Mihai MAGA [*]

Invitati ascendant.
The Moral Ideal of the University Philosopher in the Beginning of the 15th Century in Central Europe and its Rhetoric Expression

Abstract: This article introduces the first edition of an anonymous graduation discourse from the Faculty of Liberal Arts of the University of Prague, dating from the beginning of the 15th century and preserved in the manuscript Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, VIII.E.5, ff. 80r–81r. This short text is an example for the practices and the motivations of the masters and students in philosophy in a less investigated environment, and reveals a combination of scholastic formalism, classical references and picturesque details. An exposition of the university sermons genre and its usage in central European universities at the end of the Middle Ages sets forth a detailed analysis of the structure of the text, and a comparison with similar texts exposes some details about its unknown author and his fellows.

Keywords: medieval philosophy, intellectual history, university sermon, exhortation to philosophy.

1. Introduction

The graduation discourses are a widespread practice in our universities to the extent that every student and teacher expects one or more speeches as part of an academic ceremony. However, not everybody questions why do we do this and for how long have we been doing this. It is in our nature as intellectuals to praise and motivate those who study, therefore we can assume that the history of these speeches is just as long as the history of education. While many of such discourses were conveyed only through spoken words for that special moment, others were recorded in writing and transmitted to us across centuries.

One of these discourses survives in the manuscript Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, VIII.E.5, ff. 80r–81r. It is a graduation discourse from the University of Prague, in the Faculty of Liberal Arts, dating from the beginning of the 15th century. The study of a discourse like this one can help us to better understand the history of this genre, which is mostly

---

[*] PhD Lecturer, Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania;
e-mail: mihai.maga@ubbcluj.ro

unexplored today. At the same time, the research on those discourses can enrich our knowledge about the intellectual practices at the end of the Middle Ages and it can fill gaps in our representation of the history of philosophy.

In order to understand the context and the contents of this text, we have to discuss what the university sermons were in the Late Middle Ages, to analyze the structure of this discourse, to compare it with other similar texts and to point out the details regarding the manuscript, attribution, dating and critical edition.

2. University sermons

The genre of medieval university speeches is so diverse and widespread that we are far from having a complete picture of it. Efforts of local scholars (Spunar 1985-1995; Kowalkzyk 1970) present us with lists of hundreds of discourses which formally marked every important moment in the history of a university. Maria Kowalczyk tries to distinguish them in several categories by audience: speeches of the rectors and deans, speeches at the Faculty of Arts, at the Faculty of Law, funeral speeches (Kowalkzyk 1970, 35-136) and Pavel Spunar classifies them by intellectual groups (Spunar 1985, 35-370; Spunar 1995, 37-234). Only a small part of those discourses is edited (Jung-Palczewskiej 2000; Włodek 2000). We know that those discourses were formally required, as some statutes of the universities and faculties are still available in manuscripts.

The general name of those speeches was *sermo*, but specifically because most of them marked the moment of conferring an academic title, they were called *recommendatio*, and, to a lesser extent, *collatio*; this last one is still an ambiguous word, because it may sometimes represent the action of the verb *conferre* in the strict sense of bestowing a title, but other times it may refer to the procedure of collating a text (Wenzel 2015, 107-109).

If we follow the curricula and the practices of the central European universities, we can further differentiate those discourses (Šmahel 2007; Knoll 2016). The academic year was opened with a *recommendatio studiorum*, and ended with a *recommendatio promovendorum* (*recommendatio baccalaureorum* in the Faculty of Arts). The students in theology were required to give a sermon when they began reading their commentary on the *Bible* (*collatio in sacra Scriptura*) and on each of the four *Books of Sentences* (*sermo collativus in Principia Sententiarum*). A new rector was introduced by another distinguished professor in a *recommendatio rectoris*. For members of the faculty who passed away, the deans gave *sermones pro defunctis*, which were distinct from the parish priest funeral sermon. In special occasions, like the enthronement or death of a king, or a very important visit, the professors would also give speeches, as well as in special gatherings, like the councils of the Church. Thus, in each university, in a year there were at least twenty such discourses,

and if we multiply by number of universities and by years, we can easily reach tens of thousands. Unfortunately, the number of written versions preserved in manuscripts is much lower, for example, Maria Kowalczyk only identified 210 discourses in Krakow (Kowalkzyk 1970, 150-186).

All those discourses had in common two things: they were given by the members of the university and they had the same form. Indeed, they followed the formal requirements of a religious sermon, yet not any kind of sermon, but a specific form called *sermo modernus*. The tradition of the religious sermons is better documented, as there were also manuals of preaching called *De artes praedicandi* (Wenzel 2015, 3-42).

There were at least four different ways to compose a sermon, each of them being identified as belonging to a period in history by those authors of *De artes praedicandi*. First, *sermo antiquissimus*, also called *postillatio*, is said to have begun in the Gospels and in the Church Fathers, which takes the form of a literal or moral interpretation following the reading of an episode from the *Bible* (thus the name *postillatio*, from 'post illa', after that). Second, *sermo antiquus*, also called *homilia*, is said to have been formally instantiated in the 6th century by Gregory the Great, and this was a sequential comment of a *Bible* passage, covering the four senses of the Scripture: allegorical, moral, anagogical and literal. Third, *sermo modernus*, also called scholastic sermon, thematic sermon, popular sermon or university sermon, was developed in the 13th century by the mendicant orders (mainly the Franciscans and the Dominicans) in the new environment of the universities and was destined to be better understood by lay people through a clear structure and explicit partition, requiring a theme, a division and a development of each member of the division. Fourth, *sermo subalternus*, was initiated as an alternative to *sermo modernus* by combining elements from *antiquus* and *modernus* (Wenzel 2015, 45).

