

# Confession and Nation in the Era of Reformations

Central Europe in Comparative Perspective



Edited by  
Eva Doležalová and Jaroslav Pánek





CONFESSION  
AND NATION  
IN THE ERA  
OF REFORMATIONS

CENTRAL EUROPE  
IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

EDITED BY  
EVA DOLEŽALOVÁ AND JAROSLAV PÁNEK

INSTITUTE OF HISTORY  
PRAGUE 2011

Peer-reviewed by:

Prof. PhDr. Marie Bláhová, DrSc. and PhDr. Pavel Král, Ph.D.

Scientific editor:

Prof. PhDr. Eva Semotanová, DrSc.

ISBN 978-80-7286-180-4

© Institute of History  
of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, v. v. i., 2011

## CONTENTS

Jaroslav P á n e k Foreword .....	7
Robert B. P y n s e n t Czech Nationalism after Dalimil and before Huss .....	9
František Š m a h e l The English Rising of 1381, Wyclif and Lollards in the Czech point of view .....	35
Anne H u d s o n Aspects of Tradition in English Wycliffism .....	53
Eva D o l e ž a l o v á National and religious aspects of the Czech reform movement in the 14 <sup>th</sup> and 15 <sup>th</sup> centuries and of the Hussite revolution in the mirror of Western historiography .....	63
Martyn R a d y Jiskra, Hussitism and Slovakia .....	77
Robert Š i m ů n e k Toleration from necessity or from indifference? The role of faith in South Bohemia in the late Middle Ages .....	91
Petr V o r e l Nationality and confession in the political life under the Jagiellonian dynasty (Contribution by Vilém of Pernštejn to the formation of a new societal model) .....	113
C. Scott D i x o n Martin Luther and the German Nation: The Reformation and the Roots of Nationalism .....	123

Jaroslav P á n e k	
Nation and Confession in the Czech Lands in the pre-White Mountain Period .....	139
R. J. W. E v a n s	
Language and Politics: Bohemia in International Context, 1409–1627 .....	155
Jaroslav M i l l e r	
Legitimizing War: National Past as an Instrument of Protestant Propa- ganda in England and the Holy Roman Empire .....	183
Eva K o w a l s k á	
Confessional Exile and National Identity: The Slovak Case .....	197
Svatava R a k o v á	
Toleration as Principle or Necessity? The Case of the British Colonies in Seventeenth Century North America.....	209
Index.....	229

## FOREWORD

The *Forum of British, Czech and Slovak Historians* was founded in 2000 thanks to the initiative of a leading British historian, Robert J.W. Evans, the Regius Professor at the University of Oxford, with the support of the Czech Republic Embassy in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Its main task became the creation of a platform for comparative research into the history of Central Europe in juxtaposition with the history and historiography of Great Britain. The inspiring force of this endeavour was manifested shortly afterwards by the emergence of *Young Forum*, an association of young historians studying in the United Kingdom the history of Central European countries.

The *Forum of British, Czech and Slovak Historians* made it possible for Czech and Slovak scholars to form close scholarly contacts with British historians and provided opportunity to the younger generation of British historians to gain deeper understanding of not only Czech and Slovak but broader Central European issues. The main publication outcomes of this cooperation are collective monographs devoted to particular key themes of contemporary European historiography. While the first monograph, edited by R.J.W. Evans and Mark Cornwall, was devoted to nationalism and fascism in the twentieth century, the present second publication is dedicated to religious and national (in the ethnic sense) issues at the turn of the medieval and early modern era.

The Historical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic thanks their British colleagues, especially Professor R.J.W. Evans and also Mark Cornwall, his successor in the leadership on the British side of the *Forum*, but also all the other co-authors of this book, for their participation in this work. Thanks are also due to Professor Petr Vorel, Dean of the Faculty of Arts, University of Pardubice, and Dr. František Šebek, Director of the Museum of East Bohemia in Pardubice. It was their merit that the debates that laid intellectual foundation for this publication could take place in the beautiful Renaissance castle of the Pernštejn family.

Jaroslav Pánek





## Czech Nationalism after Dalimil and before Huss

*Robert B. Pynsent*

I am concerned here with the period from Dalimil's creation of the ideological basis for Czech mass nationalism near the beginning of a flowering of vernacular literature to the writing and preaching activity of John Huss, whose followers brought about a fairly speedy devastation of Czech literary culture, which began to revive only in the seventeenth century. I will write chiefly about one writer, Přebík Pulkava of Radení (d. c. 1380), whose national sentiments fall rather uncomfortably between those of Dalimil and Huss, Dalimil the positively Fichtean nationalist<sup>1</sup> and Huss the patriot.

<sup>1</sup> The fact that all the essential points contained in Fichte's *Reden an die deutsche Nation*, except the notion that to be a nation a people must have a literature, are to be found in Dalimil is discussed in a lecture printed as R. Pynsent, 'Die Dalimil-Chronik als polymytischer Text (Dalimil–Fichte–Havel)', in E. Behring, L. Richter and W.F. Schwarz, eds., *Geschichtliche Mythen in den Literaturen und Kulturen Ostmittel- und Südosteuropas* (Stuttgart, 1999), pp. 194–231. That the term 'nationalism' was invented only in 1774, by Herder (see P. Alter, *Nationalismus* [Frankfurt am Main, 1985], p. 12) does not dismay one. 'Consumption' is, after all, now variously analysed as tuberculosis or emphysema or arsenic-poisoning (from green paint).

Because social scientists, most effectively those associated with the London School of Economics (particularly Kedourie, Plamenatz, Gellner, Anthony D. Smith) and Marxist historians (particularly Hobsbawm and Hroch), both groups wedded to the ideologically loaded and intellectually questionable concept 'modernisation', have made nationalism their preserve, it is still regarded as somewhat anachronistic to speak of nationalism in the Middle Ages. That bewitchingly erudite and always circumspect historian Susan Reynolds has not helped either by her invention of the term 'regnal': 'Lacking an adjective in common use derived from "kingdom", Anglophone medievalists usually write of the solidarities of medieval kingdoms as "national". Although medieval "regalism" had much in common with the underlying theories of modern nationalism [...], this usage begs important questions. I shall therefore use the word "regnal" instead'.<sup>2</sup> As far as the meaning of *regnum* is concerned one might remember that the first chronicler of Bohemia, Cosmas of Prague, used the word to mean the Duchy. Kidd denies the possibility of nationalism existing even later; he writes apodictically that 'it is clear that nationalist thinking was alien to the early modern era'.<sup>3</sup> That had, however, been refuted previously by Greenfeld, who combines the social scientists' association of nationalism with modernisation (although nationalism predates 'the development of every significant component of modernisation'<sup>4</sup>)

<sup>2</sup> S. Reynolds, 'Medieval *Origines Gentium* and the community of the Realm', *History*, 68 (1983), p. 382. In this article Reynolds points out that Regino of Prüm (d. 915), one of Cosmas's sources, was the first known medieval writer to have stated, in his *Chronicon*, that language (vernacular) was a key element separating one community from another: 'he took it for granted that different peoples (*diversae nationes populorum*) differed from each other in descent, manners, language, and laws (*genere, moribus, lingua, legibus*)' (ibid., pp. 383–84). Regino's statement runs 'Just as different peoples differ between themselves in descent, manners, language and laws so the holy and universal church throughout the world, although joined in the unity of faith nevertheless varies in its ecclesiastical customs among them'. Cited in A. Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood. Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 195. It appears that in fourteenth-century Bohemia language has become the primary marker of a people: Dalimil uses *jazyk* (tongue; he normally uses *řěč* to mean 'language') to mean nation, in, I submit, an entirely modern sense. For the employment of *gezung* and *zunge* in the early fifteenth century, see F. Šmahel, *Idea národa v husitských Čechách*, 2<sup>nd</sup>, augmented edn (Praha, 2000), p. 280. It has been suggested that in 1295 Edward I of England's use of *lingua* when, expecting the French to attack, he spoke of the French wanting to 'exterminate the English language', was semantically equivalent to the modern use of nation. See T. Turville-Petre, *England the Nation. Language, Literature and National Identity* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 9, 24.

<sup>3</sup> C. Kidd, *British Identities before Nationalism. Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600–1800* (Cambridge, 1999), p. 5.

<sup>4</sup> L. Greenfeld, *Nationalism. Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge MA and London, 1992), p. 21.

and a well-argued conviction that nationalism began in England in the early sixteenth century, when the 'birth of the English nation was not the birth of a nation; it was the birth of the nations, the birth of nationalism'.<sup>5</sup> None the less, she avers, 'the idea of the "nation" [...] forms *the constitutive element of modernity*' and 'nationalism is a product or reflection of major components of modernization. Rather than define nationalism by its modernity, I see modernity as defined by nationalism'.<sup>6</sup> Greenfeld has attempted to come to a compromise with the social scientists while endeavouring to persuade them that so-called modern nationalism, what I would call Dalimilian nationalism, began at the very beginning of the early modern period, not in the Enlightenment.

It was, however, a theologian's book that really set the cat among the social scientist pigeons,<sup>7</sup> Hastings's passionate *The Construction of Nationhood*, which though overtly directed primarily at Hobsbawm also dismisses, quite kindly, Greenfeld. Like her, Hastings considers England the prototype for national consciousness and nationalism. His argument, for making England the first, though he will later turn to various nations and 'ethnicities' chiefly in Europe and Africa, runs as follows: 'ethnicities naturally turn into nations or integral elements within nations at the point when their specific vernacular moves from an oral to written usage to the extent that it is being regularly employed for the production of literature, and particularly for the translation of the Bible'.<sup>8</sup> Clearly, this argument helps my own in this essay, for if we omit devotional poetry, Czech literature, including translation of parts of the Bible, particularly the Psalter, is beginning towards the end of the thirteenth century, not long before Dalimil; in the non-devotional works, odd brief passages of a nationalistic hue do occur earlier than Dalimil. Hastings takes a sense of nationhood back to the Venerable Bede with his 'historia nostrae nationis', a concept he does not find in English before the fourteenth century<sup>9</sup> (which is also pertinent to my essay); he maintains that England was a nation-state before the Norman invasion, possessing 'all the characteristics required for nationhood by Anthony Smith'.<sup>10</sup> He gives ample

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 23.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>7</sup> It engendered a special issue of the journal *Nations and Nationalism*, 9 (2003), 1, entitled *Symposium on Adrian Hastings*.

<sup>8</sup> Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood*, p. 12.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 42.

social historical and literary evidence for this. Smith's *Chosen Peoples* constitutes a riposte to Hastings which develops some of the latter's insights into, say, Ethiopian and Armenian forms of statehood and national myth. Even though he still insists that nationalism cannot exist in pre-modern times,<sup>11</sup> and even if he persistently maintains that various elements of 'ethnohistory', symbols and beliefs, often served to help create nationalism in its proper age, but do not demonstrate an earlier existence of the ideology, the reader gains the impression that Smith is beginning to wobble. Perhaps students of history and even students of literature will soon topple the social scientist dogma – after all, the social scientists have certainly provided the tools for students of history and literature to describe and interpret pre-modern nationalism.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, in the Czech case, given the fairly large number of extant manuscripts of both Dalimil and Pulkava, and the topical additions, or just glosses, made to the *Ur-Dalimil*, there is no doubt that we may speak of a nationalist movement. By movement I mean a body of people sharing the same (ideological) aims and striving to broadcast their ideas over an extended period of time.

I distinguish between 'nationalism' and 'patriotism', even though the tendency today is to subsume the latter under the former – not only because it can be difficult to draw a precise line between the two concepts, but also because in American English today, and historically in British English, too, 'patriotism' tends to subsume 'nationalism' rather than the other way round. Greenfeld, for example, states that in her book the concept 'nationalism' does not include 'the politically activist, xenophobic variety of national patriotism, which [the word] frequently designates'.<sup>13</sup> Hechter's understanding of 'patriotism' is only comprehensible if one takes his taxonomy of nationalisms into account: state-building nationalism (the attempt of rulers to assimilate culturally different territories in one state); peripheral nationalism (resisting such assimilation or attempting to secede from that state); irredentist nationalism ('incorporating territories of an adjacent state occupied principally by co-nationals'); and unification nationalism (aiming to

<sup>11</sup> For example, 'it is surely anachronistic to speak of nationalism, the ideological movement, in early fifteenth-century France' or 'pre-modern ages [...] knew nothing of nationalism and its theories of a world of authentic self-realizing nations', A.D. Smith, *Chosen Peoples* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 111 and 219.

<sup>12</sup> Turville-Petre uses social scientists to demonstrate the correctness of his argument that full-blooded nationalism was evident in late thirteenth and in fourteenth-century literature in English, particularly in chronicles. His *England the Nation*, for all its persuasive quotations and interpretations, does not actually demonstrate that the ideology demanded by Smith or Hobsbawm was actually present.

<sup>13</sup> Greenfeld, *Nationalism*, p. 3.

merge two territories politically, but not culturally divided). With this in mind, patriotism, defined as ‘the desire to raise the prestige and power of one’s own nation state relative to rivals in the international system’, is not a ‘form of nationalism at all, for here the boundaries of the nation and governance unit are already congruent. [...] Since few states, if any, qualify as nation states, patriotism [...] hardly exists’.<sup>14</sup> Patriotism may, indeed, normally not be a form of nationalism, but it will also not normally involve either aggression or the desire to outshine some or all other nations. The difference between nationalism and patriotism is rather similar (they are not exact analogues) to the difference between self-importance and dignity, and even the blurred conceptual boundary seems to work, since one can stand on one’s dignity.<sup>15</sup> The simplest way to look at the relationship is,<sup>16</sup> however, to understand nationalism as ideologised patriotism. That is what really lies behind the distinction made by the nationalist Ján Kollár two centuries ago: ‘Love of one’s mother-country [patriotism] is something instinctual, a blind natural drive. Love of one’s nation and nationality [nationalism] is more a product of reason and culture [*Bildung*]. One may find love of mother-country even in plants and animals’.<sup>17</sup> He too, however, associates unbecoming behaviour with patriotism rather than nationalism. In his case that is logical: for a man of his times, the human being should always be trying to dominate the animal within. Judging him by Kollár’s distinction, Dalimil is chiefly a nationalist, but also exhibits a nasty patriotic streak. Though I will not here

<sup>14</sup> M. Hechter, *Containing Nationalism* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 15–17.

<sup>15</sup> Self-importance is a negative concept, but much of self-importance consists of ambition, which is not normally a negative concept outside the world of crusty old Brits. Nationalism can, however, hardly be called a negative concept, since it appears to have functioned as a fairly efficient creator of viable socio-economic units, in most of Europe at least. What nationalism is rather frequently has little to do with what is done in the name of nationalism, but I shall come to noses later. Greenfeld believes that nationalism constitutes the very root of democracy. The Czech interwar thinker Rádl believes much the same of what he calls Western, civic, nationalism. See T. Hermann, *Emanuel Rádl a české dějepisectví. Kritika českého dějepisectví ve sporu o smysl českých dějin* (Praha, 2002), pp. 137–38, 148. For an intelligent, lively history of patriotism, see M. Viroli, *For Love of Country. An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism* (Oxford, 1995). The trouble with nationalism is that its manifestations are frequently comic to anyone who does not share the ideology or the mythology supporting that ideology in a given people.

<sup>16</sup> For safety’s sake I had better say ‘for a Briton’. The problem with the Czech *vlastenectví*, let alone Fichte’s *Vaterlandsliebe*, seems slightly more difficult.

<sup>17</sup> J. Kollár, *Über die literarische Wechelseitigkeit zwischen den verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slawischen Nation* (Praha, 1837; corrected edition, 1844), reprinted in Jan Kollár, *Rozpravy o slovanské vzájemnosti*, ed. M. Weingart (Praha, 1929), p. 77.

discuss Dalimil in any detail at all, I shall have to refer back to him because his influence was so strong.

The work I concentrate on, Pulkava's chronicle, was completed in 1374, sixty years after Dalimil completed his chronicle, and very nearly thirty years before Huss became preacher in the Bethlehem Chapel in Prague. Palacký considers Pulkava the scholar and Dalimil something of a dangerous fabricator – although I harbour few doubts that Dalimil's conception of Czech history influenced Palacký's own. Pulkava is very much a nationalist. The fact that Graus spends so little time on that in his book on medieval nation-building amongst the Czechs and Poles is surprising. He does mention Pulkava's Slav-consciousness and his emotional use of the concept *patria*,<sup>18</sup> but appears generally not to have considered the text at all imaginatively. Kersken possibly surprises one even more than Graus in that, implicitly comparing Pulkava with Dalimil, he denies that any 'early Czech nationalism' is evident in Pulkava. On the other hand, Kersken is right to lay more emphasis on the author's Slavism than Graus had.<sup>19</sup>

Pulkava, together with someone at Charles IV's court, most probably the king emperor himself, wrote his chronicle in Latin (14 MSS extant) or translated someone else's Latin chronicle into Czech (16 MSS extant). I doubt that the same author did both.<sup>20</sup> In the Latin, for example, Denmark is to the north, in the Czech to the south. The chronicle was used by historians as a reliable source into the seventeenth, indeed the early eighteenth century. It has six redactions, a large number of manuscripts survive, and two German translations were made of it in the Middle Ages, just as two were made of Dalimil. I use primarily the Czech text for three reasons. First, it is particularly this, sometimes mangled, text that inspired other vernacular writers and that embellished Czech national mythology. Second, because the passages of verse<sup>21</sup> in the Czech version of this prose chronicle place Pulkava firmly among the writers who were establishing the norm in fourteenth-century vernacular literature. Third, and from a theoretical point

<sup>18</sup> F. Graus, *Die Nationenbildung der Westslaven im Mittelalter* (Sigmaringen, 1980), pp. 133 and 227.

<sup>19</sup> N. Kersken, *Geschichtsschreibung im Europa der 'nationes'. Nationalgeschichtliche Gesamtdarstellungen im Mittelalter* (Köln – Weimar – Wien, 1995), pp. 602–03 and 614.

<sup>20</sup> The convention remains, however, that Pulkava is the author of both the Latin and the Czech. See, for example, F. Kutnar and J. Marek, *Přehledné dějiny českého a slovenského dějepisectví. Od počátků národní kultury až do sklonku třicátých let 20. století*, 2<sup>nd</sup> revd edn (Praha, 1997), p. 41.

<sup>21</sup> Lehár's statement that the translator of Pulkava's chronicle had 'no literary ambitions and translates prose into prose' is misleading. See J. Lehár, *Nejstarší česká epika. Dalimilova kronika, Alexandreida, první veršované legendy* (Praha, 1983), p. 33.

of view most important, given Dalimil's approach to the relationship between language and nation and given the social inclusiveness of his delineation of nationality,<sup>22</sup> it makes sense to look only at vernacular works. In fact, unfortunately, I shall have to refer sparingly to some Latin works, especially for the background to Pulkava's writing. The expression of Dalimilesque, or 'modern', nationalism is to be found largely in vernacular texts. The same thing was going on in fourteenth-century Bohemia as in fourteenth-century England, where only just before Dalimil the anonymous author of *Cursor Mundi* (26,000 octosyllabic rhyming couplets) declares: 'Þis ilk [same] boke it es translate / In to Inglis tong to rede / For the loue of Inglis lede [people], / Inglis lede of Ingland, / For the comunat to understand [For the common people to understand]'.<sup>23</sup>

Charles IV's first wife, Blanche of Valois, may indeed have decided to learn German rather than Czech in order to make herself understood in Bohemia, but in fact, despite or because of the increased influence of German in Charles's time, vernacular literature began to flourish. Furthermore, the authors belonged to all three estates. The majority of this vernacular literature displayed no nationalism or even patriotism, the verse chivalrous romances, social satires, moral or devotional disquisitions, lawyers' infernal romances, most legends of saints, and apocrypha like the life of Adam or the Gospel of Nicodemus. None the less there was a lot of nationalism about in *belles-lettres*, and this nationalism referred to a people, not

<sup>22</sup> See Pynsent, 'Die Dalimil-Chronik als polymytischer Text'. Dalimil's Bohemia also does not quite fit with Hastings's definition of a nation-state, 'which identifies itself in terms of one specific nation whose people are not seen simply as "subjects" of the sovereign but as a horizontally bounded society to whom the state in a sense belongs. There is thus an identity of character between state and people' (Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood*, p. 3). Although Dalimil is insistent that a king must always be elected, and so at least the duke or king theoretically rises from amongst his subjects, he also points out the conflict immanent in the separation of *hrad* (castle, normally taken to mean royal castle) and the *obec* (community, normally taken to mean community of nobles). In Dalimil's day, *obec* also meant the community of people living on a lord's land, and as elsewhere, the community had obligations to the lord and the lord to the community, especially as far as common land, grazing or maresfields were concerned. The late thirteenth-century (incomplete) book of legal procedure, *Knihá rožmberská* (The Rosenberg book), the earliest Czech vernacular law-book, two articles suggest that the national community was just such as Hastings demands. Under article 115 we find instructions on how the king should sue for damages if someone has interfered with his hunting land. In the index of procedures under article 209, we find a statement on the witnesses necessary for suing the king or queen in matters of hereditary property. V. Brandl, ed., *Knihá rožmberská. Kritické vydání* (Praha, 1872), pp. 64 and 86.

<sup>23</sup> Quoted in T. Hahn, 'Early Middle English' in David Wallace, ed., *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature* (Cambridge, 1999) p. 89.



to one estate, not to one or more institutions. In stating that, I am not ignoring the fact that a Czech commentator, Matthias of Janov (c.1350–1393), towards the end of the fourteenth century regarded nationality as a belonging to a given crown. Matthias considers nationalism the work of the Antichrist and the most important reason for the papal schism. He is bitter, almost sarcastic, in his *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (completed 1392/93):

Thus the French, rejoicing at being subjects of their king, looked down with manly scorn on others as if they were animals. Similarly, the English, almost too united, and their king, were ready to fight and subjugate other Christians. [...] and so too the Germans and Bohemians, Hungarians and Poles. Being divided amongst themselves, all these behaved towards their fellow-Christians as if they were aliens, from a different family: not only did they selfishly love themselves, but they also [...] subjugated and insulted different fellow-Christians.<sup>24</sup>

This egoistic self-love as exhibited primarily in Dalimil, but also, more diffusely and less aggressively in Pulkava, comes to a climax in the Hussite period. By then even the vocabulary and the semantics of nationalism are becoming sophisticated, and the term *jazyk přirozený* (native nation, nation you [Czech lords] were born into)<sup>25</sup> implies haematic nationalism. Nationality is in the blood, immutable, indelible.

Dalimil's nationalism was largely ethnically exclusive, based on language, but did also have a territorial dimension. Pulkava's is ethnically inclusive because of its essentially imperialist nature (dictated by the king emperor), and inconsistently Slav rather than just Bohemia-centred. Dalimil's was consistently misoteutonic, Pulkava's, not quite so consistently, misopolonic and misohungaric. Dalimil's nationalism grew out of a conviction that the Bohemians were in a state of rapid decay,<sup>26</sup> Pulkava's out of a conviction of the spiritual and material affluence of Bohemia. Dalimil expresses his basic nationalist principle, a principle which could apply equally to non-exclusive patriotism, through the words of the misoteutonic

<sup>24</sup> Matěj z Janova, *Výbor z Pravidel Starého i Nového zákona*, trans. by R. Schenk (Praha, 1954), p. 160.

<sup>25</sup> In the verse version of 'Žaloba koruny české k Bohu na krále uherského a sbor kostnický', in J. Daňhelka, ed., *Husitské skladby Budyšínského rukopisu* (Praha, 1952), p. 50.

<sup>26</sup> Theorists of nationalism, in particular Smith, consider the sense of decay normally to be a starting-point of Enlightenment-Romantic nationalisms. The early Czech Revivalists' submission to decay mythology is well documented in F. Kutnar, *Obrozenské vlastenectví a nacionalismus. Příspěvek k národnému a společenskému obsahu české doby obrozenské* (Praha, 2003), passim.

Duke Soběslav: ‘The good man fosters his nation; / the faithless has no concern for his nation; [...] the country is everyone’s mother; / I do not consider anyone who does not wish her well to be virtuous’.<sup>27</sup> Pulkava would agree with that.

The new aspects of Pulkava compared with earlier vernacular writers, and in many cases also Latin writers, consist in, first, efforts to transmit Charles IV’s dynastic ideology and, second, the imaginative slants he puts on historical events and the characteristics of humanity. He takes his chronicle only up to 1330, the death of John of Luxembourg’s wife, Elizabeth Přemyslid, Charles’s mother; his account of John’s reign is sketchy, because his intention had been to write a history of the Přemyslid dynasty to emphasize the legitimacy of Charles as King of Bohemia. His expression of Slav consciousness serves Charles’s purposes in wishing to consider his Bohemia the successor state to Greater Moravia.<sup>28</sup> Perhaps because, unlike Dalimil, he manifests no express interest in the common people, but perhaps out of ignorance, he disregards the Slavness of the inhabitants of northern Hungary. Although he explicitly abhors the conflict between Přemyslid brothers, cousins and uncles, as often as not when a Přemyslid ruler does something disreputable, Pulkava blames that on bad, or deceitful, advisers. Pulkava includes Charles’s own *vita* of St Wenceslas in his chronicle, perhaps on the author’s orders; it was important for the priest-loving Charles to assert his impeccable Christian credentials by emphasizing he had a great saint among his forebears. Apparitions of Wenceslas ensuring Czech military triumphs also play a role. On the other hand, the treatment of St Adalbert, especially the translation of his uncorrupt remains from Gnesen to Prague is also treated in considerable detail, and St Procopius and the Slavonic Sázava monastery do not even receive the space given them by Dalimil. None the less, Pulkava, who is an even greater etymologizer

<sup>27</sup> ‘[...] Dobrý svůj jazyk plodí, / nevěrný o svém jazyku nerodí [...] Země jest máteř každého, / ktož jí nepřeje, nemám jeho za šlechtného’. J. Daňhelka, K. Hádek, B. Havránek and N. Kvítková, eds., *Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila* (Praha, 1988), vol. 2, p. 179.

<sup>28</sup> One does not forget that Charles founded the ‘Slavonic’ monastery of Emaus in 1347 (consecrated 1372), which he peopled with Benedictines from Croatia and Dalmatia. This foundation was intended primarily to underline the existence of an unbroken tradition from the Greater Moravian crown to Charles’s, but also, theoretically, to be a centre for missionary activity among Slavs outside the Bohemian Crown Lands. Actually, Dalimil had been the first to suggest that the Kingdom of Bohemia remained firmly in the tradition of Greater Moravia. See Kersken, *Geschichtsschreibung im Europa der “nationes”*, pp. 636–37. Pulkava, however, makes much more of it. Analogously he alters previous versions of the dynastic foundation myth, the summoning of Přemysl by Libussa’s horse, to make it a symbolic prefiguring of the dying out of the Přemyslids redeemed by a glorious ruler (Charles).

of place-names than Dalimil, does lend onomastic support to Caroline zealotry. Here the Latin is slightly clearer than the Czech, but the idea is that the Czech word for God, *boh* (*Bůh*), is etymologically associated with the Latin word *Bo(h)emia*.<sup>29</sup> Pulkava also derives the word 'Slav' from *slovo* (word), the first so to do in Czech literature. That is also false, but many still believe him in the twenty-first century. One notes that these two etymologies appear in the introduction and allude to St John, to the statement, 'In the beginning was the Word, the Word was with God, and the Word was God'. In other words, Pulkava suggests that the new testament of Slavdom begins in Bohemia; furthermore, he suggests immediately that, in some way or another, the Czechs are a mystically chosen nation. One cannot, however, maintain that there is any consistent messianism in the chronicle as a whole.

The association of Bohemia with God and the Slavs with the Word also has secular significance, a significance that comports with Charles's imperial dignity and designs. Pulkava's version of the distinctly Mosaic arrival of the father of the Bohemian nation<sup>30</sup> in a fashion alludes not only to the promised land (with the stock image, with flowing victuals, ever since Cosmas), but, again, also to a chosen people. Pulkava takes straight from Dalimil the motive the latter attributes to Forefather Čech's coming to the promised land, that is, murder. In both Dalimil and Pulkava Čech had come from Croatia, but Pulkava, more or less didactically, points out that the original (after Babel and Byzantium) Slav lands comprised more than just Croatia; he includes all South Slav lands from Bulgaria to Carniola and Styria. This is actually intellectually difficult, or simply inconsistent. The South Slavs have the Word, but not God, and their lands represent the Captivity or the wilderness, if Pulkava were being consistent. Forefather Čech, linked with both the Word and God, has six brothers in Dalimil, no precise number in Pulkava. In both chronicles one of them, named Lech by Pulkava, soon leaves

<sup>29</sup> 'Dicitur enim Boemia a *boh*, quod Deus interpretatur in lingua slouanica. Hac itaque interpretatione a nomine Dei Boemi dicti sunt'. *Cronica Przibonis dicti Pulkaua*, ed. by J. Emler, in J. Emler, ed., *Fontes rerum bohemicarum*, vol. V, (Praha, 1893), p. 4. Přibík Pulkava z Radetína, *Kronika*, J. Gebauer, ed., in *ibid.*, p. 212, runs thus, however: 'Nazvána jest tato země Bohemia latině od jmene božieho; neb v slovanském jazyku od toho jmene Boemia buoh se jmenuje, i v českém také.' (This land is called Bohemia in Latin from the name of God; for in Slavonic *buoh* [God] is so called from this name Bohemia, in Czech too.)

<sup>30</sup> In Cosmas his name is 'Boemus', in the first vernacular chronicle, Dalimil's, 'Čech' (i.e. untransliterated 'Czech') as in the Czech Pulkava. Interestingly enough, in the Latin Pulkava the author uses the form 'Czech', and so does not associate him directly with God.

Bohemia, and goes north to found the Polish nation. Members of Lech's family then establish Rus', Pomerania, Cashubia, and Denmark (*sic*), while members of Čech's entourage establish Moravia, Meissen, Brandenburg and Bautzen, and 'Lusatia'. All the lands concerned had, of course, been unpopulated before these God-and-Word-linked Slavs arrived. Through divine Providence, then, Bohemia gives birth to all Slavdom north of the South Slav lands. That is useful propaganda for the acquisitive Charles IV, especially since all these northern Slavs are by origin holy. Pulkava's account of the dispersion of the two 'halves' of the Slavonic people has a further function, more conventionally nationalist: according to Pulkava's lists there are nine Slav tribes south of Bohemia and nine to the north. The Bohemians are at the centre (as the tenth or nineteenth, but still the central, tribe). Being at the centre has both theological/ecclesiastical and political meaning. Since Jerusalem was almost always considered the centre of the world, Pulkava may be suggesting that Bohemia is a New Jerusalem. He may, however, also be referring to contemporary political reality, Prague, thus Bohemia, at the centre of the Holy Roman Empire. Both these meanings would have appealed to his master, Charles.

From the literary historical point of view, the most important of Pulkava's additions to the Czech version are the passages in verse. With these passages he both refers back to the conventions of older Latin chronicles of Bohemia and in their subject matter associates himself with contemporary chivalrous romances, particularly those written in prose. The Latin Pulkava has only one passage in verse. The early twelfth-century *Cronica Boëmorum* by Cosmas of Prague (c.1045–1125) is written in rhymed prose, but occasionally the author bursts into hexameters. Peter of Zittau's (c.1275–1339) *Chronicon Aulae Regiae* (finishes 1338) abounds in alliterative Leonine hexameters, some of which constitute comments on human behaviour not unlike those in Pulkava's rhymstering. The author of the verse Alexander Book (*Alexandreida*, 1290s) employs a device analogous to Pulkava's; this high-style work in regular octosyllabic couplets employs tercets for comments on human nature or, indeed, on politics; these tercets often consist of proverbial sayings. Pulkava's verse is as loosely based on the would-be octosyllabic couplet as Dalimil's. In the latter the number of syllables varies from 5 to 23; in the possibly earlier chivalrous romance *Vévoda Arnošt* (Duke Ernest, early fourteenth century?) line lengths vary between 5 and 16, in the late fourteenth-century *Tristram a Izalda* between 5 and 17; Pulkava's lines have anything between 5 and 20 syllables, and so abide by the norms of Czech non-high-style narrative poetry.

Robert B. P y n s e n t

His interpolated verse introduces a popular element common in vernacular narratives, but unnecessary for the schooled audience of the Latin chronicle. His choice of proverbial sayings often tallies with those of other writers. For example, in the late fourteenth-century *Laurin* we find a double version of ‘don’t count your chickens before they are hatched’: ‘Don’t praise the day when the sun is rising, / for you don’t know what weather will come; / don’t the praise the food till you leave the banquet.’<sup>31</sup> Pulkava uses just one couplet, the shortest verse interpolation in the chronicle, here as a comment on Emperor Henry II’s failure to vanquish Duke Břetislav: ‘Don’t praise, old fellow, the banquet / before you ride home with honour.’<sup>32</sup> The first rhymed interpolation comes in the preface, and begins like most of them, with a statement that the author is repeating what the sages say. This ten-line poem has parallels in other works, too. Pulkava’s version claims to be a comment on the fact that one should know the history of one’s own country before that of others. In fact, it expresses something else: first, there’s no place like home and, second, a suspicion of the foreign and the nobility: ‘But the sages say / that he who wants to preserve his health / should enquire after news in his own country, / pay no attention to Italian cuisine. / But won’t he who wants to be called noble, / wants to sail the seas, / to be in a foreign land / where many have great troubles / and assume manners / which this chronicle will not sing of.’<sup>33</sup> One might even imagine that Pulkava here suggests the same as Dalimil had, that foreign manners bring decay and that he is writing of the sturdy old Přemyslid days. A sophisticated parody dispute from the 1390s, *Podkoní a žák* (The groom and the student), that satirises all three estates from a rebellious intellectual’s point of view, uses three of Pulkava’s lines to satirise the comfortable burgher mentality. After describing the nocturnal pub brawl of a courtier and a budding cleric, the burgher narrator declares, ‘But it is better to go without such things, / to do what one should at night, that is sleep / and wait at home for news.’<sup>34</sup> A gently patriotic prose romance, *Bruncvík* (probably very beginning of the fifteenth century), portraying the Duke of Bohemia going out

<sup>31</sup> ‘Laurin (Tuto se počíná o Jetřichovi Berúnkém)’, in J. Loriš, ed., *Sborník hraběte Baworowského* (Praha, 1903), p. 388.

<sup>32</sup> Pulkava, *Kronika*, p. 240.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 211.

<sup>34</sup> ‘Podkoní a žák’, in J. Hrabák, ed., *Staročeské satiry Hradeckého rukopisu a Smilovy školy* (Praha, 1962), pp. 128–29.

on adventures 'for the honour of his Czech nation',<sup>35</sup> vanquishing the underworld, having been allowed into the fiendish place by sexual union with Europa, a seductive mermaid, uses the same phrases positively to express a goal of knightly adventure. The hero, Bruncvík, muses to himself on landing on an island strewn with human and animal bones: 'He who sits at home in his room avoids misadventure and has nothing to talk about, but he who experiences adventure can tell others about them afterwards.'<sup>36</sup> One perhaps gains the impression that Pulkava was a stolid fellow concerned chiefly with his *borborygmus*. That is supported by another piece of interpolated verse where he comments on the fact that Vratislav's son, Břetislav, had mocked old people for their timidity: 'My son, abide by the counsel of old men, / by listening to them you will avoid conflict; / he who travels along old / well-trodden paths / will not go astray. / And if you listen carefully / to what a wise old man says, / you will have not a few great victories; / and if you do not allow young gales to blow into your ears, you will become renowned as wise.'<sup>37</sup> Another, twelve-line, poem commenting on the institution of the Prior of Vyšehrad as state chancellor, plays on two proverbial sayings, nothing is so bad that it cannot turn into something good (every cloud has a silver lining) and 'man proposes, but God disposes'.<sup>38</sup> That tells us little about Pulkava except that he is careful to temper his already muted optimism with a certain fatalism. Another, briefer proverbial poem comments on the fact that a duke of Bohemia had returned three towns to the family which constituted the great villains of Czech medieval history, the Vršovci: 'If you want to trap wolves, / first give them the chance to claw carrion; / and when they have frequently eaten of it without obstruction, / alas, they will have to lose their pelts.'<sup>39</sup> The aesthetic function of these lines, and perhaps of the other verse passages also, is to enliven the often dry narrative. One cannot claim the same for the translation of the Latin verse version of Libussa's prophecy about the future city of Prague. Three lines in Latin become six rather clumsy lines in Czech.<sup>40</sup> Pulkava is worse at translating verse

<sup>35</sup> 'Bruncvík (Počíná se řeč pěkná o Bruncvíkovi)', in Loriš, ed., *Sborník hraběte Baworowského*, p. 25.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28.

<sup>37</sup> Pulkava, *Kronika*, p. 248.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 249.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 255.

<sup>40</sup> 'Viziť já město, / jehož slovutnost nebes dotýká, věz to, / v lesěť má posazenie, / jehožto od tohoto miesta vzdálenie / za třidceti honov jest cíle. / Toť Vltava dělí svým rozdělem směle'. *Ibid.*, p. 214. One notes that only the first two lines of Pulkava bear any resemblance to the prophecy in Dalimil's:

than writing his own undistinguished proverbial jingles. Naturally, one cannot know whether all the jingles were actually written by Pulkava. Still his rendering of the Latin verse does call to mind the *explicit* in the early fourteenth-century adaptation of *Dicta Catonis/Disticha moralia*, where the Czech author apologises for making three lines out of the Latin two;<sup>41</sup> in fact, that author turns the distichs into three, four and even five octosyllabic couplets.

Where the interpolated verse interests us because it brings Pulkava into the mainstream of Czech fourteenth-century *belles-lettres*, two episodes in his chronicle interest us both as literary historians and historians of nationalism. One of the great topoi of Czech national mythology, a topos I presume to rest on historical fact, is that huge enemy armies fled once they heard a Hussite army on the march singing a battle hymn. This represents the bellicose meaning of the patriotic saying, 'Co Čech, to muzikant' (Scratch a Czech and you'll find a fiddler). Pulkava provides evidence of precedents to such melodic victories. The first of them was lifted by the authors of the early nineteenth-century Forged Manuscripts presumably in order to demonstrate that Taborite military tradition was ancient. It concerns the Polish Duke Mieszko's (= Bolesław's) occupation of Prague in the early years of the eleventh century. The lively passage reminds one of Joshua before Jericho, though this time Poles rather than walls come a-tumbling down. Duke Udalrich (Oldřich) sends a knight with a trumpet to a hill overlooking Prague (Petrín/Strahov) and at midnight he starts blowing, together with his retinue; at the same time the Pragers begin shouting that the Poles are fleeing. When the Poles hear the trumpets and the Pragers' voices, they do indeed, flee, many trampling each other to death, and many falling off the Prague bridge and cracking their skulls.<sup>42</sup> The second episode concerns King Wenceslas I's putting down a Moravian rebellion. At or just before daybreak a Moravian lord loyal to the king has drums beaten in the hills and forests around enemy encampments. This drumming so frightens the foe that they flee.<sup>43</sup>

Perhaps such tales really do belong to patriotism rather than nationalism. Certainly one can imagine a receptive popular audience. That cannot be said of the centrepiece of the chronicle, the imperial nationalism, Pulkava's obedient

'Jáz jedno miesto vědě, / to bude slovatno po světu / jako slunce v svém osvětú', Daňhelka et al., eds., *Staročeska kronika tak řečeného Dalimila*, vol. 1, p. 149.

<sup>41</sup> See 'Kato', in E. Petřú, ed., *Ezopovy bajky, Katonova dvojverší, Rada otce synovi* (Brno, 1999), p. 199.

<sup>42</sup> Pulkava, *Kronika*, pp. 233–34.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 295.

employment of history to transmit the notion that Charles IV was the natural heir to an imagined empire that comprised most of central and eastern Europe. This message is inseparable from the expression of Slav consciousness, a consciousness that was not new in 1374. The German-born adoptive Bohemian Peter of Zittau, for example, comments on language as the binding force of nationhood in words he puts into the mouths of Polish nobles when the Czech Wenceslas II is crowned King of Poland: 'If the two nations speak similar dialects of the Slavonic language they will agree on a king and live in joy under one prince. For those who speak the same language usually embrace each other with firm bonds of love.'<sup>44</sup> About ten years before Pulkava's chronicle a verse legend of St Procopius was written, in whose prologue the author declares that he will be informing his audience about 'the Slavonic heritage',<sup>45</sup> and the very choice of the Sázava Monastery theme reflects Charles IV's political dreams. The low style of this legend suggests the author intends as socially broad an audience as Pulkava with the Czech version of his chronicle. For Pulkava, the mission of Cyril and Methodius to Greater Moravia is a major political event. He associates it with Charles IV's passion for holy relics by drawing Prague into the legend of Cyril's finding the tomb of St Clement. I do not know whether it was Pulkava himself who invented the story, or Charles IV, or some fawning priest at court. According to our chronicle, when Cyril 'left Moravia, he went to Bohemia and kept St Clement's body in the church at Vyšehrad for three years. Subsequently he took this holy body with him to Rome'.<sup>46</sup> Pulkava deals peremptorily with the fact that Greater Moravia rebelled against the Empire as embodied in Arnulf (East Frankish king 887–99, Emperor only from 896), by asserting that Svatopluk's warring against his 'lord' and 'godfather' was 'unjust'.<sup>47</sup> The Slav empire had to be shown to be fundamentally as loyal as its successor, Charles IV's. Pulkava is at pains to make Greater Moravia thoroughly Slav, and for this reason writes of 'Moravian or Slav' (*moravských a slovanských*),<sup>48</sup> as he had previously written of 'these same Slavs or Bohemians' (*ti jistí Slované neb Čechové*).<sup>49</sup> For Charles's imperialism

<sup>44</sup> Petr Žitavský, *Kronika zbraslavská*, ed. and trans. F. Heřmanský, (Praha, 1952), p. 199.

<sup>45</sup> 'Legenda o sv. Prokopu', in J. Hrabák and V. Krejčí, eds., *Dvě legendy z doby Karlovy* (Praha, 1959), p. 39.

<sup>46</sup> Pulkava, *Kronika*, p. 221.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 220.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 221.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 212.



and view of himself as successor, the following statement is crucial: ‘at that time the Duke of Bohemia was under the King of Moravia. At that time, too, the following two lands were also under the King of Moravia, Poland and Rus’ [*Rusko*].<sup>50</sup> This statement acquires a certain misopolonic irony with the account of the destruction of Greater Moravia where Pulkava writes that the empire had been plundered, destroyed, and divided up among Hungarians, Austrians and Poles.<sup>51</sup> He interprets the kinging of Duke Vratislav II in 1085, first, as a *de facto* official change in the constitutional relationship between Bohemia and Moravia that had obtained under Greater Moravia and, second, as the basis on which Charles could claim to be the successor to the Greater Moravian monarchs. Pulkava first makes the connection between Vratislav and the ninth-century empire when recounting its destruction.<sup>52</sup> Pulkava claims that the connection had actually been made at an imperial assembly in Mayence in 1086; the diet had discussed the fact that there had been a ‘Kingdom of Moravia, under which Bohemia, Poland, Rus’ and many other lands had been during the times of Svatopluk [...]. And they also decided that it would be meet and right to expend great energy and effort on the re-establishment and improvement of such a glorious principedom’.<sup>53</sup> The Emperor Henry had thoroughly approved and concluded that the Moravian kingship be transferred to Bohemia and that Moravia should be a margravate subject to Vratislav and his descendents in perpetuity; the same should apply to Poland and Rus’ and other duchies’. The fourteenth-century literary text that comes closest to Pulkava in its imperial conception is the primitive prose romance *Štilfríd*.

*Štilfríd*, however, belongs in its nationalist ideology to the Dalimil, not the Pulkava, line, as we see from the climax of the romance when Štilfríd rides into the lists with a samite-coloured (*sic*) banner. The colour is said to represent the glory of the Bohemian nation; bearing it he defeats the greatest of the German heroes, Siegfried. To explain this ‘Dalimil line’, I do have to say a little about Dalimil: he dislikes everything foreign, but especially the courtly, chivalrous code introduced to Bohemia during the thirteenth century. Though in the end directed at the ears of the foreign king, John of Luxembourg, there is no reason to believe that anyone translated any of it for the king or that he would have been interested.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., p. 220.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., p. 222.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., p. 245.

As far as one knows, John never learned Czech, and anyway the chroniclers inform us that he preferred to be the other side of the Rhine or in Luxembourg to being in Prague. The noble Dalimil had no impact on the king, but because he expressed the views of his estate and soon of Czechs altogether his literary impact was considerable. Indeed, however indirect his literary influence between c.1630 and c.1750, one may without exaggeration state that his remained the most influential work in Czech literature from 1314 until the beginning of the 1860s. That was largely because of his brand of nationalism, but his own chief message had lost its immediate meaning by the last quarter of the fifteenth century. This message was that the king should have only Czech lords in his privy council. At the end of his work, Dalimil asks God to teach John to love his landed gentry (*zemany*) as well as having Czech lords in his council, for without them John would not be able to maintain peace in his land.<sup>54</sup> In a piece of interpolated verse, the Abbot Otto, who wrote the early chapters of the chronicle of Peter of Zittau, addresses King Wenceslas II thus: 'my young king, do not give foreigners any power in government'.<sup>55</sup> Towards the end of the fourteenth century this demand is repeated by the Buzzard in the partly satirical, partly piously mentorial parliament of animals known as *Nová rada* (New council), who advises the king or heir apparent: 'Do not lure foreigners into your privy council'.<sup>56</sup>

One associates Dalimil chiefly with misotetonism, not with a simple expression of hatred or mistrust of Teutons, but with the ideologisation of that hatred. Dalimil's emotion is not new; it existed from the beginning of Bohemian secular literary culture and therefore, we may assume, a good time before that. Cosmas (Book I, ch. XL) writes of the Germans' innate arrogance and of the swollen-headed disdain with which they regard Slavs and the Slavonic language. He also has nothing but praise for Duke Spytihněv's expulsion of all Germans including his own mother, who had arrived in Bohemia under the particularly romantic circumstances of gallant abduction. Dalimil takes this episode from Cosmas with glee, but so does Pulkava, albeit without the lauding of the Duke. Still before Dalimil, the author of the verse Alexander Book manifests great concern at the inordinate influence of the Germans in Bohemia, and at their evident desire that only German be spoken in Prague, although they are just guests (*hoscie*) in the

<sup>54</sup> Daňhelka et al., eds., *Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila*, vol. 2, p. 541.

<sup>55</sup> Petr Žitavský, *Kronika zbraslavská*, p. 110.

<sup>56</sup> Smil Flaška z Pardubic, *Nová rada*, ed. Jiří Daňhelka (Praha, 1950), p. 31.

land.<sup>57</sup> After Dalimil, the conception of the Germans as irrepellable guests recurs in the verse Aesop. A bitch in pup is taken in by a neighbour and after she has had her litter, she expels the neighbour from her house. ‘That’, the author writes, ‘is what the Germans do to us / when the devil brings them into this country; / they drive Czechs out of their houses / and settle in them themselves’.<sup>58</sup> This author manifests xenophobia of an entirely Dalimilesque brand. For example, he writes of the treacherous Bats: ‘They give help to foreigners, / and cast shame on the innocent gentry [*zemany*, possibly here meaning “fellow-countrymen”]’.<sup>59</sup> Germans’ usurpation of house and home suggests greed, and the author of a loose adaptation of the *Dialogus beatae Mariae et Anselmi de Passione Domini*, wrongly attributed to Anselm of Canterbury, associates Germans with avarice: ‘Judas was such a miser / that some people thought he was a German’.<sup>60</sup> The verse Procopius could be said to be only incidentally anti-German because the author so favours the Slavonic-rite monks of Sázava that he has to loathe the German (Latin-rite) monks who usurp them. But *Prokop* belongs entirely to the Dalimil line. In *Ezopus* the devil brings Germans to Bohemia; in *Prokop* the Germans themselves bear a close resemblance to devils. Procopius drives out ‘real’ devils with his staff, as he drives out Germans and, indeed, comes to haunt the German monks after his death. Twice the author disparages the Germans as ‘foreigners from somewhere or other’ (with the same nationalist rhyme, too: *Němcóm: cuzozemcóm*).<sup>61</sup> Xenophobia is also evident when the author-narrator addresses his audience on the matter of those who exploit the poor. He warns against *hostákové*, usually under-

<sup>57</sup> *Alexandreida*, ed., V. Vážný (Praha, 1963), p. 118. The *hoscielhosti* appears to have acquired a new meaning in the first half of the fifteenth century, denoting simply ‘foreigners’, even though the primary meaning, ‘guest’, remained, indeed, still remains the norm. Dalimil, who uses very similar words about no Czech being heard in Prague, has possibly taken them from the *Alexandreida*. There is no doubt that, whoever he was, he was a well-read man.

<sup>58</sup> ‘Ezopus’, in Loriš, ed., *Sborník hraběte Baworowského*, pp. 67–68.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 115.

<sup>60</sup> ‘Anselmus’, in A. Patera, ed., *Svatovítský rukopis* (Praha, 1886), p. 160. In his list of national characteristics Matthias of Janov links the French with arrogance, Flemings and Rhinelanders with debauchery, Czechs and Poles with gluttony, and Germans with greed. Matěj z Janova, *Výbor*, p. 157. Hastings cites Aeneas Silvius on money-grubbing: ‘You will never find a people who easily permit money to be taken out of their region. It is a common disease and spread equally over all provinces. For just as the Germans hate the Italians for this reason, so the Hungarians hate the Germans ... The Poles have the same grievance, so do the Danes and Swedes’. Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood*, p. 117.

<sup>61</sup> ‘Legenda o svatém Prokopu’, pp. 60, 66.

stood as foreign merchants, but probably simply ‘foreigners’ altogether, and *lejchěřevé*, usually translated as ‘usurers’, but actually probably ‘itinerant singers’. Both groups ‘wander about the world’ threatening their souls with eternal hell-fire.<sup>62</sup>

In contrast to writers of the Dalimil line, Pulkava almost never exhibits misoteutonism, the one explicit exception being in his description of the chaos during the Brandenburg regency after the death of Přemysl Otakar II. Even here, however, it is not the Czechs but the Margrave of Brandenburg who ‘recognized that the country was from day to day being ever more devastated by foreigners [...] and he issued a general edict, that no German should remain in the land, but all leave. When that happened, robberies ceased’.<sup>63</sup> The fact that Pulkava reports Svytihněv’s expulsion of the Germans without any expression of the satisfaction we find in Dalimil or the verse Procopius legend certainly suggests a conscious avoidance of misoteutonism. On the other hand, his summary portrayal of Svytihněv’s character might, just, suggest some approval: ‘he was a very pious man, a defender, faithful judge and benefactor of all the poor’.<sup>64</sup> Misoteutonism would not serve the interests of Charles IV at all.

Apart from a little promotion of ethnic cleansing, Dalimil’s most vigorous expression of misoteutonism lay in his portrayal of rhinectomy. It will always occur to the modern reader that Miloslav Rechcígl<sup>65</sup> and the issuers of Czech postage stamps have missed an important trick in their portrayal of what the Czechs had given Europe and the world. When one learns from a medical textbook that one of the most dangerous things one can do after rhinectomy is to laugh,<sup>66</sup> one realizes that the Czechs and particularly Duke Soběslav II had made a major contribution to European culture: they had created the German sense of humour. Although rhinectomy was common enough in medieval Europe, it certainly appears that Czech *littérateurs* were particularly fascinated by it. It is, I presume, sheer coincidence that in the pre-Dalimil law-book, *Knihá rožmberská*, summoning procedures are laid down for anyone who has gouged out someone’s eyes or cut

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., p. 56.

<sup>63</sup> Pulkava, *Kronika*, p. 308.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., p. 242.

<sup>65</sup> In this rather naughty quip I refer to the book edited by M. Rechcígl, *The Czechoslovak Contribution to World Culture* (The Hague – London – Paris, 1964). The Czech Republic’s postal authorities have issued a series of postage stamps ‘Czechs to Europe’.

<sup>66</sup> J. Válka et alii, *Korektivní operace nosu* (Praha, 2003), p. 143.

out someone's tongue, but not for nose-logging (article 181). Pulkava has great praise for Soběslav II, but he does not mention his cutting off German noses at the Battle of Loděnice, let alone his passion for collecting such noses. There can be no doubt that the omission is deliberate. Rhinectomy does occur in Pulkava's work; it is normally inflicted on some enemy of a Bohemian ruler, though in its first occurrence Germans are the nose-loppers. Some of Břetislav's retinue lose their noses after he has abducted his future wife from her convent. Members of the villainous Vršovci clan suffer this fate twice. First, their retainer Nejsa has 'his nose cut off and his eyes gouged out',<sup>67</sup> and then Jan Vršovec is 'relieved of his eyes, nose and chin'.<sup>68</sup> Svatopluk, though often rebelling against his cousin, Duke Bořivoj, demonstrates he is a true patriot by his behaviour in Hungary: 'With his men Svatopluk burnt and laid waste to everything between the Rivers Váh and Danube and everywhere around that area; he also captured many Hungarian spies and then ordered their noses be cut off and eyes gouged out'.<sup>69</sup> The last occasion of rhinectomy comes in a description of King Wenceslas's 1246 (Pulkava has 1248) war with the Austrians, but here Czechs are the victims again. The Austrians capture a large number of Moravians and 'many of them had their ears and noses cut off so that they could do no more damage to the Austrians'.<sup>70</sup>

Within his misoteutonic code Dalimil has the mythopoeic rhyme *čest* (honour): *lest* (deceit), where honour is associated with Czechs and deceit with Germans. The same rhyme with the same association is used by Věšrd at the very end of the fifteenth or beginning of the sixteenth century.<sup>71</sup> By the mid-seventeenth century the Jesuit poet Fridrich Bridel (1618–80) uses it, but here the honour is associated with God and the deceit with the Devil.<sup>72</sup> That last point is pertinent since, after envy, deceit is the most frequent characteristic of devils, also in Czech fourteenth-century literature. The noble divine Tomáš Štíttný, for example, examines at great

<sup>67</sup> Pulkava, *Kronika*, p. 258.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 259.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 257.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 298. Cutting off a person's nose often constituted inflicting delayed death. It can cause, for example, a cerebral abscess, meningitis, endocarditis or septic thrombosis (see Válka and team, *Korektivní operace nosu*, p. 85). Furthermore, the disfigurement that proceeds from rhinectomy not only makes mating difficult, but may also disqualify one from sacred duties (see Leviticus 21:18).

<sup>71</sup> Viktorin of Věšrdy (1460–1520) quoted by Joseph Dobrowsky in *Geschichte der böhmischen Sprache und ältern Literatur* (1818) in Josef Dobrovský, *Dějiny české řeči a literatury*, ed. B. Jedlička (Praha, 1936), pp. 405–06.

<sup>72</sup> [Fridrich Bridel], *Co Bůh? Člověk? / Kdokolivěk? / Co já? Co ty? / Bože svatý...*, [Prague], 1659, title page.

length the deceit of the Devil in his *Řeči nedělní a sváteční* (Sunday and feast-day sermons, 1392). In a poem whose style and approach are modelled closely on Dalimil, *Nota ot pana Viléma Zajiece* (Song about Lord Vilém Zajíc, 1320s?), the Germans behave in the wily way of devils: 'they deceitfully set snares for you'.<sup>73</sup> Pulkava, however, does not associate *lest* with Germans, but, again, generally with enemies of the Bohemian ruler. Naturally, the Vršovci are the culprits. They 'wanted to assume the leadership of the Duchy of Bohemia dishonourably and disloyally, deceitfully'.<sup>74</sup> When they 'deceitfully' lure Prince Jaromír into a forest, soon St John saves him from certain death because of the 'great honour' (*velká čest*) he had paid him ever since he had been a young man.<sup>75</sup> Vlastislav, who wants to wrest the country from the pacific Duke Neklan, is a 'belligerent man, deceitful in his counsel'.<sup>76</sup> The seditious Moravian Svatopluk 'deceitfully, cunningly sent some of his men into Bohemia, did everything he could deceitfully, falsely to deprive his uncle, Bořivoj, of the kingdom [*sic*] of Bohemia'.<sup>77</sup> In keeping with his usual, if not consistent, misopolonic sentiments, Pulkava lends more deceit to Duke Mieszko I (again he means Bolesław the Brave) than anyone else in the chronicle. Mieszko's intentions are characterized by 'old, well-practised deceitfulness'; he invites Duke Boleslav of Bohemia 'deceitfully' to a banquet in Cracow, but Boleslav knows of his 'inveterate untrustworthiness and deceitfulness', expected 'some dishonourable, faithless deceit' from him.<sup>78</sup> Pulkava employs a similar concatenation of deceptions when some renegade Přemyslids go into league with the Poles and invade Bohemia 'with a deceitful intention', 'deceitfully and cunningly' and using 'deceitful language'.<sup>79</sup>

It is possible that Pulkava acquired his misopolonism from Cosmas. Cosmas had considered Mieszko (Bolesław) the most slippery of men; he suggests that Poles were worse Christians than the Czechs (for example, under 1022), and he has one Duke of Bohemia maintain that Poles break their word and lack family feeling. Pulkava also writes of the 'dishonourable, ignoble Poles' and in the case of Mieszko (Bolesław) links that with cowardice. While his men are fleeing in disarray and

<sup>73</sup> 'Nota ot pana Viléma Zajiece', untitled as Addendum 7 (Doplňek 7), in Daňhelka et al., eds., *Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila*, vol. 2, p. 587.

<sup>74</sup> Pulkava, *Kronika*, p. 232.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 232–33.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 219.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 256.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 232.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 260.

dying as they flee from the occupation of Prague, the ‘ignoble Mieszko [...] got the hell out of it [*Mezek nešlechtný (...) utekl ke všem črtóm*].’<sup>80</sup>

There is more literary support for Pulkava’s misohungarism than for his misopolonism, but even more than is the case with the Poles, his hatred of Hungarians is inconsistent, is not a sentiment that runs through the work in the way misoteutonism runs through Dalimil. In Czech medieval literature before the Hussite Wars, Hungary is most frequently a place of refuge or banishment. Cosmas’s account of the decree of Duke Břetislav concerning monogamy and the indissolubility of marriage is telling. If one spouse spurns the other or if the spouses declare themselves incompatible, the offending spouse should not be sold into slavery, as the rule had been hitherto, but sent to Hungary, whence they may not be ransomed; nor may they ever return to Bohemia lest they infect other spouses. Adulteresses as well as virgins and widows who lose their good name should likewise be banished to Hungary. Pulkava has Břetislav sell captured Poles into bondage in Hungary. On the other hand, the good Slavonic-rite monks of Sázava take refuge in Hungary in Dalimil and the verse Procopius legend, and in Pulkava various kings of Hungary offer hospitality or wives to various Přemyslids, banished and free. Still the Hungarians remain weird and dangerously exotic. The so-called ‘Second Continuation of Cosmas’ (*Druhé pokračování Kosmovy kroniky*) identifies the Hungarians with Saracens and Peter of Zittau writes of Matthew of Trencsény’s soldiers: ‘They all grease their hair with fat or lard.’<sup>81</sup> Charles IV was not too fond of the Hungarian King Lewis the Great and so he has him put to shame by the Count of Holland for his avarice.<sup>82</sup> Pulkava also contrasts a king of Bohemia with a king of Hungary; Wenceslas I marches bravely against the Tatars, but the King of Hungary had fled to the seaside when faced with Tatar invasion. One little matter might turn upside down my contention that Pulkava is not essentially prejudiced against the Hungarians. Normally he uses the conventional noun-ending to define them, *Uhrové*. Twice, however, he uses a neuter ending normally employed for the young of animals, *Uhřata*,<sup>83</sup> which looks forward to a modern Czech form used only of outcasts, *cikánata* (Gipsy children), *židata* (Jewish children)

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., p. 234.

<sup>81</sup> Petr Žitavský, *Kronika zbraslavská*, p. 498.

<sup>82</sup> Karel IV., ‘Život císaře Karla IV.’ [known as ‘Vlastní životopis’], in J. Emler, ed., *Spisové Karla IV. na oslavu pětistileté památky jeho* (Praha, 1878), pp. 61–62.

<sup>83</sup> Pulkava, *Kronika*, pp. 262 and 302.

and, though I have heard it once only, *anglánata* (English children).<sup>84</sup> Miso-hungarism is more consistent later, in Hussite writings like the *Žaloba koruny české* (The charge of the Bohemian crown) and the beastly 666-line verse *Porok koruny české ku pánóm českým o korunování krále uherského* (Protest of the Bohemian Crown addressed to the Bohemian lords concerning the coronation of the King of Hungary).

It is with its refrain battle cry ‘For the nation [*jazyk*] and St Wenceslas’, its glorification of Czech military skills, its straightforward nationalism, that *Štilfríd* belongs to the Dalimil line – the Czech eponymous hero thrashes a Hungarian here, too. None the less, it has much in common with Pulkava. Indeed, it might well be under the direct influence of Pulkava. It presents a simple story of a *Zwölfkampff*. The Duke of Bohemia, Štilfríd, rides out on adventures in order to earn a decent emblem for the coat of arms of Bohemia, and he wins the right to an eagle. That is the emblem of the greedy, rich King of England or Mesopotamia (by the time this work was written the kings of England had long had the three lions), who is besieging the good King of Naples. The Bohemian, of course, comes to defend the underdog. The prose romance contains plenty of rhymed couplets like Pulkava’s chronicle; the literary historical wisdom is that this is a prose redaction of a verse work; one might, however, argue that prose with interpolated verse, the chronicler’s norm, made the romance truer to history. The choice of the name Štilfríd is unlikely to be taken from the minor character in Dalimil called Stojmír, who also appears in Christianus – a common idea, taken up even in the family history of the present Baron Stillfried in Vienna.<sup>85</sup> It is more likely that it is simply a knightly-sounding name chosen, perhaps on the basis of a German tale, because the author wanted to make clear that the story itself was emblematic, not historical. It is impossible to date any verse original, for one does not know whether the action or the names were originally exactly the same as in the extant version. Since, however, this action consists of a Czech prince defeating representatives of the whole world who are fighting in the King of England’s army, one might suggest that the romance alludes angrily to the Battle of Cressy. That idea

<sup>84</sup> This young-of-animal form may also be the only form of a word denoting a type of human being in Old Czech. It is clearly disparaging in the frequent word *tkáče*, meaning a man who is landless and also owns no roof over his head. On the other hand, *práče* from the Hussite period for boy warrior uses the form apparently simply to indicate immaturity.

<sup>85</sup> A. Stillfried, *Die Přemysliden und der Ursprung des Hauses Stillfried* (Wien, 1971). For Stojmír, see pp. 12–17.



satisfies one as little as the notion that the romance might be such a late compilation that it emblemizes the Hussites' defeats of foreign armies. I would propose that in its present redaction it was written between the late 1370s and the 1400s more or less as a fairy tale to entertain, but also to encourage Czechs to remember their historical greatness before, in accordance with Dalimil's view, foreign-inspired jousting and hunting with hounds had diminished Czech military prowess. The climax of the story, after Štilfríd has defeated Siegfried, comes when the King of England offers Štilfríd his crown. This idea could have been inspired not by Cressy but by a passage in Pulkava, and nowhere before Pulkava, because it resulted from his misunderstanding or misreading of a passage in the early chronicler Vincentius (c. 1130– after 1167). The latter mentions that when Duke Vladislav II is crowned king outside Milan by the Emperor, the ceremony takes place in a tent given by the King of England. In Pulkava, however, the Emperor gives Vladislav a crown the King of England had once given him. The King of Bohemia, who had come closest to conquering the world like Štilfríd was Přemysl Otakar II and one may find particularly two parallels between the romance and Pulkava's representation of the Battle of Laa and its results. Štilfríd refuses the offer of the crown of England, just as Přemysl turns down the chance of becoming King of Hungary. The names and provenance of the mighty knights Štilfríd defeats are, many of them, garbled or, just possibly, invented for the sake of unrealism. The list of nations Přemysl had defeated in the Hungarian army, which he sends in a letter to the Pope, also contains some garbled names – more in the Czech than in the Latin. None of the names is exactly the same in both works, but many share attributes. One knight in *Štilfríd* has a direct link with Přemysl, though not with the letter to the Pope, for he bears the name of Přemysl's bitterest enemy, Rudolf (Habsburg). So, too, though not quite so obviously, the Ipolit of *Štilfríd* is acoustically close to Lipolt (i.e., Leopold [of Austria]). In the *Štilfríd* list there is only one Pole, in the letter two; there is one Greek in each, one Hungarian (by name) in each, and the more exotic names in *Štilfríd* like the Moorish margrave Theobald or Adrian, Lord of Africa, correspond well enough with the Berimins (Besermens), Ishmaelites and Turks in Přemysl's letter. *Štilfríd* is a thoroughly formulaic work. The most blatant of these formulae describe Štilfríd's leaving the lists after a conquest, sentences like 'and so he rode merrily out of the lists' or 'he merrily jumped onto his horse'.<sup>86</sup>

<sup>86</sup> 'Kronika o Štilfrídovi', in J. Kolár and M. Nedvěďová, eds., *Próza českého středověku* (Praha, 1983), pp. 154 and 155.

Pulkava uses the same formula when Bohemians return from an expedition; for example, ‘they returned home merrily and happily’, ‘they returned home happily’ or ‘he returned home joyously’.<sup>87</sup> I would suggest one probably far-fetched parallel, namely that Pulkava’s chronicle to a very small degree, *Štilfríd* to a fairly great degree, in that motivation have much in common with the forged *Zápis Alexandra Velikého slovenskému jazyku a českému na budúcie časy* (Alexander the Great’s codicil for the Slav or Bohemian nation regarding the future), which I took to be Hussite, though Vidmanová has demonstrated that it was probably pre-Hussite, from Charles’s reign.<sup>88</sup> One has to understand the *Zápis* (Privilegium) as a would-be proof that *sclavus* (slave) and *Sclavus* (Slav) are not the same thing, and Štilfríd’s victories might be interpreted as ‘proving’ that, too. I would suggest, however, that Pulkava’s at the time convincing etymology of ‘Slav’ served a similar purpose, quite apart from the facts that in Pulkava the Bohemians are for the most part triumphant and that Pulkava transmits Caroline imperialism in the manner he does.

