




Luciano Micali (Prague)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1337-1962>

THE NOTION OF *COMMUNIS SCHOLA* IN THE THOUGHT OF JEAN GERSON (1363–1429)

Abstract. The article aims to analyze the meaning and the role of the notion of *communis schola* in the theological and ecclesiological thought of Jean Gerson (1363–1429), Chancellor of the University of Paris, schoolman influent in every intellectual debate of his time, and renowned spiritual advisor. Driven by a constant concern for the unity of the Church, Gerson is aware of the need to realize this unity first of all within the University environment, in order to avoid the circulation and the spread of heterodox or even heretical doctrines; his references to the concept of “common school”, in different textual contexts and with various shades of meaning, invest not only the doctrinal contents, but also the methodology, the moral attitudes, and the right theological models of the ideal master and of the ideal student of theology. The article also touches the way in which the Parisian chancellor deals with mysticism and mystical writers, using the concept of “common school” to define the borders and the terms in which it is possible to access the difficult and obscure field of the mystical theology.

Keywords: Gerson, Scholasticism, doctrine, theology, common school, unity, Latin, error, heresy, University, mysticism

The works and thought of Jean Gerson¹ have been the object of attention by the scholarly community since the early years of the 20th century. An abundant scientific literature flourished on basically all the aspects of his multifarious production, with a special attention to the theological and ecclesiological aspects of Gerson’s intellectual activity²: as

¹ On Gerson’s life cf. B.P. MCGUIRE, *In Search of Jean Gerson: Chronology of his Life and Works*, [in:] *A Companion to Jean Gerson*, ed. IDEM, Leiden–Boston 2011 [= BCCT, 3], p. 1–40; also cf. P. GLORIEUX, *La vie et les oeuvres de Gerson. Essai chronologique*, AHDLMA 25–26, 1950–1951, p. 149–191.

² Scholars like Marc Vial and Yelena Matusevich focused on Gerson’s mystical works, which represent an important part of the whole production of the Parisian chancellor: cf. M. VIAL, *Jean Gerson théoricien de la théologie mystique*, Paris 2005; IDEM, *Théologie mystique et syndérèse chez Jean Gerson*, [in:] *Vers la contemplation. Études sur la syndérèse et les modalités de la contemplation de l’antiquité à la Renaissance*, ed. C. TROTTMANN, Paris 2007, p. 215–232; IDEM, *Théologie mystique et expérience chez Jean Gerson*, RThPh 142, 2010, p. 229–243; Y. MATUSEVICH, *Le siècle d’or de la mystique*

a pastor³, a university chancellor, and a spiritual advisor⁴, the intense intellectual speculation of this late medieval master can be brought back to the constant need to preserve unity in the Church⁵ from the doctrinal and the ecclesiological points of view. His stances in almost every academic and doctrinal debate of his time⁶, his strong conciliarism⁷, and his active criticism against books perceived as dangerous and suspect of heresy⁸ show Gerson's concern about possible divisions, separations,

française: un autre regard. Étude de la littérature spirituelle de Jean Gerson (1363–1429) à Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (1507–1537), Paris 2004; IDEM, *Gerson's Legacy*, [in:] *A Companion...*, p. 357–400. A huge part of the scholarly attention has been devoted to Gerson's magisterial works: in the first part of the 20th century, the most solid foundations on this area of Gerson's production have been poured by André Combes and Palémon Glorieux: cf. A. COMBES, *Essai sur la critique de Ruysbroeck par Jean Gerson*, vol. I, Paris 1945; IDEM, *La théologie mystique de Gerson: profil de son évolution*, EPh 19.3, 1964, p. 444–545; P. GLORIEUX, *L'enseignement universitaire de Gerson*, RTAM 23, 1956, p. 88–113. P. Glorieux also realized what is now the standard critical edition of Gerson's complete Latin and French works: cf. JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1960–1973. More recently, the works of Sven Grosse focused on the relationship between the research of a particular style and the definition of a theological program in Gerson's magisterial works, providing one of the most thorough assessments on the conceptual prodromes of Gerson's magisterial endeavor. Cf. S. GROSSE, *Johannes Gerson und Bonaventura: Kontinuität und Diskontinuität zwischen Hoch- und Spätmittelalter*, [in:] *Herbst des Mittelalters? Fragen zur Bewertung des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts*, ed. J.A. AERTSEN, M. PICKAVÉ, Berlin–New York 2004 [= MMed, 31], p. 340–348; IDEM, *Heilungsgewißheit und Scrupulositas im späten Mittelalter. Studien zu Johannes Gerson und Gattungen der Frömmigkeitstheologie seiner Zeit*, Tübingen 1994. During the first years of the 21st century the studies of D. Hobbins provided one of the best appraisals of Gerson as one of the first “modern” intellectuals, especially with reference to his attention in strongly controlling the publication of his works and their early circulation: cf. D. HOBBS, *The Schoolman as Public Intellectual: Jean Gerson and the Late Medieval Tract*, AHR 108, 2003, p. 1308–1337; IDEM, *Authorship and Publicity before Print. Jean Gerson and the Transformation of Late Medieval Learning*, Philadelphia 2009, p. 152–182.

³ An assessment on this dimension of Gerson's activity has been provided by N. McLOUGHLIN, *Gerson as a Preacher between Mendicants and Secular Priests*, [in:] *A Companion...*, p. 249–253.

⁴ On Gerson as spiritual advisor of monks and nuns, cf. I. IRIBARREN, *Jean Gerson, Spiritual Adviser to the Celestines*, [in:] *Autorität und Wahrheit. Kirchliche Vorstellungen, Normen und Verfahren (13.–15. Jahrhundert)*, ed. G. POTESTÀ, E. MÜLLER-LUCKNER, München 2011, p. 159–178.

⁵ On Gerson's concern for unity, cf. B.P. MCGUIRE, *Jean Gerson and the Last Medieval Reformation*, University Park 2005, p. 89; also cf. L.B. PASCOE, *Jean Gerson: Principles of Church Reform*, Leiden 1973 [= SMRT, 7].

⁶ On this topic cf. Z. KALUZA, *La doctrine selon Jean Gerson*, [in:] *Vera Doctrina. Zur Begriffsgeschichte der Lehre von Augustinus bis Descartes – L'idée de doctrine d'Augustin à Descartes*, ed. P. BÜTTGEN, R. IMBACH, U.J. SCHNEIDER, H.J. SELDERHUIS, Wiesbaden 2009, p. 115–140; Z. KALUZA, *Les querelles doctrinales à Paris. Nominalistes et réalistes aux confins du XIV et du XV siècles*, vol. II, Bergamo 1988.

⁷ On this aspect cf. F. OAKLEY, *Gerson as Conciliarist*, [in:] *A Companion...*, p. 179–204; G.H.M. POSTHUMUS MEYJES, *Jean Gerson. Apostle of Unity: his Church Politics and Ecclesiology*, Leiden–New York 1999; B. SÈRE, *Les débats d'opinion à l'heure du Grand Schisme. Ecclésiologie et politique*, Turnhout 2016.

⁸ The key elements of Gerson's attitude towards books perceived as dangerous (for any reasons) can be found in his criticism to the *Roman de la Rose*, the allegorical poem started by Guillaume de Lorris and finished by Jean de Meung: cf. R. BLUMENFELD-KOSICKI, *Jean Gerson and the Debate on the*

and creations of doctrinal streams within not only Christianity as a whole, but also specifically within the university; as a theology professor and a chancellor of the University of Paris, Gerson clearly perceives the role of this institution in determining the spread or the stoppage of texts and ideas⁹. Moreover, he is aware of the philosophical and theological consequences of allowing or limiting their circulation¹⁰.