The *sermo modernus* is particularly important for understanding the university discourses. It arose in the university environment as a new expression of the religious sermons, in order to better serve the spread of Church teachings. It borrowed from the academic practices the principle of *divisio textus*, which was also used in the disputed questions genre at that time. Basically, both in *quaestiones* and in *sermones*, after exposing the subject, one had to divide the commentary into articles or members, and then treat each part in a scholastic manner, either subdividing it or solving it through authoritative quotes and syllogistic or rhetoric constructions.

For the *sermo modernus* a specific terminology was used: *thema*, *prothema*, *divisio*, *membra*, *dilatatio*, *conclusio* etc. The *thema* was a very short authoritative quote used at the very beginning and repeated after each part. The *prothema* was a complementary quote used to explain the meaning of the *thema* through another authoritative reference (for example, if the *thema* was from the Bible, the *prothema* could be from a theologian, but never the other way

around). The *prothema* may be preceded or followed by an *advocatio* or *salutatio*, in which the speaker greeted the attendance. After this, there may be an *oratio* or *recommendatio*, depending on the occasion and the *thema* is repeated. Then, a justification of the *thema* follows (*introductio thematis*), and a connection between *thema* and the rest of the sermon, called *pes* or *positio pedis*. After all this introductive part, the *divisio* follows, which was of outmost importance. The *divisio* may be performed in two ways: *intra* or *extra*. *Divisio intra* means that the *thema* is divided by words to produce the members (e.g. for the theme "Deum timete" we would have two parts, one for "Deum", the second for "timete".) *Divisio extra* implies that the meaning or the interpretation of the whole theme is differentiated in several senses (e.g. an allegorical sense, a moral sense etc.) At the peak of this genre, the division was composed so that the parts would also rhyme and have an intuitive similar grammatical structure. After the division was established, the development of the *membra* followed, sometimes called *processus* or *prosecutio*. Each member was treated in turn, either by further dividing it through a *distinctio* in *submembra* (and this could also continue through *sub-distinctio* and *sub-submembra*), or through *dilatatio*, that is the exposition of that member. Members were usually introduced by their numbers (e.g. "dico primo", "dico secundo") and the corresponding phrase from the division. At the end of each member's *dilatatio*, the *thema* was repeated. At the point where the members are exhausted, a *unitio* followed, bringing together the meaning of all members. It all ended with a *conclusio*, not in a logical sense, but as a closing part, which could be a *recitatio* or a *benedictio* or an *oratio* if it was a Church sermon. For the graduation university sermons, this was the so-called *collatio*, i.e. the solemn pronunciation of the academic title conferred to the students. Sometimes the main sermon was continued through a *subsermo* which would have its own *divisio* and *processus* (Wenzel 2015, 47-86).

Even if there were some treatises on how to compose a sermon, the methodological aspect was not an object of instruction by itself. From what we can see, there are not so many copies of those short writings *De arte praedicandi*, but there are hundreds of collections of sermons which were used both as a model for understanding the good practices and as a source of inspiration for new sermons.

In order to better understand the role of the discourse discussed here, we should follow the program of studies at the Faculty of Arts in Prague. The curriculum at the Faculty of Arts was traditionally divided into *trivium* and *quadrivium*, and this wasn't just a set of seven disciplines, but a philosophical approach based on selected books which functioned as textbooks (Maierù 1994, 10-16). Thus other books were included (Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, *Politics*, *Parva naturalia*) in a wider, encyclopedically organized, frame of science and philosophy (Šmahel 2007, 232-233). In total, at Prague this curriculum comprised 33 books (with some variations in the statues) from

which only 8 were mandatory for the bachelor's degree and 15 for the master's degree. The students were forbidden to attend more that two courses per semester from the required books, the rest of the courses functioning as optional (Šmahel 2007, 237). Thus the length of studies results from these requirements: 88–118 weeks for bachelors, and another 158–237 weeks for masters. The main problem was the high number of students abandoning their studies, at least from two reasons. First, the studies were expensive and lengthy enough to ruin a young learner coming from Bohemia or the nearby kingdoms, and the Faculty was keeping a strict record of their payments. Second, the statute of the university members was a privilege, and many enrolled for the benefit of being a *clericus*, but never finished their studies. Consequently, only around 25-33% of them reached the final stage to be awarded the title of *baccalaureus artium*. The scholars had even a name for those abandoning the studies, calling them *discoli* (not in the classical sense of deformed, but as a consequence of them dissociating from the school.)

At the end of their studies, each student had to present the list of attended courses to the dean and to swear that he followed all the courses and paid all the taxes. Thus, he enrolled for the final exams and he was called *intitulatus*. Each year a commission of three professors was appointed to examine the students, but the examinations were rather formal, because there are no records of students failing at this point. The most important task of this commission was to vote the final order of the candidates, called *locatio*, which stood as a system of grading, because the first in list was allowed to choose from all the available positions to continue his studies, then the second from what was left, and so on until the last. After examination, the beadle of the faculty (*bidellus*) visited them to call them for the final ceremony and also to notify them that, in a 15 days term, they had to pay the graduation tax (*bursa*) for which they received a receipt (*signetum*).

At a publicly announced date, the bachelors' graduation ceremony took place. The candidates had to take an oath in front of the dean that they fulfilled all their obligations, and then the festive assembly of the members of faculty decided who should be awarded the title (but the cases of rejection were very rare and were caused by the absence of the candidate.) Those formalities carried out, the three-part ceremony began: *praesentatio*, *determinatio* and *recommendatio*. Each candidate was taken by hand by his master and was presented to the dean; the master declared that his student is qualified to receive the title; the candidate swore to fulfill further obligations: to attend courses for a year, to participate in disputations, to hold lectures for two years on the optional books. Then the candidates participated in a debate of a question (*determinatio*) in which each of them had to present an answer (*positio*). When the *determinatio* ended, they were helped by the beadle to change from the student robe to the bachelor's tabard and they were ready for the final and solemn moment of the recommendation. A master

presented a *recommendatio* for one or more graduates and he praised them in order. At the end of his discourse, the master proclaimed the awarding of the title (Šmahel 2007, 244-246). From all these ceremonies, what survives in manuscripts are only the lists of promotions, the statutes and, sometimes, the recommendations.

