

Question about Mary Magdalene by Benedict Hesse of Cracow (Ms. Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 1386, f. IIIv): Study and Critical Edition

Kwestia o Marii Magdalenie Benedykta Hessego z Krakowa (Ms. Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 1386, f. IIIv): studium i edycja krytyczna

Wojciech Baran*

Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Paris
Sciences religieuses

Abstract: The article deals with the question about Mary Magdalene composed by Benedict Hesse of Cracow (ca. 1389–1456), Professor of Theology at the University of Cracow: it presents a study of the question and a critical edition of the text. The author addresses the question of attribution of the analyzed text and examines the dating of the text, establishing the *terminus post quem et ante quem* as 1431–1449. In the question, Hesse asks if Mary Magdalene committed a carnal sin. The medieval theologian analyzes the arguments for and against, and according to the long exegetic tradition concludes that Mary Magdalene committed a sin and is a conversion model for sinners. Hesse specifies that this question should be debated only at the university and not in the churches to avoid scandalizing the faithful.

Keywords: Benedict Hesse of Cracow, Mary Magdalene, biblical exegesis, University of Cracow, 15th century, Jagiellonian Library, Gregory the Great

Abstrakt: Artykuł prezentuje kwestię teologiczną dotyczącą Marii Magdaleny skomponowaną przez Benedykta Hessego z Krakowa (ok. 1389–1456), profesora teologii na Uniwersytecie Krakowskim, oraz zawiera wydanie krytyczne omawianego tekstu. Autor artykułu analizuje kwestię atrybucji i datacji tekstu, wyznaczając *terminus post quem et ante quem* na lata 1431–1449. W swojej kwestii Hesse bada, czy Maria Magdalena popełniła grzech cielesny. Średniowieczny teolog analizuje argumenty za i przeciw i zgodnie z długą tradycją egzegetyczną stwierdza, że święta

* Rev. Wojciech Baran—Doctor of Theology. Deals with theological anthropology, medieval philosophy, and critical editions of medieval Latin texts and continues postdoctoral studies in Paris in *Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes* in the field of *sciences religieuses*. He is a Catholic priest of the Archdiocese of Cracow, Poland; e-mail wojciechdariusz@gmail.com. ORCID: 0000-0002-3049-0050.

dopuszcza się grzechu, a jej późniejsza postawa jest wzorem nawrócenia dla grzeszników. Hesse stwierdza, że kwestia ta powinna być omawiana jedynie w salach akademickich, a nie na ambonach w kościołach, by uniknąć zgorszenia wiernych.

Słowa kluczowe: Benedykt Hesse z Krakowa, Maria Magdalena, egzegeza biblijna, Uniwersytet Krakowski, XV wiek, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Grzegorz Wielki

The main works contained in the manuscript Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska (later: BJ), 1368,¹ once belonging to the professor of the University of Cracow Benedict Hesse of Cracow, ca. 1389–1456² (as evidenced by the later provenance on f. 1r: *liber Benedicti Hesse*) is Hesse's *Lectura* on the final chapters of the Gospel according to Saint Matthew (chapters 26–28) (ff. 1r–307v, explicit and colophon: f. 307v, index of the questions: ff. 308r–310v)³ which was approved by Benedict Hesse himself, as evidenced by the annotations written by his hand, and a treatise on frequent communion and the Eucharist's essence with the *dubitationes* (ff. 310v–344v). These two texts constitute a codicological unit: the *Lectura* and the question on the Eucharist are copied by the same hand. Nevertheless, before

¹ Manuscript available online: <https://jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl/dlibra/publication/875156> [accessed: 14.8.2023].

