

**“BABEȘ-BOLYAI” UNIVERSITY  
CLUJ-NAPOCA  
FACULTY OF HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY  
DOCTORAL SCHOOL IN PHILOSOPHY**

***Philosophy and Theology  
at the University of Vienna in the XVth Century:  
The Case of Thomas Ebendorfer***

**PH.D. THESIS SUMMARY**

**Supervisor:  
PROF. UNIV. DR. ALEXANDER BAUMGARTEN**

**Candidate:  
CURUȚ IOANA FLAVIA**

**2021**

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Chapter 1: Society and Academic Discourse in XVth Century Vienna.....	11
1.1. Heresy and Logic in the XIVth and XVth Centuries.....	12
1.2. The Faculty of Theology and the Vienna Group Commentary.....	19
1.3. Thomas Ebendorfer: An Intellectual Profile.....	23
1.4. The <i>Sentences</i> Commentary of Thomas Ebendorfer.....	27
1.4.1. The Nature and Sequence of Ebendorfer's Lectures on the <i>Sentences</i> .....	29
1.4.2. Ebendorfer's Lectures on Book I.....	30
1.4.3. Ebendorfer's Lectures on Book IV.....	37
1.4.4. Ebendorfer's Lectures on Book II.....	39
1.4.5. Ebendorfer's Lectures on Book III.....	40
1.4.6. The Structure and Contents of Ebendorfer's Lectures on the <i>Sentences</i> .....	43
1.4.7. Ebendorfer's Sources and Citations of University Theologians.....	44
1.5. Concluding Remarks.....	48
Chapter 2: Thomas Ebendorfer and the Triumph of Theology at Vienna.....	50
2.1. Theology as Science.....	50
2.1.1. Deductive Theology (Aquinas and Scotus).....	51
2.1.2. Declarative Theology (Durand, Auriol and Ockham).....	55
2.1.3. Rimini's View of Theology as Acquired Faith.....	61
2.1.4. Ebendorfer and the VGC on Theology as Science.....	67
2.1.4.1. Ebendorfer's Second Prologue (q. 3, a. 1).....	70
2.1.4.2. Ebendorfer's Second Prologue (q. 3, a. 3).....	75
2.2. Theology as a Practical Science.....	86
2.2.1. Five Stages of the VGC Version of Prologue, Q. 2.....	89
2.2.2. Viennese Authors on the Nature of Theology.....	98
2.2.3. Viennese Authors on the Subject of Theology.....	104
2.3. Concluding Remarks.....	113
Chapter 3: Thomas Ebendorfer on the Relation Between Theology and Philosophy.....	114
3.1. The Relation between Theology, Philosophy and Logic.....	115
3.2. The Debate on <i>Virtus Sermonis</i> .....	127

3.2.1. Historical Background.....	128
3.2.2. Ebendorfer on <i>Virtus Sermonis</i> .....	132
3.3. Concluding Remarks.....	141
Chapter 4: Thomas Ebendorfer on Heterodox Religious Communities.....	143
4.1. The Other: Hussites.....	143
4.2. The Other: Jews.....	147
4.2.1. Jews and the Indemonstrability of the Trinity.....	153
4.2.2. Trinitarian Theology and Aristotelian Logic.....	160
4.2.3. Forced Baptism and Other References to Jews and Judaism.....	171
4.3. Concluding Remarks.....	178
Conclusion.....	180
Appendix 1: Thomae Ebendorfer <i>Tabula quaestionum in quattuor libros Sententiarum</i> ..	193
Appendix 2: Citation list.....	204
Appendix 3: <i>Quaestiones communes in Primum Sententiarum</i> , Prologus, Q. 2.....	206
Appendix 4: Illustration of Five Stages of the VGC, Prologus, Q. 2.....	236
Appendix 5: Thomae Ebendorfer <i>In I Sententiarum</i> , Prologus.....	240
Appendix 6: Henrici de Langenstein <i>Nota de Iudaeis</i> .....	251
Appendix 7: References to Jews and Judaism in Ebendorfer's <i>Sentences</i> commentary.....	252
Bibliography.....	262
1. Manuscripts.....	262
2. Primary Sources.....	262
3. Editions of Thomas of Ebendorfer's Works.....	266
4. Secondary Sources.....	266
5. Online Sources.....	281

## Keywords

Thomas Ebendorfer de Haselbach, University of Vienna, Viennese *Sentences* commentaries, Prologues, Vienna Group Commentary, theology as science, theology as a practical science, the relation between theology and philosophy, force of speech (*virtus sermonis*), Henry of Oyta, Hussites, Jean Gerson, Jews, the indemonstrability of the Trinity, Henry of Langenstein, the universality of Aristotelian logic, forced baptism

## Summary

The present thesis is an exploration of Thomas Ebendorfer's *Sentences* commentary and an effort to understand how Viennese theologians coped with the conflict between theology and philosophy in a plural religious context in the first decades of the XVth century. Engaging in such an inquiry by focusing on a hitherto neglected Viennese figure of the XVth century can provide a deeper understanding of the mechanisms involved in the influence of the historical sphere on academic discourse and the transmission of knowledge.

The novelty of my inquiry comes from the primary sources that make up the object of my research, including Thomas Ebendorfer's hitherto unstudied and unedited *Sentences* commentary, preserved in various manuscripts from the Austrian National Library (Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek) in Vienna. Given the philosophical and theological character of these sources, these texts have the potential to shed new light on the academic discourse at the Viennese Faculty of Theology in the first two decades of the XVth century, providing at the same time a missing link in the doctrinal evolution of the genre of *Sentences* commentaries.

I have chosen to approach this inquiry through the lens of Thomas Ebendorfer's *Sentences* commentary for two main reasons. Firstly, he lectured on the *Sentences* during 1420-1421, i.e. a period that overlaps with the Hussite wars and the persecution of Viennese Jews. Secondly, despite being a well known figure of the XVth century and an extremely prolific historian and theologian, Ebendorfer composed a commentary on the *Sentences* which has been virtually neglected by previous scholarship.

In answering the main research question stated above, I will explore the following three research sub-questions.

1. One of the sub-questions of my research is **to what extent did Ebendorfer cut off with the VGC tradition**. More precisely, I will investigate to what degree is he still anchored in the VGC tradition and what are the new topics that he approached or the new manners in which he responded to older questions. Particular attention will be paid to the manner in which Ebendorfer employs passages from previous authors, especially those authors that also represent a main source of inspiration for the previous Viennese *Sentences* commentaries from the VGC.

2. A second sub-question equally important for my study asks **what is Ebendorfer's conception on the relation between theology and philosophy**. I will analyze Ebendorfer's stance on this topic by considering his two Prologues, found in ms. Wien, ÖNB, 4369, ff. 7r-8v, and ms. Wien, ÖNB, 4387, ff. 3v-23r, respectively.

3. A third sub-question of my research asks **if there is a connection between contemporary historical events and Ebendorfer's *Sentences* commentary**. More precisely, in investigating how Ebendorfer tried to cope with the conflict between theology and philosophy, I have also questioned the possible influence of the historical sphere on the ideas Ebendorfer puts forth in his commentary. It is possible that this question will also provide a reason why Ebendorfer departed from the VGC. For this inquiry, I follow two questions: what type of attitude does Ebendorfer have towards infidels and heretics and whether his attitude towards religious alterity influenced his conception on the relation between theology and philosophy.

My hypothesis is that the progressive separation between theology and philosophy is tied to certain historical events of the XVth century, a period when the unity of Christianity was marked not only by internal threats efforts to put an end to the Great Schism, but also by the external threat of heretics, such as the Hussites, with whom the Jews were seen to be conspiring. Studying Ebendorfer's *Sentences* commentary can thus provide some answers regarding the manner in which Christians attempted to rationalize their ideas and beliefs concerning Jews and Hussites at a very intricate point in history. It is my hypothesis that Ebendorfer departed from the VGC tradition by adapting older ideas to the most pressing issues of his time.

In order to respond to all these questions, I will employ a **methodology** that is traditionally used when dealing with a previously unexplored *Sentences* commentary. This method involves reading the whole text preserved in manuscripts and gathering relevant information that allows a better understanding of paleographical and doctrinal aspects of his text.

1. One dimension of this inquiry is compiling a list of questions for each four Books (*tabula quaestionum*).<sup>1</sup> Employing this methodology in the case of Ebendorfer's commentary<sup>2</sup> will give an overview of his text, allowing a clarification of chronology. Moreover, it will bring

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix 1.

<sup>2</sup> The manuscripts containing different redactions of Ebendorfer's commentary that I have read are: ms. Wien, ÖNB, 4369, ff. 1r-405v (Books I and IV); ms. Wien, ÖNB, 4387, ff. 1r-415v (Books I and II); ms. Wien, ÖNB, 4393, ff. 1r-44r (Book II); ms. Wien, ÖNB, 4590, ff. 1r-22v (Book III).

to light those topics that Ebendorfer is most interested in, and by a general comparison of his text to other Viennese *Sentences* commentaries from the VGC, I will be able to grasp the new subjects Ebendorfer approaches. This preliminary step in investigating his commentary offers a direction regarding the philosophical themes that are worth exploring in greater detail and could be critically edited.

2. A second dimension of this methodology is providing a complete citation list of all scholastic authors ranging from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century who are explicitly mentioned in Ebendorfer's commentary.<sup>3</sup> Such an inquiry provides an overview of his sources, which ultimately allows for some preliminary conclusions concerning his doctrinal profile.

3. A third dimension of my methodology is providing a list of all of Ebendorfer's explicit references to heterodox groups, such as Jews and Hussites.<sup>4</sup> This constitutes a starting point for exploring the third research question concerning his attitude towards religious alterity in general. The aim of this inventory is also to give a complete mapping of the *loci* where themes particularly related to Jews and Judaism are usually treated in a *Sentences* commentary.

4. A fourth dimension of my methodology is critically editing several texts including the following: all the Viennese versions of the VGC for question 2 of the Prologue<sup>5</sup>, Ebendorfer's two Prologues<sup>6</sup>, and several hitherto unknown texts gathered in codex Basel, Universitätsbibliothek A-X-44, a medieval notebook in which Henry of Rheinfelden gathered texts stemming from the Viennese milieu. Taking under consideration this latter source allows a better contextualization of Ebendorfer's ideas that are tied to the Viennese context.