I have given a brief survey of full-blown xenophobic nationalist writing, said much about Pulkava, whose different, imperial nationalism may be interpreted as consciously re-modelling Dalimil’s nationalism, a version of Brubaker’s ‘nationalizing nationalism’.<sup>89</sup> I have, however, said nothing about writers who manifested only homely patriotism. I mention just one, Tomáš Štítný, a man who found romances like *Štilfríd*, but still more like *Tristram*, morally repulsive. There is no doubt that this theologically learned petty noble was fond of his country and his language. His main patriotic act was not so much his writing his moral instructions and rules for a gentleman’s management of land and people, as his heavily theological compilations that manifest patriotic endeavour (improving the moral lot

<sup>87</sup> Pulkava, *Kronika*, pp. 279, 262 and 254.

<sup>88</sup> See Šmahel, *Idea národa v husitských Čechách*, pp. 207 and 238. I probably wrongly take the text to be Hussite in ‘Misotautonic myths: lopping noses in Hussite nationalism and love’s sweet cure’, in A. Wöhl and H. Wydra, eds., *Democracy and Myth in Russia and Eastern Europe* (London – New York, 2008 [2007]), pp. 98–121. On the case for 1360, see A. Vidmanová, ‘Ještě jednou k Privilegiu Alexandra Velikého pro Slovaný’, in Z. Silagiová, H. Šalinová and P. Kitzler, eds., *Pulchritudo et sapentia. Ad honorem Pavel Spunar* (Praha, 2008), pp. 179–87 (esp. 186–87).

<sup>89</sup> Brubaker defines that as follows; for Brubaker’s ‘state’ here read empire (Holy Roman Empire): ‘Nationalizing nationalisms involve claims made in the name of a “core nation” [...], defined in ethnocultural terms. [...] Despite having “its own” state, however, the core nation is conceived [of] as being in a weak cultural, economic, or demographic position within the state. This weak position [...] is held to justify the “remedial” or “contemporary” project of using state power to promote the specific (and previously inadequately served) interests of the core nation.’ R. Brubaker, *Nationalism Reframed. Nationhood and the national question in the New Europe* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 5.

of the nation) in more or less inventing a style of writing for theological essays in Czech. His comment on Czech literature near the beginning of his *Knížky šestery o obecných věcech křesťanských* (Six books on general matters Christian, 1376) turned into a topos of prefaces throughout the early modern period in Czech literature, right up to Josef Dobrovský and V.M. Kramerius in the early stages of the National Revival: ‘many would like to condemn Czech books, and I mean good [that is, morally uplifting, noble] books. They say nothing about those fabulous works by which the lecherous are further inspired to lechery or that suggest we love the world contrary to God’s proscription. [...] It is surely better to read good books in Czech’ in castles or anywhere else.<sup>90</sup> In another work, *Řeči nedělní a sváteční* (Sunday and holy day addresses), he writes something similar of the love lyric: ‘do not be as unwise as to incite yourselves or others to lechery or pride with your songs, much in the way that foolish maidens and ladies are proud of the fact that young fools ignite lecherous desires in themselves by singing about them [...], and they [the maidens and ladies] believe that they are all as exceptional as they hear themselves described in the songs. Therefore I advise them [the females] to sing selections of psalms and hymns’.<sup>91</sup> This work also contains a pretty lengthy piece of interpolated verse, follows the norm of the chroniclers and *Štilfríd*. Naturally, in this case the verse is a hymn.

The Dalimil line lived on, but so did Pulkava’s moderate imperial nationalism, say, in Václav Hájek z Libočan’s (d. 1553) chronicle (1541). Štítný’s muted patriotism lived on, too. My example of the last comes at the end of the period this volume deals with. It is a lucidly written, intelligent tract on why Christ, not the Virgin Mary, is the only mediator between Man and God. According to the Preface it was written in exile in Germany and smuggled into Bohemia. Its short title is *Christi theanthropi mediatoris nostri eiusque nativitatis assertio* (1625; title in Latin, but text in Czech). The pseudonym this Utraquist employs combines the nationalism of *Štilfríd* with the patriotism of *Štilfríd*’s sequel, *Bruncvík*, and the text is only twice openly patriotic. This pseudonym was Štilfríd (printed in error Zstilfríd) Bruncveikar Podhořský.

<sup>90</sup> Tomáš Štítný ze Štítného, *Knížky šestery o obecných věcech křesťanských*, K.J. Erben, ed. (Praha, 1852), p. 3.

<sup>91</sup> Tomáš ze Štítného, *Řeči nedělní a sváteční*, J. Straka, ed. (Praha, 1929), p. 198.

The English Rising of 1381, Wyclif and Lollards  
in the Czech point of view

*František Šmahel*

Of all European countries, two kingdoms were closest as regards their religious climate: the English and the Czech. Only in these two places did heresy find adequate breeding ground; it was to these heresies that three out of five ecclesiastical councils in the first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century were devoted. It was Wyclifism with its popular Lollard branch on the one hand, and Hussitism with Taborite Picardy on the other. In addition to these two socially important founts of non-conformist religious views, prior to 1420 one could only find clandestine substratum of sectarians of distinctly Waldensian orientation, occasionally various species of Beghards and Beguines, and, in the triangle borderland of modern France, Belgium and Netherlands also controversial communities of brothers and sisters of the Free Spirit.<sup>1</sup> Intellectual deviations from binding orthodoxy can, in

<sup>1</sup> See M. Lambert, *Medieval Heresy. Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*. Third Edition (Oxford, 2002), most recently K. Utz Tremp, *Von der Häresie zur Hexerei. Wirkliche*

this time frame, be counted on the fingers of one hand. The same held true for different free-thinkers from among the craftsmen and artisans.

After the Hussite movement turned into a military conflict that, in the 1420s and 1430s, engulfed all of Central Europe, heretical infection began to spread also in those places, where there had previously been no mention of it. This was the case for neighbouring Poland and Slovakia, and also Moldova and Transylvania. Elsewhere, for example in Croatia and Slovenia, Hussite thoughts fell on the fertile soil prepared by Bogomils and Cathars.<sup>2</sup> The Hussite movement infused the Waldensian diaspora, supported by radical communities around Tábor and Žatec, with a life-giving force. This Waldensian-Hussite International, in the words of Amedeo Molnár,<sup>3</sup> should not be overestimated, but in this region it was a force to be reckoned with, and one that made it possible for one of the oldest heresies to survive to the present day. It was not a coincidence that Hussite articles resonated powerfully in the traditional areas of popular heresy on the frontier of southern Flanders, county Artois, Hainaut and Picardy. Elsewhere in France and also further in Italy or in Spain, however, Czech heresy left mostly a negative impression.

The explosive potential of rebellions against the established order exhausted itself in the previous years especially in France during the uprising of Etienne Marcel and peasant Jacquerie. The same held true for social tensions in Italian communes, which in Florence and in Siena spent themselves in the uprising of early textile proletariat, in the so-called revolt of the Ciompi. If we put aside the turbulences in some German towns, then Germany had to wait for its largest shake-up until the beginning of the Lutheran reformation. However, we must take into consideration the social upheavals and uncertainty during outbreaks of the so-called Black Death pandemic, whose explosiveness was to a great extent reduced by processions of flagellants and by anti-semitic pogroms. But, having examined these and similar events across the contemporary world, the only strong correspondence standing out is that between the situation in Bohemia and in

*und imaginare Sekten im Spätmittelalter* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Schriften 59, Hannover 2008).

<sup>2</sup> For an overview of Hussite responses abroad, see my *Hussitische Revolution III*. (Hannover, 2002), pp. 1913–1966. I will silently refer to this three-volume work, summarizing existing as well as my own research, in the course of this essay. For a “vade mecum” on the English situation, see A. Hudson, *The Premature Reformation. Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988).

<sup>3</sup> A. Molnár, *Storia dei Valdesi I. Dalle origini all'adesione alla Riforma* (Torino, 1974), chap. VII. L'internazionale valdo-hussita. For a critique of Molnár's thesis, see K. Utz Tremp, *Waldenser. Wiedergänger, Hexen und Rebellen* (Freiburg, Schweiz, 1999).

England. I will not speak directly about Wyclif and his Czech followers. This *causa celebris* demands book-length studies.<sup>4</sup> I will not even refer too much the Hussite movement itself.<sup>5</sup> Rather, I will limit myself to observations of a historian of the Hussite movement, who leafs through pages of English history of the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

The largest English peasant revolt of the 14<sup>th</sup> century lasted for about six weeks and impacted territory of roughly the size of half of Bohemia. Thanks to the rich archival sources and numerous chronicle accounts it is possible to give a comprehensive account of the causes and progression of this uprising.<sup>6</sup> In the populous

<sup>4</sup> For example, G. Leff, 'Wyclif and Hus: A Doctrinal Comparison', in A. Kenny, ed., *Wyclif in his times* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 105–125 (revised text of 1967–8 edition); A. Patschovsky, 'Ekklesiologie bei Johannes Hus', in H. Boockmann, B. Moeller and K. Stackmann, eds., *Lebenslehren und Weltentwürfe im Übergang vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit* (Göttingen, 1980), pp. 370–399; V. Herold, *Pražská universita a Wyclif* (Praha, 1984); B. Töpfer, 'Die Wertung der weltlich-staatlichen Ordnung durch John Wyclif und Jan Hus', in F. Šmahel, ed., *Häresie und vorzeitige Reformation*, (München, 1988), pp. 55–76; M. Wilks, 'Reformatio Regni: Wyclif and Hus as Leaders of Religious Protest Movements', in A. Hudson, ed., *Wyclif Political Ideas and Practice. Papers by Michael Wilks* (Oxford 2000), pp. 63–84. I.C. Levy, ed., *A Companion to John Wyclif. Late Medieval Theologian* (Leiden – Boston, 2006) mentions Hus only peripherally.

<sup>5</sup> See my older as well as more recent studies, available in English: 'The Idea of the Nation in Hussite Bohemia', *Historica*, xvi–xvii (1969), pp. 143–247, 93–197; 'Wyclif's Fortune in Hussite Bohemia', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, xliii (1970), pp. 16–34; 'The Kutteneberg Decree and the Withdrawal of the German students from Prague 1409. A Discussion', *History of Universities*, iv (1984), pp. 153–166; 'Jan Hus – Heretic or Patriot', *History Today*, xl (1990), pp. 27–33; 'Literacy and Heresy in Hussite Bohemia', in *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530*. Ed. by P. Biller and A. Hudson (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 237–254; 'The Hussite Critique of the Clergy's Civil Dominion', in P.A. Dykema and H.A. Oberman, eds., *Anticlericalism in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Leiden – New York – Köln, 1993), pp. 83–90; 'The Social Background of the Hussite Movement', *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*, i (1996), pp. 19–21; 'The Hussite Movement: An Anomaly of European History?', in M. Teich, ed., *Bohemia in History* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 79–97; 'Causa non grata: Premature Reformation in Hussite Bohemia', in J. Kłoczowski, ed., *Christianity in East Central Europe 2. Late Middle Ages* (Lublin, 1999), pp. 224–231; 'The Acta of the Constance Trial of Master Jerome of Prague', in H. Barr and A.M. Hutchison, eds., *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale. Essays in Honour of Anne Hudson* (Medieval Church Studies 4; Turnhout, 2005), pp. 323–334; *The Charles University in the Middle Ages. Selected Studies*, (Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 28; Leiden – Boston, 2007); 'The Hussite Revolution (1419–1471)', in J. Pánek Pánek and O. Tůma, eds., *A History of the Czech Lands*, (Praha, 2009), pp. 137–158.

<sup>6</sup> Of the older literature on the English uprising, see an important anthology of texts by R.B. Dobson, ed., *The Peasant's Revolt of 1381*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. (London, 1983), also numerous works by R.H. Hilton, for example, *Bond Man made Free. Medieval Peasant Movements and the English Rising of 1381* (London, 1973), *Class conflict and the Crisis of Feudalism. Essays in Medieval Social History* (London 1985). For a Marxist point of view, see also Gerlinde Mothes, *England im Umbruch. Volksbewegungen an der Wende*

and economically more-developed areas east of London and in the capital's vicinity, where the revolt of 1381 had its focus, communities tenaciously defended their privileges and interests already since the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. More than once in that time were they able to enforce their demands directly. Experience gained from these conflicts remained in the popular memory and made it easier to mobilize people quickly in subsequent times. The fact that the different communities, parishes and tax districts boasted developed forms of autonomy were also an important factor.

One of the symptoms of the long-term development (from the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century to the first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century) was a gradual decrease in the real value of the tithes, and also of prices of agricultural products, while, in the same time period, the real value of wages increased two and half times. These "long-wave" trends also affected development in the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, but unevenly and with cyclical fluctuations. Prices of food increased in the 1350s, and also some more in the next decade, which was, of course, advantageous to farmers. However, in the 1370s and later, the prices began to drop whereas costs of agricultural production grew. The same held true for day laborers and their wages: they continued to grow. If the real wages of artisans and craftsmen since the Black Death to the end of the century grew by 50 percent, wages of agricultural workers grew probably even more.<sup>7</sup>

The catastrophic results of the plague in England became apparent with only a tiny delay. On some manors, the lords forced their subjects to cultivate abandoned lands, elsewhere they tried to increase taxes and impose new fees for various approvals and legal services. Majority of estates in the southwest of England (but also elsewhere) employed large numbers of hired workmen, whose supply fell short of the demand owing to the high mortality in previous years. Agricultural hired hands, therefore, routinely demanded (and received) wages twice

*vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit* (Weimar, 1983). Also compare, among others, J.A. Raftis, 'Social Change versus Revolution: new Interpretations of the Peasant's Revolt of 1381', in *Social Unrest in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. F.X. Newmann (Binghamton, N. Y., 1986, pp. 3–22, collection *The English Rising of 1381*, R.H. Hilton and T.H. Aston, eds. (Cambridge, 1987); H. Eiden, "In der Knechtschaft werdet ihr verharren ...". Ursachen und Verlauf des englischen Bauernaufstandes von 1381 (Trier Historische Forschungen 32; Trier, 1995); A. Dunn, *The great rising of 1381: the peasants' revolt and England's failed revolution* (London, 2002) with Bibliography on pp. 157–161.

<sup>7</sup> For more information see especially Hilton, *Bond Man Made Free*, chapt. V–VI and Idem, *Popular Movements in England at the End of the Fourteenth Century*, in *Il Tumulto dei Ciompi* (Firenze, 1981), pp. 231–232.

and three times higher than before. Already in June 1349, eleven months after the plague struck, parliament – comprised of large land magnates – issued the first of its directives regarding agricultural laborers. In 1351 they added a number of additional statutes (*Statute of Labourers*). Most importantly, the new legislative codified factual ownership of agricultural labor force, rather than its attachment to the land. The statutes also set maximum level of wages to 1346 levels and also forced laborers to keep to the length of contractually-agreed employment. In reality, all villagers, who did not cultivate a large enough land area, were bound by this obligation.

A special royal commission supervised the keeping of statutes in each region. After 1359 it merged with another regional body for maintaining peace. Whereas earlier the maintenance of justice and enforcement of interests of feudal lords was a matter for local authorities, now they were guaranteed by royal power. The statute concerning agricultural laborers thus not only worsened the living conditions of a great portion of the village population, but also, increasingly, fueled a hatred of royal commissions and their officials. The pressure imposed by central authority elicited a unanimous response, which crossed the borders of local manors.

Relationships between governing elite and common “people”<sup>8</sup> worsened in the 1370s owing to the failure of military campaigns in France, political scandals and further increase of tax demands. Long-term wars proved a great burden on the villages, which were supposed to regularly send a set number of warriors and finance their arms and equipment. Among these warriors was perhaps also Wat Tyler, the hero of the uprising. He had allegedly gained military experience on the war fields in France. After twelve years without taxation, there followed a decade of new demands, which affected all level of the non-privileged third order in towns as well as in villages. A series of regular and irregular taxes began in 1371 with the so-called parish tax, which was in 1372 and 1373 followed by another regular tax, twice as high, and then again in 1374 and 1375. A poll tax, four pences per head for all persons older than fourteen, was imposed two years later; and in 1380 a regular tax of one and a half of the previous tax, which was then in

<sup>8</sup> Hilton, *Popular Movements*, pp. 225n counts dependent and independent farmers, whom, along with the urban craftsmen, he considers to be a part of the potential revolutionary force, among the “people”. He classifies the merchant oligarchy and the patricians (*burgesses*) as the governing class. Also, unlike other authors, he does not see the middle and lower urban classes as dynamic threats to the feudal system. This thesis is undoubtedly controversial. See also A.F. Butcher, ‘English Urban Society and the Revolt of 1381’, in Hilton and Aston, eds., *The English Rising of 1381*, pp. 84–111.



1381 followed by another poll tax, this time of one shilling, which was a three day's wage. This poll tax proved especially burdensome for big families, not to speak of unscrupulous methods of royal tax collectors, who, among other things, examined whether or not girls were of taxable age by checking their virginity.

Of the synergy of various reasons, increased (and ever increasing) tax demands proved to be of the greatest importance whereas the other long-term crisis factors did not, in fact, acquired explosive force. Those who armed themselves and participated in the rebellions were not throngs of hungry paupers, but rather members of well-off peasant classes. In times of prosperity the confidence of farmers grew, but this newly-found confidence was not reflected in personal and other freedoms. Otherwise it would prove impossible to explain, why the rebels demanded them as part of their agenda. The growing economic difficulties created additional concerns, but it was the increase demands of the tax collector that most exacerbated the tensions. The fiscal policy of the governing clique thus proved short-sighted as it escalated the situation to a breaking point.<sup>9</sup>

The rebellion began at the end of May 1381, rather spontaneously, without much in the way of prior organization or a set agenda. Anyone, who knows anything about Wyclif and the influence of his teaching on Hus and his generation, must be surprised by this important fact. The teaching of the Oxford reformer was condemned by papal curia as erroneous in 1377 and 1378; Wyclif was still alive in 1381, but not only did he have nothing to do with the rebellion but even turned his back on it. Despite Wyclif's rejection of the rebellion, the rebels tried to put several points from Wyclif's own agenda in practice. This was the case not because the rebels were themselves directly acquainted with Wyclif's opinions – after all, his academic treatises circulated only on the university soil – but because

<sup>9</sup> According to Hilton, *Popular Movements*, p. 232, the rebellions of the end of the 14th century can hardly be explained as merely a result of poverty and oppression. This idea is even more emphasized by N. Fryde, 'Die Krisen des Spätmittelalters in England in der angelsächsischen wirtschaftshistorischen Forschung der letzten zwanzig Jahre', in F. Seibt and W. Eberhard, eds., *Europa 1400. Die Krise des Spätmittelalters* (Stuttgart, 1984) pp. 174–175. To social and economic background to the Great Revolt of 1381 see also E.B. Fryde, *Peasants and landlords in later medieval England c. 1380 – c. 1525*, (New York, 1996), chapt. 3, pp. 29–53, and Eiden, „*In der Knechtschaft werdet ihr verharren ...*“, pp. 12sq. England resembled the Czech lands with regards to the size of its towns and the dense network of townlets. Most authors are of the opinion that English towns were, at this time, undergoing a period of stagnation or even decline.

these opinions reflected what they already thought and felt.<sup>10</sup> The demands of the rebels from June 14 were even more radical in that they ordered that the king confiscate all property of the church and divide it for the benefit of the laity, while Wyclif himself taught that properties only of disobedient prelates be confiscated. In both cases, the agents of this proposed secularization were supposed to be the lords or the king, but Wyclif did not envision that any reform initiative would come from among the people. Among his protectors was not only an influential member of the royal council, Duke of Lancaster John of Gaunt, but, at first, also the archbishop of Canterbury, Simon Sudbury. The attack on Gaunt's palace was one of the first acts of the rebels after their arrival to London, and archbishop Sudbury was executed a few days later as a representative of the hated regime of the governing coterie. And although Anglican isolationism was a thorn in the side of both the Avignon and the Roman popes, the English high clergy behaved at home in the same way that the continental high clergy behaved on the continent. Wyclif's reform advocated a profound improvement of the church and head members, but he did not wish to upset the foundations of the existing social order, in which the secular power continued to hold on to their privileges.<sup>11</sup>

Not even the leaders of the uprising did wish to destroy the system of oppression. Influential and numerous class of wealthy farmers only wished to codify the obligation of lords and royal officials to respect older customary laws and to add a few more. Proclamations of equality made by the leading radical preacher John Ball most certainly effected a strong response, because they gave confidence to seditious masses in their struggle with the barons. However, these proclamations did not have time to inspire a radical parceling of the baron's estates. A feature of English popular mentality, the same as elsewhere, were hopes that the ruler is good and just, and that his ignorance of the true state of affairs was caused (and abused) by his advisers and administrators. Richard II (1377–1399) was only fourteen years old in 1381, and thus became an easy vessel for various such hopes and ideas. The most fantastic hope, which the leaders of the uprising envisioned, was a monarchy

<sup>10</sup> Erroneous theories of Wyclif's influence on the ideology of the uprising are based on later pamphlets and polemics, which blamed the founders of the dangerous intellectual heresy also for the events of 1381. Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, pp. 66–69 does not exclude the possibility that there is an internal kinship between Wyclif and the rebels. And although there is no vernacular word in his extant treatises, Wyclif was co-responsible for introducing the vernacular into theological discussions. See also, A. Hudson, 'Wyclif and the English Language', in A. Kenny, ed., *Wyclif in his times* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 85–103.

<sup>11</sup> Compare Töpfer, 'Die Wertung', pp. 59–65.

without any mediator between king and his subjects and a church with one archbishop, administering all the parish clergy directly. The exclusion of secular and clerical aristocracy from the political scene was an important idea, but was not well-thought out, as far as any practical functioning of the future administrative system was concerned. The ideals of the Hussite left would later share in the same weakness; their egalitarian ideas will also lack clear proposals for how to conduct the political life on the practical level.<sup>12</sup>

It is worth noting that the ideological substratum of the rebellion bears no discernible traces of popular heresy. There were about dozen attempts to curb the activities of individual preachers and clergymen since the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century to the year 1381, but not a single one had anything to do with heresy in the strict sense of the word. The same also holds true of John Ball, who spent several years in the prison of archbishops of Canterbury. The social agenda of his cryptic letters and sermons did not exceed the ideas encapsulated in Langland's well-known *Piers Plowman*, which most likely channeled ideas of popular discontent and desires of the common people. John Ball, with his critical invective and ardent desire to return to the principles of early Christianity, was not an exception among the English clergy, which a survey of contemporary preachers' drafts makes abundantly clear.<sup>13</sup> It was not only poor clerics, who were discontent with their subordinate position. Some wealthy parish priests, motivated by an awakened biblicism, were also among the critics of the society and even among direct participants in the rebellion.<sup>14</sup>

Although visionary or prophetic voices were not lacking in the contemporary popular opinion, the rebel struggles lacked that religious fervor and exaltation, which we know from the Czech chiliasts. Events associated with the attack on the fancy residence of a hated aristocrat John of Gaunt show that the rebels did not need religion as a source for their discipline and self-awareness. The family of the duke, who was staying in Scotland at the time, was allowed to walk free, but the

<sup>12</sup> On the goals and programme of the rising see Hilton, *Popular Movements*, chap. 9 and Mothes, *England im Umbruch*, pp. 42 and 77.

<sup>13</sup> An analysis of six pamphlets of John Ball was published by S. Justice, *Writing and rebellion. England in 1381* (Berkeley, 1994).

<sup>14</sup> For more information on the ideological context of the English revolt, see important scholarly studies by A. Hudson, *Selections from English Wycliffite Writings* (Cambridge, 1978) and by M. Aston, *Lollards and Reformers. Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* (London, 1984); *Faith and fire. Popular and unpopular religion, 1350–1600* (London, 1993). Other literature is cited by Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, pp. 526–537.

rebel leaders also threatened them with the death penalty for robbery. All jewels and valuables were broken to pieces and then thrown into the Thames. Secular and distinctly non-religious atmosphere of the rebellion is even more evident in the two set of demands put before the king.<sup>15</sup>

The petition from June 13, 1381 contained four demands; abolition of servitude (including all corvee and taxation), general amnesty for rebels, freedom of trade in the whole kingdom and land rent to be at maximum four pences per acre. The last article made it clear that the institution of land ownership was to remain untouched. But the more radical program from the next day demanded confiscation of clerical properties and their division according to the needs of each parish. Moreover, the second petition demanded the abolition of all laws, with the exception of the directive of king Edward I from 1285, who, in the interest of protection of all subjects against violence, allowed all adult males to bear arms. The rebels thus hoped to abolish also the onerous statute regarding agricultural laborers from 1351. Also, the rebels were characterized by distaste for lawyers and administrative officials working in the service of the king and barons. In many places, farmers burnt official registers of the aristocracy containing administrative records of taxes and other duties of the subjects. The Hussite era knew nothing of this kind at all, although the rejection of “pagan” (that is Roman ) as well as German law were a part of the ideological arsenal of the Taborite left. In comparison with the Hussite movement, the English reform agendas were characterized by pragmatism and concreteness of their social and political demands, which was also the case for the revolt of the Ciompi. However, both these movements lacked utopian visions of a society without lords and subjects, which we know from Hussite chiliasm.

The main demands of both petitions reflect the social profile of the rebels. The interests of middle urban classes were faintly reflected in the article about the freedom of trade. In the rapid progression of events, small craftsmen and artisans lost their heads, could not make up their mind and come up with their own demands. Generally, they liked slogans about freedoms, because only one fourth of London dwellers, for example, enjoyed the benefits of burgess-ship. Unconditional allies of the rebels in the metropolis were only plebeians, and it was them who opened the gates and who joined their crowds in attacks on the

<sup>15</sup> On the petitions, see R.H. Hilton, ‘Soziale Programme im englischen Aufstand von 1381’, in R. Blickle, ed., *Revolte und Revolution in Europa* (München, 1975), pp. 31–46.

prisons and palaces of court aristocracy. Members of higher classes were few among the rebels; unlike in the Hussite rebellion, in England gentry remained uninvolved.<sup>16</sup> Territorially speaking, the English revolt from 1381 had almost national character, but it did not engulf all classes, but mostly the third order, that is more precisely, the common people.<sup>17</sup>

Similarly to the jacquerie, the English revolt began as a local incident. At the end of May of 1381, inhabitants of several villages in the Duchy of Essex refused to pay the tax which they owed and, having armed themselves, put the tax collectors there to flight. In the course of a few days, the spirit of revolt engulfed all of Essex and moved to the neighbouring Kent. A detachment of soldiers and officials, who were supposed to restore order and punish the rebels, only fueled the popular discontent, which turned into direct attacks against royal fortresses and feudal mansions. Already on June 5, the rebels captured the citadel in Kent and a few days later they seized Canterbury, the seat of archbishop Sudbury. In the meantime, the rebels in Essex attacked farm-houses of the knight order of Johannites, whose grand master, as the king's treasurer, had the worst reputation of all.

After the rescue of preacher John Ball from prison in Maidstone, the rebel army under the leadership of local countryman Wat Tyler headed for London. On June 12, throngs of famers from Essex and Kent converged near the capital and demanded to be met directly by the king. Young Richard II sailed in the direction of the rebels, but their wild shouting terrified his retinue and the meeting did not take place. And although the royal council under the leadership of city magistrate William Walworth had issued security measures, some of the aldermen sympathized with the rebels and facilitated their entry into the city.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>16</sup> More in J.A. Tuck, 'Nobles, Commons and the Great Revolt of 1381', in *The English Rising of 1381*, pp. 194–212.

<sup>17</sup> On the subject of social composition of the rebels, see a detailed account in Hilton, *Bond Man Made Free*, chap. 7, also in chap. 8 about allies from ranks of lower urban clergy. Mothes, *England im Umbruch*, p. 81, thinks that parish proletariat, craftsmen, day-laborers, several knights, who used the rebellion to enrich themselves, as well as a group of wealthy farmers and officials, were allies of the rebels. Many questions were addressed in the course of the discussion during the anniversary conference of the journal *Past and Present* in July 1981 (see the proceedings *The English Rising of 1381*). Other controversial points are addressed by Raftis, *Social Change versus Revolution*, pp. 6–13.

<sup>18</sup> Theodora Büttner attempted to trace and analyze the social struggles in London during the uprising in her: 'Die sozialen Kämpfe in London während des englischen Bauernaufstandes 1381', in E. Engelmann, ed., *Städtische Volksbewegungen im 14. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1960), pp. 116–142. For information about the attitudes of towns, see also Butcher, 'English Urban Society'.

The rebels along with their London allies behaved in rather orderly manner, burning down brothels belonging to the city magistrate as well as administrative records in the courthouse. They also opened prison gates. The royal council in the besieged Tower forced Richard to promise in vague terms the reparation of all grievances and mercy for the rebels, provided that the villagers return to their homes. The intention was to appease the rebels, remove them from London, and then disperse them. Reports saying that some eighty thousand rebels took part in the rebellion are probably exaggerated, but it is clear that so many farmers poured into London that the court had to retreat and maneuver.

Scenes from June 14 and 15 do not lack a dramatic touch. The king agreed to meet the rebels in the village Mile End, where, speaking with them face to face, he agreed with all their demands. As a proof of his good-will he ordered his thirty scribes, who were present, to issue documents regarding the abolition of servitude and pardon of all crimes. A portion of the farmers, having received a written guarantee, immediately began their return home. In this regard, the royal council achieved a great success. In the meantime, Tyler's group entered the Tower and enforced the executions of the most hated lords and officials: The revolt culminated and ended in the same moment. The royal faction took control of the situation from then on, thanks to their ability to mobilize armed detachments, which were able to put down the rebels, whose numbers had by now thinned significantly.

Ostensibly, the king agreed to meet Tyler again and accepted, on June 15, an even more radical version of the petition. Tyler, after being lured away from his army, was murdered by the city magistrate Walworth. Richard II, in order to mollify the rebels, who were by now becoming increasingly confused, notified them that he had knighted Tyler and granted all the demands of the petition. Their fears thus having been assuaged, the rebels departed, as told, to a specified location for future negotiations. But when they saw the head of their leader on a spear, they panicked, fell on their knees and awaited their fate. The village and urban people who had congregated in London almost swept the king and his courtly coterie aside, into the Thames. But their blind faith in the royal ruler and his honest intentions thwarted all that which had, for a fleeting moment, seemed to be within reach.

Elsewhere, the rebellion remained to pose a threat. Townspeople and village-people, who rose up against monastic elites in St. Albans (Hertfordshire), held out for another month. Around mid-June, farmers in Middlesex, Suffolk, Norfolk

and Cambridgeshire also rebelled.<sup>19</sup> There was violence everywhere, not even the university in Cambridge was spared. With the exception of east England and neighboring areas, where the London poor joined the rebellion, thus strengthening it, other epicenters held their ground only because the royal armies could not fight on all sides at once. In the eastern duchies, barons, led by the militant bishop of Norwich, managed to break the resistance in late June. Preacher Ball was quartered before the eyes of the king and his court on July 15, the same fate was reserved also for further leaders of the rebels. The last strongholds of the rebels in Kent were not captured until September.

The opinions on the long-term results of the rebellion vary.<sup>20</sup> It is generally thought that the subsequent social and economic development was neither accelerated nor slowed down by the attempts of the rebels. It is necessary though to hear also the opposing view, which argues that the revolts of the subsequent decades were a proof of untiring popular activity and of a desire for freedom.<sup>21</sup> The origins and expansion of the Lollard movement seem to confirm this view.

Heresy was not in England an ideological foundation for rebellion, but the rebellion opened a free field of activity to domestic heresy with a broad social response. After the rebellion drowned in blood, the religious non-conformists raised their head and plotted an exit strategy, complete with new hopes. The hopes did not, however, focus on the sphere of early material benefits and freedoms, but on the long-term, distant perspective of the afterlife.<sup>22</sup> It appeared that any struggle against landed magnates and royal officials lost its chance for success, but the struggle for church reform was in its very infancy and even the crushed rebellion did not take the wind out of its sails, as it were. The church was well aware of this danger and, in 1382, hastened to issue edicts against Wyclif and his

<sup>19</sup> I cannot go into detail here nor can I list all the works, which treat the rebellion in the individual duchies. Most recently, see D. Crook, 'Derbyshire and the English Rising of 1381', *Historical Research*, lx, Nr. 141 (2007), pp. 9–23.

<sup>20</sup> According to W.M. Ormrod, 'The peasants' revolt and the government of England', *Journal of British Studies*, xxix (1999), pp. 1–30; the reform demands of the gentry and peasantry, which had been unsuccessful, appeared again in the crisis years of 1386–1388.

<sup>21</sup> On the conflicting views of the results of the uprising, see Hilton, *Bond Man Made Free*, pp. 293–295. According to Ormrod, 'The peasants' revolt', the lenience of the government after quelling the revolt of 1381 was a result of middle-class pressures. The demands of the gentry and peasantry were formally accepted, but not implemented in practice.

<sup>22</sup> More in C.V. Bostick, *The Antichrist and the Lollards. Apocalypticism in Late Medieval and Reformation England* (Leiden, 1998).

followers. The Oxford heretic did not, at any point, change his view the division of medieval society into three orders, nor did he ceased to undermine the dogmas and subvert the foundations of the secular power of the church institutions. It is not entirely true that his academic deductions were intelligible only to a handful of chosen Latinists. Wyclif had the good will to spread his views also in the vernacular, also trying to make the Bible accessible in English to literate laymen. The first set of translations of the Bible into English began probably at Wyclif's own instigation.<sup>23</sup>

It was a small group of his pupils, who took on the main onus of this task, and translated many of their teacher's theses into the vernacular. They did not limit themselves to those, and in a short time they, drawing on both local and foreign sources, put together a wide reservoir of ambitious ideas for a new heresy, which came to be called Lollardy. This mocking term for the new heresy came from the Netherlands, where this was the nickname for Beghards. And because English heretics also quietly sang (lollen) in their secret meetings, the pejorative nickname soon took root in the clerical circles.

The teachings of the Lollards were far from systematic.<sup>24</sup> Its diversity and openness to contemporary ideas was probably attractive for a relatively wide circle of followers. While the working class in towns and villages formed the fertile soil of the movement, numerous poor "angry" clerics were among the movement's propagators. In some places the Lollards had the support of influential members of the aristocracy, who from religious or other motives found themselves near the edge of heresy.<sup>25</sup> Anticlericalism as well as general demands for a poor church were

<sup>23</sup> On Wyclif's attitudes towards the rebellion, see Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, pp. 66–69. See pp. 238–247 for a survey of unfinished discussion on Wyclif's participation in the translation of the biblical books to English. Based on the textual and critical analyses, the author thinks it virtually impossible that Wyclif was involved in the undertaking in any decisive way. For anthology of basic texts and commentary, see Hudson, *Selections from English Wycliffite Writings*.

<sup>24</sup> On the extensive literature about the Lollard teaching, see G. Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages* (Manchester – New York 1967), kap. VIII; Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, chap. 14; F. Seibt, 'Cabochiens, Lollarden. Hussiten. Zur sogenannten Krise des Spätmittelalters im europäischen Vergleich', *Francia*, xii (1984), pp. 209–221. Older findings were corrected and enriched by Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, whose work is authoritative on most questions pertaining to the history of the Lollard movement.

<sup>25</sup> For more information about noble followers of the Lollards, see the study by K.B. McFarlane, *Lancastrian Kings and Lollard Knights* (Oxford, 1972), and, more recently, M. Aston and C. Richmond, eds., *Lollardy and the Gentry in the Later Middle Ages* (Stroud, 1997). On the social status of the Lollards, see Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, p. 121n.



near everyone's heart, with the exception of prelates. In their rejection of the sacrament of clerical ordination and in several other matters, for example, in their fundamental abhorrence of images and pilgrimages, the Lollards went further than Wyclif himself. In their rejection of clerical celibacy, they fought for moral purification more consequentially, not least due to the strong influence of devout women in the movement.<sup>26</sup> With its main articles as well as its moral appeal, which at times reached levels of puritan asceticism, Lollardy shared a number of common elements with the Hussite movement. The contacts between the reform circles in Bohemia and England were surprisingly common from the very beginning, even though it was rather Wyclif's teachings, which made the link between them, and not, as many might think, mutual borrowings of their program articles.

The twelve theses, which the Lollards posted on the door of Westminster Hall during the parliamentary session in 1395, provoked a strong wave of repression, which six years later resulted in official decree of death penalty to all heretics.<sup>27</sup> The peasant rebellion was not forgotten, so the manifest, which had very boldly, it seemed, been presented by "poor people," brought the lords of royal council and of the parliament to a boiling point. The twelve theses were, however, characterized by pacifism that was readily apparent; they did not call for any kind of resistance against the crown or secular aristocracy. Gradually, however, a conviction grew inside the movement that it would not be possible to reach any kind of redress without a "just fight." This thinking is present, not by accident, in the Lollard treatise *The Lanterne of Light* from 1409–1415; its writing coincided with the unsuccessful revolt, initiated by Sir John Oldcastle, lord of Cobham. The deviation from pacifism grew out of the need for defense against the threat of burning stakes, but also from personal convictions of several high-born supporters of the

<sup>26</sup> On the women's question in the Lollard movement, most recently, wrote Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, pp. 137, 186–187, who included a list of older literature.

<sup>27</sup> The twelve theses (conclusions) were published by Hudson, *English Wycliffite Writings*, pp. 24–29. More on the subject by F. Somerset, 'Answering the Twelve Conclusions: Dymmok's Halfhearted Gestures Towards Publications', in Aston and Richmond, eds., *Lollardy and the Gentry*, pp. 52–76. More recently and inspiratively, also W. Scase, 'The Audience and Framers of the Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards', in *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale* (as note 5), pp. 283–301. The knowledge of the Lollard theses in Bohemia is confirmed by collection authorities, whose shorter version, so-called *Rosarius*, was erroneously ascribed to Matthew of Zvolen. Independently, this subject was touched by A. Hudson, 'A Lollard Compilation in England and Bohemia', *Journal of Theological Studies* N. S., xxv (1974) and J. Kejř, 'Rosarius – domnělé dílo slovenského husity', *Studie o rukopisech*, xiv (1975), pp. 83–110, and J. Kejř, 'Ještě jednou o Rosariu', *ibidem*, xv (1976), pp. 103–106.

movement, who were forced into political opposition against the king and royal court.<sup>28</sup>

The name of Sir Oldcastle begins to appear in the inquisitorial sources in 1410. His sympathies to the Lollards were of an older date and did not prevent him from a successful career at court. However, his friendly relations with the Prince of Wales, alongside whom he fought in France, cooled considerably, when his friend and protector became the king of England as Henry V. Oldcastle was accused of owning banned heretical books. He admitted to the charge, to the astonishment of the king, and later ventured to defend the principles of the Lollard teachings before the archbishop's court. The king hesitated to punish his close ally, and Oldcastle was thus able to escape from the Tower thanks to the help of London Lollards. The crisis of the political system as well as the riots in Wales and in Scotland both appeared to him to be a good opportunity for decisive action. According to Oldcastle's plan, the king and his family were to be taken hostage and their royal residence occupied, which would enable the Lollard theses to be legislated into practice. Whether it was Oldcastle's intention to put an end to the monarchy and execute its representatives including the king, of which he was later accused, cannot be proved. The beginning of the rebellion, in which some twenty thousand men from all of England were to take part, was set for the night of January 9, 1414. The rebellion was, however, betrayed before the conspirators even had the chance to congregate in St. Giles Fields in the vicinity of London. The royal military assaulted and dispersed them. Immediately afterwards the royal commission sentenced sixty nine prisoners to death. Oldcastle managed to escape again, and although Henry promised him mercy, he remained in defiant resistance until December 1417, when he was executed.<sup>29</sup>

The English Lollards gained information about the Prague reform movement from Czech students who came to Oxford and elsewhere with the intention to copy Wyclif's tractates. They discovered, to their pleasant surprise, that they were

<sup>28</sup> Regarding the original Lollard pacifism and its gradual shift towards violent revolt, see M. Aston, 'Lollardy and Sedition 1381–1431', *Past and Present*, xvii (1960), pp. 1–44, reprinted in: Aston, *Lollards and Reformers* (see note 14), pp. 1–47.

<sup>29</sup> For introductory information about the rebellion of John Oldcastle and its effects, see Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, pp. 284–294, and Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, according to the index. Seibt, Cabochiens, Lollarden, Hussiten, p. 197, classified this revolt as belonging to the series of "estates' revolutions".

not alone in their reform attempts. In letters, which they, in September 1410, wrote to John Hus, Voksa of Valdštejn and their friends, they praised the eagerness of the Czech adherents to God's law and encouraged them, lest they, as good knights of Jesus Christ, slacken in their struggles against the weakening Antichrist. One of the writers of the two extant letters, lord John Oldcastle, ended, as we know, at the gallows in 1417. The writer of the second letter, the tireless preacher Richard Wyche was burnt by domestic inquisition in June 1440. According to Anne Hudson's skillful analysis, the two reform-minded groups had unexpectedly numerous contacts at the beginning of the 15th century, of which little was previously known. Czech Wycliffites around Hus and Jerome of Prague gained, with the help of English non-conformist clerics, access to Wyclif's treatises that were previously unknown or inaccessible and, in return, offered their sympathies.<sup>30</sup> Contemporaneously, in March 1411, four "Scottish" letters written by a certain Quentin Folkhyrd, a made-up knight, who masked some unknown Lollard fanatic. Peter Payne was the only English Wycliffite, who came to Bohemia and made his home there and, in return for his work in the service of the Czech reformation, was given the honor to defend one of the four Hussite articles at the council of Basel.<sup>31</sup>

The proceedings of the Council of Constance evoked a general sense of alertness against all followers of the Oxford reformer, and disrupted direct contacts between the English Lollards and Czech Wycliffites. That meant that Hussite Bohemia did not repay its debt and did not enrich the ideological arsenal of the Lollard movement any farther. With the same perseverance, with which Lollardy resisted the continual inquisitorial meddling, it also retained its early doctrinal visions and forms, whose effect would be strengthened by adoptions of Hussite

<sup>30</sup> Hus's correspondence with the Lollards was published by V. Novotný, *M. Jana Husi korespondence a dokumenty* (Praha, 1920), pp. 73–86, N° 21, 22 and 24. Regarding the person of Richard Wyche, see Ch. von Nolcken, 'Richard Wyche, a Certain Knight, and the Beginning of the End', in Aston and Richmond, eds., *Lollardy and the Gentry*, pp. 127–154, and especially A. Hudson, 'Which Wyche? The Framing of the Lollard heretic and/or Saint', in P. Biller and C. Bruschi, eds., *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 221–237.

<sup>31</sup> The so-called Scottish letters were made available by J. Sedlák, *M. Jan Hus* (Praha, 1915), pp. 182–196, N° XIV. Regarding Fulkhyrd or Folkhyrd, see Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, p. 126. The state of research on the missionary activities of Peter Payne is described by F. Šmahel, 'Magister Peter Payne: Curriculum vitae eines englischen Nonkonformisten', in A. de Lange and K. Utz Tremp, eds., *Friedrich Reiser und die „waldensisch-hussitische Internationale“ im 15. Jahrhundert* (Heidelberg – Ubstadt – Weiher – Basel, 2006), pp. 241–260.

reform practices and their means of propaganda and based on educational songs. Lollardy did not resonate with Utraquism, and a certain similarity between the ideas of William White (burnt in 1428) and other Lollards from Norfolk and Suffolk and the decision of the Tábor synod from November 1424 was probably entirely a coincidence.<sup>32</sup>

An isolated attempt to build up contacts from the Czech side did not end well for its instigator. Pavel of Kravaře, master of the university in Paris and bachelor of medicine from Montpellier, appears in the sources as an inconsistent personality. In May 1416 he was admitted College of Masters at the Prague Faculty of Arts, but in the end found employment in the royal court in the Catholic city of Krakow. In the beginning of 1432 he lived in Prussia, from where he attempted to have an audience with the king Jagiełło, in order to acquaint him with the “divine mysteries revealed to him”. As far as Hussite articles were concerned, he chose a somewhat tortuous route for their propagation. He was, however considered a Hussite in Scotland, where in July 23, 1433 he was burnt in the abbey of Saint Andrews. English Lollards continued to sympathize with the Hussites and when another collection of indulgences was launched, this time in support of the crusade of cardinal Henry Beaufort in 1428, they resisted it both in secret and in public. A certain Ralph Mungyn was prosecuted on this occasion for saying that “it is not permitted to raise arms against declared heretics, who in large numbers rose up in the kingdom of Bohemia.” The tribunal most likely doctored the pejorative part of the statement, and Myngun denied the accusations.<sup>33</sup>

Lollardy was crushed neither by the failure of the rebellion nor by the subsequent wave of inquisitional prosecutions. Aristocratic supporters may have dis-

<sup>32</sup> A definite answer to the question whether or not contacts between Lollards and Hussites continued after 1415 were not found even by Hudson herself, *The Premature Reformation*, p. 515. On the common features between White and articles of Tábor synods, see p. 289, on the negative attitude of Lollardy to Utraquism, see p. 289, and on the interrogations of Ralph Mungyn, see p. 369. On the interrogations of the above-mentioned Mungyn, see also A. Neumann, ‘Ohlas husitství v Evropě’, *Časopis katolického duchovenstva*, lxxv (1924), pp. 249–258.

<sup>33</sup> The fate of Pavel of Kravaře in Scotland was described by F. Bednář, ‘Pavel z Kravař’, *Časopis Matice Moravské*, xxxix (1915), pp. 67–76 and M. Spinka, ‘Paul Kravar and the Lollard-Hussite Relations’, *Church History*, xxv (1956), pp. 16–26. F.M. Bartoš added a number of biographical details in his, *Husitství a cizina* (Praha, 1931), pp. 214–217; on the subject of his possible authorship of several tractates, see L. Moonan, ‘Pavel Kravar, and some writings once attributed to him’, *The Innes Review*, xxvii (1976), pp. 3–23.

appeared, but the movement made itself felt not only in the more economically developed duchies in the south, between Dover and Bristol, but also in London and in the north in Lincoln and Norwich.<sup>34</sup> In 1431, Lollardy made itself heard again in an attempted rebellion and its spirit of revolt continued until 1520s.<sup>35</sup> For comparative studies of the Hussite movement, Lollardy remains especially important because it reached, both in theory and in practice, violent enforcement of its reform goals. Lollardy was a reform movement of wider influence, not only a sect. The Hussite movement reached further in many respects. Had it not been for its victories against crusading armies, it would not have been granted acceptance at the council of Basel and the Hussites would meet similar inquisitorial prosecutions as the Lollards. I will close with words of Anne Hudson on Lollardy: “In England Lollardy was demoted on the political agenda in the face of other pressing issues. But in Bohemia the ironical force of the little local difficulty would not be lost for many further years.”<sup>36</sup>

<sup>34</sup> On late Lollardy, see J.A.F. Thomson, *The Later Lollards, 1414–1520* (Oxford, 1965), also Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, pp. 288–305, with a detailed map of epicenters, and most recently, F. Somerset, J.C. Havens and D.G. Pittard, eds., *The Lollards and their Influence in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2003).

<sup>35</sup> For more information about the rebellion of spring 1431, see, among others, Aston, *Lollardy and Seditious*, pp. 24n. Regarding a subsequent rebellion led by Jack Cade in 1450, see Mothes, *England im Umbruch*, p. 172f.

<sup>36</sup> See A. Hudson, ‘Lollardy: a little local difficulty?’, in *Vita religiosa e identità politiche: Universalità e particolarismi nell’Europa del tardo medioevo*, a cura di S. Gensini (Pisa, 1998), pp. 513–526, here p. 526. Cf. M. Aston, ‘Were the Lollards a Sect?’, in P. Biller and B. Dobson, eds., *The Medieval Church: Universities, Heresy, and the Religious Life* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 163–191.

## CONFESSION AND NATION IN THE ERA OF REFORMATIONS

Central Europe in Comparative Perspective

Prague 2011

---

### Aspects of Tradition in English Wycliffism\*

*Anne Hudson*

In 1414 bishop Bubwith of the south-western diocese of Bath and Wells investigated the cases of seven suspected Lollards from Bristol: the episcopal register records that they were asked their beliefs about the fourteen articles of faith, the ten commandments, the seven sacraments, the seven works of mercy and the cardinal virtues.<sup>1</sup> On all counts the answers of six were satisfactory, and they also denied being or consorting with Lollards, reading or hearing their books; to certify this they produced the requisite number of compurgators; only one had to abjure, probably because he could not produce sufficient compurgators. A few days later Christina More, also of Bristol, was subject to the same process and also purged herself. It seems, however, unlikely that all were so completely orthodox as they

\* The paper as given in 2004 is here printed without alteration. Since then important work, notably by Dr Mary Dove and Dr Matti Peikola on the manuscripts of the Wycliffite Bible and of the accompanying lectionaries and calendars, suggests some modifications to the comments here.

<sup>1</sup> Bath and Wells reg. Bubwith openings 133b–140a, ed. T.S. Holmes (Somerset Record Society 29–30, 1914), pp. 283–90; the details of the cases are summarized by J.A.F. Thomson, *The Later Lollards 1414–1520* (London, 1965), pp. 22–5.

succeeded in convincing the bishop – at least for the moment: eight had previously been detained in 1410 for heresy, and one at that point was reported as being ‘long of the sect’. Bristol, a large town divided between two dioceses and very close to the borders of a third, had been known for Lollardy since the 1380s and sent a sizeable contingent to the Oldcastle rebellion in 1413–14, with which at least two of those purged had connections.<sup>2</sup> By 1414 Bubwith had been bishop of Bath and Wells for five years. It is interesting that his questioning, or that of his officials, was so inept: Lollards could have been identified from their views on some of the topics listed, but not without detailed questioning; on the commandments heresy could probably have been discerned had the investigator asked about images under the second, on the sacraments further enquiry might well have discovered doubts about the validity of all save those authorised by scripture, and almost certainly would have identified Wycliffism had belief about either the eucharist or confession been pursued.<sup>3</sup> The nine almost certainly escaped through the incompetence of the authorities; Lollardy continued in Bristol throughout the fifteenth century.

But the apparently naive simplicity of the episcopal questions is, from another perspective, very interesting: leaving aside the assumption that only elementary questions could be asked of the suspects, there is presumably an expectation that on all matters Lollards would depart from accepted orthodox teaching – Lollards would deny the creed, spurn all ten commandments and so on; they should be identifiable through this complete abandonment of the elements of the faith. Such a view, even if presented in somewhat more sophisticated form, underlies much anti-Wycliffite polemic and notably Netter’s long *Doctrinale antiquitatum fidei* completed in the 1420s: Netter saw Wyclif as the heir (in some conveniently undefined way) of the early heresiarchs of the church, and Lollardy as related to

<sup>2</sup> The river Avon formed the boundary in the medieval period between the dioceses of Worcester and Bath and Wells: in the former lay those parishes north of the river, in the latter those south of it which, whilst less numerous, were densely populated; the boundary of the diocese of Salisbury ran some twelve miles east of Bristol. For the later cases see again Thomson, *The Later Lollards*, pp. 24–51; according to a citation by bishop Wakefield of Worcester (see his register ed. W.P. Marett (Worcestershire Historical Society, new series 7, 1972), no. 832) the Oxford disciples Nicholas Hereford, John Aston and John Purvey preached heresy in Bristol before August 1387.

<sup>3</sup> For a summary of Lollard beliefs on these subjects see A. Hudson, *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 301–7, 281–90, 294–301 respectively.

Manicheism, Donatism, Pelagianism and innumerable other deviant sects;<sup>4</sup> earlier and less tendentious attack focussed on Wyclif's relation to Berengar's heresy.<sup>5</sup> Modern criticism, like the contemporary chroniclers and polemicists, have connected Wyclif and his teaching with the 1381 Peasants' Revolt and argue that Oldcastle's rebellion in 1414 was the logical outcome of the master's views on dominion that Lollardy propagated.<sup>6</sup> But it is perhaps worth spending the space here to consider whether there are not some aspects of Wycliffism that are, perhaps surprisingly, remarkably conservative, traditional; and to see what these aspects may suggest about the nature of the changes that Wyclif and his followers sought to bring about.

An instructive starting point is church liturgy. Looking at the three long sets of sermons which Wyclif states he compiled in retirement at Lutterworth, it is immediately apparent that the gospel and epistle lections on which these sermons are based follow precisely the traditional usage of the Sarum rite, the rite which by the late fourteenth century was universal in the southern province of England and common in the northern province.<sup>7</sup> The organization of each set also proceeds exactly on the liturgical calendar there prescribed. The same adherence to Sarum is found in the longer four sets of English sermons; here, though some relation to Wyclif's own sermons is clear, the vernacular material extends the closeness to Sarum in that a further set of more than a hundred weekday sermons is included for precisely those occasions, and only those, for which Sarum prescribes particular lections – these have no parallel in Wyclif's Latin.<sup>8</sup> In both Latin and English sanctorale sets a few *Commune* lections are omitted, and, more explicably,

<sup>4</sup> See Thomas Netter, *Doctrinale antiquitatum fidei catholicae ecclesiae*, ed. B. Blanciotti (3 vols., Venice, 1757–9), for instance ii. 595, 674, iii. 762 etc.

<sup>5</sup> For instance in the 1381 replies to Wyclif (who himself stated his agreement with the condemnation of Berengar) by John Tissington OFM and Thomas Winterton OFA recorded in *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, ed. W. Shirley (London, Rolls Series, 1858), pp. 134, 224–6.

<sup>6</sup> William Rymington OCist connected Wyclif to the 1381 Revolt soon after its occurrence: see Oxford MS Bodley 158, f. 202; for recent influential comment on this and the Oldcastle rebellion see M. Aston, 'Lollardy and Sedition, 1381–1431', *Past and Present*, xvii (1960), pp. 1–44, reprinted with some additions in her *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* (London, 1984), pp. 1–47.

<sup>7</sup> The sermons in question are found in the first three volumes of J. Loserth's edition of Wyclif's *Sermones* (London, Wyclif Society, 1887–9). For the medieval rite see *The Sarum Missal*, ed. J. Wickham Legg (Oxford, 1916).

<sup>8</sup> See *English Wycliffite Sermons*, ed. A. Hudson and P. Gradon (5 vols., Oxford, 1983–96), especially i. 8–17 where the arrangement is discussed.



non-biblical saints are largely cut from the *Proprium* sequence; but no reorganization of the remaining material, no additional occasions disturb the conventional sequence. Furthermore, the lections so selected form in both languages the anchor for the teaching that follows: the lection is the core of the ensuing sermon, emphatically not a tag that is then forgotten in what follows.<sup>9</sup> This situation deserves consideration. Sarum, like the Roman rite more widely used on the continent, selects its gospels and epistles by their suitability to occasion only on the major festivals of the church; otherwise the choice is fairly haphazard even if there is some matching of epistle to gospel. For a sect which stressed the absolute authority of scripture, these snippets, often presenting stories or admonitions out of context, would seem to be very unsatisfactory: a coherent reading, necessarily spread over several weeks, of a single New Testament book would seem to offer a far more effective didactic use of the major assemblies of Christians. The defects of coverage within Sarum can be highlighted by the fact that the ‘Sermon on the Mount’, as conveyed by Matthew chapters 5–7, one of the major locations of Christian ethical teaching, is not covered as a whole in Sarum: extracts from the three chapters form the lections for eight individual sermons, but these are scattered through Sunday, weekday and sanctorale sequences in no logical or connected fashion.<sup>10</sup>

Furthermore, though, as I have mentioned, there is both in Wyclif’s Latin and in his followers’ English cycles of sermons some excision of sanctorale material, a surprising amount of provision is still made in each: in the *Proprium* Wyclif still includes sermons on the Sarum lections for the translation of Martin, on the Assumption of the Virgin and on the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross;<sup>11</sup> the English has all of these and also the lection for the feast of the Seven Brothers.<sup>12</sup> The most immediately surprising of these is the last, but the inclusion of the Exaltation of the Cross is perhaps the more remarkable given the Lollards’ declared hostility to the worship of the cross (as that is expressed, for example, in the

<sup>9</sup> In both collections the normal practice is for exegesis to proceed piecemeal through the entire lection; this is particularly clear in the vernacular sermons where the scribes meticulously marked out the translation of the lection on first appearance by rubrication or underlining.

<sup>10</sup> Thus in the vernacular sermons Matt. 5:1–12 is the lection for sermon 122, 13–19 for 80, 17–19 for 207, 20–4 for 6, 25–30 for 209, 43–6 for 145, 6:16–21 for 144, 24–33 for 15, 7:15–21 for 8.

<sup>11</sup> See *Sermones*, ii. nos 17, 20 and 24.

<sup>12</sup> *English Wycliffite Sermons* nos. 108, 113, 117 and 110. The fact that in several of these, both Latin and English, the honorand is not mentioned by name only emphasises the conventionality of the coverage.

*Twelve Conclusions* posted in London in 1395).<sup>13</sup> Equally, further thought will raise many questions about the *Commune* provision in both Latin and English sermons: given Wyclif's lack of interest in saints, and the more overtly declared hostility of his followers to the legends and cults of saints, for what occasion are these sermons intended? – they may lack personal specification, but is it not strange, given the opprobrium heaped by them on private religion, that both include the Sarum provision of a lection for 'Common of a Confessor and Abbot'?<sup>14</sup> Certainly Grosseteste might qualify in Wycliffite thought for celebration under one heading of 'a Confessor and Bishop', but for whom were the remaining instances with the same rubric intended? – one in Wyclif's Latin group, three in the English? Who was the 'Virgin not a martyr' for which both compiled a sermon?<sup>15</sup>

The Sarum rite does not allow unimpeded access to the biblical text. Moreover, its institution and its promulgation are the result of ecclesiastical ordinance – rite, let alone calendar, is not prescribed in the bible. Yet it is hard to maintain that the adherence to Sarum was unnoted by the Lollards. Even though the single manuscript of the relevant Wyclif sermons surviving in England does not regularly note the occasions for which each lection was appropriate, the vernacular sermons almost invariably do so.<sup>16</sup>

Many of the copies of the vernacular Bible, especially in its idiomatic later version of the New Testament, contain both a calendar of feasts and also, and more interestingly, a lectionary for the liturgical year where book and chapter references are provided, together with the opening and closing words of each lection; these are then keyed to conventional a–g marginal letters in the text itself.<sup>17</sup> This is an entirely traditional way of providing access to the text, but one that it

<sup>13</sup> See *Selections from English Wycliffite Writings*, ed. A. Hudson (Cambridge, 1978), no. 3 lines 104–7 especially 'the seruisse of the rode, don twyes euey yer in oure chirche, is fulfillid of ydolatrie'.

<sup>14</sup> *Sermones*, ii. no. 55; *English Wycliffite Sermons* no. 81.

<sup>15</sup> *Sermones*, ii. nos. 51–2 and 58 respectively, *English Wycliffite Sermons*, nos. 76–9 and 84.

<sup>16</sup> For manuscripts of the Latin sermons see my papers 'Trial and Error: Wyclif's works in Cambridge, Trinity College MS B.16.2' in *New Science out of Old Books: Studies ... in Honour of A.I. Doyle*, ed. R. Beadle and A.J. Piper (Aldershot, 1995), pp. 53–80 and 'Wyclif's Latin Sermons: Questions of Form, Date and Audience', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* lxxviii (2001), pp. 223–48; for the layout of the vernacular sermons, *English Wycliffite Sermons*, i. 126–38.

<sup>17</sup> The standard edition of the vernacular Bible is still that by J. Forshall and F. Madden (4 vols., Oxford, 1850); the lectionary is printed there iv. 683–98 from representative manuscripts but no printed version of the calendar exists (and no study has yet been made of the coverage in different manuscripts).

would be hard to parallel in English vernacular sources before the Lollards. The calendars found in these Wycliffite scriptures have not yet been properly scrutinized: the standard edition printed one version, and collated seven other copies; my somewhat haphazard checking suggests the version printed to be fairly constant. The saints whose feasts are recorded certainly extend beyond the biblical to include quite a wide selection of early christian martyrs and also many standard Carolingian figures. Interestingly there are a number of distinctively English saints of national, rather than regional, significance; but only three of these, Richard of Chichester, Edmund of Abingdon and Hugh of Lincoln lived after the Norman Conquest. But what of the most celebrated post-Conquest English saint: Thomas Becket, Thomas of Canterbury? His feast was on 29 December, his translation 7 July; neither appear in the calendar for the *Proprium*, but the first appears in the calendar for the temporale Christmas season in which position saints' feasts around the Nativity were often inserted, usually with the simple naming as 'seynt Thomas'.<sup>18</sup>

Here then we seem to have a traditionalism on many levels: of access to the bible, of teaching method in the sermons derived from that selected access, of physical presentation in the manuscripts. The obvious first explanation is that all is to be explained as unthinking adherence to convention: that Wyclif, and his disciples after him, simply took the liturgical provision without reflection and utilized current codicological habits without consideration. Yet there are problems in such an easy dismissal. Both Wyclif and the Lollards were aware of apparent inconsistencies in their teaching. In *De veritate sacre scripture* Wyclif recognized that it could be argued that scripture itself, the canonization of only certain books, could be regarded as a human selection – an authorization of the divine by the human leaders of the church in this world; Netter was only the latest opponent who objected that Wyclif appeared to accept that authorization even though he rejected almost every other exercise of papal power.<sup>19</sup> Wyclif attempted to forestall that line of attack by showing how cross references between books of the bible formed a means of verification for the canon; the General prologue to

<sup>18</sup> In Bodleian MS Selden supra 51 the name is partially erased but the lessons are given (f. 26) in the *Proprium* listing. For Wycliffite views about Becket see J.F. Davis, 'Lollards, reformers and St. Thomas of Canterbury', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, ix (1963), pp. 1–15.

<sup>19</sup> *De veritate sacre scripture*, ed. R. Buddensieg (3 vols., London, Wyclif Society, 1905–7), i. 218–228; Netter, *Doctrinale*, i. 346.

the English bible follows, though less systematically, a similar line of reasoning.<sup>20</sup> If both were alert to potential logical discrepancies which affected the primary authority of scripture, it is surely impossible that they were not aware of those impinging on the much less crucial issue of liturgy. And both on occasion question the usefulness of Sarum, and in particular the slavish promotion of Sarum as a sufficient mode in itself of christian worship: as the English *Of mynystris in the chirche* succinctly puts it ‘Salusbury us, ne York us, be not nedfulle to come to heuene’<sup>21</sup> – in later terms, such matters were adiaphora.

But, even if they were, a good deal of trouble and expense was taken within the Lollard movement for their maintenance. Are there other examples to parallel this? It is quite hard to find other equally prominent examples. The overriding biblical basis of Lollard ideology explains other apparent retentions of traditional habits: the celebration of baptism and the eucharist derive their authority from their institution in the gospels, the church’s involvement in marriage from Jesus’s participation in the feast at Cana, the only possible justification for a role for the priesthood in confession from the instruction to the healed lepers to show themselves to the priest;<sup>22</sup> the recognition of ranks of deacon and bishop can be justified, even if their contemporary realization cannot, from the Pauline epistles and Acts. But confirmation and the last rites are not canonical, and are generally ignored. The whole area of ecclesiology is measured against that biblical mirror: no aspect of the papacy, the legal and institutional aspects of the church in this world, of saints, images, pilgrimages, private religion and so forth, is spared from rigorous scrutiny against this sole authority.<sup>23</sup> Equally, if the Sarum liturgical provision is retained, the language in which it was traditionally promulgated was not, and the case against that tradition was one of the most keenly fought campaigns in English Lollardy.

What should be made of this? I think we need to think further about the kind of reform that Wyclif and his English followers aimed for, and to ask questions more critically about the way in which we have come to view the ‘movement’ which Wyclif, perhaps inadvertently, initiated. Our view, it seems to me, has

<sup>20</sup> See Forshall and Madden, i. 43 ff.

<sup>21</sup> Printed in *English Wycliffite Sermons*, ii. 362 lines 943–4; this section does not derive directly from Wyclif, but for his views see *Polemical Works*, ed. R. Buddensieg (2 vols., London, Wyclif Society, 1883), i. 345/9.

<sup>22</sup> See *English Wycliffite Sermons*, i. 275–8, iv. 41–9.

<sup>23</sup> See *Premature Reformation* pp. 375–82 for discussion.

been shaped by the opponents of Wyclif who aimed, and largely succeeded, in hereticating a set of opinions defined by themselves, and hence in hereticating a definable group of people; by that heretication they aimed to exclude both humans and ideas and so maintain a unitary, centralized church. Under the persecution that increased in its ferocity from 1401 onwards that view necessarily spread to its sufferers. Paradoxically, that exclusion was reinforced by the very successors who might have been expected to negate it: sixteenth-century adherents of the continental movements, who saw in Wyclif the ‘morning star of the Reformation’ and in Lollardy antecedents to their own beliefs, again separated out certain ideas and people, even if it shifted the apportionment of condemnation and approbation. Margaret Aston has recently considered the vexed question of whether the English Lollards saw themselves as a sect;<sup>24</sup> her analysis is indeed perceptive, but even here I wonder whether enough allowance is made for the extent to which self-portrayal fluctuated through time, and increasingly took on the colouring imposed by the enemy.

Given the topic of the present conference, it is pertinent to ask whether the reformation envisaged by Wyclif and his followers was a definably English one? Was there, in the faith and the institution which they sought to restore, anything that explicitly or implicitly drew on English traditions or habits? The rejection of papal authority, and of the institutional framework dependent upon the curia and on international orders of private religion, obviously implies a focus on the more local church; in British terms that naturally is defined as insular, effectively given the geographical dispersal of the Lollard movement, as English. But it seems to me that it is much less evident that ‘English’ is here a positive, as opposed to a negative, term: certainly it excludes the interference of foreign ecclesiastics, prevents the sending of taxes beyond the channel where they had often supported, directly or indirectly, the traditional enemy, the king of France – all well established causes before Wyclif. But does it add, or recall to memory, anything in the specifically English history of christendom? Some 35 years ago Edith Tatnall, in an article entitled ‘John Wyclif and *Ecclesia Anglicana*’ sought to show that it did.<sup>25</sup> She drew her evidence from three areas: references to English law, predominantly in Wyclif but less frequently texts by his followers, allusions to English kings, and references to the English church and its bishops. Yet, although she provides

<sup>24</sup> ‘Were the Lollards a Sect?’, *Studies in Church History Subsidia*, xi (1999), pp. 163–92.

<sup>25</sup> Published in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, xx (1969), pp. 19–43.

a wealth of references, her quotations do not, it seems to me, convince: English law provides a useful stick to beat canon law, the practice of English kings supports the conditionality of ecclesiastical endowment, Bede's history of the early English church shows how the church was established in the country, later bishops, such as Grosseteste or FitzRalph, can be used in support of individual Wycliffite concerns. What these details do not add up to, it seems to me, is either a coherent picture of an English church or even an insistent appeal to a specifically national history or tradition – they remain details, incidental pawns in argument, not an overriding vision.