² Benedict Hesse of Cracow enrolled at the University of Cracow in 1407 and obtained his Master of Arts title in 1415. He became the Bachelor of the Bible in 1425, and during 1428–1430, he commented on the Sentences. In 1431, he obtained a Doctorate in Theology and participated in the famous discussion with the Hussites in Cracow in the royal castle in 1431. He was elected twice as Dean of the Faculty of Arts, and several times, he held the office of the University Rector. He was also the canon of St. Florian's chapter and then of the cathedral chapter. See J. Fijałek, *Studia do dziejów Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego i jego wydziału teologicznego w XV wieku*, Kraków 1898, pp. 144–151; M. Rechowicz, *Święty Jan Kanty i Benedykt Hesse w świetle krakowskiej kompilacji teologicznej z XV w.*, Lublin 1958, pp. 189–196; M. Markowski, *Dzieje Wydziału Teologii Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego w latach 1397–1525*, Kraków 1996, pp. 139–142; M. Ozorowski, *Życie i działalność Benedykta Hessego*, "Studia Teologiczne" 16 (1998), pp. 79–92; S. Wielgus, *Benedykt Hesse* [in:] *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, ed. A. Maryniarczyk et al., Lublin 2000, vol. 1, pp. 94–96, <http://www.ptta.pl/pef/pdf/b/benedykth.pdf> [accessed: 14.8.2023], English version: <http://www.ptta.pl/pef/haslaen/b/benedykthesse.pdf> [accessed: 14.8.2023]; H. Wojtczak, *Benedykt Hesse — przedstawiciel naukowego środowiska krakowskiego w pierwszej połowie XV wieku*, "Folia Philosophica" 30 (2012), pp. 69–88; eadem, *Komentarze Benedykta Hessego do Ars Vetus w świetle nowych ustaleń*, "Przegląd Tomistyczny" 24 (2018), pp. 595–609; eadem, *Benedykta Hessego komentarz do Kategorii Arystotelesa. Część 1*, Lublin 2019, pp. 15–30.

³ Benedictus Hesse de Cracovia, *Lectura super Evangelium Matthaei*, ed. W. Bucichowski, vol. 1–8, Warszawa, 1979–1990: *Textus et studia. Historiam theologiae in Polonia excultae spectantia*, vol. 8 (cap. 1), 13 (cap. 2–4), 16 (cap. 5), 17 (cap. 6–8), 21 (cap. 9–13), 24 (cap. 14–17), 26 (cap. 18–20), 27 (cap. 21–23). The edition does not include the last chapters of the *Lectura* up to chapters 24–25 (ms. Kraków, BJ, 1366, Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 14646) and chapters 26–28 (ms. Kraków, BJ, 1368, Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 14648).

the first quire in the codex, there is a binion of guard-leaves ff. I–III (the conjoint leaf of f. II is missing, ff. I and III constitute an outside bifolium), and on f. IIIv the question about Mary Magdalene is preserved: *Utrum Maria Magdalena carnaliter peccaverit*—Did Mary Magdalene commit a carnal sin?⁴

These codicological facts signal a certain independence of the binion and the text written on f. IIIv from the rest of the manuscript, and deserve an independent study. In this paper, the author will deal with the question concerning Mary Magdalene presenting the issues regarding attribution, dating, and doctrinal content of the text. The article will culminate with a critical edition of a hitherto unpublished question about Mary Magdalene from ms. Kraków, BJ, 1386, f. IIIv.

Next to the *Lectura on Matthew's Gospel*, both the treatise on the Eucharist and the question with regard to Mary Magdalene from ms. Kraków, BJ, 1368, were attributed to Benedict Hesse by Jan Fijałek in 1898.⁵ In 1979, Waclaw Bucichowski pointed out that the abbreviation at the end of the text: *MBH* could be interpreted as *magister Benedictus Hesse*.⁶ Fijałek's attribution is addressed later in the detailed *Catalogus* of the manuscripts of the Jagiellonian Library in 2008 and is founded on the stronger arguments. Based on the comparison with the other autographs of Benedict Hesse of Cracow, the authors of the Catalogue say that the question about Mary Magdalene is written by Benedict Hesse himself⁷—it is not surprising, knowing that the manuscripts belonged to Hesse and preserved his other texts. This attribution is also repeated in the *Clavis scriptorum* from 2019.⁸

Next to these positive arguments of attribution to Hesse, we also find a negative argument: the text does not evoke any authority, which would be atypical for Hesse's theological questions.⁹ We might ask rhetorically: what would be Hesse's purpose of writing of another author's question in a codex containing his works exclusively? Somehow, the question about Mary Magdalene from f. IIIv: *utrum Maria Magdalena carnaliter peccaverit* interacts with the other question in the part of the Commentary on Matthew's Gospel (chapters 26–28) preserved in the same manuscript. In the commentary on Matth. 26:6–13 speaking about

⁴ W. Wisłocki, *Katalog rękopisów Biblijoteki Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, vol. 1, Kraków 1877, p. 340; *Benedictus Hesse...*, vol. 1, pp. 31–34; In the meantime, the foliage in the manuscript was changed: in Bucichowski's description of the codex, the question about Mary Magdalene was written on f. 1v, and the new catalog and digitized manuscript indicate that the question is on f. IIIv (this folio is now considered a guard-leaf); *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum medii aevi Latinorum, qui in Bibliotheca Jagellonica Cracoviae asservantur*, ed. A. Kozłowska et al., vol. 9, Cracoviae 2008, pp. 132–136.