In **chapter 1**, I have offered a historical overview on „Society and Academic Discourse in XVth century Vienna”. More importantly, after a complete reading of the various versions of Thomas Ebendorfer's *Sentences* commentary, I was able to put forth a series of conclusions concerning several aspects of his text. Regarding the nature of Ebendorfer's commentary, I established that Ebendorfer read Horaw's commentary on Book I as a *sententiarius* (annotating it in the margin of his own copy), and that he proceeded in a similar manner for the remaining books (II, III and IV), i.e. by reading other versions of the 'VGC' and annotating them in the margin. I have also made a *tabula quaestionum* (see Appendix 1) for all versions of Ebendorfer's commentary, showing that for each version of the 'VGC' that he read as a

---

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix 2.

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix 7.

<sup>5</sup> See Appendix 3.

<sup>6</sup> See Appendix 5, containing a critical edition of Ebendorfer's first Prologue. I did not include the full transcription of Ebendorfer's second Prologue (ca. 100 p. of Word text), since the *aparatus fontium* is not complete, but I have edited parts of this text to which I refer throughout the following chapters.

*sententiarius*, he also composed a *supplementum/complementum*, i.e., additional set of questions on the same book, written in his own hand, which he usually attached to the version of the ‘VGC’ he read. I also concluded that textually the first Prologue, the one preserved in ms. Wien, ÖNB 4369, is completely different from the Viennese Prologues of the ‘VGC’. More precisely, Ebendorfer composed an original Prologue as *a sententiarius*, while his second Prologue, which is part of his *Lectura secunda*, only partially supports such a conclusion. I have thus confirmed Brînzei’s and Schabel’s initial claim that Ebendorfer’s text should not be included in the ‘VGC’ tradition. In fact, in both of his Prologues Ebendorfer moves away from the topics traditionally discussed in the VGC, because of his preoccupation with heresy. If previous Viennese prologues from the VGC asked whether theology is a science and whether it is a practical or speculative science, Ebendorfer asks in his first Prologue a different question, namely „whether in theology, ruler and mistress of all other sciences, can be found a false sentence according to the virtue of speech.”

2. In the **second chapter** I have analysed the manner in which Ebendorfer treats the subject of theology as science and theology as a practical science in the effort of trying to respond to the question whether Ebendorfer broke off with the ‘Vienna Group Commentary’ tradition in these particular points. Regarding the debate whether theology is a science – a topic which was discussed in virtually all Viennese *Sentences* commentaries from the beginning of the XVth century, I have concluded that Ebendorfer aligns himself to the Viennese stance and the VGC common attempt to salvage the scientific status of theology by keeping its designation as *scientia*, even if not in the proper sense of the term (since already for Dinkelsbühl, the scientific feature that theology shares with science, namely that it “compels assent”, sufficed for calling theology *scientia*).

Regarding the debate whether theology is a practical or a speculative habit – again a topic discussed virtually in all Viennese *Sentences* commentaries from the beginning of the XVth century, Ebendorfer supports the practical nature of theology. On the basis of a diplomatic edition of q. 2 of ‘VGC’ Prologues (pertaining to Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl, John Berward of Villingen, Peter of Pulkau, George Wetzel of Horaw, John Angrer of Müldorf and Andrew of Waytra), which I attached in Appendix 3, I concluded that there is a shared strategy of individuation that became more and more manifest within the Vienna Group, culminating in Ebendorfer’s treatment, especially in the case of the debate on the subject of theology (see the illustration of five stages of the second question of the Prologues pertaining to the VGC in Appendix 4).



3. In the **third chapter** I have examined Ebendorfer's view on the relation between theology, philosophy and logic, focusing also on his stance within the debate on the virtue of speech (*virtus sermonis*). I have treated these problems by editing and analysing Ebendorfer's first Prologue, in ms. Wien, ÖNB, 4369, ff. 7r-8v, asking „whether in theology, ruler and mistress of all other sciences, can be found a false sentence according to the virtue of speech (*virtus sermonis*)”. The edition of this text is provided in Appendix 5. More precisely, I have shown that in his first Prologue Ebendorfer combines a twofold conception of theology and philosophy (acquired/infused) with a twofold perspective on the relation between them (temporal/by nature), and makes a strong claim for theology's role in advancing new logical theories – in the first part of his text, and in the second part Ebendorfer deals with the proper boundary between logic and theology, the various senses of biblical terms and the problematic role of logic in interpreting Scripture.

Concerning the first part of Ebendorfer's Prologue I have concluded that his view of the relation between the sciences illustrates a progressive awareness of the distinction between theology and philosophy. Secondly, another important aspect of the first part of Ebendorfer's first prologue is that he proposes a historical perspective through which the relation between theology and philosophy/logic should be judged and makes a strong claim for theology's role in advancing new logical theories. I have concluded that such a historical perspective on the relation between theology, philosophy and logic, espoused by both Ebendorfer's Prologue and the anonymous question in codex Basel, Universitätsbibliothek A-X-44, is only a recent perspective in the historiography of medieval philosophy.

Concerning the second part of Ebendorfer's first Prologue, I have shown that the distinction between theology and philosophy which he discusses in the first part, entails very different applications of *virtus sermonis* in the two sciences. Even if theology helped logic advance new theories, as Ebendorfer claims, nonetheless one should not let logic define the proper sense of the biblical text, as he concluded in the second part of his text. Moreover, I have shown that doctrines regarding the proper manner of interpreting the biblical text and the proper virtue of its terms (*virtus sermonis*) along with the distinction between two logics (one of theology, the other of speculative sciences), all of which played a significant part in the condemnations at Constance, were later transferred and appropriated at Vienna, as Ebendorfer's case demonstrates. I have argued that Ebendorfer's view relies specifically in being motivated by the Viennese fifteenth-century intellectual setting where the threat represented by the Hussites had just reached its climax.

4. In **chapter 4** I have analysed Ebendorfer's perspective on heterodox religious communities such as the Hussites and the Jews. On the basis of a complete reading of Ebendorfer's commentary, I have attempted to understand not only how the Viennese theologian dealt with heretical tendencies in his text, but also how Jews became scapegoats after being associated with the Hussites and victims of the Wiener Geserah pogrom of 1420-1421.

Regarding the Hussites, I have continued the investigation already opened in the previous chapter asking what other references Ebendorfer makes to the Hussites in his commentary and what is their significance. I have concluded that Ebendorfer's references to the Hussites from his prologues indicate that the problem of heresy—which would later become an important aspect of his life (for instance, in 1433, he participated in the negotiations with the Hussites at the Council of Prague)—is already preoccupying him during his years as a *sententiarius*. As I have argued, this could be the reason why he decided to approach the subject of *virtus sermonis* in his first Prologue, thus breaking from the VGC tradition and why he approached a new question in his second Prologue where he updated Scotus' treatment of heresy with references to the Waldensians and the Hussites.

Regarding the Jews, I have investigated the manner in which Viennese theologians attempted to rationalise their ideas and beliefs concerning Jews and Judaism at a very intricate point in history, i.e. in the years surrounding the 'Wiener Geserah' from 1420-1421. I based my analysis on a complete reading of Ebendorfer's commentary on the basis of which I compiled a list of explicit references to Jews and Judaism from Ebendorfer's *Sentences* commentary (see Appendix 7). I also considered a hitherto unknown fragment attributed to Henry of Langenstein (in ms. Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, A X 44, f. 166v) which sheds new light on his stance concerning the conversion of Jews (see the edition in Appendix 6). In a short note *De Iudaeis* Langenstein takes a step further towards abandoning the moral suasion and apologetics altogether. As I have shown, Langenstein argues that more extreme measures should be taken with the aim of converting Jews, an issue which should be addressed through different means than those pertaining to the sphere of reason, i.e., argumentation and apologetics. This new piece of information should be indicative of the Viennese theologian's attitude towards Jews which was degrading already from 1397.

I also based my investigation on two case studies from Thomas Ebendorfer's *Sentences* commentary, one regarding the indemonstrability of the Trinity (including the compatibility of Aristotelian logic with Trinitarian doctrine) and the other regarding forced baptism.

Regarding the indemonstrability of the Trinity, I have concluded that towards the beginning of the fifteenth century, a new stage of this polemic is developing in Vienna, where the question of the demonstrability of the Trinity gains a practical dimension due to the presence of a much bigger Jewish community. I have argued that Ebendorfer's case is particularly relevant for understanding how he justifies that a demonstration of the Trinity is impossible to the Jews by appealing to experience (i.e. to the recently forced conversion of Viennese Jews that he witnessed himself and which he related later in his *Cronica Austriae*).

Concerning the relation between Trinitarian theology and Aristotelian logic, I have shown that Ebendorfer abandoned treating the traditional question of the VGC asking "whether the rules of the philosophers and Aristotle regarding syllogisms are generally sufficient to the Catholics for syllogising in the divine". Hence, his refusal to even include this question in his more mature commentary, possibly under Langenstein's influence, denotes a lack of interest in the issue of solving Trinitarian paralogisms, marking the end of such a debate at Vienna.

Moreover, if one follows Shank's argument that Langenstein might have abandoned his faith in the validity of Aristotelian logic due to its inability to convert Jews, one could also infer that Ebendorfer's dropping of this topic mirrors his lack of confidence in reason's ability to demonstrate the truth of the Trinity, which had to be a conceptual outcome of the 1420-1421 pogrom. His negative stance regarding the validity of Aristotle's logic can be justified by the historical context in a similar way to his *post factum* justification of the indemonstrability of the Trinity and should be seen as a significant part of the fifteenth century anti-Jewish theology.

