p. 149, l. 35 – p. 150, l. 8.

³⁷ On the last sentence, cf. THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Super Sententiarum*, I, d. 33, q. 1, a. 1: "Respondeo dicendum, quod simpliciter confitendum est proprietates esse divinam essentiam. Error enim iste qui in *Littera* tangitur, dicitur Porretani fuisse, quem postmodum in rhemensi concilio retractavit." Hus's addition is, therefore, also based on this or a similar source.

Although Aquinas may not be Hus's direct source, the proximity of both solutions allows us to easily identify who held the *alia opinio*, the second extreme position, because the Angelic Doctor explicitly says that one of the partisans of this doctrine was a certain *Praepositinus*. He most probably refers to Gilbert Prevostin of Cremona, a theologian and Chancellor of the University of Paris (ca. 1135–1210).³⁸ We may also note that Hus's *opinio media* is not entirely identical to the third position presented by Aquinas. While St Thomas holds that divine properties and Persons on the one hand, and divine properties and Essence on the other, are really identical and they differ according to reason (*ratione*), Hus introduces a formal distinction. As we will see below, elsewhere he identifies the formal distinction with the distinction by reason, but in this particular passage he says no more on the topic. Thus it is unclear if he understood this distinction in the same way as Thomas.

In precisely this theological context, Hus turns his attention to the topic of universals, in which he sees a similar disagreement. On the one hand, as Hus says, Aristotle mentions the opinion of certain ancient philosophers who were persuaded that universals and singulars are entirely the same thing, i.e. that they do not differ from each other really or according to reason (*re et ratione*). On the other hand, there were others who thought that universals and singulars differ essentially and according to reason (*essentialiter et secundum rationem*). The Prague theologian says, however, that both of these opinions are false, and claims that similarly to the debate on God and his properties, a compromise between the two extremes is the right way. It consists in the aforementioned standpoint according to which universals and singulars are essentially identical, differing according to reason or formally. According to Hus, the universal "man" and "Socrates" are the same essence and they differ by reason (*ratio*), as the universal "man" can be predicated about many singulars whereas such a predication is impossible in the case of the singular "Socrates". Divine Essence, Father and paternity are identical in a similar way, but, having different reasons, they are different according to reason. And it is in this sense that Hus agrees with the title of the *quaestio*.³⁹

We have seen that in the presentation of the two extremes concerning universals Hus refers to Aristotle's exposition. Šmahel, however, rightly notes that Hus's position is inspired by Wyclif's treatise *De universalibus*.⁴⁰ In this writing,

³⁸ For more on him together with further literature, see M.L. COLISH, "Scholastic Theology at Paris around 1200," *Crossing Boundaries at Medieval Universities*, edited by S.E. Young, Leiden: Brill, 2011, p. 32–34.

³⁹ IOHANNES HUS, *Super IV Sententiarum*, I, d. 33, p. 150, l. 8–21. I provide the text in the comparison below.

⁴⁰ F. ŠMAHEL, *Život a dílo Jeronýma Pražského*, p. 194–197.

Wyclif also speaks about a middle way which harmonises two extreme opinions. However, Wyclif mentions as the first position the opinion of Thomas Aquinas, Gilles of Rome and many others, who claimed that each substance is singular and that it is also universal if apprehended universally by human reason. It follows for Wyclif that in this position, singulars are identical with universals. The second position consists in a real difference between universals and singulars, and Wyclif ascribes it to Walter Burley and, once again, many others. Wyclif, however, chooses the middle way. He agrees with the first position that each universal is a singular and each singular is a universal. Concerning the second position, he accepts the idea of a difference between singulars and universals, but in Wyclif this difference is only formal. Wyclif's middle way therefore corresponds to the opinion of Hus, who, as we can see in the following textual comparison of both the passages, used a different argumentation to reach the *opinio media*:

Iohannes Wyclif
*Tractatus de universalibus*⁴¹

Ut aliqui dicunt quod omnis substantia est singularis et, ut universaliter apprehenditur, est universalis [...]. Et ista sententia imponitur Sancto Thomae, Aegidio et multis aliis.

Secunda via dicit quod universale non est aliquod suorum singularium, cum communicabilitate, participatione vel praedicabilitate, prioritate naturae, insensibilitate et quotlibet aliis differentiis distinguatur ex opposito a singulari [...]. Et illius opinionis videtur fuisse Magister Walterus Burleigh et multi alii. Fundant autem se sic opinantes rationibus et auctoritatibus oppositis.

Ego autem per medium incedo concordando extrema, et concedo cum prima opinione quod omne universale est singulare et e contra, licet distinguantur formaliter ab invicem.