⁵ J. Fijałek, *Studia...*, pp. 145–148.

⁶ *Benedictus Hesse...*, vol. 1, p. 31.

⁷ *Catalogus...*, pp. 134–136.

⁸ *Clavis scriptorum et operum Medii Aevi Poloniae*, ed. J. Kaliszuk et al., Kraków 2019, p. 82.

⁹ I am working on Hesse's *Principia* on the *Sentences*, *lectio ultima* on the *Sentences*, and two theological questions from ms. Kraków, BJ, 1369. The results will be published soon.

the anointing of Jesus' feet done by an anonymous woman, Hesse asks a question concerning the place of Jesus' anointing by Mary Magdalene: *utrum Maria Magdalena unxit Christum ungento in domo Simonis Leprosi* (ff. 17v–18r). While the question *utrum Maria Magdalena carnaliter peccaverit* concerns the identification of an anonymous woman from Matthew's Gospel with Mary Magdalene, the question from the commentary, *utrum Maria Magdalena unxit Christum ungento in domo Simonis Leprosi*, deals with the anointing place. We can theorize that the question from f. IIIv could be Hesse's gloss on the twenty-sixth chapter of Matthew's Gospel. This hypothesis would justify the question's inclusion in the codex containing Hesse's *Lectura* on the last three chapters of Matthew's Gospel.

Presuming the abbreviation MBH being *Magister Benedictus Hesse*, we can determine the *terminus post quem* as 1431, when Hesse obtained his doctoral biretta and the title of the *magister theologiae*. Assuming that the question about Mary Magdalene was composed while commenting on the twenty-sixth chapter of Matthew's Gospel and knowing that the text of the commentary on Matthew's Gospel was copied in 1449, as evidenced by the colophon on f. 307v, we can determine the year 1449 as the *terminus ante quem*.

Hesse tries to solve the following problem: Did Mary Magdalene commit a carnal sin? (*Utrum Maria Magdalena carnaliter peccaverit*). We can distinguish four parts of the question: 1) *Videtur quod non*, 2) *Respondetur*, 3) *Ad argumentum*, 4) *Usus quaestionis*.

In *videtur quod non*, Hesse demonstrates two authorities who declined stating that Mary Magdalene committed a carnal sin. Hesse evokes an opinion based on John Chrysostom's authority that the woman who anointed Jesus' feet in Bethany was Lazarus' sister and not a prostitute. Chrysostom seems to conflate Mary of Bethany, Lazarus' sister, with the woman who anointed Jesus. According to this reasoning, Mary Magdalene is not a sinful woman who anointed Jesus. Therefore, we have no arguments for the carnal sin committed by Mary Magdalene. The argument based on Chrysostom's authority opposes the widespread Western exegetic tradition represented by Gregory the Great in his homilies on Luc's Gospel which identified three women: 1) Mary Magdalene, 2) Mary, Lazarus' sister, and 3) the anonymous woman who anointed Jesus' feet.¹⁰ It seems that Hesse did not know Chrysostom's texts directly but via Aquinas' *Catena aurea*. In *videtur quod non*, the author also evokes another opinion (*alii dicunt*) that Mary Magdalene could sin by pride in dress, hairstyle, and sensuality (*apparentia superbi*

¹⁰ Gregorius Magnus, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, lib. 2, homilia 33, ed. R. Étaix (CC SL, 141, pp. 287–298). See A. Kunder, *The Patristic Magdalene: Symbol for the Church and Witness to the Resurrection* [in:] *Mary Magdalene from the New Testament to the New Age and Beyond*, ed. by E.F. Lupieri, (*Themes in Biblical Narrative. Jewish and Christian Traditions*, 24) Leiden–Boston 2019, pp. 105–127, especially pp. 117–123; R. Atwood, *Mary Magdalene in the New Testament Gospels and Early Tradition*, (*Europäische Hochschulschriften*, 457), Bern 1993.

habitus et capitis et sensuum peccaverit) because she was a rich woman, owner of two cities: Magdala and Bethany. We find this argument in the *Legenda Aurea*,¹¹ and we suppose that this is a source of the opinion evoked by Hesse.