Concerning the issue of forced baptism, I have analyzed a question devoted to this issue from an anonymous commentary on Book IV of which Ebendorfer had a copy and which he annotated with great interest (in ms. Wien, ÖNB, 4369, ff. 224r-405v) during his period as a *sententiarus* and in the same year that the persecutions of Jews took place, i.e. 1421. In responding that everyone who is baptised receives the baptismal grace, this anonymous question continues the VGC tradition of dealing with this subject originating in Dinkelsbühl's *Sentences* commentary, d. 5. Yet Ebendorfer's marginal notes prove a particular interest in this issue, because he adduces in the margin supplementary quotations from XIIIth and XIVth century theologians, amongst whom Aquinas, Durand, Landulphus and Scotus. As I have argued, Scotus' legitimation of forced conversion of adult infidels could have been used at Vienna in support of the persecutions of the Jewish community, since the Jews, who were accused to be collaborating with the Hussites, were probably being seen as equally threatening to the Christian faith as the Hussites.

It is interesting that Ebendorfer approached the topic of forced baptism of Jewish children in his first *Lectura* and the general gist of the discussion starkly inclines towards the idea that children of Jews should not be forcibly baptised, but some doubts are already being cast on this conclusion. As the anonymous author remarked, in the case of Jewish serfdom, authors differ in their opinions and one is left wondering to what degree the open character of this question played a part in the theological motivations of the forced baptism of Jews in 1420-1421 at Vienna.

In trying to grasp what mechanisms lie behind Ebendorfer's argumentation and how historical events can have an impact on intellectuals' attitude towards certain topics (such as the indemonstrability of the Trinity), I have shown that Ebendorfer justifies his denial of a rational demonstration of the Trinity precisely based on the previous failed attempts to formulate such an efficient demonstration to the Jews. With this kind of *post factum* rationalization, the argumentation at Vienna took a circular form: the Jews had to be forcibly baptised because they could not be converted through reason (since the Trinity is not demonstrable), hence making a voluntary conversion impossible, but also – as Ebendorfer ended up claiming – the Trinitarian doctrine is not rationally demonstrable, since experience itself showed that Jews could not be convinced of this truth. The historical reality of 1420-1421, a dark episode motivated by the impossibility of convincing Jews to convert to Christianity by means of reason, thus becomes an argument of authority in proving the very indemonstrability of the Trinity.

A broader conclusion of my thesis is that in order to understand the implications and motivations of major events in the history of the XVth century, such as the two condemnations at the Council of Constance and the persecutions of Jews in 1420-1421, we should look carefully (also) at *Sentences* commentaries written in Vienna, because the authors of these texts are keen on building mechanisms of legitimizing a certain attitude towards religious alterity. If in the case of the Jews, the weapons of anti-Judaism were old, the confrontation with the Hussites brought to Christians another type of religious enemy, closer to Christianity than Jews, but more dangerous since it soon grew into a greater threat to the Christian unity. Once the two faces of threat were seen as conspiring, the Christian reaction was explosive.

For a Viennese theologian who was in the middle of these events, such as Ebendorfer, the social and religious context has a strong reflection in his *Sentences* commentary. More precisely, we find in his commentary a defensive strategy that entails the abandonment of any apologetic attempt. This is supported not only by the continuation of traditional attitudes

towards Hussites and Jews but also by several instances such as the link between the impossibility of convincing Jews of the Trinity and the indemonstrability of this dogma.

From a larger perspective, Ebendorfer's commentary shows that his major interest was his own identity and less the Other. Regarding the Hussites, the withdrawal of theology is visible from the vigorous defense of the Christian interpretative tradition in understanding the literal sense of the Bible. Regarding the Jews, the propagation of the same traditional *loci* and prejudices against Jews, even after the Jewish danger was eliminated, proves that Ebendorfer's attitude proceeds from a mechanism of defending his own identity anchored in the Christian path, and, to continue Shank's perspective, Ebendorfer's critique of Aristotelian logic and his lack of confidence in the Aristotelian syllogistic, also suggests an inward focused attitude. The connections I have drawn between Ebendorfer's stance on the indemonstrability of the Trinity and the events concerning Jews that took place in the same period do not describe a causal relation but can be seen rather as "echoes". As E. Marmusztejn put it in a different context: "They can aid in our understanding, but they do not provide an explanation."<sup>7</sup>

The mechanisms of this „internalist theology”, which have been put in action already from 1277 and grew with Rimini according to Courtenay, entails an inwardly focused attitude that is less preoccupied by inter-religious dialogue: "Theology as a tool for defending the faith and converting others was replaced by a more internal and internally consistent theological system."<sup>8</sup> The same type of theology that leaves little room for the Other seems to have been perpetuated at Vienna provoked by the „extraordinary defensive attitude” that contaminated most Viennese theologians. The academic discourse in Vienna, as Ebendorfer's case showed, is a culmination of this type of theology.

---

<sup>7</sup> MARMURSZTEJN, "Uses and Echoes of Visigothic Conciliar Legislation in the Scholastic Controversy on Forced Baptism", p. 57.

<sup>8</sup> COURTENAY, "Nominalism and Late Medieval Religion," p. 58 (*apud* WITT, *Between Faith and Knowledge*, p. 380): "One aspect of this increase in Biblical theology and the Biblical conception of God [which he thinks is characteristic of 'Ockhamism'] is that theology became less apologetic in the process. The apologetic focus of so much of thirteenth century theology—one thinks especially of Raymund Lull, Roger Bacon's *Opus Maius*, Thomas' *Summa contra gentiles* and Raymond Martin's *Pugio fidei*—was designed to convert the Jew and the Moslem and reconvert the heretic. The emergence of a scientific theology that could be rationally demonstrated, a theology that begins with the existence and nature of God, established a common ground for dialogue between Christian and non-Christian. All this began to change in 1277. With the attack of the scientific nature of theology and the limitation of the amount of knowledge of God that could be gained through the unaided reason, theology as a tool for defending the faith and converting others was replaced by a more internal and internally consistent theological system."

# Bibliography

## 1. Manuscripts

- ms. Alençon, Bibliothèque municipale, 144
- ms. Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Cod. theol. 77
- ms. Basel, Universitätsbibliothek A-X-44
- ms. Klosterneuburg, Augustiner-Chorherrenstift, Cod. 332
- ms. Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek 41
- ms. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 3546
- ms. Wien, Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, 4369
- ms. Wien, Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, 4387
- ms. Wien, Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, 4393
- ms. Wien, Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, 4590
- ms. Wien, Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, 4668
- ms. Wien, Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, 4820
- ms. Wien, Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, 5067
- ms. Wien, Schottenstift, 254
- ms. Wien, Schottenstift, 269

## 1.2. Printed sources

- AEGIDIUS ROMANUS, *Primus Aegidii: D. Aegidii Ro. columnae fundamentarii doc. Theologorum principis, Bituricensis archiepi, S. R. E. Cardin. Ordinis. Eremit. Sancti Augu. Primus Sententiarum; Correctus a reverendo magistro Augustino Montifalconio eiusdem ordinis*, ed. AUGUSTINUS MONTIFALCONIUS, Venetiis, 1521.
- AEGIDUS ROMANUS, *Quodlibeta*, Lovanii 1646.
- ARISTOTELES LATINUS, *Analytica Posteriora. Translatio Iacobi, Anonymi sive 'Ioanis' Gerardi et Recensio Guillelmi de Moerbeka I, 2*, ed. L. MINIO-PALUELLO – B. G. DOD (*Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi. Aristoteles Latinus*, 4, I), Bruges - Paris, 1968 (repr. Leiden - New York - Köln, 1995).
- ARISTOTELES LATINUS, *Ethica Nicomachea (translationes Roberti Grosseteste Lincolnensis sive 'Liber Ethicorum'. B Recensio recognita)* – ed. R.-A. GAUTHIER (*Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi. Aristoteles Latinus*, 26, 1-3), Leiden-Bruxelles, 1972.
- ARISTOTELES LATINUS, *Metaphysica, lib. I-XIV. (recensio et translatio Guillelmi de Moerbeka)* – ed. G. VUILLEMIN-DIEM (*Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi. Aristoteles Latinus*, 25, 1-3), Leiden - New York - Köln, 1995.
- ARISTOTELES LATINUS, *Physica (translatio vetus et translatio Vaticana)*, ed. F. Bossier, J. Brams, A. Mansion (Leiden-New York, 1990).
- AUGUSTINUS HIPPONENSIS, *De civitate Dei*, ed. B. Dombart, A. Kalb, Turnhout, 1955.
- AUGUSTINUS HIPPONENSIS, *De trinitate libri XV*, ed. W. J. MOUNTAIN - F. GLORIE (*CCSL*, 50, 50A), Turnhout, 1968.
- AVERROES, *Aristotelis Stagiritae De Physico Auditu libri octo, cum Averrois Cordubensis variis in eosdem commentariis*, I, com. 1, ed. Venetiis apud Iunctas, 1562.
- Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1952.
- Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, ed. H. Denifle, É. Chatelain, vol. 2, Paris, 1891.
- CONRADUS DE SOLTAU, *Quaestiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum*, ed. Zbigniew Chmyłko / Stanisław Obszyński / Józef Swierkosz / Joanna Judycka, in: *Acta mediaevalia* 5 (1989), pp. 5-142.
- D. Martin Luthers Werke. Tischreden*, 6 vols., Weimar, 1912-1921.
- Decretum Gratiani*, in: *Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. E. FRIEDBERG, vol. 1, Graz 1959.
- Die Akten der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Wien (1396-1508)*, ed. P. UIBLEIN, Wien 1978.
- Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus vitam, doctrinam, causam in constantiensi concilio actam et controversias de religione in bohemia annis 1403-1418 motas illustrantia*, ed. F. PALACKY, Osnabrück, 1966.