Iohannes Hus
*Super IV Sententiarum*⁴²

Unde sicut Aristoteles tangit opinionem antiquorum de universalibus dicens, quod quidam dixerunt, quod universale et singulare sunt penitus idem, nec re nec ratione unum differens ab altero,

quidam vero, quod differunt essentialiter et secundum rationem.

Quarum opinionum utraque est falsa, sed tertia media dicens, quod universale et suum singulare sunt idem essentialiter et differunt ratione sive formaliter. Nam idem sunt homo specificus et Sortes, quia eadem essentia, sed alia est ratio hominis

⁴¹ IOHANNES WYCLIF, *Tractatus de universalibus*, c. 4, p. 86–87, l. 40–59.

⁴² IOHANNES HUS, *Super IV Sententiarum*, I, d. 33, p. 150, l. 8–21.

specifici, quia predicabilitas de multis, alia vero ratio Sortis, quia individualitas. Sic in proposito idem sunt essentia divina, Pater et paternitas, sed alia ratio est essentiae, quia communicabilitas trium personarum, alia ratio Patris, quia distingui et generare, alia ratio paternitatis, quia distingueret. Et patet, quod questio ad istum sensum est vera.

We may conclude that while Hus's middle way in the matter of the relation of divine properties to the divine Essence and Persons finds inspiration in an opinion which is very close to Thomas Aquinas, Hus probably found the middle way in universals in Wyclif. We learn about it almost incidentally in Hus's theological commentary, which is, due to the lack of his philosophical works, one of the important sources for understanding Hus's realist position. Moreover, it is noteworthy that although Hus is probably basing on Wyclif, he introduces the authority of Aristotle into his theological writing in order to reinforce his philosophical position.⁴³

b) Sentences Commentary, Book I, Distinction 19: God as a Universal

Another theological context important for Hus's realism is his comparison of God and a universal in his *Sentences* commentary I, dist. 19.⁴⁴ This comparison is a standard topic of this distinction, in which Peter Lombard presented and tried to solve a disagreement between Augustine and John of Damascus.⁴⁵

⁴³We find Wycliffite realism understood as the middle way also in Stephen of Pálec who became acquainted with this opinion when he commented on Wyclif's *De universalibus* at the latest. See STEPHANUS DE PALEČ, *Commentarius in De universalibus Iohannis Wyclif*, edited by I. Müller, Praha: Filosofia, 2009, p. 166–171.

⁴⁴Hus's position in dist. 19 requires a basic knowledge of his theory of universals which he partly presents in dist. 33. For this reason, I decided to treat dist. 33 prior to dist. 19.

⁴⁵PETRUS LOMBARDUS, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, I, d. 19, c. 7–9, Editio Tertia, Romae: Editiones Collegii S. Bonaventurae Ad Claras Aquas, 1971, p. 165–169. On that cf. the exposition in A. MAIERÛ, "Universaux et Trinité du XII^e au XIV^e siècle," *La servante et la consolatrice. La philosophie dans ses rapports avec la théologie au Moyen-Âge*, edited by J.-L. Solère, Z. Kaluza, Paris: Vrin, 2002, p. 167–168. The theme of this *Sentences* distinction is important also from the point of view of the disagreement between Lombard and Joachim of Fiore which concerned the nature of the Godhead. It was solved in favour of Lombard by the Fourth Council of the Lateran in 1215 which also determined that between the Creator and the creature there cannot be a likeness so great that the unlikeness is not greater ("[...] inter creatorem et creaturam non potest tanta similitudo notari, quin inter eos maior sit dissimilitudo notanda [...]"). As we will see, Hus kept to this rule. Cf. the first two canons produced by the council: *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*,

According to Lombard, Augustine emphasised that the three divine Persons are the divine Essence in another way than three men are one nature, in as much as divine Essence is not genera or species and, likewise, as divine Persons are not species or singulars.⁴⁶ On the contrary, other scholars presupposed that the divine Essence is a common universal entity like a species, and that the three Persons are three singulars, i.e. three numerically distinct particulars. John of Damascus supposedly held that common entities and universals are predicated about subordinated singulars. In his view, the divine Essence is a common entity and the hypostases, i.e. Persons, are particulars which share the Essence while being different from the other Persons numerically. According to Lombard, John thought that God is a species similar to the species of man and the three divine Persons are singulars similar to Peter and Paul.⁴⁷ Lombard says in his summary that it is necessary to follow Augustine, who avoided such terminology as he was aware of the predominant difference between God and created entities. John of Damascus argued like philosophers, and transferred to God philosophical categories adequate for temporal things. According to Lombard, God is a universal only “propter similitudinem”.⁴⁸

