Medievalia et Humanistica

MCMLVI

HUSSITE RADICALISM AND THE ORIGINS OF TABOR 1415-1418

by Howard Kaminsky

WHEN John Hus decided to appear before the Council of Constance he deliberately put himself in danger of death for the sake of a body of ideas, a "Truth," that had been worked out by a generation or more of Bohemian reformers, who had felt the crisis of late medieval civilization to be essentially a spiritual one, connected with the worldliness and corruption of the Church. Before Hus' time, however, the Bohemian reform program had been primarily critical, pessimistic, and academic, looking to an improvement that would come, if at all, from individual purification or from the secular catharsis of Christ's Second Coming. Hus, and with him the other Prague University masters who took up Wyclyf's ideas, could think of a real reform of society in more practical terms: without abandoning an emphasis on individual moral regeneration, nor a kind of sentimental apocalyptic strain, they had no hesitation in calling on the secular powers to reform the Church by force. [1] The appeal was understandably well-received by the Bohemian nobility and court, but little in the way of positive reform could be accomplished before Hus' death. This event, however, faced the reform movement with an opportunity that was also a challenge: the excited mood of the whole nation made great measures possible, but these could be carried through only by a new development, in theory and practice, of the movement itself.

The period in which the challenge was realized and met ran from the time of Hus' departure for Constance (October 1414) to the time of Hussite victory over the first crusade (in the second half of 1420). Indeed it was the creation of a new "Truth," manifested in social and political, as well as religious, institutions, that lay behind the Hussite resistance in 1420, when Hus' followers met a hostile Europe not as martyrs walking to the stake but as "God's Warriors," with sword in hand. Quite clearly the meaning of the reform had changed. And it is an understandable paradox that those who refused to develop their ideas beyond the stage reached by Hus himself quickly found themselves wishing for nothing more than to be reunited with Rome, while only those ready to strike out on unexplored paths of radicalism [2] proved able to embody their ideas in stable institutions. It

[1] Cf. R. R. Betts, "The Influence of Realist Philosophy on Jan Hus and His Predecessors in Bohemia," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, XXIX (1951), 402-419.

[2] In the present discussion, "radicalism" is understood in its literal sense and with reference to religious issues. The "radical movement" is understood formally, as including a number

was above all, therefore, the radical movement within Hussitism that made the half-dozen years after Hus' death years of creative achievement, laying the foundations of the more obvious military and political successes enjoyed by the Hussite nation later on. [1]

Even within these half-dozen years, the history of Hussite radicalism is extraordinarily complicated. The greatest positive achievement of the radical movement was the creation of Tabor in early 1420, an act that *contracted* radicalism into a stable society; it therefore seems reasonable to make this event the basis for a periodization of the movement. There was, accordingly, a *preliminary* period, from 1415 through 1418, a *crucial* period, from early 1419 through February 1420 (the *chiliast* movement, from November 1419 to Febraury 1420, will be treated separately, but it forms part of the crucial period), and a *Taborite* period, from 1420 through 1421—essentially a period of consolidation and definition. Only the first of these will be treated in the present paper. [2]

The Hussite movement proper had its beginning in late 1414, when Hus left for Constance and when his associate and friend, Master Jakoubek of Stříbro (Jacobellus de Misa), introduced the practice of giving communion in both kinds to the laity. This innovation had been discussed even earlier, but Hus had wished it put off at least until the Constance process should have ended, in order to preserve the unity of the reform movement. A number of the Czech masters of the Prague University—where the reform had its center—were opposed to utraquism, [3] partly because it was unauthorized by the Church, partly because

of tendencies not actually united within a single movement: Jakoubek of Stříbro and University radicalism, John Želivský and the radicalism based on the Prague poor, the sectarian extremism of the provinces. These several tendencies will be discussed in accord with the general purpose of this study, which aims at understanding the origins of Tabor.

[1] F. G. Heymann's *John Žižka and the Hussite Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955) offers a valuable discussion of the background of the Hussite movement (pp. 16-57), as well as a sound general bibliography for those who would like to read more. The work itself is a fine presentation of the historical figure of Žižka through a reconstruction of the flow of events in which the great warrior had his being; as such it illuminates several subjects touched on in the present study. It does not, however, examine radical ideas on the basis of a systematic, detailed analysis of sources, nor does it consider the different phases and conflicting tendencies in the development of these ideas; this sort of study, which falls outside the limits assumed by Mr. Heymann, is attempted in the present paper.

[2] The form of the following discussion has been determined by the fact that most modern scholarship in the field has been done by Czechs, writing in Czech. It has therefore seemed fitting to include much material that might otherwise have been simply referred to; conversely, the discussion of certain points that might be of interest to a body of readers familiar with the general field has had to be relegated to footnotes or dismissed in a few lines. On another tack, it should be noted here that the Czech-European ambiguity also existed in the fifteenth century, so that the sources for Hussitism are partly in Czech, partly in Latin. I have translated all Czech citations, and it has seemed desirable to do the same for many of those in Latin, although some Latin is left untranslated where the original seems worth preserving.

[3] For example, Hus' successor as preacher in Bethlehem Chapel, Havlík (cf. F. M. Bartoš, *Čechy v době Husově* (Prague, 1947), p. 404); also John of Jesenic, who had served Hus faithfully

it expressed the whole complex of ideas held by the *radical* wing of the reform movement in Prague. Stated, that is, in the form given it by Jakoubek, [1] utraquism implied a judgment that the contemporary Roman Church had deviated from the Truth, and that its authority could be challenged by an appeal to the Christianity of the New Testament and the Primitive Church.

These general judgments in turn represented a more detailed body of ideas current in Prague radical circles, out of which, it will be seen, came most of the priests who were to lead the *provincial* radical movement that later developed into Tabor, This body of ideas was derived from several sources: the older Czech reform movement, particularly as embodied in the works of Matthew of Janov (d. 1394), Wyclyfism, and Waldensianism. [2] Jakoubek was chiefly influenced by the first two, but alongside him there worked the German Master Nicholas of Dresden, whose ideas may be considered as Waldensian. [3] Key ideas, primarily

as procurator when Hus had been cited to Rome, and who, throughout the period of this study, seemed to the Catholics to be one of the most dangerous Hussite leaders: according to the Prague radical preacher John Želivský, Jesenic had first opposed utraquism, then accepted it only when ill (*apud* J. Truhlář, "Husitská kázání z let 1416-1418," *Věstník České Akademie*, VIII (1899), 288). See below, p. 121 and p. 126, n. 4.

[1] In his positive determination of the question, "Utrum expediens sit et necessarium ex institucione Christi, quod communitas fidelium laicorum sumat sepius corpus et sanguinem Christi sub duplici forma sacramentali" (unpublished; cf. F. M. Bartoš' catalogue of Jakoubek's works, *Literární činnost M. Jakoubka ze Stříbra* (Prague, 1925), No. 33; this work is henceforth cited as *Činnost*). A number of tracts written for and against utraquism in 1415 have been published by H. von der Hardt, *Magnum Oecumenicum Constantiense Concilium*, III (Frankfort & Leipzig, 1698), Nos. 14-22, and on the basis of these Emile Amann has written a first-rate study of the historical significance of the controversy, "Jacobel et les débuts de la controverse utraquiste," *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle*, I (Rome, 1924), 375-387. Throughout the whole utraquist controversy, up to the Council of Basel, the radical formulation, that utraquist communion was necessary to salvation, had to fight against the conservative Hussite formulation, that it was helpful or expedient. Hus himself held the latter view. Cf. Bartoš' catalogue, *Literární činnost M. J. Husi* (Prague, 1948), No. 85. And see below, p. 121.

[2] The controverted question of Waldensian participation in the Hussite movement will be examined below; cf. R. Holinka, *Sektářství v Čechách před revolucí husitskou*, *Sborník Filosofické Fakulty University Komenského v Bratislavě*, VI (1929), 137ff. Throughout the present paper, "Waldensianism" will refer to *a certain pattern of ideas and attitudes* characteristic of the Lombard-German branch of the sect in the later Middle Ages, and generally conforming to the pattern of sectarian Christianity as defined by Troeltsch. The ideas included many of Catharan origin (cf. H. Böhmer's article in the *Protestantische Realencyklopaedie für Theologie und Kirche*, XX, 818, 826), as well as, in some cases, "Joachimite" doctrines of the Free Spirit. Convenient summaries of the Waldensianism in question are provided by inquisitorial lists, published by Holinka, *op. cit.*, pp. 176-179; J. Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*, II (Munich, 1890), 335-343. The particular significance of Waldensianism in the Hussite movement was not in its doctrines—similar ones were offered by Wyclyfism—but in its introduction of an *actual world of ideas* established among groups of common people by the work and suffering of generations.

[3] There are two modern studies of Nicholas based on firsthand study of his works, almost all of which remain unpublished: Jan Sedlák, *Mikuláš z Drážďan* (Brno, 1914), and F. M. Bartoš, "Vznik a počátky táborství", *Husitství a cizina* (Prague, 1931), pp. 113-153. Sedlák stays close to the sources while Bartoš tries to enrich the figure of Nicholas by very bold identifications and interpretations that never escape from the realm of the hypothetical. I therefore follow Sedlák. It seems clear that Nicholas of Dresden was a priest, probably a master of arts, a bachelor in

the hatred of simony and of Roman corruption, the evangelical conception of religiosity as opposed to the norm of post-Primitive Roman tradition, [1] and the identification of the Pope as Antichrist, were common to all three sources, [2] while the circumstances of the immediately pre-Hussite period (*ca.* 1408-1415) seem to have encouraged close cooperation between Jakoubek and Nicholas, and perhaps a radicalization of the former to the point were his temper coincided with that of his essentially more radical associate. [3]

The reform ideas of Jakoubek and Nicholas originated in a reaction against the current condition of the Church. [4] Both, as stated above, sought the model of purity in the Church of the Gospels and of the Apostles. The Church of Rome had been seduced by Antichrist, chiefly through the Donation of Constantine and the subsequent endowment of the Church with wealth and civil dominion. This wealth and dominion ought, therefore, to be taken away. Pluralism, holding incomes by civil title, taking money for the sacraments, scheming to get prebends, all these were simony, and simoniacal priests were to be shunned. Nicholas held that such priests had lost their sacramental power.

The beliefs, rites, and customs elaborated by the Church since the days of the Apostles were criticized. Nicholas took the extreme position, attacking much of the hierarchy, the regular orders, the "superfluous" rites, vestments, and ceremonies connected with the mass, Purgatory and all the practices predicated on its existence, veneration of images, pilgrimages, the cult of saints, and all sorts of bless-

canon law, and one of the leaders of the German "School at The Black Rose" in Prague, where philosophy and theology were taught in the light of Waldensian ideas. For this school, see H. Böhmer's "Magister Peter von Dresden," *Neues Archiv für Sächsische Geschichte und Altertumskunde*, XXXVI (1915), 212-231; Sedlák, pp. 1-3, holds that Nicholas first joined the school when it came to Prague from Dresden in 1411/1412, since his Prague writings date from at least as early as 1408. See below, p. 122, n. 3, for the further significance of the German school in the Hussite movement.

[1] E. Amann, *op. cit.*, demonstrates the remarkable fact that Catholic opponents of utraquism explicitly set the Roman tradition above even the New Testament, as authority, not just interpretation.