- DURANDUS DE SANCTO PORCIANO, *In Sententias theologicas Petri Lombardi commentariorum libri quatuor*, ed. LYON 1556.
- DURANDUS DE SANCTO PORCIANO, *Scriptum super IV libros sententiarum*, ed. Venetiis 1571.
- Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum* (= *Kompendium der Glaubensbekenntnisse und kirchlichen Lehrentscheidungen*), ed. H. Denzinger – P. Hünermann, Freiburg im Breisgau 2009.
- EUSTRATIUS, *In Ethica Nicomachea*, in: H.F.P. MERCKEN, *The Greek Commentators on the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle in the Latin Translation of Robert Grosseteste*, i. *Eustratius on Book I and the Anonymous Scholia on Books II, III and IV: Critical Edition with an Introductory Study [Scholia]*, Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum, 6.i, Leiden 1973.
- Fasciculi zizaniorum magistri Johannis Wyclif cum tritico*, ed. WALTER WADDINGTON SHIRLEY, London: Rolls Series, 1858.
- GREGORIUS ARIMINENSIS, *Lectura super primum et secundum sententiarum*, vol. 1: *Super Primum (Dist. 1-6)*, ed. DAMASUS TRAPP – VENICIO MARCOLINO – HEIKO OBERMAN, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1981.
- GUILLELMUS ALTISSIODORENSIS, *Summa Aurea*, ed. J. Ribailier, Paris – Roma 1980.
- GUILLELMUS DE OCKHAM, *Expositio in Libros Physicorum Aristotelis*, ed. V. RICHTER *et al.*, in *Opera Philosophica IV-V*, St. Bonaventure N. Y.: Franciscan Institute, 1985.
- GUILLELMUS DE OCKHAM, *Scriptum in Librum Primum Sententiarum Ordinatio*, ed. GEDEON GAL - STEPHEN F. BROWN, Opera Theologica St. Bonaventure, N. Y.: Franciscan Institute, 1967.
- HENRICUS A GANDAVO, *Summae Quaestionum Ordinariarum Theologi recept praeconio Solennis Henrici A Gandavo*, 2 vols., Badius, 1520.
- HENRICUS TOTTING DE OYTA, *Quaestio de sacra Scriptura et de veritatibus catholicis*, ed. A. Lang, Münster, 1932.
- HIERONYMUS, *Epistula ad Magnum*, (PL 22), ed. J. P. Migne, pp. 667-668.
- IOHANNES BURIDAN, *Quaestiones super octo libros Physicorum Aristotelis (secundum ultimam lectionem)*, eds. Michiel Streijger – Paul J.J.M. Bakker, Leiden, 2015.
- IOHANNES DUNS SCOTUS, *Ordinatio (Prologus)*, ed. C. BALIC, Civitas Vaticana, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, Roma, 1950 (Opera Omnia 1).
- IOHANNES DUNS SCOTUS, *Ordinatio*, IV, ed. B. HECHICH, Rome 1950.
- IOHANNES DUNS SCOTUS, *Quodlibeta*, in: F. ALLUNTIS – A.B. WOLTER, *John Duns Scotus. God and Creatures. The Quodlibetal Questions*, Princeton 1975.
- IOHANNES DUNS SCOTUS, *Reportatio Parisiensis I-A*, ed. A. WOLTER – O.V. BYCHKOV, Saint Bonaventure 1955.
- JEAN GERSON, “Gerson aux Messieurs de Navarre, Bruges, 29 avril 1400”, in: JEAN GERSON, *Œuvres complètes. II: L’œuvre épistolaire*, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris-Tournai-Roma-New York 1960, pp. 30-35.
- JEAN GERSON, “Prosperum iter”, in: JEAN GERSON, *Œuvres complètes*, ed. P. GLORIEUX, vol. 5, Paris, 1962, pp. 471-480.
- JEAN GERSON, *Contra curiositatem studentium*, in: JEAN GERSON, *Œuvres complètes. III: L’œuvre magistrale*, ed. P. GLORIEUX, Paris-Tournai-Roma-New York 1962, pp. 224-249.
- JEAN GERSON, *De duplici logica*, in JEAN GERSON, *Œuvres complètes*, ed. P. Glorieux, vol. 3, Paris, 1962.
- JEAN GERSON, *De necessaria communione laicorum sub utraque specie*, in JEAN GERSON, *Œuvres complètes*, ed. P. Glorieux, vol. 10, Paris, 1973.
- JEAN GERSON, *De sensu litterali*, in JEAN GERSON, *Œuvres complètes*, ed. P. Glorieux, vol. 3, Paris, 1962.
- JEAN GERSON, *Responsio ad quaestionem*, inc. *Ego, Joannes de Gersono*, ed. P. Glorieux, vol. 10, Paris, 1973.
- LANG, A., “Die Katharinenpredigt Heinrichs von Langenstein. Eine programmatische Rede des Gründers der Wiener Universität über den Aufbau der Glaubensbegründung und die Organisation der Wissenschaften”, *Divus Thomas* 26 (1948), pp. 123-159, pp. 233-250.
- Magistri Hieronymi de Praga: Quaestiones, polemica, epistulae*, ed. by FRANTIŠEK ŠMAHEL - GABRIEL SILAGI, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 222, Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.
- MANSI, J.D., *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 27, Graz, Akademische Druck und Verlagsanstalt, 1961.

- PETRUS AUREOLUS, *Scriptum Super Primum Sententiarum*, ed. E. M. BUYTAERT, St. PETRUS DE TARANTASIA, *In I Sententiarum*, Toulouse, 1652.
- PIERRE D'AILLY, *Tractatus ex parte universitatis studii Parisiensis pro causa Fidei contr quemdam fratrem Johannem de Montesono*, in Plessis d'Argentré 1728, vol. ½, f. 75a-129a.
- Processus iudicarius contra Jeronimum de Praga, habitus Viennae a. 1410–1412*, ed. LADISLAV KLICMAN, Historický Archiv, 1, Praha: [n. publ.], 1898.
- PSEUDO-BEDA, *Sententiae philosophicae ex Aristotele collectae* (PL 90).
- THOMAS AQUINAS, *Faith, reason and theology: Questions I-IV of his Commentary on the De Trinitate of Boethius*, (Mediaeval Sources in Translation 32), trans. A. MAURER, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1987.
- THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Summa contra Gentiles cum commentariis Ferrariensis*. Opera omnia iussu impensaue Leonis XIII P. M. edita cura et studio Fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum. (Typis Riccardi Garroni, Romae, 1918-1930), vv. XIII-XV.
- THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Summa Theologiae* I, ed. LEONINA, Romae 1888.
- THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Super De Trinitate in Boethium*, Opera omnia iussu impensaue Leonis XIII P. M. edita cura et studio Fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum, Commissio Leonina - Éditions du Cerf, Roma - Paris, 1992.
- THOMAS DE ARGENTINA, *Scriptum in primum Sententiarum*, Venetiis, 1564.

## 2. Editions of Thomas of Ebendorfer's Works

- THOMAS EBENDORFER, *Catalogus praesulum Laureacensium et Pataviensium*, incep. P. UIBLEIN, intr. and ed. H. ZIMMERMANN, Hannover 2008.
- THOMAS EBENDORFER, *Chronica Austriae*, ed. A. LHOTSKY, Berlin-Zürich 1967 (M.G.H. Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum, Nova series 13).
- THOMAS EBENDORFER, *Chronica pontificum Romanorum*, ed. H. ZIMMERMANN, Berlin-Zürich 1994.
- THOMAS EBENDORFER, *Chronica regum Romanorum*, ed. H. ZIMMERMANN, 2 vol., Berlin-Zürich 2003.
- THOMAS EBENDORFER, *Diarium sive Tractatus cum Boemis (1433-1436)*, ed. H. ZIMMERMANN, Hannover 2010.
- THOMAS EBENDORFER, *Falsitates Judeorum* in: B. CALLSEN – F.P. KNAPP – M. NIESNER – M. PRZYBILSKI (eds.), *Das jüdische Leben Jesu, "Toldot Jeschu": Die älteste lateinische Übersetzung in den "Falsitates Judeorum" von Thomas Ebendorfer*, Wien 2003.
- THOMAS EBENDORFER, *Historia Jerusalemiana*, ed. H. ZIMMERMANN, prep. H. SCHWEIGL, Hannover 2006.
- THOMAS EBENDORFER, *Sechs frühneuhochdeutsche Predigten*, ed. C. KÄMMERER, Logos Verlag, Berlin, 2005.
- THOMAS EBENDORFER, *Sermones dominicales super Epistolas Pauli*, Strasbourg 1478.
- THOMAS EBENDORFER, *Tractatus de schismatibus*, ed. H. ZIMMERMANN, Hannover 2004.

## 3. Secondary Sources

- Acta facultatis artium universitatis Vindobonensis, 1385-1416*, vol. 2, ed. P. UIBLEIN, Wien 1968.
- ANSBACHER, B.M., "Wiener Gesera," in: F. SKOLNIK – M. BERENBAUM (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (Second edition)*, vol. 21, Detroit 2007.
- APPOLD, K.G., "Academic Life and Teaching in Post-Reformation Lutheranism", in: *Lutheran Ecclesiastical Culture, 1550-1675*, ed. Robert Kolb, Leiden 2008, pp. 65-115.
- ASCHBACH, J., *Geschichte der Wiener Universität im ersten Jahrhunderte ihres Bestehens: Festschrift zu ihrer fünfhundertjährigen Gründungsfeier*, vol. 1, Wien 1865.
- ATWOOD, C.D., *The Theology of the Czech Brethren from Hus to Comenius*, Pennsylvania 2009.
- AUDISIO, G., *The Waldensian Dissent: Persecution and Survival, c. 1170–1570*, (trans. C. Davison, 1989), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- AUER, J., "Die aristotelische Logik in der Trinitätslehre der Spätscholastik. Bemerkungen zu einer Quaestio des Johannes Wuel de Pruck, Wien 1422", in: J. AUER – H. VOLK (ed.), *Theologie in*