These recommendations from the Faculty of Arts were composed following the structure of the *sermo modernus*, as said above, regarding the form. They should also be ascribed to the large genre of the protreptics or exhortations to philosophy, regarding their content. Indeed, they all praise the need for philosophy by defining and legitimizing this art, both as a way of knowledge and a way of living. This genre finds its beginnings in the Ancient Greece, in the lost work of Aristotle called *Protreptikós* which was a source for Iamblicus' work with the same title, then continued by Cicero's *Hortensius*, Seneca's lost *Exhortationes*, the discourse of Philosophy in Boethius' *Consolatio*, together with other lost works (Van der Meeren 2011, XIII-XV). The first audacious sign of this endeavor is the choice of the *thema*: in opposition with the religious sermon practice of quoting from the *Bible*, many of these *recommendationes* use citations from philosophers or poets. A thorough count in the available lists (Spunar 1985-1995; Kowalkzyk 1970) reveals that, from 109 discourses in the Faculty of Arts, only 7 have a biblical *thema*, the other 102 are, in order of frequency, from Aristotle, Seneca, Catho, Boethius, Cicero, Ovid, Alexander de Villa Dei, Godefridus de Vino Salvo, Apuleius, Eberhardus Alemannus, Valerius Maximus, Frovinus Cracoviensis, Porphyry, John of Salisbury, Petrarca, Socrates (attributed from other sources), Terentius, Averroes, Coelius Sedulius, Henricus de Septimellensis, Lucian of Samosata, Augustine, Jerome, Quintilian, Walter of Châtillon, Horace, Aulus Persius Flaccus, Vitruvius. To understand the difference, from a total of 342 university discourses (including those counted before), 228 use biblical themes, and the rest of 114 use other sources, thus we can see that most of those non-biblical themes were used at the Faculty of Arts. The counting also reveals that around 10% of the *themata* occur more than once, proving the practice of reusing the sermons, sometimes only by borrowing the *thema*, other times by also reusing parts of the sermon contents.

2. Content and structure

In the manuscript VIII.E.5 from the National Library of the Czech Republic, at ff. 80r–81r, we find an example of a *recommendatio baccalaureorum*, with the *thema* "Invitati ascendant". At first reading, it looks like a consolation for the poor students graduating in philosophy. More interesting though is what the text does not say, because a thorough comparative analysis will reveal other details about the context.

The *thema* is taken from John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, a text that revived some interest in the Late Middle Ages, even if it was written around 1159. The treatise itself was a vehicle of knowledge, being composed by compiling a large number of classical sources, most of them Roman historians and early medieval authorities. It could have functioned as a manual of politics, in a similar manner to Peter Lombard's *Book of Sentences* for theology, *Decretum Gratiani* for canon law or the *Auctoritates Aristotelis* for philosophy, as all of those were, at various degrees, comprehensive collections of authoritative statements on a given subject. Certainly, it was available in Prague, as there are still two copies now in the National Library (III.C.1 and V.D.6) dating from the beginning of the 15th century (Truhlář 1905, 167 and 357).

The words "invitati ascendant" ("those who are invited should ascend") appear in *Policraticus* in a chapter about the rewards of the prince and specifically about the functions that Roman statesmen earned for their merit (Keats-Rohan 1993, 271). Nevertheless, the recommendation brings this meaning in the context of the university studies and the consequent academic career, in praise of meritocracy.

The first surprising detail is the way it quotes the source of the *thema*: "scribit venerabilis Iohannes Policrati in De curialium nugis et vestigiis philosophorum." It seems like the author of the sermon took 'Policrati' to be the surname of John of Salisbury, and this is not an uncommon confusion in that period; indeed, the manuscript V.D.6 bears the title "Iohannis Policraticus de curialium nugis et vestigiis philosophorum" and begins with "Incipit Entheticus Iohannis in Policraticum", while the manuscript III.C.1 has only the title "Policraticus de curialium nugis et vestigiis philosophorum". A good knowledge of the history of England in the 12th century probably lacked in Prague, and the peculiar title made it resembling a person's name. In fact, John of Salisbury had invented this word in the fashion of the 12th century writers by combining Greek words, similar to Anselm's *Monologion* and *Proslogion* or Hugh of Saint Victor's *Didascalicon* (Keats-Rohan 1993, VIII). Thus, it was composed by its author from *pólis* and *krátos*, therefore it never existed in common Latin. The original title was *Policraticus sive de nugis curialium et de vestigiis philosophorum*, and from here we find in the sermon the main title as the author's surname and the sub-title as the main title. Therefore, even with this twisted name, it functioned as an authority, and, most relevant here, a non-biblical reference.

In this entire sermon we find 13 explicit quotations: 4 from *Policraticus*, 2 from Apuleius, *De dogmate Platonis*, 2 from Walter of Châtillon's *Alexandreis*, one from Horace's *Epistles*, 2 from Seneca's *Epistles*, and 2 from Cassiodorus' *Epistles*. In fact, many of those quotes come from the anthology of Thomas Hibernicus, *Manipulus florum*, the second part, called *Flores doctorum*; this book, finished around 1306, contains famous quotes from various authors, organized alphabetically by keywords, albeit some of them were altered a

little, and it circulated much in the 14th and the 15th centuries, as it was a handy source for many scholars. Thus, because the quotes from Apuleius, Seneca and Cassiodorus contain texts closer to *Flores doctorum* than to the mentioned sources, the author of the sermon must have chosen them from this anthology.

Again, what is missing in those explicit quotations is of outmost importance: there is no direct reference to the *Bible*, to the Church Fathers or to any theologian. This may be due to the desire of Liberal Arts masters to separate from the domination of Theology, a movement which may be traced back to the conflicts in the 1270's at the University of Paris, but, because there is no literal reference to it, it may also be a local development or a personal attitude.