Then Hesse addresses his answer to the question, which we called *respondetur*. According to the tradition of Gregory the Great, the woman who anointed Jesus' feet should be identified with Mary Magdalene, and, therefore, it ought to be concluded that she committed a carnal sin. This opinion is attested by the Synoptic Gospels, the three Fathers of the Church—already recognized at the end of the thirteenth century as Doctors of the Church—Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great, authority of the *Glossa ordinaria*, and the authority of Pope Innocent III. Such a strong line of argumentation based on undoubted authorities and not the opinions of some (*aliqui*) speaks to the fact that Mary Magdalene committed a carnal sin. Moreover, Hesse evokes another argument drawn from a text attributed by Hesse to Chrysostom (in reality, it is pseudo-Augustin's text), which contradicts the cited in *videtur quod non* another Chrysostom's passage. Therefore, the statement that Mary Magdalene did not commit a carnal sin *simpliciter contradicit Evangelio et dictis sanctorum*. Hesse concludes that Mary Magdalene and other biblical sinners, namely David and St. Paul are given to the sinners as an example of conversion as a sign of hope that man can arise from every sin by divine grace.

Chrysostom's argument evoked the *videtur quod non* is also rejected in the third part: *ad argumentum*, in which Hesse claims that Mary Magdalene anointed Christ twice. The first anointing is described in two synoptic gospels: Luc 7 and Matthew 26. This event took place before Mary's conversion, when she was still a prostitute. The second anointing, described in John 12, was also done by Mary Magdalene. This event, however, took place after Mary's conversion, and she was not deemed a prostitute but Christ's disciple. This argument is reinforced by the authority of Augustine who claimed that after the perfect conversion a woman can no longer be called a prostitute. In the fathers of the Church's conflict, Augustine's and Gregory's authority is stronger than Chrysostom's opinion.

The last part, called by me *usus quaestionis*, includes the noteworthy remark of this question. Hesse says this question should be debated only at the university hall and not on the church's pulpit. The public debate about Mary's sin could scandalize the simple faithful for whom Mary Magdalene is indicated as a conversion model. According to Hesse, the goal of the question is the academic reflection on the Father's authority among the university clerics, which brings veneration to Mary Magdalene, not scorn. Hesse is aware of the consequences of this debate and clearly distinguishes different goals of prediction and an academic lecture. This remark is also noteworthy in Cracow's context: in the old town, there was

¹¹ See Iacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, cap. 96, par. 1 (ed. Th. Graesse, p. 408).

St. Mary Magdalene church from the thirteenth century, which was commissioned by Cracow's bishop Piotr Wysz as a prebend for the professors of the theological faculty in 1401.¹²

To conclude, we can say that Benedict Hesse of Cracow's question about Mary Magdalene from ms. Kraków, BJ, 1386, f. IIIv is closely related to Hesse's *Lectura* on Matthew's Gospel and could have been written between 1431–1449. Based on the authorities of the Bible, Ordinary Glosse, and fathers of the Church, especially Gregory the Great, Hesse proves that Mary Magdalene committed a carnal sin and is a model for the faithful of the penitence and hope of salvation. The question is an academic lecture to be solved in the university's classroom and not on the church pulpit to avoid the scandal of the faithful. In this way, Hesse manifests his distinction between the teacher's office and the preacher's task.

Since we have an autograph of Hesse's question about Mary Magdalene, which is the unique witness of the text, we decided to prepare a diplomatic edition preserving the author's orthography. We added a subdivision of the question and punctuation marks in the text and Hesse's quotation sources in the footnotes.