Jan Hus expresses his opinion on the topic in his *quaestio* entitled *Utrum in divinis personis sit totum universale*, in which he also deals with some other topics of *Sentences* I, dist. 19.⁴⁹ At the beginning of the *quaestio*, in the typical presentation of the basic argumentation *pro et contra*, he says that the divine Essence is a universal, because it is one in many Persons and one about many Persons. He supports this by a (partly adjusted) well-known rule from Aristotle’s *Prior Analytics* II, 19, 100a 6–8, according to which a universal is one in many and one predicable about many. Moreover, God as a whole is universal as He shares himself to the Persons.⁵⁰ Hus raises Lombard’s arguments, based on Augustine,

vol. 1, edited by N.P. Tanner, Georgetown: Sheed & Ward, 1990, p. 230–233. Cf. F. ROBB, “The Fourth Lateran Council’s Definition of Trinitarian Orthodoxy,” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 48 (1997), p. 22–43.

⁴⁶ PETRUS LOMBARDUS, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, I, d. 19, c. 7, p. 165, l. 2 – p. 166, l. 18.

⁴⁷ Ibidem, I, d. 19, c. 9, p. 167, l. 17 – p. 168, l. 13. Understanding God as a common entity similar to a universal is already present for example in Gregory of Nyssa. See R. CROSS, “Gregory of Nyssa on Universals,” *Vigiliae Christianae*, vol. 56/4 (2002), p. 372–410. Cf. J. ZACHHUBER, “Once again: Gregory of Nyssa on Universals,” *Journal of Theological Studies*, NS, vol. 56/1 (2005), p. 74–98.

⁴⁸ PETRUS LOMBARDUS, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, I, d. 19, c. 9, p. 168, l. 14 – p. 169, l. 9.

⁴⁹ IOHANNES HUS, *Super IV Sententiarum*, I, d. 19, c. 6, p. 115–118.

⁵⁰ Ibidem, p. 115, l. 39 – p. 116, l. 3: “Utrum in divinis personis sit totum universale? Arguitur, quod sic. Nam essentia divina est universale, quia unum in multis personis et unum de multis; igitur est universale, et per consequens totum. Prima consequentia patet ex diffinitione universalis

against such a position, and provides a series of examples on the basis of which he shows why such a position is false. If the divine Essence, for example, would be a universal and each of the divine Persons a particular, it would follow that each of the Persons would add a certain reality to the divine Essence and, in consequence, would be more perfect than the Essence. Moreover, the divine Essence would be the cause of the Persons, because a universal is usually the cause of a subordinated singular. Hus, of course, opposes such a possibility.⁵¹

Next, via Lombard's *Sentences*, Hus presents John of Damascus's standpoint, according to which God is a species similar to the species of man, and the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are numerically distinct singulars similar to Peter and Paul. This position, in Hus's opinion, is only in apparent opposition to Augustine, since both Fathers agree that God's being has the ability to be common and is thus a universal substance to which all three Persons of the Trinity belong. Moreover, neither of the two Fathers claims that God's being is a species. Augustine rejects this explicitly, and the Damascene merely shows how God is similar to the species of man, i.e. that they are both common entities predicable of Persons or persons respectively.⁵² Nevertheless, according to Hus, they differ concerning the nature of divine Persons. While Augustine holds that the divine Persons do not differ essentially or, more precisely, that they are not distinct singular essences, John of Damascus asserts that the Persons are numerically different singulars that are, however, indivisible from each

ex 'Posteriorum', et 2a ex hoc, quia impossibile est esse universale, nisi sit communicabile, et per consequens totum esse sui singularis. Similiter Deus est unum in multis personis, et non ut pars, ergo ut totum."

⁵¹Ibidem, p. 116, l. 3–18: "In contrarium est magister in litera adducens Augustinum et argumenta. Et arguitur eciam sic: nulla essentia una in numero est totum universale; sed essentia divina est huiusmodi: ergo etc. Item: si essentia divina esset universale et quelibet persona esset particulare, tunc quelibet persona adderet aliquid realitatis supra essentiam, et per consequens esset quelibet perfectior, quam essentia. Consequens contra supradicta [...]. [...] si essentia esset universale ad personas, tunc esset causa personarum, sicut generaliter quodlibet universale est causa sui per se singularis. Consequens falsum, quia nec est causa materialis, ut deducit magister in argumento, nec efficiens, quia tunc quelibet persona foret facta et sic creatura, nec finalis, quia tunc essentia divina esset melior et dignior, nec formalis, quia tunc quelibet persona foret tamquam materia et essentia tamquam forma; et non est aliqua causa preter istas assignanda [...]."