- Geschichte und Gegenwart. Michael Schmaus zum sechzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht von seinen Freunden und Schülern*, München 1957, pp. 475-498
- BAKKER P.J.J.M. – SCHABEL, C., “Sentences Commentaries of the Later Fourteenth Century”, in: *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. 1, ed. G. R. Evans, Leiden 2002, pp. 425-464.
- BAKKER, P., “Réalisme et remanence. La doctrine eucharistique de Jean Wyclif”, in *John Wyclif Logica, Politica, Teologia*, ed. M.F.B. Brocchieri, S. Simonetta (Florence 1999), pp. 87-112.
- BARBU, D., “Feeling Jewish. Emotions, Identity and the Jews’ Inverted Christmas,” in: G. TARANTINO – C. ZIKA, *Feeling Exclusion. Religious Conflict, Exile and Emotions in Early Modern Europe*, New York 2019, pp. 185-206.
- BERNARD, P. J., “Jerome of Prague, Austria and the Hussites”, *Church History*, 27/1 (1958), pp. 3-22.
- BERNARD, P.P., “Heresy in Fourteenth Century Austria”, *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 10 (1956), pp. 50-63.
- BETTS, R.R., “Jerome of Prague”, in: *Essays in Czech History*, London: Athlone, 1969, pp. 195-235.
- BILLER, P., *The Waldenses, 1170–1530: Between a Religious Order and a Church*, Aldershot: Variorum/Ashgate, 2001.
- BOEHNER, Ph. “Ockham’s Theory of Supposition and the Notion of Truth”, *Franciscan Studies* 6 (1946), pp. 261-292.
- BOEHNER, Ph., “Ockham’s Theory of Supposition and the Notion of Truth”, *Franciscan Studies* 6 (1946), pp. 261-292.
- BOSE, M., “The Opponents of John Wyclif”, in: I. LEVY (ed.), *A Companion to John Wyclif: Late Medieval Theologian*, Leiden: Brill, 2006, pp. 407-55.
- BRÎNZEI, M. – FRIEDMANN, R.L. – SCHABEL, C., “The Late-Medieval Reception of Durand’s *Sentences* Commentary, with Two Case Studies: Peter Auriol († 1322) and Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl (†1433)”, in: *Durand of Saint-Pourçain and His Sentences Commentary*, eds. Andreas Speer – Fiorella Retucci – Thomas Jeschke – Guy Guldentops, Leuven 2014, pp. 295-341.
- BRÎNZEI, M. – SCHABEL, C., “Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the University of Vienna on the Eve of the Reformation”, in: E. JUNG (ed.), *What is New in the New Universities? Learning in Central Europe in Later Middle Ages (1348–1500)*, Turnhout 2018, pp. 396-422.
- BRÎNZEI, M. – SCHABEL, C., “The Past, Present, and Future of Late-Medieval Theology”, in: P.W. ROSEMANN (ed.), *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. 3, Leiden 2015, pp. 174-266
- BRÎNZEI, M. « Plagium », dans *Mots médiévaux offerts à Ruedi Imbach*, ed. I. Atucha et al., Turnhout 2011, pp. 503-512.
- BRÎNZEI, M. (ed.), *Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the Sentences at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth Century*, (Studia Sententiarum 1), Turnhout, 2015.
- BRÎNZEI, M., “Définition de la théologie en tant que science selon Jacques d’Elville”, in: *Coexistence and Cooperation in the Middle Ages. IV European Congress of Medieval Studies F.I.D.E.M. (Palermo 23-27 June 2009)*, eds. Alessandro Musco – Giuliana Musotto, Palermo 2014, pp. 278-290.
- BRÎNZEI, M., “La *Lectura Mellicensis* de Nicholas de Dinkelsbühl dans le sillage de l’esprit réformateur de Jean Gerson”, in: M. BRÎNZEI (ed.), *Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the Sentences at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth Century*, pp. 317-451
- BRÎNZEI, M., “Le commentaire des *Sentences* de Nicolas de Dinkelsbühl”, *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale* 15 (2013), pp. 59-64.
- BRÎNZEI, M., “Stanislaus of Znojmo and the Arrival of Wyclif’s Remanence Theory at the University of Vienna”, in: K. GHOSH – P. SOUKUP – M. BOSE – E. SOLOPOVA (ed.), *Wycliffism and Hussitism: Contexts, Methods, Impact, Responses*, Turnhout forthcoming.
- BRÎNZEI, M., “The Questions on the *Sentences* in Manuscript BH MSS 58 from the Biblioteca Histórica de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid,” in: *Pecia Complutense* 13/24 (2016), pp. 45-59.
- BRÎNZEI, M., “Unknown fragments of Petrus de Treysa in the Codex Basel, Universitätsbibliothek A-X-44”, *Chora* 14 (2016), pp. 285-293.
- BROWN, S. F., “Declarative and Deductive Theology in the Early Fourteenth Century”, in: *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter? Akten des X. Internationalen Kongresses für mittelalterliche Philosophie*, ed. JAN A. AERTSEN - ANDREAS SPEER (Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 26). Berlin, 1998, pp. 648–655.

- BROWN, S. F., “Declarative Theology after Durandus: Its Re-Presentation and Defense by Peter Aureoli”, in: *Philosophical Debates at Paris in the Early Fourteenth Century*, ed. STEPHEN F. BROWN - THOMAS DEWENDER - THEO KOBUSCH (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 102), Leiden, 2009, pp. 401-422.
- BROWN, S. F., “The Early Durand of Saint-Pourçain on the Scientific Character of Theology”, in: *Durand of Saint-Pourçain and His Sentences Commentary*, eds. Andreas Speer – Fiorella Retucci – Thomas Jeschke – Guy Guldentops, Leuven 2014, pp. 171-183.
- BURROWS, M.S., “Jean Gerson and the ‘Traditioned Sense’ of Scripture as an Argument for an Ecclesial Hermeneutic”, in *Biblical Hermeneutics in Historical Perspective: Studies in Honor of Karlfried Froehlich on His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. M.S. Burrows, P. Rorem, Grand Rapids, 1991.
- BURROWS, M.S., *Jean Gerson and De Consolatione Theologiae (1418): The Consolation of a Biblical and Reforming Theology for a Disordered Age*, Tübingen, 1991.
- BUSCHE, H. (ed.), *Departure for Modern Europe: A Handbook of Early Modern Philosophy (1400-1700)*, Hamburg, 2011.
- BYCHKOV, O., “The Nature of Theology in Duns Scotus and His Franciscan Predecessors”, in: *Franciscan Studies* 66 (2008), pp. 5-99.
- CALMA, M., “Plagium”, in *Mots médiévaux offerts à Ruedi Imbach*, ed. I. Atucha et alii (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 503-512.
- CAMERON, E., *Waldenses: Rejections of Holy Church in Medieval Europe*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford 2000.
- CHAZAN, R., *Medieval Stereotypes and Modern Antisemitism*, Berkeley 1997.
- Church History*, 58 (1989), pp. 168-181.
- COLISH, M., *Faith, Force and Fiction in Medieval Baptismal Debates*, Washington, DC 2014.
- COURTENAY, W.J., “Antiqui and Moderni in Late Medieval Thought”, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 48 (1987), pp. 3-10.
- COURTENAY, W.J., “Inquiry and Inquisition: Academic Freedom in Medieval Universities”, in *Church History* 58 (1989), pp. 168-181.
- COURTENAY, W.J., “Nominalism and Late Medieval Religion”, in: C.E. TRINKAUS – H.A. OBERMAN (eds.), *The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion*, Leiden 1974, pp. 26-59.
- COURTENAY, W.J., “The Two ‘Late Middle Ages’”, in: R. H. PICH – A. SPEER (ed.), *Contemplation and Philosophy: Scholastic and Mystical Modes of Medieval Philosophical Thought*, Leiden-Boston 2018, pp. 108-128.
- COURTENAY, W.J., “Theological disputations as Vienna in the Early Fifteenth Century. Harvard Ms lat. 162”, *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale*, 53 (2011), pp. 385-401.
- COURTENAY, W.J., “From Dinkelsbühl’s *Questiones Communes* to the Vienna Group Commentary. The Vienna ‘School’, 1415–1425”, in: M. BRINZEI (ed.): *Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the Sentences at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth Century*, (Studia Sententiarum 1), Turnhout, 2015, pp. 267-315.
- COURTENAY, W.J. – TACHAU, K.H., “Ockham Ockhamists, and the English-German Nation at Paris, 1339-1341”, *History of Universities* 2 (1982), pp. 53-96.
- COURTENAY, W.J., “Force of Words and Figures of Speech: The Crisis over *Virtus Sermonis* in the Fourteenth Century”, *Franciscan Studies* 44 (1984), pp. 107-128.
- COURTENAY, W.J., “Some notes on Robert of Halifax O.F.M.,” in: *Franciscan Studies* 33 (1973), pp. 133-142.
- COURTENAY, W.J., TACHAU, K.H., “Ockham Ockhamists, and the English-German Nation at Paris, 1339-1341”, *History of Universities* 2 (1982), pp. 53-96.
- CROSS, R., *Duns Scotus*, Oxford 1999.
- CURUȚ, I., “Review of Marcia Colish’s *Faith, Fiction and Force in Medieval Baptismal Debates*”, in: *Philobiblon* XXII, 1/2017, pp. 236-239.
- CURUȚ, I., “The *Sentences* Commentary of Thomas Ebendorfer: Manuscripts and Question Lists,” in: *Archives doctrinale d'histoire et littérature du Moyen Age* 88 (2021), pp. 65-111.
- CURUȚ, I., “Thomas Ebendorfer of Hasselbach”, in: H. LAGERLUND (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy: Philosophy between 500 and 1500 (Second Edition)*, Dordrecht 2020, pp. 1902-1906.
- CURUȚ, I., “Thomas Ebendorfer on *Virtus Sermonis* and the Relation between Theology, Philosophy and Logic (With an Edition of His Prologue in Ms. Wien, ÖNB 4369),” forthcoming.