[2] In about 1421 Jakoubek attacked various heretical tendencies in or associated with the Hussite movement. Of the Waldensians he wrote that "they have today abused the papal endowment [nadání papežovo] and under this heading have denied many truths, such as the existence of Purgatory, the value of saints' intercessions, etc. (i.e., Catholic doctrines accepted by Wyclyf and the Wyclyfite Hussites) (*apud* V. Flajšhans, "Vrstevník Husuv," *Věstník Kralovské České Společnosti Nauk* (1903), p. 16ff.). The attack on the "papal endowment"—the wealth and secular power held by the Roman Church—was thus accepted by Jakoubek, and we know this from other sources as well. One may suppose that this attack was the basis for the early collaboration between Waldensian and Czech University reformers in Prague, and that the points of difference became important only later. Cf. Holinka, *op. cit.*, p. 140; J. Pekař, *Žižka a jeho doba*, I (Prague, 1927), 7ff.

[3] Pekař, *op. cit.*, ch. 1, discusses the early relationship between the two in detail. After 1415 the differences were to become more prominent. Jakoubek, like the more conservative masters, accepted the intellectual universe of scholasticism, while Nicholas, despite considerable erudition, belonged to the world of sectarianism, which was essentially hostile to the works of medieval civilization. See below, p. 125 f.

[4] The following discussion is based chiefly on Bartoš' *Činnost*, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 19-26, 28, 31, 51, 53, and Sedlák, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

ings and cults established by the Roman Church. Jakoubek did not reject any of these things on principle, but his critique of abuses and "superfluities" was as violent as one could wish. [1] All radicals, moreover, were at one in emphasizing the need for active evangelical preaching and in attacking "public sins," a category that included most human pleasures, vicious or otherwise. On the other hand, Nicholas held various specifically Waldensian ideas: laymen feeling a call to preach should do so; confession to God is enough; a priest's absolution is valid only if God concurs, and He does not automatically do so; there is no Purgatory; it is wrong to swear oaths, to resist evil, to do any killing or violence.

This body of radical ideas, all developed before 1414, was the basis of Jakoubek's introduction of utraquist communion, which in a real sense came out of the radical movement as a whole. [2] As Hus had feared, some of his old associates were alien-

[1] An example of the closeness with which the Czech reformers could collaborate with the German Waldensians is the correspondance between John Hus' sermon *Dixit Martha* (cf. Bartoš, *Činnost... Husi*, No. 50), of 3 November 1411, and Nicholas' *De Purgatorio* of *ca.* 1415. Both criticize masses for the dead, etc., with the same violence and in part with the same words, even though Hus, unlike Nicholas, accepted Purgatory. That one copied from the other shows that practical agreement was more important than theoretical difference. (Sedlák, *op. cit.*, p. 48, thinks Hus copied from an earlier draft of Nicholas' work; Bartoš, "Studie k Husovi a jeho době. 1. Hus a valdenství," *Časopis Českého Musea* (*ČČM*), LXXXIX (1915), 5-6, argues for Nicholas' dependence on Hus).

[2] The origin of the idea of utraquism remains doubtful. Some sources have associated it with the Dresden masters; perhaps the most explicit of these is a set of anti-Hussite Czech narrative verses (ed. F. Palacký, *Staří letopisové čeští* ("Old Czech Annalists"—henceforth cited as *OCA*), *Scriptores rerum Bohemicarum*, III (Prague, 1829), 472):

> That year the Dresden masters and bachelors lived... in Prague and had a college there: Master Peter and Master Nicholas, [that is, Peter] English and Nicholas Loripes [for this resolution of the four names, cf. Sedlák, *op. cit.*, p. 3]. They had been expelled from Dresden for they had secretly given the Lord's Blood. They began to advise Master Jičín to begin to give the Lord's Blood, and he accepted this advice and persuaded Master Jakoubek, as well as many other priests, to join him and hold to this practice.

There are many ambiguities in this account, but it is interesting in that it links the Dresdeners to Hussite utraquism through Master John of Jičín, later to be an important Taborite and here described as in some sense a disciple of the Dresdeners. Pekař, *loc. cit.*, accepts the Dresden tradition, but Sedlák, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-7, regards Nicholas as only the "co-originator," subordinate to Jakoubek. Contemporaries regarded the latter as the key figure, and he himself took responsibility for leading the fight against the anti-utraquists. The issue does not seem as important as the clear fact that utraquism was the work of a whole party of Hussites. Thus Nicholas of Dresden wrote, "Non pro libito incepimus porrigere, sed longa et matura super hoc prehabita deliberatione cum magistris et aliis legem Christi diligentibus," and Jakoubek, replying to charges of rashness, asked, "Whom might they mean, if not me and the others who are carrying it through?" (Both quotations from Pekař, *op. cit.*, I, 10 notes 4, 3.)

All of this still does not explain how the reformers hit on the idea of utraquism. Bartoš has suggested the influence of Greek Orthodoxy (*Čechy v době Husově*, pp. 393-397), but it is certainly safest to eschew unprovable hypotheses in such matters. Jakoubek himself called it a revelation, and then described what this meant: "Voco revelacionem modum cognoscendi, venientem ex scrutinio legis Domini et ex solidis exposicionibus et auctoritatibus antiquorum sanctorum ut Augustinus... Habeo cognicionem ex lege et scriptis authenticis. Hec cognicio... vocari potest revelacio" (*apud* Bartoš, "Počátky kalicha v Čechách," *Husitství a cizina*, pp. 62-63). I find such a statement clear and convincing: new ideas *do* come this way, and there is no explaining them further.

ated, but most remained with the movement, and the enormous popularity of utraquism, as well as its value as an epitome of the reform idea, made it a common ground on which a number of different tendencies were to be able to rest. Disciples of the reform movement went out from Prague to preach the new doctrine, along with the reform message generally, and the very definiteness of utraquism, which could be realized by a single clear-cut act, made it an ideal vehicle for the whole radical program.

Another important development connected with Hus' absence was the organization of a Hussite party among the nobility. Under the guidance of leading University masters, sections of the nobility favorably disposed to the reform movement had sought to influence the Constance process by a series of protests to the Council. [1] Hus himself, in a letter written just before his death to two of the lords who had escorted him to Constance, had more or less committed the cause to the protection of the feudality: [2]

> I beseech you by the bowels of Christ to flee evil priests but love good ones, according to their works, and, together with others of the faithful, barons and lords [or perhaps, "with other faithful barons and lords,"] to the extent of your power, not to permit these good priests to be oppressed. It is indeed for this that God has set you over others. I believe that there will be a great persecution in the Kingdom of Bohemia of those who faithfully serve God, if God does not intervene through the secular lords, whom He has enlightened more than the clergy in His Law...

In the same letter, he had vigorously defended utraquism, thus associating it with the reform cause in general:

> O what madness, to condemn as erroneous the Gospel of Christ, the Epistle of Paul, which he said he received not from man but from Christ, and the acts of Christ and of His apostles and of other saints! To condemn, that is, communion with the Lord's cup, instituted for all faithful adults.

After Hus' death this program became a reality. On 2 September 1415, the Hussite nobles joined to send the Council a final protest, [3] more like a feudal defiance, and on 5 September they formed a Hussite League. [4] In the protest they declared their intention of "defending and protecting, to the point of shedding their blood, the Law of ... Jesus Christ and its devoted, humble, and constant preachers, regardless of ... human statutes to the contrary." In the compact of the League, they swore to encourage such preachers on their domains and to defend them against unjustified punishment and episcopal jurisdiction. The compact indeed went much further, recognizing the University of Prague

[1] See V. Novotný, *Hus v Kostnici a česká šlechta* (Prague, 1915). The texts are published in F. Palacký's *Documenta Mag. Joanni Hus vitam, doctrinam, causam in Constantiensi concilio actam ... illustrantia* (Prague, 1869), Nos. 63, 65, 73, 74, 75, 85 (cited hereafter as *Documenta*).

[2] *Documenta*, pp. 125-126.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 580-584.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 590-593.

as the highest judge of religious truth, and thus, in spite of ostensible acceptance of the existing ecclesiastical system, setting up the nucleus of a new system, a sort of *Landkirche*. Obedience to the papacy was affirmed, but not to the system of papal jurisdiction that had brought the Bohemian church into direct subjection to Rome.

Along with the development of this baronial Hussitism, the reform movement scored great successes in Prague. Hus' martyrdom (on 6 July 1415) had aroused men and women of all classes to anger against the Catholic hierarchy, who had been active in supporting the prosecution of Hus. Moreover, at the end of October 1415, Prague was put under an interdict because of the presence there of the excommunicated John Jesenic. The Praguers had already been engaging in acts of violence against the Church, and the observance of the interdict by the clergy of the city had the effect of allowing Hussite priests to take over the churches for utraquist services. [1] Outside the city the same factors of reform enthusiasm, the violent reaction to Hus' death, and the protection of powerful lords and magistrates, combined to foster the spread of the movement. As early as the Spring of 1415 the Council of Constance had been made aware that "the followers of this sect give communion to the laity of both sexes in both kinds, bread and wine, in various cities, villages, and places of the kingdom, and they constantly teach and insist that communion must be given in this way." [2] A chronicle sums up the development in much the same way: "Many of the simple priests adhered to [the founders of utraquism] and went about through the whole land, giving communion to the people in both kinds and asserting in their sermons that the old priests were thieves of this sacrament." [3] On 29 June 1415 two lay preachers of Hus' doctrines became the first martyrs of the movement when the German citizens of Olomouc, in Moravia, burnt them to death. The leader of the two had been associated with the University of Prague, where he had been known as a zealous promoter of the "Law of God." [4]

Faced with this movement, the Council of Constance took the lead in organizing opposition to it in Bohemia. On 26 July 1415 the Council sent letters to various

[1] Laurence of Březová's "Hussite Chronicle," ed. J. Goll, *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum*, V (Prague, 1893), 338f, 341f. This is the basic narrative source for the early years of Hussitism; I cite this edition henceforth as "Březová."

[2] *Documenta*, p. 259.

[3] *Chronicon universitatis pragensis*, ed. J. Goll, *op. cit.*, p. 580. The attack on non-utraquist priest as "thieves of the sacrament" became a radical commonplace, doubtless of considerable potency. See below, p. 111.

[4] *Documenta*, pp. 561-562 (a letter from the Rector of the University to Lord Lacek of Kravaře, Hejtman (= Hauptmann) of Moravia and a leading Hussite). Cf. also the account by the chronicler Wenceslas of Jihlava, ed. J. Loserth, *Mittheilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen*, XIX (1881), 88. The incident, occurring as early as it did, foreshadows the pattern that was to emerge: on the one side the Hussite reform, the Prague University, the Hussite barons, the Czech nationality; on the other, Catholic orthodoxy, the Roman hierarchy, and the German bourgeoisie. The national issue is emphasized in the letter.

religious and secular authorities in Bohemia, urging them to oppose Hussitism and "not to admit pestiferous men, spreading the doctrine of the condemned heretics, Wyclyf and his follower Hus, to preach and dogmatize in their cities and regions." [1] The Prague archiepiscopal consistory took steps to implement these instructions in a diocesan letter of 18 September 1415: "praedicatores vagi," who were preaching erroneous and scandalous doctrines, abusive of the clergy, in various parish churches, sometimes against the will of the local priest, were to be guarded against and if necessary excommunicated. [2] And to counter the Hussite League of barons there was formed, on 1 October 1415, a Catholic League, sworn to loyalty to the King, the Church, and the Council of Constance. [3]

By late 1415 a real battle had been joined: the Hussite side had come to include elements of all estates, both in Prague and the provinces. In many parishes, it is true, the new movement meant simply the substitution of one priest for another, or of utraquism for the Roman rite, with perhaps some "reform" of the Church, at least in material matters. Apart from the chalice, the most important long-run change in such parishes would be a much stronger subordination of the Church to the secular authorities, for the independent power of the Roman hierarchy (i.e., the "freedom" of the Church) would have been broken. Certain sources, however, indicate a quite different pattern emerging, a realization of very radical doctrines in an almost explosive manner. In so far as these sources are localized, they refer chiefly to Moravia (probably around Olomouc), the area around Plzeň, and the South Bohemian region around Písek and Ústí-nad-Lužnicí, [4] but the existence of later, non-localized sources describing similar or identical practices suggests that the pattern of radical anti-Roman outbursts existed in a number of places. [5] It is doubtless significant, though, that the most abundant

[1] *Documenta*, pp. 568-572. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 600f.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 601f. Cf. F. M. Bartoš, *Do čtyř pražských artikulů* (2d ed.; Prague, 1940), p. 11. It should be noted that King Wenceslas IV did not pursue a clear policy, and both sides could therefore consider themselves loyal to him.