If organizing knowledge can be seen as one of the main aspects of Scholasticism¹¹, a part of this effort of organization consists of filtering works, doctrines, philosophical categories, and modalities of expressing concepts in order to accept only those which can be useful¹². This is the meaning of the monumental *summae* of the golden age of Scholastic philosophy, but also of the shorter treatises that characterize the works of late medieval masters, like Gerson. Scholastic masters filter the philosophical and theological past, select ancient texts perceived as useful in order to support their argumentations, and prepare collections of *auctoritates* that basically create a new corpus of authoritative sources and condemn to the

Roman de la Rose, [in:] *A Companion...*, p. 317–356. From this point of view, it is also interesting to consider the case of the censure against Ruusbroec's masterpiece *Die geestelike Brulocht*, cf. A. COMBES, *Essai...*, vol. I, p. 664. A similar case is Gerson's criticism of the Franciscan Ubertino da Casale's *Arbor vitae crucifixae Iesu*; cf. D. HOBBS, *Gerson on Lay Devotion*, [in:] *A Companion...*, p. 62–63.
⁹ Cf. B.P. MCGUIRE, *Jean Gerson...*, p. 240–283.

¹⁰ This specific concern touches the University of Paris at all levels and involves the hierarchies. The most famous case is probably that of bishop Tempier's condemnation of 219 philosophical propositions circulating at the Faculty of Arts in 1277. Gerson often refers to this condemnation and to the censored articles, warning the students and the masters about avoiding to follow those philosophical doctrines: cf. IOHANNES GERSON, *Nova positio*, p. 150, l. 20, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. VI, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1965. On Tempier's condemnation in the frame of the process of control of texts and doctrines circulating at the University of Paris during the Late Middle Ages, cf. M.M.H. THIJSSSEN, *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris, 1200–1400*, Philadelphia 1998, p. 40–56; IDEM, *What Really Happened on 7 March 1277? Bishop Tempier's Condemnation and Its Institutional Context*, [in:] *Texts and Contexts in Ancient and Medieval Science. Studies on the Occasion of John E. Murdoch's Seventieth Birthday*, ed. E. SYLLA, M. McVAUGH, Leiden 1997 [= BSIH, 78], p. 84–114; S. PIRON, *Le plan de l'évêque: pour une critique interne de la condamnation de 1277*, RTPM 78.2, 2011, p. 383–415; L. BIANCHI, *1277: A Turning Point in Medieval Philosophy?*, [in:] *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter?*, ed. J.A. AERTSEN, A. SPEER, Berlin–New York 1998 [= MMed, 26], p. 90–110; A. DE LIBERA, *Philosophie et censure*, [in:] *Was ist Philosophie...*, p. 71–89. For a general look at the historiographical debate on the condemnation of 1277, cf. C. KÖNIG-PRALONG, *Avènement de l'Aristotélisme en terre chrétienne. L'essence et la matière: entre Thomas d'Aquin et Guillaume d'Ockham*, Paris 2005, p. 15–24; L. BIANCHI, *Censure et liberté intellectuelle à l'Université de Paris (XIII^e–XIV^e siècles)*, Paris 1999.

¹¹ On the typical features of Scholasticism, cf. R. SCHÖNBERGER, *Was ist Scholastik?*, Hildesheim 1991, p. 52–102; IDEM, *Scholastik*, [in:] *LMA*, vol. VII, ed. R.H. BAUTIER, R. AUTY, München 1995, p. 1521–1526. Such an effort of organization of knowledge proceeds through the dialectic confrontation of the arguments, as we will see later.

¹² On the notion of *utilitas* and with a specific reference to Gerson's works, cf. C. BURGER, *Aedificatio, Fructus, Utilitas. Johannes Gerson als Professor der Theologie und Kanzler der Universität Paris*, Tübingen 1986, p. 110–125.

oblivion many other ancient texts¹³. This immense intellectual effort is the core of a process of systematization of knowledge that can be finally understood as an attempt to preserve unity in theology. Independently of the presence of various schools of thought characterizing the medieval debate, every school and every master has the ambition to provide works which can represent a synthesis of what the past left, with the aim to reduce everything to the unity of a solid theological system¹⁴.

Looking at Gerson's works from this perspective, his frequent references to unity in theology not only from the doctrinal, but also from the methodological point of view acquire an importance that seems decisive in order to understand the intellectual project of this master, i.e. defending the *sana doctrina* within the university practice; the chancellor warns both the masters and the students of his university about the dangers of curiosity, vanity, *peregrinitas*, because they lead to the abandon, meant methodologically and doctrinally, of the safe path traced by the Fathers of the Church and by the previous Scholastic masters¹⁵.

In the frame of this search for unity, a relevant place assumes, in our opinion, the notion of *communis schola*, and the aim of this contribution is to analyze its importance and role in Gerson's theological thought. This expression appears in a number of gersonian textual passages from different kinds of works (magisterial, spiritual, ecclesiological works, letters, etc.) and is always referred, even if with specific *nuances*, to the university environment; the understanding of this concept seems of a primary importance when it comes to analyze how Gerson conceives teaching, writing in the field of theology, and the relationship between magisterial authority and defense of the true doctrine from what is perceived (or often simply constructed¹⁶) as the falsehood of heterodoxy and heresy.

¹³ The most important example of such a ponderous collections of *auctoritates* is maybe represented by the *Auctoritates Aristotelis*; on the story and on the philological reconstruction of this text, cf. J. HAMESSE, *Les Auctoritates Aristotelis. Un florilège médiéval. Étude historique et édition critique*, Louvain 1974, p. 7–16.

¹⁴ On the medieval schools of thought and their dynamics, cf. M.J.F.M. HOENEN, *Categories of Medieval Doxography. Reflections on the Use of 'Doctrina' and 'Via' in the 14th and 15th Century Philosophical and Theological Sources*, [in:] *Vera Doctrina...*, p. 69–70; M.J.F.M. HOENEN, *Late Medieval Schools of Thought in the Mirror of University Textbooks. The 'promptuarium argumentorum' (Cologne 1482)*, [in:] *Philosophy and Learning. Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. M.J.F.M. HOENEN, H.H.J. SCHNEIDER, J. WIELAND, Leiden–New York–Boston 1995 [= *ESMER*, 6], p. 329–369.

¹⁵ For a general look at the concept of curiosity in the medieval thought, cf. I. IRIBARREN, *Curiositas*, [in:] *Mots médiévaux*, ed. I. ATUCHA, D. CALMA, C. KÖNIG PRALONG, I. ZAVATTERO, Turnhout 2011, p. 199–209; in particular p. 199: *Quel qu'en soit l'usage précis, en contextes médiévaux le terme curiositas est toujours marqueur d'une frontière... La curiosité est en ce sens une forme d'empiètement et sa dénonciation une forme de censure, une tentative de redresser l'ordre*. Cf. G. BÖS, *Curiositas. Die Rezeption eines antiken Begriffes durch christliche Autoren bis Thomas von Aquin*, Schöning 1995.

¹⁶ Cf. *Aux marges de l'hérésie. Invention, formes et usages polémiques de l'accusation d'hérésie au Moyen Âge*, ed. F. MERCIER, I. ROSE, Rennes 2017.

In the treatise *Contra curiositatem studentium*, the Parisian chancellor exposes his thoughts about curiosity, vanity, pride, and other intellectual attitudes seen as wrong and dangerous in the study of theology; the reflection on these topics is certainly not new, and Gerson has illustrious models from which he takes inspiration in discussing this sort of matter: Augustine of Hippo warned his readers about the dangers represented by the excess of curiosity, through which the human being is brought to continuously wander in search of intellectual pleasures and finally forgets to follow the path towards God¹⁷; in such a misuse of the intellectual abilities, the things to be used (*uti*) are confused with those that need to be enjoyed (*frui*)¹⁸. Coming to medieval Scholasticism, Thomas Aquinas wrote two *quaestiones* devoted to the discussion of the concepts of *studiositas*¹⁹ and *curiositas*²⁰, respectively seen as the good and the bad moral attitudes leading the human being to exalt his natural inclination to know, driving it to a useful and fruitful knowledge or, to the contrary, to spoil it. By their characteristics, they are seen by Thomas as totally opposite²¹. Also Bonaventure of Bagnoregio, one of Gerson's great models²², linked in several passages *curiositas* and *studiositas*²³.