Benedictus Hesse de Cracovia, *Quaestio de Maria Magdalena*

Adalbertus Baran edidit¹³

Ms. Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 1368, f. IIIv

<Quaestio>

Utrum Maria Magdalena carnaliter peccaverit

¹² *Codex diplomaticus universitatis Studii generalis Cracoviensis: continet privilegia et documenta quae res gestas Academiae eiusque beneficia illustrant. Pars I, pertinet ab Anno 1365 usque ad Annum 1440*, Cracoviae 1870, pp. 38–40, no. XXII. P. 39: “Damus itaque, donamus, conferimus, ascribimus, adiungimus et perpetuis temporibus incorporamus eiusdem Studii Cracoviensis generalis Sacrae Theologiae Professoribus, Doctoribus et Magistris ac Universitati praebendam ecclesiae sive capellae Beatae Mariae Magalena, ex opposito ecclesiae Sancti Andreae et in contrata Canonicorum in Cracovia sitae, quae vacat de praesenti.” The church was constructed in 1325–1327 and demolished in 1811. See M. Rożek, *Nie istniejące kościoły Krakowa*, “Biuletyn Biblioteki Jagiellońskiej” 33 (1983), pp. 100–101; G. Bednarczyk, *Nieistniejące kościoły Krakowa*, 2017, pp. 43–45, <https://issuu.com/grzegorzbednarczyk/docs/nieistniejace> [accessed: 14.8.2023].

¹³ I want to thank Cédric Giraud of l'EPHE in Paris, with whom I have revised the transcription.

<Videtur quod non>

Et videtur, quod non, quia dicit Crisostomus, *Omelia VI super¹ Johannem*, quod hec non fuerit meretrix, sed soror Lazari¹⁴, de qua Lucas loquitur VIII^o capitulo¹⁵ et Matheus¹⁶. Hec enim fuit honesta et studiosa circa obsequium Domini. Ergo si honesta, non meretrix, ergo nec peccavit carnaliter. Hic dicunt aliqui, quod tantum in apparentia superbi habitus et capitis et sensuum peccaverit, ex quo fuit domina magna, habens castrum Magdalum et Bethaniam¹⁷. Non est verisimile, quod ipsa peccasset carnaliter, nam status et condicio personarum multos retrahit a carnalite.

<Respondetur>

Sed hec sententia simpliciter contradicit Evangelio et dictis sanctorum. Nam Marcus dicit, capitulo XVI [9]: *surgens*, Iesus Christus *apparuit primo Marie Magdalene, de qua eiecerat VII demonia*. Et Gregorius in *Omelia*: “quid per septem demonia, nisi universa vicia designat? Septem ergo demonia Maria habuit, que universis viciis plena fuit”¹⁸. Manifestum est autem, quod per demonia non peccata venialia vel apparentia tantum, sed mortalia intelliguntur, que si universis plena fuit, utique tunc et corporali luxuria. Item Matheus, XXI [31], dicit: *respondens Iudeis: Amen, dico vobis, quia publicani et meretrices precedent vos in regno Dei*. Glossa: publicani, ut Matheus, meretrices, ut Maria Magdalena¹⁹.

Item Ieronimus in *Originali super Matheum* Mariam Magdalenam manifeste benedictissimam meretricem appellat²⁰. Et Innocencius²¹, *Super psalmum: benedixisti, Domine, terram tuam*²² etc. meretricem dicit.

Item Crisostomus in *Sermone de parasceve sive de passione Domini* dicit: “Accessit meretrix vas alabastrum manibus portans et unguentum supra Domini

¹⁴ Hec non fuerit meretrix, sed soror Lazari] cfr Thomas de Aquino, *Super Evangelium Iohannis lectura*, caput 12, lectio 1, numerus 1597 (ed. Marietti, p. 299).

¹⁵ Lucas loquitur VIII^o capitulo] cfr Luc. 7:36–49.

¹⁶ Matheus] cfr Math. 26:6–13.

¹⁷ Hic dicunt aliqui — Magdalum et Bethaniam] cfr Iacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea...*, cap. 96, par. 1, p. 408.

¹⁸ Gregorius Magnus, *Homiliae in Evangelia...*, lib. 2, homilia 33, pp. 287–298; cfr Thomas de Aquino, *Catena aurea in Lucam*, cap. 8, lectio 1, (ed. Marietti, p. 109); idem, *Catena aurea in Marcum*, cap. 16, lectio 2, (ed. Marietti, p. 563).