[4] For Moravia see the complaint (in late 1416) of the canons of the Cathedral of Olomouc to the Council of Constance, ed. J. Loserth, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Husitischen Bewegung," *Archiv für Oesterreichische Geschichte* (*AOG*), LXXXII (1895), 386-391. The evidence for Písek consists of a complaint made in 1416 by John, the "administrator" of the parish living (cited by J. Macek, *Tábor v husitském revolučním hnutí*, I (Prague: Rovnost, 1952), p. 216, note 53a). For Plzeň see below, p. 119 f. The account of Ustí radicalism follows just below.

[5] Stephen of Dolany, the prior of a Carthusian cloister near Olomouc, wrote *Epistolae ad Hussitas* in the fall of 1417 (ed. B. Pez, *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, IV, ii (Augsburg, 1723)), in which he described many Hussite practices, including those characteristic of the radicals (cf. coll. 552, 556, 590, 580, 539, 517, 557ff., 569, 518, 519). He makes it clear that he is addressing himself to the leaders of the movement—the Prague masters—and his charging *them* with these practices suggests that these seemed to be part of the national movement. The anti-Hussite verses, "Slyšte všickni staří i vy děti," ed. V. Nebeský, "Verše na Husity," *ČČM*, XXVI (1852), vol. i, 141-151, include the same kind of material, likewise without identifying the radicals except as the "new-believers" (*novověrci*)—i.e., Hussites. Cf. also the "Žaloby na Husity" cited by Pekař, *op. cit.*, I, 23.

and precise evidence concerns the area around Ústí-nad-Lužnicí, where Tabor was later to be founded; it is thus possible and highly appropriate to consider the provincial radicalism of 1415-1416 in this particular setting.

A seductively circumstantial, but late and rather dubious set of narrative rhymes gives the following account of what went on in Ústí: [1]

> Then there was agitation among the priests in Prague, and they gave out the Lords' Blood. Master Jakoubek was the first to do this, at St. Michael's, and then the practice spread from there to Ústí. At Ústí it caused quarreling, priests driving each other out of the church. They stayed at Joha the baker's for almost a year. Pytel the clothier was a rich man of the town, and he took care of them: Jičín, Věněk, Peter the Tall, Antoš, Peter of Ústí, Pšenička, Kaniš, Bydlín, and other priests were boarded there. They did as they saw fit, thereby dividing the city into three factions, and they were never at peace among themselves, and they deprived many people of their lives. And thereby they destroyed the city, laying it waste.

This array of interesting detail may be taken as evidence that the turbulence at Ústí followed the introduction of utraquism from Prague. The rest of its information seems to bear on a period some years later (1418-1419), [2] and in any case little is said about the specific nature of the doctrines and practices at issue. Fortunately the want is handsomely supplied by another source, an anonymous account of practices "in [the castle of] Kozí Hradek and around the castle and

[1] *OCA*, pp. 471-472 (the same set of verses cited above, p. 106, n. 2).

[2] Palacký, *Dějiny národu českého* (Prague: Kočí, 1902), p. 521, and other historians following him (especially Holinka, *op. cit.*, p. 147ff.), have made much of this source, supposing it to mean that the listed priests came to Ústí from Prague in 1415. The first lines do seem to show the spread of *utraquism* from Prague to Ústí, in 1414-1415, but the following material cannot be clearly dated, for the last lines obviously refer to events of 1420. Březová (p. 357f.) tells how, on 21 February 1420, "a Taborite priest called Vanček, with a bell-ringer Hromádka... together with John of Bydlín and John Smolín" led a band of "Taborite" brethren in attacking and taking Ústí. Soon they destroyed the city and founded the new city of Tabor on a nearby site; this is evidently what the rhymes refer to. Since Bydlín appears in both sources, it is, I think, quite possible that Vanček is the same as the Věněk of the rhymes (but cf. Pekař, *Žižka*, I, 39 n. 3), and that Hromádka, whose first name was Peter, is the same as Peter the Tall or Peter of Ústí (for the latter possibility, cf. V. Tomek, *Dějepis města Prahy*, IV (2d ed.; Prague, 1899f), 30; I incline to the former identification. If Hromádka was in fact one of the Ústí radicals, then the group of priests was probably not active until 1418, for it was only on 23 June of that year that Hromádka's chaplaincy in Dolní Střimelice was given to a new man after Hromádka had resigned, doubtless under compulsion (see the *Libri confirmationum* of the Prague Archdiocese, ed. J. Emler, VII (Prague, 1886), 100, 265). Master John Jičín, moreover, who was one of the Ústí group, was probably still in Prague as late as the second half of 1417, for a list of Hussite University masters made at that time mentions him (*Documenta*, p. 693; see below, p. 125 n. 1). Finally, the date 1418 would fit the rhymes' statement that the priests stayed at Joha's for almost a year (I assume that Pytel took care of them while they were staying at Joha's): it was evidently in early 1419 that the Hussite priests were expelled from Ústí, for it was on account of their exclusion from the parish churches that the radicals of that area, led by Vanček and Hromádka, began to hold their congregations on "Mt. Tabor," near Bechyně (Březova, pp. 344-345, 357-358). For these reasons I do not think the rhymes can be used for the years 1416-1417, except indirectly and generally.

in Ústí," written evidently by a local Catholic, in bad Latin interspersed with Czech phrases actually used by the people. [1]

The picture is one of a violent assault on the whole Roman system by a group of priests and laymen holding radical beliefs of a clearly sectarian character. They attacked the "stone church" in Waldensian fashion as a den of thieves run by fornicating priests and containing valueless images. They asserted that divine rites might just as well be celebrated outside the church, for the whole system of consecrated vestments, altars, and other equipment, had been invented by the bishops for their enrichment, and had no value. Indeed, the priest who could make the Body of Christ could certainly consecrate his own apparatus for doing so, and he could, accordingly, officiate in fields or in barns, using a table or cask or even the ground for an altar. They did in fact celebrate mass in this way and, according to the account, "extra missas communicant populum, conficientes solum dictis quibusdam orationibus;" in other words they evolved a new and radically simplified rite of mass. [2] Their communion was aggressively utraquist, for they attacked the Roman priests as thieves of the sacrament. The peculiar Roman mass celebrated on Good Friday, when the priest himself takes communion only under the form of bread, which has been consecrated the day before, was attacked as an incomplete mass, and the people were invited to assist at two "complete" masses offered on that day by the extremists in a nearby barn.

Along with these tenets concerning the mass, the extremists held a number of others stemming from the same anti-ecclesiastical bias. They made a sharp distinction between good and bad priests, the latter category including all those not holding with Hus, whose memory was praised extravagantly. The bad, or Roman, priests were derisively abused; their sacramental acts were held to be invalid, and tithes were not to be given them. Laymen assumed various priestly functions, particularly preaching and the hearing of confessions. The extremists baptized in fish-ponds and refused to perform the usual ceremonies connected with funerals, which consequently became very simple. Various works for the dead were also rejected, as was burial in Catholic cemeteries. The churching of women after childbirth was apparently ignored. The writer of the account says, moreover, that the extremists had succeeded in winning the people to their point of view.

As stated above, the other sources for early extremism reveal much the same pattern. Apparent divergences are generally to be explained rather easily as due to the difference between the implicit and the explicit. For example, various artisans and villagers of the Písek area were accused, in 1416, of having driven

[1] *Documenta*, pp. 636-638. The account is undated; Palacký suggests 1416, but R. Holinka, *op. cit.*, p. 271, argues strongly for 1415. The actions described would of course have emerged at least a couple of months before the report, and I suppose that these actions can be dated, roughly, in late 1415 and 1416.

[2] Cf. Z. Nejedlý, *Dějiny husitského zpěvu za válek husitských* (Prague, 1913), p. 117ff., for the way in which the simplified mass was developed among the radical Hussites.

out the local vicar and tortured his servant, of holding services outside of churches, even in barns, and in the Czech language, of baptizing in brooks, and of publicly venerating John Hus and Jerome of Prague. [1] The actual violence does not appear at Ústí, but it is implicit in the bitterness of the ant-iRoman agitation there. [2] Similarly the use of Czech in liturgy is not specified at Ústí, but we are told that the funeral services were conducted in Czech, and it may be supposed that the simple outdoor masses were too. The rejection of such things as canonical hours, pilgrimages, specific church blessings (of salt, water, lambs, wheat, etc.), the cult of saints—with its holidays, images, relics, and profusion of altars—and canonical fasts—all these may be supposed for early extremism generally. [3] Certain sources also talk of a rejection of the doctrine of Purgatory, while the Ústí radicals merely abandoned the offerings and works for the dead based on that doctrine: [4] here one may well be cautious in generalizing, for the radicals themselves might not yet have agreed on a doctrine so obviously and characteristically Waldensian. [5]

How is one to explain the eruption of provincial extremism so early in the movement? If one works purely on the basis of doctrines, one can try to explain extremism as the application of Wyclyfism, the application of the ideas of John Hus and Jakoubek of Stříbro (hence Wyclyfism and the Czech reform movement), or the emergence of previously concealed Waldensianism. [6] Indeed it must

[1] See above, p. 109, n. 4.

[2] Violence is also mentioned by the Olomouc canons, Stephen of Dolany, and the two anti-Hussite verse-polemics, "Slyšte všickni staří i vy děti" and "Žaloby na Husity" (see above).

[3] Cf. the complaint of the Olomouc canons and the anti-Hussite rhymes just cited.

[4] "Slyšte všickni staři..." also mentions the denial of offerings and works for the dead; the explicit denial of Purgatory is charged only by the Prague University masters (see below, p. 118f.), but Holinka, *op. cit.*, p. 150f., supposes it implicit at Ústí.

[5] The dogmatic denial of Purgatory seems to have impressed contemporaries as the Waldensian doctrine *par excellence*, one not shared with the other "evangelical" tendencies of the time. Březová, for example, says that the Taborites denied Purgatory "with the Waldensians" (p. 411). Cf. also p. 105, n. 2 above. It has already been seen (p. 106, n. 1) that a Waldensian-style critique of "excessive" works for the dead was compatible with an acceptance of Purgatory, and it would therefore be rash to suppose that the two could not have been associated at Ustí, unless one assumes that the Ustí radicalism was *simply* emergent Waldensianism.