- CURUȚ, I., “Viennese University Theologians on Practical Theology”, *Archa Verbi*, 14 (2017), pp. 101-156.
- DAHAN, G., “Saint Thomas d’Aquin et la métaphore: rhétorique et herméneutique”, *Medioevo* 18 (1992), pp. 85-117.
- DAHAN, G., *Lire la Bible au moyen âge: Essais d’herméneutique médiévale*, Geneva, 2009.
- DAHMUS, J., *The Prosecution of John Wyclif*, New Haven, Conn., 1952.
- DE LIBERA, A., *La querelle des universaux. De Platon à la fin du Moyen Âge*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1996.
- DE LIBERA, A., *Penser au Moyen Age*, Paris, 1991.
- DE RIJK, L.M., “Semantics and Ontology. An Assessment of Medieval Terminism”, in: *Medieval Supposition Theory Revisited*, ed. E.P. BOS, in collaboration with H.A.G. BRAAKHUIS, W. DUBA, C.H. KNEEPKENS, C. SCHABEL, Leiden-Boston 2013, pp. 13-59.
- DE VOOGHT, P., *Les sources de la doctrine chrétienne d’après les théologiens du XIVe siècle et du début du XVe avec le texte intégral des XII premières questions de la Summa inédite de Gérard de Bologne († 1317)*, Desclée de Brouwer 1954.
- DUMONT, S.D., “Theology as a Science and Duns Scotus’s Distinction between Intuitive and Abstractive Cognition”, *Speculum* 64 (1989), pp. 579-599.
- EIDELBERG, S., *Jewish Life in Austria in the Fifteenth Century: As Reflected in the Legal Writings of Rabbi Israel Isserlein and His Contemporaries*, Philadelphia 1962.
- ELBEL, P. – ZIEGLER, W., “Am schwarzen sntag mardert man dieselben juden, all die zaigten vill guets an under der erden... Die Wiener Gesera: eine Neubetrachtung,” in: H. TEUFEL – P. KOČMAN – M. ŘEPA (eds.), *Avigdor, Benesch, Gitl. Juden in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien im Mittelalter. Samuel Steinherz sum Gedenken (1857 Güssing – 1942 Theresienstadt)*, Brünn / Prag / Essen 2016, pp. 201-268.
- FLANAGIN, D.Z. “Making Sense of It All: Gerson’s Biblical Theology”, in *A Companion to Jean Gerson*, ed. B.P. McGuire, Leiden, 2006, pp. 133-178.
- FLÜELER, C., “Teaching Ethics at the University of Vienna: The Making of a Commentary at the Faculty of Arts (A Case Study)”, in: I.P. BEJCZY (ed.), *Virtue Ethics in the Middle Ages. Commentaries on Aristotle’s, Nicomachean Ethics, 1200–1500*, Leiden 2008, pp. 277-346.
- FORREST, I., *The Detection of Heresy in Late Medieval England*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005.
- FRASSETTO, M. (ed.), *Heresy and the Persecuting Society in the Middle Ages*, Leiden, Brill, 2006.
- FRIEDMANN, R., *Medieval Trinitarian Thought from Aquinas to Ockham*, Cambridge 2010.
- FRIEDMANN, R.L., “The Sentences Commentary, 1250-1320. General Trends, The impact of the Religious Orders, and the Test Case of Predestination”, in *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, ed. G. R. Evens, Leiden, 2002, pp. 41-128.
- FUDGE, T. A., *The Magnificent Ride: The First Reformation in Hussite Bohemia*, St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History, Ashgate, Aldershot 1998.
- FUDGE, T. A., *The Trial of Jan Hus: Medieval Heresy and Criminal Procedure*, Oxford, 2013.
- FUDGE, T.A., *Jan Hus. Religious Reform and Social Revolution in Bohemia*, London-New York 2010.
- GELBER, H.G., *Exploring the Boundaries of Reason: Three Questions on the Nature of God by Robert Holcot* OP, Toronto 1983.
- GELBER, H.G., *Logic and the Trinity: A Clash of Values on Scholastic Thought, 1300-1335*, Madison 1987.
- GEORGEDES, K., “Robert of Halifax,” in: H. LAGERLUND (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy: Philosophy between 500 and 1500 (Second Edition)*, Dordrecht 2020, pp. 1719-1721.
- GHOSH, K., “Logic, Scepticism, and ‘Heresy’ In Early Fifteenth-Century Europe: Oxford, Vienna, Constance”, in: D. G. DENEY – K. GHOSH – N. ZEEMAN (ed.), *Uncertain Knowledge: Scepticism, relativism, and doubt in the Middle Ages*, Turnhout 2014, pp. 261-283.
- GIRGENSOHN, D., *Peter von Pulkau und die Wiedereinführung des Laienkelches. Leben und Wirken eines Wiener Theologen in der Zeit des großen Schismas*, Göttingen 1964.
- GOLDMANN, A., “Die Wiener Gesera und die Urteils-Verkündigungen vom Jahre 1421,” in: A. GOLDMANN (ed.), *Das Judenbuch der Scheffstraße zu Wien (1389-1420), mit einer Schriftprobe*, Wien / Leipzig 1908, pp. 112-133.
- GONNET, J. – MOLNÁR, A., *Les Vaudois au Moyen Âge*, Claudiana, Turin 1974.

- GRUNDMANN, H., *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages*, (trans. S. Rowan, 1935) Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1996.
- GRUNWALD, M., *Vienna*, 1836.
- HABERKERN, E., *Die ›Wiener Schule‹ der Pastoraltheologie im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert. Entstehung, Konstituenten, literarische Wirkung*, Göppingen 2003.
- HADINGER, A., *Katalog der Handschriften des Augustiner Chorherrenstiftes Klosterneuburg. Teil 1: Cod. 1-100*, Vienna 1983.
- HALLAMAA, O., “Defending Common Rationality: Roger Roseth on Trinitarian Paralogisms,” *Vivarium* 41 (2003), pp. 84-119.
- HARVEY, M., “The Diffusion of the *Doctrinale* of Thomas Netter in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Century”, in: L. SMITH – B. WARD (ed.), *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages: Essays presented to Margaret Gibson*, London, 1992, pp. 281-294.
- HOBBS, D., *Authorship and Publicity before Print: Jean Gerson and the Transformation of Late Medieval Learning*, Philadelphia 2009.
- HOENEN, M.J.F.M. “Tradition and Renewal: The Philosophical Setting of Fifteenth-Century Christology. Heymericus de Campo, Nicolaus Cusanus, and the Cologne *Quaestiones vacantiales* (1465)”, in: *Christ Among the Medieval Dominicans: Representations of Christ in the Texts and Images of the Order of Preachers*, ed. K. EMERY, J. WAWRYKOW, Notre-Dame, 1998, pp. 462-492.
- HOENEN, M.J.F.M., “Jean Wyclif et les *universalia realia*”, in: *La Servante et la consolatrice: la philosophie dans ses rapports avec la théologie au Moyen Âge*, ed. JEAN-LUC SOLERE – ZÉNON KALUZA, Paris: Vrin, 2002, pp. 172-92.
- HOENEN, M.J.F.M., “*Modus loquendi platoniorum*: Johannes Gerson und seine Kritik an Platon und den Platonisten”, in: *The Platonic Tradition in the Middle Ages: A Doxographic Approach*, ed. STEPHEN GERSH – MAARTEN HOENEN, Berlin: Gruyter, 2002, pp. 325-43.
- HOENEN, M.J.F.M., “Nominalismus als universitäre Spekulationskontrolle”, *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales*, 73 (2006), pp. 349-74.
- HOENEN, M.J.F.M., “Theology and Metaphysics: the Debate between John Wyclif and John Kenningham on the Principles of Reading the Scriptures”, in MARIA-TERESA FUMAGALLI BEONIO BROCCIERI – STEFANO SIMONETTA (eds.), *John Wyclif: Logica, Politica, Theologica*, Firenze: Galluzzo, 2003, pp. 23-55.
- HOENEN, M.J.F.M., “*Via antiqua* and *via moderna* in the Fifteenth Century: Doctrinal, Institutional, and Church Political Factors in the Wegestreit”, in: RUSSELL L. FRIEDMANN – LAUGE O. NIELSEN (eds.), *The Medieval Heritage in Early Modern Metaphysics and Modal Theory, 1400–1700*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2003, pp. 9-36.
- HOLOPAINEN, T.M., *William Ockham's Theory of the Foundations of Ethics*, Helsinki 1991.
- HORST, U. – FAES DE MOTTONI, B., “Die Zwangstaufe jüdischer Kinder im Urteil scholastischer Theologen,” in: *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift* 40/3 (1989), pp. 173-199.
- HÜBENER, W. “Der theologisch-philosophische Konservatismus des Jean Gerson”, in: *Antiqui und Moderni. Traditionsbewusstsein und Fortschrittsbewusstsein im späten Mittelalter*, ed. A. Zimmerman – G. Vuillemin-Diem, Berlin 1974, pp. 171-200.
- KALUZA, Z., “Auteur et plagiaire: quelques remarques”, in *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter? Akten des X. Internationalen Kongresses für mittelalterliche Philosophie*, ed. JAN A. AERTSEN - ANDREAS SPEER (Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 26). Berlin, 1998, pp. 312-320.
- KALUZA, Z., “Jérôme de Prague et le *Timée* de Platon”, *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 61 (1994), pp. 57-104.
- KALUZA, Z., “Le chancelier Gerson et Jérôme de Prague”, in *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 51 (1984), pp. 81-126.
- KALUZA, Z., “Les sciences et leurs langages. Note sur le statut du 29 décembre 1340 et le prétendu statut perdu contre Ockham”, in: *Filosofia et teologia nel trecento. Studi in ricordo di Eugenio Randi*, ed. L. BIANCHI, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1994, pp. 197-258.
- KALUZA, Z., *Les querelles doctrinales à Paris: Nominalistes et realistes aux confins du XIVe et du XVe siècles*, Bergamo 1988.
- KEJŘ, J., *Die Causa Johannes Hus und das Prozess-recht der Kirche*, trans. by Walter Annuss, Regensburg: Pustet, 2005.
- KIECKHEFER, R., *Repression of Heresy in Medieval Germany*, Philadelphia 1979.