The one central English element in Wycliffism, most emphasised in the writings of the master's disciples but incipiently present in his own, is obviously language. I have argued long ago that Wycliffism was 'the English heresy', by which I meant not that it originated in England but that it foregrounded language;<sup>26</sup> to take the most extreme instances, Lollards were apparently recognized by their enemies, the investigating bishops and their officials, by their insistence on the use of English for scripture and for the elements of religion – knowledge of the Lord's prayer or of the creed in English could be *prima facie* evidence of heresy. But even here I am unsure whether nationalism, let alone England, is the important element: the crux is surely the use of the idiom familiar to the people, or to the majority of them, not a language understood only by a small minority and learned even by them as a secondary skill. Language is, as Wyclif said, a *habitus*;<sup>27</sup> in other words, it is a medium not a message – that is, for Lollards, English is a historical accident not itself a part of ideology. Like Wyclif's appeals to *Magna carta* or to Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, the English language comes into question not as an end in itself but only as a vehicle for instruction. And it is not coincidental that, if Wyclif and Wycliffism had any influence outside the island on which it originated, it was through the medium not of English but of Latin: copies of the majority of Wyclif's own works are found abroad, predominantly in Bohemia,<sup>28</sup> copies of the Latin Lollard texts, the *Floretum/Rosarium*, the *Opus arduum*,<sup>29</sup> Latin

<sup>26</sup> See A. Hudson, *Lollards and their Books* (London, 1985), pp. 141–63; the paper was first published in 1982.

<sup>27</sup> See *Polemical Works*, ed. R. Buddensieg (Wyclif Society, London, 1883), ii. 700/27ff and compare *De veritate sacre scripture*, ii. 144/9 ff.

<sup>28</sup> See the listing in W.R. Thomson, *The Latin Writings of John Wyclif* (Toronto, 1983).

<sup>29</sup> For these two see *Lollards and their Books*, pp. 13–42 and 43–65; continental copies of the former are further discussed by J. Kejř, 'Rosarius – domnělé dílo slovenského husity', *Studie o Rukopisech*, xiv (1975), pp. 83–110 and Idem, 'Ještě jednou o Rosariu', *Studie o Rukopisech*, xv (1976), pp. 103–106

Anne Hudson

versions of Thorpe's account of his conversation with Arundel, of Taylor's 1406 sermon,<sup>30</sup> of Richard Wyche's letter from bishop Skirlaw's northern prison<sup>31</sup> – but no works in English.<sup>32</sup> The reason is obvious – that English would be incomprehensible – but the fact deserves recall, not least because it brings me back to my starting point. Latin, that traditional language of medieval theology, was in so many ways central to the Wycliffite programme.

and by S. Petr, 'The New Floretum – Rosarium Manuscripts Founded in Libraries of Czech and Moravian Chateaux', *Studie o Rukopisech*, xxx (1993–4), pp. 29–50.

<sup>30</sup> See my edition *Two Wycliffite Texts* (Early English Text Society 301, 1993) and 'William Taylor's 1406 Sermon: a Postscript', *Medium Aevum*, lxiv (1995), pp. 100–6.

<sup>31</sup> Printed by F.D. Matthew, 'The Trial of Richard Wyche', *English Historical Review*, v (1890), pp. 530–44.

<sup>32</sup> The only English in a Wycliffite text that I have found in the course of my work in continental libraries is in the refrain 'With an O and an I' in the Latin poem 'Heu, quanta desolatio Anglie prestatatur' (printed T. Wright, *Political Poems and Songs* (Rolls Series, 1859–61), i. 253–63), which I know in three continental copies; see my paper 'Peter Pateshull: One-time Friar and Poet?', in *Interstices: Studies in Middle English and Anglo-Latin Texts in Honour of A.G. Rigg*, ed. R. Firth Green and L.R. Mooney (Toronto, 2004), pp.167–83.

National and religious aspects of the Czech reform  
movement in the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries and of the Hussite  
revolution in the mirror of Western historiography

*Eva Doležalová*

Ordinary Czech citizen, educated in Czech schools and socialized in the Czech cultural environment, is much surprised when he or she opens virtually any foreign popular historical publication written in English, German or French and learns from it that nationalism was the underlying motivation for the Hussite and the antecedent reform movement in Bohemia. It all appears to him or her to be at least an exaggeration, especially in comparison with the present day when nationalism enjoys so bad a reputation and the Czech Republic is one of the least nationalistic countries in Europe.

The Hussite movement and the processes associated with it are keys to understanding Czech history and were almost always seen as such by all, whether they were emphasized or deliberately de-emphasized, whether they were praised or condemned. Modern historiography collected and analyzed numerous sources from



Eva Doležalová

this period, but the material is still so incomplete that even today it is impossible to say about some events whether they actually happened, and if so, then how. Thus, there is space for conjectures and interpretations. But no historian can avoid making evaluative judgments and expressing his or her own opinions, sympathies and antipathies, however hard he or she tries. And what remains unanswered by the historian himself, his or her readers and listeners often surmise. Every historical period contains political, economic, cultural, religious, social, national and many other elements. All these aspects play their role. If we try to decide, however, which of them were the most important ones, we enter into the field of ideology. Different eras, different generations, different nations and interest groups see different aspects of past events as the most important for them and they may not agree in it with other eras, other generations etc.

This contribution, therefore, deals with the space of ideology in the gaps between facts and not with the facts themselves, to the extent that I have been able, up to now, to come to know this space in my study and research, which were primarily focused on facts. Thus, I do not treat the subject in a systematic way, but as a confrontation of selected citations.

### **Exposition**

I will focus on Bohemia and, within Bohemia, on the pre-Hussite and the early Hussite periods. Within those, I will limit myself to those events that tend to be seen as central to nationalist interpretations. Historiographers began to describe and evaluate these periods already shortly after, in the late Hussite and post-Hussite periods. Two mutually opposing trends in this historiography emerged already at that time, one that celebrated and another that condemned the movement. A typical representative of the former is Lawrence of Březová and his *Historia hussitica*, whereas Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini with his *Historia bohémica* represents the latter trend.

Aeneas writes about the events surrounding the Decree of Kutná Hora:

*Before, the Prague University was controlled by Germans. The Czechs, people naturally wild and untamable, could not bear it. One of them, ... who studied ... in Oxford, when he acquainted himself with the works of John Wyclif, ... brought their copies with him. ... He used to lend these writings ... mainly to those who*

*hated Germans, among whom a certain John stood out, a man of low lineage who derived his name from a village called Hus ... He took hold ... of Wyclif's teaching and started to annoy German masters with it, in a hope that the Germans will leave the University in confusion. When this plan failed, he pushed it through with Wenceslas that the Prague University adopted the rules of the Paris University. This took the control of the schools away from the hands of the Germans. The German masters became irritated by this ... and ... left Prague ...*<sup>1</sup>

Lawrence does not begin his chronicle until 1414, so we cannot cite his description of the same events along with that of Aeneas. However, Lawrence does mention several times the national conflicts of 1420, in which, nevertheless, he always sees the religious motivation as primary. He writes, for example:

*When ... the Prague legation returned from the Hungarian king ..., the fortifications were removed, at which point the opponents of truth, and especially the Germans, laughed and clapped their hands saying: "Finally, these heretics, these Hussites and Wycliffites, will die and be done with."*<sup>2</sup>

and further on:

*... after the declaration ... of the crusade ... against Bohemia ... [some] inhabitants of Prague, enemies of the chalice ... said gleefully: "Now the worst heretics will be burned ... or they will die by the sword of the Hungarian king. Let us flee quickly from them ... lest we perish with them." Fearing for the loss of life and property, they moved with their wives, children, treasures and other valuable property to the Prague and Vyšehrad Castles and ... surrounding fortresses ... [;] there were about two hundred of them from the Prague Old Town and about as many from the New Town, and [they were] particularly Germans. ... But almighty God ... turned the harp of their rejoicing into wailing and lamentations...*<sup>3</sup>

and also:

*And then, on June 30, Sigismund, the Hungarian king, approached with a mighty army. ... In this army ... there were ... people ... of different nations. ... Daily, standing at the top of the mountain above the river ..., they howled like wolves*

<sup>1</sup> Enea Silvio, *Historia Bohemica – Historie česká*. Edited and translated from the Latin original by D. Martínková, A. Hadravová and J. Matl (Praha, 1998), p. 91.

<sup>2</sup> Vavřinec z Březové, *Husitská kronika*. Translated by F. Heřmanský (Praha, 1954), p. 42.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

Eva Doležalová

*against the city: “Ha, ha, Hus, Hus, Katzer, Katzer.” And if, by chance, any Czech fell into their hands, they ... burned him as heretic without mercy.*<sup>4</sup>

These authors already appraise the events from both the nationalistic and the religious perspective; more accurately, they try to explain one factor with the help of the other, the one which is, in their view, more primary and more important. Lawrence explains the ethnical clash as a consequence of the conflict between different attitudes towards the Church reform. Aeneas, in contrast, sees ethnical differences and conflicts of interest as the primary agents and culprits of the religious storms.

### **Conflict of ideologies**

Those who wish to see the Hussite movement as primarily an ethnical conflict, will focus their attention on two moments, much like Aeneas and Lawrence. First, they will zero in on the dispute regarding the votes of the University's nations, the Decree of Kutná Hora and the subsequent departure of German scholars. Second, they will focus on the expropriation and eviction of German burghers in the years following Hus's death at the stake. An extremely nationalistic interpretation of these events can be found in the works of some of the German historians of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Constantin Höfler, in his treatise from 1864, called “Master John Hus and the departure of German professors and students from Prague in 1409”, writes:

*Forcible interventions of the king ... found its response in the people. And if Hus had not earlier ignited conflicts between Germans and Czechs in his sermons, he would not have hesitated even now, from his blind hatred of Germans, ... to drag university matters to the pulpit. “Children,” he called to Czech artisans, who made up the majority of his audience, “praise be to God Almighty that we expelled the Germans and attained the goal which we had hoped for. We have won!” ... The departure [of German professors and students was] as a result of these events irrevocable. It happened at the point when all academic and legal standing of the three nations had been annihilated, any agreement was no longer possible, the*

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., pp. 71–72.

*compromise which had been offered was rejected and the rule of violence replaced the rule of the law. ... King Wenceslas must not have anticipated that.”<sup>5</sup>*

An article written in 1937 by Heinz Zatschek and entitled “History of Bohemia and its standing among medieval states” contains the following lines:

*It was the era of John Hus and the military exploits that followed his burning at the stake, which gave Bohemia an ethnically unified character and left indelible marks on the Czech nation and culture. We would not be evaluating the Hussite movement correctly if we saw it exclusively or mostly as a matter of the faith although it is true that historiography of the era sees the movement more as a religious rather than an ethnical conflict. However, we must not allow ourselves to be misled by that. It is often the case that false reasons are given [for a certain thing], when one does not wish to adduce the correct ones or when [the correct reasons] do not seem to be attractive enough. The ethnical conflict between Czechs and Germans would hardly hold the interest of uncommitted observers, while the entire Western Europe could be roused by concerns for Christian community! It is necessary to note that among the accusations against Hus there is also an accusation that he agitated against Germans and that was responsible for the departure of the German academics from Prague. Hus obviously could not refute these accusations. His attitude to them is documented in the treatise [by Peter of Mladoňovice], the author of which had access to Hus’s manuscripts. There it is explicitly stated that [Hus] regarded the situation, when offices in Bohemia were held by Germans, as injustice and [something] against God’s law. Another [of Hus’s] statements on the subject is characteristically evasive, when he says that he prefers a good German to an evil Czech. It is, therefore, not to be doubted that Hus consciously acted against Germans.<sup>6</sup>*

And another citation of the same author:

*The anti-German attitude of the king Wenceslas only became clearly evident after his deposition [from the throne of the Holy Roman Emperor]. When the tension between Germans and Czechs continued to grow, he gave it free reins. His contemporaries praised his father for his ability to prevent dissension between the two*

<sup>5</sup> Carl A.C. Höfler, *Magister Johannes Hus und der Abzug der deutschen Professoren und Studenten aus Prag 1409* (Prag, 1864), pp. 245–246.

<sup>6</sup> H. Zatschek, *Geschichte und Stellung Böhmens in der Staatenwelt des Mittelalters, Das Sudetendeutschtum* 1 (1937), pp. 43–92, here p. 75.

*nations. Had Wenceslas pursued the same goal, Bohemia might have been spared the Hussite wars. ... A special role in the European history and in the history of the German nation fell to the year 1409... The Czechs were mainly striving for posts in the colleges; therefore many [Germans], tired by incessant disputes, used to leave Prague for other German universities. These conflicts started earlier than the division in religious and scientific questions due to the imported Wyclif's teaching. In other words, the roots of the conflict must be sought in national antagonisms. ... The national conflict flared up after the Decree of Kutná Hora. When Master Jan Hus had been burned to death, [this conflict] changed into persecution of the Germans, during which vent was given to an unrestricted and cruel eviction. In the following period, the mightily strengthened Slavic self-confidence turned against the German settlers and caused damages, not rectified to this day, to German settlements in the East. The question, whether the Prague riots of 1419 would have ever occurred, if hundreds of German students had been present in the town as before, has never been raised. The mere fact that it could emerge should be a warning for us not to see the Hussite chaos as an unavoidable necessity.<sup>7</sup>*

Johann Loserth, German historian from the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, was much more objective. In his “History of the Late Middle Ages”, published in 1903, he described the situation of 1420 in the following way:

*The manifest of the Praguers called on other towns in Bohemia, asking them to join [in the defence of the chalice] and raised the most passionate accusations against Germans as “the natural enemies of the Czech nation.” In order that the hatred against Sigismund would spread among all segments of the people, it was said [about him] that he intended to exterminate the Czech nation and settle their land with Germans. In reality, German lives were being threatened as were their property, and German families – the wealthiest in the town– were forced to leave Prague. Their possessions were confiscated and given to the Hussites, either for free or for a nominal price. [Other] towns in which Czech Wycliffism was successful experienced similar events: the conflict had also an ethnical character from the very beginning.<sup>8</sup>*

<sup>7</sup> H. Zatschek, *Deutsche Geschichte* (Wien, 1941–42), pp. 243–247.

<sup>8</sup> J. Loserth, *Geschichte des späteren Mittelalters von 1197 bis 1492* (München – Berlin, 1903), p. 489.

Similar appraisals probably surfaced in the German literature in older times as well; however, the German reformation was aware that it was linked to the Hussite movement, which is why the views of German Protestants were more positive. In 1520, Martin Luther wrote:

*“I do not wish to make John Hus into a saint and a martyr, as some Czech writers do, but I do wish to add that he was been wronged and that his book and his teachings were condemned unjustly.”* Ulrich von Hutten, the humanist and adherent of German reformation, wrote in 1521 *“about the celebrated Czech Žižka, who expelled rogues, idle priests and lazy monks from the country and returned their property to the families of the former donors or used it for the public good.”*<sup>9</sup>

Modern German historiography saw these events as a matter of honor and blood, and could not, therefore, be objective. Lenka Bobková reports, in her article on Charles IV and John Hus in German grammar-school textbooks, on the views of the Hussite movement these textbooks offered between 1880 and the present day.<sup>10</sup> Textbooks from years before the First World War always emphasized the anti-German character of the conflict. Textbooks from the Weimar Republic, that is between 1919–1933, did not mention Hus at all though they did cover the Hussite wars, but esteemed Charles IV as the founder of the first German university. Textbooks of the Federal Republic of Germany from the 1950s mentioned the departure of the German academics from Prague in 1409 but did not give more details as to its driving force. In some textbooks, Hus was seen as the follower of Wyclif. Contemporary textbooks emphasize, even if in moderate terms, the national, that is, anti-German aspect of the Hussite movement.

In contrast, English protestant environment never forgot that Hus and his adherent built on Wyclif. That is why Anglophone historiography is more objective in trying to cover different aspects of the phenomenon and different perspectives. The re-edition of Hastings Rashdall's treatise on “The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages” from 1936, volume II, has this to say about the events surrounding the Decree of Kutná Hora.

<sup>9</sup> Cited according to: F. Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce IV – Epilog bouřlivého věku* (Praha, 1993), p. 154

<sup>10</sup> L. Bobková, ‘Karel IV. a Jan Hus v německých gymnaziálních učebnicích. Několik poznámek k učebním textům od konce 19. stol. do současnosti’, *Historický obzor* 6–7 (1998) pp. 15–17.

Eva Doležalová

*The Germans promptly had recourse to the old weapon which had once proved so mighty an engine against Royal or civic tyranny in Paris and Bologna: they bound themselves together by an oath to secede from Prague in a body if the decree were not withdrawn. ... But the old weapons had lost some of their power; the decree was not withdrawn; national passions were becoming too strong for the continuance of the cosmopolitan Universities of the thirteenth century. ... The final split between the German and the Czech elements at Prague was immediately occasioned, we have seen, by the ardour of the Bohemians for ecclesiastical reform. ... Sooner or later the disruption of the bi-racial University was inevitable: Teuton and Czech could not live and study together in the same Schools. Even at the present day [(written at the end of 19th century)], beneath the strong hand of a military monarchy, the separation seems inevitable, and the Bohemian capital now embraces two distinct Universities, a Czech University which still holds aloft the standard of Nationality, and a German University ministering to the wants of students whose patriotism does not rebel against the wider culture to which the German tongue is now the indispensable key.<sup>11</sup>*

The same Rashdall further writes about the German reformation:

*When the standard of revolt was raised once more, it was raised by the very nation which had most strenuously set itself against the Hussite movement. The Teutonic nation was the last of the nations of Europe to attain to moral and intellectual maturity: it was the last to assert its manhood by a rebellion against Roman usurpation, but it was the first to carry its revolt to a successful issue. The Reformation which succeeded, like the earlier reform-movements of the Middle Ages which had failed, was born in a University.<sup>12</sup>*

Anglophone literature published by Protestant churches can sometimes be biased in the opposite direction. It emphasizes the reforming role of John Hus and of the Hussite movement and excuses the nationalist excesses by statements, the veracity of which has not been proven. An example is James Wylie's book "History of Protestantism" from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Wylie writes, in the third book of the first volume, entitled "John Hus and the Hussite wars", the following:

*Huss was able soon after (1409) to render another service to his nation, which, by extending his fame and deepening his influence among the Bohemian people, paved*

<sup>11</sup> H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages II* (Oxford, 1936), p. 225, 226, 228.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 232.

*the way for his great work. Crowds of foreign youth flocked to the University of Prague, and their numbers enabled them to monopolize its emoluments and honors, to the partial exclusion of the Bohemian students. By the original constitution of the university the Bohemians possessed three votes, and the other nations united only one. In process of time this was reversed; the Germans usurped three of the four votes, and the remaining one alone was left to the native youth. Huss protested against this abuse, and had influence to obtain its correction. An edict was passed, giving three votes to the Bohemians, and only one to the Germans. No sooner was this decree published, than the German professors and students ... left Prague. ... Among these students were not a few on whom had shone, through Huss, the first rays of Divine knowledge, and who were instrumental in spreading the light over Germany.*<sup>13</sup>

However, popular English (and also French) literature, unless it is based on works of Czech historians, often takes over the nationalist interpretation, not as much because of preconception but rather because of lack of interest in details.

I will limit myself to two examples:

First, "History of Medieval Europe" by Charles Bémont and Roger Doucet:

*As far as eradication of heretics is concerned, the issue was to stop the progression of the Hussite heresy, which was only one of the several aspects of the conflict between Czechs and Germans in Bohemia. The conviction of John Hus and his pupil Jerome of Prague ... was not only in the interest of [maintaining] orthodoxy but also a result of the weight of the German element at the council.*<sup>14</sup>

Internet textbook "The End of Europe's Middle Ages" of the University of Calgary mentions John Hus in two lines in this way:

*Hus, Jan*

*The Czech leader of the Hussites situated in Bohemia, he was called before the Council of Constance in 1414 to debate his beliefs. Instead, he was charged and convicted of heresy and was burned at the stake as a heretic. This actions created*

<sup>13</sup> J. Wylie, *History of Protestantism. Volume First – Book Third. John Huss and the Hussite Wars*, p. 160, <http://www.doctrine.org/history/HPv1b3.htm>.

<sup>14</sup> C. Bémont and R. Doucet, *Histoire de l'Europe au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1931).



Eva Doležalová

*a martyr for the Czechs and flamed the already existing tension between the Germans in Bohemia and the Czechs.*<sup>15</sup>

For contrast, let me cite several typically formulations uttered by Czech authors. František Palacký was a creator of the ideology which regarded Hussitism as the most significant era of Czech history and which continues to prevail in modern Czech historiography. Nevertheless, he was able to mention objectively all the above-mentioned events. Regarding the situation at the university, he writes in his “History of the Czech Nation in Bohemia and Moravia”:

*Strong influx of foreigners, especially Germans ... to the university of Prague ... could not but introduce different national tensions and conflicts, which later gained great and almost decisive force. This aspect cannot, therefore, be ignored here.*<sup>16</sup>

He describes the evictions of Germans in 1420, following the account by Lawrence of Březová, but moderating it:

*...more fearful Catholic burghers in Prague admitted ... that it would be soon necessary for them to see to their safety. About seven hundred families from the Old Town and the same number from the New Town left their houses, among them especially many wealthy Germans, and hid ... either ... in Hradčany or in Vyšehrad or also elsewhere in the country in various castles and fortresses.*<sup>17</sup>

On the whole, however, Palacký only sparingly reports on the national conflicts; the mentions of them are difficult to find in the text of his book, with an obvious exception of his famous formulation defining the leitmotiv of Czech history as “the socializing as well as wrestling of Slavdom with Romanhood and Germanism” in the introduction to volume one. Regarding his attitude to the Hussite movement, we are more likely to find formulations suggesting that Palacký did not see the national conflict as the driving force of the Hussitism.

Thus, he writes, for example:

*We do not wish to conceal that among many Germans, especially in Prague, there were some supporters of the Hussitism; but they were of course much less numerous than Catholics among the Czechs.*<sup>18</sup>

<sup>15</sup> The End of Europe's Middle Ages, The University of Calgary, [http://www.ucalgary.ca/applied\\_history/tutor/endmiddle/FRAMES/eastframe.html](http://www.ucalgary.ca/applied_history/tutor/endmiddle/FRAMES/eastframe.html)

<sup>16</sup> F. Palacký, *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě* III (Praha, 1937), p. 32.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 199.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 178.

Regarding the perception of Wyclif's teaching at the University of Prague:

*This new trend of freeing the spirit from under the sheer authority took on, from the very beginning, a solely ecclesiastical and religious character, opposing in the first place only the pope and the Roman hierarchy but not also secular rulers.*<sup>19</sup>

In the context of our theme, we can read between the lines: "this trend, this movement did not primarily have a nationalistic character". Palacký appraises the Hussitism as a whole in this way:

*All of a sudden we find ourselves at a time, when under the label of religion and faith ignoble acts and sins were spreading ... countless horrors and atrocities were committed. Religious fanaticism disrupted all social bonds, brutalized minds and lay waste the welfare of the people.*<sup>20</sup>

Not a single word is uttered about the nationalist fanaticism.

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Josef Pekař almost fully identified himself with the nationalist appraisal of German historians, putting however an opposite (i.e., positive) algebraic sign in front of it:

*The religious aspect is in the foreground of the Hussite movement during Hus's life, but even then its another, ethnical aspect is emerging to the surface – the Hussite movement is at the same time a struggle for emancipation of the Czech element from the hegemony of Germans or an [onerous] alliance with them, a terrible struggle which is ... also of economic nature. ... By the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century we see this struggle be fought at the university, where the Czech minority attempts to attain a more honorable standing ... in 1409, the king issues the Decree of Kutná Hora, in which the German nation is told that it does not have a right of residence in the land. The two sides were locked in conflict almost everywhere: the ruling German minority and the powerless Czech majority, which longed for change and whose self-confidence grew. ... This change was made by the storm of the Hussite wars, in a way that was sometimes horrible. The Prague Germans fled, if they were not slaughtered. Many towns lost their German ... population, occasionally as a result of massacres. ... That is ... from today's perspective ... the most valuable result of the Hussite movement.*<sup>21</sup>

The last two sentences have, however, been much abbreviated.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 165–166.

<sup>21</sup> J. Pekař, *Postavy a problémy českých dějin* (Praha, 1990), pp. 105–106.

All Czech literature after the Second World War contained, as an obvious after-effect of the war, implicit nationalist appraisals of the Hussitism but this aspect was not emphasized and no one attached large importance to it. This situation continues to the present day. In his popular book “Wanderings through Czech History”, Petr Hora-Hořejš evaluated the Hussite movement in this way:

*The Hussite movement emerged from religious motivations and was then carried on by old Christian, that is religious, ideals. ... “it is necessary to see, in spite of all the accompanying evil, the apex stone which held the dome of the Hussite drama: Czechs stood up against the whole world not in order to loot and lead aggressive wars, but in order to defend few noble ideals, to which they adhered due to Hus, his predecessors and his followers. After all, the deadly struggle was not begun by them, it was forced upon them. ... This is important – Czechs fought for ideals!”<sup>22</sup>*

In many places of his “Hussite Revolution” and also in his other works, František Šmahel concerns himself with the genesis and emancipation of the Czech nation in the Hussite era and also with the role of nationalism in the Hussite movement. However, the polemic against the nationalist interpretation of the driving forces of Hussitism is not in the focus of his attention. In the conclusion of the last volume of the “Hussite Revolution”, he writes:

*... the interpretation of ethnical ... moments is least troublesome. Universalism of Western Christian .... reform ideologies was a replica of the church doctrine [itself] which was no less universal. ... before the reform propaganda could overcome the confines of its initial venue, ... the apparatus of church reaction pushed it back into ethnical ... isolation. The shift into defensive position ignited the nationalist ... self-consciousness of the reform community, which oscillated from higher-level reflections ... to spontaneous expressions of mob ... intolerance. The nationalistic moment emerged most distinctively in the Czech lands, where German minority's attitudes towards ... the reform movement, cold from the beginning, ... [were becoming] increasingly hostile. The nationalistic appeals [, however,] lost much of its potential to integrate, when the divisions of the [Czech] ethnical ... community [itself] in relation to the reform movement became apparent. ... although ethnical passions exploded with frantic force in the moments ... of confrontations, ... the nationalistic argumentation degraded to a journalistic instrument, which the combatants subjugated to their actual priorities.<sup>23</sup>*

<sup>22</sup> P. Hora-Hořejš, *Toulky českou minulostí 2* (Praha, 1997), pp. 260–261

<sup>23</sup> Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce IV*, p. 164.

## Conclusion

What to say in conclusion? Is it even possible to judge a conflict between ideologies? Is it even possible to argue about taste? Many attempted it and are still attempting. František Palacký set out to write a lengthy and passionate defense of Hus and the Hussite movement against Constantin Höfler. In addition to correcting Höfler's factual mistakes, he only succeeded in creating another ideological work. Many other historians tried to soften the nationalist condemnations of Hus and the Hussites by pointing to various mitigating circumstances, or by doubting whether such (for Czechs) compromising events ever took place and whether the hostile statements (towards Germans) were actually ever spoken or written down. Critical analysis and respect for facts are certainly basic features of modern historiography, but it cannot be said that they themselves are capable of removing ideological disputes. Even one of the most ideological historians, Heinz Zatschek, was renowned for his reliable and creative work with objective facts. I think that we need to see the matter in a reverse way: we can find ideology in places where the society demands it. And although this demand can be generated by those very events that are to be evaluated, it is not so in the case of Hus and Hussitism. The societal demand of today is reconciliation, which allows historians of all nations to discuss, to a great extent truthfully, all aspects of events and attitudes. If I may be more specific, it means for the Czech historical community to admit that the nationalistic motivation was present and for foreign historians to cease to assert that it was the primary motivation. Therefore, I will end this exposition by citing from the cover of Howard Kaminsky's "A History of the Hussite Revolution":

*Religious reformism, sectarian heresy of every sort, national passions, class hatreds, laicization and anticlericalism – all the disturbing factors at work in late-medieval Europe came together in the Hussite revolution, which provided examples of virtually every form of chase with which Europe would be concerned for the next free centuries.*<sup>24</sup>

<sup>24</sup> H. Kaminsky, *A History of the Hussite Revolution* (Berkeley – Los Angeles, 1967).



## Jiskra, Hussitism and Slovakia

*Martyn Rady*

Jan Jiskra, warlord of a large part of Slovakia (i.e. Northern Hungary) in the 1440s and 1450s, is typical of the military enterpriser who launched his career in Hungary in the service of Sigismund of Luxemburg. He was of foreign origin, and thus not connected to the rival baronial families and leagues, of non-aristocratic descent, and both a warrior and an organizer of men and resources. In these respects Jiskra may be usefully compared to the early fifteenth-century Italian condottiere and logistician, Filippo Scolari (Pipó Ozorai); to the Dubrovnik enterprisers, Frank, Matko and Jovan Tallóci; to the Teutonic knight and administrator of south-eastern Hungary in the 1430s, Nicholas von Redwitz; and, most obviously, to Jiskra's own long-standing adversary, John Hunyadi.<sup>1</sup> Whereas these, however,

<sup>1</sup> Filippo Scolari is reputed to have amazed Sigismund at a meeting of the royal council in 1399 by being able to establish on the spot the cost of mounting a force of 12,000 troops – see P. Engel, 'Ozorai Pipó', in F. Vadas, ed., *Ozorai Pipó emlékezete* (Székszárd, 1987) pp 53–88, at p. 56; for the Tallóci brothers, see E. Mályusz, 'The Four Tallóci brothers', *Quaestiones medii aevi novae*, iii (1998), pp. 137–75; for the career of Redwitz, who lacks any substantial biography, see E. Joachim, 'König

Martyn R a d y

made their reputation fighting the Turks on Hungary's southern frontier, Jiskra was primarily involved in campaigning in a less illustrious theatre. As a consequence he has been accorded only a minor place in history. In what follows we will seek to establish the broad outline of Jiskra's career and put it in the context of the political, military and fiscal events of the period as well as against the background of religion and confessional allegiance.

### Biographical Outline

Jiskra was the scion of an impoverished Moravian branch of the Brandýs family and he is thought (although there is no evidence for this) to have once fought alongside Žižka and Prokop the Bald.<sup>2</sup> His own religious affiliation is, however, (and as we will discuss below) uncertain. If he followed the utraquist rite, his allegiance can only have been lukewarm, for Aeneas Sylvius, the later Pope Pius II, both in his biography of Jiskra and in his other writings reserves for Jiskra the greatest praise, and gives no hint that his character was compromised by religious heterodoxy.<sup>3</sup> In any event, during the 1430s Jiskra entered Venetian service. According to Aeneas Sylvius, he fought in *ultramarina loca* (we are not told where), and then joined Sigismund's employment. Conceivably, he may have been part of the company of 12 boats of 'taborites and others' which was despatched by Sigismund in 1437 to aid the defence of Belgrade.<sup>4</sup>

Following Sigismund's death in December 1437, Jiskra continued in the employ of his daughter, Elizabeth, and of her husband, Albert of Habsburg, who was Sigismund's successor as king of Hungary and Bohemia and also the elected *rex Romanorum*. In October 1439, however, Albert died, leaving a pregnant wife. Within Hungary (and Bohemia), several competing factions emerged in response to the calamity introduced by the king's untimely death. The largest group,

Sigismund und das deutsche Ritterorden in Ungarn 1429–1432, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, xxxiii (1912), pp. 87–119.

<sup>2</sup> In the following account, I have relied extensively on F. Oslanský, 'The Role of John Jiskra in the History of Slovakia', *Human Affairs*, vi (1996), pp. 19–33; P. Tóth-Szabó, *Giskra. Különös tekintettel Abaijmegyére* (Budapest, 1903); by the same author, *A cseh-huszita mozgalmak és uralom története Magyarországon* (Budapest, 1917).

<sup>3</sup> Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, *De viris illustribus* (Bibliothek des literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, i: Stuttgart, 1843), pp. 56–8; Idem, *Historia Bohemica*, ch 58 (Opera quae extant omnia, Basileae, 1571, p. 100); Idem, *Epistolae* 81, 93, 108 (Opera quae extant omnia, pp. 564–6, 581, 615).

<sup>4</sup> Tóth-Szabó, *A cseh-huszita mozgalmak*, pp. 178, 370–1.

mindful both of the hereditary principle and of the promises they had made during Albert's lifetime in respect of the succession, stood by Elizabeth and her unborn child, whom the doctors predicted would be a male heir.<sup>5</sup> Members of a second group looked, however, to Poland and to its young king Wladislas III, and asserted the right of the nation to elect the monarch. Although they explained their cause in terms of Hungary's need for a mature ruler capable of repelling the Turks, it is likely that they considered Wladislas more pliant than Queen Elizabeth.<sup>6</sup>

The contest between the two factions intensified during the course of 1440. In January of that year a delegation of the royal council went to Cracow to invite Wladislas to assume the crown. At this point, Elizabeth seems to have acquiesced to the mission on the understanding that she would marry the Polish king. The next month, however, on the night of 20–21 February, Elizabeth's maid stole the royal crown from Visegrád castle and, on the following day, the queen herself was delivered of a male heir, the future King Ladislas V. On the 15 May, the little Ladislas was crowned with the Holy Crown in Székesfehérvár by the Archbishop of Esztergom – he cried throughout his ceremony.<sup>7</sup> Less than a week later, Wladislas entered the capital city of Buda with a large retinue and, on 17 July, he was crowned King Wladislas (Úlászló) I of Hungary by the same archbishop, in the same church and with many of the same lords in attendance as had witnessed the coronation there two months earlier. (He received, however, a different crown.)

The next few years were marked by armed conflict between the rival sides. The various groups were, however, never stable. Individuals and families switched sides with bewildering frequency, depending mainly upon the inducements offered them. Jiskra, by contrast, remained conspicuously loyal to the cause of Elizabeth and of her baby son. Indeed, Jiskra's inclusion in Aeneas Sylvius's pantheon of heroes was entirely due to the constancy which he was considered to have displayed at a time of intense factional intrigue and change. Appointed by Elizabeth *ispán* (sheriff) of Šariš (Sáros) county in 1440, and two years later of Zvolen (Zólyom) county, Jiskra built up a formidable military power in what is now Slovakia, most notably around the main commercial and mining centres. In 1442, there was a brief lull in the fighting following on a truce by the terms of which

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.*, p. 171.

<sup>6</sup> J. Held, *Hunyadi: Legend and Reality* (Boulder and New York, 1985), p. 82.

<sup>7</sup> The theft of the crown and the coronation of Ladislas are recounted in the maid's own remarkable autobiography – see *The Memoirs of Helene Kottanner (1439–1440)*, M.B. Williamson, ed. & trans. (Cambridge, 1998).



Wladislas now committed himself to marry Elizabeth's daughter, Anna. But within less than a week of the truce being agreed, Elizabeth was dead and the conflict resumed. The next year, another truce was negotiated by the papal legate, Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini, on the understanding that all parties would join together against the Turks. After some early military successes in the south, in which Jiskra played no part, Wladislas was defeated and slain by the Turks at the battle of Varna in November 1444.

For many months the fate of Wladislas was not known in Hungary where it was generally believed that, rather than perishing in the battle, he had assumed the habit and career of a wandering penitent. In the interim, the diet appointed seven captains, amongst whom were included both Jiskra and the voevode of Transylvania, John Hunyadi. Each of the seven captains possessed a strong regional power, and each was enjoined by the diet to maintain order in the kingdom and see to the destruction of the private forts built over the preceding years. Once it had been established, however, that Wladislas was indeed dead, the diet recognized Ladislas V as the rightful king, abolishing the institution of the captains. Since Ladislas was still a minor and under the guardianship of his uncle, Frederick III of Habsburg, at whose court he remained, the diet appointed John Hunyadi as governor of the realm.<sup>8</sup> Hunyadi himself had prospered enormously out of the civil war and had built up a patrimony consisting by this time of 28 castles, almost 60 towns and about a thousand villages.<sup>9</sup> Although consistently portrayed in Hungarian historical literature as an instrument of the 'national interest', Hunyadi should more properly be considered a factional leader in his own right who remained consistently opposed to Ladislas V's and the Habsburg inheritance in Hungary. In view of this, it is not surprising that Jiskra should not have come to terms with Hunyadi but continued to retain his regional power, styling himself 'supreme captain of King Ladislas' on whose behalf he acted *persona regia*.<sup>10</sup> Four campaigns waged by Hunyadi in 1447, 1449, 1451 and 1452 failed to dislodge Jiskra from his northern strongholds. It is, however, a measure of Jiskra's prominence that over these years he should have first married into the powerful Rozgonyi

<sup>8</sup> The texts of the *decreta* appointing the seven captains and conferring the governorship on Hunyadi are given in *The Laws of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary 1301–1457* (*Decreta Regni Mediaevalis Hungariae*, ii), J.M. Bak, P. Engel, J.R. Sweeney and P.B. Harvey, Jr, eds. (Salt Lake City, 1992), pp. 106–15.

<sup>9</sup> B. Hóman and G. Szekfű, *Magyar történet*, ii (Budapest, 1936), p. 433.

<sup>10</sup> Tóth-Szabó, *Giskra. Különös tekintettel*, p. 20.

family, then been selected as a future spouse for John Hunyadi's sister, and subsequently been engaged to the daughter of the Serbian despot, George Branković, who was also the widow of the Sultan Murad II.<sup>11</sup>

In 1453, Ladislas V entered Hungary, but (after some wobbling) did not seek to divest Jiskra of the power he had accumulated.<sup>12</sup> Plainly Ladislas and his Austrian advisors, most notably Ulrich Cilli, recognized Jiskra as an important counterweight to Hunyadi whose own power was scarcely diminished by the king's return. In 1456, John Hunyadi died and leadership of the anti-Habsburg faction passed to his son, Ladislas. The next year, Ladislas Hunyadi unmasked his real purpose by murdering Ulrich Cilli and capturing the king. Relying in part on Jiskra, Ladislas V escaped his captors and had Ladislas Hunyadi tried and executed.<sup>13</sup> This was sufficient pretext to launch a full-scale civil war between the Hunyadi faction (now represented by John Hunyadi's widow, Elizabeth, and her Szilágyi kinsmen). In November 1457, however, Ladislas V died in flight in Vienna, allegedly poisoned. Jiskra immediately sought out Casimir of Poland as the next king of Hungary, but his purpose was thwarted by the election of John Hunyadi's son, Matthias (Corvinus), as king on 1 January 1458. Over the next few years, Matthias chipped away at Jiskra's power in the north while for the most part Jiskra himself delayed in Casimir's service, aiding briefly in Poland's wars against the Teutonic Knights. In 1462, Jiskra recognized the inevitable. He acknowledged Matthias's rights to the throne and relinquished his own northern redoubts in exchange for a massive land grant in south-eastern Hungary.<sup>14</sup> Jiskra subsequently served Matthias on campaigns against the Turks and in Wallachia as well as in several diplomatic missions to Constantinople, eventually dying around 1470.

<sup>11</sup> Oslanský, 'The Role of John Jiskra', p. 24, errs in assuming that the marriage to Hunyadi's daughter actually took place – see Tóth-Szabó, *A cseh-huszita mozgalmái*, pp. 224, 246, 248, 325.

<sup>12</sup> Tóth-Szabó exaggerates the speed with which Jiskra overcame the machinations of Ulrich Cilli and Hunyadi to win the confidence of King Ladislas (*A cseh-huszita mozgalmái*, pp. 269–75). Clearly, Jiskra did not retrieve the royal favour until at least 1455 – see Hungarian National Archive, *Collectio Antemohácsiana*, *Dl* 14908, *Dl* 14910.

<sup>13</sup> *Antonio de Bonfinis Rerum Ungaricarum Decades*, I. Fögel, B. Iványi, L. Juhász, eds., 4 vols (Leipzig and Budapest, 1936–41), iii, pp. 196–7 (3. 8. 245).

<sup>14</sup> The terms of the treaty are given in Tóth-Szabó, *Cseh-huszita mozgalmái*, p. 325.

### Military and Fiscal Contexts

Aeneas Sylvius in his biography of Jiskra, which is included in his compendium *De Viris Illustribus*, treats Jiskra as an example of steadfastness and of unswerving loyalty to the young Ladislav V.<sup>15</sup> Emblematic of his virtue is the account which Aeneas Sylvius gives of a meeting in Vienna in 1445 between Jiskra and Ladislav V. Upon hearing of the many services that Jiskra had performed on his behalf, the little king took up six pennies and solemnly gave them to the captain. Jiskra subsequently had the coins mounted on gold and carried them around his neck for the rest of his life (the story is repeated in Bonfini's account, written in the 1490s).<sup>16</sup> But in order to comprehend Jiskra's career we should go beyond his personal qualities, however deeply they may have determined the personal choices which he made. As we indicated at the outset, Jiskra should be seen as one of a number of military enterprisers who rose to prominence in the first decades of the fifteenth century. According to Aeneas Sylvius, Jiskra's qualities included his skills of military leadership and the bond which he built up with his men, even to the extent of sharing his wealth and lodgings with them.<sup>17</sup> What Aeneas Sylvius does not say is that the vast majority of his followers were mercenaries, recruited from the Bohemian lands, Poland, Hungary and Austria.

Of these mercenaries, the largest group were almost certainly Czechs and probably for the most part Taborites and Orphans, whose opportunities for service in their homeland had been greatly diminished after their defeat at the battle of Lipany in 1434.<sup>18</sup> Many of these subsequently turned to mercenary activity. As we have seen, they served Sigismund in his campaigns against the Turks. They also entered the employment of Albert of Habsburg and of his widow, Elizabeth, and, in the civil wars of the 1440s, served all sides. A band of 700 Czech mercenaries, led by Ján Šmikovský (whose troops had raided Hungary only a few years before), was thus recruited by the queen-mother and attended the coronation of Ladislav V in 1440. For his part, King Wladislav enlisted in the same year the

<sup>15</sup> For the background to this work and its use of motifs and topoi taken from Plutarch, Petrarch and Boccaccio, see G. Bürck, *Selbstdarstellung and Personenbildnis bei Enea Silvio Piccolomini (Pius II)* (Basle and Stuttgart, 1956), esp. pp. 75–6.

<sup>16</sup> The story is also given by Aeneas Sylvius in 'Epistola 81'. See back, note 3. Also, Antonio de Bonfinis, *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades*, iii, p. 106 (3. 5. 13).

<sup>17</sup> *De viris illustribus*, p. 58.

<sup>18</sup> Z. Tóth, *Mátyás király idegen zsoldoserege (A fekete sereg)* (Budapest, 1925), pp. 34, 55.

services of Ján Čapek, a former Orphan captain.<sup>19</sup> Other mercenaries joined the retinues of individual magnates, including those of John Hunyadi,<sup>20</sup> while the election itself of Matthias Corvinus as king in 1458 was accompanied by the appearance at the diet of 5000 Czech and Polish mercenaries under the leadership of Michael Szilágyi.<sup>21</sup>

Mercenaries enlisted in the wars of the 1440s and 1450s generally fought under their own captains who were responsible for their recruitment, payment and continuing loyalty. The names of these captains – Brcál, Axamith, Komorowski and so on – indicate their different origins. Individual captains might enter into service-agreements with any one of the participants in the contest. Although most at one time or another fought alongside Jiskra, we will find them all on many occasions also pitted against him. The willingness of parties in the conflict to recruit mercenaries, and especially Czech ones, may be explained partly by their availability for service and partly by their mastery of warfare techniques – in particular the deployment of mobile artillery and the use of small units in an integrated battleplan (i.e. not just slamming large blocks of cavalry against the enemy and waiting for the outcome).<sup>22</sup>

The cost of such expertise was, however, heavy: half a florin a week for an infantryman and twice that for a horseman.<sup>23</sup> But mercenaries needed payment. If individual captains did not receive money from whomsoever retained them, then they would look elsewhere for support and take their companies with them. The same applied to individual soldiers whose captains could no longer fund them – they either deserted and enlisted elsewhere or took to raiding. By the 1450s large parts of northern Hungary were thus in the hands of *vagi* – variously adventurers, deserters and decommissioned mercenaries who plundered the countryside and established their own ‘brotherhoods’ under elected captains.<sup>24</sup> At this time,

<sup>19</sup> Tóth-Szabó, *Cseh-huszita mozgalmak*, pp. 175–6; Antonio de Bonfinis, *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades*, iii, p. 226 (3. 10. 1–5).

<sup>20</sup> The war of 1447 was thus conducted by Hunyadi using the Komorowski brothers – Tóth-Szabó, *Cseh-huszita mozgalmak*, p. 234. In the campaign of 1452, Hunyadi further relied on the Komorowskis and Brcál – *ibid.*, p. 261.

<sup>21</sup> Tóth, *Mátyás király idegen zsoldosserege*, p. 64.

<sup>22</sup> The point is well made by Zoltán Tóth – see Tóth, *ibid.*, pp. 27–37.

<sup>23</sup> Tóth-Szabó, *Giskra. Különös tekintettel*, p. 31.

<sup>24</sup> J. Thuróczy, *Chronicle of the Hungarians*, trans. F. Mantello and ed. P. Engel (Bloomington, 1991), pp. 162–3 (ch. 244).

the number of these *bratřici* (i.e. ‘brothers’)<sup>25</sup> was put at 20,000 men, operating from 36 field camps and castles.<sup>26</sup> The brethren or *bratřici* were often identified with the ‘regular’ forces who fought with Jiskra, and punitive measures taken against him on the grounds that he was responsible for their misdeeds.<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, as Palacký argued long ago, the *vagi* and brethren should more accurately be compared to cossacks, heyducks and other such military companies as have always operated in the interstices of authority.<sup>28</sup>

By virtue of the awards granted him by Elizabeth in the early 1440s, Jiskra was well placed to meet at least part of the financial demands imposed on him by the mercenaries and their captains. From Šariš and Zvolen counties, Jiskra steadily extended his power by straightforward seizures and by royal grant of redoubts previously held by his adversaries. Along with these came often extensive appurtenances, including villages and markets. To these may be added the revenues of justice which fell to Jiskra through his control of the administration of the counties of which he was *ispán*.<sup>29</sup> Significantly also, Jiskra drew to the side of the queen and of Ladislav V the principal mining towns and commercial centres of the region. These included the minting and mining chambers of Košice (Kassa) and Kremnica (Körmöcbánya), as well as rights to an extensive range of revenues, including taxes, tolls and market dues. It was not, however, the case that the towns and mining communities of Slovakia were forced into supporting Jiskra. The merchant patricians of Košice in particular were anxious at this time to free themselves from the economic ascendancy of Cracow and they resented recent Polish intrusion into Spiš (the Szepesség).<sup>30</sup> They thus shared with Jiskra an interest in advancing the cause of Ladislav V against the Polish party of King Wladislas. The extent to which the city and citizens of Košice effectively ‘bankrolled’ Jiskra is demonstrated not only by the large sums lent to him by the city council – almost

<sup>25</sup> Hungarian accounts commonly refer to these as *bratrik, vagi, fratres, fraticelli, latrones* and *latrunculi*.

<sup>26</sup> Oslanský, ‘The Role of John Jiskra’, p. 27. These redoubts were for the most part converted churches, temporary wooden structures and fortified caves – see B. Polla and M. Slivka, ‘Husiti, Jiskrovci a bratřici na východnom Slovensku vo svetla archaeologickeho bádania, *Archaeologia historica*, v (1980), pp. 69–103 (with German-language résumé, pp. 101–2).

<sup>27</sup> Tóth-Szabó, *Cseh-huszita mozgalmak*, pp. 240–1.

<sup>28</sup> F. Palacký, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, IV (Prag, 1857), pp. 523–5.

<sup>29</sup> Tóth-Szabó, *Cseh-huszita mozgalmak*, pp. 231–4.

<sup>30</sup> E. Fügedi, ‘Kaschau, eine osteuropäische Handelsstadt am Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts’, *Studia Slavica*, ii (1956), pp. 185–213, at pp. 206–9.

27,000 florins between 1440 and 1445<sup>31</sup> – but also the loans of individual citizens, most notably of the city magistrate, John Moderer, who in the 1440s lent Jiskra well over 30,000 florins.<sup>32</sup> Although by the 1450s, Jiskra had lost the automatic support of Moderer and of the urban communities of the north,<sup>33</sup> until this time it is possible to conceive him as being as much the agent of merchant capital as of Elizabeth, the Habsburg faction and Ladislav V. Nor, we should add, did Jiskra's power weigh heavily on the communities over which he ruled. Indeed, despite the condition of endemic civil war, investment and extraction rose significantly in Kremnica's mining industry during the 1440s.<sup>34</sup>

The reciprocity of relations between Jiskra and the cities of Slovakia is demonstrated by his military deployments. The vast body of Jiskra's castles in the region were situated around the principal mines and cities. They extended thus in two main locations – in Lower Hungary, namely Bars and Zvolen counties, and thus in the immediate vicinity of the mining towns of Kremnica, Banská Štiavnica (Selmechánya) and Nová Baňa (Újbánya);<sup>35</sup> and in Upper Hungary, in Šariš, Abov (Abaúj) and Spiš counties, and so guarding the cities of Košice, Bardejov (Bártfa), Prešov (Eperjes) and Kežmarok (Késmárk).<sup>36</sup> Castles set in more distant parts of the kingdom, as for instance in the westernmost Nitra (Nyitra) and Trenčín (Trencsén) counties were typically either pulled down shortly after their acquisition, or else were ceded for little gain.<sup>37</sup> Set between the two main swathes of castles was Gemer (Gömör) county. Here Jiskra maintained a number of castles, mainly for purposes of communication, including a principal residence at Rimavská Sobota (Rimaszombat).<sup>38</sup>

Nevertheless, the resources of the cities and mining towns of northern Hungary were insufficient to retain a large body of mercenaries, for their surpluses in terms of tax revenue scarcely amounted to more than several thousand florins a year.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>31</sup> L. Kemény, *Kassa város régi számadáskönyvei 1431–1533* (Košice, 1892), pp. 22–30.

<sup>32</sup> Tóth-Szabó, *Cseh-buszita mozgalmak*, p. 217.

<sup>33</sup> *ibid.*, p. 261.

<sup>34</sup> A. Péch, *Alsó Magyarország bányamivelésének története*, 2 vols (Budapest, 1884–7), i, pp. 50–1.

<sup>35</sup> The castles of Revište, Dobrá Niva and Zvolen. For the information on castles which follows, see P. Engel, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301–1457*, 2 vols (Budapest, 1996), i, pp. 261–468.

<sup>36</sup> Plaveč, Brezovica, Kapušany, Kysak, Lipovec, Jasov, Velká Ida, Spišský Hrad.

<sup>37</sup> For example, the castles at Topolčany and Tokaj.

<sup>38</sup> Thus also Rožňava, Drienčany, Sirkovce.

<sup>39</sup> E. Birk, 'Adalék Magyarország pénztörténetéhez V László idejében', *Új Magyar Múzeum*, iii (1853), pp. 509–15; L. Fejérfalvi, 'II. Ulászló jövedelmeinek jegyzéke', *Történelmi Tár* (1880), pp. 167–70.

Martyn R a d y

Consequently, in the truces which Jiskra concluded both with King Wladislas and John Hunyadi, the payment of large sums from the treasury or the right to farm taxes in a specific region were invariably included in the terms of peace. Usually also, relations broke down because the promised money had not been forthcoming. On many occasions, the grant of money was linked to Jiskra's commitment to use the sums involved to pay off his mercenaries. Such, however, frequently resulted in the mercenaries and their captains setting up independently and warring on their own or, alternatively, entering the service of another captain. For the continuing condition of mayhem, Jiskra was often blamed and accused of dishonesty.<sup>40</sup> The final disbandment of Jiskra's army in the early 1460s thus involved the payment of 40,000 florins, by which he could pay off his troops, and a concerted military campaign aimed at preventing the mercenaries so released from continuing to make war on their own. It was not, however, until 1469 that the last remnants of these forces were either militarily vanquished or brought into the service of King Matthias himself as part of his own mercenary or 'Black' army.<sup>41</sup>

### Jiskra and Hussitism

We do not know Jiskra's religious affiliation. Palacký refers to him as a 'formerly outlawed heretic' but there is no evidence for this claim.<sup>42</sup> Tóth-Szabó, author of the most substantial biography of Jiskra, holds Jiskra responsible for driving out the Catholic clergy from his seat in Rimavská Sobota, but if we chase up his footnotes we will again find no support in the sources.<sup>43</sup> As Špirko indicates, we should

<sup>40</sup> Tóth-Szabó, *Cseh-huszita mozgalmak*, pp. 210–3, 229–30, 240–1, 248, 255, 262–3, 305, 315–6, 320–2.

<sup>41</sup> *ibid.*, p. 325; Tóth-Szabó, *Giskra. Különös tekintettel*, p. 46. In similar fashion, the mercenaries of the Czech commander, Axamith, were taken – albeit briefly – into royal service in 1453. See Tóth-Szabó, *Cseh-huszita mozgalmak*, p. 287.

<sup>42</sup> Palacký, *Geschichte Böhmens*, IV, p. 22; The absence of any evidence suggesting Jiskra's adherence to utraquism was noted by B. Varsik, *Husiti a reformácia na slovensku do žilinskej synody* (Bratislava, 1932): cited in D.P. Daniel, *The Historiography of the Reformation in Slovakia* (Sixteenth Century Bibliography, 10: St Louis, 1977), p. 19.

<sup>43</sup> Tóth-Szabó, *Giskra. Különös tekintettel*, p. 55. Tóth-Szabó ultimately relies on Ladislas Bartholomaeides, *Comitatus Gömöriensis. Notitia historico-geographico-statistica* (Levoča, 1806–8), p. 688, but all Bartholomaeides actually states is that during the fifteenth century some of inhabitants of Rimavská Sobota converted to Hussitism.

be careful to distinguish between Jiskra, Hussites and *bratřiči* and not conjoin (in the manner of Bonfini's history from the 1490s) all three in indiscriminate fashion.<sup>44</sup>

A large number of the Czech mercenaries who served with Jiskra were Hussites and, following the sources, we may presume that many were taborites. Certainly, some of these demonstrated a calculated disregard for churches and monasteries, not a few of which they either plundered or converted into forts.<sup>45</sup> (We should, however, note that the despoliation of places of worship was also practised by Hungarian lords – including Hunyadi – and even by Catholic priests.)<sup>46</sup> Doubtless, and as Thuróczy's chronicle asserts, many of the *bratřiči* settled down and took wives, and we may presume that the womenfolk were at least aware of their husbands' religious beliefs.<sup>47</sup> Beyond this, however, we may note very little evidence of support for Hussitism within Slovakia. Although later commentators, misled by an older historiography, have understood that on the basis of linguistic affiliation the indigenous Slovak population must have been open to Hussite beliefs, their contention cannot be convincingly demonstrated.<sup>48</sup> Certainly, there are references to convictions for heresy in this region, but upon closer inspection the heretics described prove not to be Hussites at all but instead sexual deviants, mostly guilty of incest.<sup>49</sup>

Clearly, therefore, Hussitism was present in the medieval kingdom. Nevertheless, apart from the mainly German population of Bratislava (Pozsony),<sup>50</sup> the principal regions where Hussite beliefs spread lay in the south of the country. In the region around Zagreb, in what was then Slavonia, Hussite beliefs were transmitted by

<sup>44</sup> J. Špirko, *Husiti, jiskrovci a bratřiči v dejinách Spiša (1431–1462)* (Levoča, 1937), p. 81.

<sup>45</sup> Tóth-Szabó, *Cseh-huszi mozgalomok*, pp. 279, 332.

<sup>46</sup> The fortified Premonstratensian priory at Jasov, hitherto occupied by a 'Polish robber', was recaptured by Matthias in 1458. It was not, however, returned to the order but given over instead to Matthias's commanders, Blaise and Kelemen Magyar – see Tóth-Szabó, *Cseh-huszi mozgalomok*, p. 308. On the contemporary depredations of a Catholic priest, see M. Rady, 'Justice Delayed? Litigation and Dispute Settlement in Fifteenth-Century Hungary', *Central Europe*, ii (2004), pp. 3–14, at p. 7.

<sup>47</sup> J. Thuróczy, *Chronicle of the Hungarians*, p. 163 (ch 244).

<sup>48</sup> Thus, Liptai, *Magyarország haditörténete*, i, p. 92; G. Székely, 'A Huszitizmus és a magyar nép', *Századok*, xc (1956), pp. 331–67, 556–90, at pp. 583–4. Ludwig von Gogolák has indicated that the notion of Hussite influence over the indigenous Slovak population goes back to eighteenth-century Lutheran historiography – see his *Beiträge zur Geschichte des slowakischen Volkes*, 3 vols (Munich, 1963–72), i, p. 11. As František Šmahel has argued, Czech Hussite influence in Slovakia was largely confined to military affairs – *Die Hussitische Revolution*, 3 vols (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Schriften, 43: Hannover, 2002), iii, pp. 1953–4.

<sup>49</sup> K. Fehértói, 'Husziták voltak-e a Heves megyei hereticusok', *Századok*, cvii (1973), pp. 435–9.

<sup>50</sup> Šmahel, *Hussitische Revolution*, iii, p. 1952.



former students of the University of Prague and fuelled by a strong anticlericalism which originated in the often violent contest between bishopric and city. But this was evidently only one centre of heterodoxy. In 1421, a papal inquisitor was sent into the south-western counties of the kingdom to combat heresy and to reconstruct the region's monasteries.<sup>51</sup> At the end of the next decade, a second inquisitor, Jacob de la Marchia, was active in what is now the Vojvodina and, more particularly, in the county of Szerém (immediately north of Belgrade). Here, between the Sava and Danube rivers, lay, according to its bishop, a nest of heresy, transmitted by Bosnians and Serbs, but which included among its depravities those of the Hussites. Other accounts talk of the intermixing of Hussite heresy with the older traditions of the Bogomils and Patarenes. The centre of Jacob's investigation was the city of Kamenica where he had a number of heretics burnt, exhuming the bodies of others which he also consigned to the flames.<sup>52</sup>

Jacob de la Marchia's zeal provoked a flight from southern Hungary to the principality of Moldavia whose voevode was evidently unperturbed by Catholic allegations of heresy. Among the refugees were the Hungarians Thomas and Valentine who continued in the safety of Moldavia their translation into Hungarian of the Old and New Testaments.<sup>53</sup> From the 1430s, a number of Hussite settlements were founded in Moldavia, including ones named Husz (Huszvárosa), Jeromosfalva and Prokopfalva.<sup>54</sup> In the 1440s, these were visited by the English Wycliffite, Peter Payne. Nevertheless, although earlier accounts talk of the mixing of Hussitism with older Slavonic heresies, a description of their beliefs, as recorded in the 1460s by Cardinal Giovanni Turrecremata, indicates that the Moldavian Hussites adhered to the taborite branch of Hussitism, and there is no suggestion of the accretion of dualist traditions. According to Turrecremata's account, the Hussites of Moldavia denied the real presence, the mass, the veneration of saints and images, as also the doctrines of purgatory and papal supremacy. They administered communion in both kinds, even to children, and baptized in flowing

<sup>51</sup> Székely, 'A Huszitzizmus és a magyar nép', pp. 556–8.

<sup>52</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 558–9; P. Eusebius Fermendžin, *Acta Bosnae* (Monumenta Spectantia Historiam Slavorum Meridionalium, 23: Zagreb, 1892), pp. 163, 173–4, 180.

<sup>53</sup> The Hungarian Hussite Bible survives in three fragments – the Vienna, Munich and Apur codexes. For the careers of Thomas and Blaise, see G. Décsi, *Müncheni kódex [1466]. A négy evangélium szövege és szótára* (Budapest, 1985), pp. 6–8 (also published in a German-language edition). More generally, see T. Kardos, *A huszita Biblia keletkezése* (A magyar nyelvudományi társaság kiadványai, 82: Budapest, 1953).

<sup>54</sup> K. Benda, *Moldvai Csángó-Magyar okmánytár*, 2 vols (Budapest, 1989), i, pp. 31–3.

water. Additionally, they denounced the pope as a whore, the Roman church as ‘the synagogue of Satan’, and holy water as the ‘urine of priests’. They even celebrated the mass in stables, appointed women as priests, and, as Turrecremata assures us, shared their wives.<sup>55</sup>

Although the Hungarian Hussites of Moldavia were joined in the principality by some Polish Hussites, there is no evidence that Hussite beliefs were taken up by the majority Romanian population.<sup>56</sup> Certainly, during the later fifteenth or early sixteenth centuries the earliest attempts were made in Moldavia to translate Orthodox religious texts into the vernacular. Nevertheless, the motivation for this work came most probably from within Orthodox spirituality.<sup>57</sup> There is in this respect (and as is often averred) no evidence of Hussite or Lutheran influences.<sup>58</sup>

The Hungarian Hussite community in Moldavia endured until well into the seventeenth century. In the 1630s the number of Hussite families in Husz alone was put at between 60 and 120 families. A Franciscan visitor reported a few years later that these continued to perform the liturgy in Hungarian – *Hussiani ungarica lingua sacrum et vesperas huc usque cantarunt*.<sup>59</sup> The community was not, however, immune from persecution. Towards the end of the sixteenth century, the Prince of Moldavia, acting under Jesuit influence, confiscated the churches of the Hussites. Upon the plea, however, of the English ambassador to Constantinople, Edward Barton, the churches were returned to their congregations after only a few years.<sup>60</sup>

## Conclusion

Certainly, therefore, there were Hussites in Hungary. They dwelled, however, mainly in the south of the kingdom and not in any immediate proximity to the Bohemian lands. It was, moreover, the activity of papal inquisitors in these southern parts which forced the emigration of the Hungarian Hussites to Moldavia. There

<sup>55</sup> Fermentžin, *Acta Bosnae*, pp. 245–8.

<sup>56</sup> Ș. Papacostea, ‘Știri noi cu privire la istoria husitismului în Moldova în timpul lui Alexandru cel Bun’, *Studii și cercetări științifice. Istorie*, xiii (1962), pp. 253–8. (I am most grateful to Alex Drace-Francis for drawing my attention to this work).

<sup>57</sup> M. Costinescu, *Codicele Voronețan* (București, 1981), pp. 79, 84.

<sup>58</sup> N. Iorga, *Istoria bisericii românești*, 2 vols (Vălenii-de-Munte, 1908), pp. 75–6; I. Gheție and A. Mares, *De când se scrie românește?* (București, 2001), p. 40.

<sup>59</sup> Benda, *Moldvai Magyar-Csángó*, i, pp. 170, 174, 355.

<sup>60</sup> *ibid.*, p. 115.

Martyn R a d y

is, as we have indicated, no evidence that inquisitors were sent into the area of modern-day Slovakia, which suggests that this region was seen to be largely unaffected by heresy. We do not doubt that linguistic affiliation constituted a powerful influence in the fifteenth century. In his bid for support in Hungary, Wladislas of Poland thus sent ambassadors to the Croats who appealed to these for support on the basis of their common origin and language (*dum cognationis et originis eiusdem primordia communemque linguam referunt*).<sup>61</sup> We cannot see, however, that linguistic relations served to bind the Slovak population of Northern Hungary to the beliefs of the Bohemian Hussites. Indeed, we may guess that the constant raiding of Hussite mercenaries served only to alienate the native population of Northern Hungary from the tenets of Hussite belief.

In order thus to understand Jiskra and the power which he wielded in Slovakia over two decades, we should look elsewhere than notions of linguistic or confessional community. Jiskra's authority derived from his steadfast allegiance to Ladislas V, and his power rested on mercenaries and money. Once Ladislas was dead and Hungary had a new king, and once his mercenaries and money were gone, Jiskra's own influence was also spent. He thus ended his career as a famed warlord and warrior, but not, unlike his great adversary, as either the hero of the chroniclers or the father of a king.

<sup>61</sup> Antonio de Bonfinis, *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades*, iii, p. 111 (3. 5. 97–8).

Toleration from necessity or from indifference?  
The role of faith in South Bohemia in the late Middle Ages\*

*Robert Š i m ů n e k*

Introduction – Description of region and setting of objectives

Regarding matters of confession, the post-Hussite and the Jagiellonian eras are characterized by toleration, codified by *Compactata* (1436) and then again by the Peace of Kutná Hora (1485).<sup>1</sup> The reality of confessional tolerance in post-Hussite Bohemia was obviously multi-layered. Its contours become more distinct when, instead of the whole country, one looks at a regionally confined sample, namely,

\* The paper as given in 2004 is here printed without alteration.

<sup>1</sup> Confessional and political development in the Jagiellonian period is described in W. Eberhard, *Konfessionsbildung und Stände in Böhmen 1478–1530* (München – Wien, 1981), pp. 41–119; J. Macek, *Víra a zbožnost jagellonského věku* (Praha, 2001), regarding toleration in general esp. pp. 385–416; in the broader context of the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries development J. Pánek, The Religious Tolerance in the Bohemian Lands in the Early Modern Times, *Přednášky z XXXIX. běhu LŠSS* (Praha, 1997), pp. 266–280.

at the region of South Bohemia.<sup>2</sup> In the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries, this area included the domain of the lords of Rožmberk, the extensive landed property of Zlatá Koruna monastery and other smaller ecclesiastical and secular estates; the royal town České Budějovice had a specific status. As for the rights of patronage, the most privileged position was undoubtedly held by the Rožmberk family, especially after their taking over of extensive previously ecclesiastical domains; only few patronates were in the hands of gentry and equally low was the number of churches with the right of presentation belonging to the king.

South Bohemia was in the 15<sup>th</sup> century characterized by two main specific features – first, the prevalence of Catholicism (at least formally declared; in this connection, the Rožmberk family used to be described as pillars of the Catholic faith), and, second, symbiosis with Tábor and her allies. It should be recalled that the pre-existing network of churches and monasteries did not suffer in a direct way in the course of the Hussite revolution. In the whole region, only a single monastery ceased to exist due to the revolution (Sezimovo Ústí), and the number of abandoned churches (like, for example, Příběnice) was negligible. However, the means of subsistence of a number of ecclesiastical institutions – mainly monasteries – were reduced to almost nothing, because their estates had been either devastated or secularized. Of the towns, it was only Prachatice that seriously suffered in the course of the Hussite revolution, having been conquered and burnt down in 1420. Rožmberk's towns had to face military attacks (and some, for example Soběslav, did so repeatedly), but with the exception of Trhové Sviny and Nové Hrady they were neither conquered nor burned down. The royal town České Budějovice and the Johannite town Strakonice remained untouched. Another specific feature of this region was its close contacts with abroad (e.g., Mühlviertel and Bavaria) and a significant number of German speaking population; confessional toleration cannot be therefore thought of separately from ethnical toleration.