¹⁹ publicani — Magdalena] cfr *Biblia latina cum glossa ordinaria*, Math. 21:31, glossa interlinearis (ed. A. Rusch, vol. 4, f. 954r, col. 2).

²⁰ Mariam Magdalenam manifeste meretricem appellat] cfr Anonymus (Hieronymus [Pseudo]), *Expositio Evangelii secundum Marcum*, cap. 16 (CC SL, 82, p. 61).

²¹ Innocencius] *non inveni*.

²² benedixisti, Domine, terram tuam] Ps. 84:2.

caput effundit, grandem fidem, multam reverenciam, mirandam correccionem ostendit. Paulo ante meretrix, subito pudica processit et profudit obruta peccatis, portum serenitatis intravit²³. Et mox fecit comparacionem inter ipsam et Iudam, dicens: “Et quando prostituta lupanar exivit, tunc discipulus jehennam intravit. Quando illa mercedem sui corporis abdicabat, tunc iste precium Magistri sanguinis postulabat. Quando illa osculabatur pedes, ut susciperetur, tunc iste Domini labia osculabatur, ut proderet. Ideo dixi tunc, ut non Magistrum infirmitatis accuses, quando discipulum reperis proditorem. Magister etenim virtutem doctoris ostendit, qui et meretrices ad obediendum suo Magistro convolare profecit. Quid igitur? Qui meretricum mores valuit immutare, discipulum non potuit retinere?²⁴ Valde, inquam, et incunctanter voluit retinere, sed necessitate noluit bonum efficere²⁵ nec vi trahere ad se curabat²⁶. Hec ille.

Et Augustinus, *Super psalmo XIII^o*, dicit: “illa mulier, que erat in civitate peccatrix, venit et accessit ad pedes Iesu. Illa in pudica, quondam formosa ad fornicacionem², frondosior ad salutem, irrupit in domum alienam. Sed qui ibi discumbebat, non erat alienus²⁷.”

Et sic patet ex dictis sanctorum apertissimis, qualis hec mulier fuerit, quia meretrix²⁸. Et ratio est: voluit enim Deus de singulis criminibus eciam maioribus extra exempla ponere cunctis peccatoribus ne desperent, sed ad veniam respirent, ut in Paulo patet de superbia, in Matheo de avaricia, in Magdalena de luxuria et de David rege adultero et de multis similibus.

<Ad argumentum>

Ad racionem de auctoritate Crisostomi respondetur, quod Maria bis unxit Ihesum, quia³ prima facta fuit in civitate Naim, ut dicit Lucas VII²⁹, alia in Bethania, Ioh. XII³⁰, quia cum in alio et in alio statu fuit, ideo alio modo nuncupatur. Nam primam unccionem fecit ut peccatrix, secundam fecit ut Xristi ardens amatrix. Nam Augustinus in libro *Rectractacionum* dicit, quia non est mulier reputanda

²³ Accessit — intravit] Augustinus (pseudo) Belgicus, *Sermones* (ed. D.A.B. Caillau et D.B. Saint-Yves, p. 180); cfr Petrus Abelardus, *Sic et non*, quaestio 105, sententia 1 (ed. B. Boyer, R. McKeon, p. 339).

²⁴ Et quando prostituta — retinere] Augustinus..., p. 180.

²⁵ Et quando prostituta — bonum efficere] cfr Petrus Abelardus..., p. 340.

²⁶ Et quando prostituta — nec vi trahere ad se curabat] cfr Hincmarus Remensis episcopus, *De praedestinatione contra Godescalcum* (*opus posterior*), cap. 24 (PL, 125, col. 221).

²⁷ illa — alienus] Augustinus Hipponensis, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, 140, 8 (CSSL, 40, pp. 2030–2031).

²⁸ qualis he mulier fuerit, quia meretrix] cfr Luc. 7:39.

²⁹ prima facta fuit in civitate Naim, ut dicit Lucas VII] cfr Luc. 7:11. 36–50.

³⁰ alia in Bethania, Ioh. XII] cfr Ioh. 12:1–9.

adulteram post perfectam penitentiam³¹, ergo a simili nec Maria reputanda est meretrix post penitentiam. Ergo Crisostomus loquitur de ea ut iam conversa et sancta et iam non peccatrix, quia iam in alio statu quam prius, quamvis in veritate una et eadem fuerit in natura.