Against the background of this authoritative tradition, Gerson warns his students about the dangers of following unapproved paths, driven by a curious approach to the study of the texts: in a passage of *Contra curiositatem studentium* such a wrong intellectual attitude is linked to the bad tendency to choose uncommon terms in the field of theology, and in Gerson's criticism the notion of *communis schola* has a remarkable place:

¹⁷ For a detailed study about the concept of curiosity in Augustine's works, cf. J. TORCHIA, *Restless Mind. Curiositas and the Scope of Inquiry in Augustine's Psychology*, Milwaukee 2013.

¹⁸ Cf. AUGUSTINUS, *De doctrina christiana*, I, 4, ed. I. MARTIN, Turnholti 1962 [= CC.SL, 32], p. 8. Cf. AUGUSTINUS, *De vera religione*, 29, 52, 2–12, ed. I. MARTIN, Turnholti 1962 [= CC.SL, 32], p. 22: *videamus quatenus ratio possit progredi a visibilibus ad invisibilia et a temporalibus ad aeterna conscendens... In quorum consideratione [the things of the world], non vana et peritura curiositas exercenda est, sed gradus ad immortalia et semper manentia faciendus*. On the concept of *vana curiositas* in Augustine and through the Middle Ages, cf. H. OBERMAN, *Contra vanam curiositatem. Ein Kapitel der Theologie zwischen Seelenwinkel und Weltall*, Zürich 1974; J. TORCHIA, *Restless Mind...*, p. 239; J. HAMBURGER, *Speculations on Speculation*, [in:] *Deutsche Mystik im abendländischen Zusammenhang*, ed. W. HAUG, W. SCHNEIDER-LASTIN, Tübingen 2000, p. 369.

¹⁹ Cf. THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Summa theologiae*, q. 166, Romae 1894 (cetera: THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Summa theologiae*).

²⁰ Cf. THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Summa theologiae*, q. 167, art. 1.

²¹ Cf. THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Summa theologiae*, q. 167, art. 1: *studiositas curiositati opponitur*.

²² On Bonaventure as a theological model for Gerson, cf. M. SCHLOSSER, *Bonaventure: Life and Works*, [in:] *A Companion to Bonaventure*, ed. J.M. HAMMOND, J.A.W. HELLMANN, J. GOFF, Leiden–Boston 2014 [= BCCT, 48], p. 9–59, 57. Cf. D. HOBBS, *Authorship...*, p. 18; S. GROSSE, *Johannes Gerson...*, p. 340–348.

²³ Cf. BONAVENTURA, *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten*, 62, 1, 39; 97, 2, 34, [in:] IDEM, *Opera Omnia*, vol. VI, Romae 1893; cf. BONAVENTURA, *Commentarius in Evangelium Sancti Lucae*, 315, 1, 33; 437, 2, 2, [in:] IDEM, *Opera Omnia*, vol. VII, Romae 1893.

Quamobrem dum terminos quosdam apud aliquem ex doctoribus approbatis invenimus non usitatos in schola communi illos introducere non debemus, nisi pia et reverenti resolutione praevia ut dicendo: terminus iste a tali sic accipiebatur; qui scilicet usus vel quia usus communis aliter accipit cavenda est audientium offensio in divinis²⁴.

The idea of “unusual”²⁵ here is not at all vague; Gerson doesn’t simply refer to a general and not specified “usual” way of expression or to a not specified “usual” set of terms belonging to an ambiguous tradition; on the contrary, the chancellor refers to a “common school” perceived as concrete and present. This “common school” is innervated by the authority of the masters who went through an approved educational path in order to be able to teach. The message that Gerson sends through this textual passage implies that the theological language must be handled and ruled by those who possess an academic training, i.e. the masters in theology.

Inspired again by Augustine and quoting his famous statement *nobis ad certam regulam loqui fas est*²⁶, the author often warns theologians and students about the necessity to use terms belonging to the Scholastic use, and this idea also touches the question about whether it’s possible to use vernacular languages in theology²⁷. In his harsh criticism of the third book of Ruusbroec’s *Die geestelike Brulocht*²⁸, Gerson affirms that in the theological field only Latin can be allowed, in order to avoid a dangerous Babel²⁹. If in the biblical Babel the human beings couldn’t

²⁴ IOHANNES GERSON, *Contra curiositatem studentium*, p. 244, ll. 15–18, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. III, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1962.

²⁵ The term *inusitatus* applied to theology with a negative connotation can be also found in IOHANNES GERSON, *À Barthélemy Clantier I*, p. 98, l. 7, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. II, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1960 (cetera: IOHANNES GERSON, *À Barthélemy Clantier I*): *Modus loquendi doctorum si reperiat in propriis et parabolicis et inusitatus, aut figurativus, extendi vel in usum trahi non debet... Alioquin frustra essent Doctores in Theologia constituti principaliter ad officium elucidandi Sacram Scripturam, quam magis atque magis aliter agendo confunderent.*

²⁶ Cf. AUGUSTINUS, *De civitate Dei*, 10, 23, 21, ed. B. DOMBART, A. KALB, Turnholti 1955 [= CC.SL, 47–48]: *nobis autem ad certam regulam loqui fas est, ne uerborum licentia etiam de rebus, quae his significantur, impiam gignat opinionem.*

²⁷ Cf. IOHANNES GERSON, *De examinatione doctrinarum*, p. 466, l. 28, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. IX, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1973; IOHANNES GERSON, *De modis significandi*, 630, 14, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. IX... (cetera: IOHANNES GERSON, *De modis significandi*); *De sensu litterali sacrae scripturae*, 336, 22–25, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. IX...; IOHANNES GERSON, *Pro licentiandis in decretis*, 228, 7–8, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. V, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1963. On this aspect, cf. I. IRIBARREN, *Le Paradis retrouvé: l’utopie linguistique de Jean Gerson*, RHR 231, 2014 (= *Langue et autorité théologique à la fin du Moyen Âge*, ed. IDEM), p. 223–251.

²⁸ Gerson’s criticism of Ruusbroec’s work is studied in detail by A. COMBES, *Essai...*

²⁹ Cf. IOHANNES GERSON, *À Barthélemy Clantier II*, p. 97, ll. 19–23, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. II... (cetera: IOHANNES GERSON, *À Barthélemy Clantier II*): *Prima consideratio: Nobis ad certam regulam loqui fas est. Posita est illic sententiosissima haec verissima que Augustini sententia quae tollit barbaram confusionem linguarum a sacra doctrina. Nam qualis altera esset efficacior via*

understand each other, now the chancellor highlights the risk hidden behind the possible use of the vernacular languages in theology: this risk consists of losing the perfect correspondance between concepts and words, a correspondance that was consolidated by a very long tradition and that was concretely embodied by what Gerson perceives as an unitarian Scholastic method and by the standardized Scholastic Latin used at the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris. In Gerson's words, the *communis schola* preserves the unity of the language, of the terminology, and of the method; preserving these aspects of the intellectual activity inside the university is seen by our author as a way to defend, *tout court*, the unity of the *sana doctrina*, because the linguistic and terminological confusion can lead to errors, and from the errors heresy can arise³⁰. Heresy – Gerson perfectly knows it – is often described in the canonical sources³¹ as something which multiplies errors and doctrines, and such a multiplication is depicted through concrete images, like that of a series of tails, all different but connected³². For this reason, heresy is seen as the opposite of the doctrinal unity. Preserving unity (in language, terminology, method, and – finally – doctrine) seems to be the only way conceived by Gerson to avoid errors and heresy.