Our focus will be on two groups of themes: first, looking for the roots of confessional toleration in the Hussite and the post-Hussite eras, its particular symptoms and its impact on daily life, and, second, the extent to which the toleration was a necessity dictated by common sense and the role which might have been played in this matter by the lack of deep interest in confessional questions. The answers

<sup>2</sup> The specialised work by V. Schmidt, *Die kirchliche Verhältnisse in Südböhmen seit dem Ende des Hussitenkrieges bis zur Bannung des Königs Georg von Podiebrad (1436–1466)*, 38. *Programm des k. k. deutschen Staatsgymnasiums in Budweis (1908)–1909*, pp. 3–21, is not an analysis of the relevant issues but a prosopographical study of leading representatives of church hierarchy and a collection of facts.

to these questions will be based, in the first place, on the analysis of confessional toleration showed by the lords of Rožmberk (on a country-wide scale, then with respect to Tábor, and also with respect to their own domain) and then on five probes, representing five angles from which one can see the status and role of faith in post-Hussite South Bohemia. This will also enable us to verify the hypothesis about confessional lukewarmness set forth above; by analyzing specific examples, we will illustrate the extent to which the declared zeal for faith was – or was not – more important than pragmatic reasoning.

A side-look at earlier times, namely, at about the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, will demonstrate the shift in attitudes which took place in the course of the Hussite revolution; gradually, the antagonized factions began to solve their conflicts in a rational way and sober judgement replaced the previous blind religious fanaticism.

### **Toleration of the post-Hussite period and its roots**

In South Bohemia, the post-Hussite period appears to be a time of toleration, dictated by common sense and being indeed the only choice that made mutual coexistence both possible and acceptable. The toleration of the post-Hussite period must be seen in a retrospective context – looking back several decades. There is evidence of confessional intolerance in the period immediately preceding the Hussite revolution and in the first years of the revolution, but during the revolution we already see the beginnings of rational thinking of both fighting sides about the possible future *modus vivendi*.

In South Bohemia, too, there is evidence of confessional intolerance in the pre-Hussite period and the beginning years of the Hussite revolution. The infiltration of heretical currents is also documented in neighboring countries, on the estates of the bishopric of Passau. Among the cases related directly to Český Krumlov, the residential town of the Rožmberk family, we can mention the persecution of Hus's followers in 1411<sup>3</sup> and especially the swing of Čeněk of Vartenberk (d. 1425) to Utraquism. For a short time, he also led “astray” his young ward Oldřich of Rožmberk (d. 1462). Oldřich's temporary swing to Utraquism culminated in 1417 by his instruction ordering all priests in the parishes of Rožmberk patronage either to convert to Utraquism or to be replaced by Utraquist clerics. However, this conversion only lasted two years and was followed by an unobtrusive return to

<sup>3</sup> F.M. Bartoš, Husův ctitel J. Bradáček z Krumlova, *Jihočeský sborník historický*, xvi (1947), pp. 39–41.

Catholicism. Confessional somersaults, typical for these years, are nicely illustrated by the conditions in the parish of Trhové Sviny. According to surviving documents, Václav Višně of Větřní was a parish priest there since 1408, was banished in 1417 and replaced by an Utraquist priest Mikuláš Mníšek, who in turn was forced to leave after two years, at which point the former parish priest returned and remained there until the early 1440s.

Confessional attitudes of Oldřich of Rožmberk underwent a certain evolution. In the years 1418–1420, for example, Master Jan of Jesenice was imprisoned in Český Krumlov and probably also died there. If we can believe the authenticity of Aeneas Silvius's testimony, the young Rožmberk told him that in his prison there had been several men and women from the Adamite sect, whom he subsequently ordered to be burnt. When (in 1420 at the latest) Rožmberk finally returned to Catholicism, all evidence suggests that Oldřich was already free of religious fanaticism of any kind and that the consequent Catholic orientation of the family was largely a matter of political calculation – their reluctance to armed confrontations with the Taborite party is evident from the series of truces from 1420s and early 1430s. This development prefigures the general trend of confessional tolerance.

### **The Rožmberk family and confessional affairs in Rožmberk dominions**

Questions of confession were only a marginal concern for the Rožmberk family in the Hussite and the post-Hussite periods. Their outwardly proclaimed loyalty to the Catholic Church was guided by sheer pragmatism. They employed it whenever they suspected profit for themselves. Religious lukewarmness, dominance of rational thinking over confessional fanaticism, accompanied by an acute awareness of the necessity of compromise and toleration as the only possible *modus vivendi*, are typical for Oldřich of Rožmberk, as well as for several subsequent generations of the family. The attitude of Oldřich of Rožmberk can be illustrated by adducing several examples. Arguments about confessional subtleties seemed even to young Oldřich to be narrow-minded and unimportant. It was at the beginning of 1420s (perhaps in 1421) when he admonished the reeve in Veselí nad Lužnicí for allowing a disputation in his house on the question of holy communion, at which occasion the local parish priest suffered an insult. At base Oldřich's attitude to the church was utilitarian – he tried, repeatedly, to pose as a warrior against Tábor and defender of the Catholic faith and, as such, to obtain

money from the Church Council and also from the king Sigismund. He was not very successful, however, perhaps because his hypocrisy and lukewarmness of his promises were readily apparent. (Sigismund had a prior experience with Oldřich's dealings in this matter: the self-confident Rožmberk quite openly ignored the king's appeals and commands whenever they did not match his own interests.) Another example is from the post-Hussite period. At the beginning of 1440s, Oldřich endeavored to reach an official recognition by the Church of Mikuláš of Řebříky, who had been nominated archbishop of Prague by the Council of Basel. In 1441 the clerics who gathered at a provincial synod in Třeboň elected their legates, who were to swear allegiance to pope Felix; one of the legates was the abbot of Vyšší Brod monastery Zikmund Pirchan, also a diplomat in Oldřich's services. When it became evident that Oldřich's hopes of gaining a financial subsidy from the curia or the Council were again in vain, Rožmberk's interests in the subsequent fate of the elected archbishop Mikuláš rapidly diminished.<sup>4</sup> Faith had also little in common with Oldřich's long-standing conflicts against the Taborites or with his personal animosity toward Jiří of Poděbrady, which culminated around 1450.<sup>5</sup> The weak response, which ardent preachers such as John of Capistrano (d. 1456) or Hilarius Litoměřický (d. 1468) elicited from the Rožmberk family, provides another example. It was the latter preacher, who used to incite Jan of Rožmberk into a war against king Jiří – he regarded the active struggle against heretics as a necessary prerequisite for salvation (which Jan of Rabštejn mocked shortly after the death of Hilarius).<sup>6</sup>

Oldřich's sons, contrary to their father, were able to work out a compromise even in relation to the king of Bohemia, but their attitude to confessional matters was no less pragmatic. This was also true of Jošt of Rožmberk (d. 1467), whose ecclesiastical career started at the post of grand-master of the Johannite commendam in Strakonice and culminated with the bishopric of Vratislav (Breslau). Jošt

<sup>4</sup> V. Schmidt, Abt Sigismund Pirchan aus Hohenfurt, Bischof von Salona, *Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benedictiner und Cistercienser Orden* xxxiii (1912), pp. 643–652; A. Mařík, K postavení katolické církve v Čechách v době poděbradské (Činnost katolických administrátorů za Jiřího z Poděbrad), *Folia Historica Bohemica* vii (1984), pp. 101–196, here p. 108–109.

<sup>5</sup> Regarding the contemporary situation, see R. Urbánek, *Věk Poděbradský*, vol. 2 (Praha, 1918), passim.

<sup>6</sup> Z. Nejedlý, Česká missie Jana Kapistrana, *Časopis českého museum* lxxiv (1900), pp. 57–72, 220–242, 334–352, 447–464; Hilarius adressed Rožmberk in 1467 with a tractate, in which he gives nine arguments why the lords and towns should fall away from king Jiří; see Z. V. Tobolka (ed.), *Hilaria Litoměřického Traktát k panu Janovi z Rozenberka* (Praha, 1898); Rabštejn reacted to the last argument of *Traktát*, see B. Ryba, ed., *Jan z Rabštejna: Dialogus* (Praha, 1946), p. 76.



– as well as his brothers – was above all a dispassionate politician and an opposer of military confrontation as a way of solving problems; he endeavored to have king Jiří accepted in Silesia and, to that end, even traveled to Rome (1458–1459). It was clear even to him that religious fanaticism often serves as a disguise for personal and purely secular goals and ambitions; he notified the members of the Zelená Hora Unity of his opinion in this matter, with an addendum saying that their attitude actually harmed the case of the Catholic Church. In this context, he was able to see very accurately the true background and meaning of the attitudes of Zdeněk of Šternberk and his proclamations.<sup>7</sup>

The fate of Jošt's brother, Jan of Rožmberk (d. 1472), who remained loyal to king Jiří for a long time, resembled that of Jan of Rabštejn (d. 1473), a Catholic cleric and a diplomat in royal services, who adhered to Poděbrad up to 1470, when he abjured his loyalty under the threat of excommunication. These two men were convinced that confessional antagonisms – however insurmountable they may have appeared – could not take priority over the common good (*bonum commune*) and could not therefore justify forced conversions. The following generations of Rožmberk's rulers showed much tolerance as well. Petr of Rožmberk (d. 1523), who at the end of his life felt remorse in front of Eternity, returned a number of previously secularized properties to the Church; his last will brought the Rožmberk domain to the edge of catastrophe.

Rožmberks also proved to be very tolerant seigneurs in relation to their own domain. For example, the draft of municipal ordinance for their residential town Český Krumlov (1443) did not even touch upon confessional matters, bespeaking apparent toleration and probably also a lack of interest in these matters on the part of the seigneurs.<sup>8</sup> Neither do we find any confessional limitations or conditions in guild statutes of Rožmberk dominions from this period. In contrast, for example, in post-Hussite Prague the adherence to Utraquist confession was a condition on being admitted to a guild. The confessional orientation of Rožmberk's officials is not mentioned in any of surviving sources; as it seems, Rožmberks did not interfere in the matters of their faith (although we may presuppose that the majority of Rožmberk's officials were Catholic, with many of them being the benefactors of

<sup>7</sup> R. Urbánek, *Věk Poděbradský*, vol. 3–4 (Praha, 1930, 1962), passim; B. Ryba, ed., *Jan z Rabštejna: Dialogus*, p. 68, 70; A. Mařík, *K postavení*, p. 108; on Jošt see W. Urban, *Szkice z dziejów diecezji wrocławskiej*. Biskup Jodok z Rosenbergu, *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia* iii (1965), pp. 383–417.

<sup>8</sup> H. Gross (ed.), *K obnově řádů městských v Č. Krumlově r. 1443*, *Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk* 1906, no. 7.

church institutions under Rožmberk's patronage) and regarded their contingent conflicts with church institutions as their private matter (for example, Rožmberks did not interfere in the long-standing dispute between Oldřich of Dvorec and the Augustinians in Borovany and even Oldřich's excommunication did not prevent them from appointing him to a strategically important office).<sup>9</sup>

Other faiths, which did not fall under either of the two categories legalized by *Compactata* (Catholic and Utraquist) were also tolerated in the Rožmberk dominions. Even though no congregations of the Unity of Brethren were directly operating in South Bohemia, it is certain that the Rožmberk family never acted against the Unity on the level of provincial administration and did not get actively involved in heightened repressions against the Unity at the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The area around Jindřichův Hradec had a long tradition of Waldensianism and other outlaw sects<sup>10</sup> and their influence surely infiltrated into the adjacent dominions of Rožmberks, especially the Soběslav region. At the end of 1470s, a fearful official reported to Český Krumlov that a strange heresy was spreading directly in Soběslav; not specifying more details – it is difficult to say what response his complaint actually had.<sup>11</sup>

The atmosphere of confessional and ethnical tolerance can be illustrated in the example of Anabaptist community in Český Krumlov in the second decade of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The members of this by all accounts not very numerous community owned property in the town. Nothing seems to indicate that their confessional or ethnical allegiance may have been a subject of disputes. The Anabaptist community in Český Krumlov did not cease to exist until the decision of the February Provincial Diet in 1528, which was passed at the suggestion of the king. The ensuing extensive persecution of all Anabaptist communities in Bohemia, initiated from above, eventually within ten years reached also the community in Český Krumlov. However, at least two other communities of Anabaptists stayed within South Bohemia for the remainder of the 16<sup>th</sup> century on the dominions of Hluboká and Jindřichův Hradec.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> H. Pexa, Oldřich ze Dvorce. Příspěvek k dějinám Dvorce a Trocnova, *Jihočeský sborník historický*, lx–lxi (1991–1992), pp. 1–8, here pp. 2–4.

<sup>10</sup> V. Vondra, Zmínky o bekyních a begardech z jižních Čech v inkvizičních protokolech, *Jihočeský sborník historický*, lii (1983), pp. 30–38.

<sup>11</sup> *Archiv český*, vol. 9, pp. 218–219, no. 899.

<sup>12</sup> M. Kovář, Novokřtění na dominiu pánů z Hradce, *Opera Historica*, vi (1998), pp. 387–400 (on the end of the Anabaptist community in Český Krumlov pp. 393–394); generally about the toleration of Anabaptists in the Czech lands of that time, J. Pánek, The Religious Tolerance, pp. 274–276.

The fact that the great majority of parishes were under the Rožmberk patronage and were therefore Catholic meant that South Bohemia remained virtually untouched by the resolution of the Diet in Kutná Hora (1485), which ordered to observe *status quo* in Catholic and Utraquist parishes, regardless of the confessional orientation of the patron.<sup>13</sup> A rare argument regarding the parish priest appointment outside the Rožmberk domain is documented in sources from the parish of Kovářov (near Milevsko) at the beginning of 1490s; also unique is the accompanying testimony confirming the traditionally Catholic orientation of the parish, deposed by thirteen people.<sup>14</sup> There is some, but very rare, evidence in the South Bohemian region of clerics having been expelled from parishes, violence against parish priests and putting obstacles to carrying out God's services. Clearly politically motivated must have been the case, when a parish priest from Mirovice, who offered communion *sub utraque specie*, was taken captive; the king would hardly have gotten involved in the case of a village priest. As a matter of fact the king himself demanded from Jan of Rožmberk that the priest be released (1464).<sup>15</sup>

The confessional toleration can also be illustrated on the example of three individuals and their fates. The best known of them is Petr Chelčický (d. 1460), original thinker and author of numerous treatises, who surrounded himself with a group of followers – there is not a single evidence of his group being a subject of harassment or persecutions of any kind; the group was evidently tolerated and Chelčický himself was held in high esteem.<sup>16</sup> The second example is Jan Vodňanský (d. 1530), a bachelor of theology, who recanted the chalice and entered the Franciscan order (thus becoming one of very few such converts whom we know by name). Having authored a number of polemical tractates, he was not an ivory tower thinker; since the 1480s he traveled around the countryside of South Bohemia and did not miss a single opportunity to discuss matters of faith – his person thus completes the picture of contemporary atmosphere of mutual respect, bridging over confessional differences. To complete the triad, let us mention Mikuláš of Vlásenice, a visionary, whose disputation with Catholic priests in the Choustník castle (1471) was, according to all evidence, conducted in the spirit of

<sup>13</sup> On the genesis of the Peace of Kutná Hora and its basic provisions see J. Macek, *Víra*, pp. 391–396.

<sup>14</sup> *Archiv český*, vol. 15, pp. 60–61, no. 125; pp. 319–324, no. 38.

<sup>15</sup> *Archiv český*, vol. 14, pp. 100–101, no. 1715.

<sup>16</sup> Possible antipathies between gentry in the Vodňany region, siding with Rožmberks, on the one hand and Chelčický himself on the other hand, are deduced, without much of a reason, by M. Truc, *K sociálnímu zařazení Petra Chelčického a Petra Záhorky, Husitský Tábor*, iv (1981), pp. 76–81.

tolerance and mutual respect. Neither of the sides managed to persuade the other of its truth, after which Mikuláš was for a short time interned in the castle *pro forma* and released shortly after.<sup>17</sup>

### Faith and toleration – five angles of view

The role of confessional matters in the daily life of post-Hussite South Bohemia can be illustrated by five probes: looking into the agenda of Rožmberk's officials, analyzing action suit files of both the Taborite and the Rožmberk party from the beginning of the 1440s, tracing the elements of confession in contemporary political conflicts, analyzing the evidence of conflicts between parish priests and their parishioners or the priests amongst themselves, and focusing on intolerance toward Jews and its reasons, both ostensible and actual.

1. Matters of church administration were in the 15<sup>th</sup> century an indelible part of the agenda of Rožmberk's officials but made only a small portion of it and relatively little importance was attached to them. It was a totally marginal field of administrative practice; the role of Rožmberk's officials in the appointment of parish priests (on behalf of their seigneurs) is barely ever documented. It happened only rarely that the officials were forced to involve themselves in disputes about ecclesiastical and confessional questions. In most cases, these disputes were over property and were dealt with by scribes of the appropriate dominions.

2. The action suit files of both the Taborite and the Rožmberk party served as background papers for the arbitral decision made in summer of 1442 by Hynek Krušina of Švamberk; the lengthy text of his statement reflects in a comprehensive way the wide range of disagreements to be settled.<sup>18</sup> Confessional matters and violence against clergy are also mentioned in the files; the passages devoted to them deserve our closer attention. In the first place, only one paragraph relates to

<sup>17</sup> Among the vast literature on Chelčický, see, for example, F. Šmahel, Peter von Cheltschitz und seine Kritik der geistlichen und weltlichen Gewalten, *Historica*, ii/xxxii (1995), pp. 61–73; on Vodňanský, see F. Teplý, *Dějiny města Jindřichova Hradce*, vol. I/2 (Jindřichův Hradec, 1927), pp. 91; on Mikuláš of Vlásenice, see J. Jireček, Mikulášenci, *Časopis českého musea*, I (1876), pp. 47–82, here esp. pp. 49–60.

<sup>18</sup> B. Rynešová (ed.), *Listář a listinář Oldřicha z Rožmberka 1418–1462*, vol. 2 (Praha, 1932), pp. 153–189, no. 198, 202; on confessional conflicts pp. 170–171, § 5; on the destruction of crosses p. 171, § 7; on usurpation of parish incomes p. 174, § 16; p. 176, § 20, 21; pp. 178–179, § 29; p. 184, § 35.

confessional questions; it tackles in very general terms *šacování* [searching personal property] of priests and oppression of priests. Equally vague is the admonition spoken by Taborites that Oldřich of Rožmberk appointed Catholic priests to parishes that had been previously Utraquist. These accusations lack a single specific example, which is somewhat surprising for documents of this type: the action suits are otherwise filled with names of people and locations. The Krušina's decision in this respect is worthy of king Solomon – the violence ought to stop and both sides are summarily referred to the wording of *Compactata*. The other examples that somehow relate to ecclesiastical matters are entirely free of religious ardor – a Taborite legate named Pražák demolished a wayside cross near Český Krumlov and the Taborites repeatedly enriched themselves at the expense of the church by usurping parish incomes and extorting tributes from villagers, including parish debtors. The Taborites defended themselves stereotypically by pointing to their inalienable rights, warranted by *Compactata*. However, a stolen horse, a parish priest's meadow mowed and harvested or money extorted from parishioners do not point to an ardent confessional zeal. Even the church in Nedvědice, forcibly taken over by the Taborites, was attractive to them solely as a fortress and not as a house of God. The analysis of the action suits makes it clear: matters of faith were, in the context of Taborites vs. Rožmberk relationship, only of marginal importance (including the passages about the priests who have been robbed, these affaires take up less than one tenth of the text). The lack of specificity in the case of unlawful appointments of Catholic parish priests raises a doubt that these sentences may have been describing general clichés rather than actual cases. We also see such clichés in the defensive arguments of the Taborites, when they justified their acts of openly criminal nature by their care of the faith. By the way, violence against priests and their debtors completely fits into the context of the period, which is characterized by numerous small robberies and road violence (exactly these types of crimes make, in fact, the major part of the action suit files).

3. If we analyze individual power conflicts, usually accompanied by armed confrontations, we must conclude that their confessional element was very weak. The tension between Český Krumlov and Tábor, which culminated roughly between 1443 and 1447, was a logical continuation of previous small everyday hassels, which virtually lacked any confessional background. The long-standing animosity between Taborites and Austrians, which also had secular origins, was coming to

an end in the second half of the 1440s.<sup>19</sup> Even the all-province political groupings – irrespective of their ostensibly confessional polarization – were actually dominated by power ambitions of different factions. The Unity of Strakonice and the Unity of Poděbrady, which were founded at the end of 1440s, were grouped along political lines, as was the later Unity of Zelená Hora (1465). The participants in military confrontations at the beginning of 1450s (when Jiří of Poděbrady deftly used the situation in order to finally paralyze Tábora)<sup>20</sup> were preoccupied by questions of religion as little as the members of the Unity of Zelená Hora who in later years militarily confronted the king's followers.

Zdeněk of Šternberk (d. 1476),<sup>21</sup> who in 1465 initiated the foundation of the Unity of Zelená Hora, was after 1468 a registered holder of Rožmberk's dominions Choustník and Soběslav. Šternberk, who had mercilessly secularized the property of several monasteries, behaved in South Bohemia in an equally opportunistic manner. All his activities were presented as driven by his absolute loyalty to the pope. However, even his contemporaries were clear (and Rabštejn noted this repeatedly in his *Dialogue*) that the Unity of Zelená Hora had nothing to do with questions of religion and served only to enforce Šternberk's political ambitions. This self-appointed defender of the Catholic faith insisted that he was endeavoring to enforce *křesťanský řád* [Christian order] on Rožmberk's estates, while his men were robbing and looting and Šternberk himself was threatening by additional violence unless Jan of Rožmberk submits to him (that is, betrays the king Jiří). In cooperation with Jindřich of Hradec (d. 1507), Šternberk finally attained his goal. It was hardly possible to abuse faith more shamelessly in promoting one's secular goals.<sup>22</sup> The Catholic priests, whose welfare Šternberk had, as he claimed, firstly in mind, did not feel at all secure at that time; they fled to Třeboň and entrusted their fate, quite passively, in the hands of Jan of Rožmberk. When the Augustinians in Třeboň were not sure how to perform basic liturgical acts and laid the arbitration on the shoulders of their abbot,<sup>23</sup> Jindřich of Hradec hastened to show

<sup>19</sup> B. Rynešová, O účasti Oldřicha z Rožmberka na jednání o mír mezi Táborskými a Rakousy, *Časopis Národního musea*, cvii (1933), pp. 55–75.

<sup>20</sup> F. Šmahel et al., *Dějiny Tábora*, vol. I/2 (České Budějovice, 1990), pp. 537–542.

<sup>21</sup> V. Kosinová, Zdeněk ze Šternberka a jeho královské ambice (Studie k portrétu z dějin české šlechty předrenesanční), *Sborník prací k 60. narozeninám J. B. Nováka* (Praha, 1932), pp. 206–218.

<sup>22</sup> B. Ryba (ed.), *Jan z Rabštejna: Dialogus*, esp. p. 32, 48, 52; *Archiv český*, vol. 7, p. 394, no. 361; on the general context, see: F. Beneš, Zradil Jan z Rožmberka krále Jiřího Poděbradského?, *Jihočeský sborník historický*, xxxv (1966), pp. 115–137.

<sup>23</sup> *Archiv český*, vol. 7, pp. 330–331, no. 234.

his devotion to the Catholic faith in a flaunting way – he expelled burghers who received communion *sub utraque specie* from his residence town Jindřichův Hradec; many of them subsequently sought (and probably found) safe haven in Rožmberk's Soběslav. Jindřich found a capable second in Eliáš Čech, parish priest in Jindřichův Hradec (d. after 1492), a Premonstratensian and previously an administrator of the bishopric of Litomyšl, who had been called to Jindřichův Hradec at the beginning of 1460s and was very zealous in the matters of Catholic faith; this provided a pretext for accusing him of having been previously a *husita* [Hussite].<sup>24</sup>

Completely free of confessional passion were frequent local declarations of enmity and other local animosities. In the 1420s as well as half a century later their primary motivation was the concern in property and, in some cases, the concern in power; faith might have been used as an argument when it was convenient.<sup>25</sup> Confessional overtones can hardly be found, for example, in the burning down of the parish priests house in Kájov in 1469 – looting and robbing was self-explanatory and did not require theoretical justification.<sup>26</sup>

The internal development in the royal town of České Budějovice reflected contemporary political situation – the burgers were divided into two groups, concealing their actual goals under the guise of loyalty, either to the king or to the pope. The control over the town, which the former wished to maintain and the latter wished to seize, was at stake. The main exponent of the king's policy was burgomaster, Ondřej Puklice of Vztuhy (d. 1467) – together with his followers he soon realized that their own fate depended on that of the king, but they underestimated the danger and Puklice himself paid for his mistake with his life. The revolt in České Budějovice in the middle of 1467 – a forcible overthrow of burgomaster Puklice and his followers – shows again that confessional matters did not play any role in the events of that period. Loyalty to the king as well as

<sup>24</sup> *Archiv český*, vol. 7, p. 278, no. 130; p. 283, no. 140–141; for contemporary context see F. Teplý, *Dějiny města Jindřichova Hradce* I/2, pp. 21–35; P. R. Pokorný, *Knihovna Eliáše Čecha, Bibliotheca Strahoviensis*, ii (1996), pp. 131–135.

<sup>25</sup> For contemporary context (chronologically following the events), see: R. Šimůnek, Jan Smil z Křemže. K postavení nižší šlechty v jižních Čechách v první polovině 15. století, *Jihočeský sborník historický*, lxvi–lxvii (1997–1998), pp. 3–12; F. Šmahel, Drobné prameny k válečné ekonomice: Obležení Vodňan na jaře 1443, *Táborský archiv*, ii (1989), pp. 9–36; F. Mareš, Jindřich Roubík z Hlavatec. Kulturní obrázek z polovice 15. století, *Časopis českého musea*, lv (1881), pp. 73–87, 214–223.

<sup>26</sup> V. Schmidt – A. Picha, Ein Gojauer Pfarrinventar aus dem Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts, *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen*, xlv (1906), pp. 180–209, here pp. 184–185.

obedience to the pope were motivated by immediate needs and rational strategizing. Not even the ethnical aspect was in play – Czechs as well as Germans were among the followers of both sides, and both were a part of the armed crowd that beat up Puklice so brutally that he died in several days. Puklice cried out in both languages that he wished to surrender, but this proved useless.<sup>27</sup>

4. Regarding the conflicts, in which clerics made up one or both sides of the conflict, we may immediately say that, as expected, the subject of controversy was almost in all cases purely material. Parish priests demanded loudly and repeatedly their tithes *in naturalia*, which they thought they had been cheated out of. During the Hussite wars, the parish priest in Suchdol nad Lužnicí did not receive tithes from his parishioners either *in naturalia* or in money (1430); the parishioners in Hořice refused to pay their parish priest chimney tax (1438) and the parishioners in Štěpánovice not only denied tithes, wine and wafers for the mass, but harmed their spiritual shepherd in any way they could (around 1450). A diligent parish priest in Miličín started to look for any means of augmenting his income as soon as he took up his post and initiated a lawsuit about an old testamentary bequest (after 1470). These illustrative examples could be supplemented by naming other conflicts among parishioners and their spiritual shepherds, the causes of which have not been explicitly recorded. The obstinacy, with which both sides kept the animosity alive for years, shows that even these cases must have been driven by material interests as, for example, in Lomnice nad Lužnicí at the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century or in Chvalšiny around 1450. Material interests obviously also dominated many conflicts between clerics. For example, the parish priest in Bavorov had a dispute with the local preacher Jiří, whom the priest evidently regarded as an undesirable competitor. Several conflicts which revolve around parish tithes or fishing privileges are documented in the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Wrangling and strategizing in the long-standing disputes about the appointment of parish priest in České Budějovice in the 1440s illustrates in exemplary way how confessional lukewarmness acts hand in hand with prioritizing political interests.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>27</sup> K. Pletzer, *Násilný převrat v Českých Budějovicích v květnu 1467, Jihočeský sborník historický*, lxiv (1995), pp. 74–83.

<sup>28</sup> On the whole dispute, see V. Schmidt, *Die kirchliche Verhältnisse*, pp. 6–7.



Where do we see even a hint of interest in the matters of faith or in the importance of sacraments, such as confession or holy communion? The care for the salvation of souls falls heavily behind the care for property, tithes, refused bequests and other material delights. This aspect flashes out even in the cases, where the confessional undercurrent is clearly present, for example in the dispute between the parish priests of Dráchov and Soběslav in 1464. The parish priest from Dráchov came to Soběslav in order to hear confession of a sick man. The Soběslav priest did not like this and let his colleague know that he should not attend the Soběslav parishioners. To rid himself of the inconvenient competition, he argued that he was afraid lest the unwelcome guest would lead his poor faithful into error. The Dráchov priest did not give up and went to Prague to obtain support from the archbishop Jan of Rokycany. We do not know how the affair ended. In any case, the Soběslav priest played a time-proven card – the threat of heresy seemed a better argument than the fear of unwelcome competition which posed a danger only to his own purse.<sup>29</sup>

Animosity between parish priests and their parishioners was fairly common – in many villages the parish priests evidently did not value their relatively affluent and easy livelihood and, although they owed it to their parishioners, they behaved condescendingly toward them. The parish priests from Suchdol nad Lužnicí and Štěpánovice, for example, complained about hatred of their parishioners – the settlers hated them and channeled their rage into violent acts directed either against the priests directly or more often against their property. One such escalation of controversies between the parish priest and his parishioners occurred in Deštná – the priest did not fulfill his duties and answered repeated complaints of his parishioners with disdain. When the latter ran out of patience, the priest chose to flee.<sup>30</sup> It is evident that confessional matters were in these cases hardly at the forefront of events, if they played any role at all. More often it was personal traits of parish priests that irritated and incited their parishioners against them. Also in Černo-vice the settlers disparaged their priest, insulting him and calling him a liar and a smatterer. Nevertheless, this incident is unusual in one aspect: their reason for their anger was allegedly the fact that the priest repeatedly refused to offer chalice to them (1516).<sup>31</sup> Low authority of the church (which in South Bohemia meant

<sup>29</sup> *Archiv český*, vol. 7, pp. 250–251, no. 81.

<sup>30</sup> Suchdol: *Archiv český*, vol. 14, pp. 3–4, no. 1478; Štěpánovice: *Archiv český*, vol. 14, pp. 56–57, no. 1600; Deštná: *Archiv český*, vol. 14, pp. 156–157, no. 1841, 1842.

<sup>31</sup> *Archiv český*, vol. 11, pp. 198–199, no. 1260.

virtually always the Catholic church) and their representatives is equally illustrated by other details to be found in the sources: both in the country and in the town, it was common to hear people blaspheme; they did not keep fasts and, for example, local butchers in Soběslav did not bother to observe feasts, slaughtering pigs even on Epiphany. In Mirovice, the reeve himself used his authority to enforce that a market was open before the mass could start, regardless of parish priest's ire. People in the countryside also derisively speculated on liturgical procedures, including the holy communion – in Suchdol nad Lužnicí they once took a loaf of bread and placed it before a wayside cross saying: “*Jsi-li Buoħ, jez tento chléb*” [“If you are God, eat this bread.”]<sup>32</sup>

The climate of placid toleration, in which confessional matters tended to be of less importance (or rather of little interest) and the disturbance of which was a rare exception, can be illustrated on several other examples – windows into everyday life of believers. When Přebík of Klenová (d. 1465) came in 1436 to hold the town of Volyně as its registered holder, he summoned all inhabitants and asked them to divide into two groups according to their faith. Catholics had a considerable majority. Then, when *táborští* (that is, Utraquists) demanded their own priests, Přebík responded that there were too few of them and that if they wished a priests of their own faith, they had to procure him themselves. His response was free of any sign of intolerance (which could be expected from a political convert such as Přebík).<sup>33</sup> By contrast, in Prachatice, the parish priest himself subsidized a Utraquist priest for the non-Catholics from adjacent villages, and no one tried to disturb their services that took place right in the town; however, when these non-Catholics were asked to donate money for a painting in the Prachatice church, they were slow. They did not accept images in general and even mocked them. The official of Prachatice remarked on that occasion that they would not have objected to contribute to the rebuilding of altarpiece, alluding to the vandalism of Hussites in Prachatice, still noticeable at that time.<sup>34</sup> Similar toleration was characteristic for the domain of the lords of Hradec – there is evidence that (after the previous excesses of lord Jindřich) the churches in Jindři-

<sup>32</sup> *Archiv český*, vol. 9, pp. 218–219, no. 899; *Archiv český*, vol. 14, pp. 3–4, no. 1478; *Archiv český*, vol. 15, pp. 70–71, no. 142.

<sup>33</sup> *Archiv český*, vol. 7, pp. 311–312, no. 197.

<sup>34</sup> *Archiv český*, vol. 7, p. 310, no. 195.

chův Hradec were at the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century again allocated to particular ethnical and confessional groups.<sup>35</sup>

5. The last angle of view reveals the only distinctive manifestations of intolerance that could be seen in the period and area studied. It was the Jews who were the objects of intolerance – being described as “*hubitelé křesťanů*” [“exterminators of Christians”] or “*nestydatí rúhači*” [“shameless blasphemers”].<sup>36</sup> A closer look on specific argumentation accompanying the reprisals against them will show that confessional motives were secondary even in this case. The sources do not explicitly reveal any general and permanent animosity against Jews, but such animosity apparently existed and had an obvious economic undermeaning. Manifestations of animosity escalated around the turn of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The Rožmberks expelled Jews from Český Krumlov in 1494. An official justification of this act did not even hide the true reason, saying that “*lidé křesťanství k chudobě a záhubě přicházejí*” [“Christian people come into poverty and destruction”] and only secondarily noting that Jews were also “*nestydatí rúhači a posměvači přeslavné Panny Marie*” [“shameless blasphemers and mockers of the most glorious Virgin Mary”].<sup>37</sup> Jews also became targets of a diligent campaign in the nearby town of České Budějovice. Various things came in useful to discredit the Jews, for example, unsubstantiated accusation of arson or of harboring stolen liturgical objects. Investigation of the theft of a reliquary in Zlatá Koruna, then allegedly sold to Jews in České Budějovice (1502–03), was a suitable pretext for a final reckoning with the Jews in the town. The anti-Jewish climate of these years was also heated up by lawsuits against Jews in Strakonice and also in Pleissing in Austria. The lawsuits in České Budějovice in 1505 were monstrous; they ended with twenty men executed, with most of the remaining Jewish community expelled from the town and the synagogue confiscated. Those who remained were forced to accept baptism. Religious arguments were used during this anti-Jewish campaign from start to end, while the true reason was much more pragmatic – desire to obliterate debts by exterminating the lenders. This strategy of dealing with Jewish population was obviously of very old date.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>35</sup> F. Teplý, *Dějiny města Jindřichova Hradce* I/2, pp. 183–184, 202.

<sup>36</sup> On the status of Jews in the Jagiellonian period, see J. Macek, *Víra*, pp. 355–384.

<sup>37</sup> *Codex iuris municipalis*, vol. 4/2, pp. 322–327, no. 582.

<sup>38</sup> For more details about the incident, see K. Pletzer, *Zánik židovské obce v Českých Budějovicích roku 1505*, *Jihočeský sborník historický*, xliv (1975), pp. 8–21.

### Religious life of the post-Hussite period – decline or change of paradigm?

Rožmberk's residence town of Český Krumlov was not touched by the Hussite wars (the town had not even been besieged) and its development in the post-Hussite period could apparently pick up on older traditions. However, the spiritual life in the town never reached the intensity of the pre-Hussite period. The tradition of *corpus Christi* processions in Český Krumlov survived the Hussite wars but what remained was a mere shadow of the former glory.<sup>39</sup> The fact that the two Český Krumlov monasteries which in the pre-Hussite era took important part in the processions were going through a decline phase played probably some role. At some stage the house of Beguines in Český Krumlov, mentioned around 1400 for the last time, ceased to exist. In contrast, at the latest by the end of the 1430s, Český Krumlov started to show signs of transformation into a late medieval noble residential town. The castle was rebuilt, as was the town and its suburbs (Latrán, Nové Město). An extensive reconstruction of the St. Vitus parish church was accomplished in 1439. Oldřich of Rožmberk attempted in the mid-1440s to found an Augustinian priory in Český Krumlov. His attempt, although unsuccessful, ought to be seen in the context of building a representative family residence, of which the town was an integral part.

Two belated and, for long, the last monastic foundations in South Bohemia can be dated to the post-Hussite period. The foundation of the Augustinian monastery in Borovany in 1455 by Peter of Linda (a wealthy burgher from Linz, later in České Budějovice) is an example of ostentatious representation, typical for the period; it was founded as a family necropolis and manifestation of family prestige. In contrast, the plan of Petr and Oldřich of Rožmberk to establish a Paulinian monastery Kuklov (Kugelweit) in the neighborhood of the defunct castle of the same name in the forests between Český Krumlov and Netolice (1495) was associated with the contemporary popularity of the order of the Paulines (another monastery of the Order of the Paulines was founded at the same time, for example, in the Nová Bystřice domain of the family Krajíř of Krajek). The circumferential brickwork of the unfinished church indicates a munificent

<sup>39</sup> F. Tadra, Ukazování sv. ostatků v Č. Krumlově v XIV. věku, *Časopis českého musea*, liv (1880), pp. 432–437; V. Schmidt, Das Krummauer Heilthumsfest, *Festschrift des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen seinen Mitgliedern gewidmet zur Feier des 40jährigen Bestandes, 27. Mai 1902* (Prag, 1902), pp. 117–125.

intention. The foundation was, however, unsuccessful; only few Paulines lived there and the monastery ceased to exist after several decades.<sup>40</sup>

The effort at dynastic representation of the Rožmberk family is documented by extensive building activities at the turn of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, mostly related to sacral buildings. Rožmberks was the only lordly family in Bohemia that owned their own masonry workshop, which took part in construction or fundamental reconstruction in the Late Gothic style of the churches in Kájov (1471–85), Trhové Sviny (around 1485–1520), Horní Stropnice (around 1486–1510), Chvalšiny (around 1487–1507), Dolní Dvořiště (around 1488–1507), Rožmberk (after 1488) and Zátouň (around 1490–1510). The construction of the western choir loft of St. Vitus church in residential Český Krumlov is dated around the turn of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The period roughly between 1480 and 1520 saw construction or reconstruction of a number of other churches (for example, in Soběslav, Suchdol nad Lužnicí and Hořice) and monasteries – such as the reconstructions of the Minorite and Poor Clare monasteries in Český Krumlov in the Late Gothic style, reconstruction of the church and monastery in Kuklov (1495–1518) or the construction of a new church near the hermitage in Přední Výtoň (1515–1523).<sup>41</sup>

The analysis of donation (from the viewpoint of both donors and recipients) contributes only partially to the characterization of religiosity. This phenomenon is insufficiently documented by the sources. Besides necrologies, some use can be made of rarely surviving testamentary bequests, not numerous enough for a systematic statistical evaluation and, therefore, not allowing definite conclusions. There are practically no extant town books or collections of last wills from the Rožmberk dominions (with the only exception of the Soběslav collection of testaments from 1455–1523); another collection of wills (15<sup>th</sup>–16<sup>th</sup> century) is preserved in the archives of the royal town of České Budějovice.<sup>42</sup>

The post-Hussite period also saw intensification of South Bohemian pilgrimage. Although it is hypothesized that pilgrim traditions in Kájov have pre-Hussite roots, reliable evidence suggests that the beginnings of the later glory of Kájov as

<sup>40</sup> J. Kadlec, Pavláni v jižních Čechách, *Časopis Společnosti přátel starožitností českých*, lviii (1950), pp. 40–52.

<sup>41</sup> V. Kotrba, *Architektura, Jihočeská pozdní gotika 1450–1530* (Hluboká n. Vlt. – Praha, 1965), pp. 61–96; J. Hořejší, *Katalog architektury*, ib., pp. 97–123.

<sup>42</sup> R. Šimůnek, Die Laienfrömmigkeit im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert im Lichte der Nekrologien, *Geist, Gesellschaft, Kirche im 13.–16. Jahrhundert*, ed. F. Šmahel, Praha 1999, pp. 229–239; Státní okresní archiv České Budějovice, Archiv města České Budějovice, stará spisovna, řada tematická – závěti.

a pilgrimage place date to the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Michael Pils, a long-time parish priest in Kájov (between 1460/1 and 1503) worked hard to make it happen; it was during his tenure that the church gained its Late Gothic appearance (1471–85).<sup>43</sup> He obtained indulgences for his church and right after taking office he made sure that unfair competition to Kájov in its close proximity, namely, a stone with alleged footprints of St. Wolfgang, was paralyzed. An altar in the vicinity of the stone was a destination for pilgrims and soon a center for the cult of this saint, popular in the border regions of Bohemia, Bavaria and Austria. Pils maximized on the situation – risking his life (so he writes), he had the altar removed and transferred the veneration of St. Wolfgang into his own church, where he founded an altar in honor of the saint in 1466. The pilgrimages to the stone did not cease, however; this was not surprising because they had powerful supporters in the Rožmberk and Hradec lordly families.<sup>44</sup>

Personal involvement – this time of the parish priest Václav Hayder (d. 1505) – can be also noted in the case of St. Nicholas church in České Budějovice and its glory as a pilgrimage site. Hayder was parish priest from 1491/2 to his death. From the beginning he tried to elevate the reputation of his church; he procured a new organ, a bell and liturgical manuscripts. The Jubilee Year 1500 helped advance his plans – the papal curia rewarded České Budějovice for its role as the stronghold of Catholicism in South Bohemia. It was the very church of St. Nicholas which found itself on the list of sites the visit of which earned a 100-day indulgence. Hayder did not leave anything to chance and quickly composed a pamphlet celebrating his church and describing thirteen miracles (for the most part, miraculous healings) directly associated with the pilgrimage to the church.<sup>45</sup>

## Conclusion

We started this study by analyzing confessional tolerance of the Rožmberk family, noting their privileged position both in South Bohemia and in the context of

<sup>43</sup> Most recently, J. Hrdina, *Die Topographie der Wallfahrtsorte im spätmittelalterlichen Böhmen, Geist, Gesellschaft, Kirche im 13.–16. Jahrhundert*, F. Šmahel, ed. (Praha, 1999), pp. 191–206, here pp. 200–201.

<sup>44</sup> V. Schmidt – A. Picha, *Ein Gojauer Pfarrinventar*, pp. 184, 193–200; A. Mařík, *K postavení*, pp. 136–137.

<sup>45</sup> K. Pletzer, *Spisek českobudějovického faráře Dr. Václava Haydera o zázracích v roce 1500, Jihočeský sborník historický*, xxxv (1966), pp. 71–78 (with an edition of the source).

provincial politics. We found out that the Rožmberk family, who took a strictly Catholic position, did not privilege faith over pragmatic, rational consideration. The post-Hussite generations of Rožmberks were free of religious fanaticism in all their activities.

The five probes into the role of confessional matters indicated that these matters did not play a dominant role in the life of town and village people. Confessional matters barely appeared in the agenda of Rožmberk's officials; nor do we see them in the action suit files from 1440s. The conflicts between clergy and their parishioners tended to be primarily of material character. General religious lukewarmness created the environment in which it was usual to employ confessional arguments for hiding secular ambitions. We saw it on the example of Zdeněk of Šternberk, whose ostensible devotion to the cause of Catholic church and blind obedience to the pope served as a demagogic cover for promoting his goals. The same thing is documented in the urban environment – the eradication of Jewish communities in Český Krumlov and České Budějovice had a purpose, in the first place, to rid the town of inconvenient lenders.

The toleration from necessity did not exclude the toleration from indifference. Quite the contrary; both components of toleration permanently co-existed. Toleration from necessity, the roots of which have to be sought in the Hussite period, was nurtured by the conviction that confessional conflicts cannot and should not trump rational calculations. This conviction is clearly manifested in the attitude of Oldřich of Rožmberk towards Taborites and their allies, as well as towards the king Sigismund. The same principle underlay the politics of Oldřich's successors, who consequently applied it in varying political circumstances. Probes into South Bohemian confessionality revealed the marginal role that confession played in comparison with material and political interests. All this, together with opportunistic and pragmatic use of confessional argumentation, testifies to the absence of religious zeal among the majority of the population – nobility, burghers, as well as village people. Moreover, this seemed to have been the case also for a considerable part of parish clergy.

These findings correspond with the fact that late medieval religiosity, when compared with the previous period, was in the midst of a change of its paradigm. The dominant feature now was the close connection between religiosity and public representation of individuals or families – donations to existing altars, churches and monasteries or new foundations (chapels, chaplaincies, altarships), as well as cultural patronage (votive images and statues); all of these were components of

representation and elements of effort aimed at ensuring individual or dynastic *memory*. Český Krumlov was transformed during the post-Hussite period into a late medieval residential town with all its necessary attributes. Primary role was obviously given to the sacral component – the sacral architecture created by the Rožmberk masonry workshop underscored the dynastic representation. Spectacular buildings and opulent interiors were intended to enthrall and captivate the observer while proclaiming the glory of the patron. Lower nobility and ennobled burghers began to found family necropolises in churches and sometimes even built special chapels for that purpose (we can mention, for example, the Špulířská chapel in the church of the Assumption of Our Lady in Jindřichův Hradec). Pilgrimages also expanded – it was primarily individual parish priests who ensured the popularity of their churches as pilgrimage destinations. Starting from the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, pilgrimages became social events, which was evident in South Bohemia but also in other regions. External attributes of religiosity thus compensated for the atrophy of inner faith.

South Bohemian environment appears to be in the late Middle Ages a very tolerant region on the confessional as well as ethnic level. The rare manifestations of intolerance came from individuals and not from whole communities. From back in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the towns were home to non-negligible German population. Sermons in churches and at pilgrimages were given in both languages, Czech and German (a complaint against the parish priest in Netolice, who around 1500 refused to secure a German speaking preacher for German villagers, is a rare exception). The community of Anabaptists in Český Krumlov, that is, people who were different both confessionally and ethnically, lived in peace until its destruction due to a decision from above; likewise, people of other faiths among miners, who had been coming to Český Krumlov in large numbers from German-speaking areas since the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, faced no obstacles.<sup>46</sup> Ethnical and confessional allegiance were not the attributes that would divide the population of South Bohemia in the post-Hussite period into two mutually enmical camps. That is the main difference in comparison with the period before the battle of White Mountain.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>46</sup> A. Kubíková, *Protestanté v Českém Krumlově, Zlatý věk Českokrumlovska 1550–1620* (Český Krumlov, 2002), pp. 22–42, here pp. 25–26.

<sup>47</sup> Illustrated on the example of residential Český Krumlov by A. Kubíková, *Protestanté*, s. 29–37 (from the confessional point of view); M. Pangerl, *Wie die von Krummau keine deutschen Briefe mehr schreiben wollten, Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen*, xii (1874), pp. 188–189 (from the linguistic point of view; related to the year 1615).





Nationality and confession in the political life  
under the Jagiellonian dynasty  
(Contribution by Vilém of Pernštejn  
to the formation of a new societal model)

*Petr Vorel*

In the early modern period, the question of ethnical and confessional identity in Central Europe significantly gained in importance, more so than in any preceding era in European history.<sup>1</sup> This shift was, in the case of ethnicity, brought about by the emphasis put on the idea of national German state, when Maximilian I attempted at the turn of the 16<sup>th</sup> century to renew the integrity of the Holy Roman Empire. Secondly, the importance of individual's religious affiliation increased fundamentally as a result of two new contingencies: 1) the rapid progress

<sup>1</sup> H. Schilling, 'Nation und Konfession in der frühneuzeitlichen Geschichte Europas (Zu den konfessionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen der frühmodernen Staatsbildung)', in K. Garber, Hg., *Nation und Literatur im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit* (Akten des I. Internationalen Osnabrücker Kongresses zur Kulturgeschichte der frühen Neuzeit: Tübingen, 1989), pp. 87–107.

of reformation in Western Christendom in the 16<sup>th</sup> century and 2) the newly defined importance of religious affiliation in the political life of the Empire (1555).

However, the situation in Bohemia somewhat stood out against this trend, because the Czech society had had to equilibrate its ethnical and religious affiliations much earlier than its neighbors, after its specific development during the 15<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>2</sup> The Czech lands continued to possess a unique standing in the confessional structure of Europe for much of the Jagiellonian period.<sup>3</sup> This situation was even mirrored in a maxim saying that “every Czech is a heretic”, widely spread throughout Europe in the late Middle Ages and presupposing a confluence of ethnical and religious identities.<sup>4</sup> Bohemia’s actual religious and ethnical situation looked, of course, differently. Nevertheless, the politically enforced religious toleration, at which the Czech society arrived in very end of the Middle Ages (1485), that is, significantly earlier than the surrounding parts of Europe had to face the implications of confessional division in their societies, emerged as a rare model of co-existence within a wide community divided in faith. This model has yet to be fully appreciated.<sup>5</sup>

It was essential for both aspects discussed above that the confessional identity had in the early modern era and across Europe greater weight in the formation of new religious groups than the ethnical identity – this principle also appeared in the Hussite reformation.<sup>6</sup> Whereas the confessional division (Catholic vs. Utraquist) did not appear in Bohemia earlier than in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the attempts to define the ethnical identity are much older, especially in what concerns the Czech-German antagonism.<sup>7</sup> This antagonism could be observed throughout the whole co-existence of the two ethnicities in our territory since the High Middle Ages<sup>8</sup> up to modern times; but its weight was different in different periods of our history.

<sup>2</sup> The problem of ethnical identity development in the confessional context of medieval Bohemia was analyzed in detail by F. Šmahel, *Idea národa v husitských Čechách* (Praha, 2000).

<sup>3</sup> J. Macek, *Jagellonský věk v českých zemích (1471–1526)*, vol. 4, Venkovský lid – Národnostní otázka (Praha, 1999); Idem, *Víra a zbožnost jagellonského věku* (Praha, 2001).

<sup>4</sup> Šmahel, *Idea národa*, pp. 119–121.

<sup>5</sup> Macek, *Víra a zbožnost*, pp. 385–416.

<sup>6</sup> Šmahel, *Idea národa*, pp. 119–121.

<sup>7</sup> F. Šmahel, ‘Česká anomálie? Úvaha na okraj diskusí o modernosti českého „národa“ a českého nacionalismu ve 14. a 15. století’, *Československý časopis historický*, xvii (1969), pp. 57–68; most recently eadem, *Husitská revoluce I* (Praha, 1993), pp. 337–352.

<sup>8</sup> J. Kořalka, ‘Mýtus německého nepřítel: Dalimil a ti druzí’, in W. Koschmal, M. Nekula and J. Rogall, eds., *Češi a Němci. Dějiny – kultura – politika* (Praha, 2001), pp. 414–418.

Political circumstances in particular periods determined to what extent the relatively stable ethnical structure of population of the Czech lands could be used as an argument in the matters of power.

In the Middle Ages and in the earliest modern period, we see emanations of the ethnical antagonism mainly in high politics.<sup>9</sup> It entered into play as an argument in times when, on the one hand, domestic political structures felt that their influence on events in the country was weakening (usually due to pressure from the German side), but they still had sufficient means how to slow down the process or stop it altogether. The defense of national interests was the simplest common denominator, one on which Czech nobility could quickly agree in spite of old unsettled accounts and personal animosities. Another political alternative to this model was the principle of “provincial patriotism”, according to which political elites were supposed to identify themselves with the country (kingdom, duchy) and not with the interests of an ethnically defined ruling group (no one was particularly interested in the ethnical identity of peasants). We encounter the provincial patriotism in times when the influence of the central ruler’s court was strengthening at the expense of the estates.

In my contribution, I would like to point out several aspects pertaining to the development of both ethnicity and confessionality in the Bohemian kingdom at the beginning of the early modern period, especially from the perspective of their role in real politics on the level of the ruling elite of the country. When studying these two themes, we cannot avoid an extraordinary personality of Moravian and Bohemian magnate Vilém of Pernštejn (1438–1521). This is so owing to a large collection of extant sources,<sup>10</sup> but also due to the fact that he had opportunity to implement his opinions on ethnical and religious problems in practice, both in the provincial politics and in his vast dominions. It is from his pen that we get a first exact definition of the term “nation”; based not on the provincial but on the language criterion. Vilém of Pernštejn is also rightly seen as one of major practical creators of the model of supra-confessional Christianity, exercised in the Czech lands before the Lutheran reformation and providing in this environment a major

<sup>9</sup> T. Berger, ‘Jazyk a národ, in *Češi a Němci*’, pp. 131–135. The author gives particular examples from different periods (from the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries).

<sup>10</sup> J. Válka, ‘„Politická závět“ Viléma z Pernštejna (1520–1521) – Příspěvek k dějinám českého politického myšlení v době jagellonské’, *Časopis Matice moravské*, xc (1971), pp. 63–86.

foundation on which political culture of the ruling aristocratic class was built until the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>11</sup>

From the perspective of formation of the Czech national identity, the 15<sup>th</sup> century is considered to be a culmination of the development, during which the Czechs were able to define themselves against the background of their German neighbors. It was the most important impulse, on which then all later efforts, such as the definitions of the nation made by the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century by Daniel Adam of Veleslavín,<sup>12</sup> could draw. It would certainly be possible to trace direct connections between the extreme nationalism of the Hussite period and the nationalist feelings of the Veleslavín period;<sup>13</sup> nevertheless, it was exactly those several decades between the end of the medieval wars in Bohemia and the onset of European reformation that played, in my opinion, a very central role in the process, during which the question of ethnical (or national) identity gained a new dimension.

The political end to previous religious conflicts, expressed in the so-called Religious Peace of Kutná Hora (1485), made it possible to enforce inside the ranks of Czech native aristocracy the principle that ethnical (hence, national) identity was more important than confessional allegiance. The author of this idea was nobody else than Vilém of Pernštejn, whose starting point, however, was not the Czech-German antagonism, but another contemporary context.

In the course of the five decades of Jagiellonian rule, it came to important shifts in ethnical relations on the Czech political scene. At the beginning of the early modern era, the ruling elite of the Kingdom of Bohemia did not feel the need to protect its ethnical identity vis-a-vis the German element, because they did not feel threatened by it. The earlier legal ties of the Czech lands to the Holy Roman Empire weakened already in the first years of the reign of Vladislav Jagiello. The Roman Emperor's confirmation of the enfeoffment of the Czech lands only required from the king of Bohemia to carry out the office of Imperial Arch-Cup-bearer (which belonged to the Bohemian king as a first secular Imperial Elector). A theoretical possibility of external interference by the Emperor or anyone of the

<sup>11</sup> J. Pánek, 'The question of tolerance in Bohemia and Moravia in the age of the Reformation', in O.P. Grell and B. Scribner, eds., *Tolerance and intolerance in the European Reformation* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 231–248;

<sup>12</sup> Z. Beneš, 'Pojmy národ a vlast v díle Daniela Adama z Veleslavína', *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Philosophica et Historica*, 1, *Studia historica*, xxxii (1988), p. 61an.

<sup>13</sup> P. Čornej, 'Cizí, cizozemec a Němec', in B. Chocholáč, L. Jan and T. Knoz, eds., *Nový Mars Moravicus aneb Sborník příspěvků, jež věnovali Prof. Dr. Josefu Váškovi jeho žáci a přátelé k sedmdesátinám* (Brno, 1999), pp. 97–109.

other Imperial Electors into Czech affairs was finally warded off in 1486 by the decision of the Bohemian Diet, which nullified the decisions of foreign courts if they were not in accordance with Bohemian legislation. This precedential decision was instigated by the worries about stability of the existing two-stage structure of the privileged noble class. The worries were aroused by the attempt of the German-speaking noble family Šlik of Pasoun, settled in northwestern Bohemia, to reserve the role of arbiter for the Saxon Imperial Elector in their proprietary legal cases inside the kingdom of Bohemia. These controversies (still continuing at the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century) accelerated the process of “closing the estate of lords” in Bohemia, that is, of compiling an exhaustive list of lordly families, which thus created a privileged social group, exclusively entitled to hold the highest offices in the country. The lordly families were, with rare exceptions, of Czech descent. The Czech aristocracy thus made use of the experience of neighboring Moravia, where the ranks of the lordly estate had been closed two decades earlier.

Around the same time, Czech language asserted itself as the only official language in both Bohemia and Moravia. It was used in the proceedings of Provincial Diets and Provincial Courts and for entries in Public Records. The ethnically German aristocracy settled in Bohemia was not formally excluded from political life, but without active command of Czech they could not hold any of the higher offices. Even among royal towns the Czech-speaking towns prevailed. Few royal towns in Bohemia with a German-speaking majority could participate in the political life as legal corporations (for example, in the proceedings of Diets) only through the medium of representatives who had a command of Czech.

Even during the rule of Maximilian I, when nationality as a political category was purposefully developing in the neighboring German space,<sup>14</sup> the Czech aristocracy did not feel like directly threatened by this development. The Czech lands did not officially belong to that part of the former Holy Roman Empire, which under the emperor Maximilian I attempted to coalesce since the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century into a centrally ruled “Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation”.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> A. Schröcker, *Die Deutsche Nation. Beobachtungen zur politischen Propaganda des ausgehenden 15. Jahrhunderts* (Lübeck, 1974), pp. 137–141; H. Münkler, ‘Nation als politische Idee im frühneuzeitlichen Europa’, in K. Garber, Hg., *Nation und Literatur im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit* (Akten des I. Internationalen Osnabrücker Kongresses zur Kulturgeschichte der frühen Neuzeit: Tübingen, 1989), pp. 56–86; H. Schulze, ‘Deutschland in der Neuzeit’, in A. Bues and R. Rexheuser, Hgg., *Mittelalterliche nationes – neuzeitliche Nationen. Probleme der Nationenbildung in Europa* (Wiesbaden, 1995), pp. 103–120.

<sup>15</sup> J. Pánek, ‘Der böhmische Staat und das Reich in der Frühen Neuzeit’, in V. Press, Hg., *Alternativen zur Reichsverfassung in der Frühen Neuzeit?* (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs Kolloquien 23:

Imperial laws and decisions of the Imperial Assembly (a new institution founded in 1495) did not apply in the Czech lands,<sup>16</sup> and the ethnically German nobility did not play an important role on the domestic political scene, even though the active knowledge of German was common among Czech aristocracy of that time (contemporary manuals on child-rearing of young Czech aristocrats recommend learning both German and Latin).<sup>17</sup> The main domestic diplomatic language was definitely Czech.

From the perspective of politically active segments of the ruling elite, Bohemia and Moravia became at the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century Czech-speaking countries, regardless of the actual ethnical composition of the population. Bohemian and Moravian lords themselves were well-aware of their exclusiveness in the sense that the number of privileged lordly families was relatively small and that an intervention of external power might easily disrupt the ethnical integrity of this class in the life of a single generation (which later, in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, indeed happened). At the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, however, these lords did not feel a danger of this sort threatening from the Austrian or Imperial nobility. Instead of the earlier traditional “national enemy” in the shape of foreigners from German-speaking areas, the Jagiellonian era more markedly accentuated the Czech – Hungarian antagonism.<sup>18</sup>

Fears of political influence of the Hungarian nobility followed from the very existence of the Bohemian-Hungarian personal union, which had its political center in Buda since 1490, but were also aroused by unresolved questions regarding division of the countries of the Bohemian crown into the Bohemian part and the Hungarian one. Even in this case the problem was not only a question of affiliation to a particular country or province (the mother tongue of a part of the Upper

Oldenbourg, 1995), pp. 169–178; A. Begert, *Böhmen, die böhmische Kur und das Reich vom Hochmittelalter bis zum Ende des Alten Reiches. Studien zur Kurwürde und zur staatsrechtlichen Stellung Böhmens* (Historische Studien, Bd 475: Husum, 2003), pp. 593–594; J. Pánek, ‘Břemeno politiky. Raně novověká Svatá říše římská v proměnách moderní české historiografie’, in J. Klápště, E. Plešková and J. Zemlička, eds., *Dějiny ve věku nejistot. Sborník k příležitosti 70. narozenin Dušana Třeštíka* (Praha, 2003), pp. 187–200; most recently to the same theme P. Vorel, *Říšské sněmy a jejich vliv na vývoj země Koruny české v letech 1526–1618* (Pardubice, 2005).

<sup>16</sup> Vorel, *Říšské sněmy*, pp. 29–43.

<sup>17</sup> P. Vorel, ‘Dítě na aristokratickém dvoře na počátku raného novověku podle představ Viléma z Pernštejna („Naučení rodičům“ a jeho obsahová interpretace)’, in T. Jiránek and J. Kubeš, eds., *Dítě a dětství napříč staletími* (2. pardubické bienále 4.–5. dubna 2002) (Pardubice, 2003), pp. 13–48.

<sup>18</sup> J. Petráň, ‘Stavovské království a jeho kultura v Čechách (1471–1526)’, in *Pozdně gotické umění v Čechách* (Praha, 1984), pp. 14–72.

Hungarian nobility was at that time seen as a provincially delimited variant of the common, mutually intelligible west-Slavic language, which was, for that matter, also the case with Polish), but explicitly a question of the “Hungarian tongue”, the main language of the politically influential Hungarian magnates.

Hungary at that time was ethnically very diverse. Even though Latin was the official language of communication, at the court in Buda it was mainly the magnates from the ranks of the Hungarian-speaking aristocracy who were able to assert their influence and who therefore gained in the 1460s and 1470s large dominions in Moravia. The old hereditary aristocracy in Moravia numbered only several families; therefore, the settlement of a larger number of Hungarian magnates, who thus would become members of the Moravian provincial estates, was seen by Moravians as a threat to their national interests. An effort to avert this danger was, in my opinion, the main motivation for exact delimitation of the lordly estate in Moravia as early as 1480. In Bohemia, the danger of an increasing Hungarian influence was not felt until after 1490, which is why the closing of lordly ranks did not take place there until the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

The political exclusivity of Czech language came into being at the time when the political elite of Bohemia arrived at a compromise solution of religious arguments. The Peace of Kutná Hora 1485 ratified equality of both provincial confessions (Catholic and Utraquist) and forbade seigneurs to force their subjects to change religion. Relations to Roman curia and formation of a unified church administration remained subjects of controversies and further negotiation, but, since that time, the conflicts between Catholics and Utraquists ceased to rank high on the top-level political agenda. This is not to say, of course, that the signing of the treaty of 1485 put a stop to all religious conflicts in Bohemia. However, their main arena was repositioned to the level of royal towns and parishes. The political solution to long-standing religious conflicts was a compromise, advantageous to the ruling aristocracy. Factual non-existence of a unified hierarchical system of church administration also suited the needs of aristocracy.<sup>19</sup>

However, as the royal court was Catholic-oriented, it was the Catholics from the ranks of the Bohemian lords who used to be purposefully appointed to the highest provincial offices, even though a majority of domestic aristocracy professed

<sup>19</sup> J. Pánek, ‘The Religious Questions and the Political System of Bohemia before and after the Battle of the White Mountain’, in R.J.W. Evans and T.V. Thomas, eds., *Crown, Church and Estates. Central European Politics in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1991), pp. 129–148.



Utraquism. Such a distribution of power ensured a relative political balance, in which the Catholic minority – thanks to their politically-influential leaders – did not have to fear repressions from non-Catholics.

The Peace of Kutná Hora did not apply to the Unity of Brethren, which at the time when the treaty was signed was not an outwardly important religious movement and had a social isolation, among other things, in its program. This situation was gradually changing since the last decade of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, when the internal reform of the Unity of Brethren allowed its members to enjoy active participation in social life and, by creating its own administrative structure, independent of the Roman curia, offered even the aristocracy a new dimension of spiritual culture, drawing on domestic traditions. Between 1503 and 1508, the royal court reacted to the growing influence of the Unity of Brethren, which found more and more sympathizers even among the higher aristocracy, by banning its activity.

The attitude towards the Unity of Brethren became at the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century a new factor on the Bohemian religious and political scene. Majority of the estates at the Diet of 1508 formally ratified that the activity of the Unity of Brethren was contrary to the valid religious laws. At the same time, however, a majority of important land magnates (regardless of their confessional affiliation) blocked the implementation of effective sanctions against the Unity within their dominions, because they considered such sanctions a threat to their privileges. The principle of religious toleration, formulated as “supra-confessional Christianity,” was becoming one of important political buttresses of the domestic aristocracy, as it prevented the king from using religious persecution or exploiting the system of religious administration for enforcing his centralizing policies, a strategy which Ferdinand I Habsburg tried to use during his own reign.

In 1508, it did not prove possible to break the laboriously negotiated religious compromise between Catholics and Utraquists only to legalise the Unity of Brethren. However, it was necessary to get adjusted to the new situation. The response to the formal ban on the activity of the Unity of Brethren in Bohemia was its toleration in practice, regardless of the valid religious laws. This toleration became an unwritten societal norm, guaranteed by the ethnically Czech provincial aristocracy and holding that religion was not supposed to mix with politics. At the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the Catholic magnate and the Lord High

Steward of the kingdom of Bohemia Vilém of Pernštejn agreed on that in a friendly discussion with one of the leaders of the Unity of Brethren, Tůma of Přelouč.<sup>20</sup>

Hence, any native aristocrat needed also certain ethnical and confessional prerequisites, in addition to sufficient wealth, landed property and estateship, for a successful career on the Bohemian political scene at the turn of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The most advantageous was to be a member of the old lordly family, a native Czech and a tolerant Catholic. Even Vilém of Pernštejn, a Moravian magnate from a traditionally Utraquist family, working in the services of the Hungarian king, who since 1490 started deliberately to build a new political career in the kingdom of Bohemia, had gradually to adapt to these requirements.

Personal standpoints of Vilém of Pernštejn in the questions of nationality and religion had a great weight and played a distinctly precedent role in Bohemia of the turn of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Lord Vilém belonged among the highest land officials, ruled the greatest landed property in Bohemia and Moravia,<sup>21</sup> and enjoyed personally friendly relations with the king Vladislav of Jagiello. He had invaluable political experience from his youth, he knew well the Habsburg court of the old emperor Friedrich III, fought as an army commander in the services of Matthias Corvinus all around central Europe and was capable of personal communication with Hungarian counts as well as Breslauer Germans. His standpoint was not that of an ignorant parvenu whom only good fortune had brought to success, but bespoke the experience of a well-informed politician knowing the world, who was able to expressively analyze and forecast possible outcomes of future development. In the course of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, some of his fears were indeed fulfilled; first, however, those relating to family finances and the house-keeping of his descendants.<sup>22</sup>

On the questions of nationality and confessionality, he came to hold certain opinions which he then consistently supported and enforced in practice. He saw the main threat to future development of the country in the increasing influence

<sup>20</sup> P. Vorel, 'Život na dvoře Viléma z Pernštejna', in V. Bůžek and P. Král, eds., *Aristokratické rezidence a dvory v raném novověku* (Opera historica 7: České Budějovice, 1999), pp. 331–360; Idem, *Páni z Pernštejna. Vzestup a pád rodu zubří hlavy v dějinách Čech a Moravy* (Praha, 1999), pp. 124–127.