[6] Scholars have hacked away at these possibilities and at each other for two generations. The Wyclyfite line has been represented by J. Loserth (especially in his *Hus und Wiclif* (1884), while the most systematic attempt to equate Taboritism with Waldensianism on the doctrinal level was that made by W. Preger, "Ueber das Verhältnis der Taboriten zu den Waldesiern des 14. Jahrhunderts," *Abhandlungen der königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Historische Classe, XVIII (1889), 1-111. Cf. also H. Haupt, *Waldensertum und Inquisition im südöstlichen Deutschland* (Freiburg im Br., 1890). In his reviews of these two works, J. Loserth tried to prove that the Taborites were simply the most consistent followers of Wyclyf (*Göttingische gelehrte Anzeiger* (1889), N. 12, 475-504; (1891), No. 4, 140-152). He asked the methodologically astounding question, "Wozu also dem Phantom des Waldensertums nachjagen, wenn sich die Genesis dieser Lehren aus den Schriften Wiclifs so leicht erwiesen lässt?" (*GGA* (1889), 501-502), a question which is answered in any case by the non-Wyclyfite origins of certain extremist phenomena (denial of Purgatory, the prominence of laymen and lay-women), and the abundant evidence, accumulated since 1889, for Bohemian Waldensianism and its influence

appear most extraordinary that the available causes are so redundantly multiple. The march of science has accustomed even historians to accept—for no good reason that I can see—the validity of Occam's Razor as a principle of explanation, and hence to seek "the" cause or "the main" cause, when reality and one's own experience of life ought to suggest the vanity of such an endeavor. Who can give "the" cause of even his own simplest act? In human affairs and in history, *entitates non sunt subtrahende*, and in the present case, where an explanation is sought for the extremist phenomena at Ústí and elsewhere, it is necessary to consider all the influences that can be supposed to have worked on the people. Since the spirit of these people was not that of either Hus or the University masters, whose criticism of the Church never broke out of an essentially Catholic frame of reference, we must be prepared to look for the source of this spirit in a point of view *outside* the Roman system—with which the Ústí radicals were *at war*.[1] Such a point of view was that of popular sectarian heresy, which did in fact exist in the Ústí area; it is this subject that must now be considered.

It is probable that there were Waldensians in Bohemia as early as the thirteenth century, but specific, localized, and conclusive evidence dates only from the fourteenth. By the middle of this century, at the latest, popular heresy of the Waldensian type, which had earlier spread into Germany and Austria, made its appearance in South Bohemia.[2] The sources, meager as they are, suggest a good deal more than they actually say, for the nature both of Waldensianism and of the surviving sources for it almost forces one to presuppose a lot of unattested, underground activity. Thus when we read of a Waldensian insurrection in the villages of Velký Bednarec and Malý Bednarec, on the domains of Lord Ulrich of Jindři-

on Hussitism. More recent Czech scholarship, as represented by the works of Sedlák, Holinka, and Pekař, has established the Waldensian line, and on a sounder basis than that offered by Preger; the problem will be considered in more detail below.

[1] Against the line of argument that will be pursued below, it might be argued that the use of violence by the Hussite extremists of 1415-1416 means that they cannot have been inspired by Waldensianism, for the Waldensians rejected violence and killing as un-Christian. This rejection, however, may be interpreted as essentially part of the Waldensian rejection of the whole established order, based as this was on force. There is no reason to suppose that the sectarian hatred of the Roman-medieval system could not, under proper conditions, have found expression in positive acts of violence. The tense situation of 1415, with its possibilities for open anti-Romanism and its attraction of unassimilated masses into the sectarian ranks, doubtless provided these conditions. Moreover, the South Bohemian and Austrian heretics *had* engaged in violence long before the Hussite period: cf. Preger, *op. cit.*, 100-101, and see below.

[2] S. Harrison Thomson, "Pre-Hussite Heresy in Bohemia," *English Historical Review*, XLVIII (1933), 25-36 and *passim*. See also the very full discussion by R. Holinka, *op. cit.*, *passim*. The presence of the "Waldensian" complex of ideas and attitudes in the minds of individuals need not imply any particular organization, but it suggests contact with heretical teaching and a *predisposition* to accept a critique of the Roman system; this predisposition was very widespread among lower social strata in the later Middle Ages—hence the pervasiveness of Waldensianism and hence, perhaps, the ready acceptance of its doctrines by people not formally members of the sect.

chův Hradec (Neuhaus, Nova Domus) in the late 1330's, [1] we may suppose a fairly widespread fabric of heresy in the area. And when a contemporary inquisitional record notes that in 1377 the burgrave of Kozí Hradek was ordered to give up Henzl and Konrad of Bednarec, whom he had taken from the inquisitor, it suggests that this popular movement had not only persisted but even spread—from Bednarec to the Kozí Hradek area. [2] Similar conclusions may be drawn from the attestation, in 1381, of the heresy of two generations of the family of a certain Johlin in the town of Písek. [3] The fact that the Prague provincial synod in 1381 mentioned Waldensian activity for the first time in a synodal statute is further evidence for the supposition at least that this popular heresy had become a problem for Church authorities in Bohemia, [4] while various other pieces of evidence suggest that Bohemia had actually become, by the end of the fourteenth century, a leading center and breeding-ground for the heresy in Central Europe. [5]

On the other hand, fourteenth-century Bohemian Waldensianism seems to have been largely a German affair, flourishing among those Germans who had "colonized" Bohemia during the previous century or so. Hence the original introduction of the heresy and, doubtless, the possibility of its extra-Bohemian connections and influence. But around the turn of the century Waldensianism, like so much else brought by Germans, spread to the Czech population, whose point of view regarding the problems of religious and social life was in no way different from that of their German neighbors. [6] The process is shown conclusively, if not clearly, by the series of lists of Waldensian "errors" found in Bohemian manuscript collections and dating from the 1390's up to the Hussite period. These show not only a preoccupation with heresy but a substitution of Czech for German vernacular elements in the various articles. [7] Czech Waldensianism,

[1] Thomson, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-36.

[2] V. Chaloupecký, "K dějinám Valdenských v Čechách před hnutím husitským," *Český časopis historický* (*ČČH*), XXXI (1925), 376.

[3] Thomson, *op. cit.*, p. 39 (c.f also note 1 on this page and note 4 on p. 40: Písek seems to have been a center of Waldensian activity in the 1360's).

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 41.

[5] Cf. Holinka, *op. cit.*, p. 123. In the 1390's we find explicit statements appearing in the sources to this effect. Thus an anonymous fragment refers to the Waldensians "qui in Austria prius et nunc in Bohemia pullularunt" (*ibid.*, p. 135), and confessions of Waldensians in Pomerania and Brandenburg include the statement that "doctores suos ex Bohemia ad se ventitare solere" (Thomson, *op. cit.*, p. 42).

[6] F. M. Bartoš, "Vznik a počátky táborství," *Husitství a cizina*, pp. 115ff., holds that Bohemian Waldensianism was not very extensive and that it was in any case restricted to Germans, chiefly because of the language barrier. Bartoš' opinion deserves mention, but it has not convinced many others.

[7] Cf. Holinka, *op. cit.*, p. 130ff. and p. 175: Among the documents connected with the inquisition of Peter Zwicker in various parts of Germany and the Bohemian Crown Lands in the 1390's there survives a MS. of "Errores haereticorum Waldensium" (ed. J. Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*, II (Munich, 1890), 335-343); this list was copied into a Bohemian MS. at the beginning of the fifteenth century (the text in Holinka, pp. 176-179), whence it was used, in part verbatim, by the Catholic Johlin of Vodňany in his *Postilla*,

like that of the Germans, flourished among the common people, particularly those of South Bohemia, "in a district of a twenty-mile radius, in which Hus was to be born and where, later, Tabor was to be the centre of the militant Hussite movement." [1]

It does not seem too bold to suppose that the people around Ústí and Kozí Hradek who responded so enthusiastically to Hussite preaching had been prepared for this response by at least a generation of popular heretical activity. This inference seems almost dictated by the sources just considered. [2] But again we find the curious *embarras de richesses* mentioned above: when John Hus had to leave Prague in 1412 because of his excommunication, he spent part of his "exile" in the very region under consideration. He later wrote that "they miss me very much in the region where I preached: in the towns, in villages, in fields, at castles and around the castles, and in the woods under a linden-tree at the castle called Kozí Hradek." [3] Another view of this activity appears in a later, hostile source: [4]

> In the year 1413 [sic] Master John Hus was expelled from Prague because of his excommunication. He performed divine sevices and preached at Kozí Hradek, in a barn, and many came to his preaching from Ústí. For he inveighed against the Pope, bishops, and canons, and constantly heaped abuse on the spiritual order. Here the priest Věněk began to baptize children in a fish-pond and to slander the chrism and holy oil and holy water. Afterwards Master Hus returned to Prague and the King ordered him to appear at the Council of Constance, and he never returned from there.

This account, by juxtaposing Hus' preaching with Věněk's more extremist practices, creates a kind of connection between the two, but the exact nature of the link remains obscure. Indeed it hardly seems likely that Hus did celebrate mass in a barn, as the popular heretics of the area were doing. [5] Nevertheless, the power-

written in 1404. Johlin used the various articles as samples of the doctrines of Bohemian Waldensians, who, he said, were multiplying. But the same Bohemien MS. list served as a source for still another list, composed about 1421 (ed. K. Höfler, *Geschichtschreiber der hussitischen Bewegung in Böhmen*, I, *Fontes rerum Austriacarum*, I. Abth., Bd. II (Vienna, 1856), 503-505), and crammed with Czech phrases mixed in with the Latin or added to it (the only German words in the earlier list are here given in Latin). Chaloupecký, *op. cit.*, p. 377, n. 3, considers this list to be related to the "anonymous account" of radical practices around Ústí; in any case the anonymous account closely parallels the Waldensian lists, even though it is so circumstantial and explicit that its information must have come from the observation of actual events.

[1] Thomson, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

[2] A similar succession of earlier Waldensianism and Hussite extremism can be shown for the areas around Písek (above, pp. 111 f., 114) and Olomouc (Thomson, *op. cit.*, p. 41; above, p. 109).

[3] *Jan Hus. Sebrané spisy české*, ed. K. Erben, III (Prague, 1865), 241.

[4] The rhymed chronicle cited above, p. 106, n. 2 (the present passage immediately precedes that quoted above, p. 106).

[5] V. Novotný (*M. Jan Hus. Život a dílo*, II (Prague, 1921), 334-335), in spite of his usual cautiousness, is inclined to accept the testimony, although only as an exception to Hus' general conservatism in matters not directly connected with reform. Perhaps he is right; a statement of Stephen of Dolany, made in 1417, may explain *non*-Waldensian services outside of churches: "...ubi per fideles clauduntur vobis Ecclesiae, facitis hoc [i.e., utraquist communion] in stabulis vel horreis" (*op. cit.*, coll. 579-580).

ful anti-Roman, evangelical preaching of Hus must be considered along with the pre-existent popular sectarianism in explaining the extremist outbreak at Ústí in 1415-1416. Furthermore, it is impossible to neglect the influence of the Prague-trained radicals who preached reform in 1415, and who brought elements not originally part of the Waldensian movement: utraquism and the veneration of Hus's memory. Hence we must assume that the radicalism of Jakoubek and Nicholas of Dresden was also involved in the turbulence of these early years. Indeed, the non-localized sources for this turbulence make no distinction at all between the Prague University movement and extremism outside of Prague; they present a picture of *one* movement, with a single origin in Prague. [1] The picture, therefore, that must be drawn from all the evidence, is that of a single effect with several diverse causes. If one tries to go on to develop a causation that would be both necessary and sufficient, one will fail, for it is *a priori* obvious that no such causation can be offered to which some other scholar may not legitimately object. Nor indeed can it be shown that the concatenation of *all* determined causes was necessary—not, at least, without begging every pertinent question of philosophic importance. If, on the other hand, one does not try to explain too much, then the profusion of causes can appear rather gratifying: the mysterious cooperation of all "reform" tendencies—or, perhaps more precisely, the convergence of all vital spiritual currents in a single reform movement—shows the profoundness of the movement that is being considered. Moreover, it throws a powerful light on the spiritual condition of Europe in this period.