In another magisterial work, *De modis significandi*, the *doctor christianissimus* discusses again the relationship between curiosity and theology and, again, he refers to the “common school” in describing how to properly express the doctrinal concepts in a proper way:

prohibendi aedificationem turris davidicae in bonum quam si fieret nominum vel terminorum pro libitu cujuslibet variatio? Non enim tunc intelligeret unus alterum sed in quamdam Babylonis confusionem laberemur. On this association of the use of vernacular and Babel's linguistic confusion, cf. P. VON MOOS, *Zwischen Babel und Pfingsten. Sprachdifferenzen und Geschprächverständnis in der Vormoderne (8–16 Jh.)*, Zürich–Berlin 2008.

³⁰ On the notion of *sana doctrina* and on the necessity to avoid the scandal of the error and of the heretical division of the unity, cf. IOHANNES GERSON, *Errores circa praeceptum: non occides*, p. 505, l. 12, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. VIII, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1971. On the style and on the terminological uniformity in theology, cf. I. IRIBARREN, *Question de style. Langage et méthode comme enjeux rhétoriques dans l'œuvre de Jean Gerson*, [in:] *Langage et méthode. Réflexions historiques et historiographiques sur la pensée médiévale*, ed. U. ZAHND, Freiburg im Breisgau 2017, p. 183–221.

³¹ Cf. LUCIUS III, *Ad abolendam*, [in:] *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, vol. I, ed. A. RICHTER, Romae 1955, col. 751–753; cf. INNOCENTIUS III, *Vergentis in senium*, [in:] *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, vol. I... (cetera: INNOCENTIUS III, *Vergentis in senium*), col. 753–754; CLEMENS V, *Ad nostrum*, ed. A. RICHTER, [in:] *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, vol. I..., col. 1183–1184. On the medieval ecumenical councils of the Church and on their dealing with heresies, cf. P. VALLIÈRE, *Conciliarism. A History of Decision-Making in the Church*, Cambridge 2012; K.A. FINK, *Die konziliare Idee im späten Mittelalter*, [in:] *Die Entwicklung des Konziliarismus. Werden und nachwirken der Konziliaren Idee*, ed. R. BAEUMER, Darmstadt 1976, p. 275–294; J. MIETHKE, *Einheit als Aufgabe: Momente der Integration in der politischen Theorie der Scholastik*, *VuF* 63, 2005, p. 241–272.

³² Cf. INNOCENTIUS III, coll. 753–754: *Vergentis in senium: Ut capiamus vulpeculas quae demoliuntur vineam Domini Sabbaoth. Spiritus quidem habent diversos, sed caudas invicem colligatas, quia de vanitate conveniunt in idipsum.*

Theologus in inquisitione speculabilium curiositatem evitet non plus quam expedit, moralia dimittendo. Sequatur insuper modos significandi quibus utitur communis schola doctorum etiam si quandoque posset invenire suo iudicio magis idoneos³³.

Here Gerson specifically refers to the theologian who deals with speculative, doctrinal theology, leaving apart the affective one; in fact, the objects of knowledge described in these lines are the *speculabilia*, investigated through the application of the intellect abstracting informations from the sensitive data: this is the positive, scientific knowledge³⁴. Through the analysis and research (*inquisitio*) on the visible things that can be investigated through the intellect, the theologian can know a number of things about God and about His relationship to the created world³⁵, not being able anyway to reach the essence of the Creator (which is something impossible *in via*); in the frame of this earthly form of intellectual knowledge and with the need to express the results of this *inquisitio*, the master in theology needs not only a set of terms and a common language, but also a clear way to put the concepts together and to express them in a way in which they can be absorbed by those who will then receive them (no matter if they are other masters or students)³⁶. The *modi significandi* to be used are those of the “common school of the doctors”: this is a clear reference to the scholastic ways and forms adopted in order to systematize and communicate the theological knowledge, avoiding styles and forms that are not adopted in the university practice.

This passage can be better understood if compared to an extract from Gerson's second letter to Barthélemy Clantier³⁷, where the *doctor christianissimus* affirms that it is necessary to follow the examples of Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure and other masters *who, left apart every terminological embellishment, transmitted theology through questions, in order to have, under certain rules and a precise form, both a very safe speculative and practical theology, reducing all the previous doctors to only one and sure way of expression*³⁸. This textual passage and its terminological choices

³³ IOHANNES GERSON, *De modis significandi*, p. 630, l. 5.

³⁴ The most systematic reflection of Gerson on the topic of the sensorial perception and on the intellectual abstraction from the the sensorial data is contained in the treatise IOHANNES GERSON, *De oculo*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. VIII... In this work Gerson discusses the various forms of vision, from the sensorial to the intellectual and the mystical one.

³⁵ This is a key-concept in medieval theology. Cf. BONAVENTURA, *Commentarius in Evangelium Sancti Iohannis*, 243, 7; 318, 4, [in:] IDEM, *Opera omnia*, vol. VI, Romae 1893); cf. THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Summa theologiae*, q. 43, art. 7; cf. HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE, *De archa Noe*, 4, 6, ed. P. SICARD, Turnholti 2001 [= CC.CM, 176].

³⁶ On the figure of the medieval master in theology and its role within the University, cf. R. GRYSO, *The Authority of the Teacher in the Ancient and Medieval Church*, JES 19.2, 1982, p. 176–187; A.L. GABRIEL, *The Ideal Master of the Medieval University*, CHR 60.1, 1974, p. 1–40.

³⁷ Cf. IOHANNES GERSON, *À Barthélemy Clantier II*, p. 97–102.

³⁸ Cf. IOHANNES GERSON, *À Barthélemy Clantier II*, ll. 18–20, p. 98: *Hac consideratione permotos existimo doctores novissimos Thomam, Bonaventuram et similes, dum omisso omni verborum ornatu tradiderunt theologiam per quaestiones, ut sub certis regulis et sub praecisa verborum forma tutissimam*

is absolutely illuminating in the way in which it perfectly summarizes Gerson's account of academic theology: the idea of "very safe" (*tutissimam*) theology goes together with that of "one and sure" (*unam securamque*) way of expression; the author stresses here the connection between the unity in the modality of expression and the doctrinal safety. It is only in being *one* that the mode of expression can be *sure*, i.e. not exposed to the risk of misinterpretations. The "one and sure way of expression" is that of the *communis schola doctorum* mentioned in *De modis significandi*, but the extract from the letter to Barthélemy Clantier specifies the nature of this community and its role: the common school of the doctors "transmits theology through questions", and this is a clear reference to the typical genres of the Scholasticism³⁹. Through its typical genres and its typical methodologies⁴⁰, this community of scholars "leaves apart every terminological embellishment" and just focuses on the essence of the theological activity, i.e. systematizing and transmitting knowledge. This is, again, a clear reference to the idea of utility and fruitfulness of the theological inquiry, in the frame of the search for doctrinal unity.

The connection between scholastic models and doctrine can be retraced in another textual passage from a magisterial work of Jean Gerson, *De vita spirituali animae*, in which the notion of *communis schola* has the connotation of magisterial consensus compared to other minority positions concerning the concept of venial sin; if Henry of Ghent in his *Quodlibet III* and Bernard of Clairvaux in *De precepto divino* classify venial sins as acts against the divine law, Gerson affirms that, according to the position of other masters, venial sin is an act outside of the divine law, and not against it. In particular, the *doctor christianissimus* writes:

Aliorum opinio contraria, ut Thomae et communis scholae, dicentium veniale non esse contra sed praeter praeceptum⁴¹.