The form of the sermon in the manuscript seems to be truncated, because it is very short and it lacks some compulsory parts. It starts with the *thema*, an *advocatio*, the *prothema* (again from *Policraticus*), a short *divisio* in two *membra*, then the *dilatatio* of each *membrum*, ending swiftly in a second division, which would have been developed further in a *subsermo*, brought together in a *unitio*. It doesn't have the specific parts of a *recommendatio*, namely the praise of each student and the awarding of the bachelor title. Those missing parts may indicate that this sermon was recorded in writing as a model rather than a factual document.

In fact, this discourse is part of a series of eight recommendations from the Faculty of Arts, contained in the manuscript between ff. 71r–82r, preceded and succeeded by blank pages. They all present the same aspect of being truncated and missing the names of their authors, also missing the names of the recommended bachelors. But in some of them we find the *collatio*, for example, in one with the theme "Ut rosa flores" we read at its end, on f. 78r: "Confero ergo sibi gradum baccalariis in artis auctoritate mihi in hac parte concessa, ut possit legere et disputare et ceteros actus ad hunc gradum pertinentis exercere hic et ubique locorum in nomine Patri et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen."[1] The fact that this part is missing from *Invitati ascendant* may be due to the standard required expression being well-known to the masters, therefore there was no need to copy it again.

The division is quite minimal, having two members and is placed immediately after the *prothema*: "ad philosophie studia invitantur humiles et mansueti, ut gradibus exaltentur; insuper, honorabiles et honesti, ut virtutibus premientur." The fact that this is the *divisio* appears from the introduction of each member ("Dixi… primo… ad philosophie invitantur studia humiles et mansueti…", "Dixi secundo… ad philosophie studia invitantur honorabiles et honesti…"). We see from these statements that a *divisio extra* is applied here. The choice of those not very common word associations in the division still reveals something about the intentions of the author which may have been discreet allusions to other well-known texts. The first one

has the expression "humiles et mansueti" which can be found in the *Book of Judith*, 9, 16: "sed humilium et mansuetorum semper tibi placuit deprecatio." The *Book of Judith* is a deuterocanonical book of the *Bible*, but it has a controversial statute: is not a part of the *Hebrew Bible*, neither is it accepted by the Protestants, and saint Jerome considered it apocryphal (Pope 1910, 554). The second expression "honorabiles et honesti" can be found in Jean Buridan's *Commentary on De anima*, I, q. 3: "omnis scientia in bonis est honorabilis et honesta." Buridan was a controversial author and a fit example for a life devoted to philosophy: he was only active in the Faculty of Arts, he didn't study in a superior faculty neither was he a member of a religious order; all his work is dedicated to the natural sciences and to logic; he was a Nominalist, but participated in the condemnation of Nominalism in 1340 (Patar 1991, 14–18).

The first member expands the idea from the division: "At the studies of philosophy are invited those humble and meek, so that their degrees are elevated." The argument is that only those hardworking are promoted to eligible functions, while those who do not deserve functions are called 'discoli', and we must understand this word in the context discussed above, as those quitting the school. The demonstration is mainly a series of quotes about the merit and the honesty of the soul, stressing on the moral character of those who are invited to philosophy. It ends by repeating the *thema*.

The second member develops on the second term of the division: "At the studies of philosophy are invited those honorable and honest, so that their virtues are rewarded." Here he explains that the reward of philosophy is not in a common material good, but in the superior state of life and morality, despite hardships. This member is also presented as a series of quotes, but at the end the author paints a picturesque image of the philosophy studies, to which some students in our days could also relate: his students were enduring many discomforts to pursue their studies, like staying awake, ruining themselves, emptying their pouches, but they did not give up. Therefore, not for a reward, but for their strength they are invited to philosophy, thus the repetition of the *thema* concludes this last member.

The second division connects the members of the sermon with the ceremony, applying a *divisio intra*: the word 'invitati' indicates the evocation of those graduating students, and the word 'ascendant' points to the act itself of awarding the bachelor title. This division remains undeveloped, but we can guess what it contained: the first member would have eulogized each student, and the second one would have pronounced the standard formula mentioned above.

The ending sentences are intended to further motivate the graduates to reach "a greater status, a higher degree and a superior place." This can also be interpreted as an invitation to further pursue the university studies for a superior qualification. As mentioned above, a bachelor had to teach courses

and to participate in debates for the next two years in order to be accepted as full members of the Faculty; therefore, this incentive had a precise purpose for the audience.

3. Similarities with other discourses

There are some other university sermons with similar content and a comparative analysis can help us determine some facts about this anonymous recommendation. I have identified three other discourses which present textual similarities with the one titled *Invitati ascendant*. Those three use another *thema*, "Ite simul in ardua montis", from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, book 8.

In the same manuscript (Praha, NkČr, VIII.E.5) we find two of these sermons. At ff. 14r–15v there is an unattributed text beginning with the same formula which has the same wording as the one preceding Ian Hus' first *Quodlibet* (Ryba 2006, 5), then the usual parts of a sermon:

> In nomine Patri et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, unius Dei omnipotentis qui est omnium rerum principium in quo vivimus, movemur et summus, sine quo nullum rite fundator exordium […]
>
> Pro recommendacione eorum assumo verba sapientis Ovidii et sic intonantis: "Ite simul in ardua montis." Ego autem vobis, domini licentiati pro hec imperatio 'ite', dico vos alloquendo, 'ascendite'. Ascendite ergo "simul in ardua montis."
>
> Venerabiles patres, magistri dominique venerandi, "quis," inquam, "ambigit illos aliis esse preferendos, qui quasi naturali privilegio fulciti maiorum titulis ad virtutem evocantur et eorumdem beneficio future bonitatis ceteris faciunt fidem?"
>
> Et ob hoc ad philosophie studia invitantur humiles et mansueti, ut gradibus exaltentur; insuper, honorabiles et honesti, ut virtutibus premientur, quibus non est phas premium virtutis denegare, cum "honor sit premium virtutis," IV° *Ethicorum.*

The members of the division are: 1. "ascendant ad altam naturalis speculationis profunditatem"; 2. "ascendant ad altiorem moralis edificationis fecunditatem"; 3. "ascendant ad altissimam magistralis honoris sublimitatem" (there is no *dilatatio* for the third one.)