<sup>21</sup> P. Vorel, 'Vývoj pozemkové držby pánů z Pernštejna v 15.–17. století', in P. Vorel, red., *Pernštejnové v českých dějinách. Sborník příspěvků z konference konané 8.–9.9.1993 v Pardubicích* (Pardubice, 1995), pp. 9–76.

<sup>22</sup> P. Vorel, 'Zánik aristokratického dvora pánů z Pernštejna v Pardubicích v roce 1550', in *Poddanská města v systému patrimoniální správy. Sborník příspěvků z konference v Ústí nad Orlicí 12. – 13. září 1995* (Ústí nad Orlicí, 1996), pp. 70–77.

of Hungarian magnates and in a possible return of the religious discord, caused by new reformation impulses that were surpassing the provisions of the Peace of Kutná Hora. He was ahead by a whole century in fearing the return of confessional conflicts as a great danger that might possibly lead to the loss of national sovereignty: “...*be rather mindful of it to bring about concord among people, rather than inciting ones against others. That is certainly necessary lest we wish to perish dreadfully and come into disruption and even into fear of being subjugated to foreign nations ....*”<sup>23</sup>

He saw the creation of a legally-defined lordly estate (at the foundation of which he stood in Moravia as well as in Bohemia), and purposeful cooperation between Bohemians and Moravians (who – based on the language criterion – formed one nation) as the ways of averting the danger of de-Czechization of the ruling elite. His definition of nation is contained in one of his letters to Moravian estates: the member of the Czech nation is every native Czech, wherever he might happen to live.<sup>24</sup>

He also saw the broad religious toleration offered to all social classes and a consequent priority given to seigniorial power over ecclesiastic institutions as the best means for avoiding destructive religious wars. He emphasized that it was the duty of every seigneur to ensure religious freedom to his subjects, regardless of church authorities. He made himself the best example of this, modeling how seigneurs should deal with their subjects of different faiths. In the meantime, religious tensions persisted in royal towns, where the influence of the lordly estate did not reach, to the point that individual towns gradually confessionalized. On the other hand, the rapidly growing network of Bohemian and Moravian subject-towns, owned by nobility, offered in the first quarter of the 16<sup>th</sup> century a safe haven not only to members of the Unity of Brethren but also to Christians of other, elsewhere persecuted, faiths. Thanks to this attitude to the matters of faith, the domestic aristocracy even managed to absorb without overt conflicts the first wave of Lutheran reformation, which of course also overstepped the existing framework of religious laws.

<sup>23</sup> Vilém of Pernštejn, in his letter to the administrator of the utraquist party Václav Šišmánek, July 13<sup>th</sup>, 1520 (*Archiv český* I, F. Palacký, ed. (Praha, 1840), no. 69, pp. 123–124).

<sup>24</sup> Vilém of Pernštejn in his definition clearly differentiates between the “land” (kingdom, duchy) and “nation” (people speaking the same language regardless of their place of residence). In the extant correspondence, Vilém devotes a lot of attention to the national question; his opinions are, however, most explicitly formulated in his letter to Moravian estates from September 27, 1518, in which he exhorted the Moravians to remain in solidarity with the Bohemians (*Archiv český* XVI, ed. F. Dvorský (Praha, 1897), no. 120, pp. 70–71).

**Martin Luther and the German Nation:  
The Reformation and the Roots of Nationalism**

*C. Scott Dixon*

In 1507 Andreas Meinhardi wrote a book in praise of Wittenberg. In the seventh chapter he described the contents of the Castle Church, a site renowned throughout Europe for its treasury of holy relics. Included in the collection was a piece from the cloak of John the Baptist, the gown of the Virgin Mary, a fragment of the burning bush, thirty-five splinters of the cross, and one whole skeleton of a Bethlehem innocent. When Lucas Cranach took stock of the collection the following year in his *Wittenberger Heilthumbbuch* (1509), eight isles had been set up in the church in order to house the treasury. By 1518, the number of relics had trebled, and twelve isles were in use for the display. Two centuries later, however, the relics had disappeared; some had been melted down to pay for war, while others had found their way into cabinets of curiosity. Pilgrims still travelled to Wittenberg, but by the eighteenth century it was in order to visit the rooms where Martin Luther had lived and worked. By then the only relic collection was in the Luther room, where visitors could see objects such as an image of the reformer embroidered by his wife Katharina von Bora or the shattered remains of a glass allegedly used

by Luther and friends as they shared in a drink. But the prize possessions, according to the visitor Johann Gottlieb Heynig, were the two large portraits hanging in the entrance hall, one of Luther and one of Philipp Melanchthon, the two great reformers of the German Nation. 'Above all things it was these two paintings which kept drawing us to this place,' wrote Heynig; 'we would often stand there deeply affected, touched by the most profound of feelings.'<sup>1</sup>

This brief history of Wittenberg's relic collections might be used to illustrate any number of general developments, but the most obvious is the shift in meaning associated with the relics themselves. In the early sixteenth century the sacred objects were on display in order to unite the pilgrim with two essential sacral communities: the Roman Catholic Church, which was effected through the indulgences, and the Holy Roman Empire, which was effected through the symbolism of the display, from the paintings of imperial history to the holy objects gifted to the Saxon Electors by former kings and emperors. Two centuries later pilgrims travelled to Wittenberg in order to see the sites and the objects associated with the great reformer of the German Nation, Martin Luther. For these visitors the relics evoked a different type of affinity: they spoke of the community of the German peoples, united in time and place by their most famous son.

In the short study which follows I would like to examine the ways in which Luther contributed to the foundation of this community, this cultural nation. The analytical framework deviates a bit from traditional approaches to the theme. Rather than investigating how the Reformation might be understood in relation to the making (or non-making) of the German state, I would like to look at the specific contributions made by Luther to the evolving sense of German cultural identity. Of course, it is well known that the reformer used national sentiment to his advantage; the relationship between the early Reformation and burgeoning nationalism has long been on the historiographical agenda.<sup>2</sup> But Luther also made important contributions of his own to the evolving sense of German identity which were more than just a continuation or an amplification of extant trends. As Georg Schmidt has remarked, 'the "early Luther" was a national event, because *in him*

<sup>1</sup> S. Laube, 'Der Kult um die Dinge an einem evangelischen Erinnerungsort', in S. Laube and K.H. Fix, eds., *Lutherinszenierung und Reformationserinnerung* (Leipzig, 2002), p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> For a recent discussion see R. von Friedeburg, 'Dickens, the German Reformation, and the Issue of Nation and Fatherland in early modern German History', *Historical Research*, lxxvii (2004), pp. 79–97.

the traditions converged and *through him* new horizons were opened.<sup>3</sup> Throughout I will be speaking in terms of what Friedrich Meinecke termed the ‘cultural nation’ (*Kulturnation*). The age of Reformation was not yet the age of nationalism, and it would be centuries before the Germans were able to situate their ideas of national identity in any overarching social or political framework. Nevertheless, most scholars seem to agree that modern nationalism has its roots in cultural phenomena. Ernest Gellner, for instance, locates the origins in ‘the ‘fusion of power and culture,’ ‘standardized, homogenous, centrally sustained high cultures’; Benedict Anderson writes of imagined communities with shared ‘horizons of perception’, ‘horizontal comradeship,’ and vernacular landscapes.<sup>4</sup> In essence, this is to suggest that any cultural nation, including the cultural nation of early modern Germany, is shaped by three fundamental commonalities – time, place, and language.

### Luther and German History

When the Luther affair first surfaced, the two medieval notions of German identity were in flux. On the one hand there was the concept of the *Imperium Romanum*, the sacral empire bequeathed to the German kings, on the other the idea of the German Nation, a community defined primarily by language, custom, history, and political reality. And yet, despite this dual inheritance (*imperium* and *regnum*), there was a fairly consolidated impression of national identity on the eve of Reformation. Politically, a latent sense of community inhered in the very notion of Empire. Whatever the significance of the various sovereigns as actual rulers, the German kings remained the centre of the political constellation. Clientage, patronage, chivalric values, the matrix of sovereignty, the sense of imperial history – ultimately all derived their meaning from the Emperors. In practical terms as well, especially during the imperial reform movement which began with the Diet of Worms (1495), the German estates had become much more aware of the unique

<sup>3</sup> G. Schmidt, ‘Luther und die frühe Reformation – ein nationales Ereignis?’, in B. Moeller, ed., *Die frühe Reformation in Deutschland als Umbruch* (Gütersloh, 1998), p. 57.

<sup>4</sup> See the discussion in U. Özkirimli, *Theories of Nationalism. A Critical Introduction* (London, 2000), pp. 127–56; recent studies on culture and nationalism include: S. Shulman, ‘Challenging the Civic/Ethnic Dichotomies in the Study of Nationalism’, *Comparative Political Studies*, xxxv (2002), pp. 554–85; J. Hutchinson, ‘Nations and Culture’, in M. Guibernau & J. Hutchinson, eds., *Understanding Nationalism* (London, 2001), pp. 74–98; R. Brubaker, *Citizenship and Nationhood* (Cambridge, 1992).

political system which, to an extent, marked out the land and its people, and they began to speak more and more abstractly in the petitions and the grievances of the need to secure the German Nation in the face of external threats.<sup>5</sup> At the same time, a latent sense of national identity began to find expression in the works of the theologians and the humanists. Early efforts were religiously inspired and antipapal in tone. From the work of Nicholas of Cusa and Gregor Heimburg to the Grievances of the German Nation (*Gravamina nationis Germanicae*), the underlying thread remained the desire to invest the German church with its own legitimacy and to remove Rome from national affairs. Prophecies and prognostications spoke of the fall of the Catholic church and the rise of a heroic emperor, while tracts and pamphlets appeared projecting a new social order. This was also the age of secular patriotism; jingoistic humanists such as Conrad Celtis, Sebastian Brant, Jacob Wimpfeling and above all Ulrich von Hutten, set out to rewrite the history of the German Nation. Little wonder the *Germania* of Tacitus proved such a central text during this period, for it was the ideal foundation for the emerging notion of identity – in particular its encapsulation of the supposed primal virtues of the German race (virtue, honesty, piety, a love of liberty and fatherland) which, according to the humanists, once flourished in the land.<sup>6</sup>

Thus a sense of the nation and its people did exist on the eve of Reformation, but it was still largely in the making. Germany was still far removed from the type of national monarchies France and England were becoming. Moreover, most of the trends, from the prophecies to the programmes of political reform, waited on

<sup>5</sup> P. Moraw, 'Bestehende, fehlende und heranwachsende Voraussetzungen des deutschen Nationalbewußtseins im späten Mittelalter', in J. Ehlers, ed., *Ansätze und Diskontinuität deutscher Nationsbildung im Mittelalter* (Sigmaringen, 1989), p. 107; H. Lutz, 'Die deutsche Nation zu Beginn der Neuzeit. Fragen nach dem Gelingen und Scheitern deutscher Einheit im 16. Jahrhundert', *Historische Zeitschrift*, cccxxiv (1982), pp. 529–59; H. Thomas, 'Die Deutsche Nation und Martin Luther', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, cv (1985), pp. 426–54; U. Nonn, 'Heiliges Römisches Reich Deutscher Nation. Zum Nationen-Begriff im 15. Jahrhundert', *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung*, ix (1982), pp. 129–42; Schmidt, 'Luther und die frühe Reformation', pp. 54–75; for a recent reinterpretation of the development of the German Nation see G. Schmidt, *Geschichte des Alten Reiches. Staat und Nation in der Frühen Neuzeit 1495–1806* (München, 1999); for the debate it has aroused: H. Schilling, 'Reichs-Staat und frühneuzeitliche Nation der Deutschen oder teilmodernisiertes Reichssystem', *Historische Zeitschrift*, cclxxii (2001), pp. 377–95; G. Schmidt, 'Das frühneuzeitliche Reich – komplementärer Staat und föderative Nation', *Historische Zeitschrift*, cclxxiii (2001), pp. 371–99.

<sup>6</sup> A. G. Dickens. *The German Nation and Martin Luther* (London, 1974), pp. 1–48; H. Kloft, 'Die Germania des Tacitus und das Problem eines deutschen Nationalbewußtseins', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, lxxii (1990), pp. 93–114.

a catalyst to set them in motion. To borrow an expression from the *Reformatio Sigismundi*, the most influential reforming tract of the late medieval age, the only thing the Germans could be certain of was that ‘the hour will come’.

With the appearance of Martin Luther, the vague sense of expectation assumed an immediacy. He worked as a catalyst for public perception, convincing people to believe that the time to act had finally arrived. In large part, this was due to his own skills as a publicist. In his reforming tract *Address to the Christian Nobility* (1520), Luther simply announced that a new age had dawned. ‘The time for silence is over,’ he wrote, paraphrasing Ecclesiastes, ‘and the time for speech has come.’ In the *Address*, Luther wrote directly to the ruling elite of the German Nation and outlined a programme of reform which was little less than the manifesto for a national movement. Moreover, unlike previous (medieval) proposals, the *Address* spoke in a much more direct and aggressive tone. Luther did not just list the grievances and hope for better days; he targeted the cause of Germany’s misery (the Papacy) and called for immediate action.<sup>7</sup>

The *Address* was a ‘calculated step’ taken by Luther in order to transform his religious concerns into political action.<sup>8</sup> And it was skillfully done. Source analysis of the text reveals that Luther drew on an unprecedented wide range of materials in order to equate his cause with the cause of the German Nation. Borrowing from the traditional themes in the grievances and various conciliar tracts, he also seems to have made use of more activist clerical works such as the *Reformatio Sigismundi* and the report on the reform of the German church drawn up by Wimpfeling at the request of Emperor Maximilian. The *Address* was infused with the popular antipapal language of the day, and it was clearly (and openly) indebted to the work of the humanists. Indeed, in many ways it was a public thanks for the support he had been offered by the German nobility, a declaration of allegiance. (Luther had received a letter from Hutten just as he began work on the *Address* and no doubt thought him, at this stage, a useful ally.)<sup>9</sup> Perhaps just as important as the range of works he borrowed from was the stock of phrases and commonplaces gathered by Luther by way of rumour and report. He got many of his particulars about the state of affairs in Rome, for instance, from discussions with Johann von der Wieck, Johann Reuchlin’s lawyer. The result

<sup>7</sup> Thomas, ‘Die Deutsche Nation und Martin Luther’, pp. 449–52.

<sup>8</sup> Schmidt, ‘Luther und die frühe Reformation’, p. 69.

<sup>9</sup> W.E. Köhler, *Luthers Schriften An den Christlichen Adel deutscher Nation im Spiegel der Kultur- und Zeitgeschichte* (Halle, 1895), pp. 86–287.



was a work, to cite its most exact interpreter, with an ‘extremely lively relationship to the present,’<sup>10</sup> and thus a text which offered both a point of origin and a fresh horizon for the creation of German identity. After decades of waiting for a new age to commence, Luther simply announced that it had begun.

Luther’s words had resonance, not only because he was a writer of genius, but because they spoke directly to the long-forecast idea of a ‘great change’ in circulation during the late-medieval period. For those familiar with the prophetic traditions, it was easy to cast Luther as the long-promised *reformer* come to unite the German peoples or to see him as the fulfilment of the biblical prophecies. When Luther first appeared, many of his followers referred to him as the White Rider of Revelation, the herald of the Last Days; others spoke in terms of a prophet, a holy man, an apostle reborn or an angel sent by God. Some evangelical clergymen even dated their letters from ‘Elijah’s appearance’. Necessarily, Luther as the figure or symbol of apocalyptic expectation had a powerful historical dimension; his appearance was both the confirmation, the final realisation, of the long tradition of medieval prophecies (soon gathered and collated by Lutheran scholars) and the cause for future speculation. In the words of a recent interpreter: ‘The figure of Luther had become a commonplace in the eschatological delineation of the era; viewed as a signpost on the horizon of human history, his person and his message were already altering the apocalyptic imagination.’<sup>11</sup> Of course, speculation of this kind did little to provide an inclusive sense of German history; but it did serve as ‘a latent framework out of which most contemporaries deciphered and interpreted the world and events around them,’ and it did provide a launching pad for further conjecture.<sup>12</sup>

Protestant Germany became Europe’s laboratory for ‘prophetic research’; scholars devoted themselves to the study of sacred, secular, and even natural history in the hope that the course of time could be reduced to a comprehensible order and God’s ultimate purpose (the Reformation) revealed and confirmed. Numerous Lutheran scholars contributed to this enterprise, including central figures such as Matthias Flacius Illyricus, Philipp Melancthon, whose reworking of Johann

<sup>10</sup> Köhler, *Luthers Schriften An den Christlichen Adel*, p. 94.

<sup>11</sup> R. Kolb, *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero. Images of the Reformer, 1520–1620* (Grand Rapids, 1999), p. 52.

<sup>12</sup> O.P. Grell and A. Cunningham, *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse. Religion, War, Famine and Death in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 51; on this in general see R.B. Barnes, *Prophecy and Gnosis. Apocalypticism in the Wake of the Lutheran Reformation* (Stanford, 1988).

Carion's *Chronicle* went through fifteen editions, and Lukas Osiander, author of *Conjectures on the Last Days and End of the World* (1544), whose eschatological distress not only helped to refine the biblical chronologies and draw parallels with contemporary events (thereby 'actualising biblical time') but also brought about greater precision to the study of German history.<sup>13</sup> This type of speculation was considered pious work, for as the clergyman Cyprian Leowitz remarked, '... surely God has wished to place the changing of time before our eyes like an hourglass or a clock.'<sup>14</sup>

As a consequence of the Reformation, a knowledge of history became more critical than ever before, even if it was often used for polemical ends.<sup>15</sup> As the Lutherans soon realised, a 'proper' reading of the Christian past had become a main pillar of the faith, not only to prove to their enemies that the evangelical religion was the true faith, but to demonstrate why the German lands had been chosen by God as the cradle of its rebirth. This started the drift from a sense of history based on vague patterns of prophetic expectation to a sense of history rooted in the concerns of the present.

Luther worked as a catalyst for this development, as has been suggested above, but he also made a direct contribution to this revaluation of German history. It derived from his understanding of tradition and thus his approach to historical sources. Famously, during the debate in Leipzig, Luther rejected the authorities of the Catholic church and elevated Scripture to the status of 'sufficient authority'. Later scholars have turned this axiom of *sola scriptura* into a broad principle of interpretation, to such an extent one historian has claimed that 'never again could there be an unconscious possession of tradition'.<sup>16</sup> That is perhaps overstated, but there is little doubt that Luther's rejection of the authority of Catholic tradition (pope, councils, apostolic custom) in the face of a single text that was wholly substantial (Scripture) had a general effect on the writing of history in Germany. Historians began to scrutinize their sources more closely, and they were much less hesitant to discard established authorities and elevate new ones in their place. As Melancthon remarked a few years after Leipzig, to that point no trustworthy history of Germany existed because no scholar had been capable of writing it – to date they had been monks and theologians, reliant on doubtful sources and

<sup>13</sup> Grell & Cunningham, *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse*, pp. 50–1.

<sup>14</sup> Barnes, *Prophecy and Gnosis*, p. 150.

<sup>15</sup> P. Polman, *L'élément historique dans la controverse religieuse du 16<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Gembloux, 1932).

<sup>16</sup> J.M. Headley, *Luther's View of Church History* (New Haven, 1963), p. 79.

unaware of how a text should be understood in its setting. Only now, concluded Melancthon, could such a history be written.<sup>17</sup> German historians seem to have taken these words to heart. Inspired in large part by the principles established and the example set by Luther, evangelical scholars set out to rewrite the German past and in doing so laid the foundations for the historiographical innovations that came to fruition with the Enlightenment.<sup>18</sup> Indeed, the historian Wolfgang Reinhard has suggested that much of German history has been written with an unconscious debt to Luther (what he terms ‘thinking with Luther’s thoughts’), by which he means that modern historians have often based their reading of the past on the techniques pioneered by the reformer.<sup>19</sup> Having devalued the traditional sources of the faith, Luther placed stress on the authority of the text itself (Scripture) and insisted that it must be understood in light of its own inner logic, free of the weight of the established interpretations and no longer imprisoned by the hermeneutical dogmas of the day.<sup>20</sup>

### Luther and the German Community

Despite the scale of their efforts, German humanists had never been able to agree on the exact dimensions of Germania. Histories and atlases offered some guidance, but the size and shape tended to vary depending on the regional identity of the authors. Even the great cartographer Abraham Ortelius, a precise and exacting man, admitted that the dimensions escaped him. Language was sometimes used as a guide, and often as a synonym for nation, both to situate the people and the

<sup>17</sup> U. Neddermeyer, “Was hat man von solchen confusionibus...recht und vollkömmlichen berichten können?” Der Zusammenbruch des einheitlichen europäischen Geschichtsbildes nach der Reformation’, *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, lxxvi (1994), p. 89.

<sup>18</sup> For a recent study of early Protestant historiography see I. Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378–1615)* (Leiden, 2003). Conceived in part as a revision of the claims made by Polman (*L’élément historique*), Backus illustrates ‘the creative role of history in the Reformation era as a decisive factor in the affirmation of confessional identity’ (p. 5); on later developments in the universities see E.C. Scherer, *Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte an den deutschen Universitäten. Ihre Anfänge im Zeitalter des Humanismus und ihre Ausbildung zu selbständigen Disziplinen* (Freiburg, 1927), pp. 135–273; K. Wetzel, *Theologische Kirchengeschichtsschreibung im deutschen Protestantismus 1600–1760* (Gießen, 1983), pp. 19–131.

<sup>19</sup> W. Reinhard, ‘Martin Luther und der Ursprung der historischen Geschichtswissenschaft in Deutschland’, in H.R. Guggisberg & G.G. Krodel (eds), *Die Reformation in Deutschland und Europa: Interpretationen und Debatten* (Göttingen, 1993), p. 374.

<sup>20</sup> Reinhard, ‘Martin Luther und der Ursprung der historischen Geschichtswissenschaft’, p. 380.

land; but the German language itself was divided into a variety of dialects, some of which were mutually incomprehensible, and it was hardly the stuff to facilitate unity.<sup>21</sup> But there is more to a sense of community than the lines on a map. As Anthony Smith has remarked, nations develop an awareness of place by imagining a historic territory or 'homeland'. 'The homeland,' writes Smith, 'becomes a repository of memories and associations, the locus where 'our' sages, saints, and heroes lived, worked, prayed and fought.'<sup>22</sup>

Luther helped to fashion both a sense and an image of community by identifying the papacy as the Antichrist and severing all association with Rome. In doing this he borrowed from medieval traditions, and there is more than a hint of the nationalist fervour of the humanists in many of his impassioned declarations. 'Give us back our freedom, our power, our honour, our bodies and souls; and let us be an empire as an empire ought to be, and let there be an end of his [the pope's] words and claims!'<sup>23</sup> But Luther introduced two essential insights which broke with the past. First, he ignored the corpus of apocalyptic speculation and located the proofs in Scripture – it was a solely theological claim; and second, he made the Antichrist a collective rather than an individual threat. As he wrote in the *Babylonian Captivity*, the final antagonist was not a person but an institution.<sup>24</sup> This had the effect of locating and pluralising the enemy. Moreover, Luther's reliance on Scripture also meant that he could draw on the stock of biblical imagery in order to create a mental picture of the communities at war.

The first effective attempt at visualising the contrasts appeared in a series of woodcuts entitled the *Passional Christ and Antichrist* (1521). It worked as a set of antitheses, pitching the evils of the papacy against the virtues of Christ. The following year, with the publication of his New Testament translation, the eschatological dimensions of this division were emphasised in the illustrations prepared for the Book of Revelation. The notorious papal tiara atop the Beast of the Apocalypse was perhaps the most shocking image, and the most direct proof that Luther was working behind the scenes.<sup>25</sup> This use of imagery was taken one step further with

<sup>21</sup> Lutz, 'Die deutsche Nation zu Beginn der Neuzeit', p. 538.

<sup>22</sup> A.D. Smith, *National Identity* (London, 1991), p. 9.

<sup>23</sup> Quoted in K. Stadtwald, *Roman Popes and German Patriots. Antipapalism in the Politics of the German Humanist Movement from Gregor Heimburg to Martin Luther* (Geneva, 1996), p. 186.

<sup>24</sup> On Luther's ideas of the Antichrist see H. Preuss, *Die Vorstellungen vom Antichrist im späteren Mittelalter, bei Luther und in der konfessionellen Polemik* (Leipzig, 1907), pp. 83–144.

<sup>25</sup> P. Martin, *Martin Luther und die Bilder zur Apokalypse* (Wittig, 1983), pp. 104–12.

the appearance of the Bible translation of 1534, which came with a series of woodcuts projecting this cosmic battle in nationalistic terms. Kneeling before the Babylonian whore, for instance, were the figures of Emperor Charles, Archduke Ferdinand, Duke Georg of Saxony, and Johann Tetzl, while the cityscape of Babylon, based on the image of Rome taken from Schedel's *Weltchronik*, was swallowed up by the earth. In contrast to this, Elector Friedrich the Wise appeared in the guise of the pious kings of the Old Testament, while Luther himself played the role of the most sacred high priests.<sup>26</sup> Later editions of the Bible would develop these types of images, with woodcuts of Worms or Augsburg serving as biblical cityscapes and Germanic tribesmen standing in for Old Testament figures, thus further biblicising German history and stressing the contrasts at the root of the division. Many readers must have reacted like Georg von Anhalt, Lutheran bishop of Merseburg, who remarked how glad he was to be alive in an age when 'the most holy David and the holy prophets speak to us so clearly in both words and meaning, as if they had been born and raised in our own mother tongue.'<sup>27</sup>

Luther's Antichrist, unlike medieval notions of the Antichrist, was physically present. In his view the prophecy of Daniel, which associated the Antichrist with the fourth monarchy (Roman Empire) had been fulfilled, leaving Luther to conclude that the present Empire was a mere counterfeit of the original, a deception invented by the papacy and entrusted to the Germans. 'For the Emperor is not the Emperor at all,' he wrote, 'but rather the Pope, to whom the Emperor is as submissive as a slave.'<sup>28</sup> In nationalistic discourse, this tended to make the German peoples even more unique in that God had invested them with the task of defending the faith while Rome succumbed to corruption. And thus, wrote Melancthon, 'may the German princes, and especially the electoral princes, quite rightly hold their honour in high regard, that God had entrusted them with the sovereignty to watch over peace, justice, and religion.'<sup>29</sup> This idea provided a further basis for the sense of historic community – a place where 'sages, saints, and heroes lived, worked, prayed and fought'. That is why the antipapal humanists were so eager to unearth any textual remains relating to the figure of Arminius (much as the Elizabethans went in quest of King Arthur), for it provided an ancient history and

<sup>26</sup> P. Schmidt, *Die Illustration der Lutherbibel 1522–1700* (Basel, 1962), pp. 13–28.

<sup>27</sup> H. Reinitzer, *Biblia deutsch. Luthers Bibelübersetzung und ihre Tradition* (Hamburg, 1983), p. 207.

<sup>28</sup> A. Seifert, *Der Rückzug der biblischen Prophetie von der neueren Geschichte. Studien zur Geschichte der Reichstheologie des frühneuzeitlichen deutschen Protestantismus* (Vienna, 1990), p. 9

<sup>29</sup> Seifert, *Der Rückzug der biblischen Prophetie*, pp. 22–23.

thus a continuum for the idea of the native integrity and piety of the Germans. Much of the basic German/Italian bipolar scheme – honesty versus treachery, virtue versus corruption, freedom versus tyranny – was taken from Tacitus and later infused with a religious dimension by the evangelicals.<sup>30</sup> Moreover, this strategy of antithesis afforded the Germans a critical distance to the Empire and made it possible to contemplate actual separation. It would be beyond the scope of this paper to trace the political implications of this development; and yet there is little doubt that the idea of the papal Antichrist and its association with the Emperor became a central topos in the language of German liberty on the eve of the Schmalkaldic War. Even the Catholic princes could agree that Charles' efforts to force through a religious settlement smacked of Roman tyranny.<sup>31</sup> And even in the most candid of the Lutheran theories of resistance, such as the work *About Defence and Self-Defence* (1547) by Regius Selinus, tutor to the children of the Saxon Elector, the main issue was not one of religious conscience but rather the liberties of 'our dear Fatherland of the German Nation' and how they had been threatened by Spanish domination and papal tyranny. This was something that all Germans, Catholics and Protestants alike, could fear in equal measure.<sup>32</sup>

One other thing created a sense of community, of course, and that was communication, or more specifically, the print community. For many, this was proof enough that the Germans had been set aside as a unique people. As Hartmuth von Cronberg put it in a letter to Luther (1522): 'God has revealed his most Holy Word and irrefutable truth to us Germans before other nations, and the art of printing, from which the whole world may find comfort and salvation, was first invented in the German lands.'<sup>33</sup> Of course, with the Reformation, words themselves could work to divide, as the century of confessionalisation would attest; but print

<sup>30</sup> Cf. H. Kloft, 'Die Idee einer deutschen Nation zu Beginn der frühen Neuzeit. Überlegungen zur *Germania* des Tacitus und zum *Arminius* Ulrichs von Hutten', in R. Wiegels & W. Woesler, eds., *Arminius und die Varusschlacht. Geschichte – Mythos – Literatur* (Paderborn, 2003), pp. 197–210.

<sup>31</sup> G. Schmidt, *Geschichte des Alten Reiches*, p. 85; O. Waldeck, 'Die Publizistik des Schmalkaldischen Krieges', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, vii (1909/10), pp. 1–55; viii (1910/11), 44–133; G. Vogler, 'Kurfürst Johann Friedrich und Herzog Moritz von Sachsen: Polemik in Liedern und Flugschriften während des Schmalkaldischen Krieges 1546/47', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, lxxxix (1998), pp. 178–206, E. Hühns, "'Nationale" Propaganda im Schmalkaldischen Krieg', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, vi (1958), pp. 1027–48.

<sup>32</sup> R. von Friedeburg, *Self-Defence and Religious Strife in Early Modern Europe. England and Germany, 1530–1680* (Aldershot, 2002), p. 82.

<sup>33</sup> Quoted in Reinitzer, *Biblia deutsch*, p. 192.

technology played an additional role in the rise of the nation, and this, in contrast, could work to unite. As Benedict Anderson has suggested, the importance of the printed text for the rise of national identity was not just in its content but also in its form. Books not only provided a forum for ideas; the very dialogue itself was shaped by the methods and techniques developed by print. Anderson speaks of ‘forms of imagining’ and refers to the role played by newspapers and novels in the making of modern nationalism: they created a ‘community in the know,’ he suggests, sharing the same issues and concerns, directed at the same themes (spoken and unspoken) and joined by a ‘remarkable confidence of [a] community in anonymity.’<sup>34</sup>

No other author did more to fashion a community of this kind than Martin Luther. Luther made use of all the means of expression available – from sermons and disputations to pamphlets and broadsheets – to catch the attention of the German public. Whether for or against, it was impossible to be a literate German in the early sixteenth century and not know something about the Luther affair. This type of general or shared knowledge, the ‘community in anonymity,’ was first created in Germany by the Reformation, and its main author, in every sense, was Martin Luther. From the very beginning, Luther realised the significance of the text for the formation of public opinion. He brought printers to Wittenberg, watched over the production of his own works at every stage (editions, reprints, costs, quality, engravings), and wrote with great skill in a variety of formats (tracts, pamphlets, catechisms) in order to reach the broadest possible audience. The sheer range of his publications was enormous: by 1519 there were over 250,000 copies of his works in circulation; by 1521, at the time of the meeting in Worms, up to 500,000 individual texts in his name had been sold; by 1525, historians calculate the number of copies to run in the millions. During the early years of the movement it was enough for the Wittenberg publishers to print M. L. A. (Martin Luther Augustinian) or simply M. L. on the title page for the reading public to know which author was meant.<sup>35</sup> With the onset of the *causa Lutheri*, the printing industry was radically transformed within the space of a few years. The number of books increased multifold, the number of publishing houses in Germany proliferated, the printed text emerged as one of the central commodities of the age,

<sup>34</sup> Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 2003), p. 36.

<sup>35</sup> J. Burckhardt, *Das Reformationsjahrhundert: Deutsche Geschichte zwischen Medienrevolution und Institutionsbildung 1517–1617* (Stuttgart, 2002), pp. 39–48.

and a reading public (or, at least, a public held in the grip of the printed word) was fashioned. In Augsburg, for example, primarily through the publication of works by Luther, the industry grew sixfold between 1517 and 1525 and the sale of books followed suit. Other centers of the book trade experienced a similar increase, while some locations, Wittenberg being the obvious example, were more or less created by the movement. It was a media revolution, inspired by Luther in his dual role as private author and public celebrity.<sup>36</sup>

Luther sometimes thought of books as an active force, as heralds and soldiers. As he once remarked, 'I was born for this purpose, that I must take to the battlefield and fight with the rabble and the devil; that is why my books are so stormy and belligerent.'<sup>37</sup> But he also viewed books in more constructive terms; they were the means through which individuals and communities could begin to understand themselves. That is why when he spoke of personal religion he so frequently used the book as a metaphor – the book of faith, the book of life, the book of Christ. And that is why, when he addressed a broader community, he spoke of the 'book of memory', as he did with his repeated warnings to 'my dear Germans,' for the book was the voice, the essence, and the storehouse of identity. Without it, to paraphrase Melancthon, the German Nation would forever remain in infancy.

### Luther and the German Language

The German language in its written form is the most obvious 'national' trait which owes a debt to Martin Luther. (The most famous tribute to this is Jakob Grimm's reference to High German as the 'Protestant dialect'.) More than any other author of the age, Luther invested the vernacular with both the facility and the authority to serve as the language for a nation. He did this in two ways.

First, Luther used the vernacular much more effectively than ever before as a means of defining the boundaries of the community. Philologists no longer speak of Luther as the founder of the modern German language, but there is little doubt

<sup>36</sup> B. Hamm, 'Die Reformation als Medienereignis', *Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie*, xi (1996), pp. 137–66; M.U. Edwards, Jr., *Printing, Propaganda, and Martin Luther* (London, 1994), pp. 1–56; R. Wohlfeil, 'Reformatrische Öffentlichkeit, Literatur und Laienbildung im Spätmittelalter und in der Reformationszeit', in L. Grenzmann & K. Stackmann, eds., *Literatur und Laienbildung im Spätmittelalter und in der Reformationszeit* (Stuttgart, 1984), pp. 41–54; R. Wittmann, *Geschichte des deutschen Buchhandels* (München, 1990), pp. 48–81.

<sup>37</sup> H. Flachmann, *Martin Luther und das Buch. Eine Studie zur Bedeutung des Buches im Handeln und Denken des Reformators* (Tübingen, 1999), p. 307.



that he was the most dynamic force behind the consolidation and the evolution of the language forged out of the various dialects in and around the lands of Saxony (the *Schreiballianz* of middle Germany). From the very outset, especially after the appearance of the New Testament translation, Luther's use of German emerged as a model of proper style throughout the Empire (indeed, the reformer even charged some of his Catholic opponents with having stolen 'my language'), and it was soon enshrined in a wide range of publications – mandates, ordinances, tomes and pamphlets, poems and prose, and books of grammar (Luther's use of German remained the basis for the *Grammatica Germanicae linguae* of Johannes Clajus from 1578 to 1720).<sup>38</sup> Moreover, Luther's vast output and his unprecedented ability to reduce and refine the vernacular to a level of general readability laid the foundations for a community empowered by a common (printed) language, much more aware of where the centre and the peripheries lay. The Basel edition of Luther's New Testament (1523), for instance, came with a glossary of unknown Thuringian terms rendered into Swiss-German in order to enable the reader to follow the translation. It was a minor technical innovation, but the very attempt to connect the two vernaculars in the southern Empire and elsewhere – a development the Germanist Werner Besch has termed a 'forced exchange of words' – generated a sense of linguistic self-consciousness without precedent in German history.<sup>39</sup>

Second, and perhaps more importantly, Luther elevated the status of the language. Not only did he demonstrate that German could bear the burden of theological discourse; his translation of the Bible entrusted the vernacular with the weight of God's Word. 'I thank God,' wrote Luther, 'that I may find and hear my Lord in the German tongue in a manner which I have not experienced before, neither in Latin, nor in Greek, nor in Hebrew.'<sup>40</sup> From this point forward, at least in the Lutheran lands of the Empire, the way to God was through the printed (German) word.<sup>41</sup> After the appearance of the New Testament and its massive success, few people could now seriously doubt that a written language capable of speaking for the divine might not also mediate between the dialects of upper and lower Germany. Luther's Bible conveyed this idea to the German public

<sup>38</sup> H. Wolf, *Martin Luther* (Stuttgart, 1980), pp. 68–74; B. Stolt, *Martin Luthers Rhetorik des Herzens* (Tübingen, 2000), pp. 1–41.

<sup>39</sup> W. Besch, *Die Rolle Luthers in der deutschen Sprachgeschichte* (Heidelberg, 1999), pp. 17–20.

<sup>40</sup> Lutz, 'Die deutsche Nation', pp. 546–7.

<sup>41</sup> Burckhardt, *Das Reformationsjahrhundert*, p. 48.

and ultimately helped to create a sense of linguistic community. Indeed, the sheer ubiquity of the translation codified the language. For centuries children learned the basics of grammar by pouring over this text – its style, rhythm, syntax, images, allusions, metaphors, and treasury of words became the heartbeat of the language. Some scholars consider it the crucible for the making of the modern written form of German.<sup>42</sup>

In a less precise manner as well, Luther helped to create a common cultural language for the German Nation. His theology, of course, was the heuristic foundation for the process of Lutheran confessionalisation. For centuries after his death, millions of people equated Lutheranism with the idea of being German. But millions of others, Catholics and Calvinists being the most obvious examples, did not, and the Reformation's failure to unite the German people has been considered the tragic flaw in the national narrative since the days of Leopold von Ranke. Yet even in the midst of this lost political opportunity, the figure of Martin Luther has always been a symbolic centre to notions of German identity. From the very outset of the Reformation movement, the iconography of Luther (from saint to knight to Cranach's woodcut of Luther as *Hercules Germanicus*) served to capture and express notions of the German community in opposition to Rome.<sup>43</sup> In later centuries, historians, poets, and philosophers often drew on the figure of Luther whenever it was necessary to express an *essential* truth about the German condition. From Hutten to Leibniz, Lessing to Friedrich the Great, Luther was seen to embody the fundamental virtues of the race (honesty, courage, morality, genius) and stand alone in history as the figurehead of the nation. As Johann Gottfried Herder, the architect of German nationalism, once remarked, 'Luther was a powerful mind, a true prophet and preacher of our fatherland.'<sup>44</sup> Nor did the power of this symbolism fade once the German Nation became a political reality. In 1892, on the occasion of a celebration marking the restoration of the Castle Church in Wittenberg, the Emperor Wilhelm II raised Luther's drinking glass to his lips, one of the treasured relics, and declared: 'This cup, which once touched Luther's own lips, may serve me in a toast to the health of my most gracious guests. To the evangelical princes and to the rulers of the German free imperial cities – live

<sup>42</sup> Besch, *Die Rolle Luthers*, p. 35.

<sup>43</sup> R.W. Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk: Popular Propaganda for the German Reformation* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 14–36; Kolb, *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero*, pp. 1–134.

<sup>44</sup> E.W. Zeeden, *The Legacy of Luther* (London, 1954), p. 171.

long!<sup>45</sup> By this stage, the symbolism associated with Luther had long been part of the rhetoric behind the making of the state.

Martin Luther, like his contemporaries, would have been surprised by this association – the evangelical reformer and the making of the German Nation. For most the opposite was true: Luther was a catalyst for division rather than a voice for unity. As Sebastian Frank once observed, Germany did not really become divided until the year 1520 – the year when Luther published his major reforming tracts.<sup>46</sup> Centuries would pass before these divisions could be overcome, and when the German Nation did finally coalesce into a political whole it was the creation of completely different forces in a completely different age. And yet, Luther did put some of the foundations in place for a more consolidated sense of national identity. He provided frameworks for development – a sense of time and a sense of place – and he made it possible for the German people to engage in a mass dialogue with one another – not just because of the advances he made in the language and the forms of media, but also because of his symbolic centrality to nationalist modes of thought. When Johann Gottfried Herder wanted to awaken the German Nation from its long slumber, he called on Luther, asking the ‘noble shade’ to return and aid him in the task. ‘Become once more the Teacher of thy nation,’ he wrote, ‘its Prophet and Preacher, it may be that Germany, its princes, nobles, court and people, will hear thy voice, with its truth clear as noonday, its tone and sound as persuasive as it can be terrible and fearful.’ For it was Luther, as Herder worded it, who first ‘roused a whole nation to think and feel.’<sup>47</sup>

<sup>45</sup> Laube, ‘Der Kult um die Dinge’, p. 34.

<sup>46</sup> Lutz, ‘Die deutsche Nation’, p. 554.

<sup>47</sup> Zeeden, *The Legacy of Luther*, pp. 171–2.

**Nation and Confession in the Czech Lands  
in the pre-White Mountain Period**

*Jaroslav Pánek*

Two extreme declarations of ethnical and confessional allegiance emerged in the Czech lands at the turn of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The later of them is better-known: in 1615, the Bohemian Diet promulgated a law about the exclusivity of Czech language, which drew on an older regulation from the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century but was much more radical. This piece of legislation laid a threshold for division of the society of estates on the principle of loyalty to the language of the country; having or not having active knowledge of Czech implied far-reaching legal and political consequences. Lords, knights and burghers who did not have an active command of Czech were supposed to be, effectively, excluded from public life and their descendants (unless they assimilated) were to enjoy a very restricted right of inheritance. Granting citizenship to foreigners and, thereby, the influx of foreigners were to be reduced considerably. Likewise, the freedom of association for foreigners living in Bohemian towns was to be curtailed and those who disparaged Czech language were to be prosecuted. Especially tough punishments (label of an evil-doer and expulsion from the country) were reserved for people of

Czech descent who would hesitate to use their mother tongue or discouraged their compatriots from speaking it.<sup>1</sup>

However, the legislative sanctions needed to give weight to these harsh measures were not sufficiently supported by the judicial and executive powers. In the ethnically diverse society of post-Rudolphian era, the whole project remained unfeasible. The legislation apparently could not attain the objective proclaimed, that is, the actual assimilation of all inhabitants of Bohemia speaking one language. Such assimilation would be in the interest of conservative circles of ultraquist aristocracy and burghers. Measures of this sort would also suit the pro-Habsburg Catholic aristocracy which, in alliance with a part of the Evangelic faction, divided in their attitudes, would like to put legal barriers to the Lutheran (and possibly also Calvinist) part of the oppositional estates and their preachers, whose native language was German.<sup>2</sup>

This remarkable crisscross of confessional and ethnic interests was powered by latent nationalistic emotions. Its attempted legal solution was an effort to support particular interests by exclusion of foreigners from influential posts in institutions of the Bohemian kingdom. Even though inter-ethnic tensions in the Czech lands had many sources, this defensive initiative next to xenophobia originated unquestionably from the Czech side.

There was also an opposite extreme, of a different kind. About one quarter of a century before the passing of the language law, we could see an extraordinary escalation of tensions between Czechs and Germans in the critical area on the Bohemian-Saxon borders. These tensions found their literary expression in the theater play of an anonymous German author (possibly Johann Sandel, a Chomutov/Komotau town scribe) from 1594. In it, the nationalist hatred the level at which (at least from the perspective of a German observer) either of the two ethnicities thought the other to be “dogs” and the members of the German minority were afraid that there might someday come a confrontation in the manner of St. Bartholomew’s Day massacre, in which Germans – including the emperor Rudolf II – would be slaughtered by the Czech majority. The contemporary Czech

<sup>1</sup> Record of the diet resolution: K. Tieftrunk, ed., *Pavla Skály ze Zhoře Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623*, vol. 1 (Praha, 1865), pp. 355–358.

<sup>2</sup> More detail in J. Klik, *Národnostní poměry v Čechách od válek husitských do bitvy bělohorské* (Praha, 1922), pp. 111–113.

literature also occasionally mentions Germans as being “snakes” or “hornets,”<sup>3</sup> as well as fears of total (though gradual) eradication of Czechs,<sup>4</sup> but the Chomutov vision of total ethnic massacre is exceptional and deserves special attention.

The dramatic pamphlet “*Eine crunser seltsambe tragoedi*” captures a one-sided view of the relations between both ethnicities, seen by German eyes and based on actual experience from the Czech-German ethnic borderland, moreover, from a town, which was one of the centers of Lutheranism in the Czech lands and was considered to be rigorously nationalist (in 1634, Pavel Stránský, a humanistic writer, recorded a widespread Czech saying: “everywhere there are people, in Chomutov there are Germans” or in Latin interpretation, “toto regno homines esse significatur, solam vero Chomutovian à Germanis incolí”<sup>5</sup> The acute xenophobia – this time on the German side – was a result of extraordinary circumstances, that is, the conflict between ardent Chomutov Lutherans and their no-less radical Catholic lord, one of the most powerful aristocrats in Bohemia, the Lord High Steward Jiří Popel of Lobkovic. He, after gaining the Chomutov domain (1588), decided to forcibly subjugate local Lutherans and used a newly founded Jesuit college for that purpose. In 1591, Chomutov burghers responded by a rebellion against the lord and the Jesuits. The defeat of the rebellion was followed by executions, fines and confiscation of town privileges.<sup>6</sup> However, immediately after this deep humiliation of Chomutov, Lobkovic found himself in a conflict (1593–1594) with Rudolph II, followed by his rapid fall.<sup>7</sup> In this way, three different

<sup>3</sup> Pavel Stránský, ‘Proti hostinským, v Čechách se do kostelův tlačícím jazykům na nedbalého Čecha učiněný okřik (1618)’, in B. Ryba, ed., *Český stát. Okřik* (Praha, 1953), pp. 361–380, here p. 372.

<sup>4</sup> Stránský, *Okřik*, passim; Pavel Ješín z Bezdězí, ‘Předmluva k rozumnému a nekvapnému čtenáři (1620)’, in J. Daňhelka, ed., *Die altschechische Reimchronik des sogenannten Dalimil* (München, 1981), passim. The contemporary historian Skála also summarized the opinion of the members of the estate assembly from 1615 in the fear that “with the perishing of the Czech language also the Czech nation and the name of the Czechs would perish”; Tieftrunk, ed., *Pavla Skály ze Zhoře Historie*, vol. 1, p. 355.

<sup>5</sup> *Respublica Bohemiae a M. Paulo Stranskii descripta*, (Lugd. Batavorum, 1634), p. 79.

<sup>6</sup> A. Sedláček, *Místopisný slovník historický Království českého* (Praha, 1908), p. 323; J. Bahlcke, Komotau, in: *Handbuch der historischen Stätten: Böhmen und Mähren*, ed. by J. Bahlcke, W. Eberhard and M. Polívka (Stuttgart, 1998), pp. 282–285, here p. 283f.

<sup>7</sup> W.W. Tomek, ‘Spiknutí Jiřího z Lobkovic r. 1593’, *Časopis Českého musea*, xxvii (1853), pp. 215–245; Idem, *Dějepis města Prahy*, vol. 12 (Praha, 1901), pp. 350–364; I. Krahl, *Geschichte der königl. Stadt Komotau* [Komotau 1861], pp. 30–37; M. Dvořák, ‘Process Jiřího z Lobkovic’, *Český časopis historický* ii (1896), pp. 271–292; *Heimatkunde des politischen Bezirkes Komotau*, hrsg. vom Deutschen Bezirksvereine Komotau (Komotau, 1898), pp. 184–186, 274–275; A. Sedláček, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze Království českého*, XIV (Praha, 1923, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 1998), pp. 320–321; V. Pešák, ‘Správní

planes of motivations came together to feed the conflict: the defiance of burghers against aristocracy, Germans against Czechs and Lutherans against Catholics, or rather against fanatically acting re-Catholizers. Unlike the multi-faceted circumstances which accompanied the language legislation for the whole land, the ethnical and confessional frontiers within the Chomutov microcosm were clearly demarcated. Inside this microcosm, being German was identified with being Lutheran, whereas being Catholic became synonymous – rather paradoxically – with being Czech.<sup>8</sup>

If we were to generalize, relying on these and other similar exceptional expressions of ethnical and confessional tensions and perhaps also on numerous news on street scuffles in Prague and other clashes between Czechs and Germans (and also Italians),<sup>9</sup> we would reach the conclusion that inter-ethnic and inter-confessional relations in the Czech lands at the turn of the 17<sup>th</sup> century were catastrophic. But such a conclusion would be considerably biased, because the relations between the Czech majority and ethnic minorities, as well as those among Catholics, Utraquists, Czech Brethren, Lutherans and Calvinists, were of a very complex nature, both on the theoretical level and in practice.

Defensive pamphlets of Czech patriots from the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, especially *Okřik* (Reproach) by Pavel Stránský (1618) and programmatic *Foreword to the edition of Chronicle of the so-called Dalimil* by Pavel Ješín of Bezdězí (1620), indicate the high level of disparateness of the society on a theoretical level. They build on the Czech defensive nationalism, which crystallized in the Hussite and post-Hussite periods under the pressure of external threats. Their formulations, expressing this sort of nationalism, reflect contradictory concepts of what being Czech meant on the levels of language, religion, history, politics and nation. The defensive nature of the Czech nationalism grew out of the awareness of numerical majority and political dominance of the German element over the Czech one in the framework of Central Europe. It also reacted to the fact that Czech lands were

vlivy v prvním procesu Jiřího z Lobkovic', *Časopis Národního musea* cx (1936), pp. 50–62, 208–235; J. Janáček, *Rudolf II. a jeho doba* (Praha, 1987), pp. 297ff.

<sup>8</sup> A detailed analysis of these events and their literary echo is given in the study: J. Pánek, 'Chomutovská divadelní hra z roku 1594. Dramatický obraz náboženských, politických a národnostních rozporů v předbělohorské stavovské společnosti', in: P. Rak, ed., *Comotovia 2002. Sborník příspěvků z konference věnované výročí 750 let první písemné zmínky o existenci Chomutova (1252–2002)* (Chomutov, 2003), pp. 31–78.

<sup>9</sup> J. Pánek, 'Šarvátka mezi Čechy, Němci a Italy na Staroměstském náměstí a neklid v Praze ve dnech 18.–19. září 1584', *Folia Historica Bohemica*, xiv (1990), p. 225.

even at that time unable to separate themselves consequently from the Holy Roman Empire (at that time already called “The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation”) and could be considered the “best region of Germania”<sup>10</sup> rather than a territory completely set apart from the imperial lands. That is why the theoreticians of Czech nationalism maintained honorable distance from the Germans of the Empire, referred to as “the German nation, famous and highly celebrated in all Christendom as well as among us, Czechs,”<sup>11</sup> drawing a distinction only between themselves and German inhabitants of the Czech lands, regarded as recent immigrants. In their historical argumentation, they emphasized that the cultivation of the Czech lands, that is, their integration into the European civilization, was entirely a Czech undertaking, because it took place, at the dawn of history, only after the arrival of the first Slavs to this territory and after their reception of Christianity.<sup>12</sup>

These Czech writers took a much more preemptory stance against the growing contemporary German minority in the Czech lands. Especially worthy of scorn were in their eyes “Bohemian Germans and Germanized Czechs,”<sup>13</sup> who in the Czech lands expanded at the expense of domestic populations despite their status as mere “guests”,<sup>14</sup> behaving “obnoxiously”, “enviously”, “defiantly”<sup>15</sup> and “imperiously”, belittling Czech language and law.<sup>16</sup> The most effective means of defense, from the Czech perspective, appeared to be systematic efforts to prevent Germans, both those already settled and those newly arriving, from gaining control of schools and churches so that they could not create institutional background for spreading German language and strengthening their positions in the competition.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Z. Beneš, ‘Humanistický obraz dějin vlasti (Češi a Němci na hranicích Imperia Romana)’, *Folia Historica Bohemica*, xviii (1997), pp. 7–18, here p. 11.

<sup>11</sup> Stránský, *Okřík*, p. 378; Ješín, ‘Předmluva’, p. 49.

<sup>12</sup> Daniel Adam z Veleslavína, *Kroniky dvě o založení země české a prvních obyvatelích jejích* (Praha, 1585); Idem, *Kalendář historický* (Praha, 1590; 2<sup>nd</sup> edition); Beneš, ‘Humanistický obraz’, pp. 8–16.

<sup>13</sup> Stránský, *Okřík*, p. 363.

<sup>14</sup> Stránský, *Okřík*, p. 374.

<sup>15</sup> Stránský, *Okřík*, p. 373, 377.

<sup>16</sup> Ješín, ‘Předmluva’, p. 49, writes about the defense of the homeland “against foreigners, who intrude into our homeland, thus suppressing our nation and our language.”

<sup>17</sup>Also the diet of 1615 warned about “parishes, churches and schools” as the most important institutions supporting the preservation of the Czech element, or oppositely, threatening it, if they were Germanized; Tieftrunk, ed., *Pavla Skály ze Zhoře Historie*, vol. 1, p. 357.



Maintaining Czech monopoly in ecclesiastical and educational institutions was supposed to guide Germans towards their adaptation to the language of the country (that is, Czech) and in consequence towards their maximum possible integration within the majority population. The authors of these apologies saw motivation of Germans to move into the Czech lands in their expansionism and their desire for economic profit in the newly acquired space, but they did not notice the coincidence of interests between Czech and foreign Evangelics. It is particularly noteworthy that the nationally defensive concepts which emerged on the eve of the Thirty Years War or even later, in the course of the Bohemian uprising, regarded ethnicity and language as autonomous values, standing aside from the confessional-political context and independent of the particular confession of their bearers.

The sources which testify about the goings-on on the ground paint a different picture. Officially (from the perspective of the cosmopolitan Habsburg court), the tendency to regulate inter-ethnic relations in the spirit of tolerance predominated. From the perspective of the autochthonous Czech population, however, the foreigners in Habsburg services and the preference of German language by the court offices, however justified by arguments of practicality, were disquieting. On the other hand, Czechs and Germans, and sometimes also members of other ethnical minorities, lived side by side in large aristocratic dominions, especially in border areas, and their co-existence was, for the most part, without unusual problems. The situation was more complicated in royal towns and especially in Prague, where economic competition between the ethnical majority and the minorities was strongly perceived and where, in addition, the exercise of rights and privileges with respect to ecclesiastical and educational institutions produced further sources of tension. The Czech intellectual elite noted the growing number of non-Czech population, but reacted defensively, rather than aggressively: the humanists of the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century exhorted others to defend Czech language against any contamination by German influences, whereas at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century their descendants emphasized (in accord with the language law of 1615) the requirement that newly-arriving population should learn the language of the majority in order to ensure a lasting homogenization of the population, which would in turn ensure a lasting supremacy of the Czechs.

Confessionally based institutions, that is churches and schools, which were supposed to remain in Czech hands, should play a decisive role in this process.<sup>18</sup>

However, the situation turned out to be the exact opposite from what the Czech patriots, focused on the language, had envisioned. The development in the Czech lands, especially in Prague as a metropolis of the kingdom and, temporarily, also of the Holy Roman Empire, tended to develop in the 16<sup>th</sup> and at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century from local homogeneity (Czech dominance in the inland and German dominance in several border regions and in the largest part of Silesia and Lusatia) toward a dynamic intermingling of ethnicities. It was not even possible to retain the Czech monopoly – which, after all, never fully existed – in ecclesiastical and educational institutions. It was precisely around these institutions, defined through confession, that collective identities of minority ethnicities settled in the Czech environment were formed, the very identities that the language law rejected.<sup>19</sup> This was true in Prague, a metropolis of about 60,000 inhabitants, where the minorities were at the turn of the 17<sup>th</sup> century most concentrated. It was not only Germans, but also Italians, Dutch and, of course, Jews, whose traditional institutions – although based on religious and educational functions – had a different legal basis and were not seen by any group of Christians as a dangerous competition.<sup>20</sup>

The process of crystallization of minority as a community with a clearly defined ethnical and confessional orientation and with an interest in forming autonomous institutions can be followed on the example of the Italians. They came to Prague and other Czech towns to make a living, because their country was undergoing a long-term economic recession when merchant routes were being transferred from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic. They brought knowledge and skills, which were lacking among the native population, and did not therefore encounter much domestic competition. They established themselves in building

<sup>18</sup> For summary treatment of this question, see Alois Míka, 'Národnostní poměry v českých zemích před třicetiletou válkou', *Československý časopis historický*, xx (1972), pp. 207–233.

<sup>19</sup> Tieftrunk, ed., *Pavla Skály ze Zhoře Historie*, vol. 1, pp. 357–358.

<sup>20</sup> Summary treatment of Prague in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries: E. Poche et alii, *Praha na úsvitu nových dějin (Čtvero knih o Praze)* (Praha, 1988); J. Pešek, *Měšťanská vzdělanost a kultura v předběllohorských Čechách 1547–1620 (Všední dny kulturního života)* (Praha, 1993); J. Hausenblasová and M. Šroněk, *Urbs aurea. Prague of Emperor Rudolf II* (Praha, 1997); V. Ledvinka and J. Pešek, *Praha (Dějiny českých měst)* (Praha, 2000); V. Ledvinka, B. Mráz and V. Vlnas, *Pražské paláce (Encyklopedický ilustrovaný přehled)* (Praha, 2000; 2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Overview of the history of Jews in Prague by Tomáš Pěkný, *Historie Židů v Čechách a na Moravě* (Praha, 2001).

crafts, chimney-sweeping (which was immensely important at the time when fires remained a constant threat to early modern towns), in trade and other specialized services. They also showed artistic talents, for which they were sought after both by the court and in towns. The activities of Italian immigrants became a welcome supplement to the life of the fastidious metropolis, but their success depended on intensive contacts with the host country. That is why even those Italians who did not sever their relationship with the old home, showed a tendency toward rapprochement or even assimilation into the Prague burgher community. An illustrative example of this trend is provided by the unusually wealthy merchant of Mantuan origin Ercole da Nova, especially by his social contacts, marriages and bequests.<sup>21</sup>

On the other hand, the Italian minority was separated from the majority of Prague's population by their different faith. A few hundred Italians (around 1600 a little over half per cent of Prague population) formed one of the few Catholic islands in the sea of Czech, and partially also German, Evangelics. The fact that since 1560s it was the Jesuits, who became the spiritual pastors of Prague's Italians, introduced numerous complications into the lives of the latter: The close contacts with the Jesuit academy and with the pope's nunciature opened an abyss between the Italians and non-Catholic Praguers, and the religion functioned as a factor of divergence, although it was the Jesuits, who were the movers, while the lay Italians in Prague were rather only objects of their intransigent canvassing. In 1575, when the Evangelic aristocracy and burghers congregated around the Czech Confession (*Confessio Bohemica*), the Jesuits founded the congregation of Assumption of Blessed Virgin Mary, which was supposed to lead the Italian minority in the Czech environment toward a struggle against non-Catholics. In 1590s the Jesuits initiated erection of a new Italian (*Vlašská kaple*), which served to showcase the Italian presence in Prague.

At the same time, opposite tendencies also became evident, mostly because at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century the majority of Italians moved their residences to the Lesser Town, thus escaping the immediate influence of the Jesuits. An Italian hospital and a privat Italian school were founded there at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, to maintain a cultural cohesion of the minority. Along with the

<sup>21</sup> J. Krčálová, 'Italští mistři Malé Strany na počátku 17. století', *Umění*, xviii (1970), pp. 545–581; J. Janáček, 'Italové v předbělohorské Praze (1526–1620)', *Pražský sborník historický*, xvi (1983), pp. 77–118.

contiguous residential area of Italians around the Italian street (*Vlašská ulice*), these institutions made it easier for Italians to put down roots in Prague and to gradually assimilate with old-time residents of Lesser Town. A basic structure of Italian spiritual institutions in Prague (congregation, chapel, hospital and school, to which a church and a cemetery were added between 1613 and 1617) was thus formed, showing that Bohemia truly became a new home for the Italian immigrants. The situation feared by Pavel Stránský became a reality; these foreigners truly gained their own spiritual support system, in which they were able to maintain their linguistic and cultural identity. In this case, however, the cohesion of the Czech majority in Prague was endangered. Moreover, the massive re-Catholization, which took place after 1620, diminished the barriers between long-time residents and Italian immigrants and thus accelerated the assimilation of the latter.<sup>22</sup>

A similar model of institutionalization can be seen also on the example of the Dutch. Their immigration to Prague was, unlike that of the Italians, less numerous and generally without conflicts. Since 1580s, they enriched the Prague environment (especially that of the court) with important painters, goldsmiths and other artists, scholars, merchants and bankers. The artistic and intellectual segment of this minority underwent an especially interesting development. The members of the small Dutch community, mostly Calvinists, joined at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century an international religious congregation called *House of Charity* (*Huis der Liefde, Familia Amoris*). This community was characterized by coupling eschatologically flavoured messianism with neo-stoicism and kept both personal and correspondence contacts between the Netherlands and Prague (as well as other important capital cities of the Habsburg monarchy such as Vienna and Wrocław/Breslau).<sup>23</sup>

When confessional antagonisms in Bohemia culminated, the Dutch in Prague reacted in a way similar to the Italians but – from a confessional perspective – in the opposite direction. After the Rudolph II's *Letter of Majesty* from 1609, promulgating religious rights, they inclined toward adherents of the Czech confession and entered into intimate contacts with the Unity of Brethren, remaining however an autonomous Calvinist church. Their goal was to build their own

<sup>22</sup> On the later development of the Italian minority, especially the artists from their midst, see P. Preiss, *Italští umělci v Praze (Renesance, manýrismus, baroko)* (Praha, 1986).

<sup>23</sup> M.E.H.N. Mout, 'The International Calvinist Church of Prague, the Unity of Brethren and Comenius 1609–1635', *Acta Comeniana*, iv (1979), pp. 65–77.

church, for which the Dutch had been collecting contributions since 1613 both in the Czech lands and abroad. Between 1615 and 1618, the Dutch community re-built a dilapidated church in the Prague's Old Town and made it their own church center. Although the Dutch, who were congregated around this center, took the side of the Evangelics during the Bohemian uprising against the Habsburgs, their church appeared to be an ethnically allochthonous island (cosmopolitely colored due to the presence of Prague's French, Valons, English and Scots, but also of German Calvinists) in the steadily weakening sea of ethnically Czech burghers.<sup>24</sup>

Obviously, it was the German minority that had a decisive influence on the long term development of ethnical relationships. It had deep medieval roots in Prague, but its importance shrank already in the pre-Hussite period, reaching its minimum after the Hussite revolution. It was not until the 16<sup>th</sup> century that the German element began to strengthen. After the elevation of the Habsburgs to the Bohemian throne, there came numerous courtiers, diplomats and officials, merchants, clerics and other specialists from different parts of the Holy Roman Empire, including the Austrian lands and also the ethnically German borderlands of the Czech lands. They took advantage of German as the main language of communication in Central Europe and either entered the services of the ruling court and domestic aristocracy or they became, as it were, the elongated arm of their foreign patrons, in whose interest they influenced events in the Czech metropolis. Czechs and Germans also influenced each other on many different levels, for example in visual arts and scientific research at the court of Rudolph II, or in transferring German motifs into Czech literature or, conversely, Czech themes into German writings.<sup>25</sup>

The members of the growing German majority found themselves at times in conflict with the majority Czech population. As early as 1570, the police executive order for Prague towns issued by Maximilian II endeavored to prevent radicalization of the tensions, capturing the main areas of friction between the two ethnicities as follows. "No nation ought to demean or mock any other [nation] regarding

<sup>24</sup> M.E.H.N. Mout, 'Political and Religious Ideas of the Netherlanders at the Court in Prague', *Acta Historiae Neerlandicae*, ix (1976), pp. 1–29.

<sup>25</sup> On the infiltration of Germans into the Czech lands: J. Klik, *Národnostní poměry v Čechách od válek husitských do bitvy bělohorské* (Praha, 1922); A. Míka, 'Národnostní poměry v českých zemích před třicetiletou válkou', *Československý časopis historický*, xx (1972), pp. 207–233; K. Bosl et alii, *Handbuch der Geschichte der böhmischen Länder*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart, 1974).

language, dress, or anything else. Also no inhabitant [= domestic] or foreigner, guest or housekeeper, may in any way, in speech or by action, in writing or in any other way interfere, berate, insult or through nailing public posters demean or do anything against each other that could tend towards any kind of evil; rather, they are to behave to each other in a friendly, respectful and proper way, so that no conflict or grievance would arise.”<sup>26</sup> This royal edict reacted to random conflicts but also to intentional expressions of hostility, generated by conflicts of interests among the peoples of different ethnicities and confessions.

Essentially, the police order was designed to regulate relationships between the absolute majority and numerically weak minorities. The latter could for various reasons incite animosity among the autochthonous population but not existential fears. However, in the course of the reign of Rudolph II (1576–1612), when Prague became the metropolis of a multi-national Habsburg monarchy and the primarily German-speaking Holy Roman Empire, the position of Germans and other foreigners changed significantly. This was due to the increase of their numbers and their influence in Prague towns and especially at the ruler’s court. In this situation, it was natural that the members of the German minority grew in awareness of their collective identity and attempted to gain for it also the appropriate institutional support. Churches as meeting-places of religious communities and the most important spiritual and communication centers played a fundamental role in this process.

What is characteristic is the religious character of organization of the Evangelic segment of Prague German minority, which shows commonalities with the Italian and Dutch minorities. Until the issuance of the *Letter of Majesty* in 1609, church services in most Prague Utraquist churches were accessible to German Protestants. German co-religionists could receive Holy Communion *sub utraque specie* there, but many of them did not understand sermons preached in Czech. After 1610, the German minority, strong in numbers, attempted to secure their own churches in the Lesser Town (Church of the Most Holy Trinity), in the Old Town (Saint Salvator) and in the New Town (Sts. Simon and Jude).

The sources give detailed information regarding the establishment of the Lutheran church in the Old Town of Prague between 1611 and 1614. The German community in Prague, which called itself in Latin *Germani evangelici Pragrae* and was defined both ethnically and religiously, came into the foreground.

<sup>26</sup> State Regional Archive in Třeboň, Historica, No. 4791.