This passage is significant because it highlights how Gerson conceives the "common school" in an authoritative frame that sees in Thomas Aquinas a reference and cohesive element: not only the school represented by the authority of the masters is "common", but Gerson is very well aware also of Thomas' position

haberemus theologiam tam practicam quam speculativam, reducendo doctores omnes priores ad unam securamque locutionis proprietatem.

³⁹ Gerson expresses the same concept in a passage from *De directione cordis*, p. 107, l. 23–26, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. VIII...: *Attendatur denique pro praemissis et aliis similibus dubiis resolute definiendis, quod doctores sancti priores, utentes rhetoricis persuasionibus, in aggravationem vitorum et laudem virtutum, non ita tradiderunt resolutionem moralium materiarum, immo nec speculabilium, sicut doctores recentiores qui per quaestiones et per argumenta processerunt ad utramque partem et per decisiones processerunt.*

⁴⁰ On this aspects of the university practice, cf. W. KLUXEN, *Institution und Ideengeschichte zur geschichtlichen Bedeutung der mittelalterlichen Universität*, [in:] *Philosophy and Learning...*, p. 1–16.

⁴¹ Cf. IOHANNES GERSON, *De vita spirituali animae*, p. 182, l. 4, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. III...

of common master and common example to follow⁴². If the philosophical and theological debate about sin allows different positions, as it is normal in the academic environment, Gerson finds anyway a majority position on the theme and defines it as the one “of Thomas and of the common school”. On one side, Thomas is seen as a seal of quality and approval of a theory: putting his name automatically certifies the validity of a statement; on the other side, Gerson seems to indicate Thomas Aquinas as a sort of *caput* and cohesive element of the academic tradition of the university of Paris. In the expression *ut Thomae et communis scholae*, we can retrace both a time and space perspective: Thomas is seen as the historical model to follow in the present of the academic speculation, but also as the figure around which the concept itself of “common school” is built up. Therefore, unity is, again, what drives Gerson through his speculation: the “common doctor” seals and authenticates the leading position of the academic community of Paris, a community sharing precise methods and models that became the reference point for the philosophical and theological speculation in medieval Europe⁴³.

This concept is confirmed by a passage from a letter to a Franciscan friar, where Gerson explicitly links the academic environment of Paris at the times of Bonaventure with the notion of *communis doctrina*. About the *doctor seraphicus* Gerson writes:

Secutus est doctor iste (Bonaventura), se testante, doctrinam communem et solidam quae Parisius vigeat maxime tempore suo⁴⁴.

If the “common school” is the structure connecting and holding together, in a unity, philosophy and theology in the academic community in Paris, the result of this unity of models, methods, and ways of expression is a “common doctrine” that preserves the unity in faith and avoids the birth and the spread of

⁴² Thomas is often cited by the late scholastic master as the *doctor communis*. Cf. IOHANNES WYCLIFF, *Sermones* 50, p. 436, l. 27, ed. J. LOSERTH, London 1887–1890; cf. DIONYSIUS CARTUSIANUS, *Enarratio in librum Deuteronomii*, art. 1, p. 524, l. 27, [in:] *Dionysii Cartusiani Opera omnia*, vol. II, [s.l.] 1897). On the posterity and reception of Thomas’ works and legacy, cf. P. PORRO, *Tommaso d’Aquino. Un profilo storico-filosofico*, Roma 2012, p. 464–480; A. WALZ, *Thomas von Aquin. Lebensgang und Lebenswerk des Fürsten der Scholastik*, Basel 1953, p. 126–141.

⁴³ On this aspect, cf. Y. CONGAR, *Theologians and the Magisterium in the West: from the Gregorian Reform to the Council of Trent*, ChS 17, 1978, p. 210–224; S. MÉNACHE, *La naissance d’une nouvelle source d’autorité: l’Université de Paris*, RH 1982, p. 305–328. By the way, the acceptance of Thomas Aquinas’ teaching and doctrines by Gerson and other contemporary masters should not be seen as unequivocal; cf. IOHANNES GERSON, *Contre Jean de Monzon*, p. 12, l. 27, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. X, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1973. The same criticism can be found in Pierre d’Ailly’s works: cf. D. TABER JR., *Pierre d’Ailly and the Teaching Authority of the Theologian*, ChH 59.2, 1990, p. 163–174.

⁴⁴ Cf. IOHANNES GERSON, *À un frère mineur*, p. 277, l. 18, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. II..., Paris 1960.

heterodox or heretical positions inside the university⁴⁵. Through the example of Bonaventure, Gerson highlights the necessity to teach and write in a common way and to share common and solid positions deriving from the adoption of certain patterns of argumentation.

Alongside the reflection on how the *communis schola* preserves unity in the field of the speculative theology, we also find in the gersonian works some passages in which this concept applies to mysticism and spiritual theology⁴⁶; in particular, we find references to the role played by the academic environment in handling, judging, and controlling mystical theories and doctrines coming from outside the university. We mentioned above⁴⁷ Gerson's criticism to the third book of Jan van Ruusbroec's *Die geestelike Brulocht*, which was read by Gerson in the Latin translation of Surius⁴⁸ with the title *De ornatu spiritualium nuptiarum*. This criticism, intensively studied by André Combes in four ponderous volumes⁴⁹, is carried out by Gerson with regard to both the content and the style of the work of the Flemish author⁵⁰ and is contained in two letters addressed to the Carthusian monk Barthélemy Clantier⁵¹, who asked the Parisian chancellor to read the *Brulocht* and to provide his opinion about the work. Shortly summarizing, Gerson criticizes some expressions used by the Flemish mystical writer because of their obscurity and of the risk of misinterpretations by the simple reader, especially in some passages that seem to allow the possibility of the essential union between the human being and God already during this life⁵²; then, he affirms that theology is a matter for

⁴⁵ The notion of *communis doctrina* in the late medieval thought has been deeply studied by A. ROBIGLIO, *Aspetti della nozione di «communis doctrina» all'inizio del XIV secolo*, [in:] *Aspetti della nozione di «communis doctrina» all'inizio del XIV secolo / Durandus and Durandellus. The Dispute behind the Promotion of Thomist Authority*, ed. A. ROBIGLIO, I. IRIBARREN, Bern 2004, p. 5–6.

⁴⁶ For some references on Gerson's account of mystical theology, cf. *supra*, n. 2.

⁴⁷ Cf. *supra*, p. 5.

⁴⁸ This translation has been studied by M.J.F.M. HOENEN, *Translating Mystical Texts from Vernacular into Latin. Intentions and Strategies behind Laurentius Surius' Translation of Ruusbroec's Complete Works (Cologne 1552)*, [in:] *Per perscrutationem philosophicam. Neue Perspektiven der mittelalterlichen Forschung. Loris Sturlese zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet*, ed. A. BECCARISI, Hamburg 2008, p. 348–374. Also cf. K. SCHEPERS, *Introduction*, [in:] *Willem Jordaens – Jan van Ruusbroec, Ioannis Rusbrochii. De ornatu spiritualium nuptiarum. Wilhelmo Iordani interprete*, ed. K. SCHEPERS, Turnhout 2004 [= CC.CM, 207], p. 101.

⁴⁹ Cf. A. COMBES, *Essai...*

⁵⁰ For a general look at the life and works of this late medieval mystical author, cf. G. WARNAR, *Ruusbroec. Literature and Mysticism in the Fourteenth Century*, Leiden 2007 [= BSIH, 150]; J. WISEMAN, *Introduction*, [in:] JOHN RUUSBROEC, *The Spiritual Espousal and Other Works*, praef. et trans. J. WISEMAN, Mahwah 1985, p. 1–37; P. VERDEYEN, *Ruusbroec l'admirable*, Paris 2004, p. 1–107; W. TRITSCH, *Einführung in die Mystik. In Quellen und Zeugnissen*, Augsburg 1990, p. 175–176.