At ff. 110r–114v we find a very similar text, this one attributed to Martinus Kunssonis de Praga:

> In nomine Patri et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, unius Dei omnipotentis qui est omnium rerum principium in quo vivimus, movemur et summus, sine quo nullum rite fundator exordium […]
>
> Igitur pro recommendacione nostrorum licenciatorum sic intonantis assumo verba sapientis Ovidii: "Ite simul" seu ascendite simul "in ardua montis."
>
> Venerabiles patres, magistri dominique venerandi, "quis," inquam, "ambigit illos aliis esse preferendos, qui quasi naturali privilegio fulciti maiorum titulis ad

virtutem evocantur et eorumdem beneficio future bonitatis ceteris faciunt fidem?"

> Et ob hoc ad philosophie studia invitantur humiles et mansueti, ut gradibus exaltentur; insuper, honorabiles et honesti, ut virtutibus premientur, quibus non est fas premium virtutis denegare, cum "honor sit premium virtutis," ut patet IVᵒ *Ethicorum*.

The members of the division are the same as in the previous sermon (though the third member has also a *dilatatio*.) From the striking similarity between those two texts we can infer that, most probably, they are different versions composed by the same author, and that Martinus Kunssonis de Praga is also the possible author of the text from ff. 14r–15v.

The third sermon is in the manuscript Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, X.C.3, at ff. 131rb–132ra, attributed in the manuscript to one named "Magister Gregorius":

> Iam pro aliquali congratulacione ad laudem nostrorum magistrandorum aliqua restaret proponere, sed in duobus considerans obprobrium non audeo oris habenda laxare ne magis in me culpa gratulacionis redundaret. Duo enim sunt que nunc conspicio michi, ymo vobis omnia contraria: unum ex parte augustie que populi […] ut igitur ipsos hortarer maiora conscendere verba que scribit Ovidius poeta percipimus IVᵒ libro *Metamorphoses* preassumpsi: "Ite simul in ardua montis."
>
> Venerabiles patres, magistri dominique venerandi, "quis," inquam, "ambigit illos aliis esse preferendos, qui quasi naturalis privilegio fulciti maiorum titulis ad virtutem evocantur et eorundem beneficio future bonitatis ceteris faciunt fidem?"
>
> Et ob hoc ad philosophie studia invitantur humiles et mansueti, ut gradibus exaltentur; insuper, honorabiles et honesti, ut virtutibus premientur, quibus digne exaltatio competit et ad quos etiam verbum imperativi debet dirigi ut ascendant cum autem nostri magistrandi sepius a philosophia sunt notati […]

This sermon has a different structure, beginning with a long introduction which makes it resemble a *postillatio*, and there is a *divisio intra* only in its *sub-sermo*: 1. "personarum notatio imperativa cum dicitur 'ite'"; 2. "earumdem convinctio solidativa cum dicitur 'simul'"; 3. "utrumque premium gradativa cum dicitur 'in ardua montis'".

We see here that all these three texts share some lines with *Invitati ascendant*, the ones from the quote from *Policraticus* starting with "quis ambigit…" to the words after, ending in "… virtutibus premientur." and they also use the verb 'ascendere' somewhere. However, neither one of these mentions the source from John of Salisbury.

It would be an extremely improbable coincidence for those authors to independently pick the same quote, because *Policraticus* is long and, while it was red in Prague, it was not really that popular, therefore one of these four

sermons must have served as a first model for the other ones. Therefore, we should analyze the clues resulting from the textual differences.

First, only *Invitati ascendant* mentions *Policraticus*; it would be most improbable that its author took the quote from one of the other three texts, afterwards he identified the source; this means that it was omitted in the other three which only appropriated the text from the quote.

Second, there are words which differ in the four texts, also comparing with the original source. The three ones are opposed to *Invitati ascendant* by some word differences: the three add the defective verb indicating indirect speech "inquam" after "quis", but not *Invitati ascendant*; the three use the forms "esse preferendos", "fulciti", and add "evocantur" after "virtutem", while *Invitati…* uses "fore preferendos", "ampliati" and does not have "evocantur". Neither does *Policraticus* have "inquam" (obviously), "evocantur", has "ampliati" instead of "fulciti", but it has "aliis" where all the four sermons have "ceteris". The closeness of *Invitati…* to *Policraticus'* text and the common differences of the other three texts may only be explained by a subsequent alteration of the quote in those other three sermons.

Third, the *thema* from *Invitati ascendant* is somehow reminiscent in the other three ones: The two ones attributable to Martinus Kunssonis de Praga use 'ascendite' as an explanation of 'ite', while the one of Master Gregorius has it in the *introductio thematis*: "… verbum imperativi debet dirigi ut ascendant…" and it is most probable that Martinus and Gregorius have had seen this word in the *thema* of the anonymous recommendation.