⁵²Ibidem, p. 116, l. 19–32: "Hic est sciendum, quod Augustinus, ut magister eum allegat, negat divinam essentiam esse genus, similiter et speciem et personas negat esse individua. E contrario autem Johannes Damascenus in Libro de Trinitate libro 6° capitulo 3° dicit, quod Deus est species, ut homo, et Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus sunt individua sicut Petrus, Paulus; et quod numero differunt. Et licet videntur ista contradicere, non est tamen ita: uterque enim, tam Augustinus, quam Damascenus, concedunt Deum esse communicabilem et sic universalem substantiam et quamlibet personam individuum; et neuter concedit Deum esse speciem, quia Augustinus expresse negat divinam essentiam esse speciem et Damascenus dicit quodammodo habere Deum similitudinem ad speciem humanam, sc. ratione communicabilitatis et predicabilitatis de personis."

other and distinct only by a personal distinction.⁵³ Thus, as Hus writes, Augustine maintains that the divine Essence and a universal are more different than they are similar, whereas for John of Damascus it is the reverse. It should not escape our attention that Hus speaks in this context about a logical universal (*universale logicum*) which he understands as a thing of the second intention. When formulating his position, he was perhaps once again inspired by John Wyclif's opinion, influenced by Duns Scotus.⁵⁴

Before finishing the *quaestio*, Hus summarises his position in terms of the similarities and differences between God and a universal. To emphasise similarities, he draws the following three conclusions:

- 1) Universals and the divine Essence are both predicated about particular entities;
- 2) The species of man always encompasses all singular men, and similarly the divine Essence encompasses all divine Persons;
- 3) The species of man has the ability to be shared by singular men, which makes it different from singular men who do not possess this ability. It is likewise with the divine Essence and Persons.⁵⁵

⁵³Ibidem, p. 116, l. 32–38: “Et Augustinus negat esse individua (subaudi: essentialiter distincta) esse ipsas personas et sic negat eas differre numero, i.e. essentia singulari. Damascenus concedit personas esse individua, quia res singulares, a se quamlibet indivisam et a quolibet alio personaliter distinctam; et sic concedit eas differre numero, i.e. personaliter, cum altera sit persona Patris quam Filii et Spiritus Sancti.”

⁵⁴Ibidem, p. 116, l. 38–43: “Et sic Augustinus consideravit magis dissimilitudinem essencie divine quoad universale logicum, quod est genus, vel species, Damascenus vero consideravit magis similitudinem essencie divine ad universale logicum, manuducens tamquam peritus philosophus per exemplum philosophicum in cognitionem essencie divine.” Hus does not explain the term *universale logicum* any further. He probably understands it as a universal with its ability to be predicated about many and to be shared by many. Cf. A. CONTI, “Wyclif's Logic and Metaphysics,” p. 98–99; for the term *genus logicum*, see p. 104. For the division of universals into *universale metaphysicum*, *physicum* and *logicum* in Scotists and the application of *universale logicum* to the Trinity, see D. HEIDER, “The Role of Trinitarian Theology in Universals Bartolomeo Mastri da Meldola (1602–1673) and Bonaventura Belluto (1600–1676),” *Herausforderung durch Religion? Begegnungen der Philosophie mit Religionen in Mittelalter und Renaissance*, edited by G. Krieger, Würzburg: Verlag Königshausen und Neumann, 2011, p. 268–284.

⁵⁵IOHANNES HUS, *Super IV Sententiarum*, I, d. 19, c. 6, p. 116, l. 43 – p. 117, l. 7: “Nam in multis est similitudo, ut in predicacione de particularibus, ut sicut homo vel animal predicatur de multis individuis, sic essentia divina vel Deus de multis personis; et sicut homo est omnes homines simul et quilibet divisim, sic essentia divina omnes persone collectim et divisim; et sicut homo communicabilitate distinguitur a quolibet suo supposito, sic divina essentia a qualibet persona: et sic de aliis similitudinibus.” In the last example, Hus alludes to another of Aristotle's rules concerning universals, this time from *On Interpretation* 7, 17a 39–40, i.e. that a universal is capable of being predicated about many whereas a singular does not have such a capacity.