⁵¹ IOHANNES GERSON, *À Barthélemy Clantier I*, p. 54–62; cf. IOHANNES GERSON, *À Barthélemy Clantier II*, p. 97–103.

⁵² IOHANNES GERSON, *À Barthélemy Clantier I*, p. 57.

academically trained people who possess all the notions, skills, and lexical background in order to properly speak about God⁵³.

It's exactly writing about this aspect –the necessity of a proper theological training– that the *Doctor Christianissimus* refers to the notion of *communis schola* in a meaningful passage that is worthy of being integrally quoted:

Inter tales scripturas numerantur aliquae narrationes aut regulae vel doctrinae particulares aliquorum patrum veterum, quae magis admirandae dicuntur quam imitandae, quemadmodum Johannes qui Climacus dicitur ponit virtutes esse impassibilitates, et quaedam valde austera super poenitentia et peccatis; et Cassianus de libero arbitrio notatus est, et alia alii parum examinata aut nimis rigida tradunt, quae communis schola theologicae veritatis merito non admittit aut rejicit⁵⁴.

After having criticized, in the previous lines, the Flemish writer and his attempt to investigate the obscurities of mysticism without possessing the necessary background, with the risk to mislead simple writers, in the quoted passage Gerson assimilates some doctrines contained in Ruusbroec's *Brulocht* to the example of some *narrations, rules, or particular doctrines of some old Fathers of the Church*, such as John Climacus and John Cassian, *that the common school of the theological truth doesn't admit or rejects*. If the faith and the zeal of Ruusbroec, Climacus and Cassian are never called into question by Gerson, their doctrines are seen as not acceptable by the university; the reason is expressed by the terminology itself that is used by Gerson: the "doctrines" of these authors are "particular" (*particulares*), i.e. they introduce unusual elements from the point of view of the content, of the words, or both, and for this reason they must be avoided.

Therefore, also in the field of the mystical theology a conflict between "common" and "particular" may arise: on one hand, the matter of mysticism is magmatic, fluid, and intrinsically difficult to express because of the obscurity and depth of the experience; on the other hand, preserving unity is seen by Gerson as a need and a duty of the *communis schola theologicae veritatis*, and this unity goes also through the control of the spirituality of religious people outside the university or even of laypeople. Under the light of this concept we can, for instance, understand why the Parisian chancellor and other late scholastic masters censure the *Begardi*⁵⁵,

⁵³ IOHANNES GERSON, *À Barthélemy Clantier I*, p. 62, l. 30; cf. IOHANNES GERSON, *À Barthélemy Clantier II*, p. 98, l. 26.

⁵⁴ IOHANNES GERSON, *À Barthélemy Clantier I*, p. 62, l. 17–21.

⁵⁵ On the community of the Beghards, cf. J. GREVEN, *Die Anfänge der Beginen: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Volksfrömmigkeit und des Ordenswesens im Hochmittelalter*, Münster 1912; IDEM, *Der Ursprung des Beginenwesens*, HJb 35, 1914, p. 26–58; E.W. McDONNELL, *The Beguines and the Beghards in Medieval Culture. With Special Emphasis on the Belgian Scene*, New York 1969, p. 81–100; H. GRUNDMANN, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter. Untersuchungen über die geschichtlichen Zusammenhänge zwischen der Ketzerei, den Bettelorden und der religiösen Frauenbewegung im 12. und*

who are considered by Gerson as an element of disorder⁵⁶, and whose behaviors and doctrines are seen as not acceptable and are the object of some ecclesiastical condemnations in the Middle Ages⁵⁷.

Conclusions

The textual passages analyzed in this contribution illustrate the meaning and the relevance of the notion of *communis schola*, in its various aspects, within the theological and ecclesiological thought of Jean Gerson. Driven by a constant concern for the unity of the Church at all levels, the *doctor christianissimus* insists on the decisive role played by the theological community of the academic masters in handling and holding the doctrine, preserving it, and protecting it from possible abuses and misleading interpretations both in the speculative and in the mystical sphere. Such a community is strongly perceived by Gerson in the time and in the space, in its deposit of models, and in a set of strongly defined methods, models, linguistic features, and ways to express the concepts. All these elements contribute to select doctrines produced inside and outside the university and, at the same time, they regulate the way in which the academic speculation itself is put into the concrete forms of teaching and writing. Moreover, the notion of *communis schola* finds its roots in its intrinsic opposition to everything that, in theology, is “particular” and may represent an element of destabilization, since Gerson seems to automatically assimilate particularism to division or, at least, to fragmentation of the unity. For these reasons and for their important theological and ecclesiological implications, the concept of *communis schola* represents an important key to understand Gerson as a writer, as a teacher, as a university chancellor, and as a spiritual advisor.

13. *Jahrhundert und über die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik*, Darmstadt 1961, p. 371–438; IDEM, *Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters*, Göttingen 1978, p. 47–67.

⁵⁶ Cf. IOHANNES GERSON, *De mystica theologia*, p. 256, l. 3, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. III...; cf. IOHANNES GERSON, *De distinctione verarum revelationum a falsis*, p. 51, l. 13; p. 51, l. 35, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. III...

⁵⁷ The most important one is contained in the dogmatic constitution *Ad nostrum* (Council of Vienne, 1312). The text is edited by A. RICHTER, [in:] *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, vol. I, Romae 1955, col. 1183–1184.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- AUGUSTINUS, *De civitate Dei*, ed. B. DOMBART, A. KALB, Turnholti 1955 [= *Corpus christianorum, Series latina*, 47–48].
- AUGUSTINUS, *De doctrina christiana*, ed. I. MARTIN, Turnholti 1962 [= *Corpus christianorum, Series latina*, 32].
- AUGUSTINUS, *De vera religione*, ed. I. MARTIN, Turnholti 1962 [= *Corpus christianorum, Series latina*, 32].
- BONAVENTURA, *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten*, [in:] BONAVENTURA, *Opera Omnia*, vol. VI, Romae 1893.
- BONAVENTURA, *Commentarius in Evangelium Sancti Iohannis*, [in:] BONAVENTURA, *Opera omnia*, vol. VI, Romae 1893.
- BONAVENTURA, *Commentarius in Evangelium Sancti Lucae*, [in:] BONAVENTURA, *Opera Omnia*, vol. VII, Romae 1893.
- CLEMENS V, *Ad nostrum*, [in:] *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, vol. I, ed. A. RICHTER, Romae 1955.
- DIONYSIUS CARTUSIANUS, *Enarratio in librum Deuteronomii*, [in:] *Dionysii Cartusiani Opera omnia*, vol. II, [s.l.] 1897.
- HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE, *De archa Noe*, ed. P. SICARD, Turnholti 2001 [= *Corpus christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis*, 176].
- INNOCENTIUS III, *Vergentis in senium*, [in:] *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, vol. I, ed. A. RICHTER, Romae 1955.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *À Barthélemy Clantier I*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. II, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1960.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *À Barthélemy Clantier II*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. II, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1960.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *À un frère mineur*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. II, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1960.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *Contra curiositatem studentium*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. III, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1962.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *Contre Jean de Monzon*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. X, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1973.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *De directione cordis*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. VIII, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1971.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *De distinctione verarum revelationum a falsis*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. III, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1962.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *De examinatione doctrinarum*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. IX, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1973.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *De modis significandi*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. IX, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1973.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *De mystica theologia*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. III, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1962.