In Prague, religious developments were quite different from those just considered. Tremendous gains had been scored, partly because of the reform movement's popularity, partly because of the Roman clergy's implication in Hus' death, partly because of the interdict of October 1415, which had given the Hussites control of most of Prague's churches. But this situation had its disadvantages also. For more than a year the conservative Hussites and King Wenceslas tried to come to terms with the ecclesiastical authorities in such a way as to preserve the reform movement's gains and yet secure the lifting of the interdict. Archbishop Conrad did lift it, probably at the end of 1415, but he thereby drew the fire of the Council of Constance on himself, and the interdict had to be reimposed, early in 1416. [2] The Hussites then tried to satisfy the Church as fully as possible. Probably in late 1416, John Cardinal, as Rector of the University, agreed with the Archbishop on a virtual restoration of the *status quo ante*: Church property was to be returned; the expelled priests were to be reinstated; the archiepiscopal authority was to be fully recognized; and John Jesenic was to leave Prague. Only utraquism was not surrendered. A royal decree confirmed and executed

[1] These are the sources mentioned above, p. 109 n. 5. The same picture is to be inferred from the attempts made by Prague conservatives to stem provincial radicalism: see below, p. 117ff.
[2] *Documenta*, pp. 645-647; cf. Tomek, *op. cit.*, III (1875), 601.

the agreement just cited and specified that certain churches were to be reserved for utraquism, and that neither side was to agitate against the other. [1] But these efforts seem to have failed in their general aim, [2] moreover, the University itself was suspended by the Council of Constance in late 1416, and on receipt of this order, Archbishop Conrad, as Chancellor, refused to allow the usual examinations for the master's degree (20 January 1417). [3] The policy of appeasement, evidently one imposed by King Wenceslas, [4] had proven bankrupt.

The result of these developments seems to have been a change of policy by the leaders of the national Hussite party. The charter of this party had been the baronial compact of 5 September 1415, which had recognized the University as the supreme authority in religious matters, and had pledged the nobles to defend the reform against the hostile Roman authorities. Only now, in 1417, was this program put into action in all of its implications. First, the University's authority was asserted over the whole Hussite movement; then it was asserted against the Catholics, and then steps were taken to establish Hussitism as the regular religion of Bohemia. These events will be considered one by one.

Even before early 1417 the masters had been compelled to give the Hussite extremists "very frequent fraternal admonitions" doubtless of an informal character. [5] Indeed, not only the extremists in the provinces, but also the groups around Jakoubek and the Dresdeners in Prague had become troublesome as innovators, whose continual development of the reform made *rapprochement* with the Church more difficult, while the extremists' irresponsible, anarchic propagation of novelties threatened the authority of the University over the movement as a whole. Furthermore, the Hussite barons had little sympathy for new doctrines—their compact of 1415 had not even mentioned utraquism—and no sympathy for the apparent wildness, dissoluteness, and subversiveness that characterized many extremist preachers. [6] Working closely with these barons, [7] the largely conservative body of University masters met, on 25 January 1417, to consider the problems posed by radical anarchy.

[1] The texts may be found in the *Documenta*, pp. 645-647, and in Loserth's *Beiträge*, *AÖG*, LXXXII (1895), 375, respectively. Cf. also *Documenta*, pp. 642-645. The texts are not satisfactorily dated; my reconstruction of their sequence agrees with Tomek's, *op. cit.*, III, 600ff.

[2] My inference from the objections raised by the Cathedral Chapter of St. Vitus' in Prague (*Documenta*, p. 606) to the proposed lifting of the interdict.

[3] Tomek, *op. cit.*, III, 609-610.

[4] I infer this from the texts just discussed and from Březová's statement (p. 329) that both King Wenceslas and Archbishop Conrad worked to suppress utraquism during its first two years of existence.

[5] *Documenta*, p. 634 (a letter from Master Christian of Prachatice to Wenceslas Koranda; see below). Texts of the admonitions are not known to survive, but they may have been oral.

[6] See below, p. 122 and n. 1; cf. *Documenta*, p. 635.

[7] Christian of Prachatice's letter to Koranda, already cited, is the main source for the background of the conservative meetings. Modern scholars have unanimously dated the letter in early 1417, on the basis of its content, its reference to a meeting ("nuper convocatis nostris senioribus magistris") and its reference to a "literam magistralem de ecclesiasticis ritibus"—presumably one of the declarations discussed just below.

It seems that this meeting was confronted with a kind of conservative extremism also: Master John Jesenic, a man whose devotion to reform and whose cooperation with Hus had made him the Hussite *par excellence* in Catholic eyes, although his extreme conservatism had made him slow to accept even the chalice, asked the masters not only to condemn radicalism but to proclaim the authority of the Council of Constance and the exalted position of the papacy. [1] It also seems that the radical doctrine of infant communion (in both kinds) was called into question by Lord Čeněk of Vartemberk, the leader of the Hussite barons, and perhaps also by some of the masters. [2] The official declaration of the meeting, however, avoided these points. [3] Selected for condemnation were the rejection of Purgatory (a Waldensian doctrine); the corollary rejection of prayers, masses, and works for the dead; the rejection of the cult of images; and the rejection of such ceremonies and customs as the blessing of water, salt, grain, and the like, aspersion, bell-ringing, and thurification. Exhorting the faithful to deny even a hearing to innovators who had not proven the rightness of their opinions to the University or to other pertinent authorities, the masters enunciated the guiding principle that, "according to the canons of the saints, in matters about which divine Scripture decrees nothing definite, the custom of the people of God and the institutes of our predecessors are to be held for law."

The mere issuing of such a proclamation was, of course, only a first step. It was at once accepted as normative by the Hussite nobles, but not by the radicals. The conservative masters doubtless realized that they could not simply demand that their opponents change their minds, but they could insist on confining doctrinal development to the *University's* framework of discussion and final authority.

[1] The text of Jesenic's proposals is given by F. M. Bartoš, *Do čtyř pražských artikulů* (2d ed.; Prague, 1940), pp. 66-67, and it may be reproduced in full here, as a document of extreme Hussite conservatism:

> Conclusiones Jesenic, quas posuit sub a. 1417 in die conversionis s. Pauli [25 January] in lectorio ordinariarum. 1° quia purgatorium est. 2° quia suffragia existentibus in purgatorio prosunt. 3° quia debent ymagines adorari, coli, venerari. 4° quia papa potest adorari et eciam coram ipso flecti nec talia facientes sunt ydolatre. 5° quia conciliis est credendum. 6° quia consuetudinibus ecclesiarum non est contradicendum. 7° osculantes ymagines non sunt ydolatre. 8° quia eciam ymagines debent decorari propter augendam devocionem, quia plus afficitur ad ymagines pulcras quam deformes. 9° quia propter abusum hominum nullo modo debent destrui ymagines.

[2] For Čeněk's declaration against infant communion, cf. Christian's letter, *Documenta*, p. 635, where the subject is clearly distinguished from the points discussed by the official letter. It is known that several of the masters were resolute enemies of infant communion, but their leader, Jesenic, did not mention the issue in his protocol; the reason is probably to be found in Christian's letter, which admits the existence of authorities for the practice, but urges that it should not be adopted without further discussion of its truth and its expediency.

[3] For the text, cf. *Documenta*, pp. 654-656. The meeting was held in Master Christian of Prachatice's parish church of St. Michael, in the Old Town of Prague. Although not as harsh as Jesenic's protocol, the declaration embodies most of his points and has a very sharp tone: the novelties are attributed to the Devil; it is said that they are held by various communities, and that they are wrong; the injunction to desist is couched in the second person. (See below p. 119, n. 2).

This point, indeed, was never rejected by Jakoubek, even though he continued to argue for infant communion and against the cult of images.[1] The provincial extremists, however, had been going their own way, and it was to bring them back into the national movement that the masters now began to exert their influence. On 7 February the conservative declaration was reissued, but with a distinctly softer tone, in what seems to have been a more official manner.[2] And it was probably soon after this Master Christian of Prachatice addressed a personal letter to the priest Wenceslas Koranda, then in Plzeň,[3] in which letter we can see the application of the University declarations to the actual situation (it is quite possible that other letters were sent to other provincials). Christian complained that Koranda, a man who had enjoyed a splendid reputation in Prague Hussite circles, was among those who, "alas, possessed only of zeal and not acting according to knowledge, spurning the very frequent fraternal warnings of the masters, follow their own opinion and [the leadership] of unlearned men and women." It must be supposed that these men and women were local sectarian

[1] Březová (p. 334), states that "Master Jakoubek of Stříbro... promulgated and began [infant] communion, together with masters and priests associated with him," and he notes that it divided the University community. In 1417 and 1418, Jakoubek kept up a running polemic with the opposing masters (cf. the entries for these years in Bartoš' *Činnost*), and finally won his point, in September of 1418 (see below). In the matter of images, Jakoubek vigorously criticized their cult in a sermon delivered only a few days after the conservative declaration—on 31 January 1417 (*Činnost*, No. 69; parts of the sermon are printed by Z. Nejedlý, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-75, 80), but he was careful to note that he was attacking only abuses, not the principle of images as auxiliaries to devotion (see below, p. 126f.).

[2] For the text, cf. J. Loserth, *Beiträge*, *AÖG*, LXXXII (1895), 383f. Against the formulation of the 25 January text, this one says merely that people are beginning to question verities and examine novelties, now that the end of the world is at hand (there is no mention of the Devil); it appeals to the people to stop, and it uses the passive periphrastic rather than the direct imperative. It has been suggested that the second declaration was a reaction to Jakoubek's attack on images of 31 January, but it may be more logical to suppose that the second declaration —which bore the University's seal—was meant to be a kind of official Hussite definition of doctrine rather than merely a resolution of the conservative party. Hence its loftier, calmer tone.