As for differences, Hus mentions the following:

- 1) Singular men subordinated to the species of man differ essentially. They are different singular essences, which is not the case of the divine Essence and divine Persons;
- 2) The species of man precedes singular men by temporal priority as well as by priority of nature, which is not true as far as the divine Essence and Persons are concerned;
- 3) The number of singulars subordinated to the species of man increases and decreases, while the number of the divine Person is unchangeable;
- 4) The species of man is said to be *triplex* for, as the case may be, three essentially different subordinated entities fall under the species. Divine Essence, however, does not include three essentially different entities, which is why we do not use the term *triplex* in this case. Rather, since the divine Essence includes three Persons distinct by a personal distinction, we use the term *trina*.⁵⁶

From the above arguments it follows, at least for Hus, that there is significant similarity as well as dissimilarity between God and a universal. Hus therefore concludes that there is no doubt that it would be devious and false if someone would want to see the similarity in all aspects.⁵⁷ Still, we may note that his standpoint is more forthcoming in terms of the comparison between a universal and the divine Essence than the one we find in Lombard's *Sentences*. The same is true about Wyclif's, as well as Stephen of Pálec's and Jerome of Prague's,

⁵⁶ IOHANNES HUS, *Super IV Sententiarum*, I, d. 19, c. 6, p. 117, l. 7–16: “Sed est in multis dissimilitudo: nam in specie humana individua distingwuntur essentialiter, sed in essentia divina persone non distingwuntur essentialiter, quod voluit Augustinus: et hec species homo preedit multa sua singularia temporaliter et naturaliter; non sic autem essentia divina. Similiter individua speciei humane multiplicantur et demultiplicantur; non sic autem persone divine. Et species humana dicitur triplex propter tria supposita distincta essentialiter; sed divina essentia non dicitur triplex, quia non habet tria supposita distincta essentialiter. Sed bene dicitur trina, quia habet tres personas, que differunt personaliter.” On the last point, cf. O. NIELSEN, “Trinitarian Theology from Alcuin to Anselm,” *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*, edited by G. Emery, M. Levering, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, p. 160. According to a grammatical analysis present in the latter study, the first term indicates a numerical difference whereas the term *trina* does not allow numerical difference of individual parts of an entity. On that cf. PETRUS LOMBARDUS, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, I, d. 19, c. 12, p. 171, l. 2–13.

⁵⁷ IOHANNES HUS, *Super IV Sententiarum*, I, d. 19, c. 6, p. 117, l. 21–26: “Ex hiis apparet, quod magna est similitudo in essentia divina et universale logicum, et etiam magna est dissimilitudo in multis; et sicut universalia et particularia logica sive philosophica inducunt in noticiam divine essencie et personarum, sic indubie, qui per omnia vellet similitudinem capere in utrisque, duceretur in devium et errorem.”

writings. Wyclif himself wrote similar examples on the difference between God and a universal as Hus, and similarly restricted the whole comparison as such.⁵⁸

It is noteworthy that the realist standpoint allowed the Prague masters to compare God and a universal without any trouble and without withdrawing from their philosophical positions. By contrast, such a comparison was rather delicate for authors with less realist opinions. If they were to admit that God is similar to a universal, it would imply that God is similar to a human concept or to a word which does not find any counterpart in reality. For this reason, some nominalists accepted a realist vocabulary in their *Sentences* commentaries or applied a special Trinitarian logic. When speaking about the Trinity, Henry Totting of Oyta, an important Parisian, Prague and Viennese nominalist, was ready to accept that universals were imaginable.⁵⁹ Pierre d'Ailly also accepted parallels between universals and the Trinity.⁶⁰ Likewise, Peter of Pulkau, a Viennese theologian and ambassador of the University of Vienna at the Council of Constance, accepted universals as illustrative examples.⁶¹ One way or another, Hus's theological *quaestio* from his *Sentences* commentary I, dist. 19 provides us with valuable information on his realist understanding of universals.

⁵⁸ For the comparison between God and a universal in Jerome of Prague and partly also in the other mentioned scholars, cf. O. PAVLÍČEK, "Scutum fidei christianae: The Depiction and Explanation of the Shield of Faith in the Realistic Teaching of Jerome of Prague in the Context of His Interpretation of the Trinity," *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice* 9, edited by Z.V. David, D.R. Holeton (= Special Issue of *Filosofický časopis*, vol. 3 [2014]), Prague: Filosofia – Filosofický časopis, 2014, p. 72–97. For the limitation of the comparison in Wyclif, see, for example, IOHANNES WYCLIF, *Tractatus de universalibus*, c. 5, p. 106–107, l. 195–230: "Diversitas autem est multiplex. [...] Si quis igitur ex ignorantia arguit: Si istae naturae sint in aliquo analogo similes, tunc sunt in omnibus earum proprietatibus similes, quomodo culpanda est veritas ex errore ignoranter capto pro defectu notitiae? Patet quod nullo modo!"

⁵⁹ See particularly A. MAIERÜ, "Logica aristotelica e teologia trinitaria. Enrico Totting da Oyta," *Studi sul XIV secolo in memoria di Anneliese Maier*, edited by A. Maierü, A.-P. Bagliani, Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1981, p. 481–512; cf. IDEM, "Logique aristotélicienne et théologie trinitaire au XIV^e siècle," *What is "Theology" in the Middle Ages? Religious Cultures of Europe (12th–15th centuries) as Reflected in Their Self-Understanding*, edited by M. Olszewski, Münster: Aschendorf Verlag, 2007, p. 341–342.