Fourth and most convincing, the words following the quote are not to be found in other sources, and they are identical in the four texts, therefore one of those authors must have composed them first. But this is actually the *divisio* in *Invitati…*: "Et ob hoc ad philosophie studia invitantur humiles et mansueti, ut gradibus exaltentur; insuper, honorabiles et honesti, ut virtutibus premientur." The other three sermons have different divisions, as mentioned before, thus this text fragment only functions as part of the *introductio thematis* in them. The fact that the two are symmetric is rather due to the practice of defining the sermon members in observance of the practices, as mentioned above, and we see that they are constructed using the same formula: 'invitatur A et B, ut C D.' The only one who really needed this brain effort was the anonymous author of *Invitati…*

From all these similarities and differences, we can conclude with certainty that *Invitati ascendant* served as a model for the three other sermons mentioned here, those having the *thema* "Ite simul in ardua montis." Indeed, they all come from the same environment, the Faculty of Arts from Prague, and the manuscripts containing them are in the same library. The fact that, in the current manuscript, the model text comes after the first version attributable to Martinus is most probable due to a reordering of the gatherings

when the codex was later bound. Consequently, what was said above about the practice of reusing the sermons is illustrated here by the discovery of a text recycled in the other three discourses.

4. Manuscript, attribution and dating

The manuscript is shortly described in the library catalogue (Truhlář 1905, 562) and some additional information is available in the *Manuscriptorium* online database (http://www.manuscriptorium.com/apps/index.php?direct= record &pid=AIPDIG-NKCR__VIII_E_5____0VP9XU9-cs) which also provides a digital polychromatic facsimile of this manuscript. Yet these sources do not indicate a precise date for the manuscript, and only some well-known authors are identified (Martinus Kunssonis de Praga, Johannes Hus, Johannes de Muta dictus Sophista, Gregorius Leonis de Praga, Blasius Lupus, Petrus de Alvernia). The manuscript appears under the title "Quaestiones, disputationes, recommendationes novorum rectorum, magistrorum, baccalariorum magna ex parte in universitate Pragensi habitae" and is described as dating from the 15th century, on paper, in multiple writing hands, 196 folios, and its size is 15×22 cm.

The manuscript doesn't provide any explicit detail for the text we are studying here: there is no table of contents and neither a name or a date in or around the text. Furthermore, there is no other obvious clue in the text, like a datable event or an identifiable personal name. At this stage, we can only state that it is an anonymous text from the 15th century.

But the relation with the other texts can give us an approximation of this information. The discourse of Martinus Kunssonis de Praga (ff. 110r–114v) was a recommendation presented in 1430 (Gabriel 1998, 372). The other datable texts in the codex are also from the beginning of the 15th century (Truhlář 1905, 562), therefore we can date the text edited here as coming from the beginning of the 15th century, but not after 1430.

The name of the author will still remain a mystery. In that time span, there were more than one hundred masters at the Faculty of Arts in Prague (Šmahel 2007, 289-315). The fact that Martinus Kunssonis de Praga reuses this recommendation may shed a light on the allegiance of this anonymous master (although we cannot exclude Martinus from the list of possible authors). The University of Prague was in the middle of the Hussite conflict, and Martinus was on the side of Ian Hus and even disputed questions alongside (Ryba 2006, 171-172; Gabriel 1998, 372). It would have been inappropriate to use the words of an adversary in one's own speech, thus we can say at least that this anonymous master was not part of the anti-Hussite group, or even that he could have been on the Hussite side. However, the fact that he avoids explicit theological or metaphysical references at all cost

reveals a non-combatant position, as the Hussite conflict arose from the philosophical dispute on the universals, as well as from theological disputes (Šmahel 2007, 515-525). Yet that discreet allusion to Buridan in the *divisio* may indicate his convergence with Nominalism, which was also the doctrine of the Hussites.

5. Critical edition

This text has never been edited before. The main reason for adding a critical edition of this sermon to this article is to further provide details on the aspects summarized above, and especially the relevant paleographical observations, in the *apparatus criticus*, and the textual sources, both explicit and implicit, in the *apparatus fontium*.

In this edition, the text is transcribed following the medieval orthography of Latin, because there is only one manuscript, and applying a classical Latin canon would be disadvantageous both because the choice for some spellings would be an arbitrary editorial decision and because some words did not exist in classical time. Therefore, the edited text is close to a diplomatic edition, but the punctuation which is almost absent in the manuscript was replaced by a modern one. The words supplied by the editor are marked by angle brackets.

The manuscript has some corrections in a different hand, but some of them alter the text to the point that it replaces some words from the quotes which also exist in the sources with different words. Therefore, when the corrections were moving away from the source, I kept the uncorrected words in text.

The *apparatus criticus* contains the paleographic remarks on the manuscript and the manuscript is indicated by the sigil *P*. The editorial remarks are abbreviated as they are commonly used in Latin editions: *om.* = he omitted; *iter.* = he wrote twice; *a.c.* = what was before he corrected; *p.c.* = what is after he corrected; *s.l.* = above the writing line; *mg.* = in the margin; *a.m.* = a different handwriting. Where words in the manuscript differ substantially from the sources, I added them to the *apparatus* with the mention *apud fontem* for an alternative reading.

The *apparatus fontium* contains abbreviated names and titles in order to limit the size of the footnotes, and their complete reference is to be found at the end, in the list of sources. It contains both the explicit and the implicit sources.

The changes of page are indicated in the right margin corresponding to a double vertical line inside the text. Lines are numbered continuously in the left margin and used as references in the *apparatus*.

Notes

1 "Therefore I confer to him the degree of Bachelor of Arts by the authority conceded to me in this part, so that they can read and dispute and exercise the other acts which pertain to this degree here and in any place in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen."

References

Gabriel, Jiří. 1998. *Slovník českých filozofů*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Jung-Palczewskiej, Elżbiety. 2000. *Prima verba. Krakowskie mowy uniwersyteckie*. Łódz: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Keats-Rohan, K.S.B. 1993. *Iohannis Saresberiensis Policraticus I–IV*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Knoll, Paul. 2016. *A Pearl of Powerful Learning. The University of Cracow in the Fifteenth Century*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Kowalczyk, Maria. 1970. *Krakowskie mowy uniwersyteckie z pierwszej połowy XV wieku*. Wrocław/Warszawa/Kraków: Polskiej Academii Nauk.