[3] This letter and a statement by Březová (p. 389), *ad* 15 July 1420, that Koranda particularly hated Christian, are indications that a certain relationship existed between the two. In his letter Christian notes that, "Ante enim pauca tempora, dum Corandae nomen fuit auditum, omnes laudabant omnesque affluebant, mirantes verba et hujus constantiam atque veritatis zelatorem"; this may refer to a period ending sometime in 1416, when Koranda was, evidently, prominent in the University reform movement in Prague. A satirical "genealogy" of the Hussites includes Koranda in a list of names of prominent University masters (and one or two other men) active before 1414: Hus, Koranda, Čapek, Olešák, Sadlo, Zmrzlík, Jerome, Simon of Tišnov, Jakoubek, Christian of Prachatice, Simon of Rokycana, Marek of Hradec, John Jesenic, Zdislav of Zvířetice (ed. Palacký, *Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hussitenkriegs*, II (Prague, 1873), 521f.). On the other hand, similar lists, dating from the second half of 1417 (*Documenta*, p. 693) and from early 1418 (Höfler, II (1865), 241) do not mention Koranda among the University leaders; the former source does mention him in another context, along with Olešák and Čapek, as itinerant Hussite preachers in South Bohemia (*Documenta*, p. 694). Thus the evidence fits together; Koranda may have been a student of Christian's at the University, but the outbreak of Hussitism in 1414-1415 probably kept him from getting his master's degree and had, instead, associated him with the sectarian heretics of the provinces (see below).

heretics; [1] against their influence, Christian urged Koranda to acknowledge the authority of the University. The masters' demand that no novelties be promulgated without the assent of the University was spelled out by Christian with reference to the question of infant communion: "although there are some authorities for [it] ... and some directly opposed, it would be good and useful not to leap immediately to the other, the uncustomary side, but only after frequent prior conference with learned men as to whether it is expedient to promulgate these novelties thus or otherwise." [2]

It has been seen that this request of the masters was motivated by considerations of both expediency and principle. Christian's letter defines the political issue very clearly: "I know that some of our sedulous promotors of the evangelical Truth at the royal court [*coram principe*] have been very downcast by the things I have just written about [i.e., extremist practices], and they say that they no longer wish to involve themselves on our account, but rather wish to live like others, in peace of mind." [3] On a higher plane, the problem as the conservative masters saw it (and hence as it was, in a certain sense), was whether the University reform movement should be dissolved into a popular sectarian heresy that, however "pure," was a direct negation of medieval civilization. To the masters the great and beautiful civilization of the Middle Ages was something to be reformed—purified, but preserved; to the Waldensian heretics the medieval order was *per se* sinful, hypocritical, and Antichristian. It was a conflict between the culture of the cathedral and the culture of the barn, and, concretely, the issue was whether the baccalaureate preachers of reform should work as disciples of the University or as associates of the "barn-priests." [4] It would thus be wrong to regard the conservative declarations of early 1417 as merely condemnations of radicalism: they were that, but they were also invitations to the radicals to seek change within the national movement—specifically, within the University's world of ideas. Such changes would be moderated by the weight of conservatism, but not necessarily prohibit-

[1] Cf. Holinka, *op. cit.*, p. 147ff. The point is clear from the doctrines and practices that Christian complained of: the Plzeň radicals were denying the doctrine of Purgatory, the corollary works for the dead, and the cult of saints; they were burning images and throwing "dubious" relics on dung-heaps, were refusing to sing the *Salve Regina*, discarding the usual Roman ceremonies in favor of those of the Primitive Church, and were giving communion to infants (this last was Hussite rather than Waldensian).

[2] On this crucial point the Prague radicals agreed with the University's position. Jakoubek, in 1414, wrote: "Multe sunt veritates, que propter indisposicionem cordium tempore suo non sunt dicende; sed alio tempore, cum illa magis erunt apta ad suscepcionem illarum veritatum, tunc debent dici." And an anonymous radical, close to Jakoubek's ideas, wrote: "Sepe veritates sunt graves multis, quas oportet primum occulte tractari abinvicem." Both *apud* Bartoš, "Nová postila Jana Želivského?" *ČČM*, CI (1927), 143.

[3] This issue came up again and again: cf., e.g., *OCA*, p. 474; Březová, pp. 365, 449, 468, 525.

[4] The Waldensians attacked the "stone church" of the Roman parish and celebrated their own rites wherever convenience dictated—often in barns. Thus anti-Hussite rhymes of the period referred to "liars, baccalaureates, and barn-priests," the same pattern of relationships that we find in Christian's letter to Koranda, with its complaint that the University-trained Koranda had followed unlearned men and women (cf. Holinka, *op. cit.*, p. 156 n. 539).

ed, and in any case the problem was not that of establishing real uniformity—this had already become impossible—but that of preventing the creation of two Hussite universes, and of creating instead, by the methods in which the scholastic mind excelled, a unity in principle that could allow differences in practice.

Of course the University had to validate the leadership it claimed. It did not defy the order of suspension issued by the Council of Constance. [1] but it seems that its new situation allowed it to act with more militancy. By 1417 most of the masters supported utraquism, [2] but some, even within the reform movement, did not, [3] and it was high time that the University pronounce on the matter. The Council of Constance's prohibition of the chalice, on 15 June 1415, had perhaps acted as a restraining influence, but now this restraint had been weakened; on 10 March 1417 the University officially sanctioned communion in both kinds as something that all laymen ought to take as beneficial to salvation. [4] The most radical formulation, that the chalice was necessary to salvation, was avoided. At the same time, the most important anti-Hussites within the University community were forced into outward conformity. [5]

Even earlier than this, the plans had been made, doubtless by the masters and Lord Čeněk of Vartemberk acting together, for the systematic establishment of utraquism throughout Bohemia. This policy had been implied by the baronial compact of 5 September 1415, but without the specification of utraquism and without the formulation of a definite national plan. With the new militancy of early 1417, such a plan became possible; it had, indeed, also become necessary. By September 1416, if not earlier, it had become ecclesiastical policy to refuse ordination to "Wyclyfites." [6] By 1417 we find Hussite priests being expelled from their livings, while oaths against the chalice and Wyclyfism were required of those first being installed in parishes and prebends. [7] The anarchic preaching

[1] Tomek, *Děje University pražské*, I (Prague, 1849), 238-240; cf. also Tomek's *Dějepis města Prahy*, III, 609f.

[2] Cf. Bartoš, *Do čtyr pražských artikulů* (2d ed.; Prague, 1940), p. 12f. On p. 66 Bartoš prints the text of a utraquist statement sent to the town of Příbram by the then Rector of the University, in 1416; only two such declarations are known to survive, but more must have been issued.

[3] Full conformity was not enforced on the masters until 1 August 1420, under pressure of war; cf. Tomek, *Dějepis*, IV, 91f. See also above, p. 103, n. 3.

[4] The text is in Von der Hardt, *op. cit.*, III, 761; a Czech version is in *Archiv český*, III, ed. Palacký (Prague, 1844), 204.

[5] The most important case was that of Dr. Peter of Uničov; there are many sources—cf. Tomek, *Dějepis*, III, 613ff. Another case, perhaps at this time, was that of Master Nicholas Pavlíkov, Dean of the Arts faculty: cf. Höfler, III (1866), 157f.

[6] When Aleš of Březí was ordained bishop (of Olomouc) by Archbishop Conrad in September 1416 he had to swear, among other things, not to ordain "Wyclyfites;" cf. the text of his oath, *apud* Loserth, *AÖG*, LXXXII (1895), 416-418.

[7] The *Libri confirmationum ad beneficia ecclesiastica Pragensem per archidiocesim*, VII, ed. J. Emler (Prague, 1886), indicate the first such suspensions on 3 March and 2 April 1417 (pp. 220-223), and the first oath on 8 April 1417 (p. 224). The oaths appear frequently throughout 1417, then fade away in early 1418, either because the Hussite-Catholic split had become so definite as to make oaths superfluous, or because the oaths had become so routine as not to require mention. This latter possibility seems to me unlikely.

of radicals, some unordained and without regular parish attachments, had already distressed the conservative Hussites;[1] the new developments might very well make such anarchy the norm unless Hussite candidates could be furnished with ordination and parish livings in defiance of the regular channels. The crisis was met by Lord Čeněk of Vartemberk, the leading Hussite baron. He took prisoner the Augustinian monk Herman, titular Bishop of Nicopolis and suffragan of the Prague Archdiocese, and on 6 March 1417, forced him to ordain many candidates for the priesthood in Čeněk's castle of Lipnic.[2] These new priests had come from the University, where, presumably, their ordinary progress towards ordination had been interrupted by the religious conflict; what their religious attitudes were at the time is not definitely known, but many of them were to become priests of Tabor in 1419, and this fact, together with other evidence, suggests that they had been associated with the most radical University circles, particularly those around Master Jakoubek of Stříbro and Nicholas of Dresden.[3]

[1] That some Hussite preachers were unordained is shown by sources as early as 1415: see above p. 108 for the Olomouc martyrs and the archiepiscopal prohibition of itinerant preachers, some of whom, it would seem, were unordained. In regard to their way of life, Christian of Prachatice's letter to Koranda, in early 1417, complains that "Our [the word is interesting] pseudo-priests appear on every hand, drunk, sensual, and unusually scandalous. Hypocrites, wishing to appear to be doing something new, they empty the purses of widows, preach poverty but cloak the ignominy of poverty with a certain unveiled hypocrisy, wish to have the income of a church but to enjoy all things without labor. Otherwise, if the people have not given them enough, they forsake the threshed out granaries and go to the fatter churches; then, with stuffed wallets, they withdraw, saying, 'We must now go evangelize other people,'" Catholic rhymes of perhaps the same period charge that the Hussites "work hard to get rich parishes and neglect poor churches; they stay as long they can find what to take, then they run away" (ed. J. Feifalik, "Untersuchungen über altböhmische Vers- und Reimkunst," *Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, XXIX (Vienna, 1858), 326. That such charges must be taken with salt seems clear from even a superficial consideration of the points of view involved. For example, the *Libri confirmationum*, VII, 233, tell of a parish priest named Maršík who was deprived of his living on 5 July 1417 because he had been giving utraquist communion and preaching "various errors" in several churches of the diocese; from a hostile point of view his behavior might seem frivolous and neglectful of duty. But there is no reason to think that he was anything but an ardent reformer. The pattern of itinerant agitation was of course part of Waldensian life, and it would be inevitable in any similar movement, while judged by the orthodox framework of behavior and motivation, it would seem to be chiefly dissoluteness and greed. *Honi soit...*, although it is of course impossible to rule out cases of individual worthlessness.

[2] The event is mentioned by many sources, including the two main narratives, the *OCA* (p. 43) and Březová (pp. 425, 447). The anti-Hussite verses, "Slyšte všickni staří i vy děti" (above, p, 109 n. 5) suggest that Čeněk's action was instigated by the more radical Hussites, those who said that "pope and bishop were nothing" (lines 419-422), but it is not clear that the author really distinguishes between Hussite factions.

[3] The evidence is rather complicated and requires examination in detail. It may be classified into three main groups:

I. Evidence associating the Lipnic priests with the University; II. Evidence associating them with Tabor; III. Evidence associating the priests of Tabor with the University.

I. (1) The only Lipnic priest whose name is positively known was the German Bartholomew of Rautenstock, who later fell into the hands of the Inquisition in Germany (his confession

The next problem was that of getting the Hussite priests into parishes. As early as September 1415 the Hussite barons had clearly promised to "defend and protect" reform preachers and to encourage such preaching on their domains.

apud J. Döllinger, *op. cit.*, II, 629). He had been a student in Prague, not at the University proper but at the school run by the Dresden masters (see above, p. 104 n. 3). Bartholomew and others from this school had been asked to take orders at Lipnic and did so.

(2) The *Chronicon Procopii notarii Pragensis* (ed. K. Höfler, *op. cit.*, I, 71-72), although composed late (c. 1476), offers an articulation of data that is probably reliable; it describes the Lipnic candidates as "scolares." This word may mean University students or simply clerics in lower orders, but even in the latter case the candidates would probably have been trained at the University. Another description of the Lipnic candidates as "subdeacons, deacons, etc." (*Documenta*, p. 737), and Březová's statement (p. 447) that Herman ordained those "quos archiepiscopus consecrare nolebat," imply the same thing, that the candidates had been trained and indeed would have become priests through regular channels if possible. Such training, in Prague, would probably have been at the University.

II. (1) Several sources say that "many" or "almost all" of the priests of Tabor (as of late 1420) had been ordained by Herman: Březová, p. 425 ("almost all"), p. 447 ("many"); *OCA*, p. 43 ("many"); John Příbram's *Život kněží táborských*, ed. J. Macek, *Kdož jsu boží bojovníci* (Prague, 1951), p. 283 ("many").