- IOHANNES GERSON, *De oculo*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. VIII, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1971.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *De sensu litterali sacrae scripturae*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. IX, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1973.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *De vita spirituali animae*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. III, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1962.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *Errores circa praeceptum: non occides*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. VIII, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1971.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *Nova positio*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. VI, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1965.
- IOHANNES GERSON, *Pro licentiandis in decretis*, [in:] JEAN GERSON, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. V, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris 1963.
- IOHANNES WYCLIFF, *Sermones*, ed. J. LOSERTH, London 1887–1890.
- LUCIUS III, *Ad abolendam*, [in:] *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, vol. I, ed. A. RICHTER, Romae 1955.
- THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Summa theologiae*, Romae 1894.

Secondary Literature

- Aux marges de l'hérésie. *Inventions, formes et usages polémiques de l'accusation d'hérésie au Moyen Âge*, ed. F. MERCIER, I. ROSE, Rennes 2017.
- BIANCHI L., *1277: A Turning Point in Medieval Philosophy?*, [in:] *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter?*, ed. J.A. AERTSEN, A. SPEER, Berlin–New York 1998 [= *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 26], p. 90–110.
- BIANCHI L., *Censure et liberté intellectuelle à l'Université de Paris (XIII^e–XIV^e siècles)*, Paris 1999.
- BLUMENFELD-KOSICKI R., *Jean Gerson and the Debate on the Roman de la Rose*, [in:] *A Companion to Jean Gerson*, ed. B.P. MCGUIRE, Leiden–Boston 2011 [= *Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition*, 3], p. 317–356.
- BÖS G., *Curiositas. Die Rezeption eines antiken Begriffes durch christliche Autoren bis Thomas von Aquin*, Schöning 1995.
- BURGER C., *Aedificatio, Fructus, Utilitas. Johannes Gerson als Professor der Theologie und Kanzler der Universität Paris*, Tübingen 1986.
- COMBES A., *Essai sur la critique de Ruysbroeck par Jean Gerson*, vol. I, Paris 1945.
- COMBES A., *La théologie mystique de Gerson: profil de son évolution*, "Études philosophiques" 19.3, 1964, p. 444–545.
- CONGAR Y., *Theologians and the Magisterium in the West: from the Gregorian Reform to the Council of Trent*, "Chicago Studies" 17, 1978, p. 210–224.
- DE LIBERA A., *Philosophie et censure*, [in:] *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter?*, ed. J.A. AERTSEN, A. SPEER, Berlin–New York 1998 [= *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 26], p. 71–89.
- FINK K.A., *Die konziliare Idee im späten Mittelalter*, [in:] *Die Entwicklung des Konziliarismus. Werden und nachwirken der Konziliaren Idee*, ed. R. BAEUMER, Darmstadt 1976, p. 275–294.
- GABRIEL A.L., *The Ideal Master of the Medieval University*, "Catholic Historical Review" 60.1, 1974, p. 1–40.
- GLORIEUX P., *L'enseignement universitaire de Gerson*, "Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale" 23, 1956, p. 88–113.

- GLORIEUX P., *La vie et les oeuvres de Gerson. Essai chronologique*, "Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen-âge" 25–26, 1950–1951, p. 149–191.
- GREVEN J., *Die Anfänge der Beginen: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Volksfrömmigkeit und des Ordenswesens im Hochmittelalter*, Münster 1912.
- GREVEN J., *Der Ursprung des Beginenwesens*, "Historisches Jahrbuch" 35, 1914, p. 26–58.
- GROSSE S., *Heilungsgewißheit und Scrupulositas im späten Mittelalter. Studien zu Johannes Gerson und Gattungen der Frömmigkeitstheologie seiner Zeit*, Tübingen 1994.
- GROSSE S., *Johannes Gerson und Bonaventura: Kontinuität und Diskontinuität zwischen Hoch- und Spätmittelalter*, [in:] *Herbst des Mittelalters? Fragen zur Bewertung des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts*, ed. J.A. AERTSEN, M. PICKAVÉ, Berlin–New York 2004 [= *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 31], p. 340–348.
- GRUNDMANN H., *Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters*, Göttingen 1978.
- GRUNDMANN H., *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter. Untersuchungen über die geschichtlichen Zusammenhänge zwischen der Ketzerei, den Bettelorden und der religiösen Frauenbewegung im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert und über die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik*, Darmstadt 1961.
- GRYSON G., *The Authority of the Teacher in the Ancient and Medieval Church*, "Journal of Ecumenical Studies" 19.2, 1982, p. 176–187.
- HAMBURGER J., *Speculations on Speculation*, [in:] *Deutsche Mystik im abendländischen Zusammenhang*, ed. W. HAUG, W. SCHNEIDER-LASTIN, Tübingen 2000, p. 353–408.
- HAMESSE J., *Les Auctoritates Aristotelis. Un florilège médiéval. Étude historique et édition critique*, Louvain 1974.
- HOBBINS D., *Authorship and Publicity before Print. Jean Gerson and the Transformation of Late Medieval Learning*, Philadelphia 2009, <https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812202298>
- HOBBINS D., *Gerson on Lay Devotion*, [in:] *A Companion to Jean Gerson*, ed. B.P. MCGUIRE, Leiden–Boston 2011 [= *Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition*, 3], p. 41–78.
- HOBBINS D., *The Schoolman as Public Intellectual: Jean Gerson and the Late Medieval Tract*, "American Historical Review" 108, 2003, p. 1308–1337, <https://doi.org/10.1086/529968>
- HOENEN M.J.F.M., *Categories of Medieval Doxography. Reflections on the Use of 'Doctrina' and 'Via' in the 14th and 15th Century Philosophical and Theological Sources*, [in:] *Vera Doctrina. Zur Begriffsgeschichte der Lehre von Augustinus bis Descartes – L'idée de doctrine d'Augustin à Descartes*, ed. P. BÜTTGEN, R. IMBACH, U.J. SCHNEIDER, H.J. SELDERHUIS, Wiesbaden 2009, p. 63–84.
- HOENEN M.J.F.M., *Late Medieval Schools of Thought in the Mirror of University Textbooks. The 'promptuarium argumentorum' (Cologne 1482)*, [in:] *Philosophy and Learning. Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. M.J.F.M. HOENEN, H.H.J. SCHNEIDER, J. WIELAND, Leiden–New York–Boston 1995 [= *Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, 6], p. 329–369, <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004450684>
- HOENEN M.J.F.M., *Translating Mystical Texts from Vernacular into Latin. Intentions and Strategies behind Laurentius Surius' Translation of Ruusbroec's Complete Works (Cologne 1552)*, [in:] *Per perscrutationem philosophicam. Neue Perspektiven der mittelalterlichen Forschung. Loris Sturlese zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet*, ed. A. BECCARISI, Hamburg 2008, p. 348–374.
- IRIBARREN I., *Curiositas*, [in:] *Mots médiévaux*, ed. I. ATUCHA, D. CALMA, C. KÖNIG PRALONG, I. ZAVATTERO, Turnhout 2011, p. 199–209, <https://doi.org/10.1484/M.TEMA-EB.4.00895>