⁶⁰ See A. MAIERÜ, "Logique et théologie trinitaire: Pierre d'Ailly," *Preuves et raisons à l'Université de Paris, Logique, ontologie et théologie au XIV^e siècle*, edited by Z. Kaluza, P. Vignaux, Paris: Vrin, 1984, p. 253–268.

⁶¹ See A. MAIERÜ, "Ymaginationes manuductivae: Logic and Trinitarian Theology in Peter of Pulkau," *Trinitarian Theology in the Medieval West*, edited by P. Kärkkäinen, Helsinki: Luther-Agricola Society, 2007, p. 226–255, particularly p. 246–248.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editions of texts

- Bobuslai Balbini Bohemia docta*, vol. 3, edited by K.R. Ungar, Praga: characteribus haerendum Rosenmuller per Mathiam Glatz factorem, 1780.
- Catalogi librorum vetustissimi universitatis pragensis*, edited by Z. Silagiová, F. Šmahel, (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 271), Turnhout: Brepols, 2015.
- Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 1, edited by N.P. Tanner, Georgetown: Sheed & Ward, 1990.
- Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, vol. 8, edited by F. Novotný, Praha: Nadání Františka Palackého, 1932.
- HIERONYMUS DE PRAGA, *Magistri Hieronymi de Praga Quaestiones, Polemica, Epistulae*, edited by F. Šmahel, G. Silagi, (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 222), Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.
- IOHANNES HUS, *Magistri Iohannis Hus Questiones*, edited by J. Kejř, (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 205), Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.
- IOHANNES HUS, *Magistri Iohannis Hus Quodlibet*, edited by B. Ryba, ed. 2, (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 211), Turnhout: Brepols, 2006.
- IOHANNES HUS, *Super IV Sententiarum*, edited by V. Flajšhans, M. Komínková, (Spisy M. Jana Husi, 4–6), Praha: Nákladem Jaroslava Bursíka, 1904–1906.
- IOHANNES WYCLIF, *Tractatus de universalibus*, edited by I.J. Mueller, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Monumenta Historica Universitatis Carolo-Ferdinandae Pragensis*, vol. 1/1: *Liber decanorum facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Pragensis*, s.e., Pragae: Joan. Nep. Gerzabek, 1830.
- PETRUS LOMBARDUS, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, Editio Tertia, Romae: Editiones Collegii S. Bonaventure Ad Claras Aquas, 1971.
- STEPHANUS DE PALE CZ, *Commentarius in De universalibus Iohannis Wyclif*, edited by I. Müller, Praha: Filosofia, 2009.
- STEPHANUS DE PALE CZ, *Positio reverendi magistri Stephani de Palecz de universalibus*, edited by R. Palacz, in: R. Palacz, “La *Positio de universalibus* d’Etienne de Palec,” *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, vol. 14 (1970), p. 113–129.

Secondary sources

- BAKKER, P.J.J.M., “Réalisme et rémanence. La doctrine eucharistique de Jean Wyclif,” *John Wyclif: logica, politica, teologia*, edited by M.-T. Fumagalli Beonio Brocchieri, S. Simonetta, Firenze: SISMEL, 2003, p. 87–112.