Maierù, Alfonso. 1994. *University Training in Medieval Europe*. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill.

Patar, Benoît. 1991. *Le traité de l'âme de Jean Buridan (de prima lectura)*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Éditions de l'Institut supérieur de philosophie / Longueuil: Éditions du préambule.

Pope, Hugh. 1910. "Book of Judith". In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

Ryba, Bohumil. 2006. *Magistri Iohannis Hus Quodlibet*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Spunar, Pavel. 1985-1995. *Repertorium auctorum Bohemorum provectum idearum post Universitatem Pragensem conditam illustrans*. 2 vols. Bratislava/Praha: Institutum Ossolinianum.

Šmahel, Frantisek. 2007. *The Charles University in the Middle Ages*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Truhlář, Josef. 1905. *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum latinorum, qui in c. r. bibliotheca publica atque Universitatis Pragensis asservantur*. Pars prior, Pragae: Sumptibus Regiæ societatis scientiarum bohemicæ.

Van der Meeren, Sophie. 2011. *Exhortation à la philosophie : le dossier grec Aristote*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Wenzel, Siegfried. 2015. *Medieval 'Artes Praedicandi': A Synthesis of Scholastic Sermon Structure*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Wlodek, Zofia. 2000. *Scripta manent: textus ad theologiam spectantes in Universitate Cracoviensi saeculo XV conscripti*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Papieskiej Akademii Teologicznej w Krakowie.

⟨Anonymus Magister Artium Pragensis⟩

⟨Recommendatio baccalaureorum artium: *Invitati ascendant*⟩

ed. Mihai Maga

P = Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, VIII.E.5, *ff.* 80r–81r

"**Invitati ascendant**," scribit venerabilis Iohannes *Policrati* in *De cura-* P 80r
lium nugis et vestigiis philosophorum. Reverendi patres magistrique venerandi,
"quis ambigit illos aliis fore preferendos, qui quasi naturali probitatis privilegio
ampliati maiorum titulis invitantur ad virtutem et eorumdem beneficio future
5 bonitatis ceteris faciunt fidem?" Et ob hoc ad philosophie studia invitantur
humiles et mansueti, ut gradibus exaltentur; insuper, honorabiles et honesti,
ut virtutibus premientur. Et ergo non indigne nostris dicitur de talibus iustum
propositum: "**invitati ascendant**."

|| Dixi itaque primo: eorum ad philosophie invitantur studia humiles P 80v
10 et mansueti, ut gradibus exaltentur. Nam dignius est ut honestiores semper
ad officia promoveantur, discoli vero et insipidi ac mansueti deiciatur, teste
Apuleyo in libro *De dogmate Platonis* sic ex ordinate: "hec est iusta, ex equitate
veniens partitio, ut meliores semper in officiis preferantur; pessimi autem
cives vel minus boni luce careant dignitatis." Cui concordat Gualterus in
15 *Alexandreidos* libro Iᵒ sic aiens: "exaltere velis siquos insignit honestas, eos
morum sublimat apex, licet ampla facultas. Et patrie desit et gloria sanguinis alti."
Et non sine causa. Nam, qui honestatibus plenus est interioribus animi, non

---

1 invitati ascendant] Io. Saresberiensis, *Policraticus* IV, 11 (ed. Webb vol. I p. 275 l. 25;
ed. Keats-Rohan p. 271 l. 183) || **3–5** quis — fidem] Io. Saresberiensis, *Policraticus* IV,
11 (ed. Webb vol. I p. 275 l. 26 – p. 276 l. 3; ed. Keats-Rohan p. 271 ll. 184–187) || **6** humiles
et mansueti] *cf. Iudith*, 9, 16 || honorabiles et honesti] *cf.* Iohannes Buridanus,
Quaestiones in De anima I, q. 3 (ed. Patar p. 181 l. 66) || **12–14** hec — dignitatis] Apuleius,
De dogmate Platonis II, 8; *apud* Th. Hibernicus, *Flores doctorum*, cap. "Electio" (ed. 1751 p.
260 § t) || **15–16** exaltere — alti] Gualterus de Castellione, *Alexandreis* I, 1 (ed.
Colker p. 12 ll. 93–95)

---

1 invitati] 1ᵃ *add. mg. P* || **3** naturali] naturalis *P* || **14–15** Gualterus in Alexandreios]
Alexandreios *P* ; Gualterus in Allexandreios *mg. a.m. P* || **15** eos] *p.c. P*

indiget exterioribus. Atestante *Alexandreio* libro eodem ubi dicit: "non ergo eget exterius qui moribus intus habundat. Nobilitas est sola animi que moribus ornat."

20 Unde et Oratius libro *Epistolarum* suarum, epistola Iª: "virtus est vicium fugere, sapientia prima stultitia caruisse." Nam "quis sine ea ad beatitudinis viam tendit, quasi cecus in lubrico tendens ad alta presumptuosus cadit. Unde etiam divinarum et humanarum rerum compotem Crissippus asseruit." Cum ergo "virtus ad gloriam, honorem, imperium, via vera" est, ad characterem eius

25 talis calcat mundi virtutibus, festivanter properandus est invitante philosophia verbis propositis: "**invitati ascendant**." Et hoc quamquam a d p r i m u m .