- IRIBARREN I., *Jean Gerson, Spiritual Adviser to the Celestines*, [in:] *Autorität und Wahrheit. Kirchliche Vorstellungen, Normen und Verfahren (13.–15. Jahrhundert)*, ed. G. POTESTÀ, E. MÜLLER-LUCKNER, München 2011, p. 159–178, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110446753-012>
- IRIBARREN I., *Le Paradis retrouvé: l'utopie linguistique de Jean Gerson*, “Revue de l'histoire des religions” 231, 2014 (= *Langue et autorité théologique à la fin du Moyen Âge*, ed. I. IRIBARREN), p. 223–251, <https://doi.org/10.4000/rhr.8247>
- IRIBARREN I., *Question de style. Langage et méthode comme enjeux rhétoriques dans l'œuvre de Jean Gerson*, [in:] *Langage et méthode. Réflexions historiques et historiographiques sur la pensée médiévale*, ed. U. ZAHND, Freiburg im Breisgau 2017, p. 183–221.
- KALUZA Z., *La doctrine selon Jean Gerson*, [in:] *Vera Doctrina. Zur Begriffsgeschichte der Lehre von Augustinus bis Descartes – L'idée de doctrine d'Augustin à Descartes*, ed. P. BÜTTGEN, R. IMBACH, U.J. SCHNEIDER, H.J. SELDERHUIS, Wiesbaden 2009, p. 115–140.
- KALUZA Z., *Les querelles doctrinales à Paris. Nominalistes et réalistes aux confins du XIV et du XV siècles*, vol. II, Bergamo 1988.
- KLUXEN W., *Institution und Ideengeschichte zur geschichtlichen Bedeutung der mittelalterlichen Universität*, [in:] *Philosophy and Learning. Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. M.J.F.M. HOENEN, H.H.J. SCHNEIDER, J. WIELAND, Leiden–New York–Boston 1995 [= *Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, 6], p. 1–16.
- KÖNIG-PRALONG C., *Avènement de l'Aristotélisme en terre chrétienne. L'essence et la matière: entre Thomas d'Aquin et Guillaume d'Ockham*, Paris 2005.
- MATUSEVICH Y., *Le siècle d'or de la mystique française: un autre regard. Étude de la littérature spirituelle de Jean Gerson (1363–1429) à Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (14507–1537)*, Paris 2004.
- MCDONNELL E.W., *The Beguines and the Beghards in Medieval Culture. With Special Emphasis on the Belgian Scene*, New York 1969.
- MCGUIRE B.P., *In Search of Jean Gerson: Chronology of his Life and Works*, [in:] *A Companion to Jean Gerson*, ed. B.P. MCGUIRE, Leiden–Boston 2011 [= *Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition*, 3], p. 1–40.
- MCGUIRE B.P., *Jean Gerson and the Last Medieval Reformation*, University Park 2005.
- MCLOUGHLIN N., *Gerson as a Preacher between Mendicants and Secular Priests*, [in:] *A Companion to Jean Gerson*, ed. B.P. MCGUIRE, Leiden–Boston 2011 [= *Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition*, 3], p. 249–253.
- MÉNACHE S., *La naissance d'une nouvelle source d'autorité: l'Université de Paris*, “Revue historique” 1982, p. 305–328.
- MIETHKE J., *Einheit als Aufgabe: Momente der Integration in der politischen Theorie der Scholastik*, “Vorträge und Forschungen” 63, 2005, p. 241–272.
- OAKLEY F., *Gerson as Conciliarist*, [in:] *A Companion to Jean Gerson*, ed. B.P. MCGUIRE, Leiden–Boston 2011 [= *Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition*, 3], p. 179–204.
- OBERMAN H., *Contra vanam curiositatem. Ein Kapitel der Theologie zwischen Seelenwinkel und Weltall*, Zürich 1974.
- PASCOE L.B., *Jean Gerson: Principles of Church Reform*, Leiden 1973 [= *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions*, 7], <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004477179>
- PIRON S., *Le plan de l'évêque: pour une critique interne de la condamnation de 1277*, “Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales” 78.2, 2011, p. 383–415.

- PORRO P., *Tommaso d'Aquino. Un profilo storico-filosofico*, Roma 2012.
- POSTHUMUS MEYJES G.H.M., *Jean Gerson. Apostle of Unity: his Church Politics and Ecclesiology*, Leiden–New York 1999.
- ROBIGLIO A., *Aspetti della nozione di «communis doctrina» all'inizio del XIV secolo*, [in:] *Aspetti della nozione di «communis doctrina» all'inizio del XIV secolo / Durandus and Durandellus. The Dispute behind the Promotion of Thomist Authority*, ed. A. ROBIGLIO, I. IRIBARREN, Bern 2004, p. 5–14.
- SCHEPERS K., *Introduction*, [in:] *Willem Jordaens – Jan van Ruusbroec, Ioannis Rusbrochii. De ornatu spiritualium nuptiarum. Wilhelmo Iordani interprete*, ed. K. SCHEPERS, Turnhout 2004 [= *Corpus christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis*, 207].
- SCHLOSSER M., *Bonaventure: Life and Works*, [in:] *A Companion to Bonaventure*, ed. J.M. HAMMOND, J.A.W. HELLMANN, J. GOFF, Leiden–Boston 2014 [= Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, 48], p. 9–59.
- SCHÖNBERGER R., *Scholastik*, [in:] *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. VII, ed. R.H. BAUTIER, R. AUTY, München 1995, p. 1521–1526.
- SCHÖNBERGER R., *Was ist Scholastik?*, Hildesheim 1991.
- SÈRE B., *Les débats d'opinion à l'heure du Grand Schisme. Eclésiologie et politique*, Turnhout 2016.
- TABER JR. D., *Pierre d'Ailly and the Teaching Authority of the Theologian*, "Church History" 59.2, 1990, p. 163–174, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3168309>
- THIJSSSEN M.M.H., *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris, 1200–1400*, Philadelphia 1998, <https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812206722>
- THIJSSSEN M.M.H., *What Really Happened on 7 March 1277? Bishop Tempier's Condemnation and its Institutional Context*, [in:] *Texts and Contexts in Ancient and Medieval Science. Studies on the Occasion of John E. Murdoch's Seventieth Birthday*, ed. E. SYLLA, M. MCVAUGH, Leiden 1997 [= Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 78], p. 84–114, https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004247321_005
- TORCHIA J., *Restless Mind. Curiositas and the Scope of Inquiry in Augustine's Psychology*, Milwaukee 2013.
- TRITSCH W., *Einführung in die Mystik. In Quellen und Zeugnissen*, Augsburg 1990.
- VALLIÈRE P., *Conciliarism. A History of Decision-Making in the Church*, Cambridge 2012, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139059459>
- VERDEYEN P., *Ruusbroec l'admirable*, Paris 2004.
- VIAL M., *Gerson's Legacy*, [in:] *A Companion to Jean Gerson*, ed. B.P. MCGUIRE, Leiden–Boston 2011 [= Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, 3], p. 357–400.
- VIAL M., *Jean Gerson théoricien de la théologie mystique*, Paris 2005.
- VIAL M., *Théologie mystique et expérience chez Jean Gerson*, "Revue de théologie et de philosophie" 142, 2010, p. 229–243.
- VIAL M., *Théologie mystique et syndérèse chez Jean Gerson*, [in:] *Vers la contemplation. Études sur la syndérèse et les modalités de la contemplation de l'antiquité à la Renaissance*, ed. C. TROTTMANN, Paris 2007, p. 215–232.
- VON MOOS P., *Zwischen Babel und Pfingsten. Sprachdifferenzen und Gesprächsverständnis in der Vormoderne (8–16 Jh.)*, Zürich–Berlin 2008.
- WALZ A., *Thomas von Aquin. Lebensgang und Lebenswerk des Fürsten der Scholastik*, Basel 1953.

WARNAR G., *Ruusbroec. Literature and Mysticism in the Fourteenth Century*, Leiden 2007 [= Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 150], <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004158696.i-370>

WISEMAN J., *Introduction*, [in:] JOHN RUUSBROEC, *The Spiritual Espousal and Other Works*, praef. et trans. J. WISEMAN, Mahwah 1985, p. 1–37.

Luciano Micali

Charles University in Prague
Faculty of Arts
Institute for Greek and Latin Studies
nám. Jana Palacha 1/2
116 38 Prague 1, Czech Republic
luciano.micali@gmail.com