- KLICMAN, L., “Der Wiener Process gegen Hieronymus von Prag, 1410–12”, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 21 (1900), pp. 445-57.
- KÖNIG, E., *Kardinal Giordano Orsini*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1906.
- KRAUSS, S., *Die Wiener Gesera vom Jahre 1421*, Wien / Leipzig 1920.
- LAMBERT, M., *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 3rd edn, Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- LAMBERTINI, R., “Francis of Marchia”, in: H. LAGERLUND (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy: Philosophy between 500 and 1500 (Second Edition)*, Dordrecht 2020, pp. 574-577.
- LANG, A., “Das Verhältnis von Schrift, Tradition und kirchlichem Lehramt nach Heinrich Totting von Oyta”, *Scholastik* 40 (1965): pp. 214-234.
- LANG, A., *Die Wege der Glaubensbegründung bei den Scholastikern des 14. Jahrhunderts*, Münster i. W. 1930.
- LANG, P.J., *Die Christologie bei Heinrich von Langenstein*, Freiburg 1966.
- LARSEN, A., *The School of Heretics: Academic Condemnation at the University of Oxford, 1277–1409*, Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- LEFF, G., *William of Ockham: The Metamorphosis of Scholastic Discourse*, Manchester 1975.
- LEVY, I. C., “Defining the Responsibility of the Late Medieval Theologian: The Debate between John Kynyngham and John Wyclif“, *Carmelus* 49 (2002), pp. 5-29.
- LHOTSKY, A., *Thomas Ebendorfer. Ein österreichischer Geschichtsschreiber, Theologe und Diplomat des 15. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 1957.
- LICKTEIG, F.-B., *The German Carmelites at The Medieval Universities*, Rome 1981.
- LINDNER, B., *Die Erkenntnislehre des Thomas von Straßbourg*, Münster 1930.
- LOHRMANN, K., “The Vienna Gesera”, in: G. MILCHRAM (ed.), *Museum Judenplatz for Medieval Jewish Life in Vienna*, Pichler Verlag, Vienna, 2000.
- LOWE, E., *The Contested Theological Authority of Thomas Aquinas. The Controversies Between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain, 1307-1323*, Routledge 2003.
- LUKÁCS, E.A., “Contuli cum magistro meo reverendo Nicholao de Dinkelspuhel in tribus principiis meis: Die Principia des Walter von Bamberg Ocarm aus 1400-1402,” in: *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 29 (2018), pp. 479-504.
- MADRE, A., *Nikolaus von Dinkelsbühl. Leben und Schriften. Ein Beitrag zur theologischen Literaturgeschichte*, Münster 1965.
- MAIERÜ, A., “Aspetti del rapporto tra logica e teologia nel tardo Medioevo”, in P. Llorente (ed.), *Actes del Simposi Internacional de Filosofia De l'Edat Mitjana, Vic-Girona, 11-16 d'abril de 1993*, Vic 1996, pp. 39-49.
- MAIERÜ, A., “Logic and Trinitarian Theology: *De modo predicandi ac sylogizandi in divinis*”, in *Meaning and Inference in Medieval Philosophy*, ed. N. Kretzmann, Dordrecht, 1988, pp. 247-295.
- MAIERÜ, A., “Logica aristotelica e teologia trinitaria: Enrico Totting da Oyta”, in *Studi sul XIV secolo in memoria di Anneliese Maier*, ed. A. Maierü, A. Paravicini Baliani, Rome, 1981, pp. 481-512.
- MAIERÜ, A., “Logique aristotélicienne et théologie trinitaire au XVe siècle”, in M. Olszewski (ed.), *What is ‘theology’ in the Middle Ages? Religious Cultures of Europe*, Münster i. W. 2007, pp. 329-350.
- MAIERÜ, A., “Logique et théologie trinitaire dans le moyen-âge tardif: deux solutions en présence,” in *The Editing of Theological and Philosophical Texts from the Middle Ages*, ed. M. Asztalos, Stockholm, 1986, pp. 185-212.
- MAIERÜ, A., “Universaux et Trinité du XIIe au XVe siècle”, in J.-L. Solère – Z. Kaluza (eds.), *La servante et la consolatrice. La philosophie dans ses rapports avec la théologie au Moyen Âge*, Paris 2002, pp. 151-172.
- MAIERÜ, A., “*Ymaginatio manductiva*. Logica e teologia trinitaria in Pietro de Pulkau”, in *Itinéraires de la raison: Etudes de philosophie médiévale offertes à Maria Cândida Pacheco*, ed. J. F. Meirinhos, Turnhout 2005, pp. 347-364.
- MAIERÜ, A., “*Ymaginationes manductive*: Logic and Trinitarian Theology in Peter of Pulkau”, in P.A. Kärkkäinen, *Trinitarian Theology in the Medieval West*, Helsinki 2007, pp. 226-255.
- MANN, W. E., “Duns Scotus on Natural and Supernatural Knowledge of God”, in: T. WILLIAMS (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Duns Scotus*, Cambridge 2003, pp. 238-262.
- MARCOLINO, V., “Das Nachwirken der Lehre Hugolins”, in: W. ECKERMANN (ed.), *Schwerpunkte und Wirkungen des Sentenzenkommentars Hugolins von Orvieto O.E.S.A.*, Würzburg 1990, pp. 295-481.

- MARMURSZTEJN, E. – PIRON S., “Duns Scot et la politique. Pouvoir du prince et conversion des juifs,” in: O. BOULNOIS – E. KARGER – J.-L. SOLERE (eds.), *Duns Scot. Paris, 1302-2002. Actes du colloque de Paris, 2-4 septembre 2002*, Turnhout 2004, pp. 21-62.
- MARMURSZTEJN, E., “Uses and Echoes of Visigothic Conciliar Legislation in the Scholastic Controversy on Forced Baptism (Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries),” in: M. GARCÍA-ARENAL – Y. GLAZER-EYTAN (eds.), *Forced Conversion in Christianity, Judaism and Islam: Coercion and Faith in Premodern Iberia and Beyond*, Leiden – Boston 2020, pp. 33-59.
- MARMURSZTEJN, E., *Le baptême forcé des enfants juifs*, Paris 2016.
- MARTÍNEZ DÍEZ, G. – RODRÍGUEZ, F., *La colección canónica hispana*, vol. 5, Madrid 1992.
- MAURER, A., *The Philosophy of William of Ockham in the Light of Its Principles*, Toronto, PIMS, 1999.
- MEYJES, G.H.M., *Jean Gerson – Apostle of Unity: His Church Politics and Ecclesiology*, trans. J.C. Grayson, Leiden, 1999.
- MICHALSKI, K., *La philosophie au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle. Six études*, hrg. von K. FLASCH, Frankfurt, 1968, pp. 20-21.
- MÖHLE, H., “Kapitel 1. Das scotische Konzept einer scientia practica”, in: Hannes Möhle, *Ethik als scientia practica nach Johannes Duns Scotus. Eine philosophische Grundlegung*, Münster 1995, pp. 13–157.
- MOODY, E.A., “Ockam, Buridan, and Nicholas of Autrecourt: The Parisian Statutes of 1339 and 1340”, *Franciscan Studies* 7 (1947), pp. 113-146
- MOODY, E.A., “Ockam, Buridan, and Nicholas of Autrecourt: The Parisian Statutes of 1339 and 1340”, *Franciscan Studies* 7 (1947), pp. 113-146.
- NASH, P.V., “Giles of Rome and the Subject of Theology”, in: *Medieval Studies* XVIII (1956), pp. 61-92.
- NEWMAN, L., *Jewish Influence in Christian Reform Movements*, 2016.
- NIEDERBACHER, B. – LEIBOLD, G. (eds.), *Theologie als Wissenschaft im Mittelalter. Texte, Übersetzungen, Kommentare*, Münster 2006.
- OBERMAN, H. A., *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism*, Grand Rapids, 1967.
- OCKER, C., “Contempt for Friars and contempt for Jews in late medieval Germany,” in: S. J. MCMICHAEL – S. MYERS (eds.), *Friars and Jews in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Leiden 2004, pp. 119-146.
- OCKER, C., “German Theologians and the Jews in the Fifteenth Century,” in: D.P. BELL – S.G. BURNETT (eds.), *Jews, Judaism, and the Reformation in Sixteenth-Century Germany*, Leiden 2006, pp. 33-65.
- OLIVA, A., “Quelques éléments de la *doctrina theologiae* selon Thomas d’Aquin”, in: *What is Theology in the Middle Ages? Religious Cultures of Europe (11th–15<sup>th</sup> Centuries) as Reflected in Their Self-Understanding* (Archa verbi. Subsidia 1), ed. Mikołaj Olszewski, Münster 2007, pp. 167-193.
- OLIVA, A., *Les débuts de l’enseignement de Thomas d’Aquin et sa Conception de la Sacra Doctrina*, Paris 2006.
- OLSZEWSKI, M., *Dominican Theology at the Crossroads. A Critical Edition and Study of the Prologues to the Commentaries on Peter Lombard’s Sentences by James of Metz and Hervaeus Natalis* (Archa verbi. Subsidia 2), Münster 2010.
- PELLETIER, J., *William Ockham on Metaphysics. The Science of Being and God*, Turnout 2012.
- PORRO, P., *Thomas Aquinas. A Historical and Philosophical Profile*, tr. by J.G. Trabbic, R.W. Nutt, Washington 2016.
- PUTALLAZ, F.-X., “Censorship”, in: R. PASNAU (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*, 2 vols, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010, vol. 1, pp. 99-113.
- ROBERT, A., “Robert of Halifax,” in: *Encyclopaedia of British Philosophy*, Bristol, 2006.
- ROBSON, J.A., *Wyclif and the Oxford Schools*, Cambridge, 1961.
- ROSEMANN, P. W., “Introduction: Three Avenues for Studying the Tradition of the *Sentences*”, in: P. W. ROSEMANN (ed.), *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. 3, Leiden 2015, pp. 1-25.
- RUBIN, M., *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews*, Philadelphia 2004.
- SACKVILLE, L., *Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century: The Textual Representations*,