D i x i s e c u n d o quod ad philosophie studia invitantur honorabiles et honesti, ut virtutibus premientur, et non sine causa. Dignum enim videtur ut quod est scientia preditus reddatur honestiore reverendus. Seneca, libro IV *Epistolarum*

30 suarum: nam "vires boni ac honesti verbis sint eligendi et semper ante oculos sint habendi." Teste Seneca ibidem: scito autem "non eum esse beatum quem vulgus appellant, ad quem pecunia magna confluxit, sed illum cui omne bonum in animo, erectum est et excelsum et mirabilia calcantem, qui neminem videt cum quo se commutatum velit, qui hominem ea sola parte estimat qua homo

35 est, qui natura magistra utitur, ad illius leges se componit, sic vivit quomodo illa prescripsit; cui bona sua nulla vis excutit, qui mala in bonum vertit, certus iudicii, inconcussus, intrepidus; quem aliqua vis ⟨movet⟩, nulla perturbat; in quem fortunatum quod habuit telum nocentissimum vi maxima intorsit, pingit, non vulnerat," Seneca, Epistolam IVᵃᵐ. Et non mirum cum ipsi, scilicet boni

40 ac sapientes, "nutriunt virtutes exemplis premiorum, || nec quisquam est qui ad   *P 81r* morum summa invitatur ascendere, quando inremunerato non relinquitur quod conscientia teste laudatur," atteste Cassiodorus libro *Epistolarum* suarum;

18–19 non — ornat] Gualterus de Castellione, *Alexandreis* I, 1 (ed. Colker p. 12 ll. 103–104) || **20–21** virtus — caruisse] Horatius, *Epistulae* I, ep. I (ed. Borzsák p. 231 ll. 41–42) || **21–23** quis — asseruit] Io. Saresberiensis, *Policraticus* VII, 8 (ed. Webb vol. II p. 119 ll. 7–11) || **24** virtus — vera] Io. Saresberiensis, *Policraticus* VIII, 5 (ed. Webb vol. II p. 245 ll. 26–27) || **30–31** vires — habendi] Seneca, *Epistulae* I, ep. 11, § 8 (ed. Reynolds p. 25 ll. 16–17) || **31–39** non — vulnerat] Seneca, *Epistulae* V, ep. 45, § 9 (ed. Reynolds p. 117 ll. 19–29); *apud* Th. Hibernicus, *Flores doctorum*, cap. "Beatitudo sive beatus" (ed. 1751 p. 82, § q) || **40–42** nutriunt — laudatur] Cassiodorus, *Variarum* II, ep. 16, § 1 (ed Fridh & Halporn p. 67 ll. 4–7); *apud* Th. Hibernicus, *Flores doctorum*, cap. "Remuneratio" (ed. 1751 p. 643 § b)

---

18 Alexandreio] Allexandreio *P* || **21** quis] qui *P* || **22** tendens] tendes *P* || **23** rerum] *iter. P* || **33** animo] *p.c. P* || mirabilia] mortalium *s.l. a.m. P* || **34** commutatum] cogitatum *p.c. a.m. P* || **35** qui] quia *P* || natura] naturalis *a.c. P* || se] *mg. P* || **37** iudicii] iudicio *p.c. a.m. P* || movet] *om. et lac. add. P* ; *coni. apud fontem* || **38** fortunatum] fortuna, cum *apud fontem* || pingit] pungit *apud fontem* || **40** nutriunt] nutriuntur *a.c. P* || **41** quando] qui *p.c. a.m. P*

"equum enim est, ut unicuique perficiat labor suus et sicut expendendo cognoscit incommoda, ita et rebus perfectis consequatur augmenta." Cum ergo baccalaurei nostri propter studiorum acquisitionem multa incommoda perfrequentans exercitium, nec vigilando, nec ruinando, nec bursas suas evacuando pertulerunt. Non in merito ergo invitantur ad philosophie premia verbis propositis, sed "**invitati ascendant**" que fuerunt valentis.

⁎ ⁎

In quibus verbis breviter introductis d u o t a n g u n t u r : p r i m o , nostrorum baccalaureis ad honoris culmen evocatio; s e c u n d o tangitur ipsis eiusdem honoris oblatio. P r i m u m significatur in hoc pluri nominatio: '**invitati**,' s e c u n d u m notatur in hoc verbo additio: '**ascendant**;' ergo "**invitati ascendant**".

Si quereret aliquis: qui invitantur et quo ascendere dicunt? respondetur: invitantur ad premia, vocantur ad exempla. Debent autem ascendere ad statum maiorem, gradum altiorem et locum priorem.

43–44 equum — augmenta] Cᴀssɪᴏᴅᴏʀᴜs, *Variarum* II, ep. 33, § 2 (ed Fridh & Halporn p. 81 ll. 11–14); *apud* Tʜ. Hɪʙᴇʀɴɪᴄᴜs, *Flores doctorum*, cap. "Remuneratio" (ed. 1751 p. 643 § e)

44 baccalaurei] baccalaureis *P* || **55** exempla] exema *P*

Conspectus fontium

Biblia Vulgata Clementina, Roma: Typographia Apostolica Vaticana, 1592–1598.

Apuleius, *De dogmate Platonis*, in *Opera*, ed. R. Helm, P. Thomas, vol. III, Leipzig: Teubner, 1908.

Iohannes Buridanus, *Quaestiones in De anima*, ed. B. Patar, *Le traité de l'âme de Jean Buridan (de prima lectura)*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Éditions de l'Institut supérieur de philosophie / Longueuil: Éditions du préambule, 1991.

Cassiodorus, *Variarum*, CCSL 96, ed. Å. J. Fridh, J. W. Halporn, Turnhout: Brepols, 1973.

Gualterus de Castellione, *Alexandreis*, ed. Marvin L. Colker, Patavii: In aedibus Antenoreis, 1978.

Horatius, *Epistolarum*, in *Opera*, ed. S. Borzsák, vol. I, Leipzig: Teubner, 1984.

Ioannes Saresberiensis, *Policraticus sive de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum*, ed. C. Webb, 2 vols., Oxford: Cladendon, 1909; ed. K. S. B. Keats-Rohan, vol. I (books I–IV), Turnhout: Brepols, 1993.

Seneca, *Ad Lucilium Epistulae morales*, ed. L. D. Reynolds, vol. I, Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.

Thomas Hibernicus, *Flores doctorum pene omnium, tam Graecorum, quam Latinorum, qui tum in theologia, tum in philosophia hactenus claruerunt*, Vienna: apud J. P. Kraus, 1751.