They turned to their co-religionists in the Czech lands and also in the Holy Roman Empire with a request for help. In this way, the community did indeed collect a great sum, value of 62,000 golden coins, which shows that the construction of German evangelical churches was not seen as a local matter, but was understood in the context of Prague as an imperial metropolis. Neighboring Saxony excelled among foreign patrons; its ruler (Imperial Elector) had a long-term interest in expanding his influence into the Czech lands and, therefore, acted in a high-end manner. Mattias Hoe from Hohenegg, a court preacher from Dresden, and Johannes Seussius, a secretary of the Saxon embassy in Prague, were chief organizers of the ceremonial laying down of the church's cornerstone in June 1611. Even the German Lutheran school, although subordinated to Prague University, was founded according to a Saxon model and supplied with Saxon teachers. These were evident attempt to create not only a religious but also an ethnic island in the Czech environment, connected, on the top of it, with a political support of one of the most ambitious principalities of the Empire. This, even though the ethnical expansion was not Saxony's primary goal but only a part of its far-reaching confessional and political plans, was objectively an important break-through into cohesion of the Czech language space.<sup>27</sup>

Despite unambiguously German nature of this foundation, many aristocrats and burghers of Czech descent joined the numbers of its patrons together with German-speaking Bohemian aristocrats (Joachim Andreas Schlick, Leonhard Colonna von Fels and others). Confessional ties outweighed here the ethnical ones, as it is clear from the record about a gift of the Louny town, which was Czech-speaking, from July 1613: "Although the mayor and the town council of Louny gave earlier eight threescores for the building of churches for the German nation and language in Prague towns, nevertheless, to aid in building of the German church in the Old Town we give in addition, out of charity, four thalers, in the hope that this will be gratefully received, because the community of the above-mentioned Louny remains in great need and debt."<sup>28</sup> Hence, even the Czechs who put Christian principles above ethnicity helped build German churches and schools in Prague. They acted in the spirit of universal, supranational humanitarianism, but against the meaning of those patriots who feared that, should German in-

<sup>27</sup> R. Schreiber, ed., *Das Spenderbuch für den Bau der protestantischen Salvatorkirche in Prag (1610–1615)* (Freilassing – Salzburg, 1956).

<sup>28</sup> Schreiber, ed., *Das Spenderbuch*, p. 58.

filtrate into churches and schools in Bohemia, “the Czech language would be finished.”<sup>29</sup>

Coexistence in the cosmopolitan metropolis at the turn of the 17<sup>th</sup> century certainly was not without conflict; in fact, it even led to the elaboration of a political concept, whose fulfillment was supposed to preserve a homogenous Czech space and ensure the hegemony of the Czech language. The weight of confessions in the private and public life was however so strong that there was no lack in attempts of communication on inter-ethnic level, as well as attempts to build relationships that would create ethnical plurality with all its pluses and minuses.

The association of ethnicity and confessionality was – before the victory of re-Catholization – a characteristic feature of the development, because the adherence to minority ethnicities was to a great extent connected with their prevailing religious orientation, which, in turn, determined the nature of their authoritative institutions and influenced the formation of ethnical and confessional identities. This tendency toward political integration on a confessional basis was evidently becoming stronger on the eve of the Thirty Years War and can be demonstrated on two basic facts. First, in 1618, Czech and German non-Catholics together entered into the resistance against the Habsburgs and expressed this union, among others, in enacting new rituals (for example, by singing both Czech and German religious songs at the beginning of important meetings). Second, the new constitution for the lands of the Bohemian Crown (*Confederatio Bohemica* from 1619) did not draw any distinctions between ethnicities and languages, but it did privilege Evangelics over Catholics and saw the loyalty to the state, which of course was to be governed by non-Catholics, as most important.<sup>30</sup> The road enter upon would lead toward social integration on a confessional basis and was close to the idea of a confederative organization of Central Europe. It was, however, blocked by the victory of re-Catholization and by imposition of confessional absolutism.

In conclusion, I would like to offer three summarizing reflections: (1) The relationship between ethnical and confessional allegiance in the Bohemian kingdom in the 16<sup>th</sup> and at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century was fraught with conflict. There was no direct proportionality between the two, as the simplifying historical consciousness and, to some extent, also the historiography of 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centu-

<sup>29</sup> Stránský, *Okřík*, p. 369.

<sup>30</sup> Edition of the confederation constitution: F. Kameníček, ed., *Zemské sněmy a sjezdy moravské*, vol. 2 (Brno, 1902), pp. 649–669.



ries, would put it. No unequivocal relations of the type: a Czech (more precisely, a good Czech) = Utraquist or Evangelic = a linguistic patriot, or oppositely: a German = Catholic or Lutheran (in the sense of Pekař's interpretation) = a foreign element expanding at the expense of the Czechs, existed in the Czech lands of the early modern period. The apprehensible historical reality was much more complicated, and that on several levels: 1. On the ethnical level, because ethnical minorities other than German were present in the territory of Czech lands and entered into the conflict-ridden arena of ethnical identification; these minorities used similar strategies as the Germans, which did not, however, mean that they would always share German interests. 2. On the social level, because the clearly-defined nationalist programs were mostly brainchildren of intellectuals of burgher origin, whereas it was the aristocracy, either Czech or German, or bilingual or cosmopolitan, which made relevant political decisions. 3. On the political level, because the confessional and political conflict between the Habsburgs and the Evangelic opposition overshadowed – due to its importance and immediately threatening consequences – the reflections, sometimes far-sighted, warning against future threats to Czech language or ethnical community; the immediate effect was in the real politics of decisive factions usually privileged over nationalistic emotions and theories about long-term threats.

2) The relationship between ethnicity and confessionality in the Czech lands before the battle of the White Mountain can be characterized by several paradoxes. First of all, Bohemia and Moravia found themselves in the midst of a transitional period between relative isolation of the post-Hussite period and openness of the Habsburg period. Czech political elites tried to elevate Bohemian kingdom to a privileged position in Central Europe and, especially, wanted Prague to remain the imperial residence; by doing so, however, they inevitably interfered with the relative ethnical homogeneity of Bohemia and shifted this land toward multi-ethnicity. Moreover, Czech Evangelic majority, if they wanted to put in practice their ideas of religious freedom – either during the reign of the Habsburgs or later during the Bohemian uprising between 1618 and 1620 – had to join their forces with foreign co-religionists, especially with German Lutherans or Calvinists; these influential allies coming into the Czech environment could not be marginalized as suggested by the theoreticians of the Czech defensive nationalism. After all, not even the Prague university, an ideological center of Czech thinking about ethnicity and religion, from which came the authors of the nationally-defensive concepts, did not see any other escape from isolation than by inviting foreign experts; in

the presence of the latter, it was not feasible to maintain the privileged or even exclusive position of Czech (beside the universal Latin) as a language of academic, literary and religious communication, without conceding German effectively the same position.

3) In a situation full of paradoxes on the eve of the Thirty Years War, there were in principle two possible ways of further development. The first was associated with the rule of Evangelic estates in confederated lands with participation of the House of Wittelsbach from the Palatinate, who may have – in theory at least – decided later to make themselves Bohemian or even (as did the Luxembourgs in the past) Czech, but hardly could separate themselves from their imperial Calvinist background. But even if this anti-Habsburg project had succeeded, it would have been evidently impossible to keep the former monopoly of the Czech language and the Czech ethnicity in the Czech lands, incorporated into the confederated Central Europe.

The second alternative was Habsburg victory, consummated after 1620 by a radical change of the legal order in the conquered territories. The Renewed Provincial Constitution (introduced in 1627–28) established a legal equality between the two languages, by which the former monopoly (however theoretical) of Czechs and the Czech language in Bohemia and Moravia came to an end. The ideas of the Czech defensive nationalists about the future assimilation of Germans, proclaimed only a few years earlier, became a sheer fairy tale. Instead, a question arose to what extent the Czechs themselves – not only the Evangelics leaving for exile but also Catholics in their re-Catholized homeland – would be able, in the changed social, political and religious circumstances, to resist the danger that their own language might disappear, the scenario they were already afraid of before the battle of the White Mountain.



# CONFESSION AND NATION IN THE ERA OF REFORMATIONS

Central Europe in Comparative Perspective

Prague 2011

---

## Language and Politics: Bohemia in International Context, 1409–1627<sup>1</sup>

*R. J. W. Evans*

The ‘history of language’ used to mean mostly something practised by linguists as an internal part of their discipline (and not all of them gave it much prominence, as we know – in the Bohemian setting – from the priorities of the Prague Linguistic Circle). More recently it has come to connote the role of language as a historical factor far more broadly, in particular among students of the modern world. For the pre-modern period, we have had much discussion of language as ‘discourse’, and considerable advances in the less imponderable field of the social history of language (with pioneering work by Peter Burke and others<sup>2</sup>); but ‘language politics’, language as a part of political culture, have not apparently been thought relevant. One can search textbooks in vain for basic information on what

<sup>1</sup> Some parts of this text have appeared in modified form in my article ‘The Politics of Language in Europe, c.1525–1697’, *Przegląd Historyczny*, xcvi (2006), pp. 455–76.

<sup>2</sup> For a synthesis of Burke’s contribution, see his new survey, *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2004).

linguistic medium was actually in use by a given government or institution. Yet that fact could have large implications. Still less do we find comparative discussion across national or territorial boundaries.

Language is and always was an essential part of the political scene: as a cultural factor; as a vehicle of understanding, at various levels from basic to highly sophisticated; and as a binding force in the formation of parties or groups, which serves simultaneously to mark them off from outsiders. We might suppose that to be especially evident in central Europe, given the range of neighbouring or enmeshed tongues there and the subsequent significance of their interactions. Even in Bohemia, however, historians have long paid scant attention to the precocity of Czech in public life in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. One or two aspects became national totems for a wider public, as we shall see; but the matter has been little studied since the days of Josef Svátek, Zikmund Winter, and Ernest Denis, even if it subsequently generated one influential and combative anthology of texts by Albert Pražák, *Národ se bránil*, which appeared in 1945.<sup>3</sup> The tendency has been to treat language just as one (subordinate) element in a complex of identity markers of the emergent Czech nation.

This essay argues that the subject deserves historians' consideration in its own right, and should not be regarded as merely a linguistic and literary concern. Above all there is need to set the Czech case in a European context, and open it up to some of the findings of wider sociolinguistic analysis, while drawing the latter in their turn more into the political realm. That will surely throw up many parallels from elsewhere; but also attest to distinctiveness. After all, Czech-speakers simultaneously burst two barriers in the late Middle Ages: the political-social tutelage of German and the religious tutelage of Latin; and the consequent trajectory of their tongue was arguably unique. Yet I hasten to add: all this must be tentative, since much evidence remains to be gathered, and I am not aware of any kind of adequate overview for Europe at large of the role of language in the public sphere during our period.

\*

An association of the word *jazyk* not only with tongue, physically and metaphorically, but with religious and/or national affinity, stretches far back among the Slavs in general and the intermingling proto-Czechs, proto-Moravians, and proto-Slovaks

<sup>3</sup> A. Pražák, *Národ se bránil. Obrany národa a jazyka českého od nejstarších dob po přítomnost* (Praha, 1945). For relevant works by the other writers, see below.

in particular. Indeed right back to Cyril and Methodius, so Roman Jakobson once claimed – albeit he was writing in 1945 (like Pražák) and, like other members of the Prague Circle, as a better linguist than historian.<sup>4</sup> The usage continued later, broadening out to make language into a key constituent of the medieval idea of ‘natio’, and of its more modern derivatives. Not least it acted as a marker to designate delegations to that very Council of Constance through which the Czech vernacular was indirectly launched on its ecclesiastical career.<sup>5</sup> Even if often a junior partner in identity, language could assume temporary dominance as an independent variable. That was the situation in the Bohemian lands from c. 1400, as the western orientation of the country’s predominantly Slav elites left a highly porous border for contacts with the rest of the Empire, which yet coincided with what they still perceived as a basic line of ethnic division.

As is well known, tension between Czechs and Germans in Bohemia was already apparent earlier, certainly by the time of the so-called Dalimil Chronicle, with its strong linguistic, or at least *jazyk*-based, patriotism – as well as its condemnation of plurilingual diversity: ‘proto bude jazyka rozdělení a ihned země jisté zkažení.’<sup>6</sup> This early fourteenth-century mood then hardened in the increasingly fraught circumstances of the kingdom’s expansion under Charles IV, though the emperor-king himself was polyglot and multicultural (as evidenced by his Golden Bull of 1356, to which we shall return), and a cultivator of Czech, in part – presumably – to take the wind out of the Bohemian estates’ sails on the issue of ethnic allegiance.<sup>7</sup> But it was the Hussite contest, with its validation of the vernacular liturgy, which propelled Czech into becoming the main language of both church and state. Jan Hus himself, of course, showed advanced awareness of language as

<sup>4</sup> R. Jakobson, ‘The Beginning of National Self-Determination in Europe’, *Review of Politics*, vii (1945), pp. 29–42; repr. in *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, ed. J.A. Fishman (The Hague, 1972), pp. 385–97. Further examples in Pražák, *Národ se bránil*, pp. 28 f.; F. Graus, *Die Nationenbildung der Westslawen im Mittelalter* (Sigmaringen, 1980), pp. 89–110, 170–81; F. Šmahel, *Idea národa v husitských Čechách* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Praha, 2000), esp. pp. 58–61.

<sup>5</sup> L.R. Loomis, ‘Nationality at the Council of Constance’, *American Historical Review*, xlv (1940), pp. 508–27. Cf. overall on the *lingua-natio* relationship, with special reference to the Czech case: F. Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce* (4 vols, Praha, 1993), i. 337–52.

<sup>6</sup> ‘Therefore the division of language shall forthwith be the certain destruction of the land’. The standard edn is now *Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila*, ed. J. Daňhelka *et al.* (3 vols, Praha, 1988–95); cf. J. Bělič, ‘K otázce češtiny jako národního jazyka’, *Slovo a Slovesnost*, xiii (1951), pp. 71–86, esp. 78 f.

<sup>7</sup> For this point, see A. Thomas, *Anne’s Bohemia: Czech Literature and Society, 1310–1420* (Minneapolis, 1998), p. 12.

both system and medium. The ‘Orthographia Bohemica’ confidently attributed to him, which famously established the scheme of diacritics, is genuinely pioneering work, with a clear and structured sense of the operation of what we would today call Czech phonology.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, Hus’s interest was also practical and committed: he censures those who do not teach Czech to their children and those, especially Praguers, who speak a macaronic mix of Czech and German (giving examples of such speech).<sup>9</sup>

From the beginning there was a key place for translation of the Scriptures: first the ‘Dresden’ version of the Bible, then a range of others.<sup>10</sup> The Bethlehem Chapel provided a base from 1391 for Hus and others to preach exclusively in Czech. Full vindication of this endeavour came with the chief Hussite manifesto, the Prague Articles, which called for free preaching of the word of God and dismantling of the hierarchic and opaque workings of the church. Meanwhile Czech higher culture as a whole, though in uneasy interplay with the more radical reform programme, shared its endorsement of the vernacular. The Kutná Hora (Kuttenberg) decree of 1409, which ratified takeover of the Carolinum by the Bohemian ‘natio’, gives me a *terminus post quem* for this study with its conspicuous validation of the Czech language in a university context: ‘Nad Čechy sú se velmi zpínali a utiskali jazyk český’, as a chronicler put it.<sup>11</sup> Fifteenth-century ‘Dalimil’ redactions gained a sharper edge, alongside the retreat of German from almost all public functions in the core lands of the Bohemian crown. The recedence of Latin was far less complete, and by the end of the fifteenth century new, more cultivated forms of it entered into a degree of symbiosis with the first generation of Czech humanists. That went with early Bohemian printing in both languages, but notably the Czech Bibles of 1488 and 1489 within the country and 1506 in Venice. Classic expression of this new balance appears in Viktorin Kornel of Všebrdy 1495

<sup>8</sup> J. Schröpfer, ed., *Hussens Traktat Orthographia Bohemica: die Herkunft des diakritischen Systems in der Schreibung slavischer Sprachen und die älteste zusammenhängende Beschreibung slavischer Laute* (Wiesbaden, 1968). The title, however, derives from Palacký, who found the MS in 1827.

<sup>9</sup> ‘Pražané [sic] i jiní Čechové, jenž mluvie od poly česky a od poly německy’: Jan Hus, *Výklady*, ed. A. Molnár (Praha, 1975), p. 189; cf. V. Novotný, *M. Jan Hus: život a učení* (2 vols, Praha, 1919–31), i. 182–7, ii. 195 ff.

<sup>10</sup> V. Kvas, *Česká bible v dějinách národního písemnictví* (Praha, 1997); Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, ii. 34–6.

<sup>11</sup> ‘They greatly aggrandized themselves at Czech expense and oppressed the Czech language’: cf. Z. Winter, *Kulturní obraz českých měst: život veřejný v XV. a XVI. věku* (2 vols, Praha, 1890–2), i. 139.

preface to his translation of Chrysostom, where he asserts an enhanced status for Czech by cutting out other vernaculars as the mediators of learning to Bohemia.<sup>12</sup>

\*

This terrain, once gained, had to be delimited and designated. I shall briefly examine some of the formal provisions for the use of Czech over the two hundred years from the Hussites' first espousal of it. They came gradually, and can be roughly comprised under three overlapping headings: legal/constitutional; political/administrative; and ecclesiastical.

In terms of the dispensation of justice, it was Moravia which took the lead. The local customary, the *Knihá Tovačovská*, reports for the year 1480:

[B]y the will of the hejtman and the lords and the whole land, *entries in the new registers began to be written in the Czech tongue ... to make less work and better sense for those who do not know Latin; for many interpreted Latin according to their own sense, so we might have plain Czech sense instead.*<sup>13</sup>

In 1495 Bohemia followed suit, with a measure which laid stress on its applicability at all levels: 'This was enacted into law withal, that all land records of the kingdom of Bohemia, great and petty, commercial and criminative, and commemorative, are to be written in the native Czech language ...'<sup>14</sup> The basic constitutional document, the *Zřízení zemské*, initially (in 1500) specified only foreigners (*cizozemci*) as affected by the requirement 'that all should conduct their suits before the court of the land in the Czech language either themselves, or by hiring someone to do so'. Later, however, this provision was made to apply to nationals too, in other words to Bohemian Germans.

<sup>12</sup> Cited in Pražák, *Národ se bránil*, pp. 30–2; cf. J. Martínek, 'Die Einstellung der böhmischen Humanisten zu den Nationalsprachen', in *Studien zum Humanismus in den böhmischen Ländern*, ed. H.B. Harder und H. Rothe (Köln, 1988), pp. 291–302; R.J.W. Evans, 'Europa als Peripherie in der Frühen Neuzeit', *Jahrbuch für Europäische Geschichte*, iii (2002), pp. 59–79.

<sup>13</sup> '[S] vuolí pana hajtmána a panúov i vší země začali se v jich dsky nové českú řeč vkladové vpisovati ... pro menší práci a lepší rozum těm, kteří latině neumějí; neb mnozí latinu k svému rozumu vykládali, protož aby prostý rozum český stál': *Knihá Tovačovská aneb pana Ctibora z Cimburku a z Tovačova pamět obyčejů, řádů, zvyklostí starodávných a řízení práva zemského v Mar. Mor.*, ed. V. Brandl (Brno, 1868), p. 57. The italicizing of significant passages here and below is mine.

<sup>14</sup> 'Přitom toto za právo jest nalezeno, že všechny dsky zemské království českého, veliké i malé, trhové i póhonné, i památné, mají jazykem českým přirozeným psány býti ...': Viktorin ze Všehrd, *O právích země české knihy devatery*, ed. H. Jireček (Praha, 1874), p. 162; cf. p. 7.



From 1549 the *Zřízení zemské* specifically allowed the parties to present translations, but only so long as they had been duly authenticated in advance.<sup>15</sup> Pavel Kristián of Koldín, the codifier of municipal law, confirmed this for the towns in his compilation of 1579, with provisions for approved translation: ‘The plaintiff is and shall be obliged to make his accusation ... in the Czech language. ... And if any party has testimony, he should *give it to a sworn [interpreter] to have it turned into the Czech language ...*’ German oral evidence through a *Dolmetscher* was usually allowed, especially in petty cases; but Czech always enjoyed precedence.<sup>16</sup>

The most important forum in the political sphere was the diet, which appears to have been conducted solely in Czech. German and bilingual documents, however, were generated too (as is clear in the published series of the body’s sixteenth-century records). Royal coronation privileges were issued in Czech and Latin; the estates despatched their external correspondence in Latin or, more reluctantly, in German.<sup>17</sup> Language created more of a problem at the general diets which from time to time brought together representatives of all the Bohemian lands. By the early seventeenth century it gave rise to marked friction there, as in 1611, when Bohemia and Moravia insisted that all business *ex praesidio* be promulgated in Czech, with translations for the other provinces. The latter were allowed to use German from the floor, so long as an official translation was read out in full session – a proviso which sounds uncannily like the stipulations introduced for the Sudeten minority at the Czechoslovak parliament in the 1920s.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>15</sup> ‘... aby všickni před saudem zemským českým jazykem swé pře wedli sami skrze se, neb kohož sobě zjednati mohli’: *Zřízení zemské Království českého za krále Vladislava roku 1500 vydané*, ed. F. Palacký (Praha, 1863), p. 16 and *passim*.

<sup>16</sup> ‘... má a povinen bude původ svau žalobu v jazyku českém ... činiti ... A měla-li by která strana průvody ... *dej je sobě přisežnému při témž právě do jazyku českého přeložiti ...*’: Pavel Kristián z Koldína, *Práva městská Království českého a Markrabství moravského*, ed. J. Jireček (5<sup>th</sup> edn., Praha, 1876), p. 43. German in W. Weizsäcker, ed., *Quellenbuch zur Geschichte der Sudetenländer*, vol. I (München, 1960), no. 47. Winter, *Kulturní obraz*, i. 150 f., ii. 640–2.

<sup>17</sup> *Sněmy české od leta 1526 až po naši dobu = Die Böhmischen Landtagsverhandlungen und Landtagsbeschlüsse vom Jahre 1526 an bis auf die Neuzeit*, ed. A. Gindely et al. (12 vols., Praha, 1877–1954), ii. 69, 89, 191, 398, 403, 412, etc *passim*; *ibid.* viii. 302 f., 343 for coronation. Cf. J. Klik, ‘Národnostní poměry v Čechách od válek husitských do bitvy bělohorské’, *Český Časopis Historický*, xxvii (1921), pp. 8–62, 289–352, at 328 ff.

<sup>18</sup> J.B. Novák, ‘Jazyková prakse na generálním sněmu 1611’, in *Od pravěku k dnešku: sborník prací z dějin československých k šedesátým narozeninám Josefa Pekaře* (2 vols, Praha, 1930), ii. 30–8. J. Kučera, *Minderheit im Nationalstaat: die Sprachenfrage in den tschechisch-deutschen Beziehungen, 1918–1938* (München, 1999), pp. 210 ff.

The limited administrative provision for German (which I shall deal with in due course) seems to have presupposed a general rule of Czech; but this was long not formally enacted. In the towns Latin records were mostly replaced by Czech ones during the earlier sixteenth century, sometimes with a period of overlap; thus German wills (say) would be entered in Czech. Manifestly there must have been exceptions: we know of Malá Strana documents in German as well as Latin from the mid-sixteenth century onwards relating to Prague's royal household. Yet many towns were anyway hard put to write German letters at all, even to recipients elsewhere in the Reich.<sup>19</sup> Some municipalities (especially the Prague ones) might also make a formal requirement for newcomers to learn Czech within a year of their arrival.<sup>20</sup>

The language of the church likewise seems to have been customary for the most part. Evidently Czech formed a touchstone for the Utraquists vis-à-vis Rome – as defended, for instance, in the authoritative treatise by Václav Koranda of 1493<sup>21</sup> – and their faith was frequently identified as the 'Czech religion'. In its service various vernacular texts continued to be produced, including several celebrated Bibles from the presses of Melantrich and Veleslavín (as well as the more radical version published at Kralice for the fully czechophone Brethren). Liturgy, readings, communion and particularly singing might be conducted in Czech, though more Catholic and humanistically inclined Utraquist priests reintroduced some Latin, especially in the decades around 1500. Yet overall there seem to have been few clear statements of the rules.<sup>22</sup> Even where formal provisions existed, they could be invoked more in the breach, as with the requirement that (Catholic) bishops had to know Czech – another point to which I shall return.<sup>23</sup>

\*

Despite – or because of – this remarkably early endorsement, the discourse about Czech in its official capacities is striking also for its defensiveness. Whether in

<sup>19</sup> Winter, *Kulturní obraz*, i. 150–3, 747; E. Denis, *Konec samostatnosti české*, tr. J. Vančura (Praha, 1893), pp. 298–301.

<sup>20</sup> Winter, *Kulturní obraz*, i. 65.

<sup>21</sup> Koranda, *Traktát o velebné a božské svátosti oltářní* ([Praha], 1493); cf. Z.V. David, *Finding the Middle Way. The Utraquists' Liberal Challenge to Rome and Luther* (Washington, DC, 2003), p. 90.

<sup>22</sup> Z. Winter, *Život církevní v Čechách. Kulturně-historický obraz z XV. a XVI. st.* (2 vols, Praha, 1895–6), pp. 834–5, 849 ff. David sees Czech as an important marker, but gives little detail: *Finding the Middle Way*, pp. 89–90, 216–17, 225–6 (and cf. below, n. 37).

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Stránský, *Český stát. Okřik*, ed. B. Ryba (Praha, 1953), p. 185 (and below n.32).

legislation or in broader commentary, the language is seen to need protection. Moreover, its proponents themselves need protection, since in Bohemia it is the estates, both nobles and burghers (and the Utraquist establishment, linked to both) which defend Czech as part of their campaign against rivals at home and abroad.

There were signs of this already in the fifteenth century. The jurist Všehrd appealed to a fear of emulation, above all from the German side:

so that, since we are Czechs, we should burnish and propagate our language; for other nations are ever diligent in that, and even while learning German we should write and speak Czech and hold to our good Czech habits, so that nothing worse may befall us ...<sup>24</sup>

But the issue was really joined with Habsburg takeover of the Bohemian crown in 1526. From that point onward a double contest ensued. Firstly with the rulers themselves. The estates early urged Ferdinand I to issue a new Czech version of Charles IV's Golden Bull, which had called upon the imperial electors to ensure that their heirs should learn Latin, Italian and 'Slav'. The king would not do so (claiming it was *ultra vires* for him to meddle in legislation which pertained to the Reich); and he did not learn much Czech either, albeit as late as 1547 he disclaimed full competence in German either.<sup>25</sup>

But within his own family Ferdinand did observe the spirit of the Bull: his younger son Ferdinand, who later governed in Prague for fifteen years, became proficient in Czech; and so in some measure did his elder one, Maximilian, the future emperor – helped by estates' pressure for Czechs in his entourage. In 1575 Maximilian's oral confirmation of the *Confessio Bohemica* (he refused any written statement) was given also in Czech, and he could intervene *viva voce* in the language. But by that time – and in the absence, as was claimed, of sufficient stimulus – he had apparently forgotten much of it: 'k horšimu jest, neb císař J.M. také uměl česky, než nemáje při dvoře Čechů skoro jest řeč zapomenouti ráčil ...'<sup>26</sup> The estates made the same attempt, with far less return, in the case of (the young) Rudolf II.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>24</sup> '... abychom jazyk svoj, poněvadž jsme Čechové, i třeli i rozšiřovali; neb jsou toho i jiní národové všickni pilni, a německy se učie abychom česky i psali i mluvili a v obyčejích dobrých a českých trvajie, abychom se v horšie neměnili ..': Všehrd, *O právních země české*, pp. 437, 453.

<sup>25</sup> *Sněmy české*, i. 36, 179, 234 for the Golden Bull. Ferdinand: *ibid.* ii. 97.

<sup>26</sup> 'What's worse, His Imperial Majesty did know Czech too, but not having Czechs at his court has been pleased to forget most of the language ...': *ibid.* ii. 569; iv. 380n. (for 1575). Cf. J. Svátek, 'Habsburkové a český jazyk', in his *Obrazy z kulturních dějin českých* (Praha, 1891), pp. 3 ff., an overly rosy view.

<sup>27</sup> *Sněmy české*, iii. 342, 494, iv. 364, 578, viii. 770, 804. Cf. Svátek, *Obrazy*, pp. 13 ff., critical.

All in all, however, the Habsburgs' linguistic proficiency, or lack of it, amounted to no major constitutional grievance, even if the rebels in 1547 did justify their cause as the 'preservation of freedoms, of the kingdom's privileges, *and of our Czech tongue*'.<sup>28</sup> More of a target was the recovery and advance of German in Bohemia during the sixteenth century. I am concerned for present purposes not with the facts of that disputed case, but only with *perceptions* of it.<sup>29</sup> A notable witness (though his text was not known at the time) is Jan Blahoslav, leader of the Brethren – and also grammarian. It is sad, he says, 'that such a noble language, in its copiousness and diverse qualities very similar, if not equal, to other celebrated tongues or languages, should be so abandoned and discarded as if ailing'. He laments its decline since the age of the humanists: Hrubý of Jelení, Písecký, Konáček, etc.; whereas – and here Blahoslav echoes Všehrd – 'the German nation is assiduous both in promoting and in polishing its own language'.<sup>30</sup> In the same mould are comments of the publisher Daniel Veleslavín, in his series of multilingual dictionaries and important prefaces to works translated into Czech. Veleslavín, on the other hand, was probably more distinctive at the time in the stress he laid on the larger Slavonic linguistic family – that would become commoner as a topos in the baroque period, when Czech-speakers had lost their sense of seniority over other Slav varieties.<sup>31</sup>

By 1600 controversy grew over episodes concerning the public use of language, in both the ecclesiastical and civil spheres. One was raised by the appointment to the episcopate – despite the formal requirement mentioned earlier – of two non-Czech-speaking aristocrats, Franz Dietrichstein in Moravia (more particularly his

<sup>28</sup> '... zachování svobod, privilejí království a jazyku našeho českého': W. Eberhard, *Monarchie und Widerstand: Zur ständischen Oppositionsbildung im Herrschaftssystem Ferdinands I. in Böhmen* (München, 1985), p. 452 n.; cf. the denunciation of Rome's attempts 'k ublížení pravdy Krista pána a ku potupě národu i jazyka našeho českého', *ibid.* p. 442 n.

<sup>29</sup> Klik, 'Národnostní poměry', takes a distinctly nationalist view; A. Míka, 'Národnostní poměry v českých zemích před třicetiletou válkou', *Československý Časopis Historický*, xx (1972), pp. 207–29 is more balanced. Cf. also E. Skála, 'Die Entwicklung der Sprachgrenze in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien von 1300 bis etwa 1650', *Germanistica Pragensia*, v (1968), pp. 7–16; vi (1972), pp. 75–85.

<sup>30</sup> '... že tak ušlechtilý jazyk, hojností a rozličnými vlastnostmi jiným slavným řečem neb jazykům jestliže ne rovný tedy jistě velmi podobný, *tak má býti opouštěn a jako oulehlí zanechán* ... [kdežto] 'německý národ jak o zvelebení a jako pulerování jazyku svého pilen jest': Jan Blahoslav, *Grammatika česká*, ed. I. Hradil and J. Jireček (Wien, 1857), p. xviii and *passim*.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. M. Kopecký, *Daniel Adam z Veleslavína* (Praha, 1962), pp. 32 ff. For the absence of Slav (linguistic) solidarity in this period, cf. Graus, *Nationenbildung*, pp. 130–7.

membership of the land court [*zemský soud*]) and then Karl Lamberg in Bohemia.<sup>32</sup> Another involved the acclaimed politician, Karel Žerotín, while he was hejtman of Moravia. Žerotín's withering reply in 1610 to a department of the city authorities of Olomouc which had written to him in German betrays considerable pent-up emotion:

[S]uch a letter ... is against not only the custom of the country and of my office, but also your own rules, since you well know that in this country *we have our own special language*, of which you need not be ashamed; but we should rightly have to be ashamed if we permitted *this our own native tongue, so eminent, venerable and widespread, to be extruded by a foreign one*.<sup>33</sup>

All this unease culminated in the law of the Bohemian general diet of 1615 which I print as an appendix to this essay, in the original and in English translation.<sup>34</sup> It is a remarkable document, and I can only make a few comments on it here. Note firstly its length and detail: there had been a much briefer Moravian precedent a few years before (doubtless inspired by Žerotín);<sup>35</sup> but this text is unprecedentedly circumstantial. Note also its emotional and rhetorical force, heightened with a vocabulary of degeneration from the very outset ('... *judging that the extinction of the Czech language would bring with it also the extinction of the Czech nation and the Czechs' very name ...*'). Moreover the legislators provide singular and crucial evidence about Czech's loss of function and standing at various levels of civil and ecclesiastical life.

<sup>32</sup> On Dietrichstein: Denis, *Konec samostatnosti české*, pp. 631 f.; cf. O. Odložilík, *Karel starší ze Žerotína* (Praha, 1936), pp. 101 f.; also Pavel Balcárek, *Kardinál František z Ditrichštejna, 1570–1636* (Kroměříž, 1990), pp. 24 f., though he does not mention this episode. On Lamberg: Stránský, *Český stát. Okřik*, p. 189.

<sup>33</sup> '[T]akové psaní netoliko proti obyčejí země a ouřadu mému, než také proti Vašemu vlastnímu způsobu německým jazykem učiněno jest; ježte víte dobře, že v této zemi *jazyk svůj obzvláštní a vlastní máme*, za který se Vám styděti nic není potřebí; nébrž styděti bychom se slušně za to museli, kdybychme se toho dopustili, aby *tyž jazyk náš přirozený, tak vzácný, starožitný a rozšířený měl od cizího vytisknut býti ...*': Karel st. z Žerotína, *Listové psaní jazykem českým*, ed. V. Brandl (2 vols, Brno – Praha, 1870–2), ii.58 (no. 875).

<sup>34</sup> For the text from Pavel Skála ze Zhoře, see below. Most of it also appears in Pražák, *Národ se bránil*, pp. 40–2; much is in Denis, *Konec samostatnosti české*, pp. 635 f. A. Fischel (comp.), *Das österreichische Sprachenrecht: eine Quellensammlung* (Brünn, 1910), pp. 7–10, has a German translation; so has Weizsäcker, *Quellenbuch*, no. 49. Cf. also W. Wostry, 'Das Deutschtum Böhmens zwischen Husitenzeit und Dreißigjährigem Krieg', in *Das Sudetendeutschtum*, ed. G. Pirchan *et al.* (Brünn, 1937), pp. 295–370, at 341 ff.; Klik, 'Národnostní poměry', pp. 342 ff.

<sup>35</sup> Printed in Fischel, *Sprachenrecht*, loc. cit.

Yet there are odd things about this document too. The remedies which it ordains appear strong – even ferocious – but hopelessly impracticable: for example that those *‘who can speak the Czech language well’* (and how should that be judged?) are to be rewarded with a double inheritance; whereas anyone who *‘cannot intelligibly present his needs in that tongue’*, shall be excluded from citizenship and office. Those who refuse to speak Czech (though being able to), or prevent others from doing so, actually lay themselves open to banishment, or – if they stay! – are to be deprived of civil rights. Altogether we find in this law a complex but rather ingenuous mixture of linguistic and ethnic grievance, with the former shading into the latter; as notably in the passage which moves from decreeing that *‘no such foreigner [ignorant of Czech] newly accepted into the country nor his children to the third generation’* shall be able to gain preferment, through some tortuous prose, to conclude with unabashed political guarantees for the *‘original Czechs as the true, real and natural sons of our dear homeland’*. Yet language is clearly the burning issue of the day which has unleashed the whole outburst.

\*

I shall revert to the language law of 1615 again at the end of this essay. But it is time to ask how all the above evidence fits into what we know of the international picture. Most obviously, the public uses of Czech need first to be set against the history of German over the same period, in the areas of their overlap and in the Reich as a whole. German had some status in Bohemia: all the domestic business of Silesia, Lusatia, Eger (Cheb), and Elbogen (Loket) was done in German, and abundant *de facto* scope existed for it in dealings with the central authorities, including the diet. From the 1520s the Bohemian Court Chancery and then the new Court of Appeal had separate registries for German affairs. The Bohemian Court Chamber was more squarely German at times, and seems to have recruited bilingually.<sup>36</sup> The number of germanophone town councils was on the increase; and in practice many other matters were dealt with at least bilingually between the centre and the localities.

Then of course German was the language of Lutheranism, in Bohemia as elsewhere, building bridges to Czech Protestants too, although a recent book by Zdeněk David has reopened the question how many of those there really were. Certainly, the significance of the language dimension can only be enhanced if, as

<sup>36</sup> Stránský, *Český stát. Okřik*, pp. 299 f.; Novák, ‘Jazyková praxe’; Fischel, *Sprachenrecht*, pp. 1 f., 6; cf. pp. ix–xx *passim*.

he implies, it continued to mark off the country's non-Catholics from each other even in the decades around 1600, and if the activities of non-Czech-speakers such as Archbishop Lamberg and his successor Lohelius actually played a prominent part in undermining the broad majority of Utraquists still committed to their own vernacular as a central tenet of their churchmanship.<sup>37</sup> Yet in fact there was widespread and growing employment of German by Czechs too in Bohemia. An early recorded case is that of Jan z Roupova, who ordered in 1532 'that my sons should be made to learn Latin and German, and in particular my son Volf, who should be sent to Germany or to Italy to complete that education'. We have much evidence of sending or exchanging children *na němčinu* by the later sixteenth century.<sup>38</sup>

Elsewhere in the Reich the use of German was mostly conventional. In Austria one single regulation in 1555 for 'Lower Austria' (in the contemporary sense) actually prescribed it – though it is unclear to me quite why.<sup>39</sup> The main alternative was Latin, which retained obvious status as the language of tradition in the Holy *Roman* Empire. German or bilingual documents are known from the thirteenth century. By the sixteenth, German was used for major enactments: the *Reichskammergerichtsordnung*, *Reichspolizeiordnung*, *Halsgerichtsordnung*. But no legislation underpinned this practice; indeed, for a long time the only relevant law was the Golden Bull of 1356 with its specific provisions – as we have seen – for languages *other* than German. Then from 1519 successive electoral capitulations (*Wahlkapitulationen*) confirmed a diglot situation: '[I]n Schriften und Handlungen des Reichs an unserm kaiserlichen Hofe [there shall be used] keine andere Zunge noch Sprache ... denn die deutsche und lateinische.'<sup>40</sup>

By that stage German had long been pressing for a liturgical role, with the development of a genre of *Volkspredigt* and of devotional works. Under Charles IV and his son Wenceslas this movement ran parallel with the Czech programme and led among other things to the first important German version of the Scriptures,

<sup>37</sup> David, *Finding the Middle Way*, esp. pp. 225, 258, 354–6.

<sup>38</sup> '... aby synové k tomu držáni byli, aby se učili latině a německy, a zvlášť Volf, syn můj, aby dán byl do Němec neb do Vlach, aby se doučil': Winter, *Kulturní obraz*, i. 146–8.

<sup>39</sup> Printed in Fischel, *Sprachenrecht*, p. 3. 'Niederösterreich' here included both 'Oberösterreich' (i.e. Tyrol etc.) and Innerösterreich (i.e. Styria etc.), so the provision could have been intended to exclude Italian or Slovene.

<sup>40</sup> H. Hattenhauer, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Rechts- und Gesetzessprache* (Hamburg, 1987), esp. pp. 6–8.

the *Wenzelsbibel*.<sup>41</sup> German became a badge of national identity too: the word ‘*deutsch*’ came – historically – before ‘*Teutschland*’, and its use as an ethnic marker was to some degree fortified by differentiation from other speech on the territory of the Holy Roman Empire. Not by accident, perhaps, did the celebrated epithet ‘*nationis Germanicae*’ or ‘*teutscher Nation*’, to indicate the Reich’s cultural centre of gravity, come to prominence in the aftermath of the Hussite wars.<sup>42</sup> These two factors – religious and national – moved together with Luther, a linguistic pioneer (like Hus), who made a deliberate appeal both to the ‘*gemeinste Sprache*’ of educated use and to a ‘*gemeine Sprache*’ at a broader popular level, and who sought to implement what he called a ‘*communissima lingua Germaniae*’.<sup>43</sup>

Yet German itself was not yet a ‘language of power’. Large problems were created by dialectal variance (even if only Dutch would issue in a separate language, partly as an outcome of the political emancipation of the United Provinces). The rise of the Saxon variant, notably thanks to Luther, took place to some extent at the expense of earlier south-German *Kanzleisprachen*, notably that of fourteenth-century Prague, and associated literary traditions in Bohemia. It was long resisted by Catholics.<sup>44</sup> Altogether the unconformity through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries between Catholic Habsburg political dominance based in the south and Protestant princely linguistic dominance based in the north is a determinant worthy of note in the continuing disarray of early modern Germany.<sup>45</sup> For all the fears of

<sup>41</sup> L. Lentner, *Volkssprache und Sakralsprache. Geschichte einer Lebensfrage bis zum Ende des Konzils von Trient* (Wien, 1964), pp. 141 ff.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. H. Jakobs and H. Thomas in *Nation und Sprache. Die Diskussion ihres Verhältnisses in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. A. Gardt (Berlin, 2000), pp. 7–101.

<sup>43</sup> ‘Ich habe keine gewisse, sonderliche, eigene Sprache in Deutschland, sondern brauche der gemeinen deutschen Sprache ... [A]lle Reichsstädte Fürsten-Höfe schreiben nach der sächsischen und unsers Fürsten Canzeley, darum ists auch die gemeinste deutsche Sprache.’ D. Josten, *Sprachvorbild und Sprachnorm im Urteil des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts* (Bern – Frankfurt a.M., 1976), p. 46 and *passim*; F. Tschirch, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*. Vol. II: *Hochmittelalter bis Gegenwart* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Berlin, 1975), p. 107 and *passim*; Cf. E. Arndt and G. Brandl, *Luther und die deutsche Sprache. Wie redet der Deutsche man jnn solchem fall?* (Leipzig, 1983).

<sup>44</sup> H. Eggers, *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte*. Vol. III: *Das Frühneuhochdeutsche* (Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1969), pp. 48 f., 80 ff. General reflections on the evolution of dialect and standard German in Stephen Barbour *et al.*, *Variation im Deutschen: soziolinguistische Perspektiven* (Berlin, 1998).

<sup>45</sup> Cf. R.J.W. Evans, ‘Language and State-building: The Case of the Habsburg Monarchy’, *Austrian History Yearbook*, xxxv (2004), pp. 1–24, at 5–8.



purists, we find no significant linguistic interference in Bohemia: not more than 1,500 or so Germanisms in the stock of up to 70,000 contemporary Czech words.<sup>46</sup>

There is an instructive and contrasting example for the present context in the role of the German language in Denmark. Its linguistic landscape furnished some obvious resemblances to Bohemia's: German, an international language, spoken in the smaller part of the kingdom, over against a potentially hostile majority of native vernacular-speakers. In Denmark too, a sharp shift occurred around the mid-fifteenth century from Latin to the modern tongues, benefiting Danish and German in roughly equal measure, but with the latter – in its *plattdeutsch* forms – dominating commerce thanks to the Hanseatic League. Then the sixteenth century (again like Bohemia) witnessed growing German influence, as the language of the Reformation, of much of the royal court, and of higher-class immigrants. Considerable German publishing ensued in Copenhagen, and some official documents appeared in that language, by now in the – less mutually intelligible – *Hochdeutsch*. All this persisted through the seventeenth century, with much of government, the army, education, etc., at least bilingual. But in fact we can observe during this entire period a conspicuous *absence* of friction in Denmark. Anti-German comments can definitely be found there; but only, it seems, from social and economic grievance, not from linguistic antagonism.<sup>47</sup>

\*

If we look further east, Czech had clearly outstripped all the other Slavonic tongues in significant ways. As late as the 1570s even Polish continued to be recognized by its own speakers as a junior partner in terms of richness of expression.<sup>48</sup> But Polish had a substantially closer relation to Latin, still central in the public life of the Rzeczpospolita and squarely its language of record. When the emancipation of the vernacular began in later fifteenth-century Poland, it was stopped short by a vogue for humanist Latin, far stronger than in Bohemia. Yet Polish emerged vastly enhanced in its scope by its dialogue with Renaissance humanism – much more so than embattled Czech, even with the activity of Věšhrd and his likes. Latin

<sup>46</sup> E. Skála, 'Vznik a vývoj česko-německého bilingvistu', *Slovo a Slovesnost*, xxxviii (1977), pp. 197–207, at 201.

<sup>47</sup> On all this, see V. Winge, *Dänische Deutsche – deutsche Dänen. Geschichte der deutschen Sprache in Dänemark, 1300–1800, mit einem Ausblick auf das 19. Jahrhundert* (Heidelberg, 1992).

<sup>48</sup> M.R. Mayenowa *et al.* (comp.), *Walka o język w życiu i literaturze staropolskiej* (Warszawa, 1955), p. 27 and *passim*; C. Backvis, *Quelques remarques sur le bilinguisme latino-polonais dans la Pologne du seizième siècle* (Brussels, 1958), pp. 25 and n., 27.

exercised a creative influence on vocabulary and style, and formed a carapace for the progressive emergence of Polish to play a role in the official business of the diet, the courts, and elsewhere from the 1530s onward.<sup>49</sup>

That became apparent in the east: in Lithuania and Ukraine, drawn closer to the Crown through the union of Lublin in 1569 and associated land transfers. The process of social assimilation, especially of nobles, which accompanied and influenced that shift, had an important linguistic component. It was perceived cultural superiority that caused Polish to be embraced. For our purposes, political and public outcomes are what matter, and in the eastern territories of the joint commonwealth we encounter the very instructive case of Ruthene. The ‘ruskij jazyk’ was there a kind of lingua franca which long drew (as Czech did too, in the aftermath of the Hussite movement) upon liturgical use of the vernacular. Was it still ‘slavenskij’ or ‘slovanskij’: i.e. ‘common Slavonic’ in some sense? How close did it really stand to the living vernacular of Belorussia or Ukraine? At all events, Ruthene formed the official language of the eastern lands before 1569, and was confirmed as such at Lublin, and in the Second Lithuanian Statute of 1588, whose redactor claimed: ‘We have laws written, not in some ordinary language, but in our own particular one.’<sup>50</sup>

However, it was already a sign of the times that the guarantees offered in 1569 to Volhynia and Kiev for their legal *acta*, chancellery *dekreta*, etc. ‘ever to remain in Russian letters’ were in fact proclaimed in Polish: ‘nie jakim innym, jedno ruskiem pismem pisane i odprawowane być mają czasy wiecznymi’. And the rest of the administration in the eastern territories quickly went the same way: first royal edicts, then signatures, then the bulk of the texts, till only the formulae were still in Ruthene, most of this well before the *coup de grâce* in 1697, when it was tersely announced that the clerk was to write in Polish, not ‘Russian’ (‘pisarz powinien po Polsku a nie po Rusku pisać’). Scribal Ruthene had become unintelligible

<sup>49</sup> Backvis, *Quelques remarques*. J. Krókowski, ‘Język i pismiennictwo łacińskie w Polsce XVI. w.’, in *Kultura staropolska* (Kraków, 1932), pp. 385–459. The stages in the public ‘emancipation’ of Polish are covered in the compendium of sources compiled by Mayenowa and others, *Walka o język*. Their title, ‘the language war’, is exaggerated; but defences of Polish were a significant genre of the period: cf. W. Taszycki, ed., *Obrońcy języka polskiego, wiek XV–XVIII* (Wrocław, 1953).

<sup>50</sup> ‘Не обчимъ акымъ языкомъ, але своимъ власнымъ права списаныя маемъ’: A. Martel, *La langue polonaise dans les pays ruthènes: Ukraine et Russie Blanche, 1569–1667* (Lille, 1938), pp. 35 ff., quoted at 46. Analysis of the language in Chr.S. Stang, *Die westrussische Kanzleisprache des Großfürstentums Litauen* (Oslo, 1935), who thinks it would still have been intelligible locally, at least in the sixteenth century.

(indeed it was no longer even an ‘ordinary language’): it lacked rules; above all it lacked credibility as a literary or learned language. It could not compete with a Polish which had been fortified, first by the Latinate culture of the Renaissance, and then by both Reformation and Counter-Reformation.<sup>51</sup> The parallel with the fate of Czech in the century and a half after 1620 is striking.

\*

Our most notable correspondences may well lie still further afield, in western Europe; yet again with a crucial difference. Whereas France and England, like Bohemia, were pioneers in the political deployment of language, it was monarchies there, not estates, which took the lead. I shall outline three cases, each revealing a linguistic dimension to the process of state-building in centralizing mode and under a dynastic aegis.

In 1539 the French crown issued at Villers-Cotterêts a long *ordonnance* about procedures of government. Towards the end, the document addressed matters of what we would nowadays call ‘transparency’:

nous voullons et ordonnons que [les arrêts] soient faitz et escriptz *si clèrement qu’il n’y ayt ne puisse avoir aucune ambigüité* ou incertitude. ... Et pour ce que telles choses sont souventes fois advenues sur *l’intelligence des motz latins contenuz esd arrestz* nous voulons que doresnavant tous arrestz ... de nos courtz souveraines [etc.] soient prononcez, enregistrez et delivrez aux parties en *languaige maternel françois* et non autrement.<sup>52</sup>

The earlier part of this justification, with its stress on public ignorance of Latin texts and hence the scope for their abuse, is reminiscent of Czech sources we have met, like the *Kniha Tovačovská*. But the larger issue appears at the end, and has given rise to much debate. Is this ‘languaige maternel françois’ to be equated with the *langue du roi*, the speech of the Valois court and administration, as long argued – pro and con – by both supporters and detractors of the French state, and by experts like the famous and exhaustive chronicler of French linguistic history, Ferdinand Brunot? Or did it continue to include dialects (earlier specified as ‘vulgaires du pays’ or similar)?<sup>53</sup>

<sup>51</sup> Exhaustive investigation in Martel, *La langue polonaise*.

<sup>52</sup> Quoted from J. Chaurand, ed., *Nouvelle histoire de la langue française* (Paris, 1999), p. 149.

<sup>53</sup> F. Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900*. Vol. II: *le seizième siècle* (Paris, 1906), pp. 30–2. Two important qualifications to the traditional view are P. Fioretti, ‘L’ordonnance de Villers-Cotterêts’, *Le Français Moderne*, xviii (1950), pp. 277–88, and D. Trudeau, ‘L’ordonnance de Villers-

Whatever its purpose, Villers-Cotterêts certainly in the event encouraged standard forms of French, which were anyway spreading: what no less an authority than Lucien Febvre saw as the linguistic manifestation of ‘la grandeur, la prospérité, la vitalité d’une France dont tout le Midi ... a voulu faire partie’.<sup>54</sup> French still needed its *Deffences* (à la du Bellay); and dialect might still seem a liability for it (as for German). But clearly it was becoming the language of an increasingly secure culture and of reasonably uniform channels of state power. It had built on the classics (as had Polish); was nursed by more and more grammarians and lexicographers; and could confidently cite the ancient Greek model for diversity within an essentially national mould.<sup>55</sup>

A similar and exactly contemporary instance across the English Channel is the wording of the ‘Act of Union’ (as it later came to be known) for the incorporation of Wales into England’s structures of government in 1536. Again I quote a passage from a much longer text:

Also be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that *all justices, commissioners* [etc.] *shall proclaim and keep the sessions, courts* [etc.] *in the English tongue*; and *all oaths ... and affidavits* [etc.] *to be given and one in the English tongue*; and also that from henceforth *no person or persons that use the Welsh speech or language shall have or enjoy any manner, office, or fees within this realm of England, Wales or other the King’s dominion*, upon pain of forfeiting the same office or fees, unless he or they use and exercise the English speech or language.<sup>56</sup>

The background here is of English as an old-new vehicle, (re-)emerging from its Norman French chrysalis somewhat like Czech – and at much the same time, as the career of John Wyclif showed – though less swiftly: England of the Tudors still made much use of law French in its court proceedings and verdicts continued to be recorded in Latin till 1732.<sup>57</sup> More than in the French case, the decision taken in 1536 was connected directly with executive homogeneity, smoothness and efficacy

Cotterêts et la langue française: histoire ou interprétation’, *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance*, xlv (1983), pp. 461–72.

<sup>54</sup> L. Febvre, ‘Politique royale ou civilisation française? Remarques sur un problème d’histoire linguistique’, *Revue de Synthèse Historique*, xxxviii (1924), pp. 37–53.

<sup>55</sup> Background in Chaurand, *Nouvelle histoire*, pp. 115 ff. (S. Lusignan), pp. 147 ff. (G. Clerico).

<sup>56</sup> Printed in I. Bowen, ed., *The Statutes of Wales* (London, 1908), p. 87.

<sup>57</sup> The subject is too large to be engaged with here; but cf. the new and suggestive argument of J. Catto, ‘Written English: The Making of the Language, 1370–1400’, *Past & Present*, clxxix (May 2003), pp. 24–59.

(however disputed the extent of that ‘revolution’ from above may be), and with judicial reorganization.

Wales, a complex of lordships and jurisdictions in the west of Britain, made an early association of the nation with its tongue (*iaith*), rather than with a territorially-demarcated land, which like ‘Germany’ did not exist; and had in fact developed a more sophisticated vernacular legal tradition in the Middle Ages than England. But English was already taking over in administration there, alongside Latin, by the fifteenth century.<sup>58</sup> The Act of 1536 reflected that, and confirmed a socio-linguistic process. The ‘language clause’ (*cymal iaith*), as later nationalists would call it, provoked no significant protest in the country at all, and was actively welcomed by the gentry, attracted by the prospect of equality of status and by the opportunities to be vouchsafed them if they operated in English.<sup>59</sup>

Again, as with Villers-Cotterêts, there may have been a cultural agenda. ‘His Highness’ [Henry VIII], as the Act indicates at another point, ‘minding and intending to reduce [his Welsh subjects] to the perfect order, notice and knowledge of his laws of this his realm’, did undertake ‘utterly to extirp all and singular the sinister Usages and Customs differing from the same.’<sup>60</sup> Did such ‘sinister Usages and Customs’ include their Celtic language, so radically alien to the English eye and ear? But if so, the agenda was not a consistent one: in 1563, legislation reminiscent of the Utraquists enjoined the production of religious texts in Welsh, building on the claim in the twenty-fourth of the recently enacted Thirty-nine Elizabethan Articles of faith: ‘It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have Publick Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people.’ From that initiative grew the Welsh Bible translation, exactly coincident – and of equal cultural importance – with the Kralice version.<sup>61</sup> Born of some misgivings about Welsh loyalties perhaps, these were basically practical measures, revealing of the limits of English linguistic ambition.

<sup>58</sup> L.B. Smith in *Y Gymraeg yn ei Disgleirdeb: Yr Iaith Gymraeg cyn y Chwyldro Diwydiannol*, ed. G.H. Jenkins (Cardiff, 1997), pp. 24, 38, 41 f. (also in a parallel version as *The Welsh Language before the Industrial Revolution*: my references are to the Welsh edn). For the historical context: Glanmor Williams, *Recovery, Reorientation and Reformation: Wales, c.1415–1642* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 253–78.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. *Y Gymraeg yn ei Disgleirdeb*, 78 ff. (G.H. Jenkins *et al.*), 128 ff. (P.R. Roberts), on the gentry.

<sup>60</sup> Bowen, *Statutes of Wales*, pp. 75 f.

<sup>61</sup> G. Williams, *Welsh Reformation Essays* (Cardiff, 1967); P. Morgan, *Beibl i Gymru* (n.p., 1988).

The third western example is that of English versus Gaelic in Ireland. Here were languages in early conflict, as in fourteenth-century Bohemia. The Statute of Kilkenny, decreed by the English authorities in 1366, was already aggressive, condemning the fact that

... many English of the said land [of Ireland], *forsaking the English language, manners, mode of riding, laws and usages, live and govern themselves according to the manners, fashions and language of the Irish enemies ... whereby ... the English language [etc.] ... are put in subjection and decayed, and the Irish enemies exalted and raised up, contrary to reason ...*'

It is therefore commanded, among other things, 'that *every Englishman do use the English language* and be named by an English name, leaving off entirely the manner of naming used by the Irish'. And severe punishments are threatened:

[I]f any English, or Irish living among the English, use the Irish language among themselves, contrary to this ordinance, and therefore be attainted, *his lands and tenements, if he have any, shall be seized into the hands of his immediate lord, [or, if not] his body shall be taken off by one of the officers of our Lord the King, and committed to the next gaol ...*;

and clergy similarly convicted will lose their benefices.<sup>62</sup> But we should bear in mind that all this had an impact only in the Pale of English settlement around Dublin; and the statute itself was actually issued in French (as were most acts of the Irish parliament till 1472). Moreover, its backdrop lay, as the above extracts imply, in a *loss* of ground by English locally.

That weakness continued in Ireland into and through the sixteenth century. Kilkenny was revoked in its linguistic aspect in 1495, though evidently not because its concerns had been assuaged, since it had to be reimposed a century later. Meanwhile, a series of related enactments were passed to secure or assert English as a tongue requisite for the law, for appropriate forms of schooling, and for grants of urban citizenship, which may look distinctly familiar from a Bohemian vantage-point. On the other hand, in Ireland (as in Wales) the towns remained bastions of English, thus of the minority tongue; which was only partly true of Bohemia, where by contrast the majority language was the one protected by legislation.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>62</sup> T. Crowley (ed.), *The Politics of Language in Ireland, 1366–1922. A Sourcebook* (London, 2000), pp. 14–16.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 20 ff.; cf. J.J. Hogan, *The English Language in Ireland* (Dublin, 1927), pp. 15–36. M. Rockel, *Grundzüge einer Geschichte der irischen Sprache* (Wien, 1989), pp. 64–72.

Thus the provisions for English in Ireland were still in good measure a defensive response. Yet English, like French, was by this stage fast becoming a hegemonic language over its (expanding) range as a whole, and that necessarily impinged on its situation in Ireland. Indeed, it had grown into an imperial language too, though in a markedly different sense from that of German in the authentic central-European Reich; and English attitudes to Ireland were increasingly coloured by the colonizing experience in America. It has lately been argued that Irish became for conquering English elites rather what the Indian languages of the New World were to Spaniards, reckoned ‘barbarian’ whenever they proved unable to render European concepts, which were seen as corresponding to reality. Indeed, worse still, Gaelic with its culture was largely ‘invisible’ to the incoming English too, since so few of them made any effort to acquaint themselves with it.<sup>64</sup>

A crown witness to this is the governmental secretary, Fynes Moryson, also renowned as a traveller, not least in Bohemia. Moryson showed himself much more perceptive about conditions there, including language, than in the Celtic lands. His Irish experience did, however, prompt him to one prescient observation: ‘In general *all nations have thought nothing more powerful to unite minds than the Community of language.*’<sup>65</sup> Can we not discern in those words the inkling of a still distant central-European future?

\*

As I move towards a conclusion, let us ponder again that Bohemian language law of 1615 in light of its aftermath. It formed part of the uneasy build-up to revolt; in fact it was enacted right alongside measures to resolve the oppositional grievances over Broumov (Braunau) and Hrob (Klostergrab) which within three years would trigger the Defenestration of Prague.<sup>66</sup> Thus there could be little time to gauge any effects which the law might have produced. And some, like the diarist Dačický, manifestly thought the initiative had come too late: ‘It possessed no validity, for

<sup>64</sup> P. Palmer, *Language and Conquest in Early Modern Ireland. English Renaissance Literature and Elizabethan Imperial Expansion* (Cambridge, 2001).

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 66 f., 88–90. Cf. Fynes Moryson and John Taylor, *Cesta do Čech*, tr. and ed. A. Bejblík (Praha, 1977).

<sup>66</sup> Pavel Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká, od r. 1602 do r. 1623*, ed. K. Tieftrunk (5 vols, Praha, 1865–70), i. 350 ff.

the matter is already obsolete, ignored, incurable and irremediable, through the Czechs' own indifference and discord.<sup>67</sup>

But debate surrounding the law did introduce a linguistic element into the revolt, which enjoyed significant Czechophone support – even if some of its leaders could hardly ‘string together three words’ of the language, as the legislators of 1615 had put it, and there is a Czech-nationalist view which saw the (ill-conceived) insurrection precisely as the culmination of a *German(-language)* revival.<sup>68</sup> The patriotic town councillor of Litoměřice, Pavel Stránský, in his ‘Okřik’ (‘Outcry’), written in the year of the outbreak of the rebellion, is brief but fierce, especially, as his full title indicates (‘to heedless Czechs against the immigrant languages thrusting themselves into the churches of Bohemia’), about the penetration of German into the ecclesiastical domain, which appears to have taken place noticeably during the decade since Rudolf’s Letter of Majesty. Invasion from a domineering Reich worked, according to Stránský, through subversion of the native tongue, aided by local unconcern. In highly coloured prose he even accuses his compatriots of linguistic perfidy.<sup>69</sup> Germans, he goes on, keep Czechs out of their guilds; Czech is losing ground in the courts; landowners put German preachers in for a few immigrant settlers; and so forth. ‘Our language is utterly beaten and supplanted. Ancient families have ... Germanized themselves; the names of towns (etc.) are repudiated, disfigured ...’<sup>70</sup>

Many echoes of the language law can be discerned in this long-unpublished tract, and some of them would later recur in the now exiled Stránský’s more famous work, the *Respublica Bohema* of 1634, where he likewise berated self-imposed linguistic decadence.<sup>71</sup> Then two years after the ‘Okřik’ another municipal official, Pavel Ješín, marketed his *editio princeps* of the Dalimil chronicle (which had been largely forgotten in the interim), with a dedication to two protagonists of the uprising, Václav Vilém z Roupova and Václav Budovec, dated on the day

<sup>67</sup> ‘Ale to žádné platnosti neneslo, nebo věc již jest zastaralá, obměškaná, nezhojitedlná a nenapravitedlná skrze vlastní nedbalost a nesvornost českou’: Mikuláš Dačický z Heslova, *Prostopravda; Paměti*, ed. E. Petrů and E. Pražák (Praha, 1955), pp. 334 f.

<sup>68</sup> E.g. Klik, ‘Národnostní poměry’, p. 48 and *passim*, writing in 1921.

<sup>69</sup> ‘... v češtině neb naprosto němý neb nevybroušeným otců svých jazykem zatrhající rozplodek ... na vůkol dosti opodál jazyk náš již zhola opovrhl ...’: Stránský, *Český stát. Okřik*, p. 364. The full title is *Proti hostinským v Čechách se do kostelův tlačícím jazykům na nedbalého čecha učiněný Okřik*.

<sup>70</sup> ‘Jazyk náš naprosto vybyt a vytlačen, rodové starožitní ... se zněmčili; jména měst [etc.] jsou zavržena, spotvořena ...’: *ibid.* p. 369.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, esp. pp. 108 f., 300.



of the confederation with Hungary. Jeřín announces his intention to show his nation 'that their ancestors ... professed nothing dearer after God and the soul than their homeland, freedom and language'.<sup>72</sup> But he adds the worry that 'our Slavonic language [has been] debased and humiliated': it has vanished from Meissen, Brunswick, Lüneburg, Bremen and the entire course of the Elbe through Lusatia, both Marks of Brandenburg, Saxony, Pomerania, Mecklenburg, Lauenburg, Holstein and as far as Denmark, because of persecution, especially exclusive guild regulations and the like. That point had rarely been made earlier, but it anticipates many subsequent fears.<sup>73</sup>

With the defeat of the revolt, such discourse was outlawed, and the apprehensions of the legislators in 1615 became self-fulfilling. On the face of it, the new Catholic *Zřízení zemské*, the Verneuerte Landesordnung of 1627, just extended the bilingual option, available *de facto* over much of Bohemian public life in the sixteenth century, to all of it *de jure*. But (symbolically perhaps) though it was issued in both German and Czech, the latter version appeared only in incomplete form. On the whole earlier practice had been linguistically dual ('utraqvist', as it would come to be known): as we have seen, it was mainly foreigners (*cizozemci*) rather than native non-Czech-speakers against whom lingual exclusivity seems to have been directed. Remarkably we have no evidence of German protest about that 1615 language law, even though it was passed at a general diet of all the Bohemian lands: the decision, we are told, was unanimous. After 1627, as Czech languished, the entire quarrel appeared obsolete.

Yet the seeds had been set for a future Herculean ideological contest, and conditions created which helped ensure it would prove irresolvable. Precisely the recovery of these Czech defences (*obraný*) in an age of ethnic renaissance (*obrození*) and through the nineteenth century – with the progressive rediscovery of Hus, Veleslavín, Stránský, Blahoslav, Žerotín, the 1615 language law, and the rest – would punctuate the course of modern Czech national self-assertion. That yielded a crucial legacy to a fraught future of competing nationalisms. And the

<sup>72</sup> *Die älteste Reimchronik des sogenannten Dalimil, herausgegeben im Jahre 1620 von Pavel Jeřín von Bezděztz*, ed. J. Daňhelka (München, 1981), sig. B<sup>i</sup>. (This edn is wholly in Czech; its German title would assuredly not have amused Jeřín.) Cf. Stránský's comments on Silesia., *Český stát. Okřik*, p. 203.

<sup>73</sup> '... nižádnému z Rodičů Slowanských aneboližto Srbských posslému, řemeslu se učiti nedagj/ ani koho w Cechu trpj/aneb k řemeslu a žiwnosti připaustěgj/ dokad žiwotnj powinnostj a přisahau toho, že ne z Slowanské, ale Německé krwe possel, nedoložj': *Reimchronik des sogenannten Dalimil*, sig. B<sup>iii</sup>. An earlier example: Graus, *Nationenbildung*, p. 95 n.; cf. *ibid.* pp. 74, 81.

Bohemian clash had been distinctive in its own time too: quite markedly divergent from the evolution in Poland and Germany; as well as in other European regions not touched on here, so far as I know. The sharpest contrast of all lies probably with the neighbouring Hungarian lands.<sup>74</sup> Only in the very different politics of the rising national states in the west do we encounter some roughly comparable developments.

No such comparisons seem to have been made at the time. ‘Language politics’, even in Bohemia, remained localized, inconsistent, and uncoordinated, usually – as we have seen – implicit unless some challenge to existing arrangements was identified. They are not, however, any less important to the historian as a consequence.