<Usus quaestionis>

Hoc dubium scriptum est non, ut coram hominibus diceretur et predicaretur. Nam coram communi populo talia non sunt dicenda propter reverentiam sancte Marie Magdalene, que conversa sancte vite fuit et ut apostola habetur in Ecclesia. In scolis autem dici et predicari potest, quia non erit inventum scandalum in clero sicut in populo. Nam ista non dicuntur in turpitudinem beate Marie Magdalene, sed magis in maiorem sanctitatem et reverentiam ipsius.

M<agister> B<enedictus> H<esse>

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska

BJ, 1366

BJ, 1368

Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Vat. Lat. 14646

Vat. Lat. 14648

Latin sources

Albertus Magnus, *Comementarii in librum Sententiarum* [in:] *B. Alberti Magni, Ratisbonensis Episcopi, Ordinis Praedicatorum opera omnia*, ed. A. Borgnet, vol. 25–30, Parisiis 1893–1894.

Anonymus (Hieronymus [Pseudo]), *Expositio Evangelii secundum Marcum*, ed. M. Cahill (CC SL, 82), Turnhout 1997.

Augustinus (pseudo) Belgicus, *Sermones*, ed. D.A.B. Caillau, D.B. Saint-Yves [in:] *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi Operum Supplementum I, Continens Sermones Ineditos Extractos Ex Archivio Montis–Cassini Et Ex Bibliotheca Laurentiana–Medicea Florentiae. Opera et Studio*, Parisiis 1836.

³¹ non est mulier reputanda adultam post perfectam penitentiam] cfr Albertus Magnus, *Comementarii in quatuor librum Sententiarum*, d. 14A, art. 21 (ed. Borgnet, vol. 29, p. 441, col. 2); Bonaventura, *Commentaria in quattuor libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi*, IV, d. 14, pars 2, art. 2, q. 2 (ed. Quaracchi, vol. 4, p. 337, col. 1).

- Augustinus Hipponensis, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, ed. E. Dekkers, J. Fraipont (CC SL, 38–40), Turnhout 1956.
- Benedictus Hesse de Cracovia, *Lectura super Evangelium Matthaei*, ed. W. Bucichowski, vol. 1–8, Warszawa 1979–1990: *Textus et studia. Historiam theologiae in Polonia excoltae spectantia*, vol. 8 (cap. 1), 13 (cap. 2–4), 16 (cap. 5), 17 (cap. 6–8), 21 (cap. 9–13), 24 (cap. 14–17), 26 (cap. 18–20), 27 (cap. 21–23).
- Biblia latina cum glossa ordinaria*, vol. 1–4, ed. A. Rusch, Strasburg 1481.
- Bonaventura, *Commentaria in Librum Sententiarum* [in:] *Doctoris Seraphici S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia*, ed. Quaracchi, vol. 1–4, Ad Claras Aquas, 1883–1889.
- Codex diplomaticus universitatis Studii generalis Cracoviensis: continet privilegia et documenta quae res gestas Academiae eiusque beneficia illustrant. Pars I, pertinet ab Anno 1365 usque ad Annum 1440*, Cracoviae, Sumptibus et typis universitatis, 1870, <https://polona.pl/item/codex-diplomaticus-universitatis-studii-generalis-cracoviensis-continet-privilegia-et,NjIINDc2/1/#info:metadata> [accessed: 14.8.2023].
- Gregorius Magnus, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, ed. R. Étaix (CC SL, 141), Turnhout 1999.
- Hincmarus Remensis episcopus, *De praedestinatione contra Godeschalum (opus posterior)*, PL, 125, col. 55–474.
- Iacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea (vulgo Historia Lombardica dicta) [praecipue secundum editionem ab Eberto a. 1472 vulgatam]*, ed. Th. Graesse, 1850 (ed. secunda).
- Petrus Abelardus, *Sic et non*, ed. B. Boyer, R. McKeon, Chicago 1976–1977.
- Thomas de Aquino, *Catena aurea in Lucam* [in:] Thomas de Aquino, *Catena in quatuor Evangelia*, ed. A. Guarenti, vol. 2, Taurini–Romae 1953, pp. 1–319.
- Thomas de Aquino, *Catena aurea in Marcum* [in:] Thomas de Aquino, *Catena in quatuor Evangelia*, ed. A. Guarenti, vol. 1, Taurini–Romae 1953, pp. 427–566.
- Thomas de Aquino, *Super Evangelium Iohannis lectura*, ed. R. Cai, Taurini–Romae 1952.