- SALERNO, L., *Il Prologo al Commento alle Senteze di Landolfo Caracciolo: edizione e studio*, Università degli Studi di Milano 1989.
- SCHABEL, C., “Dominican Anti-Thomism. James of Metz’s Question on Divine Foreknowledge, with a Rebuttal from the *Correctorium Iacobi Metensis*”, in *Przegląd Tomistyczny* 20 (2014), pp. 35-72.
- SCHABEL, C., “Henry of Langenstein, Henry Totting of Oyta, Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the Vienna Group on Reconciling Human Free Will with Divine Foreknowledge”, in: M. BRİNZEI – C. SCHABEL (ed.), *Philosophical Psychology in Late-Medieval Commentaries on Peter Lombard’s Sentences. Acts of the XIVth Annual Colloquium of the Société Internationale pour l’étude de la Philosophie Médiévale, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, 28-30 October 2009*, Turnhout 2020, pp. 327-406.
- SCHABEL, C., “Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the *Filioque* at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth Century”, in: M. BRİNZEI (ed.): *Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the Sentences at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth Century*, (Studia Sententiarum 1), Turnhout, 2015, pp. 15-83.
- SCHÖTTLER, H.G., “*Vera theologia est practica*. (Martin Luther). Theologie als topologische Wissensform in einer Welt als fragiler *topos* der Gottesbegegnung”, in: *Quo vadis, theologia? Neue Perspektiven auf Religion in der späten Moderne*, eds. Johannes Först/ Heinz-Günther Schöttler, (Biblische Perspektiven für Verkündigung und Unterricht 4), Berlin, 2009, 107–150.
- SCHUBERT, K., “Die Wiener Gesera und der Freitod von Wiener Juden zur ‘Heiligung Gottes’,” in: B. KLEIN – C. MÜLLER (eds.), *Memoria – Wege jüdischen Erinnerns. Festschrift für Michael Brocke zum 65. Geburtstag*, Berlin 2005, pp. 541-551.
- SCHUBERT, K., *Die Geschichte des österreichischen Judentums*, Wien – Köln – Weimar 2008.
- SHANK, M.H., ‘*Unless You Believe, You Shall Not Understand*’. *Logic, University, and Society in Late Medieval Vienna*, Princeton 1988.
- SHANK, M.H., “University and Church in Late Medieval Vienna: *Modi Dicendi et Operandi*, 1388-1421,” in: M.J.F.M. HOENEN – J.H.J. SCHNEIDER – G. WIELAND (eds.), *Philosophy and Learning. Universities in the Middle Ages*, Leiden 1995, pp. 43-59.
- SLOTENMAKER, J.T. – WITT, J.C., *Robert Holcot*, Oxford 2016.
- SLOTENMAKER, J.T., “Henry of Gorkum’s *Conclusiones Super IV Libros Sententiarum*: Studying the Lombard in the First Decades of the Fifteenth Century”, in: *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. 3, ed. Philipp W. Rosemann, Leiden 2014, pp. 145-173.
- SLOTENMAKER, J.T., *Trinitarian Theology in Medieval and Reformation Thought*, Springer Nature, 2020.
- SMALLEY, B., *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, Oxford, 1952.
- SOMMERFELDT, G., “Zwei Schismatraktate Heinrichs von Langenstein: Sendschreiben an König Wenzel von 1381 und Schreiben an Bischof Friedrich von Brixen, um 1384”, in: *MIÖG*, Ergänzungsband 7 (1907), pp. 461-469.
- SONDAG, G., “La théologie comme science pratique”, in: Duns Scot, *La théologie comme science pratique (Prologue de la »Lectura«)*, introduction, traduction et notes par Gerard Sondag, Paris 1996, pp. 75–103.
- SOUKUP, P., *Jan Hus: The Life and Death of a Preacher*, Indiana 2019.
- SPINKA, M., “Hus’ Trial at the Council of Constance”, in *Czechoslovakia: Past and Present*, ed. M. Recheigl (The Hague, 1968), vol. 2, pp. 1208-1220.
- STEGMÜLLER, F. *Repertorium commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, vol. 1, Würzburg 1947.
- STENECK, N.H., *Science and Creation in the Middle Ages. Henry of Langenstein (d. 1397) on Genesis*, Notre Dame 1976.
- STRNAD, A., “Die Zeugen im wiener Prozess gegen Hieronymus von Prag”, in *Husitství – Reformace – Renaissance: Sborník k 60.narozeninám Františka Šmahela*, ed. JAROSLAV PÁNEK – MILOSLAV POLÍVKA – NOEMI REICHERTOVÁ, 3 vols, Praha: Historický ústav, 1994, vol. 1, pp. 331-68.
- SWANSON, R. N., *University, Academics and the Great Schism*, Cambridge 2002.
- TABER, Jr., D., “Pierre d’Ailly and the Teaching Authority of the Theologian”, *Church History*, 59 (1990), pp. 163-74.
- Tabulae codicum manu scriptorum, praeter graecos et orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum. Edidit Academia Caesarea Vindobonensis. Vol. III: Cod. 3501-5000*, Wien 1869.
- THIJSEN, J. M. M. H., *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris, 1200–1400*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998.
- THOM, P. *Logic of the Trinity: Augustine to Ockham*, New York, 2012.



- THORNDIKE, L., *University Records and Life in the Middle Ages*, New York 1944.
- TRACHTENBERG, J., *The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and Its Relation to Modern Anti-Semitism*, Philadelphia 2002.
- TRAPP, D., “Augustinian Theology of the 14<sup>th</sup> Century. Notes on Editions, Marginalia, Opinions and Booklore,” *Augustiniana* 6 (1956), pp. 146-274.
- TURNER, N., “Jews and Judaism in Peter Aureol’s *Sentences* Commentary,” in: S. MCMICHAEL – S. MYERS (eds.), *Friars and Jews in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Leiden 2004, pp. 81-98.
- TURNER, N., “Robert Holcot on the Jews,” in: S. DELANY (ed.), *Chaucer and the Jews*, New York 2002, pp. 133-144.
- TURNER, N., “An Attack on the Acknowledged Truth: French, English, and German Theologians on the Jews in the Fourteenth Century,” PhD thesis, University of Iowa, 1996.
- TURNER, N., “Jewish Witness, Forced Conversion, and Island Living: John Duns Scotus on Jews and Judaism,” in: M. FRASSETTO (ed.), *Jews and Christians in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, New York 2006, pp. 183-209.
- UIBLEIN, P., “Epilegomena zur Neuausgabe der Cronica Austriae Thomas Ebendorfers”, in *Die Universität Wien im Mittelalter. Beiträge und Forschungen*, Wien, 1999, pp. 461-488.
- ULLMANN, W., *The Origins of the Great Schism: A Study in Fourteenth Century Ecclesiastical History*, London 1948.
- UNTERKIRCHER, F., *Die datierten Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek von 1401 bis 1450*. 1. Teil: Text. 2. Teil: Tafeln, Wien 1971.
- WALSH, K., “Vom Wegestreit zur Häresie: Zur Auseinandersetzung um die Lehre John Wyclifs in Wien und Prag an der Wende zum 15. Jahrhundert”, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 94 (1986), pp. 25-47.
- WALSH, K., „Professors in the Parish Pulpit: Zu Thomas Ebendorfers homiletischer Tätigkeit als ‚Winzerseelsorger‘ in Perchtoldsdorf”, in: *Innsbrucker Historische Studien* 22 (2000), pp. 79-116.
- WALZER, M. –LORBERBAUM, M. –ZOHAR, N.J. –ACKERMAN, A. (eds.), *The Jewish Political Tradition. Vol. II: Membership*, Yale 2003.
- WITT, J., “Creating Jewish Otherness: The Jew as an Archetype in Fourteenth-Century Philosophical and Theological Reasoning,” in: M. KRUMMEL – T. PUGH (eds.), *Jews in Medieval England. The New Middle Ages*, Cham 2017, pp. 71-86.
- WITT, J.C., *Between Faith and Knowledge: ‘Theological Knowledge’ in Gregory of Rimini and his Fourteenth-Century Context*, PhD Thesis, Boston College, 2012.
- WÖLLER, F., *Theologie und Wissenschaft bei Petrus Aureoli. Ein scholastischer Entwurf aus dem frühen 14. Jahrhundert* (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 117), Brill, Leiden-Boston, 2015.
- XIBERTA, B. M., *De scriptoribus scholasticis saeculi XIV ex ordine Carmelitarum*, Louvain 1931. York: York Medieval Press; Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2011.
- ZAHND, U., “Disputing without *socii*. The *Principium* on Book IV of Conrad of Rothenburg, Vienna 1408–09”, in M. BRÎNZEI – W. DUBA (eds.), *Les principia sur les Sentences. Entre exercice institutionnel et débat philosophique*, forthcoming.
- ZAHND, U., “Plagiats individualisés et stratégies de singularisation. L’évolution du livre IV du commentaire commun des *Sentences* de Vienne”, in: M. BRÎNZEI (ed.): *Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the Sentences at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth Century*, (Studia Sententiarum 1), Turnhout, 2015, pp. 85-265.
- ZAHND, U., *Wirksame Zeichen? Sakramentenlehre und Semiotik in der Scholastik des ausgehenden Mittelalters*, Tübingen 2014.
- ZUMKELLER, A., “Die Augustinerschule des Mittelalters. Vertreter und philosophisch-theologische Lehre”, in: *Analecta Augustiniana* 27 (1964), pp. 167-262.

### 3. Online Sources

- ALPHONSUS VARGAS, *In I Sent.*, ed. Venice 1490 (transcription by L. CIOCA, accessible online at <http://textlib.thesis-project.ro/html/vargas/atv-11d2.xml>).
- IOHANNES DE MIRICURIA, *In I Sent.*, ed. E. RANDI – M. PARODI, accessible online at <http://filosofia.dipafilo.unimi.it/~mparodi/mirecourt/testi/questioni/questio18.htm>).



LUKACS, E.A., “*Sentences Commentaries from the Early University of Vienna under the Paleographical Magnifying Glass*”, in: *Iter Austriacum*, February 25, 2016. [www.iter-austriacum.at/uncategorized/sentences-commentaries-from-the-early-university-of-vienna-under-the-paleographical-magnifying-glass/](http://www.iter-austriacum.at/uncategorized/sentences-commentaries-from-the-early-university-of-vienna-under-the-paleographical-magnifying-glass/).

*Repertorium Academicum Germanicum* (RAG), <https://rag-online.org>.

ROBERT HOKOT, *Super quattuor libros Sententiarum questiones*, ed. Lyon 1518 (transcription by D. COMAN, accessible online at <http://thesis-project.ro/robertusholcot/files/Circa%201um%20librum%20Sententiarum%2C%20q.%201.pdf>)