## APPENDIX

### Artikul sněmu generálního, 1615:

#### O zachování starožitého jazyka českého a vzdělání jeho

A jakož jsou sobě stavové i to ku paměti přivedli, kterak vzáctní předkové jejich, snaživše se jazyk a národ svůj český vzdělati, rozmnožiti a zachovati, a *soudíce to, že s zahynutím jazyka českého i národ český i jméno Čechův by zahynouti musilo*, bezpochybně příkladem národův těch, kteříž, chtějíce sobě spůsobiti u národův jiných slavné jméno, netoliko sami v zemích svých jazyk svůj přirozený sobě zotřovati hleděli, ale i od sousedův svých, s nimiž v přátelství a nějaké smlouvy vcházeli, toho při nich mezi jiným obzvláště, aby jazyku jejich se učili a v zemích svých užívali, žádali – to za právo nařídili, aby před soudy v tomto království jinak mluveno a pře vedeny nebyly než jazykem českým.

<sup>74</sup> A subject crying out for attention. Some preliminary thoughts by J.M. Bak, ‘A Kingdom of Many Languages: The Case of Medieval Hungary’, in *Forms of Identity. Definitions and Changes*, ed. L. Löb *et al.* (Szeged, 1994), pp. 45–55. For the situation at a later date, see R.J.W. Evans, ‘The Politics of Language and the Languages of Politics: Latin and the Vernaculars in Eighteenth-Century Hungary’, in *Cultures of Power in Europe during the Long Eighteenth Century*, ed. H.M. Scott and B. Simms (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 200–24.

Což pak při predcích našich, kteříž jsou tak na vlast svou jakožto praví jeho synové laskaví a vzdělání národu i jazyka svého žádostivi byli, vysoce chvály hodné a potřebné jest, tak že *naproti tomu při mnohých nynějších obyvatelích království tohoto, potomcích jejich nemůže se než tupiti, že šlépějí predkův svých nenásledují, více se na uvedení do vlasti své milé všelijakých cizích jazykův a národův vydávají. Čemuž kdyby jednou časně v cestu vkročeno nebylo, že nemohlo by naposledy to než s velikou záhubou i utištěním národu našeho českého býti.*

Jakož pak na oko se spatřuje, že vždy *více a více do země cizincův přibývá*, kteříž se v ní usazují, své živnosti a obchody vedou, velikých statkův docházejí, na ouřady rozličné, obzvláště v městech, v městečkách, do rady, *mnozí neumějíce tři slov českých, stranám česky své věci přednášejícím nerozumějíce a práva království tohoto povědomi nejsouce* dosazováni bývají; ano i v mnohých místech tohoto království před soudy a v místech radních jazyky cizími, což patrně čelí proti zřízení zemskému B 32, i také proti výš připomenutému predkův našich nařízení, že mluví a pře vedou. Ano i *na nejedněch kollaturách stavův*, k kterýmž však lidé poddaní osadní, větším dílem mimo jazyk český jiného žádného neumějící, náležejí, *kněží cizozemci, jazyka českého neužívající, se dosazují a chovají*; ještě tomu na odpor že neslyší se, aby Čechové z země jinam se táhnouti, osazovati, kdekoli u cizích národů podobného pohodlí a fedruňku užiti, a kde v které cizí zemi jazykem českým buď při právích mluveno aneb v kostelích slovo boží kázáno býti mělo. *Odkudž zřejmé jest, že Čechové ubývají a cizozemcův do království českého zhusta přibývají musí.* A protož na tom císař s stavy jednomyslně se snesl:

I. Aby všickni ti, kteříž z cizích zemí posavad do království českého buď za obyvatele do země anebo do měst za měšťany přijati jsou, *děti své i hned z mladosti jazyku českému povinni byli dáti učiti*, tak aby jsouce v Čechách rodilí a zrostlí, toho, že Čechové jsou, *poněvadž jeden národ od druhého ničím tak jako jazykem rozeznán býti nemůže*, skutkem dokazovali.

II. A aby děti cizozemcův, také v nově posavad do země přijatých, větší příčinu k učení se jazyku českému měli: protož aby *dědicové obojího pohlaví vyšších i nižších stavův, kteříž by jazykem českým dobře mluvíti uměli, po smrti rodičův svých napřed před jinými v statcích pozemských dvojnásobně dědili*, a tak jim raději statkové pozemští zůstávali; jiní pak kteří by česky neuměli, aby na penězích neb jináč díly své přijíti a na tom přestati povinni byli.

III. Na potomní však a budoucí časy od zavření tohoto generálního sněmu aby žádný cizozemec, kterýž by jazyku českého neuměl a potřeby své v něm srozumitelně přednésti nemohl, do země za obyvatele ani do měst za měšťánina žádným způsobem

*přijímán nebyl, nýbrž aby každý ten, kdož by toho, aby do království přijat byl, žádati chtěl, nejprve se jazyku českému naučiti povinen byl, a když by se naučil, to teprv aby mu se toho dostati mohlo a prvé nic; však s toutou přitom znamenitou výminkou: aby žádný takový v nově do země přijatý cizozemec ani děti jeho do třetího kolena na žádné úřady zemské neb městské i jiné, ani také do žádných soudův dosazován nebyl;* a to jak proto, že není možné cizozemcům tak rychle všech zvyklostí a obyčejův zemí svých, v nichž zrozeni jsou, odvyknouti, aby snad jsouce v nějakých povinnostech potřebováni, něco takového do země a dobrých pořádkův našich nevtrušovali a právům království tohoto, podle nichž samých obyvatelé české země souzeni býti mají, tak naspěch rozuměti a se naučiti; tak ovšem i proto, aby starožitní Čechové jakožto praví, vlastní a přirození vlasti naši milé synové před tímž v nově do země přijatými cizozemci jako nějakými pastorky jejími většího fedruňku a odměny za věrné a platné služby králi a království činěné užiti mohli. ...

IV. Nicméně jak při sněmích též *při soudech vyšších* na hradě Pražském, *tak i ve všech městech a městečkách* JMC a Její M Králové, též *panských, rytířských, městských a duchovních* při právicích *nená jinak mluveno*, pře vedeny, slyšány, příčiny přijímány a souzeny *býti, než to vše jazykem českým*.

V. Tolikéž *v těch farách, kostelích neb školách, v kterýchž jest před lety desíti slovo boží jazykem českým kázáno bývalo a dítky témuž jazyku českému se vyučovaly, aby to nyní ještě i budoucně v tom předešlém dobrém způsobu zůstávalo*, a jiní cizího jazyku správcové školní, kněží a kazatelové, kteříž by česky neuměli a nekázaly, tam uvozování a dosazování nebyli. ...

VI. ... *kdož by koli ten byl, a jsa obyvatel království českého jazykem českým, uměje jej, mluvíti nechtěl a jiné též od mluvení českého odvozoval, aby v zemi trpín nebyl, nýbrž v půl létě pořád zběhlém ven z země se vystěhovati povinen byl. A pokudž by toho neučinil, aby jako rušitel obecného dobrého dále žádných práv a svobod království českého užívati nemohl.*

Pavel Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká, od r. 1602 do r. 1623*, ed. K. Tieftrunk (5 vols, Pr., 1865–70), i. 355–8 [*italics mine; a few minor passages omitted*].

R. J. W. E v a n s

**Law of the General Diet of 1615:  
On the Preservation and Cultivation of the Venerable Czech Language**

And the estates also recalled to mind how their noble ancestors, seeking to cultivate, extend and conserve their Czech language and nation, and *judging that the extinction of the Czech language would bring with it also the extinction of the Czech nation and the Czechs' very name*, and doubtless following the example of those nations which, wishing to secure for themselves an honourable name among other nations, not only looked to intensify the use of their own native tongue in their own lands, but made a point of requesting from their neighbours, with whom they entered into friendship or some kind of treaty, that their language be taught and employed in those other lands – [these ancestors] enacted into law that before the courts of this kingdom no other language than Czech should be spoken or utilized in procedure.

Yet what was highly praiseworthy and necessary among our ancestors, who thus cherished their homeland as its true sons should and showed themselves ambitious for cultivation of their nation and language, *serves only to shame many of the present denizens of this kingdom, their descendants*, who far from following in the steps of those ancestors, set more store by *introducing all manner of foreign tongues and nations into their dear homeland*. This, unless it were nipped in the bud, could not fail to lead in time to great perdition and oppression of our Czech nation.

It is plain to see that *more and more foreigners continually enter the country* and settle in it, ply their crafts and trades, acquire large properties, and come to occupy various offices, especially in towns and townships, on the council, *many of them unable to string together three words of Czech or to understand parties who present their case in that language, and ignorant of the laws of this kingdom*; indeed in many places here before the courts and in council chambers they speak and record their suits in foreign tongues, which clearly infringes article B 32 of the land ordinance and the above-mentioned enactments of our ancestors. Moreover *in some of the parishes of the estates*, where most of the people are peasant farmers who know no other language but Czech, *foreign priests with no Czech are installed and maintained*. Yet by contrast we do not hear of Czechs moving elsewhere from this land, settling or finding comfort and support among foreign nations, or that in any foreign land the Czech tongue should be spoken in the law-courts or used for preaching the word of God in churches. *Whence it is manifest that the Czechs must*

*diminish and foreigners soon advance in the kingdom of Bohemia.* And therefore the emperor and the estates unanimously agreed:

I. That all those who till now have been accepted from foreign lands into the kingdom of Bohemia, either as denizens of the country or as citizens of the towns, *should forthwith be obliged to have their children learn Czech from their youth*, so that born and raised in Bohemia they should demonstrate by deed that they are Czechs, *since nothing so distinguishes one nation from another as its language.*

II. And so that the children of foreigners who are newly received into the country might have greater cause to learn the Czech language, *heirs and heiresses of both higher and lower estates who can speak the Czech language well shall inherit landed property first and in double measure after the death of their parents*, so that such property shall rather remain with them; whereas those who do not know Czech will be required to take their share in money or otherwise without further recourse.

III. Henceforth and for the future from the conclusion of this general diet, *no foreigner who does not know Czech and cannot intelligibly present his needs in that tongue shall by any means be accepted as a denizen of the country or as citizen of a town*; but all those who request acceptance into the kingdom shall first be obliged to learn the Czech language, and only when they have learned it may they receive this and not before. Yet with this signal condition withal, *that no such foreigner newly accepted into the country nor his children to the third generation shall be preferred to any state or municipal or other office, or to any courts of law*, and this [for two reasons: firstly] because it is not possible for foreigners [either] so swiftly to unlearn all habits and customs of their own lands where they were raised, but that being called upon in some duties they might perhaps insinuate something into our country and against her good order, or so promptly to understand and learn the laws of this kingdom according to which alone the denizens of the land of Bohemia are to be judged; [and secondly] also so that the original Czechs as the true, real and natural sons of our dear homeland should avail themselves of greater support and reward for their faithful and true service to the king and the kingdom than these foreigners newly accepted into the country who are like their stepsons. ...

IV. No less at the diets and *in the higher courts in Prague castle as well as in all royal towns and townships* and in all manorial, municipal and ecclesiastical courts *nothing is to be said nor trials conducted nor causes heard nor judgments given except in the Czech language.*

R. J. W. E v a n s

V. Likewise *in those parishes, churches or schools in which ten years ago the word of God was being preached and children educated in the Czech language, now and in future things are to remain in that good ordering*, and other school rectors, priests and preachers using foreign tongues, who cannot speak and preach in Czech, are not to be appointed or instituted. ...

VI. ... Whosoever, *being a denizen of the kingdom of Bohemia and of Czech speech, knowing the language, shall be unwilling to speak it, and divert others from speaking it, is not to be tolerated in the country*, but on the expiry of half a year shall be obliged to emigrate from the country. And if he should not do so, as a troubler of the common weal he shall no longer enjoy any rights and freedoms in the kingdom of Bohemia.

Translated from: Pavel Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká, od r. 1602 do r. 1623*, ed. K. Tieftrunk (5 vols, Pr., 1865–70), i.355–8 [*italics mine*; a few minor passages omitted].

**Legitimizing War: National Past  
as an Instrument of Protestant Propaganda  
in England and the Holy Roman Empire**

*Jaroslav Miller*

This article contributes to the debate on the religious and political polarization in Europe in the decades before and during the Thirty Years War.<sup>1</sup> In the battle of words that preceded the armed conflict of men, references to the national past and greatness were used and misused by the opposing sides as influential instruments of propaganda.

This study is concerned with the image of Frederick, Elector Palatine in Jacobean England and the Holy Roman Empire. I will endeavour to show that exalted nationalism was a building stone of pro-Palatine propaganda. In short, I set out to address one central issue: In which way was Frederick, the Palatine Elector, put within the context of the English and German national past.

<sup>1</sup> The research has been supported by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic (P405/10/0375).



After the death of the Virgin Queen in 1603, the Elizabethan cult in England was revived and further developed by Henry Stuart, first-born son of James I and, as such, royal successor. As the spiritual heir of Elizabethan legend he became the chief symbol of a tradition embodying the imperial aspirations, religious values, chivalric virtues and patriotism that grew out of the long-term victorious struggle against both domestic and foreign enemies. As a consequence, Henry presented himself, and was perceived by the public, as a warrior prince and as a resolver of the religious dissensions in Europe by force of arms. Most historians agree that Henry's premature death in 1612 discontinued this bellicose tradition while others argue that patriotic aspirations were later personified by Henry's sister Elizabeth Stuart, the consort of Elector Palatine and the queen of Bohemia.<sup>2</sup> Yet little attempt has been made so far to analyze the image of Frederick as Henry Stuart's heir.

After the unexpected death of Henry Stuart, one may recognize in English dramatic and literary propaganda a conscious attempt to revive the Henrician militant legacy by associating it with the Elector Palatine. However, given that Frederick was a foreigner in England, the Palatine myth had to be placed within the framework of **national** (that is English) Protestant mythology. Moreover, as a true successor of Henry, Frederick was not presented as *fidei defensor* but rather as the victorious conqueror commanding Protestant forces in their final struggle with Catholicism.

The fact that Frederick was a foreigner in England had a fundamental influence on the manner of his public presentation. While the glorification of Elizabeth I, Philip Sidney, the Earl of Essex, Walter Raleigh or Henry Stuart combined anti-Catholic sentiment with English national awareness, the latter was necessarily lacking in the case of the Palatine Elector.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance, R. Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London, 1986); Idem, *The Cult of Elizabeth* (London, 1999); F.A. Yates, *Astrea – The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*, (London – Boston, 1975); A.B. Ferguson, *The Chivalric Tradition in Renaissance England*, Washington – London – Toronto, 1986); R.M. Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia, 1987), esp. pp. 15–42.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, F.A. Yates, 'Elizabethan Chivalry: The Romance of the Accession Day Tilts,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, xx (1957), pp. 4–25; Idem, *Astraea*, esp. pp. 56–111; G. Parry, *The Golden Age restor'd* (Manchester, 1985); D. Norbrook, 'The Masque of Truth: Court Entertainments and International Protestant Politics in the Early Stuart Period,' *The Seventeenth Century*, 2 (1986), pp. 81–110; Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth*, esp. pp. 114–191.



Figure 1: Frederick of Palatinate and Elizabeth Stuart as Protestant Conquerors, (1619).

The marriage between the representatives of two Protestant powers in itself created considerable space for propaganda, but without bringing Frederick into the historical context of Anglo-Spanish rivalry and English national mythology, there could hardly be, in 1612–1613 as well as 1619–1621, any massive spontaneous manifestations of public support for the married couple. The existence of a Palatine myth was thus contingent upon the identification of Frederick with Elizabethan chivalry and generally accepted symbols of English national virtues. Moreover, there was still another and equally important factor behind such an image. Given Henry's death and the infancy of Elizabeth's younger brother, Charles Stuart, the potential accession of the Palatine couple to the English throne was far from theoretical. In this light, the public presentation of the Palatine Elector as a national hero might appear as a preparation for the potential royal installation

of Elizabeth and Frederick. In 1614 their chances considerably grew as Parliament legalized accession rights of the Palatine couple and their descendants.<sup>4</sup>

Various means were brought into play in order to create an image of the Palatine Elector not merely as the defender of the Protestant Church but as the leader of Protestant expansion and militarism. Chief among them were drama, literature, pictorial representations and, of course, printed political propaganda.

Of the means of mass communication in Jacobean England, which played an important role in stimulating anti-Catholic feeling and spreading the Palatine myth, the most important was public drama, which after 1610 experienced its final flowering. Let me shortly analyse at least one of the plays that contributed substantially to the creation of the Palatine myth in England. Its author remains unknown but we have strong reasons to believe that it was Wentworth Smith. The play is entitled *The Hector of Germany, or the Palsgrave, Prime Elector* (1614) and was presented in at least two London theatres, the Red Bull and the Curtain. The fact that the play did not escape enforced modifications is indicated by the satirical prologue ridiculing the contemporary practice of censorship.<sup>5</sup> This play, in which the genesis of the Palatine myth is most clearly worked up, invites attention for several reasons.

Although the action is set in Mediaeval Europe, the author obviously counted on the ability of the audience to grasp the historical theme in the context of the current political and religious situation in England and on the Continent. In several places in the text the author identifies the chief character in the drama, Palsgrave Robert, with symbols of English chivalry, the Black Prince (Edward, Prince of Wales, 1330-1376), and Henry Stuart. The plot itself works with an allegorical identification of the Palsgrave with the Black Prince, Henry Stuart and Frederick of the Palatinate. Wentworth Smith, if he was indeed the author of the play, also made use of the chronological coincidence of Frederick's arrival in England (16 October 1612), the sudden death of the heir to the throne (6 November) and the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth in February of the follow-

<sup>4</sup> S. Adams, *The Protestant Cause: Religious Alliance with the West European Calvinist Communities as a Political Issue in England, 1585–1630* (Oxford, 1973), unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, p. 219.

<sup>5</sup> Print of 1615. Wentworth Smith (?), *The Hector of Germany or the Palsgrave, Prime Elector* (London, 1615), unpaginated. On drama in the context of Anglo-German relations see H. Werner, 'The Hector of Germanie, or the Palsgrave, Prime Elector' and Anglo-German relations of early Stuart England: the view from the popular stage', in R.M. Smuts, ed., *The Stuart Court and Europe* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 113–132.

ing year. The chief message of the play is to present Frederick as the legitimate heir to the still living political and religious legacy of Henry Stuart.

I shall attempt briefly to recapitulate the action of the play. The central problem is presented at the outset. The chief protagonist, the gravely ill Palsgrave Robert, receives a letter from the English king Edward expressing his support for the Duke of Savoy in the approaching imperial election.<sup>6</sup> The apparently certain victory of the candidate, however, is thrown into doubt by the military intervention of the Bastard of Trastamara, who after usurping the Spanish throne, yearns also for the imperial crown. In the ensuing conflict the Palsgrave's allies, the Bohemian king, the Duke of Savoy, the Marquis of Brandenburg and the Bishop of Cologne, suffer a decisive defeat at the hands of the allies of the self-proclaimed emperor, the Duke of Saxony and the bishops of Trier and Mainz. At the moment of greatest despair, however, the unseated Spanish king Peter arrives incognito at the Palsgrave's court, and employs his healing art to cure the Palsgrave Robert. This is made clear to the audience by a letter from the Palatine to the English king. The author thus again emphasises the motif, otherwise repeated elsewhere in the text, of alliance between England and the chief character in the drama, the symbol of the Holy Roman Empire. The action then shifts to Spain, where the Palsgrave achieves a great victory over the Bastard of Trastamara and hands him over to the restored Spanish king, Peter. The triumph, however, is undone by the intervention of the Duke of Saxony, who frees the Bastard. The embittered Palsgrave sets out to seek help from the English king, while the usurper of the imperial crown negotiates for a military alliance with the king of France. The nascent Anglo-German (= Palatine) and Franco-Spanish alliances thus evoke the fundamental divisions between the Protestant and Catholic powers in Europe. The play culminates in the final victory of the Palsgrave Robert over the Duke of Saxony in a duel at the French royal court, the surrender of the imperial title by the Bastard of Trastamara and the coronation of the Duke of Savoy.

The text contains a number of historical parallels and analogies with the contemporary political and religious situation in Europe, which indicate the strong ideological subtext of the play. Just as once one of the main protagonists of the Hundred Years' War, Prince Edward in 1367, so also the main character undertakes a military campaign in Spain. The identification of the Palsgrave with the

<sup>6</sup> Hans Werner identifies the hero, Robert, with Ruprecht II, a contemporary of the Black Prince. *Ibid.*, p. 119, n. 28.

English ideal of Mediaeval chivalry is shown by the Bastard of Trastamara's monologue on *Blacke-Prince, lately my greatest Foe who ... opposed me at Mazieres*. Elsewhere in the text, however, it is made clear that the Black Prince is already dead at the time of the action. The dethroned Spanish king Peter, for example unites the beginning of his personal tragedy with the death of the English royal heir, which points to the not too distant past of this event. Moreover, when King Edward describes the late Black Prince as his son, the analogy with the recent death of the firstborn son of James I is brought to mind. The Black Prince, then, is also the personification of Henry Stuart. But if the play is to be conceived as a celebration of Frederick of the Palatinate, then the author needed to insert the fact into the action in such a way as to leave the public in no doubt as to the main message of the play. The identification of the chief character with Frederick of the Palatinate is eloquently signified in several episodes. One of these key moments is the conferral of the Garter on the Palsgrave on his arrival in England.

*My gracious Liege here is the Garter ready. King: Which to the Palsgrave we command your beare, Garter and Herald heere presents your Honour.*<sup>7</sup>

We know that the same honour was granted to the Palatine elector several days before his marriage to Elizabeth Stuart. Similarly, the author's description of the triumph of the Palsgrave Robert at a tournament is associated with Frederick's success at the knightly tilt, which formed part of the wedding celebrations.<sup>8</sup> The outline of the myth, then, is drawn upon the stage, and chiefly in the minds of the public: the hero of the play = the Black Prince = Henry Stuart = Frederick of the Palatinate.

If the contemporary representation of Henry Stuart is analyzed, one must conclude that the entire play may be also understood as a dramatisation of traditional Elizabethan iconography of chivalrous virtue and militant anti-Catholicism, which were most often symbolised in knightly tournaments and the Order of the

<sup>7</sup> Smith, *The Hector*.

<sup>8</sup> More about the tilts in *Beschreibung der Reiss: Empfangung dess Ritterlichen Ordens: Vollbringung des Heyraths: und gluecklicher Heimfuehrung: Wie auch der ansehnlichen Einfuehrung, gehlener Ritterspiel und Frewdenfests. Des Durchleuchtigsten, hochgebornen Fuersten und Herrn Herrn Friderichen dess Fuenften, Pfaltzgraven bey Rhein, dess Heiligen Roemischen Reichs Ertztruchsessen und Churfuersten Hertzogen in Bayern etc. Mit der auch durchleuchtigsten, hochgebornen Fuerstin und koeniglichen Princessin Elizabethen dess Grossmechtigsten Herrn Herrn Iacobi des Ersten Koenigs in Grossbritannien Einigen Tochter* (1613), pp. 41–44.

Garter. In this regard an illustrative example is the equestrian portrait of Henry as tourney hero, painted by Robert Peake between 1610 and 1612. The artist portrays the heir to the throne in the spirit of Elizabethan political culture, based on Protestant chivalric heroism and nationally oriented anti-Spanish sentiment. Henry is pictured at the moment of triumphal entry into the tilt-yard, with armour and lance, the direct heir of the victorious legacy of Elizabeth I, Sir Philip Sidney and Essex, hero of the expedition against Cadiz (1596). The stress which the text of the drama places on these attributes of Elizabethan and early Stuart chivalric iconography leaves no doubt as to the tradition which the Palsgrave Robert is meant to embody. It may be argued further that Frederick of the Palatinate is at the same time the last authentic representative of Elizabethan iconographic tradition and in a figurative sense also the last hero of the Elizabethan period. At any rate, a comparison of Peake's portrait of Henry Stuart and the famous equestrian portrait of Charles I by Van Dyck, painted nearly three decades later in 1638, strongly supports this conclusion. In the latter picture, national and religious elements are discarded in favour of a supra-national conception of an absolute ruler. Charles I is no longer the embodiment of the chivalric values professed by the political culture of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods, but rather a cosmopolitan symbol of imperial government, whether British, French or Habsburg.<sup>9</sup>

*The Hector of Germany* was conceived in the first instance as a glorification of the Palatine marriage, but its strongly militarist tone and general conception indicate that the author's aim was to place the event in the broader framework of European politics. The historical tale from Mediaeval Germany also glorifies the recent triumph of the Protestant camp in the first phase of the Jülich-Cleve conflict. The occupation of a relatively insignificant Imperial territory by forces of the Austrian Habsburgs in the spring of 1609 resulted in the mobilisation of the newly created Protestant Union, which was soon followed by the formation of a Catholic League. This ideological and religious line is clearly discernible in the drama in the union of the Palsgrave Robert with the English ruler. The theme of European political crisis, threatening to grow into a general armed conflict, is indicated at the outset by the occupation of territory rightfully belonging to the main character of the play. This act of unprovoked aggression – just as in the case

<sup>9</sup> On the chivalric iconography of the Elizabethan and Stuart period see J.S.A. Adamson, 'Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England', in K. Sharpe and P. Lake, eds., *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London, 1994), pp. 161–197.

of the Jülich-Cleve conflict – results in the mobilisation of a significant portion of Europe. Also the Franco-Spanish alliance, at which the author of the play merely hints, had its archetype in the real historical situation after the dramatic death of Henry IV, when the government of the regent Marie de Medici soon abandoned the policy of the late ruler and openly indicated willingness to strengthen political ties with the Spanish Habsburgs. The conclusion of the drama, describing the triumph of the English king Edward and the Palgrave Robert, was nothing more than an appreciation of the active policy of James I in the course of the Jülich-Cleve crisis, whose result was interpreted by the Protestant camp as a defeat for the ambitions of the House of Habsburg.

As mentioned above, the death of Henry Stuart and his legacy served Protestant propagandists as material from which to construct a Palatine myth. Although *The Hector of Germany* was by far the most pronounced attempt to present Frederick as a national symbol of militant Protestantism, efforts to resuscitate the myth of Henry Stuart through the Palatine dynasty may be found elsewhere in contemporary literature. One such instance was the panegyric by Robert Allyn published on the occasion of Frederick's and Elizabeth's departure from England to Heidelberg:

*Our Henry-Fredericke, lies in timelesse toome,  
Whose double name exprest not halfe wis worth,  
A Fredericke in his losse, supplies his roome,  
And bearing halfe his name, one halfe sets forth  
Of him, whose all, is hardly match'd by two [...]  
Go then, great Prince, and thou his other halfe,  
Grace of his youth, and glory of his age,  
Key of his secret thoughts, his second self [...].*<sup>10</sup>

Even more explicit was Henry Peacham's *Prince Henrie Revived* (1615), composed at the birth of Henry Frederick, the first son of Frederick and Elizabeth, and dedicated to the future Winter Queen.<sup>11</sup> While *The Hector of Germany* brings

<sup>10</sup> R. Allyn, *Tears of ioy shed at the happy departure from Great Britaine, of two paragons of the Christian world. Fredericke and Elisabeth, and princesse Palatines of Rhine*, 1613, in: E.C. Wilson, ed., *Prince Henry and English Literature* (New York, 1946), pp. 161–162.

<sup>11</sup> Henry Peacham, *Prince Henrie Revived or a Poeme Upon the Birth, and in Honor of the Hopefull Yong Prince Henrie Frederick* (London, 1615).

Frederick into the context of the national myth only indirectly through references to English historical and political events, Peacham from the outset baldly asserts that Henry's death is counterbalanced by the marriage of the king's daughter to the Palatine elector: "*Deare Henries losse, Eliza's wedding day*". Henry's virtues, however, are not ascribed to Frederick but rather to the firstborn son of the Palatine couple, in whom, following the model of the panegyrics on Henry's birth in 1594, the author beholds invincible Caesar and expresses the conviction that "*Caesar Henrie thou maist one day raigne, as good, as great, as ever Charlemagne*". The obstacle facing the newborn Caesar is the common enemy "*Byzant beast*" (the Catholic League), to whose defeat the hero is called. After this triumph "*Germanie, and Brittain, shall be one, in League, in Lawes, in Love, Religion*".<sup>12</sup>

Peacham's parallel between Caesar and the firstborn son of the Palatine couple would perhaps deserve even more attention. Some texts from these years indicate the existence of public conviction or faith that within some time the Palatine dynasty could be elevated to the status of Roman Emperors.<sup>13</sup> Debates about the potential political advance of the Palatine Elector were also led on an official level during Frederick's stay in London as in September 1620 James I acknowledged in Privy Council that as early as 1612 he had discussed with his future son-in-law the hypothetical chance of Frederick's accession to the Bohemian throne. Seen from this perspective, Frederick's decision from 1619 to accept the proposal of the Bohemian Protestant Estates could not have been a complete surprise to James I.<sup>14</sup>

To a higher degree than in England was the accent upon the national past in the Holy Roman Empire intertwined with eschatology and classical mythology. Some authors resuscitated the ancient tradition of an eternal struggle between the German tribes and the Romans which in the Middle Ages transformed itself into conflicts between emperors of the Holy Roman Empire and Popes over secular power. Calling to mind famous victories over the Romans, some early 17th century pamphlets saw Protestant leaders as natural heirs and successors of Arminius and other German warriors. These texts mostly reflected upon the discovery of Tacitus' *Germania* in the 15th century which subsequently provoked nationalistic sentiments and a romanticizing picture of ancient German history as represented,

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> See, for instance, George Wither, *Prince Henrie Obsequies or Mournfull Elegies upon his Death* (London, 1612).

<sup>14</sup> Adams, *The Protestant Cause*, p. 220.



among others, by Ulrich von Hutten's famous short novel *Arminius*. By referring to the glorious deeds of Arminius who saved the country from the Roman yoke, Johannes Freinsheim in his *Teutscher Tugendspiegel* encouraged German Protestant leaders, and above all Bernhard of Weimar-Saxony, to keep this bellicose tradition alive and once again raise arms against Rome.

[Augustus wished] *den Teutschen ihren Muth und alte freyheit nehmen (...) Wan aber Armin kompt, und deinen Varus schlegt, Und dreissig tausent Man in einem Tag erlegt.*<sup>15</sup>

At the same time, a number of texts distributed on the eve of the Thirty Years War in Germany recalled the immortal glory of the name "Frederick", which was associated with medieval German resistance to papal political aspirations. Here, Frederick I Barbarossa as well as Frederick II served as positive examples to be followed by future Fredericks who would complete their unfinished mission. Not devoid of eschatological dimensions, these pamphlets voiced the prophecy according to which the honorary task to eventually destroy Rome was bestowed upon Frederick of Palatinate.<sup>16</sup> Composed of two words, *Frieden* (Peace) and *Reich* (Empire), the name Frederick (Friedrich) obliged its bearers to wage a victorious war against tyrannical Rome with the objective of securing the freedom of Germany and a long-deserved eternal peace in the Empire. The adoration of Frederick, the saviour of Germany, had its roots in mediaeval eschatological prophecies by Joachim of Fiore (1145–1202) who once heralded that the apogee of human history would come in the years 1250–1260 when a *novus dux*, a secular king, would eventually annihilate the worldly and corrupted Church. In Germany, this prophecy was connected with Frederick II who, however, unexpectedly died in

<sup>15</sup> See, for instance, Johannes Freinsheim, *Teutscher Tugendspiegel, der Gesang von der Stammen und Thaten deß alten und neuen teutschen Hercules. An der Durchleuchtigen Hochgebornen Fürsten und Herren, Herren Bernharden, Hertzogen zu Sachsen, Gülch, Cleve und Berg* (Strasbourg, 1639), pp. G3 – G4.

<sup>16</sup> Johannes Plaustrarius, *Wunder- und Figürlich Offenbarung: Das ist: 1) Vergleichung der Welt Anfang und Ende, darinnen der jetzigen Zeit trübsäliger Zustandt begriffen. 2) Vergleichung des Falls Adams und Even, mit jetzigem letzten Fall der Menschen. 3) Vergleichung der Kinder Israel Ausführung auß Egypten, mit der jetzigen Aufßführung und Erlösung der Außerwöhlten und glaubigen Kinder Gottes auss der Baylonischen Dienstbarkeit. 4) Von dem endlichen Untergang und Zerstörung der grossen Statt Babylon, das ist Rom. 5) Von dem neuen König Friderico Pfaltzgrafen, etc. oder brüllendem Löwen auss dem Waldt, im 4. Buch Esdrae am 11. Und 12. Capitel* (1620).

1250. Nevertheless, the campaign continued and subsequent German rulers were viewed as reincarnations of Frederick II. The legend survived also as part of popular culture as no less than three or four pseudo-Fredericks appeared during the 13<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> century in various regions of Germany. In the later period, the myth of the future Frederick saw its revival thanks to several influential tracts distributed across the Holy Roman Empire. In an anonymous tract from the first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century generally known as *Gamaleon* the future Emperor will annihilate the Papacy and discipline the whole of Central Europe. Popular eschatological expectations featured in all later tracts dedicated to the myth of Frederick, including the so-called *Reformation of Sigismund* and above all the *Book of a Hundred Chapters*. Probably penned in Breisgau around 1500, the latter referred to the semi-secret fellowship of pious men acting under the auspices of St. Michael and summoned by the Emperor Frederick, “the ruler from the Black Forest”, who would reign for a thousand years. Not only that Frederick would free the country from the Roman yoke but would restore the glory of Germany which had been predestined to dominate the world.<sup>17</sup> This also explains why the later propagandist campaign in favour of the Swedish king Gustavus Adolphus was systematically built upon the legacy of the German/Roman rivalry. By presenting himself as the natural heir of Frederick of Palatinate, Gustavus Adolphus, a foreigner in Germany, entered the pantheon of German national heroes fighting Rome.<sup>18</sup> Symbolically, the Swedish king became another Frederick.

<sup>17</sup> See N. Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (London, 1993), pp. 108–126.

<sup>18</sup> Gustavus Adolphus as an heir of Frederick of Palatinate in *Epigrammata Dicata Virtuti, Honori, et Felicitati Serenissimi, Potentissimique Principis ac Domini, Domini Gustavi Adolphi, Suecorum, Gothorum, et Wandalarum Regis, etc. In Prælium ad Lipsiam commissum etc. Contantiae itidem ac Magnitudini animi Serenissimi, Potentissimique Principis D. Friderici Palatini, Bohemorum Regis, etc. Aliorumque Herum Epigrammata Sacrata, a diuersis autoribus* (Frankfurt, 1632), esp. pp. 30–34; *Klag und Trauer-Predigt ueber den toedilichen ab-gang zweyer Fuernemen Koenigen, ie in einem jahr, und in einem monat auss diesem leben ab-geschieden, Gustavi Adolphi, Koenigs zu Schweden, etc. so den 6/16 Novemb. und Friderici, koenigs zu Boehmen, etc. so den 19/29 Novembris dieses Jahrs 1632* (Leiden, 1632). Also the anonymous pamphlet signed Von B. S. P. Vertriebenen Pharrhern im Nahmen aller Exulierenden Churpfälztz. Kirchen Diener, *Vivat Rex Sveciae. Schwedischer Triumph unnd Dancksagung* (1631). The same motif can be found in a couple of English prints. See, for instance, *The Pallatinates ioy or the meeting of the King of Bohemia with the King of Sweden* (London, 1632) and perhaps also the lost elegy on the heroic death of both Protestant leaders *A Mournfull Lamentacion on the death of the king of Sweden and king of Bohemia*, in H.E. Rollins, ed., ‘An Analytical Index to the Ballad-Entries (1557–1709) in the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London,’ *Studies in Philology*, 21 (1924), p. 160, no. 1830.



Figure 2: Ancient German warriors. Plate from Philipp Cluverius, *Germaniae antiquae libri tres*, Leiden 1616.

In addition to the heroic German past, the Protestant propaganda sought inspiration also in Greek and Roman mythology. Following the older mediaeval and early modern tradition, most written and iconographic sources depicted Frederick as Hercules. In the famous book of emblems by Julius Wilhelm Zinzgref, for example, one finds a picture of a newborn Hercules/Frederick strangling with his hands two serpents seeking his death.<sup>19</sup> Here, Zinzgref took advantage of the motif that was previously used in the campaign glorifying Henry of Navarre, later

<sup>19</sup> Julius Wilhelm Zinzgref, *Emblematum Ethico-Politicorum Centuria* (1619), unpagged. See also A. Henkel and A. Schöne, eds., *Emblemata – Handbuch zur Sinnbildkunst des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart, 1967), pp. 1641–1642.

known as Henry IV.<sup>20</sup> In presenting the future Palatine Elector as Hercules, Zingref also relied upon earlier dynastic mythology and iconography as developed by Frederick's predecessors, namely Frederick I and Ottheinrich (1502–1552), *Hercules Palatinus* who “*Pfaltz durch Gottes gnad, Von deß Babsts greuln erledigt hat*”.<sup>21</sup> Unlike Frederick, who was not fortunate enough to achieve victory and thus complete his heroic mission, the incomparably more successful Swedish king Gustavus Adolphus could be celebrated as the invincible Hercules annihilating the Hydra. In a leaflet entitled the *Schwedischer Hercules*, Gustavus Adolphus was depicted as the mythological hero fighting the monster, a symbol of the Catholic Church oppressing the True Faith and Germany itself. Compared to older depictions of ancient Greek and Roman figures, the 17<sup>th</sup> century Hercules mythology was, however, increasingly influenced by Baroque visual culture and by virtues highlighted in Baroque art. The leaders of both Protestant and Catholic Europe were henceforth portrayed not only as invincible warriors but also as paragons of piety, wisdom and virtue.<sup>22</sup>

Finally, in the German-speaking environment the Protestant cause and propaganda in favour of Frederick and his successors were closely connected with millenarism, eschatological expectations and biblical prophecies. The second and third decades of the 17<sup>th</sup> century saw an explosion of visions and prophecies that heralded the annihilation of Rome by Frederick and later Gustavus Adolphus, the renaissance of the true Church and the beginning of the millenium. It is well-known that John Comenius himself made Frederick familiar with the prophecies of the Silesian artisan Christoph Kotter, who predicted the final victory of Elector Palatine over the Habsburg and papal Antichrist. Of these, arguably the most

<sup>20</sup> See, *Henri IV – images d'un roi entre realite et mythe* (Pau, 1992), pp. 313–314; M.-R. Jung, *Hercule dans la littérature française du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Genève, 1966), pp. 174–177.

<sup>21</sup> B. Zeitelhack, ed., *Pfalzgraf Ottheinrich: Politik, Kunst und Wissenschaft im 16. Jahrhundert* (Regensburg, 2002), pp. 238.

<sup>22</sup> Above all in Georg Rodolf Weckherlin, *Des grossen Gustav-Adolfen u. f. w. Ebenbild, Zu glorwürdigstem und unvergänglichem Gedächtniss Seines so schnellen als hellen Lebenslaufs* (1633); Johannes Balthasar Schupp, *Hercules Togatus Sive de illustrissimo celsissimosque heroe domino Georgio II. Cattorum Landgravio Comite In Cattimeleboco, Decia, Zigenhaina & Nidda, &c. Pacificatore pio & prudentissimo* (Marburg, 1640); Johannes Freinsheim, *Teutscher Tugentspiegel, der Gesang von der Stammen und Thaten deß alten und newen teutschen Hercules. An der Durchleuchtigen Hochgebornen Fürsten und Herren, Herren Bernharden, Hertzogen zu Sachsen, Gülich, Cleve und Berg* (Strasbourg, 1639). As for the analysis of Hercules in the baroque literature see M. Disselkamp, *Barockheroismus – Konzeptionen politischer Größe in Literatur und Traktatistik des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen, 2002), pp. 250–261.

popular was the allegedly Paracelsian prophecy of the Midnight Lion which is briefly referred to also in the famous *Rosicrucian* manifestos.<sup>23</sup> Popularized by Johannes Kärcher, Paul Felgenhauer, Simeon Partlicius and many anonymous authors, the prophecy associated the Midnight Lion with Frederick of Palatinate, conqueror of Rome, reformer of the Church and harbinger of Jesus Christ himself. Besides purely propagandistic purposes, references to national past, classical mythology and biblical prophecies proved instrumental also in another respect. They made it possible for protestant authors to introduce military and political leaders of European Protestantism as natural heirs and direct successors of the past heroes. While in England, Frederick of Palatinate, by recalling the belligerent myth of the Black Prince and Henry Stuart, personified the continuity of the English heroic past, in German-speaking Europe protestant propaganda systematically built a myth of an unbroken chain of German warriors fighting Rome, beginning with Arminius and Frederick Barbarossa, whose mission was later taken over by Frederick of Palatinate, Gustavus Adolphus and, after his tragic death on the battlefield, by the new *Hercules Germanicus*, Bernhard of Saxony.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>23</sup> See, above all, R. Haase, *Das Problem des Chiliasmus und der Dreißigjährige Krieg* (Leipzig, 1933), esp. pp. 54–58, 69; C. Gilly, ‘The „Midnight Lion“, The „Eagle“ and The „Antichrist“: Political, religious and chiliastic propaganda in the pamphlets, illustrated broadsheets and ballads of the Thirty Years War’, *Nederlands Archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 80 (2000), pp. 46–77.

<sup>24</sup> As for the image of Bernhard of Saxony as Gustav Adolph’s successor see Johannes Freinsheim, *Teutscher Tugentspiegel, der Gesang von dem Stammen und Thaten deß alten und newen Teutschen Hercules. An den Durchleuchtigen Hochgebornen Fürsten und Herren, Herren Bernharden, Hertzogen zu Sachsen, Gülch Cleve und Berg* (Strasbourg, 1639), p. M2. According to the author ‘bey diesem Helden [Gustavus Adolphus] hat der HERTZOG in dem Krieg, Viel guter stuck gelernt, erhalten manchen Sieg.’ George of Hesse was glorified in a panegyric by Johann Balthasar Schupp, *Hercules Togatus Sive de illustrissimo celsissimosque heroe domino Georgio II. Cattorum Landgravio Comite In Cattimelebo, Decia, Zigenhaina & Nidda &c. Pacificatore pio & prudentissimo* (Marburg, 1640).

Confessional Exile and National Identity:  
The Slovak Case

*Eva Kowalská*

In Early Modern times, confessional exile became one of the most important instruments for solving the situation of “disident” religious groups in various European states.<sup>1</sup> It affected hundreds of thousands of people and changed the demo-

<sup>1</sup> R. Postel, ‘Asyl und Emigration in der Frühen Neuzeit’, in H.W. Eckardt and K. Richter, eds., *Bewahren und berichten. Festschrift für Hans-Dieter Loose zum 60. Geburtstag* (Hamburg, 1997), pp. 201–223. On specific waves of emigrants in Early Modern Europe see A. Dünnwald, *Konfessionsstreit und Verfassungskonflikt. Die Aufnahme der niederländischen Flüchtlinge im Herzogtum Kleve 1566–1585* (Bielefeld, 1998); H. Schilling, *Niederländische Exulanten im 16. Jahrhundert. Ihre Stellung im Sozialgefüge und im religiösen Leben deutscher und englischer Städte* (Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte No. 187, Jahrgang 78–79; Gütersloh, 1972); W.W. Schnabel, *Österreichische Exulanten in oberdeutschen Reichsstädten. Zur Migration von Führungsschichten im 17. Jahrhundert* (München, 1992); L. Bobková, *Exulanti z Prahy a severozápadních Čech v Pirně v letech 1621–1639* (Documenta Pragensia monographia, vol. viii; Praha, 1999); F. Hartweg and S. Jersch-Wenzel, eds., *Die Hugenotten und das Refuge: Deutschland und Europa. Beiträge zu einer Tagung. Einzelveröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission zu Berlin*, Bd. 74 (Berlin, 1990); H. Duchhardt, ed., *Der Exodus der Hugenotten. Die Aufhebung des Edicts von Nantes 1685 als europäisches Ereignis* (Köln – Wien, 1985); A. de Lange,

graphic and settlement situation in various regions.<sup>2</sup> It was a significant phenomenon, not only in social and ecclesiastical contexts, but also in cultural history and the history of mentalities. Therefore, it is possible to suppose that it also significantly influenced the process of forming ethnic communities, whether through the simple fact of the resettlement of a great number of people, short-term disturbance of the social structure of the population or the structures of cultural or educational institutions.

Elimination of people of other confessions (i.e. in the given case of those whose theological teachings differed from those approved by the dominant or state-preferred religion) by deporting them to exile was de facto a progression when compared with the procedures implemented in the Middle Ages – when one was declared to be a heretic, he could easily be condemned to death.<sup>3</sup> Mainly after the end of the 30 Years' War, new provisions were included in the legislation of European countries that made it possible to expel as to their confession “non appropriate” citizens. In addition, the emigration rights in regard to implementing the principle *cuius regio (ius emigrandi)* and the right to accept those who were deportees became part of legislations.<sup>4</sup> The principle of accepting citizens expelled from other countries started to be gradually implemented, regardless of the dominant confession in the host state; economic and political interests outreached confessional borders and deportees were accepted mainly due to their possible contribution in the development of the accepting country. This characteristic marks the exodus of Huguenots to religiously diverse European countries. They inhabited e.g. the

'Die religionspolitische Bedeutung der Ansiedlung der Waldenser in Deutschland 1699 damals und heute', in G. Frank, ed., *Asyl, Toleranz und Religionsfreiheit. Historische Erfahrungen und aktuelle Herausforderungen* (Göttingen, 2000), pp. 140–188.

<sup>2</sup> S. Jersch-Wenzel, 'Hugenotten in Preußen', in A. Demandt, ed., *Mit Fremden leben. Eine Kulturgeschichte von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (München, 1995), pp. 158–171. E. Štěříková, *Z nouze o spásení. Česká emigrace v 18. století do Pruského Slezska* (Praha, 1992). W. Brunner, 'Westungarn als Zuflucht steirischer Glaubensflüchtlinge', *Reformation und Gegenreformation im Pannonischen Raum. Wissenschaftliche Arbeiten aus dem Burgenland (WAB)*, Vol. cii (Eisenstadt, 1999), pp. 107–129.

<sup>3</sup> The principle “comburanbtur” due to which should be burnt all Protestants and disseminators of Reformation implemented into the Hungarian legal system the law from 1523.

<sup>4</sup> Ch.D. Klesch, *Dissertatio de jure peregrinantium*. Jena 1713. The author refers to church fathers Athanasius or Tertulianus as well as Justinianus, Hugo Grotius or Jean Bodine. Klesch defended his dissertation in December, 1680, it was in fact the treatise written by his grandfather from mother's side, Daniel Gruber. See Ch.F. Bartholdi, *Dissertatio de jure principium recipiendi exules fidei socios* (Frankfurt, 1686).

deserted parts of Royal Prussia and contributed in the development of manufacturing in Prussia in general.

Exile itself was a factor disturbing historical continuity and memory, and not supporting the preservation of the ethnic identity of those who did not intend to return to their homelands. A foreign language environment already only gave stimuli for more rapid assimilation.<sup>5</sup> However, on the other hand, it offered the satisfaction of those needs which could not be satisfied at home: freedom of religion, profession and enjoyment of civil rights. In addition, precise confession could be a factor associated, for example, with ethnic origin, and through which consciousness was formulated of belonging to an ethnic group as the bearer of a confessional identity. Members of the Unity of the Brethren (*Unitas Fratrum*) became known as “Czech Brethren” precisely in exile, although a message to the country of origin can also be supposed in this case. Texts testifying to a definite patriotism are known from their environment.<sup>6</sup> In the case of the (Czech and Moravian) Brethren, efforts to preserve confessional and ethnic identity supported each other. The Protestant countries in which they settled were not supporters of full religious freedom, and this strengthened the confessional and so also the ethnic identity of the emigrants.

While the exodus of the Czech Brethren and other Protestants from the Czech Lands involved tens of thousands of people and had significant effects in the home and receiving countries, the confessional exiles from the Kingdom of Hungary were more or less a matter of an elite group, small in number and ethnically heterogeneous. Hungary did not become fixed in the consciousness of the European public as an important “producer” of confessional emigrants. On the contrary, Hungary was for many decades rather a country to which large groups of deportees from Austrian and Czech lands headed.<sup>7</sup> Mainly the large wave of exile to western part of Hungary which is today Western Slovakia after the battle of the White

<sup>5</sup> M. Kraus, ‘Integration und Akkulturation. Eine methodische Annäherung an ein vielschichtiges Phänomen’, in M. Beer, M. Kintzinger and M. Kraus, eds., *Migration und Integration. Aufnahme und Eingliederung im historischen Wandel* (Stuttgart, 1997), pp. 11–25.

<sup>6</sup> E. Maur, ‘Pojetí národa v díle českých pobělohorských exulantů’, in M. Hrubá, ed., *Víra nebo vlast? Exil v českých dějinách raného novověku* (Ústí nad Labem, 2001), pp. 174–183. J. Hanzal, ‘Vlastenectví a kosmopolitismus v českém pobělohorském myšlení a kultuře’, in *Studia Comeniana et Historica*, xix (1986), pp. 54–70.

<sup>7</sup> I. Mrva, ‘Uhorsko, azylová krajina v období novověku’, *Česko-slovenská historická ročenka* (1999), pp. 17–25. P. Kónya, ‘Českí exulanti v Prešove v prvej polovici 17. storočia’, in Hrubá, *Víra nebo vlast?*, pp. 118–131.



Mountain initiated the creation of independent congregations of the Brethren church,<sup>8</sup> which had not been present in the Kingdom of Hungary before and turned into a cultural impulse for Slovak Lutherans. The first groups of authors of Slovak Lutheran writings (Jacob Jakobaeus, Juraj/ Jiří Tranovsky) and printers (Vokal in Trencin) emerged from the environment of Czech emigrants (mainly from those who converted to Lutheranism). In spite of this, the departure of a narrow educated elite of priests and teachers belonging to both Protestant confessions after 1673–74 had important consequences for the whole society of the Kingdom of Hungary. It was combined with an almost complete ban on the practice of the Protestant religion.<sup>9</sup> The domestic population remained without real protection and exposed to pressure from growing re-Catholicization. During the 1670s, this also took forcible forms, and the rural population especially did not have the possibility to resist for long. Application of the principle of the priesthood of all believers as a means to preserve confessional identity even when the public practice of their religion was prohibited, as an exile recommended to the people at home in Hungary,<sup>10</sup> presupposed a basic knowledge of doctrine and at least the ability to read. While in an urban environment, these demands could be fulfilled, the serfs in the countryside had no possibility to resist the arguments and activities of the numerous Catholic missionaries.<sup>11</sup>

The origin of several hundreds of people who left Hungary in the short period from autumn 1673 to May/June 1674 was a result of several judicial trials, which became an instrument for the elimination of the Protestant educated elite. The pretext for this was the discovery of the alleged participation of Protestant clergy of both confessions including superintendents in the preparation and course of a conspiracy led by Palatine György Wesseléni against the monarch and following attempts to negotiate with the Ottomans. From the modern point of view it was a matter of applying the principle of collective guilt. For example, an individual defence at the trial was not allowed. The accused were automatically considered

<sup>8</sup> V. Žbirková, *Reci. Českí bratři v Recí koncom 17. a na začiatku 18. storočia* (Nitra – Reca, 1996).

<sup>9</sup> For a brief account on the period of the „Trauerdekade“ see M. Bucsay, *Der Protestantismus in Ungarn 1521–1978. Ungarns Reformationskirchen in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Vol. I: *Im Zeitalter der Reformation, Gegenreformation und katholischen Reform* (Wien – Köln – Graz, 1977).

<sup>10</sup> D. Klesch, *Treuhertzige Wachter-Stimm* (Jena, 1679), § 17.

<sup>11</sup> On missionaries in Hungary I. Gy. Tóth, ‘Počiatky rekatolizácie na východnom Slovensku (Pôsobenie Jána Vanovicziho a rádu paulínov)’, *Historický časopis*, 1 (2002), pp. 587–606, here 599–602. The same, ‘Katólické misie na území Slovenska v 17. storočí’, in M. Kohútová (ed), *Kresťanstvo v dejinách Slovenska* (Bratislava, 2003), pp. 72–77.

guilty, and rejection of guilt was regarded as an actual confession.<sup>12</sup> The aim of the court, which was also composed exclusively of Catholics, was to achieve a decisive change in the confessional situation in the country and also to weaken the anti-Habsburg opposition, led mainly by Protestants. It used a mechanism, already known and applied in the 1620s in the Czech Lands, where the first step in repression against Protestants was the expulsion of their clergy from Prague.<sup>13</sup> However, in the case of the trials in Hungary, it was a matter of identically formulated verdicts stating that the accused had participated in rebellion. This offence was subject to the death penalty, but in practice, those willing to sign a written confession were granted pardons. The condition was renunciation of office and agreement to withdraw into private life or go into exile. Those who still resisted and refused to sign confessions were condemned to death, but the sentence was commuted to life imprisonment in various Hungarian fortresses. Even in other European countries the well-known group of galley slaves – prisoners sold to the Spanish galleys at Naples, came from these convicts.

The “reversalists”, as those who signed the text of the conviction began to be called, had to leave Hungary and go abroad, outside the territory of the Habsburg Monarchy or to Silesia, within 15 days, a deadline soon increased to a month. The journey was organized by the Hungarian royal chamber, which provided passports and the magistrates of individual towns, who provided transport and armed escorts. It involved larger groups of pastors and teachers, mostly travelling without families, and their departure was a manifestation of Lutheran identity. The exiles were accompanied by crowds of people and touching scenes of parting were usual, although the exiles had strict instructions not to express their status in any way. They were forbidden to sing and pray with their fellow believers or grant them consolation.

Since the repression only affected so-called Royal Hungary, which was under the rule of the Habsburgs, the majority of the accused belonged to the Lutheran

<sup>12</sup> Work on the delegated court S. Némethy, ‘A Delegatum Iudicium Extraordinarium Poseniense anno 1674 története és jogási’. *Theologiai szemle* (1980–1984). K.S. Varga, ed., *Vitetnek ítélőszékére... Az 1674-es gályarabper jegyzőkönyve* (Pozsony, 2002). See also E. Frimmová, ‘Bratislavské mimoriadne súdy v Diariu Joachima Kalinku’, in J. Doruľa, ed., *Obdobie protireformácie v dejinách slovenskej kultúry z hľadiska stredoeurópskeho kontextu (z príležitosti 300. výročia úmrtia Tobiáša Masníka)* (Bratislava, 1998), pp. 93–105.

<sup>13</sup> (Anonym) *Fabianus Natus redivivus seu modesta solutio quaestionis de fuga in persecutione, utrum pastores Bohemici recte fecerint, quod ad mandatum Caesareum Praga excesserint?* (Wittenberg, 1624); (Christianopolis [= Cluj], 1675).

denomination, which predominated in this territory. The decree about appearance before the court was also supposed to apply to the territories occupied by the Turks, but the Ottoman administration took the local clergy under its protection. It was also impossible to hold the trials in Transylvania. Therefore, the ethnic composition of the persecuted corresponded to the composition of the church communities, with pastors from the German and Slovak (“Czech”) Lutheran communities predominant. The ethnic Hungarians mostly belonged to the Calvinists and represented church communities and territories not under the administration of the Turks. At least in the case of the Lutheran clergy, who had very often worked in the linguistically mixed environment typical of the towns and to a lesser extent also of the rural environment, it could be expected that they would be able to apply themselves in the new conditions of their existence. They could be assumed to have good knowledge of the German language, especially if in the case of royal boroughs, appointment of a graduate of a German university, in the best case Wittenberg, as the local pastor, became a question of prestige. The more important towns (e.g. Bratislava, mining towns) were even favoured by natives from various imperial territories and towns. Therefore, at least linguistic knowledge and education could give guarantees for easy application.

In spite of this, exile became a source of frustration for many of them. Those who were not able to preach fluently in German could apply themselves only among Czech exiles or Polish or Lusatian Sorb church communities, but their number was limited. If an applicant for a position in a German community did not acquit himself well and his sermon aroused ridicule or indignation, the negative impression of the “abilities” of preachers from Hungary was transferred to the whole community of exiles. In various polemic texts, the exiles complain that the local German population literally described them as parasites, beggars and potentially dangerous people. However, this was not only a question of a lack of linguistic preparedness, but also of the critical attitude of the exiles towards the situation in Germany. From a certain position of superiority, “of those suffering in the name of Christ” or literally of martyrs, some preachers did not hesitate to sharply admonish the population and clergy in Germany for the inadequacies, which in Hungary resulted in God’s punishment in the form of persecution. On the other hand, mention of people from Hungary as sources of tension and originators of “tumults” became stereotypes in German clerical circles, which points to the possible political results of the case of the Hungarian exiles. This, along with the numerous

reports about the kuruc's uprising under the leadership of Imre Thököli,<sup>14</sup> supported the image of a "rebellious Hungarian" and made it even more firmly rooted in the consciousness of the German public.

However, the social unacceptability of the extent of aid required by various groups of emigrants was a very important factor influencing the attitude of the local population to the exiles from Hungary, as well as from other countries.<sup>15</sup> Though after the 30 Years' War, German towns mostly positively accepted the increase in their population, the groups of foreigners that purposefully separated themselves could have problems with integration into the town environment.<sup>16</sup> The Hungarian exiles publicly claimed their status – not only by their appearance<sup>17</sup> but also by publicly declaring it in occasional written works printed in quite large numbers (preachings, shorter literary works, and the like). In this way they showed that their lot should be considered temporary, in spite of the fact that the actual political situation in their homeland in the second half of the 17th century did not allow any speculations about their return. Even though the groups of Hungarians made up only a small part of the group of migrants moving to German towns, their wives and children needed to be considered as well because they gradually started joining them from the middle of 1674. On the basis of the status of "persecuted in the name of Christ", they all had the right to charitable support from the town and its inhabitants. For example, the town records of Coburg mention 40 exiles from Hungary fully supported by the town in the period 1674–1700.<sup>18</sup> While a number of lay exiles settled in the town for a longer or shorter period, worked as craftsmen, paid municipal taxes and so contributed to the development of the town, six preachers and two teachers only passed through the town and were dependent

<sup>14</sup> B. Köpéczi, *Staatsräson und christliche Solidarität. Die ungarischen Aufstände und Europa in der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Wien – Köln – Graz, 1983).

<sup>15</sup> A. Schunka, 'Exulanten, Konvertiten, Arme und Fremde. Zuwanderer aus der Habsburgermonarchie in Kursachsen im 17. Jahrhundert', *Frühneuzeitinfo*, xiv (2003), Heft 1, pp. 66–78, here 67–69.

<sup>16</sup> A. Schaser, 'Städtische Fremdenpolitik in Deutschland der Frühen Neuzeit', in A. Demandt, ed., *Mit Fremden leben. Eine Kulturgeschichte von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (München, 1995), pp. 137–157.

<sup>17</sup> E.g. Andreas Günther from Hrabušice (Krabschitz), later the pastor in Naumburg ordered his wife and children to wear "Hungarian clothes" during the whole year after his coming to Naumburg in order to fix their image of exiles in eyes of community. J.R. Lademann, *Ein danckender Priester. Wurde an dem Exempel des...Herrn M. Andreas GÜNTHERS...vorgestellet* (Naumburg, 1709), p. 95.

<sup>18</sup> Information about Coburg according to W. Reifig, 'Ungarndeutsche Exulanten in Coburg nach dem Dreißigjährigen Kriege', *Jahrbuch der Coburger Landesstiftung*, xxvii (1982), pp. 109–127. Slovak historiography does not mention the phenomenon of civil or lay exile from Hungary at all.

on contributions from the town treasury and inhabitants throughout their stay. Especially the Silesian and Saxon towns that had already been favoured by deportees from the Czech lands were described as literally overcrowded with exiles from Hungary.<sup>19</sup> Those whose families initially remained at home and those seeking contacts leading to Czech-speaking church communities preferred these towns because of their relatively easy contact with Hungary. However, only a few could succeed against the numerous competition. Therefore, it was not unusual for clergy, who had been successful at home, to have difficulty gaining even occasional invitations to give sermons, which could also be an appropriate source of income if they were published. On the other hand, the local population welcomed “voluntary” activities and sometimes clergy from a linguistically different environment were also appreciated, as in the case of the Pilárik family or Martin Chladný at Görlitz.<sup>20</sup> Special sermons by the former parish pastor from Köszeg (Güns), Stephan Fekete, finally pointed to the importance of the study of language. He praised himself for mastering German in the course of one year to a level at which he was able to compile and present a sermon.

However, the attitude of the German population to the exiles from Hungary was largely determined by disputes, which shook their community. An effort by the already freed “galley slaves”, that is the clergymen and teachers sentenced to imprisonment and sold to the galleys, to exclude from the use of charity those who had agreed in writing at their trials (in the form of the reverse) to withdraw into private life or go into exile, formed the substance of this. The problem was that the reverse also contained a de facto confession that the person had to answer an accusation of participation in a rebellion. However, in the opinion of the “martyrs”, such people renounced the status of clergy, betrayed the faith and should not be recognized as worthy of support as people persecuted for their faith. The two sides carried on their controversy by means of printed polemics, which shaped a negative public opinion of the people from Hungary in general. In my view, the struggle for confessional integrity did not give much space for clear expressions of patriotism

<sup>19</sup> In 1673, Görlitz already had 12 Hungarian preachers and teachers, one of whom, Martinus Chladni is mentioned as a *eigfriger Prediger* who also devoted his attention to teaching children. C.G.Th. Neumann, *Geschichte von Görlitz. Mit einer Ansicht und und einem Situationsplane der Stadt* (Görlitz, 1850), pp. 438–439. *Web- und demüthige Elend-Klage*, p. 10 states that 60–70 exiles lived with their wives and children in Wroclaw at the same time.

<sup>20</sup> From the large Pilárik family, 8 worked as preachers in Germany and Silesia. They were all exiles and victims of persecution. F. v. Schroeder, ‘Die slowakisch-deutsche Predigerfamilie Pilárik’, *Südostdeutsches Archiv*, ix (1966), pp. 65–88.

or a specific ethnic consciousness among the exiles from Hungary, as happened in the Czech case. The authors who mentioned the Kingdom of Hungary in their works were more focused on how to explain to the European public the incomprehensible and rapid changes in the religious situation. At the same time, their exile did not last long enough for them to be able to formulate more comprehensive patriotic works. In the texts containing mentions of homeland, only some words of sorrow over the destiny of the “sweet homeland” could be found, about the homeland that used to flourish and was rewarded by God’s redemptive word.<sup>21</sup> The fact that the country was deprived of this Godly benefit caused its unavoidable decline. The Kingdom of Hungary is used as a warning example to show how far the effects of the “*calamitas principum*” can reach.<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, the international political situation and the development in Hungary itself at the beginning of the 1680s was promising and gave real chances for a relatively quick return of exiles. Therefore they focused in their work more on preparing both the return to their homeland and their future activities there.

The elimination of Protestant priests and teachers from public activity and their subsequent departure mostly to Germany also significantly contributed to a turn in the process of re-Catholicization in Hungary. The domestic population was deprived of its spiritual elite, and it was problematic for it to retain its confessional identity in a period when the public practice of the Protestant confessions was more or less prohibited and re-Catholicization was carried out by force. The forced placing of preachers, the activities of missionaries of opposing confession as well as the organization of quick, mostly mass conversions were only some of the signs that accompanied the re-Catholicization process. A no less important fact was that instead of an educated elite with local roots, spiritual leadership, especially at the beginning, was often entrusted to members of Catholic religious orders from linguistically foreign environments. Understandably, their communication with the faithful was not without problems. For a number of missionaries, the use of interpreters complicated their spiritual work among simple people. However, establishing a network of Catholic schools and funds for poor students created a basis, from which domestic theologians-to-be could be selected.

<sup>21</sup> L. Lucius, *Hungariae lamentatio, Das ist: Klage, Ach und Weh, des Welt-berühmten Königreichs Ungarn* (Wittenberg, 1674).

<sup>22</sup> L. Lucius, *Tuba poenitentialis, oder Buss-Posaune welche Gott durch den Propheten Jeremiam geposaunet* (Wittenberg, 1674). Similar later M. Ritthaler, *Lumen in tenebris* (Wolfenbüttel, 1683).

The re-Catholicization process was not only a simple, though gradual change in the confessional structure of the population. At the same time, the conditions for nation building substantially changed. The given change was very significantly reflected in communication and self-identification. In the case of the Slovak-speaking Catholic population, Catholic authors systematically applied in their pastoral work and publication activity, a different type of language to that used in publications from the earlier period. They began to prefer cultivation of the spoken language of the western Slovak type as a clear distinguishing feature of Slovak-speaking Catholics. The language of the Kralice Bible became a significant confessional symbol of the Lutherans. It had previously been used only as a liturgical language, but with the passage of time, it also became the norm in other types of text such as catechisms, prayer books and hymn books. It was the environment of the former exiles, in which the idea of its codification<sup>23</sup> was initiated. In this way the Slovak Lutherans accepted the Czech language as their “mother” tongue. The extent to which “Bibličtina” was also applied in cultivated private writing such as correspondence is a question for future research. However, this trend can be assumed to have taken place in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. This state of diglosia significantly influenced, however, the process of nation building in later periods.<sup>24</sup>

Continued use of so-called Bibličtina was further strengthened by the fact that it became a link between the “Slovak” clergy working as pastors in Germany with their faithful from exiled Czech communities. The return of the Hungarian exiles from Germany to their homeland after 1681–83 did not mean the interruption of contacts with the communities in which they had lived during their exile. The Slovak Lutherans or their spiritual elite were also, in the later period, conscious of the need to strengthen the Lutheran identity of their fellow believers, exposed to assimilation in the German language environment and diminishing possibilities for contact with the Word of God in their native Czech language. In addition, the existence of Czech Brethren congregations was a challenge for the linguistically close Lutheran exiles from Hungary in terms of helping their integration in the e.g. Saxonian Lutheran environment. The Czech Brethren, who were accepted to incline to Calvinism, were also seen as a challenge for Lutherans to try to get

<sup>23</sup> Tobiáš Masník / Masnicus, the author of grammar *Správa písma slowenského* (1696) was a protagonist of the escape from the transport to the galleys in Naples.

<sup>24</sup> On diglosia M.R. Lauersdorf, ‘Protestant Language Use in 17<sup>th</sup> Century Slovakia in Diglossia Framework’, in P. Žeňuch, ed., *Život slova v dejinách a jazykových vzťahoch. Na sedemdesiatiny profesora Jána Doruľu* (Bratislava, 2003), pp. 49–60.

them integrated in their denomination. Pietism could have been the possible link because it was consciously promoting missionary activities and trying to build contacts with Czech Brethren. One of the prerequisites was the production of necessary literary works, the editing of which was co-coordinated from Halle.<sup>25</sup> The consciousness of connection between the Czech and Slovak Protestants became a significant phenomenon in the development of contacts, for example, through Halle and its publishing activities. Also, it was important in the times after the issuing of the Edict of Tolerance (1781) when the Czech Protestants were defining their confessional identity.<sup>26</sup>

In conclusion, it is possible to state that the emphasis of the Reformation on teaching in people's native language led, as is well-known, to the strengthening of the consciousness of ethnic groups. However, this trend was not unproblematic or irreversible in the Kingdom of Hungary. The intensity and character of the Counter-Reformation not only made the stability of the Protestant churches problematic, but also influenced the processes leading to the formation of ethnic and later also national communities.