Studies

- Atwood R., *Mary Magdalene in the New Testament Gospels and Early Tradition*, (*Europäische Hochschulschriften* 457), Bern 1993.
- Bednarczyk G., *Nieistniejące kościoły Krakowa*, 2017, <https://issuu.com/grzegorzbednarczyk/docs/nieistniejace> [accessed: 14.8.2023].
- Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum medii aevi Latinorum, qui in Bibliotheca Jagellonica Cracoviae asservantur*, vol. 1–11, ed. M. Chmielowska, M. Kowalczyk, A. Kozłowska, M. Markowski, S. Włodek, J. Zathey, M. Zwiercan, Wratislaviae (vol. 1–6), Cracoviae (vol. 7–11), 1980–2016.
- Clavis scriptorum et operum Medii Aevi Poloniae*, ed. J. Kaliszuk, A. Pienądz, P. Węcowski, K. Skwierczyński, Kraków 2019, https://www.academia.edu/44876605/Clavis_scriptorum_et_operum_Medii_Aevi_Poloniae_oprac_Jerzy_Kaliszuk_Aneta_Pieni%C4%85dz_Piotr_W%C4%99cowski_Krzysztof_Skwierczy%C5%84ski_Krak%C3%B3w_2019 [accessed: 14.8.2023].
- Fijałek J., *Studia do dziejów Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego i jego wydziału teologicznego w XV wieku*, Kraków 1898, <https://polona.pl/item/studia-do-dziejow-universytetu-krakowskiego-i-jego-wydzialu-teologicznego-w-15-wieku-w,MTQ2ODk0OTA/4/#info:metadata> [accessed: 14.8.2023].

- Kunder A., *The Patristic Magdalene: Symbol for the Church and Witness to the Resurrection* [in:] *Mary Magdalene from the New Testament to the New Age and Beyond*, ed. by E.F. Lupieri, (*Themes in Biblical Narrative. Jewish and Christian Traditions* 24), Leiden–Boston 2019, pp. 105–127.
- Markowski M., *Dzieje Wydziału Teologii Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego w latach 1397–1525*, Kraków 1996.
- Ozorowski M., *Życie i działalność Benedykta Hessego*, “*Studia Teologiczne*” 16 (1998), pp. 79–92.
- Rechowicz M., *Święty Jan Kanty i Benedykt Hesse w świetle krakowskiej kompilacji teologicznej z XV w.*, Lublin 1958.
- Rożek M., *Nie istniejące kościoły Krakowa*, “*Biuletyn Biblioteki Jagiellońskiej*” 33 (1983), pp. 95–120.
- Wielgus S., *Benedykt Hesse* [in:] *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, red. A. Maryniarczyk et al., Lublin 2002, vol. 1, pp. 94–96, <http://www.ptta.pl/pef/pdf/b/benedykth.pdf> [accessed: 14.8.2023], English version: <http://www.ptta.pl/pef/haslaen/b/benedykthesse.pdf> [accessed: 14.8.2023].
- Wisłocki W., *Katalog rękopisów Biblioteki Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, 2 vol., Kraków 1877–1881, vol. 1: <https://jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl/dlibra/publication/297832/edition/285039/content> [accessed: 14.8.2023]; vol. 2: <https://jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl/dlibra/publication/297833/edition/285040/content> [accessed: 14.8.2023].
- Wojtczak H., *Benedykt Hesse — przedstawiciel naukowego środowiska krakowskiego w pierwszej połowie XV wieku*, “*Folia Philosophica*” 30 (2012), pp. 69–88.
- Wojtczak H., *Benedykta Hessego Komentarz do Kategorii Arystotelesa, część 1*, Lublin 2019.
- Wojtczak H., *Komentarze Benedykta Hessego do Ars Vetus w świetle nowych ustaleń*, “*Przegląd Tomistyczny*” 24 (2018), pp. 595–609.