(2) The *Chronicon Procopii*, the sources cited in II. (1), and many others, state that the Lipnic priests were later to be responsible for drowning Bishop Herman, who was, in fact, drowned by the Taborites. Procop also states that the Lipnic priests were to burn churches and kill priests—i.e., they were Taborites.

III. (1) The University Master John Příbram pointed out that the Taborite chiliasts, who comprised almost all the priests of Tabor in 1420, and who urged the destruction of Prague as "Babylon," were attacking the city that had taught them to know the truth (cited by Pekař, *op. cit.*, I, 140 n. 2).

(2) Příbram, attacking Taborite arguments for simplification of the mass, took a tone not only of hostility but of contempt; one feels that here is the University master judging the works of ex-students. For example, against the Taborites' claim to have founded their arguments solidly, Příbram snorted: "...revera falsum est usque ad experientiam, cum haec scripta et vocetenus facta non sint digna memoria sapientum levi una responsione prorsus exsufflanda. Nec mirum, quod aranea se putet ferrea nectere tenimenta" (*De ritibus missae*, Höfler, *op. cit.*, II, 532).

(3) Much evidence points to a period when the Taborites were pupils of Jakoubek of Stříbro. The earliest Taborite defense of a simplified ritual appeals in several places to Jakoubek's authority. For example: "Et hoc idem praetendit Jeronymus ad Nepotianum scribens, quem saepe magister Jacobellus contra ceremonias legis veteris observare volentes allegare *solebat*, et specialiter in tractatu illo suo saepius nominato, quamdiu in ista materia nobiscum idem sensit, allegat..." (Höfler, *op. cit.*, II, 499; my emphasis). The tractate in question was Jakoubek's *De cerimoniis* (*Činnost*, No. 59), written most probably in 1415; Příbram (*op. cit.*, p. 545) said that the Taborites had gotten the work by fraud: "...scripta... quae sibi subdole et occulte per quendam fratrem sunt rescripta et ulterius tradita..." Even this circumstance points to a time of greater intimacy, when such an act could have been committed. Jakoubek himself, late in his life, found it necessary to attack the Taborites in order to make clear the difference between their acts and his own ideas, for the Taborites had been justifying their acts by saying that Jakoubek's works sanctioned them. In his attack, Jakoubek referred to an original unity of spirit; more important perhaps is his statement that various conservative masters were themselves of the opinion that Jakoubek's sermons had indeed caused Taborite extremism (Pekař, *op. cit.*, I, 110; cf. *Činnost*, No. 91).

More passages could be cited from other works, and the whole problem of the origins of the priests of Tabor could be pursued in greater detail for the whole Hussite period and for specific individuals (cf. e.g., p. 119, n. 3 above), but the above evidence seems conclusive for the University origin of most Taborite priests, and hence of most Lipnic priests.

There is evidence that Hussite priests were indeed being installed in parishes by Hussite nobles in the course of 1416 and 1417, often at the expense of Catholic incumbents. [1] But the first circumstantial account of a large-scale turnover on the domains of a particular lord is associated with action taken by Čeněk of Vartemberk, doubtless in pursuance of the same policy that had led him to arrange the Lipnic ordinations. On 15 June 1417 Čeněk and his ward, Lord Ulrich of Rožmberk, the greatest lord of South Bohemia, summoned the priests holding Rožmberk parishes to a meeting at which they were given the choice of either giving communion in both kinds or turning over their parishes to priests who would. [2] The threat was made good in many churches, although not in all, and it may be supposed that since a similar policy was enforced on Čeněk's own domains, [3] it was also carried out by the other Hussite barons; indeed it may be that the policy was promulgated within the framework of the Hussite League of 5 September 1415. It is most significant that the priests involved were those recently ordained at Lipnic; [4] the nobles whom Christian of Prachatice had represented as strongly anti-radical in early 1417 were now—doubtless with the advice of the conservative masters—actually helping radicals to get established in parishes under the nobles' control. [5] The change struck contemporaries as a

[1] Stephen of Dolany, *op. cit.*, is very explicit. Writing in 1417 he accused the Hussites of relying on the nobility to install them in parishes, both by legitimate use of the right of presentation (col. 670) and by the simple expulsion of incumbents (coll. 517, 670; other references are abundant). Cf. also, for the Moravian situation, the complaint of the Olomouc canons in late 1416 (above, p. 109, n. 4); *OCA*, p. 474; O. Odložilík, "Z počátků husitství na Moravě," *Časopis Matice moravské*, XLIX (1925), 117. Queen Sophia was accused, some time before April 1418, of having expelled non-utraquists and installed utraquists in her towns and villages (Höfler, *op. cit.*, II, 310f.), and the Council of Constance, on various occasions, mentioned the expulsion of Catholic priests and the intrusion of Hussites (*Documenta*, p. 647f. (late 1416); Höfler, *op. cit.*, II, 240 (early 1418)). For the turnover in Prague due to the interdict of late 1415, see Březová, p. 341.

[2] *OCA*, p. 23f.

[3] See the next note.

[4] The clearest statement of this is in the *Chronicon Procopii*, cited above: "Čeněk of Veliš, then the Supreme Burgrave of the Castle of Prague and the guardian of the barons of the Lord of Rožmberk, had control of a certain suffragan bishop Herman, who ordained many "scolares" in Čeněk's castle of Lipnic. These priests came to Prague and to various places, giving communion to the laity in both kinds and singing and reading masses in Czech. A large number of people began to adhere to them, and thus mere laymen expelled the legitimate pastors from the churches and introduced their priests. Čeněk also, on his domains and those of the Lord of Rožmberk, installed these very priests [eosdem sacerdotes], the legitimate ones being removed... These priests [iidem sacerdotes] later drowned the bishop who had ordained them; Čeněk indeed suffered many evils from them, and greatly regretted that he had obtained their ordination, seeing them afterward burn churches and kill priests."

[5] This point is proven most clearly by an action parallelling Čeněk's, the installation of the German John Drändorf, a pupil of the Dresden school in Prague, as parish priest in Jindřichův Hradec (Neuhaus) in 1417 (Bartoš, "Vznik a počátky táborství," *Husitství a cizina*, p. 120 n. 19). Like Bartholomew Rautenstock, Drändorf held ideas of a Waldensian type, for which he was later martyred in Germany (Böhmer, *op. cit.*, p. 228ff.). In his case therefore it is quite clear that a Hussite patron (I suppose Lord Ulrich Vavák of Jindřichův Hradec) used his patronage in behalf of an extreme, sectarian radical.

remarkably sudden one, which indeed it was; [1] like all sudden changes it posed many problems for the future. Could the new situation created so violently be stabilized in the realm of ideas, with a doctrinal unification to accompany the practical collaboration of conservatives and radicals?

Meanwhile the course of religious development in Prague had also been favorable to the unification of the Hussite party. It has already been seen that Master Jakoubek of Stříbro was much more radical in his concept of reform than most of the other masters. In a series of tracts, statements, and sermons, written in the period 1415-1417, Jakoubek developed a position distinct from both the sectarian Waldensianism of the extremists and the conservatism of the masters. On the one hand he agreed with the latter in seeking to eliminate from the movement the refusal to take oaths, the refusal to kill, the rejection of Purgatory, and in general the fundamentally negative attitude of Waldensianism towards civil government and the Roman Church. [2] Jakoubek was thus dissociating himself from Nicholas of Dresden, whose Prague activities seem indeed to have ended in 1416. [3] On the other hand, he did not agree with the conservatives' adherence to the elaborate cult of images, their rejection of infant communion, their willingness to accept incomes drawn from rents and "usury"—in fact, the conservative adherence to virtually the whole Roman system. [4] And the fact that, as already seen, Germans attached to the Dresdeners' school in Prague benefited from the Lipnic ordinations and the patronage of Hussite barons in 1417 must mean that this school, with its Waldensianism, remained part of the unified Hussite movement, even though it had doubtless lost its influence on Jakoubek. [5]

[1] A set of anti-Hussite rhymes written (in the second half of 1417) by someone with intimate knowledge of the Rožmberk situation (perhaps one of the displaced priests) addresses itself at one point to Čeněk: "Nobilis domine Čenko,/tua prudentia en quo / ad praesens evanuit, / quod rumoribus frivolis / et hominibus malivolis / tam subito annuit" (*Documenta*, p. 694). There follows a list of the "malevolent men," whom I suppose to be those installed in Rožmberk livings on 15 June 1417; among the names is that of Koranda, about whose extremist practices Čeněk had complained to the masters in Prague only a half-year before.

[2] *Činnost*, Nos. 58ff. *passim*; cf. especially Nos. 61-64.

[3] At least there is no evidence for his work in Prague after that year. A reference, in 1419, to the martyrdom of "Nicholas, a priest of Christ, in Meissen" (in the sermons of John Želivský, ed. A. Molnar, *Jan Želivský. Dochovaná kázání z roku* 1419, I (Prague, 1953), 126f.) may mean that Nicholas of Dresden had left Prague to spread his doctrines in Germany (Sedlák, *op. cit.*, p. 7), like so many of his associates of the School at The Black Rose in Prague, which has been aptly called a school for martyrs (Böhmer, *op. cit.*, p. 228).

[4] *Činnost*, Nos. 60, 67, 69, 71, 72, 73.

[5] The radical John Želivský, whose ideas were close to Jakoubek's while at the same far more violent, more like those of sectarianism, complained (apparently in 1419) of the "hereticationn" of those professing various Waldensian doctrines (J. Truhlář, "Paběrky z rukopisů klementinských. Husitská kázání z let 1416-1418 [sic]," *Věstník České Akademie*, VIII (1899), 287). Taken with Želivský's sympathetic reference to Nicholas of Dresden (above, note 3), this complaint may show the continued strength of the Dresdeners' group and ideals in the most radical Hussite circles.

The essence of Jakoubek's concept of reform was the basic acceptance of Catholicism, including the authority of the Church and of the tradition, coupled with the most violent, absolute-sounding attack on abuses. Sometimes the acceptance was more significant than the attack, as when Jakoubek argued for the possibility of radically simplifying the mass in cases of necessity; [1] the *regular* simplification accomplished by the provincial radicals did not find a supporter in Jakoubek when the issue came up. But often the attack was so vigorous that the saving clause of acceptance seems only an afterthought. For example, Jakoubek held that images "ought to be destroyed," as a great danger to the faithful, as the occasion of more harm than good, and—to boot—as purely human "customs" not required by the Gospel; on the other hand, "it does not follow from all of these arguments that an image is not in any way to be allowed in Christian churches, nor does it follow that no one of the faithful can ever be moved by some image, like a crucifix, to remember Christ's bitter death." [2] By the year 1418 this delicate yet powerful doctrine of reform had been fully defined and had, it would seem, become the doctrine of Prague radicals far more sympathetic to Waldensianist extremism than Jakoubek himself. [3] It had, in fact, become capable of reuniting the Hussite movement.

The new union was expressed and worked out in the Hussite Synod of St. Wenceslas' Day (28 September) 1418, which arrived at unanimous agreement on twenty-three articles almost wholly in the spirit of Jakoubek's program. [4]

[1] *Činnost*, No. 59.

[2] *Posicio de imaginibus*, of 31 January 1417 (*Činnost*, No. 69; my citations are from Nejedlý, *op. cit.*, pp. 80, 73-75).