<sup>25</sup> H. Rösel, *Die tschechischen Drucke der Hallenser Pietisten* (Marburger Ostforschungen xiv: Würzburg, 1961).

<sup>26</sup> On the contacts between Slovak Lutherans and new Protestant communities in Moravia and Bohemia after 1781 E. Kowalská, 'Heretici, bludáři a prozelyti: formovanie a vnímanie konfesijnej identity českých protestantov po roku 1781', in K. Kubiš, ed., *Obráz drubého v historické perspektivě II. Identity a stereotypy při formování moderní společnosti* (Studia historica LII, AUC Philosophica et historica v: Prague, 1999 / published 2003), pp. 135–146.





Toleration as Principle or Necessity?  
The Case of the British Colonies  
in Seventeenth Century North America

*Svatava Raková*

Central Europe, with its varied mosaic of national and religious groupings and related interests, was not the only locality in the early modern Western world, which saw struggles for the nature of religious life unfold amidst a plurality of religions. The development in Bohemia (and in Central Europe in general) presented only one of several possible models for solving the ever-present conflict between efforts to introduce a monopoly of one faith (which would come to control all areas of spiritual and secular life) and those to encourage religious diversity in a given society (which would be defined by the presence of dissenters, actively involved in the political and economic life of the community). This study aims to present a comparative material from the community in which the above mentioned conflict and its solution helped in finding new answers to the problem of religious plurality and coexistence at the dawn of the modern era.

I wish to focus on British colonial settlements in North America. In the seventeenth century, these settlements reflected the situation in Europe, marked by a relatively homogenous culture but divided in matters of religious faith. They were split into numerous churches, including the Catholic church on the one hand and a number of mutually-suspicious and hostile Protestant denominations and dissenting individuals.<sup>1</sup> A large part of the immigrant population sought a safe haven from religious persecutions. Indeed, it is a well-known fact that some colonies were founded as asylums for religious dissenters. This does not mean, however, that at the beginning of the colonization process, the founders, i.e. the crown or the Proprietors, or even the majority of new immigrants saw America as a place defined by religious tolerance, peaceful coexistence and respect to one's choice of religious faith. New settlers came from a condition marked by intolerance, by nuanced theological confrontations, bloodshed and exile. This cultural and mental baggage was an indelible part of their value system, one which they carried with them to their new home. The settlers wished to live according to their own ideas and to avoid struggling with religious dissenters – in fact to create the same religious environment they had escaped from. None of the main sects or churches, which settled on the American soil after 1620, not even those which later came to be famed for their openness to religious plurality (such as the Society of Friends a.k.a. Quakers), set out with religious tolerance as part of their program. Groups and individuals that professed other faiths, both in America and in war-torn Europe, were seen as a hostile and undesirable element. It was up to the strategy of the ruling elite to decide whether they would accept them into their communities.

Before giving examples of such strategies, I wish to set aside the question of nationality, which – in the context of European development in the 17<sup>th</sup> century – is seen as related to religious identity. Here, we can only say that at least in the early years of British America (and unlike the 18<sup>th</sup> century), individual Protestant denominations were not identified with national churches. Many Scotsmen, for example, whom one might expect to be Presbyterian, in fact identified themselves

<sup>1</sup> Religious life in early colonial America has attracted interest of many historians, who, for the most part, focused on individual faith communities in the New World. New England Puritans have been the most studied, also as an excellent example of permeation of religious, social and cultural features. One of the best surveys, which is also an excellent comparative analytical study, remains D.D. Hall, *Religion and Society: Problems and Reconsiderations*, in Jack P. Greene, J.R. Pole, eds., *Colonial British America. Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era* (Baltimore – London, 1984), pp. 317–344.

as Quakers, as the example of the “Scottish province” New Jersey has made clear.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, the Irish were not all Catholics, even if many pioneers in the Catholic Maryland had Irish connections.<sup>3</sup> German Lutherans were present from the beginning of the European “invasion,” but they did not become a minority in the sociological sense of the word until group immigration from Frankonia to Pennsylvania took place.<sup>4</sup> And although the French Huguenot immigration after 1685 kept a very strong cultural identity, its religious identity dissolved in the majority population of the respective colonies.<sup>5</sup> The only political articulation of religious-national struggle could be seen in New Netherland – between the Dutch and English in New York after 1664. But, as I will show in detail below, the solution to the problem of multi-religious coexistence in this authoritatively ruled “Duke’s” colony turned out to be subsumed under the much larger topic of political emancipation. On the whole, until the turn of the 17<sup>th</sup> century political monopoly resided in the hands of the English while religious dissent surfaced in the colonies, without being necessarily connected with nationality (or language).

It has already been said that new immigrants, whether motivated by faith, adventure or wish for better life, did not seek religious toleration. However, denominations seeking asylum as well as possibility to live out their doctrinal and social ideals were soon confronted by the reality that many, or even the majority of the society, did not share their faith. Of these, the most famous were the congregationalists (Puritans) in New England and their biblical City upon on a

<sup>2</sup> For more information about the participation of Scottish Quakers in early colonization efforts, see J.E. Pomfret, *The Province of East New Jersey, 1609–1702: The Rebelious Proprietary* (Princeton, 1962), p. 130n.; Eadem, *The Province of West New Jersey, 1606–1702: A History of Origins of an American Colony* (Princeton, 1956), p. 120n.; also the introduction to N.C. Landsman, *Scotland and Its First American Colony, 1683–1760* (Princeton, 1985).

<sup>3</sup> R.R. Menard, Immigrants and Their Increase: The Process of Population Growth in Early Colonial Maryland, in Aubrey C. Land – Lois Green Carr – Edward C. Papenfuse, eds., *Law, Politics and Society in Early Maryland* (Baltimore, 1977), pp. 64–81.

<sup>4</sup> For a discussion regarding the beginnings of German migration to Pennsylvania, see S. Schwartz, „A Mixed Multitude”: *The Struggle for Toleration in Colonial Pennsylvania* (New York – London, 1987), p. 26n. The author of the basic modern study of the origins of Pennsylvania, G. Nash, ignored the German element completely (G.B. Nash, *Quakers and Politics: Pennsylvania, 1681–1720* (Princeton, 1968), chapter The Structure of Immigrating Society, pp. 49–56); even the name of the leader of the first wave of immigrants, Daniel Pistorius, mentioned in the political context, is mangled (pp. 65, 85).

<sup>5</sup> L.B. Wright, *The Cultural Life of the American Colonies, 1607–1763* (New York – London, 1957), pp. 55–51–57.

hill and Society of Friends in Pennsylvania and New Jersey and their Realm of the Holy Spirit.

Puritans, Quakers and even Catholics, to whom Charles I granted a charter for Maryland, held a minority position in “their” colonies almost from the beginning. And during the Stuart Restoration Lutherans, Huguenots, Presbyterians, Baptists, Quakers, and members and ardent propagandists of various other Protestant denominations from England and continental Europe streamed into “secular”, Anglican colonies – Virginia, both Carolinas, and the West Indies, which were originally religiously uniform. In addition, the first Jewish diaspora appeared in the Atlantic harbors in the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>6</sup>

As a rule, British settlers in America chose between two basic approaches to the question of secularization of faith that defined and regulated the relationship between religious activities and concerns of everyday life. On the one hand, people who had experienced persecution wished to enforce for themselves and their co-religionists either a completely exclusive position (Puritans, Plymouth independents) or at least a dominant one (Quakers, Maryland Catholics). On the other hand, they were aware of the existential necessity to reconcile themselves with the presence of dissenters, with whom as white Europeans they after all shared numerous ideals, cultural values and patterns of life. Those very same ideals and values fundamentally separated them from native “savagedom.” The European confessional gap between “us” and “them” gained in America yet another dimension. I would present three case studies in order to illustrate the different ways of resolving this internal conflict in the so-called faith colonies, that is, settlements founded as havens for a specific faith or denomination. These three case studies are New England Puritans, Maryland Catholics and Quakers in West Jersey. In my analysis of the different solutions, I will focus on constitutional law, with special attention to normative texts of constitutional nature, taking note both of their letter and of their spirit and also considering *ad hoc* laws for extraordinary circumstances. I will not address questions of practical application of these written but also customary laws nor will I consider social implications of religious coexistence and discrimination in specific communities, families or churches.

The Great Migration of Puritans to New England has traditionally been understood as the best example of organized migration, organized with the goal

<sup>6</sup> The beginnings of Jewish presence were discussed in S. Oppenheim, *The Early History of Jews in New York, 1654–1664* (New York, 1909).

of gaining religious monopoly.<sup>7</sup> The realities of settlements in New England can be best described using the denominational paradigm even though allowances would have to be made for the strict separation between spiritual and secular powers and for extensive congregational autonomy. However, modern historians tend to think that secular and political reasons, rather than Puritan doctrinal despotism, were to blame for the wave of persecutions of non-conformists and Antinomians in 1630s.<sup>8</sup> Boston's *establishment* feared punitive expeditions from London in case that the colony would entirely abandon Anglicanism, and rightly so. Thus, dogmatic conflicts were accompanied by personal struggles for positions in the colonial management and for influence in the major congregations.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, the stigma of fanatical intolerance, clearly evidenced by the executions of four Quaker missionaries, was a mainstay in American historiography of early New England Puritanism since the dawn of the so-called progressive school at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This final verdict seemed to be confirmed beyond all dispute by Salem's witch trials, popularized in 19<sup>th</sup> century literature and 20<sup>th</sup> century film.

The interpretation of early New England as a community that was relatively permissive, that allowed different forms of Protestantism to flourish and that, given their numerical weakness, avoided searching out and persecution of potential heretics, is not common even in recent American historiography. However, this view is shared by leading historians, especially students of comparative typologies, for example Edmund Morgan or Timothy Breen who noted the existence of Presbyterian congregations in New England since its foundation.<sup>10</sup> Before we draw

<sup>7</sup> This tradition was based on the glorifying filioipietistic school; however, it was a wave of anti-Puritan, liberal works at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> century that supported the idea of New England religious totalitarianism. (Brooks Adams, James Truslow Adams, Thomas Wertenbaker).

<sup>8</sup> On the role of security concerns in the attitude of Boston's municipal authorities on matters of orthodoxy and tolerance, see for example, F. Bremer, *The Puritan Experiment: New England Society from Bradford to Edwards*, rev. ed. (Hanover – London, 1995), pp. 71–72, also, R.E. Wall Jr., *Massachusetts Bay: The Crucial Decade, 1640–1650* (New Haven – London, 1972), p. 33.

<sup>9</sup> Records of Massachusetts governor, John Winthrop, offer abundant proof of secular as well as religious loyalty of Puritan Boston to the crown, especially in 1630s. See S. Raková, *Souboj hada s myší: realita, ideologie a sebepojekce v deníku Johna Winthropa*, in J. Mikulec, M. Polívka, eds., *Per saecula ad tempora nostra. Sborník k 60. narozeninám profesora Jaroslava Pánka*, vol. 2 (Praha, 2007), pp. 555–564, esp. p. 558.

<sup>10</sup> E.S. Morgan, *New England Puritanism: Another Approach*, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 18 (1961), no. 2, pp. 236–242; T.H. Breen, 'Persistent Localism: English Social Change and the Shaping of New England Institutions', *William and Mary Quarterly*, xxxii (1975), no. 1, pp. 3–28.

conclusions, let us examine legal and normative texts, specifically tracing their view of mandatory religion, dissent and potential for religious toleration.

The eminently influential text of American Puritanism (though not being a legally-binding document) was the well-known sermon *A Modell of Christian Charity*, composed and proclaimed by John Winthrop in summer 1630 on the deck of *Arbella*, the flagship of the first Puritan expedition into the New World.<sup>11</sup> The sermon was supposed to present to the listeners a vision of the biblical “City upon hill,” the exemplary Christian community, which the Puritans intended to build in America. The future governor of Massachusetts, however, conceived the document as a practical manual for solving thorny issues of neighborly Christian coexistence. He wished to offer guidance for those cases when, owing to the human nature, the commands for compassion and charity seem endangered by material interests or by desire for self-preservation. The opening sentence of the sermon was, somewhat surprisingly, framed as an axiom; Winthrop subverted the expectations of his listeners that in the New World the principle of Christian charity and solidarity would mean social and material equality: “God Almightye in his most holy and wise providence hath soe disposed of the Condiçion of mankinde, as in all times some must be rich some poore, some highe and eminent in power and dignitie; others meane and in subieccion.”<sup>12</sup>

In what followed, Winthrop offered practical advice for how to be successful while living in accordance with the demands of one’s faith in the world of hierarchy, inequality and divisions. He advocated that people rely on their own strengths, save for the future, remember bad times and offer only such social aid that would not threaten “comfortable subsistence” of the donor and his family. This was because poverty was seen as weakening the entire community and as a possible source of various “Godless” behaviors.<sup>13</sup> Love for one’s neighbor was for Winthrop not an emotion, however ideal, but an organizational principle of the complex fabric of relationships in a modern hierarchical and bourgeois society, which – acting in its own interest – must fold the merchant and entrepreneurial instincts

<sup>11</sup> Direct quotations taken from D.A. Hollinger, C. Capper, eds., *The American Intellectual Tradition*, Vol. I: 1630–1865, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York – Oxford, 1993), pp. 1–16.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>13</sup> Answers to the first three questions regarding expressions of Christian love (gifts, loans, forgiveness) (*ibid.*, p. 8). Winthrop recommended judicious restraint also in the matter of loans; if „thy brother“ is not able to repay the loan, then „thou must giue him according to his necessity, rather then lend as hee requires“ (*ibid.*, p. 9).

into public morality. Hundred or more years later, Adam Smith based his theory of early capitalism on a similarly dual principle, when he preceded his economic theory described in the *Wealth of Nations* by an ethical discourse of the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*.

Puritan rules of community life did not require that social and material situation of individuals be subjugated to the ideals of biblical equality or asceticism; on the contrary, they presupposed (and possibly anticipated) a great deal of individual entrepreneurship. This condition allowed numerous religious dissenters integrate easily into the community, morally governed and often even personally ruled by Puritan “Saints.” They were even welcomed to attend town councils, which were open to all community members, and invited to voice their opinions.<sup>14</sup> The existence of non-Puritan majority and the necessity to cooperate with it were taken into consideration in the drafting of legal documents, which already possessed some features of constitution, being at the same time compendia of most important laws. The covenants, which regulated the life in individual communities, set legal and constitutional standards at the founding of new towns in New England, in which they supplanted the more common royal charters.

The oldest of these covenants, *Fundamental Orders* of the Puritan colony Connecticut dated to 1639, is often seen as the first constitution written in what would become United States of America.<sup>15</sup> Individual sections worked out the system of representative government, defined powers of its individual branches, set rules regarding elections and defined the manner in which taxes were to be imposed and collected, all of this in great detail. However, none of the articles addressed matters of faith. This rather conspicuous absence can be explained by several circumstances. Dissenting (Puritan) communities, especially in their early years, were careful not to mention any doctrinal or liturgical deviations from the state (Anglican) church in their public documents nor did they limit the autonomy

<sup>14</sup> Discussions about political qualification occupied American historiography especially in the 1960s and 1970s, see for example, S. Foster, ‘The Franchise in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts’, *William and Mary Quarterly*, xxiv (1967), no. 4, pp. 613–623; T.H. Breen, ‘Who Governs: The Town Franchise in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts’, *William and Mary Quarterly*, xxvii (1970), no. 3, pp. 460–474; B.K. Brown, ‘The Controversy over the Franchise in Puritan Massachusetts, 1654 to 1674’, *William and Mary Quarterly*, xxxiii (1976) no. 2, pp. 212–241; A.I. Ginsburg, ‘The Franchise in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts: Ipswich’, *William and Mary Quarterly*, xxxiv (1977), no. 3, pp. 446–452.

<sup>15</sup> S.L. Schlechter, ed., *Roots of the Republic: American Founding Documents Interpreted* (Madison, 1990), pp. 22–35.



of individual congregations, one of the fundamental features of Calvinist churches. No less significant was the fact that original New England covenants were understood as tools for regulating communal government and administration, rather than as offering a definition or even guarantee of individual freedoms. The need for normative rules of religious life coincided with the legalization and politization of different Protestant dissenting movements and sects, which were increasingly prevalent in England during the Revolution, Civil War and Interregnum, and found its reflection in overseas settlements. This stage was followed by a relative liberalization of the church establishment.

The new situation was reflected especially in relevant legal/constitutional documents of the second wave of colonization after 1660; nevertheless, the Massachusetts' *The Book of the General Lawes and Libertyes Concerning the Inhabitants of the Massachusetts* from 1648 already included some specific rules defining religious coexistence. The emergence of the oldest legal codex in British America, which took three years to assemble and which was based on an entire pyramid of legal digests from county level to the level of Assembly, was concluded with a collection of 121 unnumbered, alphabetically arranged articles (clauses). In relation to the earlier legal statutes, this was a collection of the most important constitutional and legal norms of the colony (criminal law was represented only selectively),<sup>16</sup> which also considered the relationship between church and state (community), unlike the covenants, which were instrumentally practical.

The creation and resulting shape of the Code was, undoubtedly, influenced by the advancement of England's Civil War, which elevated the Puritans from the position of outsiders in the kingdom to a dominant group on the political scene. However, the position of the Saints was not strengthened by this development. Rather, the Revolution brought into the Puritan colonies radical sectarianism and also republican demands for general validity of the "rights of English subjects". At stake was implementation of property census (valid in England) and religious tolerance in face of various Protestant dissent.<sup>17</sup> In the Massachusetts Code, it was

<sup>16</sup> T.G. Barnes, ed., *The Book of General Lawes and Libertyes Concerning the Inhabitants of the Massachusetts* (San Marino, 1975). Of the first collection of Massachusetts laws (Body of Liberties), composed by lawyer, reverend Nathaniel Ward, which contained a hundred most important laws, 86 were adopted into the codex with hardly any change.

<sup>17</sup> At the time when the codex was being debated in the assembly committee, the Boston municipality had to face protest petitions from rebels around Samuel Gorton; more in P.F. Gura, 'The Radical Ideology of Samuel Gorton: New Light on the Relation of English to American Puritanism', *William and Mary Quarterly*, xxxvi (1979), no. 1, p. 78–100. Gorton, himself a radical Puritan close to the

the article *Ecclesiasticall*, divided into sixteen sections, which dealt with the questions of tolerance.<sup>18</sup> The very first section defined the limits of freedom of religious organization: all inhabitants “ortodox in judgement and not scandalous in life” had the right to congregate in churches (congregations), providing that their intention was approved by ruling authorities of the colony; the content of their orthodoxy was not specified in any way. Congregations that had been approved by General Court then made independent decisions about its religious life: they were allowed to lead their own worship services in accordance with their own judgment, appoint and ordain their spiritual leaders, regulate morals in the congregation, accept and excommunicate members, convene conferences or councils regarding pressing questions of faith. They were also allowed to appoint special days of prayer, fasting or thanksgiving. A special paragraph protected churches as well as individuals from secular interventions in matters of doctrine, liturgy and morals.

This congregational autonomy did not affect legal relationships nor civic privileges of individuals. Dignitaries as well as common members were subject to common law and to laws of the assembly, including criminal procedures. And, in case of legal proceedings, their position in the church was not to benefit them unduly. The law also expressly stated that a congregation might not ban any citizen from the performance of secular duty. Special institution of spiritual conferences was introduced in order to prevent possible conflicts inside congregations; they were to convene every month “when the season will bear it.” In addition, there were also regular meetings of elders of several congregations with the faithful. Essentially, these were the spiritual equivalent of famous town meetings, during which anyone was welcome to express his opinion, disagreement, critique or to make a proposal regarding any matter of church business. This measure was supposed to help eradicate the frequent interruptions of preaching and worship services. Shouting and mocking commentary were a common occurrence in the emotionally charged air of early Puritan worship services, and the law stipulated that first the disturbers should be brushed down by admonishment and then “they shall either pay five pounds to the publick Treasurie; or stand two hours openly upon a block or stool, four foot high on a lecture day with a paper fixed

circle of chaplains from Cromwell’s „New Army“ demanded religious freedom for different sects according to the English model, and, especially, the abolishment of the principle of voting based on evidence of religious maturity („sanctity“).

<sup>18</sup> Barnes, *The Book of the General Lawes*, pp. 18–20 (pagination in accordance with the facsimile).

on his breast, written in capital letters AN OPEN AND OBSTINATE CONTEMNER OF GODS HOLY ORDINANCES.”<sup>19</sup>

Besides the relatively modest two-page text of the “Ecclesiasticall” article, this first Code of laws of Massachusetts, a colony which became almost synonymous with religious frenzy and fanaticism, devoted to matters of church and faith only a brief paragraph called simply “Jesuits.”<sup>20</sup> In the spirit of Elizabethan laws against Catholics it advocates vigilance against this much-feared religious order. This attitude was motivated, in America as in England, not by doctrinal animosity but by state interest. In the introduction, the authors pointed to “great wars, combustions and divisions which are this day in Europe” and to the role of the Disciples of Jesus in their foment. With the prospect of protecting the colony from divisive influence of the “men brought up and devoted to the religion and court of Rome,” the Boston assembly, pointing to the example of other states (“divers states expell them”), promulgated the same measure in 1647, that is complete ban on entry of Jesuits into the colony. Persons suspected of belonging to the order, which in Protestant Europe was synonymous with secret conspiracies and behind-the-scenes intrigues orchestrated by the papal curia, were to be incarcerated and expelled after a legal trial. In case of repeated returns to the colony, the death penalty followed. However, Puritan entrepreneurs, who were eminently practical, made sure that members of official missions or victims of shipwrecks as well as merchants and members of ship crews were excluded from this measure. Nevertheless, Jesuits thus found themselves to be the only group in the system of New English colonial law who faced legal discrimination for religious reasons, and not only because of their affiliation to a faith, but because they were suspected of organized subversive activities against the state. On the other hand, activities of individual Protestant denominations or orthodox Anglicans, or the mere presence of Catholic faithful were not limited by any such statute.

The extraordinary solidification of power of Puritans and Presbyterians in revolutionary England increased their prestige and power more in southern colonies, in which they previously belonged to a tolerated minority. Anglican Virginia, where the majority of population continued to be loyal to Stuart kings, is a good example. Another is Maryland, which was administered by Catholic proprietors but contained numerous Protestants of different denominations. The

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 26.

Calverts could not expect the followers of their “papist” faith to have any kind of special position or political advantages, and they did not seek them. The Maryland’s charter from 1632, appealing to the freedoms granted in Magna Charta and quoting whole passages from the colonial privileges of Durham bishops, pioneers of the Scottish Border colonization, ensured strict equality of faiths: It granted that “no interpretation is made by which God’s true and holy Christian religion ... would suffer any prejudice diminution or curtailment” without closer stipulation as to which of the branches of contemporary Christianity is meant.<sup>21</sup> The *Acts of Ordinance* granted a true extent of religious toleration. These laws were passed by Maryland Assembly in 1639, after it rejected statutes compiled by George Calvert, the proprietor. Assembly representatives even left out any mention of Christianity from the statement granting the church (the original plural “churches” was subsequently corrected) and all inhabitants “all rights and liberties;” given the fact that several of the representatives were Jews, we can conclude that the absence of a modifier was not entirely a coincidence.<sup>22</sup>

In the course of 1640s, a great number of Puritans from Virginia and also from England streamed into Maryland, which was not cohesive but which was, in fact, confessionally very divided. It was the Puritans, who launched anti-Catholic agitation and changed the country into a battlefield of competing religious factions. In order to prevent an impending civil war, the Assembly – which was religiously mixed – in cooperation with Cecil Calvert, lord Baltimore, passed a law granting religious toleration in 1649, in the year of king Charles’s execution and one year after the peace of Westphalia.<sup>23</sup> The majority of Protestant representatives and

<sup>21</sup> T. O’Brien Hanley, ‘Church and State in Maryland in the Maryland Ordinance of 1639’, *Church History*, xxvi (1957), no. 4, pp. 325–341, p. 330. The author points to the divalence of the term „true and holy religion“, which, in England, was used to describe the state church. But in the context of Durham privileges, the interpretation depended on the view of the Baltimores and especially of the Maryland assembly. Virginia’s complaints about Maryland’s religious liberalism, which stemmed from colonial rivalries, did not use doctrinal orthodoxy as its main argument, but rather pointed to the danger of the Catholic-Spanish connection.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 337; also, W. Hand Brown et al., eds., *The Calvert Papers No. 1*, (Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, 1889), p. 83 (on religious freedom in the Act of Ordinance).

<sup>23</sup> Act Concerning Religion (*Maryland Toleration Act*) of 1649, Archives of Maryland, (Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, 1883), pp. 244–247. About the circumstances of the legislation and about the religious policy of the Calverts, see D.D. Jordan, ‘„The Miracle of This Age“: Maryland’s Experiment in Religious Toleration, 1649–1689’, *The Historian*, xlvii (1985), pp. 338–350; J.D. Krugler, ‘„With Promise of Liberty in Religion“: The Catholic Lords of Baltimore and Toleration in Seventeenth Century Maryland’, *Maryland Historical Magazine*, lxxix (1984), pp. 21–43.

the fact that the governor was of Anglican faith were made evident in the disparity in punishments for blasphemy, which opened the text of the law: for denying the divinity of Jesus Christ or the Holy Trinity the law demanded death penalty, but insulting Virgin Mary, apostles or Catholic saints cost only five pounds or, in some cases, flogging. However, the subsequent codification of the religious rules did not show any signs of partiality. The law – with typical contemporary thoroughness – listed all the possible names and attributions, which inhabitants, merchants and visitors in the colony were not permitted to use “in reproachful manner” to describe another person, under the penalty of property confiscation: “heretick, Schismatick, Idolator, purotan, Independant, Prespiterian popish prest, Jesuite, Jesuited papist, Lutheran, Calvenist, Anabaptist, Brownist, Antinomian, Barrowist, Roundhead, Sepatist, or any other name or terme ... relating to matter of Religion”.<sup>24</sup> This lengthy, yet not exhaustive, list underscores how fragmented and diverse was the environment in which colonial elites had to look for and identify strategies for religious consensus. The last part of the law attempted to solve this situation in an uncharacteristically radical manner: under the threat of property and physical punishments, lawgivers forbade persecution for religious reasons of anyone and in any way. The only limit of toleration, in the spirit of the founding charter, was faith in Jesus Christ, which, however, the faithful were free to profess and practice as they wished. With the exception of Puritan government between 1653–1657, Maryland under the Baltimores boasted absolute equality between Catholics and Protestants, at least in the legal sense.<sup>25</sup>

This extraordinary legal act can be on the one hand seen as an exemplary expression of “tolerance from necessity” František Šmahel spoke about in describing the situation in 14<sup>th</sup> century Bohemia.<sup>26</sup> The ruling Catholic elite was surrounded by a Protestant majority, and the Baltimores in London had to skillfully maneuver in order to protect their unique colonial enclave during parliamentary reign. This broad-minded (though ultimately unsuccessful) attempt to find reconciliation was

<sup>24</sup> *The Maryland Act of Toleration* of 1649, p. 245.

<sup>25</sup> Jordan, „The Miracle of This Age“, p. 346n. The Toleration Act was abolished by the Protestant assembly elected in 1653, which in 1654 excluded the Catholics according to the model of London's Instruments of Government; religious freedom was renewed in so-called Proprietor's parliament elected after confirmation of Baltimore's rights in 1658 (D.D. Jordan, *Foundations of Representative Government in Maryland, 1632–1715* (Cambridge, U.K., 1987), pp. 56–57).

<sup>26</sup> F. Šmahel, Svoboda slova, svatá válka a tolerance z nutnosti v husitském období, *Český časopis historický*, xcii (1994), pp. 644–679, especially p. 645. The study tracks the development of confessional attitudes until the religious reconciliation of 1485.

undoubtedly dictated by instincts of self-preservation. Nevertheless, it seems that in its motivation, at least, it is possible to recognize a certain attempt to consciously obliterate collective “instinctive phobias.” Among them, Šmahel classified also religious intolerance. Both sides were free to resolve any confused or explosive situation through a direct confrontation, one in which both would rely on their advantages: Catholics on the transatlantic support of Proprietary laws, Protestants on their superior numbers, political power and military advantage. Although Maryland did not in the end escape civil war (which struck in 1650s), historians have described its laws as a culminating point of early liberalism in matters of faith and as a radical step in the direction of “privatization of conscience”, reached one century later in the revolutionary demand for separation of church and state.<sup>27</sup>

The example of Maryland shows that individual colonies, founded as religious havens, developed heterogeneous religious conditions in fundamentally different ways. Naturally, the representatives of relatively more homogenous New England did not have a reason to pass similar explicit toleration laws, especially at a time, when the metropolis was governed by their co-religionists. Yet it seemed that the level of mutual intolerance among the Protestant denominations often outweighed the hatred for Roman Catholics, even in the colonies. When it came to religious toleration in the tension-filled atmosphere at the end of the Protectorate, Puritan “fanatics” from Massachusetts behaved the same way as religiously lukewarm and secular Anglicans who ruled Virginia and the West Indies. The death penalty for Quakers (who openly dissented) which was passed by the Boston assembly in 1658 by one vote and which remained valid for only a very short time, became a notorious symbol of Puritan bigotry and intolerance. However, the fact that Quakers in Virginia were treated only slightly better is known only by a handful of specialists. The governor of Virginia and the courts were determined to get rid of the sectarians who refused to swear oaths, serve in the militia and forgo their secret societies. They began to take advantage of existing statutes against non-conformists, and eventually passed a similarly stringent law against them in 1658, which remained valid even longer than in Boston. Death penalty was changed to exile, but as is evident from the example of preacher

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., p. 54n.

George Wilson and his colleagues, in practice Quaker missionaries did disappear without a trace and without appeal in the Jamestown prison.<sup>28</sup>

The efforts to defuse and extinguish sectarian conflicts, which accompanied the return of the Stuart dynasty, imprinted colonial documents after 1660 with a peculiar seal of religious toleration. Renewed interest in overseas commerce led to the founding of several proprietary settlements, whose owners governed themselves in accordance with the rules of sound entrepreneurship and commercial success, which they did not want to endanger by religious prescriptions. Possibly the best known example of liberal solution was the document known as *The Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina* from 1669, put together by one of the Carolina owners Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, in cooperation with John Locke.<sup>29</sup> As a condition for obtaining full citizenship and acquiring property, the constitution required faith in God, which was not defined any further. Monetary grants of the colonial assembly were supposed to be directed at the support of “only true and orthodox and the national religion of all the King’s dominions” – state Anglicanism (article 95 and 96).<sup>30</sup> On the other hand, the proprietors clearly predicted a future diversity of confessions, as necessary and beneficial to the success of the colonial enterprise. Article 97 stated that “those who remove from other parts to plant there will unavoidably be of different opinions concerning matters of religion, the liberty whereof they will expect to have allowed them, and it will not be reasonable for us, on this account, to keep them out”.<sup>31</sup> The establishment of a state of law and of civilized conditions was privileged before doctrinal ambitions and considerations; a welcome colonist was he, who abided by the 120 articles of the constitution, which set out rules for political and social life and which, according to the authors, would anyway lead the colonist sooner or later into the arms of the true church.<sup>32</sup> But, before such

<sup>28</sup> W.M. Billings, ‘A Quaker in Seventeenth-Century Virginia: Four Remonstrances by George Wilson’, *William and Mary Quarterly*, xxxiii (1976), no. 1, pp. 127–140.

<sup>29</sup> The Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina, in: W.L. Saunders, ed., *The Colonial Records of North Carolina*, vol. 1 (1662 to 1712) (Raleigh, 1886; reprint New York, 1968), pp. 187–205; also accessible on Avalon, an electronic editorial project of Yale University: <http://www.yale.edu/lewweb/avalon/states/nc05.htm>, from which I cite below.

<sup>30</sup> The Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina, <http://www.yale.edu/lewweb/avalon/states/nc05.htm>, p. 15; *The Colonial Records*, p. 202.

<sup>31</sup> The Fundamental Constitutions, p. 15.

<sup>32</sup> Native American were to be treated with the same kind of toleration („the natives, who...are utterly strangers to Christianity, whose idolatry, ignorance, or mistake gives us no right to expell or

a conversion could take place, any group of at least seven members, “agreeing in any religion” could found its own church and call it whatever they wished, in order to “to distinguish it from others”.<sup>33</sup> Carolina was typical example of a southern colony, religiously lukewarm, whose owners were for the most part indifferent to the religious faith of the settlers. After all, the commercial and civic comfort and future prosperity depended on those very settlers.

However, the principle of toleration was even professed by the owners of territories which were supposed to fulfill goals inspired by a very specific faith and by religious and social visions. After the English took over New Netherlands, the first constitutional-legal document in one part of the territory called New Caesarea or New Jersey (which James Stuart, duke of York, enfeoffed to aristocratic entrepreneurs George Carteret and John Berkeley) was a document called *Concessions and Agreements* from 1664 which regulated relationships between lords-proprietors and future settlers.<sup>34</sup> Rules for religious life were set out in the sixth article of the text, right after the proclamation of basic legal and property privileges. The rules privileged civic qualities over religious qualifications, even more so than Locke’s Carolina constitution: if a settler had sworn an oath of loyalty to the king, he was not to be in any way persecuted for his religious opinions or practice nor be interrogated on such questions. On the contrary, he was free to profess any faith he wished and conduct rites connected to it, as long as he did not subvert public order or accepted customs.<sup>35</sup> The first Jersey Concessions and Carolina’s Constitution were marked by the spirit of Locke’s liberalism, respecting the right for own profession of faith as one of the basic liberties of English subjects.<sup>36</sup>

use them ill“); the same held true for Jews, heathens and other dissenters, („that, Jews, heathens and other dissenters from the purity of religion may not be scared and kept at a distance from it, but...by gentleness and meekness...be won to embrace and unfeignedly receive the truth“; *ibid.*, p. 15, 16).

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16. Article 100 granted liturgical freedom („in any other sensible way“), on the condition of public worship services.

<sup>34</sup> The Concessions and Agreements of the Lords Proprietors of the Province of New Caesarea, or New Jersey; to and With All and Every the Adventurers and All Such as Shall Settle or Plant There, <http://www.yale.edu.lewweb/avalon/states/nj02.htm>.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.

<sup>36</sup> The view that Carolina’s constitution from 1669 could be seen as a practical model of Locke’s applied constitutional liberalism has recently been discussed by historians, who underscored the plurality of roots of the early American constitution. Carolina’s context emphasized especially inspiration by the republican theory of civic virtues of James Harrington, see V. Hsueh, ‘Giving Orders: Practice in the Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, lxiii,



What was remarkable was however the fact that Quakers, who in 1674 acquired control over western part of Jersey and intended to create there a model for future ideal city of the Society of Friends, not only kept this tolerant model but even justified it by modern emancipatory philosophy. In 1677, *Concessions and Agreements of West Jersey* were promulgated. Interestingly, many important Quakers entrepreneurs and lawyers, among them William Penn, participated in their composition.<sup>37</sup> The document contained elaborate system of representation, based upon the theory of mixed government and division of power long before Charles Montesquieu should resurrect this ancient political concept, and anticipated the principles of later federal Constitution of the Union and its First Amendment. Article sixteen, related to matters of religion, granted freedom of religion and faith to an extent that was certainly not dictated by tolerance from necessity, but was rather influenced by Penn's deep sense that having internal relationship with God was the most important, and allegedly also by his sympathies to Catholicism.<sup>38</sup>

Two sentences sufficed to the authors of *Concessions* to express the fundamentals of the basic modern human liberties. In the introduction, they stated that “no Meen, or number of Men upon Earth, hath Power or Authority to rule over Men's Consciences in religious Matters”, and therefore it had to be made sure that no one – neither individual nor group (Person or Persons) – “any ways upon any pretence was called in Question, or in the least punished or hurt, either in Person, Estate, or Privilege, for the sake of his Opinion, Judgment, Faith or Worship towards God in Matters of Religion.” This principle was applicable “at any Time or Times hereafter” and “throughout the said Province.” The second sentence confirmed the principle of toleration by positive statement – full citizens of the colony (freeholders) could “freely and fully have, and enjoy his and their Judgements, and the exercise of their Consciences in Matters of religious Worship”.<sup>39</sup> While Maryland's law from 1649 still put all the faithful under the

2002, no. 3, p. 425–446. It was Bernard Bailyn, who in 1967 brought the republican tradition of J. Harrington and Algernon Sydney into the constitutional discursus.

<sup>37</sup> Of the numerous editions, see for example *The Concessions and Agreements of the Proprietors, Freeholders and Inhabitants of the Province of West New Jersey in America*, in W.A. Whitehead, ed., *Archives of the State of New Jersey*, vol. 1. Documents Relating to the Colonial History, 1631–1687 (Newark, 1880), pp. 241–269, cited below.

<sup>38</sup> Almost twenty most important share-holders and investors in West Jersey had, like W. Penn, an Irish connection, mostly Dublin Quakers (J.E. Pomfret, *The Province of West New Jersey, 1609–1702: A History of the Origins of an American Colony* (Princeton, 1956), p. 285).

<sup>39</sup> Whitehead, ed., *The Concessions and Agreements ... of West New Jersey*, p. 253.

rubric of Christianity, Quaker theorists no longer felt the necessity to limit the freedom of faith nor of its ritual expression. Their text allowed a very open way to God, regardless of its outward expression.

The proto-Constitution of West Jersey served William Penn as a model in his work on another milestone of American constitutionalism, Pennsylvanian constitutions, which in its original form as well as later mutations had similar formulations.<sup>40</sup> The typology of development of early American understanding of tolerance was importantly enriched by another colonial document of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, *New York Charter of Liberties* (1683), which specified a legislation framework for the relationship between men and God. New York began as an atypical colony in British America. By taking over New Netherland (1664), former property of the Dutch West India Company, the English acquired a territory ethnically diverse and religiously heterogeneous, but lacking a developed structure of autonomous local government. English administration built on both elements of Dutch tradition: it adopted the policy of religious broad-mindedness, including tolerance of small Jewish diaspora and even of the activities of the Jesuit order, but it denied New York as the only colony in America the privilege of home rule.<sup>41</sup> Governor Thomas Dongan, himself an Irish Catholic, convened the legislative assembly as late as in 1683, when – in accordance to the Duke’s instructions – he submitted to the demands of revolting merchants and farmers from Long Island, who were encouraged and inspired by the creation of representative governing bodies in their Quaker neighborhoods.<sup>42</sup> Eighteen delegates, both English and Dutch, set out to draw up and pass a legal framework composed in the spirit of Locke’s Restoration liberalism including the principle of religious toleration, blended with the elements of Quaker thought as applied in the Middle colonies.

<sup>40</sup> The first colonial legislative assembly in America was convened by W. Penn. Its members refused the text and after stormy discussions ratified a revised version in the spring of 1683. Penn’s numerous versions of the constitution’s text were published in M.M. Dunn and R.S. Dunn, *The Papers of William Penn*, vol. II (1680–1684) (Philadelphia, 1982), pp. 140–226; see also The Frame of Government of the Province of Pennsylvania and Territories from 1683, in *Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania. Published by State*, vol. I (Philadelphia, 1851), pp. 42–47. On the development of Pennsylvania’s constitution, see for example R.A. Ryerson, ‘William Penn’s Gentry Commonwealth: An Interpretation of the Constitutional History of Early Pennsylvania, 1681–1701’, *Pennsylvania History*, lxi (1994), pp. 393–427.

<sup>41</sup> For early colonial history of New York, see R.C. Ritchie, *The Duke’s Province: A Study of New York Politics and Society* (Chapel Hill, 1977).

<sup>42</sup> Text of the instruction, J. Brodhead and E.B. O’Callaghan, eds., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State New York*, vol. III (New York, 1853), pp. 317–318.

Quaker influence was evident not only in the various ideological borrowings but also in the role of lawyer Thomas Ruyard, co-author of Penn's Constitution and Concessions of West Jersey, in the text of the New York document.<sup>43</sup>

The final document called *Charter of Liberties and Privileges* had already all the elements of a modern constitution.<sup>44</sup> It defined the structure, powers, function and mechanisms of the operation of legislative and judicial institutions. The text also contained a list of civil liberties including devices necessary for their upholding. Article about faith, with which the document closed, was the longest of the 29 sections. In addition to all the usual proclamations of freedom of all Christian professions and ban on all kinds of persecution for doctrine or rite, it featured a fundamental innovation, one that probably challenged the legal craftsmanship of the legislators the most. This detailed regulation enabled any Christian faith, even Catholics, to set themselves up as a state church in particular localities: if two thirds of the voters in the community passed a tax for the support and maintenance of the local congregation, this duty was binding for all the citizens, including dissenters. If the minority believers wished to employ their own clergy and ensure the performance of their own religious rites, they were required to cover any additional private expenses, which were not covered by the majority tax.<sup>45</sup> This conception of religious coexistence makes it clear that its authors anticipated that different churches would be established (and supported from public taxes) in different parts of province. In practice, these most often turned out to be ethnic denominations: Anglicans, Congregationalists (Puritans), Presbyterians, Baptists, the Dutch Reformed, Huguenots and Lutherans, and (only rarely) Catholics.<sup>46</sup> Thus originated a unique model, which disappeared hundred years later along with the British rule over the thirteen colonies. The model, however, remained, in a modified version of the original, in colonial Canada.

<sup>43</sup> More details in D.S. Lovejoy, 'Equality and Empire: The New York Charter of Liberties, 1683', *William and Mary Quarterly*, xxi (1964), no. 3, pp. 493–515.

<sup>44</sup> Text of the document first published in J. Brodhead and E.B. O'Callaghan, eds., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State New York*, vol. III (New York, 1853), pp. 111–116; recently with the commentary of John Murrin in: S.L. Schechter, ed., *Roots of the Republic. American Founding Documents Interpreted* (Madison, 1990), pp. 66–82, from which I cite below.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 81–82.

<sup>46</sup> For an excellent discussion of the religious and ethnic heterogeneity of colonial New York and its far-reaching consequences for the birth of modern political pluralism, see P.U. Bonomi, *Factional People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York* (New York – London, 1971).

The efforts of New Yorkers toward political emancipation were put on hold after the death of Charles II. However, the short-lived Jacobean attack on the municipal institutions in British America did not thwart the common trend toward religious toleration as a basic civic liberty, tested by everyday practice. The claim that this phenomenon was exclusively the product of home environment, that in America this shift of faith to the private sphere was the result of natural conditions and of constant shortage of labor, is not entirely valid. The conditions in mother country were equally important in the definition of who constituted an opponent or enemy agent. The colonies suffered the most as a result of forceful transgressions against the spirit of tolerance especially in the period of religious wars in England, as it was evident from armed conflicts in Maryland, the governance of Puritan minorities in Chesapeake or persecution of Baptists, executions of Quakers, the “heresy” trial of William Pynchon<sup>47</sup> and short term legal persecution of dissenters in Massachusetts. The politics of general reconciliation of the returning Stuart dynasty after 1660 brought the need for religious coexistence into the colonies as well, even into communities that already possessed a rigorously defined religious identity.

Although Quakers came to America with the vision of the New World, a vision no less ardent than that of the Puritans half a century before them, it was their colony which became the model of tolerance from conviction, which fundamentally shaped the attitude of the society in favor of plurality of faiths. Also, due to their example, freedom of religion became a natural part of colonial life in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, so much so, in fact, that revolutionary leaders, who in the summer of 1787 came together to write the Federal Constitution of the Union, did not even think it necessary to include a mention of this civic liberty into its body.

<sup>47</sup> See P.F. Gura, ‘„The Contagion of Corrupt Opinions“ in Puritan Massachusetts: The Case of William Pynchon’, *William and Mary Quarterly*, xxxix (1982), no. 3, pp. 469–491; M.P. Winship, ‘Contesting Control of Orthodoxy among the Godly: William Pynchon Reexamined’, *William and Mary Quarterly*, liv (1997), no. 4, pp. 795–822.



## INDEX

- A**
- Edmund of **Abingdon** 58  
Abov (Abaúj) 85  
St Adalbert 17  
Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pius II)  
26, 64-66, 78, 79, 82, 94  
Albert (Albrecht) of Habsburg 78-79,  
82  
Benedict **Anderson** 125, 134  
Anselm of Canterbury 26  
America 174, 209, 210, 212-215, 218,  
224, 225, 227  
Arminius 132, 133, 191, 192, 196  
Arnulf, East Frankish king 23  
Thomas **Arundel** 62  
Margaret **Aston** 60  
Augsburg 132  
Avignon 41
- B**
- John **Ball** 41, 42, 44, 46  
Bánská Štiavnica (Selmecebánya) 85  
Bardejov (Bártfa) 85  
Edward **Barton** 89  
Basel 50, 52, 95, 136  
Bath and Wells, diocese 53, 54  
Bavorov 103  
Henry **Beaufort** 51  
Thomas **Becket** of Canterbury 58  
Venerable **Bede** 11, 61  
Belgium 35  
Belgrade 78, 88  
Belorussia 169  
Charles **Bémont** 71  
John **Berkeley** 223  
Bernhard of Weimar-Saxony 192,  
196  
Werner **Besch** 136  
Bethlehem 123  
Bethlehem chapel, Prague 14, 158  
Black Prince, Edward, Prince of  
Wales 186-188, 196  
Jan **Blahoslav** 163, 176  
Lenka **Bobková** 69  
Bohemia 7, 10, 15-21, 23-26, 28-34,  
36, 37, 48, 50-52, 61, 63-65, 67,  
68, 70-72, 78, 82, 89, 91-93, 95,  
97-99, 101, 104, 107, 108-111,  
114-122, 139-141, 143, 146-148,  
151-153, 155-160, 162-168, 170,  
173-177, 181, 182, 184, 187, 191,  
209, 220  
Boleslav I of Bohemia, duke 29  
Bolesław I of Poland, duke 22, 29  
Katharina von **Bora** 123  
Borovany 97, 107  
Boston 213, 216, 218, 221  
Brandenburg 19, 27, 176, 187  
George **Branković** 81  
Sebastian **Brant** 126  
Bratislava (Pozsony) 87, 202  
Timothy **Breen** 213  
Bremen 176  
Fridrich **Bridel** 28  
Bristol 52-54  
Broumov (Braunau) 174  
Brunčvík 20, 21, 34  
Ferdinand **Brunot** 170

- Brunswick 176  
 Břetislav I, duke 20, 28, 30  
 Břetislav II, duke 21  
 Lawrence of **Březová** 64-66, 72  
 Nicholas **Bubwith** 53, 54  
 Buda 79, 118, 119  
 Václav **Budovec** 175  
 Bulgaria 18  
 Peter **Burke** 155
- C**
- Cadiz 189  
 Calgary 71  
 Cecil **Calvert** 219  
 George **Calvert** 219  
 Cambridge 46  
 Cambridgeshire 46  
 Cana 59  
 Canada 226  
 Canterbury 41, 42, 44  
 Thomas Becket of **Canterbury** 58  
 Ján **Čapek** of Sány 83  
 John of **Capistrano** 95  
 Johann **Carion** 129  
 Carniola 18  
 Carolina 212, 222, 223  
 George **Carteret** 223  
 Casimir of Poland, king 81  
 Eliáš **Čech** 102  
 Forefather **Čech** 18  
 Conrad **Celtis** 126  
 Giuliano **Cesarini** 80  
 České Budějovice 92, 102, 103, 106-110  
 Český Krumlov 93, 94, 96, 97, 100, 106-108, 110, 111
- Charles I, king of England 189, 212, 219  
 Charles II, king of England 227  
 Charles IV, emperor and king of Bohemia 14, 15, 17-19, 23, 24, 27, 30, 33, 69, 157, 162, 166  
 Charles V, emperor 132, 133  
 Petr **Chelčický** 98  
 Richard of **Chichester** 58  
 Martin **Chladný** 204  
 Chomutov (Komotau) 140-142  
 Choustník 98, 101  
 Chvalšiny 103, 108  
 Ulrich **Cilli** 81  
 Johannes **Clajus** 136  
 St Clement 23  
 Coburg 203  
 Leonhard **Colonna** von Fels 150  
 Cologne (Köln) 187  
 John **Comenius** (Jan Amos Komenský) 195  
 Constance (Konstanz) 50, 71, 157  
 Constantinople 81, 89  
 Anthony Ashley **Cooper**, Earl of Shaftesbury 222  
 Copenhagen 168  
 Matthias **Corvinus** 81, 83, 121  
 Cosmas of Prague 10, 18, 19, 25, 29, 30  
 Cracow (Kraków) 29, 79, 84  
 Lucas **Cranach** 123, 137  
 Cressy 31, 32  
 Croatia 17, 18, 36  
 Hartmuth von **Cronberg** 133  
 Nicholas of **Cusa** 126  
 St Cyril 23, 157

- D**
- Mikuláš **Dačický** z Heslova 174  
 Dalmatia 17  
 Dalimil 9-21, 24-34, 142, 157, 158, 175  
 Zdeněk **David** 165  
 Ernest **Denis** 156  
 Denmark 14, 19, 168, 176  
 Franz **Dietrichstein** 163  
 Josef **Dobrovský** 34  
 Dolní Dvořiště 108  
 Thomas **Dongan** 225  
 Roger **Doucet** 71  
 Dover 52  
 Dráchov 104  
 Dresden 150, 158  
 Dubrovnik 77  
 Oldřich of **Dvorec** 97
- E**
- Edward I 10, 43, 187, 188, 190  
 Edward, Prince of Wales, Black Prince 186-188, 196  
 Eger (Cheb) 165  
 Elbogen (Loket) 165  
 Elizabeth I 184, 189  
 Elizabeth of Luxemburg 78-82, 84  
 Elizabeth Přemyslid 17  
 Elizabeth Stuart 185, 186, 188  
 England 10, 11, 15, 31, 32, 37, 38, 40, 44, 46, 48, 49, 52, 55, 57, 61, 123, 170-172, 183, 184, 186-188, 190, 191, 196, 212, 216, 218, 219, 227  
 Essex 44, 184, 189  
 Esztergom 79
- F**
- Stephan **Fekete** 204  
 Paul **Felgenhauer** 196  
 Ferdinand I of Habsburg 120, 132, 162  
 Joachim of **Fiore** 192  
 Quentin **Folkhyrd** 50  
 France 35, 36, 39, 49, 60, 126, 170, 171, 187  
 Sebastian **Frank** 138  
 Frankonia 211  
 Frederick I Barbarossa 192, 195, 196  
 Frederick II 192, 193  
 Frederick III of Habsburg 80  
 Frederick, Elector Palatine 183-196  
 Johannes **Freinsheim** 192  
 Friedrich III, emperor 121  
 Friedrich the Great 137  
 Friedrich the Wise, Elector of Saxony 132
- G**
- John of **Gaunt**, duke of Lancaster 41, 42  
 Ernest **Gellner** 10, 125  
 Gemer (Gömör) 85  
 Georg von Anhalt 132  
 Gniezno (Gnesen) 17  
 Görlitz 204  
 František **Graus** 14  
 Liah **Greenfeld** 10-13  
 Jakob **Grimm** 135  
 Gustavus Adolphus 193, 195, 196
- H**
- Halle 207



Adrian **Hastings** 11, 12, 15, 26  
 Michael **Hechter** 12  
 Gregor **Heimburg** 126  
 Henry Frederick 190  
 Henry II, emperor 20  
 Henry IV, king of France 190, 195  
 Henry V, king of England 49  
 Henry VIII, king of England 172  
 Johann Gottfried **Herder** 9, 137, 138  
 Hertfordshire 45  
 Johann Gottlieb **Heynig** 124  
 Hluboká nad Vltavou 97  
 Matthias **Hoe** 150  
 Constantin **Höfler** 66, 75  
 Holstein 176  
 Holy Trinity 220  
 Petr **Hora-Hořejš** 74  
 Horní Stropnice 108  
 Hořice 103, 108  
**Hrob** (Klostergab) 174  
 Řehoř **Hrubý** z Jelení 163  
 Anne **Hudson** 50, 52  
 Hungary 17, 28, 30-32, 77-83, 85, 88-90, 119, 176, 199-207  
 John **Hunyadi** 77, 80, 81, 83, 86, 87  
 Ladislav **Hunyadi** 81, 87  
 Jan **Hus** (John Huss) 9, 14, 40, 50, 65-71, 73-75, 157, 158, 167, 176  
 Husz (Huszvárosa) 89  
 Ulrich von **Hutten** 69, 126, 192

**I**

Matthias Flacius **Illyricus** 128  
 Ireland 7, 173, 174

**J**

Jacob **Jakobaeus** 200  
 Roman **Jakobson** 157  
 James I, king of England 184, 188, 190, 191  
 Jamestown 222  
 Matthias of **Janov** 16, 26  
 Jaromír, duke 29  
 Jerome of Prague 50, 71  
 Jeromosfalva 88  
 Jan of **Jesenice** 94  
 Jesus Christ 50, 59, 196, 218, 220  
 Pavel **Ješín** of Bezdězí 142, 175, 176  
 Jindřichův Hradec 97, 101, 102, 111  
 Jan **Jiskra** 77-87, 90  
 St John the Evangelist 18, 29  
 St John the Baptist 123

**K**

Kájov 102, 108, 109  
 Howard **Kaminsky** 75  
 Johannes **Kärcher** 196  
 Kent 44, 46  
 Norbert **Kersken** 14  
 Kežmarok (Késmárk) 85  
 Kiev 169  
 Kilkenny 173  
 Přibík of **Klenová** 105  
 Pavel Kristián of **Koldín** 160  
 Ján **Kollár** 13  
 John Comenius (Jan Amos **Komenský**) 195  
 Mikuláš **Konáč** z Hodiškova 163  
 Václav **Koranda** Jr 161  
 Kőszeg (Güns) 204  
 Košice (Kassa) 84, 85

Christoph **Kotter** 195  
Kovářov 98  
Václav Matěj **Kramerius** 34  
Pavel of **Kravaře** 51  
Kremnica (Körmöcbánya) 84, 85  
Kuklov (Kugelweit) 107, 108  
Kutná Hora 64, 66, 68, 69, 73, 91,  
98, 116, 119, 120, 122, 158

## L

Laa 32  
Ladislav V (the Posthumous), king of  
Hungary and Bohemia 79-82, 54,  
85, 90  
Karl **Lamberg** 164, 166  
Lauenburg 176  
Gottfried Wilhelm **Leibniz** 137  
Leipzig 129  
Leopold of Austria 32  
Cyprian **Leowitz** 129  
Gotthold Ephraim **Lessing** 137  
Lewis the Great, king of France 30  
Libuše (Libussa) 17, 21  
Lincoln 52  
Hugh of **Lincoln** 58  
Peter of **Linda** 107  
Lipany 82  
Lithuania 169  
Litoměřice 175  
Hilarius **Litoměřický** 95  
Litomyšl 102  
Jiří Popel of **Lobkovice** 141  
Loděnice 28  
Lomnice nad Lužnicí 103  
London 10, 38, 41, 43-46, 49, 52,  
57, 186, 191, 213, 220  
Long Island 225

Johann **Loserth** 68  
Lublin 169  
Lüneburg 176  
Lusatia 19, 145, 165, 176, 202  
Martin **Luther** 69, 123-125, 127-  
138, 167  
Lutterworth 55  
John of **Luxemburg** 17, 24

## M

Jacob de la **Marchia** 88  
Maryland 211, 212, 218-221, 224,  
227  
Massachusetts 213, 214, 216, 218,  
221, 227  
Frank **Matko** 77  
St Matthew 56  
Maximilian I, emperor 113, 117, 127  
Maximilian II, emperor 148, 162  
Mayence (Mainz) 24, 187  
Mecklenburg 176  
Marie de **Medici** 196  
Friedrich **Meinecke** 125  
Andreas **Meinhardi** 123  
Meissen 19, 176  
Philipp **Melanchthon** 124, 128-130,  
132, 135  
St Methodius 23, 157  
Middlesex 45  
Mieszko I, duke 22, 29, 30  
Milan (Milano) 32  
Mirovice 98, 105  
Peter of **Mladoňovice** 67  
Mikuláš **Mníšek** 94  
John **Moderer** 85  
Moldavia 88 89  
Amedeo **Molnár** 36

Charles **Montesquieu** 224  
Montpellier 51  
Moravia 19, 22-24, 72, 117-119,  
121, 122, 152, 153, 159, 160,  
163, 164, 207  
Greater **Moravia** 17, 23, 24  
Christina **More** 53  
Edmund **Morgan** 213  
Fynes **Moryson** 174  
Mühlviertel 92  
Ralph **Mungyn** 51  
Murad II, sultan 81

## N

Naples (Napoli) 31, 201, 206  
Nedvědice 100  
Nejsa 28  
Neklan 29  
Netherlands 35, 47, 147  
Netolice 107, 111  
Thomas **Netter** 54, 58  
New England 210-213, 215, 216,  
221  
New Jersey 211, 212, 223-226  
New Netherland 211, 223, 225  
New York 211, 225, 226  
Nitra (Nyitra) 85  
Norfolk 45, 51  
Norwich 46, 52  
Nová Baňa (Újbánya) 85  
Nová Bystřice 107  
Nové Hrady 92

## O

John **Oldcastle**, lord of Cobham 48-  
50, 54, 55

Abraham **Ortelius** 130  
Lukas **Osiander** 129  
Otto, abbot of Zbraslav 25  
Oxford 7, 40, 47, 49, 50, 54, 64

## P

František **Palacký** 14, 72, 73, 75, 84,  
86, 158  
Simeon **Partlicius** 196  
Peter **Payne** 50, 88  
Henry **Peacham** 190, 191  
Josef **Pekař** 73, 152  
William **Penn** 224-226  
Pennsylvania 211, 212, 225  
Vilém of **Pernštejn** 113, 115, 116,  
118, 121, 122  
Peter, Spanish king 187, 188  
Philip Sidney, Earl of Essex 184  
Aeneas Sylvius **Piccolomini** (Pius II)  
26, 64-66, 78, 79, 82, 92  
Zikmund **Pirchan** 95, 163  
Václav Hladič **Písecký** 163  
Aeneas Sylvius (**Pius II**) 26, 64-66,  
78, 79, 82, 92  
Jiří of **Poděbrady** 95, 96, 101  
Poland 23, 24, 36, 79, 81, 82, 90,  
168, 177  
Prague (Praha) 14, 17, 19, 21-23,  
25, 26, 30, 49-51, 64-73, 88, 95,  
96, 104, 142, 144-150, 152, 155,  
157, 158, 161, 162, 167, 174,  
181, 201  
Cosmas of **Prague** 10, 18, 19, 25,  
29, 30  
Prachatice 92, 105  
Albert **Pražák** 156, 157  
Prešov (Eperjes) 85

Prokop the Bald 78  
Prokopfalva 88  
St Procopius 17, 23, 26, 27, 30  
Prussia 51, 199  
Přední Výtoň 108  
Tůma of **Přelouč** 121  
Přemysl Otakar II, king of Bohemia  
27, 32  
Příběnice 92  
Ondřej **Puklice** of Vzduhy 102, 103  
Přibík **Pulkava** of Radeníň 9, 12, 14-  
25, 27-34  
William **Pynchon** 227

## R

Jan of **Rabštejn** 95, 96, 101  
Přibík Pulkava of **Radenín** 9, 12, 14-  
25, 27-34  
Walter **Raleigh** 184  
Leopold von **Ranke** 137  
Hastings **Rashdall** 69, 70  
Mikuláš of **Řebříky** 95  
Nicholas von **Redwitz** 77  
Miloslav **Rehcígl** 27  
Wolfgang **Reinhard** 130  
Johann **Reuchlin** 127  
Susan **Reynolds** 10  
Richard II, king of England 41, 44,  
45  
Rimavská Sobota (Rimaszombat) 85,  
86  
Robert, Palsgrave 186-190  
Jan of **Rokycany** 104  
Jan of **Roupov** 166  
Václav Vilém of **Roupov** 175  
Rožmberk, family or property 92-  
102, 106-110

Jan of **Rožmberk** 95, 96, 98, 101  
Jošt of **Rožmberk** 95, 96  
Oldřich of **Rožmberk** 94, 95, 100,  
107, 110  
Petr of **Rožmberk** 96  
Rudolf I of Habsburg 32  
Rudolf II of Habsburg 140, 162, 175  
Thomas **Rudyard** 226

## S

Salisbury (Salusbury) 54, 59  
Johann **Sandel** 140  
Šariš (Sáros) 79, 84, 85  
Saxony 132, 136, 150, 176, 187, 192  
Sázava 17, 23, 26, 30  
Filipo **Scolari** (Pipó Ozorai) 77  
Scotland 42, 49, 51  
Regius **Selinus** 133  
Johannes **Seussius** 150  
Johannes **Schedel** 32  
Joachim Andreas **Schlick** 150  
Georg **Schmidt** 124  
Sigismund of Luxemburg 65, 68, 77,  
78, 82, 95, 110, 127, 193  
Silesia 96, 145, 165, 176, 195, 201,  
204  
Slovakia 36, 77, 79, 84, 85, 87, 90,  
199  
Slovenia 36  
Ján **Šmikovský** 82  
Adam **Smith** 215  
Anthony **Smith** 10-12, 16, 131  
Wentworth **Smith** 186  
Soběslav, town 92, 97, 101, 102,  
104, 105, 108  
Soběslav I, duke 17  
Soběslav II, duke 27, 28

Josef **Špirko** 86  
Spiš (the Szepesség) 84, 85  
Spytihněv, duke 25, 27  
Zdeněk of **Šternberk** 96, 101, 110  
Alfons **Stillfried** 31  
Tomáš **Štítný** (Tomáš of Štítné) 28,  
33, 34  
Strakonice 92, 95, 101, 106  
Pavel **Stránský** 141, 142, 147, 175,  
176  
Stojmír 31  
Elizabeth **Stuart** 184-186, 188, 190  
Henry **Stuart** 184-190, 196  
Charles **Stuart** 185  
James **Stuart**, duke of York 223  
Styria 18, 166  
Simon **Sudbury** 41  
Suffolk 45, 51  
Suchdol nad Lužnicí 403-105, 108  
Hynek Krušina of **Švamberk** 99, 100  
Josef **Svátek** 156  
Svatopluk 23, 24, 28, 29  
Székesfehérvár 79  
Szerém 88  
Michael **Szilágyi** 83

## T

Tábor 36, 51, 92-94, 100, 101  
Tacitus 126, 133, 191  
Jovan **Tallóci** 77  
Edith **Tatnall** 60  
William **Taylor** 62  
Johann **Tetzel** 132  
Imre **Thököli** 203  
William **Thorpe** 62  
Pál **Tóth**-Szabó 86  
Juraj **Tranovský** 200

Transylvania 36, 80, 202  
Matthew of **Trencsény** 30  
Trenčín (Trencsén) 85, 200  
Trhové Sviny 92, 94, 108  
Trier 187  
Třeboň 95, 101  
Wat **Tyler** 39, 44, 45

## U

Udalrich (Oldřich), duke 22  
Ukraine 169

## V

Voksa of **Valdštejn** 50  
Blanche of **Valois** 15  
Anthonis **Van Dyck** 189  
Varna 80  
Čeněk of **Vartenberk** 93  
Adam of **Veleslavín** 116  
Veselí nad Lužnicí 94  
Anežka **Vidmanová** 33  
Villers-Cotterêts 170, 171, 172  
Vincentius, chronicler 32  
Virgin Mary 34, 106, 123, 146, 220  
Virginia 212, 218, 219, 221  
Visegrád 79  
Václav **Višně** of Větrní 94  
Vladislav II, duke and king of  
Bohemia 32  
Vladislav Jagiello, king of Bohemia  
116, 121  
Mikuláš of **Vlásenice** 98, 99  
Vlastislav 29  
Jan **Vodňanský** 98, 99  
Vojvodina 88  
Volhynia 169

Volyně, town 105  
Vratislav II, duke and king of  
Bohemia 21, 24  
Jan **Vršovec** 28  
Viktorin Kornel of **Všehrady** 28, 158,  
162, 163, 168  
Vyšší Brod 95

## W

Wallachia 81  
William **Walworth** 44, 45  
Bath and **Wells**, diocese 53, 54  
Wenceslas I, king of Bohemia 22, 28,  
30  
Wenceslas II, king of Bohemia 23,  
25  
Wenceslas IV, emperor and king of  
Bohemia 65, 67, 68, 166  
St Wenceslas 17, 31  
György **Wesseléni** 200  
West Jersey 212, 224-226  
Westphalia 219  
William **White** 51  
Johann der **Wieck** 127  
Wilhelm II, emperor 137  
George **Wilson** 222  
Jacob **Wimpfeling** 126, 127  
Zikmund **Winter** 156  
John **Winthrop** 213, 214

Wittenberg 123, 124, 134, 135, 137,  
202

Wladislas (III), king of Poland and  
(I) king of Hungary 79, 80, 82,  
84, 86, 90

Worms 125, 132, 134

Wrocław (Breslau, Vratislav) 95,  
121, 147

John **Wyclif** (Wycliffe) 35, 37, 40,  
41, 46-50, 54-61, 64, 65, 68, 69,  
73, 171

Richard **Wyche** 50, 62

James **Wylie** 70

## Y

York 59, 223

## Z

Vilém **Zajíc** 29

Žatec 36

Heinz **Zatschek** 67, 75

Zelená Hora 96, 101

Karel **Žerotín** 164, 176

Julius Wilhelm **Zincgref** 194

Peter of **Zittau** 19, 23, 25, 30

John **Žižka** (Jan Žižka) 69, 78

Zlatá Koruna 92, 106

Zvolen (Zólyom) 79, 84, 85

Matthew of **Zvolen** 48

**CONFESSION AND NATION IN THE ERA  
OF REFORMATIONS**  
**Central Europe in Comparative Perspective**

Edited by Eva Doležalová and Jaroslav Pánek

Translation of Czech texts into English by Marcela K. Perett

Cover: A carriage pulled by two horse-teams to opposite sides, symbolising Bohemia torn apart by different religions; a cutout from the map of Bohemia (1518) by Nicolaus Claudianus (Bishopric of Litoměřice collections)

Back cover: The map of Bohemia (1518) by Nicolaus Claudianus (Bishopric of Litoměřice collections)

Institute of History  
Prague 2011

ISBN 978-80-7286-180-4