- BARTOŠ, F.M., "Hus jako student a profesor Karlovy university," *Acta Universitatis Carolinae — Philosophica et Historica*, vol. 2 (1958), p. 9–26.
- BARTOŠ, F.M., "Ze spisovatelských počátků Husových," *Věstník České akademie věd a umění*, vol. 52 (1943), p. 29–46.
- CEDLOVÁ, M., "K Husovu autorství výkladu Summy Naturalium Alberta Velikého," *Husův sborník*, edited by R. Řičan, M. Flegl, Praha: Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1966, p. 35–41.
- COLISH, M.L., "Scholastic Theology at Paris around 1200," *Crossing Boundaries at Medieval Universities*, edited by S.E. Young, Leiden: Brill, 2011, p. 29–50.
- CONTI, A., "Wyclif's Logic and Metaphysics," *A Companion to John Wyclif: Late Medieval Theologian*, edited by I.C. Levy, (Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, 4), Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2006, p. 67–125.
- CROSS, R., "Gregory of Nyssa on Universals," *Vigiliae Christianae*, vol. 56/4 (2002), p. 372–410.
- DAÑHELKA, J., "Das Zeugnis des Stockholmer Autographs von Hus," *Die Welt der Slawen*, vol. 27 (1982), p. 225–233.
- DE VOOGHT, P., *L'Hérésie de Jean Huss*, ed. 2, Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1975.
- FUDGE, T., *Jerome of Prague and the Foundations of the Hussite Movement*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- HEIDER, D., "The Role of Trinitarian Theology in Universals Bartolomeo Mastri da Meldola (1602–1673) and Bonaventura Belluto (1600–1676)," *Herausforderung durch Religion? Begegnungen der Philosophie mit Religionen in Mittelalter und Renaissance*, edited by G. Krieger, Würzburg: Verlag Königshausen und Neumann, 2011, p. 268–284.
- Jeroným Pražský: Středověký intelektuál, mučedník české reformace a brdina národní tradice*, edited by O. Pavlíček, Praha: Filosofia, 2018.
- KALUZA, Z., "La création des universaux selon Jean Hus. A propos de la question *Utrum omne testimonium fidei*," *Septuaginta Paulo Spunar oblata (70+2)*, edited by J.K. Kroupa, Praha: KLP, 2000, p. 367–375.
- KALUZA, Z., "La question de Jérôme de Prague disputée a Heidelberg," in: Z. Kaluza, *Études doctrinales sur le XIV^e siècle: théologie, logique, philosophie*, Paris: Vrin, 2014, p. 301–332.
- KALUZA, Z., "Le chancelier Gerson et Jérôme de Prague," in: Z. Kaluza, *Études doctrinales sur le XIV^e siècle: théologie, logique, philosophie*, Paris: Vrin, 2014, p. 207–231.
- KALUZA, Z., "Stvoření univerzálií podle Jana Husa (Ke kvestii *Utrum omne testimonium fidei*)," translated by J. Žůrková, O. Pavlíček, *Filosofický časopis*, vol. 63/6 (2015), p. 893–905.
- KEJŘ, J., *Kvodlibetní disputace na pražské universitě*, Praha: Universita Karlova, 1971.

- KVAČALA, J., "Wiklef a Hus ako filosofi," *Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk. Třída filosoficko-historicko-filologická*, Praha: Král. čes. spol. nauk, 1925, p. 1–91.
- MAIERÙ, A., "Logica aristotelica e teologia trinitaria. Enrico Totting da Oyta," *Studi sul XIV secolo in memoria di Anneliese Maier*, edited by A. Maierù, A.-P. Bagliani, Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1981, p. 481–512.
- MAIERÙ, A., "Logique aristotélicienne et théologie trinitaire au XIV^e siècle," *What is "Theology" in the Middle Ages? Religious Cultures of Europe (12th–15th centuries) as Reflected in Their Self-Understanding*, edited by M. Olszewski, Münster: Aschendorf Verlag, 2007, p. 329–350.
- MAIERÙ, A., "Logique et théologie trinitaire: Pierre d'Ailly," *Preuves et raisons à l'Université de Paris, Logique, ontologie et théologie au XIV^e siècle*, edited by Z. Kaluza, P. Vignaux, Paris: Vrin, 1984, p. 253–268.
- MAIERÙ, A., "Universaux et Trinité du XII^e au XIV^e siècle," *La servante et la consolatrice. La philosophie dans ses rapports avec la théologie au Moyen-Âge*, edited by J.-L. Solère, Z. Kaluza, Paris: Vrin, 2002, p. 151–171.
- MAIERÙ, A., "Ymaginationes manufactivae: Logic and Trinitarian Theology in Peter of Pulkau," *Trinitarian Theology in the Medieval West*, edited by P. Kärkkäinen, Helsinki: Luther-Agricola Society, 2007, p. 226–255.
- NIELSEN, O., "Trinitarian Theology from Alcuin to Anselm," *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*, edited by G. Emery, M. Levering, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, p. 155–167.
- PALACZ, R., "La *Positio de universalibus* d'Etienne de Palec," *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, vol. 14 (1970), p. 113–129.
- PAVLÍČEK, O., "Filosoficko-teologické základy myšlení Jana Husa: Univerzálie a některá s nimi spojená témata," *Filosofický časopis*, vol. 63/6 (2015), p. 859–892.
- PAVLÍČEK, O., "Husův komentář k Sentencím Petra Lombardského: nalezení filosofické a teologické střední cesty," *Via Media. Studie z českých náboženských a intelektuálních dějin*, edited by P. Hlaváček, Praha: Filosofia, 2016, p. 21–27.
- PAVLÍČEK, O., "Scutum fidei christianae: The Depiction and Explanation of the Shield of Faith in the Realistic Teaching of Jerome of Prague in the Context of His Interpretation of the Trinity," *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice* 9, edited by Z.V. David, D.R. Holeton (= Special Issue of *Filosofický časopis*, vol. 3 [2014]), Prague: Filosofia — Filosofický časopis, 2014, p. 72–97.
- PAVLÍČEK, O., "Stephen of Pálec's *Quaestio de esse aeterno*. A study and critical edition," *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge*, vol. 84 (2017), p. 349–378.
- PAVLÍČEK, O., "The Chronology of the Life and Work of Jan Hus," *A Companion to Jan Hus*, edited by F. Šmahel, O. Pavlíček, (Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, 54), Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015, p. 9–68.
- PAVLÍČEK, O., "Wyclif's Early Reception in Bohemia and His Influence on the Thought of Jerome of Prague," *Europe after Wyclif*, edited by M. Van Dussen, P. Hornbeck, New York City: Fordham University Press, 2017, p. 89–114.