[3] Cf. the excerpts published by Bartoš from an anonymous radical postilla of 1416/1419 ("Nová postila Jana Želivského?" *ČČM*, CI (1927), 135-148). The author did not, as far as Bartoš' excerpts go, make a principled break with the Roman system. In discussing bad priests, for example, he urged that "non advertantur eorum confessiones, predicaciones, mine, terrores quod non deciment eis nec eorum obediant seduccionibus," but did not, apparently, state that their sacramental acts were invalid (p. 143). Like Jakoubek, the author criticized the insistence on always celebrating mass in church, so that a priest could not celebrate in the chamber of a sick man, but he seems to have regarded celebration in church as the normal way. The same holds for his other criticisms of abuses: however violent, they attack only abuses (p. 139f.). If, as Bartoš suggests, the author was Želivský, the statement in the text above would be amply documented, for Želivský was very close to sectarianism, if not actually a crypto-Taborite. Because of this, Pekař, *op. cit.*, IV, (1933), 12-13, argues against Želivský's authorship, but agrees that the postilla reflects a point of view more radical than Jakoubek's.

[4] The MS. is unique and includes the date as I have given it; it is published in the *Documenta*, p. 677-681. Although one of the few precisely dated sources of importance for this period, it has been attacked rather savagely by modern scholars. Bartoš has argued (*Do čtyr pražských artykulů* (1st ed.; Prague, 1925), Appendices III and IV, pp. 74f., 86-88) that the Synod should be dated 1419, chiefly because there was no reason for a compromise to have been reached in 1418, but every reason in 1419. Pekař has rejected Bartoš' arguments as frivolous, but he in turn has questioned the MS.' authenticity, chiefly in regard to infant communion, which he believes was prohibited by the Synod (cf. his changing views in *Žižka*, I, 29, n. 1; IV, 10-11, 192). He thinks that the true version of the Synod's decisions is represented by a set of 19 articles in Czech, undated (ed. F. Palacký, *Archiv český*, VI (1872), 37-38) and partly corresponding to the topics of the Synod as given in the 1418 MS. The Czech articles are obviously a draft or an

The specifically Waldensian points were categorically rejected, although with as much in the way of concession as possible. The main body of Catholic tradition was adhered to in specific points as well as in general principle, but this fundamental conservatism was significantly tempered by the sanctioning of infant communion, the permission of the vernacular in certain parts of the mass, and an extremely radical critique of abuses connected with the various traditional practices that were approved. [1] One article of the Synod will show the spirit that prevailed:

abstract: they are very terse, make no concession to radicalism in either tone or content, and are, in fact, wholly Catholic in character, since they do not permit utraquism. A rather vague heading says that all of them, except for the one opposed to utraquism, were accepted by John Jesenic and his associates among the leaders of the Hussite party. Although scholars have interpreted these articles as, variously, a protocol not accepted by the Synod of 1418, a protest against the Synod's decisions, or in fact the truest version of these decisions (cf. Pekař, *loc. cit.*), their content and heading suggest that they originated in some sort of *rapprochement* between Catholics and conservative Hussites, with only an agreement to disagree on the chalice as a flaw in an otherwise perfect union. The articles cannot be cogently dated in any case; among the possible guesses, I would select September 1419, for reasons that I give in my study of the period immediately succeeding the present one.

A further complication is introduced by a collection of sermons for the last quarter of the Church year (July to November), attributed to Želivský. They show an atmosphere of tension, with a strong Catholicizing reaction among conservative Hussites and a bitter struggle over infant communion, particularly after the end of September (if the sermons are dated 1419). Cf. B. Auštěcká, *Jan Želivský jako politik* (Prague: Husitský Archiv, II, 1925), p. 24; excerpts are given by Auštěcká and Truhlář, *op. cit.* Pekař, almost alone among scholars, has argued that these sermons must be dated 1418, but he does not prove that 1419 is impossible, and this is the date that the arrangement of the MS suggests (cf. A. Molnár, *op. cit.*, p. 10). If the true date *were* 1418, the sermons' discussion of infant communion would more or less fit Pekař's ideas about the Synod of that year, but then the clear data of the 1418 MS. would have to be rejected. Against all such hypotheses, I feel that the dated MS. must be accepted in the absence of any clear impossibilities.

[1] For the sake of reference I give the gist of the Synod's articles, although in very cursory form: (1) Infant communion, in both kinds, (2) No one to hold that explicit statements of Holy Scripture constitute all that may be believed, (3) Purgatory to be believed in, (4) Masses are to be said for the dead, (5) Prayers, alms, and other works are to be done for the dead, (6) The saints can help the elect on earth, (7) No one may say that oaths are never to be sworn, (8) No one may say that the death penalty is never to be inflicted, (9) A priest who sins mortally does not lose his power to perform valid sacraments, (10) Only a priest can make the sacrament of the Eucharist, (11) In auricular confession, various works of penance are to be imposed if necessary; mere repentance is not always enough, (12) Extreme unction, (13) Spiritual and temporal authorities are to be obeyed, even if evil, in legitimate matters, but lovingly resisted in illicit ones, (14) Constitutions of the Church not against the Law of God, but helping it, are to be obeyed, (15) Authority of the Holy Doctors of the primitive Church is to be respected, (16) All ceremonies, customs, and rites of the Church, helpful to the Law of God and to good morals among the faithful, are to be preserved, unless something better is found (17) Consecration of water and benedictions of other things are legitimate, (18) The ritual of the mass is not to be changed without great necessity, (19) The Gospel and Epistles are to be sung in the vernacular, the other parts in Latin, (20) Images can be kept in churches, (21) Sunday, other feasts of Christ, of Mary, of the Apostles, and of other saints, are to be kept, (22) Church fasts are to be kept (23) Evangelical priests may have necessities by divine and natural law, although not by civil law. This list gives little idea of the *spirit* of the Synod; compare article 20 with its full text quoted below.

> Imagines ecclesiae possunt in ecclesia sustinere [sic], si tamen non sunt superfluae et petulanter et false exornatae, ut seducant oculos sumentium a respectu dominici corporis, aut mentem distrahant vel aliter impediant. Non autem esse possunt ut aliquo modo adorentur aut colantur per candelarum sacrificia vel geniculationes vel alios cultus potius divino corpori impendendos: sed solummodo ad nudam significationem rerum gestarum in Christo aut a Christo, quas in iis simplices faciliori discursu possunt respicere et sic in sua devotione promoveri.

If this article be compared with the more conservative declarations of early 1417, it will be seen that the Synod cannot be characterized—as Pekař has done—as a "general condemnation of early Taboritism," a retreat from the original reform program, and a preparation for a return to Rome. [1] Quite the reverse. A careful study of the language of the articles reveals that while numbers 1-5, 7-16, 18, 21, and 22 are compulsory, couched in the passive periphrastic or preceded by "nemo audeat dicere," as the case may be, the other articles are, so to speak, electives. Thus: saints can help (6); consecrations of water, etc. can legitimately be made (17); images can be kept in churches (20; see just above); priests can have certain goods (23). A radical community or congregation could, therefore, eliminate the cult of saints, images, and consecrations of water in practice. Moreover, the Synod expressly sanctioned infant communion and the use of Czech in the mass. All in all, the Synod must be considered a triumph of radicalism (although not of sectarian extremism) and a striking fulfillment of what Christian of Prachatice had implied in his letter to Koranda: that radical innovations could be established for the movement as a whole, if only they were advocated by discussion within the University world of ideas. It was still not too late to reunite the Hussite factions. [2]

But *did* the synod reunite the movement? The prologue to the articles suggests that it did: the Synod was held,

> in order to remove dissensions in regard to certain points, about which extreme diversity of views among the brethren was causing various scandals and vain controversies... The brethren were pleased to remain in unanimous profession of these points and to hold them in mutual concord...

It is not known that the "brethren" included provincial extremists, but Prague synods were meant to be normative for the province as a whole. Moreover, the language of the articles suggests a compromise between tendencies on both

[1] Pekař, *Žižka*, I, 28-30.

[2] As a sidelight on the situation in 1418, one may point to the group of about forty men, with their women and children, who came to Bohemia in that year from the North of France, where they had been persecuted (cf. Aeneas Sylvius, *Historia Bohemica*, ch. xxxii; Březová, p. 431; Bartoš, "Pikardi a Pikarti," *ČČM*, CI (1927), 225ff.) These "Pikarts" later emerged as deniers of transsubstantiation, to be persecuted and slaughtered by both Prague and Tabor, but in 1418, having declared adherence to the "evangelical Truth," they were received enthusiastically in Prague, even Queen Sophia and some of Wenceslas' courtiers resorting to them for "consolation:" the general idea of reform overshadowed doctrinal differences.

left and right; since the final version corresponded precisely to the views of Jakoubek, the more radical tendencies can best be identified with the views of the provincial extremists, whose leaders were later to recall a time when they had agreed with Jakoubek.[1] Finally, on 3 January 1421, Wenceslas Koranda referred to a previous conflict on the questions of images and the consecration of water;[2] it is possible that his words bear on the Synod of 1418, which, as shown, did sanction radical views on these points. All in all, I see no reason to suppose that the Synod was not accepted by the main body of provincial radicals.

The unity thus achieved was not to last; events of the following year—which will have to be considered separately —forced the development of Hussitism onto new paths of inner disintegration, with the radical movement developing in isolation from the conservatives, and with Jakoubek of Stříbro ranged with the latter. The end result of this new period was the foundation of Tabor in early 1420 as the capital of one part of a split national movement. But the work accomplished in the years 1415-1418 was not wasted, although it was frustrated in its main aim. It would be a great mistake to suppose that Tabor was merely an expression of popular sectarianism or a "natural" answer to popular needs. On the contrary, Tabor was a synthesis, worked out with great genius and labor, of popular sectarianism and University scholasticism, neither of which could, by itself, create a new and stable society. Since indeed the goal of the Hussite movement was a renewed and reformed world, it may be said that Tabor was that movement's only success. But Tabor would not have come into existence, had not the events of 1417 and 1418 strengthened the University-oriented leaders of provincial radicalism over the sectarians. When the fierce challenges of 1419 and 1420 came, the latter returned to prominence, but they were always kept within the framework of constructive action on a national scale by those radical priests to whom reform was not a matter of sectarian fanaticism, but of the establishment of stable institutions in the real world. Furthermore, although the founding of Tabor might seem to be a rejection of the Prague world of ideas, the interesting fact is that the Taborite leaders never ceased to debate their ideas with the Prague masters, and this fact is, I think, more important than the further fact that agreement was never reached. Finally, it may be noted that those radicals who refused to be absorbed into

[1] See above, p. 122 n. 3, III, 3.

[2] The occasion was Koranda's defense of the Taborite rite of mass, which had been violently attacked by the Prague masters. He noted that the Taborities would act against "homines altos" defending the use of Roman-style vestments, just as they would act "contra quoscunque alios infideles scripturas adulterantes, sicuti antea pro ymaginibus et consecracione aquarum fecerunt" (Březová, p. 467). These points had been attacked in early 1417 and it may be that Koranda was referring to the radical triumph of the Synod of 1418; on these points, as well as on the question of a simplified rite of mass, the Taborites appealed to the authority of Jakoubek.

Tabor could find no better way of reacting to events than by relapsing into quietism (and tacitly enjoying Tabor's protection) or by breaking out into the kind of lunatic excess characteristic of the Münster Anabaptists a century later. It was from the latter type of "reform" that the University saved the radical movement in 1417 and 1418.

WOODMERE, NEW YORK