- ROBB, F., "The Fourth Lateran Council's Definition of Trinitarian Orthodoxy," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 48 (1997), p. 22–43.
- SCHABEL, Ch., BRINZEI, M., MAGA, M., "A Golden Age of Theology at Prague: Prague Sentences Commentaries, ca. 1375–1385, with a Redating of the Arrival of Wycliffism in Bohemia," *Acta Universitatis Carolinae — Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis*, vol. 55 (2015), p. 19–39.
- SOUKUP, P., *Jan Hus*, Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2014.
- SOUSEDÍK, S., "Huss et la doctrine eucharistique rémanentiste," *Divinitas*, vol. 21 (1977), p. 383–407.
- SOUSEDÍK, S., "Pojem *distinctio formalis* u českých realistů v době Husově," *Filosofický časopis*, vol. 18/6 (1970), p. 1024–1029.
- SOUSEDÍK, S., *Učení o eucharistii v díle M. Jana Husa*, Praha: Vyšehrad, 1998.
- SPUNAR, P., *Repertorium auctorum Bobemorum provectorum idearum post Universitatem Pragensem conditam illustrans*, vol. 1, Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1985.
- ŠMAHEL, F., "Doctor evangelicus super omnes evangelistas: Wyclif's Fortune in Hussite Bohemia," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, vol. 43 (1970), p. 16–34.
- ŠMAHEL, F., "Hus und Wyclif: Opinio media de universalibus in re," in: IDEM, *Die Prager Universität in Mittelalter/The Charles University in the Middle Ages. Gessamelte Aufsätze/Selected Studies*, Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2007, p. 515–525.
- ŠMAHEL, F., "Jan Hus a viklefské pojetí universálií," *Acta Universitatis Carolinae — Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis*, vol. 21/2 (1981), p. 49–68.
- ŠMAHEL, F., *Jan Hus: Život a dílo*, Praha: Argo, 2013.
- ŠMAHEL, F., "Písemné záznamy kvodlibetních disputací na pražské univerzitě do roku 1420," in: IDEM, *Alma mater Pragensis*, Praha: Karolinum, 2016, p. 326–348.
- ŠMAHEL, F., *Život a dílo Jeronýma Pražského: Zpráva o výzkumu*, Praha: Argo, 2010.
- VALENTE, L., "Gilbert of Poitiers," *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy: Philosophy Between 500 and 1500*, vol. 1, edited by H. Lagerlund, Dordrecht: Springer, 2011, p. 409–417.
- ZACHHUBER, J., "Once again: Gregory of Nyssa on Universals," *Journal of Theological Studies*, NS, vol. 56/1 (2005), p. 74–98.

JAN HUS AS A PHILOSOPHER:
THE TOPIC OF UNIVERSALS IN TWO THEOLOGICAL
CONTEXTS OF HIS *SENTENCES* COMMENTARY
(*SUPER IV SENTENTIARUM* I, DIST. 19 AND 33)

S U M M A R Y

After a brief summary of the literature on the topic of universals in Hus's writings, the present study continues with a summation of our knowledge of Hus's commentaries on Aristotle, and a presentation of those of Hus's other treatises which are the most relevant to the topic of universals. Although the topic of universals is fundamentally philosophical, a significant source for our understanding of Hus's position is his theological works, particularly his *Sentences* commentary. Based on an analysis of Hus's *Super IV Sententiarum* I, distinctions 19 and 33, the study shows (in the theological contexts of the divine properties and a comparison between God and a universal) that Hus was persuaded about the reality of universals understood as formal components of the essence of individual substances, which are different from these substances by means of a formal distinction. Besides providing further details on Hus's philosophical realism, the study demonstrates that similarly to his position concerning the divine properties, which is based on Thomas Aquinas, Hus understood his realist position as the *opinio media*. Hus also agreed that there are many similarities between God and a universal, although, as Hus puts it, it would be devious and false if someone would want to see this likeness in all the aspects.

KEYWORDS: Jan Hus; universals; formal distinction; John Wyclif; University of Prague; *Sentences* commentaries; philosophical theology